

The UTeach Observation Protocol (UTOP) for Humanities Training Guide and User Manual

UTeach Natural Sciences, University of Texas Austin

Table of Contents

Overview of the UTOP	1
Procedures for Using the UTOP to Rate Lessons	3
I. Background Information.....	3
II. Lesson Overview	3
III. Rating Scales.....	4
IV. Summary Comments	52
V. Post-Observational Teacher Interview/Survey	52
VI. Teacher Demographic Questionnaire	52

Overview of the UTOP

The UTeach Observation Protocol (UTOP) is an observational instrument that was originally used to assess the overall quality of classroom instruction in math and science from kindergarten to the undergraduate level. The UTOP was designed to allow individuals to evaluate teaching effectiveness while valuing different modes of instruction. This UTOP for Humanities was developed for language arts and social studies instruction and specifically addresses a spectrum of teaching methods, from direct or traditional instruction to inquiry-based instruction.

The UTOP was created and piloted by faculty, master teachers, and research assistants in the UTeach College of Natural Sciences program at the University of Texas Austin.¹

The development of UTOP for math and science was informed by the following resources:

- National Council for the Teaching of Mathematics: *Principles and Standards for School Mathematics*
- National Academy of Science: *National Science Education Standards*
- American Association for the Advancement of Science: *Project 2061, Benchmarks for Scientific Literacy*
- National Research Council: *How People Learn: Brain, Mind, Experience, and School and Knowing What Students Know*
- Arizona Collaborative for Excellence in the Preparation of Teachers: *Reformed Teaching Observation Protocol*

¹ Those involved in creating and piloting the UTOP for mathematics and science classrooms include Mary Walker, Gail Dickinson, Mark Daniels, Denise Ekberg, Kelli Allen, Larry Abraham, Michael Marder, Candace Walkington, Prerna Arora, Jessica Gordon, and Shasta Ihorn. Audrey De Zeeuw and Paige Bauerkemper have assisted in further revisions.

- Horizon Research’s *Inside the Classroom* Observation Protocol and study

Development of the UTOP for Humanities was informed by the following resources:²

- *National Council for the Social Studies: National Standards for the Initial Preparation of Social Studies Teachers* (2004)
- *National Curriculum Standards for Social Studies, A Framework for Teaching, Learning and Assessment* (2010)
- *NCSS Performance-Based Assessment Clearinghouse*
- *National History Education Clearinghouse*
- *National Council of Teachers of English and International Reading Association: Standards for the English Language Arts* (2012)
- *NCTE Standards for the Assessment of Reading and Writing* (2009)
- Feedback from pilot applications of the protocol (2014)

The UTOP is a criterion-referenced instrument, requiring training and recalibration to maintain the integrity and fair use of the instrument. This training guide is intended to provide resources to instruct, develop, and sustain inter-rater reliability. Interactive discussion of terminology used to define and describe each indicator is essential for groups of observers in order to ensure consensus and consistency in the rating process. As much as is humanly possible, raters’ personal opinions and/or directive judgments and suggestions for improvements should not play a role in their choice of ratings; evidence for ratings must be based on what was observed or discussed in the classroom. The UTOP can be used to evaluate quality of instruction and provide meaningful feedback for improvement at any level of education, in a variety of settings. It is composed of 26 items rated on a 5-point Likert scale (1 to 5), with an NA (Not Applicable) rating option for a few items where sufficient information may not be accessible during the observation session.

As stated, the UTOP is intended for use by raters trained in its application. This training guide provides future raters with specific information relating to the various elements of the UTOP. Particularly, this guide aims to clarify the rating standards for each indicator in order to improve the accuracy and reliability of raters’ ratings.

In addition, the UTOP is an instrument that is designed for use over multiple observations of a teacher’s practices over the course of time—several weeks, at minimum—thereby reducing the impact of a low score on any other single indicator.

² Those involved in creating and piloting the UTOP Humanities version include Beth Keith, Ashley McKelvy, Megan Perry, Paul Sullivan and Mary Walker.

Procedures for Using the UTOP to Rate Lessons

I. Background Information

As the UTOP may be used by observers who, for research purposes, wish to remain “blind” to the educational experiences of the teacher being observed, the “Background Information” section of the UTOP does not ask for this kind of information about the teacher. Instead, this information will be collected through the use of the “Demographic Questionnaire,” discussed in Section VI.

Teacher is the name of the teacher being observed.

School is observation site.

Date of observation refers to the date of the lesson observed.

Start and end time of observation refers to the time that the observed lesson began and ended.

Date of post-interview refers to the date that the post-observation teacher interview/survey was completed.

Subject observed should be the actual name of the course being taught during the observed lesson—for example, World Geography, US History, English I, II, etc.

Grade level is the actual grade level of the students in the class. For example, World Geography is often taught to 9th-grade students. If the observed class is a 9th-grade World Geography class, then record “9th grade” for grade level. Some courses target multiple grade levels. For example, AP Human Geography may be any grade-level student. Whatever the case, record all the grade levels present in the class to the best of your ability. This information is also collected in the teacher interview.

Course level is a place to note whether the course is advanced, gifted, AP, special education, or regular education. This information is also collected in the teacher interview.

Observer is the person conducting the observation and filling out this form.

II. Lesson Overview

Lesson Description

In a paragraph or two, describe the lesson you observed. Include where the lesson fits into the overall unit of study. Be sure to include enough detail to provide a context for your ratings of the lesson and also to allow you to recall the details of the lesson when needed in the future.

Indicate the *major content area(s)* of the lesson or activity. This section aims to identify the main concepts within the subject that are addressed by the lesson. For example, an English lesson on fictional literature might be listed under “poetry” with the key words “symbolism” and “figurative language.” A social studies lesson that integrates literature from the time period may use the outcome of the poetry study to explore underlying catalysts for a political conflict. A lesson focusing on the political conflict would be listed under social studies

because the focus would be on understanding the event as opposed to the analysis of the poet's craft, which would be listed as language arts. If cross-disciplinary content is the focus of the lesson, be sure to indicate all subject areas with specific descriptions.

