### Framework for Assessing Teacher Collaboration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Principles</th>
<th>Evidence of Strong Implementation</th>
<th>Evidence of Weak Implementation</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Sufficient time is provided for teachers to discuss student learning needs and share, review, and provide feedback on instructional practices that address these needs | • Master schedule thoughtfully designed to provide targeted opportunities for collaboration amongst teachers  
• Collaboration meetings are at least 45 minutes long  
• Collaboration meetings are sacred, uninterrupted, and start on time | • Teacher schedules are not aligned to allow for regular meetings  
• Meetings are sporadic and less than 45 minutes long  
• Collaboration meetings are often skipped, interrupted or otherwise not taken seriously | Weak — Strong |

| **Content**    |                                   |                                 |            |
| Collaboration meetings are a mechanism for teachers to improve instruction and build expertise | • Team members strategize and discuss effective instructional practices and brainstorm ways to refine practice  
• Student-level data is used to drive collaboration and action  
• Team members routinely analyze student work and teacher assignments to gauge instructional effectiveness  
• Team members observe and learn from model lessons | • No common instructional practices are identified to drive collaboration  
• Student-level data is rarely reviewed  
• Discussion of student behavior management, logistics, or school “housekeeping” issues take center stage | Weak — Strong |
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| **Leadership and Support** | District and school leadership see collaboration as primary vehicle for improving instruction and student performance | • Administrators and coaches actively participate in and support collaboration meetings, providing guidance and feedback as necessary  
• Principal, other school leaders and teachers share common understanding of what collaboration means and entails  
• Teams are provided with the necessary material support, training, and assistance to help collaborative meetings succeed | • Principals and other school leaders have little involvement in meetings or follow-up  
• Members do not exhibit common understanding of purpose of collaborative teams  
• Teams do not have access to reference materials, consultants, etc. needed to build expertise or collaborative skills | Weak → Strong |
| **Structure** | Collaboration meetings are part of a coherent school improvement plan and are structured with clearly mapped goals and objectives | • Thought is given to who should comprise each team, offering opportunities for vertical and horizontal teaming when possible  
• All teams exhibit coherence in their focus on the same issues and content connected to instructional improvement  
• Teams have established structured operating principles with well-defined roles and responsibilities  
• Effective meeting management strategies (e.g. agendas, minutes, action items, etc.) are routinely used  
• Teams report progress publicly by distributing minutes/agendas | • Teams are hastily or haphazardly formed with insufficient thought given to whom should participate  
• There is no coherent plan for what teachers are trying to accomplish  
• Meetings are unstructured, with ill- or undefined roles for participants and lacking established norms for participation | Weak → Strong |

Notes: