

Observation Form 2016-17

	1	2	3	4	Score/Level
<p>PLANNING-1 How well did the candidate prepare for the lesson?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No lesson plan was evident, did not follow the lesson plan. • Candidate was not prepared for the lesson. • Could not continue the lesson due to technology or other preparation issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lesson plan, with handouts, submitted 24 hours in advance. • Technology was working (had been tested before the lesson). • Activities, reading, and/or projects had been completed by the candidate before the lesson to ensure they would work. • Materials were out and ready to use. 	<p>(Met Level 2 AND)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lesson was related to what came before and after or fit into the unit plan. • Candidate was able to alter course if lesson not going as planned. (Had a "Plan B") Lesson was connected to prior learning or personal /community/cultural assets. • Lesson plan had teaching steps/questions/examples clearly written out (Could you teach this lesson from this plan?). 	<p>(Met Level 3 AND)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lesson was tiered for various student needs. • "Higher level" questions were written out ahead of time. • Candidate collaborated with school resources/people to plan lessons to support learners with special needs. 	
Evidence:					
<p>PLANNING-2 What were the instructional objectives for the lesson?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lesson objectives were not aligned with CCSS/State or National Standards. • Objectives were not focused on student learning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objectives aligned with CCSS/State or National Standards. • Objectives for the lesson were specific as to what will be learned or accomplished through the activity. 	<p>(Met Level 2 AND)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instructional objectives were posted in the room in student friendly language. • Instructional objectives were referenced at the beginning of the lesson. 	<p>(Met Level 3 AND)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learners shared the instructional objectives in their own words. • Instructional objectives were reviewed by candidate and students at the end of the lesson. • Students made connections between their own learning and the lesson objective. 	
Evidence:					

	1	2	3	4	Score/Level
INSTRUCTION-1 How did the candidate demonstrate understanding in the content area?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidate used vague ideas and facts to teach a lesson. • Misinformation was provided. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidate primarily used resources from the CT or the curriculum guide or textbook. • The lesson focused on a single piece of the content, but did not make connections for content's related "big ideas." 	(Met Level 2 AND) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lesson included examples or applications of the content's "big ideas". • Candidate related the learning from the lesson to the content's wider essential understandings. 	(Met Level 3 AND) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidate used resources from a variety of research-based sources, connected the content to current issues. • Candidates clearly demonstrated content understanding beyond the lesson (real world connections, realia, higher level questions that engaged advanced students) 	
	Evidence:				
INSTRUCTION-2 How did the candidate open the lesson?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidate jumped right into the reading, activity, or lesson without catching the learners' attention. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidate began the lesson with an introduction (hook) that introduced learners to the objective. 	(Met level 2 AND) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The hook connected the lesson to prior knowledge, OR to learners' cultural or familial backgrounds. 	(Met Level 3 AND) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidate elicited and built upon student responses to promote thinking and application. • The lesson hook incorporated literature, music, art, realia, video or a related problem to solve. 	
	Evidence:				
INSTRUCTION-3 <i>What kind of questions did the candidate ask and how did they engage learners?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidate did NOT ask questions to engage learners. • Interaction was candidate to student only (lecture/teacher talk) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidate asked closed ended questions (yes or no, right or wrong) only. • There was minimal student-student interaction. • Questions were written in the lesson plan. 	(Met Level 2 AND) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidate's questions elicited students' thinking or explanations over proscribed (right) answers. • Learners were encouraged to provide examples/evidence in answers to questions. • Posed questions were planned to allow participation of all learners in the class. 	(Met Level 3 AND) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learners built on each other's answers and asked questions that led the instruction. • Prompts and questions required learners to elaborate and work with others to clarify and strengthen their responses. 	
	Evidence:				

	1	2	3	4	Score/Level
	Evidence:				
INSTRUCTION-4 Were learners engaged during the lesson?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lesson primarily focused on rote learning or repeating. Learners did no analyzing or questioning. Main focus of the lesson was for students to get information from a lecture, reading a chapter, or viewing a video. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lesson included some opportunity for pair or group work. Learners were participating in activities independently (passively). Lesson included minimal time for learners to share their thinking. 	(Met Level 2 AND) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Much of the lesson was student-to-student talk rather than candidate-to-student. Learners were actively engaged in activities and asking probing questions. 	(Met Level 3 AND) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Learners were creating, synthesizing and/or applying ideas and thinking based on lesson. Learners demonstrated self-directed learning with clear focus on content. 	
	Evidence:				
INSTRUCTION-5 What supports were given for targeted learners , e.g., learners with IEP, 504 and ELL learners?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No evidence of supports aligned with learning objectives. No planning for supports. Candidate did not take responsibility for targeted learning and listed only general supports (extended time, working with a group, instructional assistant). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports were planned, but loosely tied to learning objectives (could be used for any lesson). Supports are outside the classroom and carried out by someone other than the candidate. Targeted learners are identified in the lesson plan or shared with the observer. 	(Met Level 2 AND) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a clear plan, using supports that are integrated into the lesson. Supports can be used by a variety of learners. Supports address identified need of targeted learners. 	(Met Level 3 AND) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports were clearly developed based on collaboration with other professionals, research, and/or cultural/linguistic considerations. 	
	Evidence:				