III. Rating Scales

Description of UTOP Sections

The UTOP is divided into four rating sections: Classroom Environment, Lesson Structure, Implementation, and English and/or social studies Content.

The ***Classroom Environment*** section ***assesses the degree to which the classroom environment is conducive to the learning*** of English and/or social studies, and how the teacher facilitates and creates this setting. This includes pre-existing structures (like classroom management routines and room setup) that the teacher has in place relating to management of the environment.

The ***Lesson Structure*** section assesses how well the teacher ***plans for and organizes*** the lesson, such as the sequence of learning activities during the class period, and the degree to which this organization facilitates the learning of English and/or social studies. The focus in this section is on the potential for student engagement and learning as designed and set up by the teacher through the instructional strategies and activities the teacher chooses to employ—*not* the actual implementation of those strategies and activities.

The ***Implementation*** section assesses the instructional decisions, strategies, and practices the teacher ***actually employs*** during the lesson, how well the lesson activities flow, and whether the teacher ensures that all students remain engaged in and interact with the content and concepts that are the focus of the lesson. This section also assesses how critical and reflective the teacher is about his or her instruction ***after*** the lesson has concluded, through analysis of data collected by teacher interview/survey.

The ***Humanities (English and/or Social Studies) Content*** section assesses the ***quality of the English and/or social studies content*** being delivered by the teacher and constructed by students during the class period. Throughout this training manual, the collective reference to these disciplines is ***Humanities***. Although there are indicators within this section that measure the teacher's content knowledge, the more important focus of this section is meant to address the quality of the content students are exposed to and grappling with during class. Content to be learned by the students includes that which is directly communicated by the teacher and developed through other means like interactive group activities, discussion, and independent practice. It is important to note that the synthesis rating descriptors provided at the end of this section (e.g., superficial content knowledge) are not meant to assess the teacher's content knowledge alone but instead focus on the overall quality of the content students are learning during the class period.

In the study of both ***English and social studies***, students need to understand that the body of knowledge representing these disciplines is the work of human beings who have experienced events, conducted research, and/or created pieces while being influenced by their personal habits of mind, the culture in which they lived, recognition of the needs of their society, and

the technologies available to them. Thus the collective reference to these disciplines is *the Humanities*.

Rating Lessons on the UTOP

To use the UTOP as intended, scores should be assigned only *after* the observation has taken place, and the rater has had an opportunity to review the video or field notes as needed to provide evidence for each rating assigned. The UTOP is rated on a 1 to 5 Likert scale, with an NA (Not Applicable) option for six items. Not Applicable (NA) is an appropriate rating score *only* for the indicators that specifically mention an NA option, such as:

1.2 Classroom Interactions: Interactions reflected collegial working relationships among students.

2.6 Lesson Reflection: The teacher was critical and reflective about his/her practice after the lesson, recognizing the strengths and weaknesses of their instruction.

4.4 Content Assessments: Formative and summative assessments used by teacher (if available) were consistent with content objectives (products, projects, performances, homework, tests, quizzes, etc.).

4.5 Content Abstraction [or Content Analysis]: Elements of conceptual abstraction [OR analysis] were used appropriately to reveal patterns and structures that provide explanatory power both in and beyond a text or task in class.

All other indicators must be assigned 1 to 5 ratings, even if the rater feels the indicator is not applicable to the observed lesson. Rating boxes should not be left blank.

In general, the numerical values for the Likert scale on the UTOP can be interpreted as follows:

1 = Not observed at all / Not demonstrated at all

2 = Observed rarely / Demonstrated poorly

3 = Observed an adequate amount / Demonstrated adequately

4 = Observed often / Demonstrated well

5 = Observed to a great extent / Demonstrated to a great extent

Each numerical value on the rating scale corresponds to two descriptors, one descriptor that measures the **frequency** of the occurrence of the indicator (observed rarely, observed often, etc.), and one descriptor that is intended to capture the **quality** of the implementation of that indicator (demonstrated poorly, demonstrated well, etc.).

For some indicators, only **one** of the descriptors may be appropriate. For instance, indicator 2.1 reads, “The lesson was well organized and structured.” A measure of the frequency of the occurrence of this indicator would be inappropriate. In this case, the rater would need to refer only to the second set of descriptors that measure the quality of the lesson structure as described by the indicator.

For other indicators, descriptors of **both** frequency and quality may be appropriate. For instance, indicator 4.7 reads, “Appropriate connections were made to other areas of English or social studies and/or to other academic disciplines.” When scoring this indicator, the rater should take into account the quality as well as the frequency of the connections the teacher is making.

With respect to scoring teachers on the **frequency** with which they implement indicators, it is important for the rater to remember that some lessons will include more opportunities to exhibit certain characteristics than others. How often the teacher demonstrates the characteristics of any indicator should be considered relative to the number of opportunities available.

Synthesis Ratings

Each of the four scored sections of the UTOP concludes with a ***Synthesis Rating*** that is intended to be an overall rating for each area. The synthesis rating boxes contain scores from 1 to 5 with corresponding descriptors.

The synthesis ratings are **not intended to be a mathematical average of the indicator scores** making up each section, but are designed to allow the rater to describe his or her overall impression, using a holistic view of the domain and providing a ***human average*** of the entire lesson. Evidence to support the score chosen can be typed in the open space after the Synthesis Ratings boxes.

Supporting Evidence

Immediately after each indicator in the UTOP, space is provided for raters to present ***specific supporting evidence*** for their scores. This is done so that raters and other researchers can understand why a specific score was given long after the observation has taken place, and so that raters can achieve inter-rater reliability by comparing and discussing the supporting evidence they used to obtain different numeric scores. Supporting evidence needs to be entered in for each indicator rating with no exceptions. Supporting evidence does not need to be entered for a synthesis rating but is recommended, particularly if the data is to be shared with the observed as feedback for professional development and improvement of practice.

