# A Comparison of Charlotte Danielson's and Kim Marshall's Rubrics

February 2, 2012

Below is a comparison of the Level 3 (Effective/Proficient) elements in Kim Marshall's Teacher Evaluation Rubrics and Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching. On the left are Marshall's domains and elements, followed by the corresponding numbers and letters of Danielson's. This comparison does not cover differences and similarities at the other three performance levels.

# A. Planning and Preparation for Learning

- a. Knowledge 1a1, 1b1, 1b2
- b. Standards 1c1, 1e1
- c. Units 1a2, 1a3, 1e4
- d. Assessments 1f2, 1f3
- e. Anticipation -
- f. Lessons 1c2
- g. Engagement 1b4, 1e2
- h. Materials 1b4, 1d1, 1d2, 1d3, 1e2
- i. Differentiation 1c3, 1c4, 1e1
- j. Environment 2e1, 2e2

## **B.** Classroom Management

- a. Expectations 2b2, 2d1
- b. Relationships 2a1
- c. Respect 2a1, 2e1
- d. Social-emotional 2a2
- e. Routines -2c3
- f. Responsibility 2c1
- g. Repertoire 2d3
- h. Efficiency 2c2, 2c4, 3c4
- i. Prevention 2d2
- j. Incentives -

#### C. Delivery of Instruction

- a. Expectations 2b1, 2b2, 2b3
- b. Mindset -
- c. Goals 3a1, 3d1
- d. Connections 3a3
- e. Clarity 3a2, 3a4
- f. Repertoire 2c1, 3c2, 3c3
- g. Engagement 3b1, 3b2, 3b3, 3c1
- h. Differentiation –1b5, 1e3, 3e2
- i. Nimbleness 3e1
- j. Application -

# D. Monitoring, Assessment, and Follow-Up

- a. Criteria -
- b. Diagnosis 1b3, 1c4, 1f4
- c. On-the-spot 1f1, 3d2, 3d3
- d. Self-assessment 3d4
- e. Recognition -
- f. Interims 4d2
- g. Tenacity 3e3, 4f2, 4f3
- h. Support -4f2, 4f3
- i. Analysis 4a1, 4d2
- j. Reflection -4a2, 4d2

## E. Family and Community Outreach

- a. Respect 4c2
- b. Belief -
- c. Expectations 4c1
- d. Communication 4c2
- e. Involving -4c1, 4c3
- f. Homework -
- g. Responsiveness 4c2
- h. Reporting -
- i. Outreach 4c3
- j. Resources 2c5

### F. Professional Responsibilities

- a. Attendance -
- b. Language 3a4
- c. Reliability 4b1, 4b2, 4b3
- d. Professionalism 4f1
- e. Judgment 4f5
- f. Above-and-beyond 4d3, 4d4
- g. Leadership 4d3, 4d4, 4e3
- h. Openness  $-4e^2$ , 4f4
- i. Collaboration 4d1, 4f4
- i. Growth 4e1

Here are some interesting comparisons between the two rubrics:

- In overall content, they are very similar, but their organization and structure differ significantly.
- Danielson's rubrics have four domains, Marshall's six; 76 elements versus 60; 25 pages versus six.
- Many of Danielson's element descriptions contain considerably more detail than Marshall's.
- A number of single elements in Marshall's rubrics have two, three or four elements in Danielson's.
- Marshall's rubrics contain all of Danielson's elements, but Danielson's don't have ten of Marshall's.