	1	2	3	4	Score/Level
<p>CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT-1 How did the candidate manage the classroom?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Classroom routines have not been established. ●Candidate missed or ignored inappropriate behavior. ●Reprimands, bribes and manipulation were the main sources of management. ●Candidate expressed a deficit view of students in the class. ●Students were disrespectful to candidate or to each other. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Classroom routines were inconsistently used. ● Candidate attempted, but was unsuccessful in addressing students off task or disruptive behavior. ● Candidate primarily addressed negative behaviors. ●Some off-task behavior was missed or allowed. 	<p>(Met Level 2 AND)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Classroom routines were consistently used. ●Many successful attempts at preventing or stopping inappropriate student behavior. ● Candidate focused on positive behaviors. ●Candidate took appropriate action if misbehavior occurred. 	<p>(Met Level 3 AND)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Learners were partners in the classroom environment. ● Mutual respect/rapport with learners with varied needs and backgrounds. ● Learning environment was inclusive for all learners' needs. 	
	Evidence:				
<p>CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT-2 What is the candidate's "teacher awareness/presence?"</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ●Candidate was clearly not in charge, was apologetic, or deferred to the CT while teaching. ●Candidate gave short directions and quickly moved through activities. ●Candidate did not use the classroom to his/her advantage (stood in front of the class, did not circulate, difficult to hear and understand). ●Did not use the equipment/materials effectively. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ●Candidate made attempts to lead the class in the lesson. ●Candidate used prepared questions, planned examples, note cards, power point and/or lists to keep lesson on track. ●Candidate gave clear directions and stated expectations. Restated or corrected directions if necessary. ●Candidate use of the classroom environment in a limited way to enhance learning (some moving around the room, could be heard, used visuals during the lesson). 	<p>(Met Level 2 AND)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ●Candidate exhibited confidence in his/her instruction. ●Candidate ensured directions are understood (repeated back, explained in student words, written on board, practiced). ●Directions included counter examples and exemplars. ●Candidate used the classroom environment to enhance learning (moved around, made sure he/she AND students could be heard, varied groupings/seating arrangements, incorporated movement, used of equipment and teaching tools efficiently). 	<p>(Met Level 3 AND)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ●Candidate exhibited confidence in his/her lessons, instruction and presence. ●Candidate anticipated misconceptions and difficulties in directions/assignments. ●Candidate used the classroom environment to enhance learning for all students. 	
	Evidence:				

	1	2	3	4	Score/Level
<p>CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT -3 How does the candidate guarantee equity in the classroom?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidate seemed unaware of equity issues in the classroom (e.g. you guys, dudes, using peer language, “you’re acting like ___”, labeling, privilege) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Candidate paid attention to making classroom routines and instruction equitable for all students (calling on students, picking students to lead activities, wait time, seating, etc.) 	<p>(Met Level 2 AND)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidate used gender neutral language and non-biased examples. • Candidate ensured all students were included equally in the lesson instruction (answering questions, wait time, choosing leaders, seating etc.) 	<p>(Met Level 3 AND)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidate addressed improving equity for all learners by doing (some of) the following: bringing in family members, field trips, targeted lessons or activities, room environment, inclusive examples used in lessons, sharing different perspectives, appreciating students’ language, honoring each student’s strengths. 	
<p>LANGUAGE-1 What attention was given to addressing academic vocabulary related to the content</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No evidence of planning for specific academic vocabulary. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primarily rote learning of vocabulary definitions. • Focus is on memorization or learning definitions using a word wall, bold words, writing key words, explaining key words, etc. 	<p>(Met Level 2 AND)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of academic vocabulary was practiced with context. • Targeted academic language was used during the lesson both verbally and in writing. 	<p>(Met Level 3 AND)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate applications of vocabulary and related terms were used while analyzing, interpreting, summarizing, explaining, etc. • Supports were provided for targeted learners to practice oral and written use of academic language. 	
	Evidence:				

	1	2	3	4	Score/Level
<p>ASSESSMENT-1 What evidence did the candidate have that the instructional objectives were met?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No assessment of the learning objectives was present. • Assessment of learning objectives was not aligned to the lesson’s objectives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment clearly aligned with the lesson, learning objectives and Standards addressed. • Assessment was stated in terms of student performance. 	<p>(Met Level 2 AND)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment was shared with the learners during the lesson (verbally). • Candidate had clear evidence that learning objectives were met based on stated criteria. • The candidate had some evidence of where to take the next day’s lesson based on the assessment. 	<p>(Met Level 3 AND)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-assessment time was provided during the lesson. • Learners self-assessed their progress based on what they have learned and what they still need to know. • Learners had clear goals for improvement. 	

<p>ASSESSMENT-2 What kind of formative feedback did the candidate give the learners during this lesson.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No feedback was given during the lesson. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General feedback indicated what learners did right OR wrong. • Feedback was given to the whole class only. 	<p>(Met Level 2 AND)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific feedback indicated what learners did right AND wrong. • Feedback was individualized for some students as well as the whole class and given within the lesson. • Self-assessment was generalized. 	<p>(Met Level Three AND)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feedback focused on longer term learning goals. • Feedback protocol was built into the lesson (peer editing, self-checking, finding/fixing errors, rubrics, listed criteria). 	
	Evidence:				