In the next section, general descriptions for each possible rating are given for each indicator in order to promote consistency in the scoring across raters. Please carefully review the descriptions for each item prior to completing a UTOP observation.

Also provided in the next section are examples from specific lessons of each possible rating of each indicator. These examples show the types of supporting evidence that are typically cited for each level, as well as the typical format and level of detail of supporting evidence. Supporting evidence should be specific, factual (i.e., no personal opinions, such as “I always teach this topic this way”), and evidence-based, and can range between 2 and 10 sentences.

Indicators, Rubrics, and Examples

Classroom Environment—Section 1

1.1 Classroom Engagement: The classroom environment facilitated by the teacher encouraged students to generate questions and/or arguments that reflected engagement or exploration of important ideas in the Humanities.

This indicator captures how well the classroom environment established by the teacher supports students in exploration of ideas and deep engagement in critical and analytical thinking. Such a classroom can be described as one in which students feel free to ask questions, engage in critical discussion, make predictions, and draw conclusions. Approaches to exploration or problem solving prompt students to evaluate and challenge statements of the teacher and other students in order to propose alternate arguments or deepen understanding of fundamental concepts. The environment is also one in which the teacher devotes a sufficient amount of time to addressing students' questions, comments, misconceptions, and nascent ideas related to the subject matter.

In other words, there is a culture of learning. A classroom rated highly on this indicator creates multiple opportunities and provides rich evidence for student–student discussion and argumentation, with students encouraged to reflect on their own learning.

To rate this indicator, make note of instances during the lesson where you observe students generating ideas, questions, or arguments. Keep in mind that giving a simple response to a direct teacher question is not really “generating an idea,” and that asking a simple clarification question does not reflect deep student engagement with academic conversation.

General Rubric

1. This item should be rated a 1 if there were no examples of students attempting to or being encouraged by the teacher to generate their own ideas, questions, or arguments, and no significant intellectual engagement was observed.
2. This item should be rated a 2 if there were only occasional examples of students generating nascent ideas and questions, these contributions required only recall of knowledge, and the teacher did not respond in a manner to draw out the students' thinking.
3. This item should be rated a 3 if there were several examples of students generating nascent ideas, conjectures, and questions that reveal some application or analysis, and the teacher was making moves to encourage these contributions. However, the teacher missed several opportunities to elicit and elaborate on students' thinking in an open discussion.
4. This item should be rated a 4 if students constructed new meaning and effectively supported their conclusions during the lesson and the teacher regularly made attempts to elicit further student thinking and encouraged other students to contribute. The students' offerings demonstrated clear engagement with the content. Perhaps there was a missed opportunity by the teacher that could have facilitated deeper student learning.
5. This item should be rated a 5 if students were highly engaged in the content and consistently offered sophisticated ideas, questions, or arguments. The teacher facilitated these contributions throughout the majority of the class period, allowing for deep and meaningful student learning opportunities.

Specific Examples of Supporting Evidence for the Humanities

1. There were no ideas, questions, or arguments generated by students during this class. Only one student asked a question. The teacher lectured, only stopping to get the student input as necessary to ensure that the students were awake. The teacher dictated notes, not asking for students to predict what might happen before or during a reading activity. The teacher did not elicit students' thoughts or ideas.
2. There was some evidence of students generating ideas, questions, or arguments during the whole-class portions of the lesson. The students did seem to be talking about their assignment during the group work portion of the lesson, but the ideas generated were related to factual recall, since the content and/or activity was straightforward. Occasionally groups would call on the teacher when they had a question about whether they were "doing this right," and the teacher would respond with a simple "yes" or "no."
3. The students in this class seemed to be comfortable proposing and sharing their thoughts and ideas and were not afraid to make mistakes in front of the teacher or their classmates. There were some instances of students generating interesting questions and proposing original ideas about their work, and, although the teacher seemed to welcome these comments, she did not probe their ideas to encourage higher-level reasoning or get them to elaborate on their ideas, questions, or arguments. One student offered an interesting idea, but he generated this idea on his own and was not prompted to share it with the whole class.
4. There was frequent evidence of the students explaining their reasoning to each other or the whole class and the teacher asking for multiple approaches and perspectives. The teacher also asked for observations relating to how the content related to the world and human activity. At one point in the class, students challenged the teacher about her thinking because they held some misconceptions about the underlying concept. The teacher chose not to open this misconception for student discussion but instead carefully showed the students where they had "gone wrong" in their thinking. Overall, there was a congenial atmosphere for discussion and many students were engaged.
5. The students in this classroom were constantly generating sophisticated ideas, questions, and arguments. They frequently and persistently asked each other questions about the evidence supporting each other's arguments. They also backed up their own arguments using evidence and analysis of data, presenting text evidence, explaining graphs and charts, or citing and sharing valid sources. Because the conversation was so free and rich, the teacher noted a recurring misunderstanding revealed in the student talk and, at that point, she stopped the class and used probing questions to facilitate an open discussion that unpacked the underlying misconception for the whole class or the small group.

1.2 Classroom Interactions: Interactions reflected collegial working relationships among students (e.g., students worked together productively and talked with each other about the lesson).

This indicator assesses the degree to which students have learned to be collegial, respectful, cooperative, and interactive when working in groups. In other words, this indicator captures how well the teacher has worked with the students on developing group-work ethics and skills that create and promote an environment of active collaboration. Evidence of collegial, productive working relationships among students includes collaborative discussions about topics relevant to the lesson and successful delegation of roles and responsibilities within each group. It's also evidenced by whether all group members are participating and contributing, reflecting on their learning, and staying focused on the given task.

This indicator can be rated as Not Applicable (NA) if the lesson did not include collaboration, and the rater has no opportunity to observe student interactions. Sometimes a lesson includes collaboration, but the duration is extremely short; **the benchmark used here is that if there were student–student interactions lasting greater than 3 minutes total over the entire lesson, this indicator must be rated.** This indicator must also be rated even if the teacher did not specifically tell students to work in groups. It should also be rated if the teacher told students to work in groups, but they did not follow his directions (which would earn a rating of “1”).

