**Quality of Feedback**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | JUDGES | INFORMS | GUIDES | SUPPORTS IMPROVEMENT |
| Content, focus, timing, and effect of feedback provided | Feedback, if provided, is vague and condemning.  Is unrelated to quality practice  Focuses one valuation rather than potential for improvement  Is presented after an event is complete with not expectation of or provision for application in order to improve practice  Takes authority over and responsibility over an responsibly for improving work away from the teachers | Feedback, when provided, is general and negative.  Addresses only the least important aspects of quality  Focuses on weaknesses in teaching practices  Is timed so that it can be used to revisit event in the hope that what is learned will influence future improvements to similar practice  Takes authority away from the teacher | Feedback, when provided is specific and encouraging.  Addresses various aspects of quality without regard to priority  Focuses on both strengths and weaknesses in the mentee’s practice  Is timed so it can be used to make revisions that result in one or more specific improvements in a mentee’s practice  Allows the mentee to maintain authority over improving practice and work | Feedback is provided and is descriptive, respectful, and purposeful.  Emphasizes the most important aspects of quality work  Describes specific strengths and needs related to mentee’s practice  Is timed to support a series of reflections and revisions that can cause ongoing improvements to overall mentee practice  Enables the mentee to maintain authority over responsibility for improved practice and work |
| Support for Attributes of quality practice | Administrators confusion about attributes of quality practice prevents feedback from having a positive influence on practice  Recommendations for revisions include errors in labels, misrepresentation of uses, and/or misunderstandings of purpose and audience for tools reviewed  Presents own views or commentary on ‘best practices’ own curriculum, instruction, or assessment as fact, closing the door on further discourse | Administrators limited understanding of quality practice creates a disconnect between feedback and improved practice  Focuses on refinements that maximize the generic of certain assessment tools or maximize alignment currently used standardized measures  Prompts questions related to basic comprehension of attributes of quality practice | Administrators understanding of quality practice guides the feedback and direction of revision  Encourages refinements that support clarity, specificity, and students use of assessment tools (checklists, rubrics, criteria charts, etc.) and strategies  Promotes deeper understanding of quality attributes of curriculum, instruction, and assessment | Administrators references to an existing, shared understanding of quality practice clearly connects the feedback to relevant and meaningful improvements  Supports revisions of curriculum, instruction and assessment strategies and tools to promote alignment, coherence, and integration  Provides motivation for continued for continued inquiry around curriculum, instruction and assessment. |