General Rubric

1. This item should be rated a 1 if collaboration was expected during the lesson, but the group work was highly unproductive. This could include behavior where the majority of the groups were socializing, off task, arguing, or ignoring each other, as well as regular instances of students copying off their group members’ papers and/or certain group members doing all of the work.
2. This indicator should be rated a 2 if collaboration was expected during the lesson, but some groups were unproductive, engaging in the off-task behaviors listed under the 1 rating. There could be occasional examples of productive group work for some groups but this was not consistent throughout the time allotted.
3. This indicator should be rated a 3 if collaboration was expected during the lesson, and the groups were adequately productive throughout the group work time. There may be some examples of off-task conversation and group members not contributing.
4. This indicator should be rated a 4 if collaboration is expected during the lesson, and most of the groups worked together productively throughout this portion of the lesson. The groups were observed discussing ideas and asking questions of each other before seeking out the teacher, and the members themselves encouraged participation of all group members. There may still be an example of an unproductive group in the classroom, but the majority of students were working well together.
5. This indicator should be rated a 5 if collaboration is expected during the lesson, and all groups worked together productively and were meaningfully engaged in the content and concepts of the lesson. All group members clearly understood and accepted their roles and were able to actively participate; groups discussed and explored ideas together, coming to a common understanding of the content and concepts.

Specific Examples of Supporting Evidence in the Humanities

1. The teacher told the students who understood the lesson to help the other members of their group complete a worksheet. However, no one in any of the groups did this, and several groups were observed to be explicitly copying off of each other’s papers. In other cases, the student group members chose not to collaborate at all, silently completing the worksheet individually. In another instance, several groups simply socialized without attempting to complete any of the assignment.
2. Although there were occasional examples of a few student groups working together well, other groups simply socialized. In one situation, the teacher stated that he did not believe a particular group was working together effectively and announced to the whole class that he would have to separate them, which caused some objections from the members of the group. These group members sat apart and were unproductive for the remainder of the class.

3. The students were put into debate groups for this class period to plan for one group to debate another group with the class as an audience. The groups worked together fairly productively, choosing who was responsible for what part of the debate, coordinating their arguments (to some degree), and splitting up the time slots as necessary. The students worked independently on their portion of the task.
4. In this class session, most of the students in the class were successfully working in groups to prepare for and carry out the debate. There were a few instances of off-task behavior observed while students were working together on developing their group's position paper and presentation. Students were engaged discussing the content and asking each other questions about their positions. All groups made sufficient progress to make reasonable presentations and debate their opponents in an open forum.
5. Students talked about their team's debate position, shared resources located in the literature they had researched, and collegially helped each other prepare for each portion of the debate presentation by explaining and discussing how to present their key points. Members of the group were observed sharing notes to prepare for the counterpoint section, providing evidence for argumentation to each other to enhance their position. There were clearly defined group roles that students assigned to each member, and each member accepted responsibility for their role. The students were aware that they would collectively assign each member a collaboration grade for their work, and they took this seriously. There were no instances of off-task behavior.

1.3 Classroom On-Task: The majority of students were on task throughout the class.

This indicator measures the proportion of time students in the class remained engaged in the day's learning activities. On-task behavior can include students participating in the lesson by asking questions and paying attention during a lecture, participating in class or small group discussions, providing answers to teacher questions, turning in assigned class work in a timely manner, and assisting other students. Raters should note any examples of off-task behavior, such as students being engaged in off-topic conversations, writing notes/text messages, putting their heads on the table, or doing work for another class. The usual benchmark used for this indicator is that if 75% of students appeared to be on task for most of the class period, the indicator should be rated as a 3. Higher or lower overall engagement would elicit numerical ratings as described in the General Rubric.

General Rubric

1. This item should be rated a 1 if less than half (0–49%) of students were on task, on average, throughout the class period. Please weight appropriately if many students were on task for one portion of the lesson while few were on task for another portion, to obtain an overall estimate of the percentage. For this rating, there must be consistent off-task behavior that affects the majority of the class.
2. This item should be rated a 2 if at least half but less than three-quarters (50–74%) of students were on task, on average, throughout the class period. There were regular instances of off-task behavior that lasted for several minutes in this classroom.
3. This item should be rated a 3 if around three-quarters (75%) of students were on task, on average, throughout the class period. There were some instances of off-task behavior that lasted for more than a few minutes in this classroom.
4. This item should be rated a 4 if more than three-quarters (75–90%) of the students were on task, on average, throughout the class period. There were only occasional instances of off-

task behavior in the classroom, and/or there were only a few students who were not fully participating in the lesson on occasion.

5. This item should be rated a 5 if most or all (90–100%) of the students were on task and engaged throughout the lesson. There were rare or no instances of off-task behavior in this classroom.

Specific Examples of Supporting Evidence in the Humanities

1. The majority of the students (more than 75%) were not on task throughout the class. Many students were being disruptive, fighting, yelling things across the room, moving around the room to socialize, having off-topic conversations, and sleeping or listening to music at their desks. There was one point when only three students were writing their answers on the worksheet while all of the other students were off task. Students in one corner of the room were making phone calls throughout the class period.
2. There were a number of instances of off-task behavior in this classroom. Many students (more than 50%) did not seem to be attempting the warm up at first, but as the class session progressed, the number of students on task increased to approximately 70% for several minutes. However, students were repeatedly observed stopping productive work to socialize with each other. One student was observed searching inappropriate and unrelated websites on a computer throughout the entire class period.
3. There were some instances of off-task behavior, but most students (75% or more) were working productively most of the time during this lesson. The observer did note a few students with headphones on, listening to music while doodling or writing nothing down. Not all students were observed to be copying down notes as the teacher explained the homework, but this could have been because they already understood the concepts.
4. The majority of the students (75–90%) were observed taking down the notes the teacher was giving, and when the class was given the opportunity to work problems at their desks, most students actively engaged in the assignment and made legitimate attempts to work. The observer did not find evidence for any ongoing off-task behavior or students refusing to participate during this activity.
5. There was not any off-task behavior observed during this class. When students were presenting their ideas, their classmates were attentive and considerate, asking focused questions for clarification that showed they were paying attention. One group continued to work on their own analysis (creating a visual representation) during one of the presentations, but they did this in a non-disruptive way that demonstrated their concern for finishing their assignment more than off-task behavior. All students were engaged in and thinking about the concepts and content for the length of the lesson.

1.4 Classroom Management: The teacher’s classroom management strategies enhanced the classroom environment.

This indicator assesses the quality of the teacher’s classroom management, in particular whether the teacher’s management positively contributed to the students’ learning in the classroom environment. Teacher behaviors that should be noted include setting clear behavioral expectations for students and making sure these expectations are met, foreseeing and preparing for inappropriate behavior that may occur during the course of the lesson, consistently and effectively dealing with off-task and inappropriate behavior, adopting successful time management strategies, and utilizing positive behavioral modification strategies when appropriate. Classroom management also includes teacher’s selection of student group members and student seating to minimize distraction, how the teacher allowed students to move

about the room during the lesson without affecting other students' ability to learn, and how the teacher expected students to speak or present their ideas in a whole-class or small-group setting.

Special notes for video analysis with the UTOP

As it can be difficult to see whether students are off task and need management on a video feed, when rating this indicator take into account the students you are able to see and hear. Keep in mind that when the teacher audio feed is all you can hear, relying on teacher verbal reprimands of student behavior may not be helpful when rating this indicator—some teachers will reprimand students constantly, even if their off-task behavior is minor, while other teachers will allow major off-task behaviors to go unacknowledged.

General Rubric

1. This item should be rated a 1 if the classroom was very poorly managed, the students did not listen to the teacher, and/or the teacher made little or no attempt to manage their behavior. The lack of classroom management significantly disrupted all aspects of the class session, making it difficult for students to learn.
2. This item should be rated a 2 if the classroom was not well managed but was still functional—students were not overtly disruptive or creating distractions for others even though the teacher was not clearly “in charge.” The lack of clear direction or classroom management occasionally disrupted the lesson, sometimes making it difficult for students to learn.
3. This item should be rated a 3 if the classroom was managed adequately; there were some disruptions that the teacher may or may not have dealt with appropriately, but overall learning by the majority of students was not negatively affected by management issues. The teacher may have made some management moves to enhance the classroom environment so that all students were able to engage and learn, but the impact was only minimally beneficial.
4. This item should be rated a 4 if the classroom was well managed—the teacher's management actions were clear, enhancing the classroom environment, and positively affecting students' opportunity to learn. There may have been minor or very occasional disruptive behavior that the teacher did not handle appropriately, but it did not negatively affect the whole class.
5. This item should be rated a 5 if the classroom was managed excellently and ran smoothly—the teacher's management actions and routines significantly enhanced students' learning of the content. Classroom expectations, instructions, and routines were clear to all students at all times.

Specific Examples of Supporting Evidence in the Humanities

1. The teacher shouted instructions for the lesson and reprimands for off-task behavior continually while the students kept talking, essentially ignoring her requests for attention and engagement. There were numerous instances of off-task behavior and socializing during this lesson that the teacher did not or was unable to manage. The teacher remained at the front of the classroom behind the desk, did not circulate while students were working, and did not attempt to address the disruptive and distracted behaviors observed throughout.
2. The teacher allowed the students to engage in whatever activity or behaviors they chose, without direction or correction to facilitate and enhance the classroom environment.

Although there were no major disruptive behaviors observed, there was also no successful productive collaboration between students focused on the assigned activity, and many students were not on task or participating. There were a few notable and inappropriate exchanges that distracted students or demonstrated disrespect for the classroom culture.

3. At the beginning of the activity, the teacher explicitly discussed and/or reminded students of the classroom behavior expectations. The teacher sometimes referred back to these expectations when some students got loud or disruptive during the class period, and this seemed to work adequately as a management tool for redirection for most of the groups (75%). However, there was some off-task behavior that the teacher did not manage, such as some groups socializing and taking a long time to get started working. Some of the students in these off-task groups missed opportunities to learn and became disengaged or only re-engaged when the teacher stood over their group.
4. The teacher managed the class by having students work in small groups and moved frequently so she could interact with each group individually. The teacher gave the students a clear overview of what was expected of them—both orally and by referring to the set of “classroom culture” rules and expectations posted on the wall. The teacher assigned each group member a role that they were responsible for and made clear the expectation that they would work collaboratively. There were no major behavior problems or disruptions, but there was very occasional and minor off-task behavior. In one instance, the teacher informed members of a group that it was important that they be respectful and allow each group member to actively contribute, but occasionally some more assertive group members took over, leaving other group members marginalized. In this particular instance, the teacher was unaware of the situation and unable to redirect the group dynamic.
5. Having established a culture of respect and making classroom expectations clear to students, the teacher dealt quickly and effectively with behavior problems (and potential behavior problems). The teacher’s strategies were accepted and well practiced, as evidenced by student responses to her management of their behavior and student requests. In whole-group discussions or when other student groups were presenting their ideas, the teacher made it clear to students that they needed to raise their hands to give an answer or ask a question and that talking over each other was not polite. The teacher moved fluidly around the classroom for the entire period, monitoring the behavior of her students. At the end of the class period, the teacher gave students clear and detailed expectations for how they would conclude the class. The teacher managed the groups’ behaviors continually by encouraging each member of the group to work respectfully and collaboratively to accomplish their work.

1.5 Classroom Organization: The classroom is organized appropriately such that students can work in groups easily and access resources as needed, and the teacher can move to each student or student group.

This indicator assesses how well the setup of the classroom promoted the intended goals of the lesson and enhanced the classroom environment. Both the organization of student seating as well as the availability of necessary materials should be considered. This indicator can be evidenced by examining the accessibility of materials needed for the lesson activities, such as technology, supplies, books, handouts, etc. This indicator also considers accessibility—students’ ability to hear and see whatever was written on the board or presented on a projection screen, etc. The rater should also consider the ease with which the teacher was able to access each student and how well the students’ physical locations allowed them to participate fully in lesson (whether it was in a small classroom or large lecture hall). The indicator can be used to

assess whether the teacher devoted an appropriate amount of preparation time to setting up materials, and how well the physical setup facilitated student collaboration when appropriate. We recognize that the setup of the classroom may not always be under the teacher's control; however, raters should rate the classroom setup without concern for this degree of control, as student access to these classroom materials and structures can have a significant impact on student learning.

General Rubric

1. This item should be rated with a 1 if there were one or more major classroom setup or organizational issues that significantly disrupted the ability of students to focus on and learn the content of the lesson. This may be something that was not under the teacher's control but still should be recorded with this instrument.
2. This item should be rated with a 2 if there were several minor classroom setup or organization issues that caused a few small disruptions to the lesson, and some students' ability to fully participate was affected negatively.
3. This item should be rated a 3 if there were no classroom setup or organizational issues that disrupted or distracted the majority (50–75%) of students from participating in the activities of the lesson—the classroom was appropriately arranged for the lesson.
4. This item should be rated a 4 if the classroom was well-organized and the teacher's actions relating to the setup of the classroom enhanced most (75–90%) students' interaction with materials or each other as required for the activity. There may be a small missed opportunity where a few students were affected in their ability to participate for a short period of time.
5. This item should be rated a 5 if the organization of the classroom was excellent and the setup for the lesson clearly and positively enhanced each student's learning and created opportunity for engagement and full participation. There was specific evidence that the teacher made moves to ensure this, and there were no instances of students negatively affected by the setup of the classroom.

Specific Examples of Supporting Evidence in the Humanities

1. The teacher did not appear to have organized the classroom at all—as the students entered the classroom, they moved their desks away from the front, and half of the class even had their backs to the board where the teacher was showing the students a map. The teacher was unable to circulate due to the haphazard placement of desks and a collection of boxes and shelves that blocked portions of the classroom so that he had difficulty monitoring student work.
2. Although the teacher asked the students to work in groups of three, the desks were not positioned to facilitate such collaboration—the students in a group in the back of the classroom were seated around a large table, and a table that was in the front of the classroom prevented some groups of students from moving their desks into groups of three, so many chose to work in pairs. The students at the large table had to talk loudly to be heard and had difficulty communicating with each other during the day's group activity as a result.
3. There were several small, movable tables that could seat pairs of students who were spread out across the classroom. These tables could be regrouped to allow for groups of four, although some students (about 25% at any one time) would have to turn around in their

chairs to see the teacher’s visual aid, a map of Europe after World War I. Overall, the students were able to collaborate with their groups and access materials successfully.

4. The classroom setup worked well for this lesson—the students were seated in groups of four distributed efficiently around the room, and all could view the center of the room and watch the teacher show the the map at the front of the classroom. However, one of the visual aids, a map from a textbook showing the rivers of Europe, was very small, which made it difficult for a few students (about 15%) to follow as the teacher pointed to those rivers that formed natural boundaries between certain countries for a small portion of the lesson. However, the teacher was able to circulate with the textbook map of the rivers during the group work portion of the lesson successfully.
5. The students were seated with their assigned groups, which were tables that were spread across the room. The room was very large and open, and the teacher could move around and talk with each member of the groups frequently. The lesson required that different groups conduct different activities across the classroom at the same time—each assessing the impact of natural boundaries on different countries in Europe after World War I. Each group could access technology as needed to see finely detailed maps of the assigned regions and had excellent workspace for active collaboration. When the activity requiring students to create a poster for class presentation of their findings was conducted, all students had access to a well-stocked supply table.

1.6 Classroom Equity: The classroom environment established by the teacher reflected attention to issues of access, equity, and diversity for students (e.g., cooperative learning, language-appropriate strategies and materials, attentiveness to student needs).

This indicator assesses the degree to which the classroom environment was unbiased related to race, ethnicity, religion, gender, sexual orientation, physical abilities, English language learners, and students with learning differences, etc. Evidence of this indicator can be obtained by reviewing the wording and formatting of classroom handouts and/or presentation methods for the whole class as well as small groups, and/or by analyzing strategies and opportunities created to ensure participation by all students, and/or by the teacher’s handling of unacceptable comments made by students. Additional evidence of this indicator can be gained by analyzing the degree to which the teacher took the diversity and individual needs of his or her students into account when planning and teaching the lesson and how the teacher facilitated a respectful and open classroom environment and culture of learning where all students were comfortable sharing their ideas. This indicator is also evidenced by the way the teacher dealt with students who struggled, including how the teacher scaffolded and supported their learning, and how the teacher worked to include all students and their divergent ways of thinking in class discussions and activities.

General Rubric

1. This item should be rated a 1 if the rater noted a major issue relating to equity, access, or diversity that significantly negatively impacted the classroom environment and any or all students’ opportunities to learn.
2. This item should be rated a 2 if the rater noted one or two minor issues relating to equity, access, and diversity that may have had a small negative impact of any or all students’ opportunities to learn. The teacher may have attempted some positive modifications to take into account issues of equity, access, and diversity, but ultimately these modifications were not successful.

3. This item should be rated a 3 if there were no major issues and no explicit moves made by the teacher relating to equity, access, and diversity, and the classroom environment was not positively or negatively impacted. This item also may be rated a 3 if there was no clear need for or evidence regarding issues of equity, access, and diversity in the classroom observed during the lesson.
4. This item should be rated a 4 if there was no evidence of actions the teacher took relating to equity, access, and diversity that negatively impacted the classroom environment, and, overall, the teacher's actions relating to this indicator had a positive impact on the classroom environment. There may have been a small missed opportunity to provide equitable access to the content or recognize and adapt for a student's individual needs.
5. This item should be rated as a 5 if there is evidence that the teacher explicitly took into account issues of equity, access, and diversity in the classroom throughout the lesson so that any or all students were equitably engaged, had easy access to lesson content and materials, and were treated with respect by all throughout the class session. In other words, the classroom environment clearly reflected thorough attention to equity, access, and diversity of every student.

Specific Examples of Supporting Evidence in the Humanities

1. The teacher was openly disrespectful to students who did not readily respond to his questions with the "correct" answer, resulting in an environment where there was very little participation or risk-taking. The teacher concentrated his attention on many negative interactions with the male students who were not working as directed, while ignoring the female students in his class who were attempting to work and repeatedly raised their hands for help.
2. In a class that included several English language learners, the teacher separated these students into groups by themselves though the rest of the class had many other students who could serve as English language resources for the non-native speakers. The teacher worked diligently with the ELL group but, because his ability to communicate was limited, these students had a difficult time completing the assignment. Meanwhile, the English speakers worked semi-productively in their own groups, not able to get the teachers' attention when they were stuck. Some of the English-speaking student groups were able to do some of the work and helped each other, but the level of success throughout the class session was low.
3. Students were arranged in cooperative learning groups, but the assignment required each individual to complete the same activity and no roles for each group member's accountability were in evidence. Nonetheless, most students appeared able to complete the work with little assistance from each other or the teacher. The classroom environment was open and relaxed, and students appeared comfortable expressing themselves and their ideas to each other without teacher facilitation or direction to do so.
4. The teacher relied heavily on cooperative learning and student-to-student coaching of the English language learners by bilingual students in this mixed-ability classroom. The teacher had created a word wall with translations of the day's new vocabulary words into Spanish. A variety of students at different levels and from different backgrounds were observed to participate in several aspects of the lesson, presenting their ideas and supporting evidence to the whole class or explaining their thinking in small groups. There was one pair of students, however, who were unable to engage in the final presentations due to their lack of communication skills, and, with no special attention from the teacher, they chose not to do so.

5. Some of the students in the class were English language learners. The format of the class and the project they were working on took into account both their limitations and their unique background knowledge. While still working collaboratively with other students, all students had the resources needed—such as translation applications on mobile devices provided by the teacher—giving them the freedom to explore challenging content and the appropriate scaffolding to help them be successful.

Lesson Structure—Section 2

2.1 Lesson Sequence: The lesson was well organized and structured (e.g., the objectives of the lesson were clear to students, and the sequence of the lesson was structured to build understanding and maintain a sense of purpose).

This indicator describes how deeply the teacher thought about the structure of the lesson by considering what content and concepts the students needed to learn and what pedagogical approaches would be most appropriate. This indicator can be evidenced by whether the teacher anticipated students' questions or misconceptions, had methods prepared to address these issues, and reflected those methods in the lesson design. This indicator can also be demonstrated by examining the quality of the learning activities chosen by the teacher, including whether they promoted learning of content objectives, whether they took into account students' prior knowledge and ability to engage with both procedural and conceptual aspects of the lesson, and whether they were appropriate for the time constraints of the lesson. The rater should also assess whether the lesson had a clear sense of purpose and clearly stated objectives. Finally, the rater should take into account the sequence of the lesson as a whole, and whether it had appropriate and reasonable engagement, learning, and wrap up activities.

General Rubric

1. This item should be rated a 1 if the lesson was structured such that there was little or no productive, learning-focused interaction between teacher and students, and/or the content objectives of the lesson were unclear or inappropriate to the developmental level of the students, and/or the sequence of the lesson was disorganized, and/or there was a major problem with the organization or framing of the lesson that significantly and negatively impacted student learning during the majority (75–100%) of the class period.
2. This item should be rated a 2 if the lesson was only occasionally structured to engage students in learning-focused activities and/or the purpose/objectives were not communicated clearly, and/or there were some problems with the organization of the lesson that negatively impacted student learning during approximately 50% of the time allotted for the lesson.
3. This item should be rated a 3 if the lesson's structure and organization were adequate for the majority of time allotted (50–75%). The lesson may not have been structured perfectly, and there may have been a part of the lesson that was disorganized or confusing to the students, but the lesson sequence generally kept students engaged and moving from one portion to the next in a reasonable manner, and students generally seemed to understand the purpose of the lesson and what they were to do to accomplish this purpose.
4. This item should be rated a 4 if the lesson was well structured and well organized. A well-structured lesson would be a developmentally appropriate, well-designed sequence of learning activities that kept students engaged in the content and had a clear sense of purpose throughout the vast majority of the class time (75–90%). However, there may have been a minor missed opportunity or minor organizational issue present during the lesson that wasted student time for learning.

5. This item should be rated a 5 if the structure and organization of the lesson was excellent. The lesson was structured to take into account or build prior knowledge of the topic and was well paced with a thoughtfully chosen sequence of learning activities, and the teacher had anticipated the pedagogical approaches that would be most effective in engaging the students throughout the entire class period.

Specific Examples of Supporting Evidence in the Humanities

1. The teacher structured this lesson such that he gave notes out of the textbook on the overhead projector for entire class, students were expected to take notes silently, and then the class was assigned questions to answer independently from the textbook as homework. The teacher did not have questions prepared to check for student understanding and did not plan for student involvement or input during the lecture portion of the lesson. There was no structured introduction or wrap up plan.
2. The teacher structured this class period as open or “free time,” with students determining their own pace and what work they needed to do without any specific directions from the teacher. The teacher’s structure did include an introduction where the expectations for what the students needed to include in their work were stated explicitly and the teacher occasionally reinforced these expectations during the class session and when he announced it was “time to hand in your work” at the end of class.
3. This lesson structure included a warm up, followed by time allotted for students to work in groups on an activity, and then a wrap up/review at the end of class. The progression from the warm up into the main activity was thoughtfully planned to review some basic concepts, followed by an activity that would take the application of this knowledge to the next level by having students conduct research on an assigned topic using the Internet. The wrap up was sequenced as an extension of the lesson activity but also to provide students with guidance to draw appropriate conclusions from their research. The teacher’s introduction to this portion of the lesson could have been better structured—the teacher’s plans had him talking through the directions at the front of the classroom while students listened and took notes. Because he delivered the directions orally and did not plan to provide a written version, this led to confusion and non-productive activity for some students.
4. The teacher had the agenda on the overhead when the students arrived. The teacher began with a Know/Need to Know/Learn activity and explained the day’s task. The lesson was well thought out, and the instructions and expected outcomes were clear. It was designed to be engaging to students and to allow them to grapple with the content. The teacher had prepared and gave the students a well-thought-out rubric describing each aspect of the day’s assignment and how their performance would be evaluated, but some definitions of quality were difficult for some students to grasp, and they spent a small amount of their work time arguing about these meanings in their groups. At the end of the lesson, the teacher brought the class back together, and they reflected on what they had learned during the lesson.
5. The lesson was structured to begin with a pre-assessment, where student teams were challenged to use claims, evidence, and reasoning to predict causes of pollution in a local river. This introductory segment was followed by an engaging video from a local news station that was stopped periodically by the teacher, who had prepared handouts with probing questions to further challenge students’ predictions and assumptions. The students were told to take notes from the video, using the handout provided, that would develop their evidence or counterpoints to other students’ claims about the causes of pollution. The

teacher had also prepared additional questions to use during the video at key points when he stopped it to emphasize certain facts and opinions by the experts interviewed. The lesson structure then had the teacher leading the students into a rapid-fire debate round where teams continued to argue their positions. This structure worked well and kept the students engaged and on task. The students voted on which team won the debate as the wrap up to the lesson.

2.2 Lesson Importance: The structure of the lesson allowed students to engage with and/or explore important concepts in the Humanities (instead of focusing on techniques that may only be useful on exams).

This indicator measures the degree to which the lesson was structured to allow students to grapple with relevant Humanities concepts and become engaged in learning. This engagement may happen through discovery, exploration, workshop or research activities, but this is not a necessary condition of the indicator. For example, a well-structured lecture can enhance students' abilities to engage with the content if it's communicated clearly, timely, connected to students' prior knowledge, experiences, and interests, and allows students to actively participate during the lesson. This type of lesson is contrasted with a structure that focuses only on techniques for exam preparation. A lesson rated highly on this indicator is structured to allow students to both *understand* and *engage with* underlying concepts and problem-solving procedures/processes/strategies rather than simply memorizing a list of facts *without* exploring the concept to develop a deeper understanding. A lesson rated highly on this indicator will be structured such that students will build meaning and have ownership of important Humanities—English language arts or social studies—ideas and develop the habits of the disciplines.

General Rubric

1. This item should be rated a 1 if the structure of the lesson did not allow students to either engage with or explore concepts or habits in the Humanities.
2. This item should be rated a 2 if the structure of the lesson occasionally or sporadically (only 20–30% of the time) allowed for student engagement in the Humanities concepts or habits.
3. This item should be rated a 3 if the structure of the lesson allowed students to engage with and/or explore the Humanities, but these opportunities were only in place during the lesson approximately 50% of the time.
4. This item should be rated a 4 if the structure of the lesson allowed students to engage with and/or explore Humanities concepts or habits for most of the class period (80–90% of the time). There may have been a minor missed opportunity or small portion of the lesson that was not designed to be as engaging.
5. This item should be rated a 5 if during most (greater than 90%) of the class period, the structure of the lesson allowed students to engage with *and* explore important Humanities concepts or habits. This was a continuous and explicit focus of the teacher's plan, and the structure and sequence were clearly designed to ensure that students remained engaged throughout the entire class period.

Specific Examples of Supporting Evidence in the Humanities

1. During the class period, the students worked silently and independently, taking notes at their desks on a list of important names and dates regarding the Spanish-American War. The structure of the lesson did not provide for any mechanism for students to engage with

or explore the content. The expectation was that students look up key terms and briefly summarize their research on the handout. At the end of class the teacher went over the list, taking volunteers to give their answers for each item and engaging with the students on the content only by stating whether the answer was right or wrong.

2. During the warm up portion of the lesson, the teacher's introductory lesson structure did not elicit elements of student engagement or exploration. During the group work portion of the lesson, the students were assigned a relatively engaging reading, but the group's assignment was secondary to the main objectives for the lesson; the focus and the majority of time spent was on the procedure for identifying persuasive verbs. The lesson structure did not provide opportunities for students to become engaged with techniques of persuasion or even made aware of the author's purpose or rhetorical strategies that the reading would have supported.
3. The movie clips the teacher showed and the sound files the teacher played were clearly chosen and sequenced appropriately to allow students to engage with central concepts of the lesson. The design of the worksheet also allowed students to engage with and further explore the content using interesting, real-world pictures, scenarios, and phenomena they could recognize or had prior experience with. However, the lesson segments that reverted to student note-taking followed by teacher-centered lecture were a missed opportunity for students to engage with or explore the concepts on their own—they were non-interactive for approximately half of the class time.
4. The lesson design incorporated instructional strategies that included giving challenging analytical tasks to the students and having students address them either as a whole class using multiple perspectives or in small groups as the teacher circulated and provided feedback. At the end of the class, the students were able to further explore and explain their understanding of the content by creating their own examples for other students to address. The sequence of the lesson using a real-world application launch activity was structured to enhance students' ability to engage in the content, although this was not brought up again in the lesson segments that followed throughout the lesson.
5. The lesson was structured as described above; however, the real-world application that was used to launch the lesson was embedded in the context of the analytical task. The teacher's lesson design consistently framed student exploration of the topic with an eye toward the students being able to address the real-world problem. The instructional strategies included group and then whole-class discussions over an editorial that addressed a dilemma in their community—the small amount and poor quality of recreational space that schools in low-income neighborhoods have compared to schools in higher-income neighborhoods. Students were first tasked with reading an engaging editorial and discuss how it related to their lives and experiences. The teacher's lesson structure then built on the student's ideas developed on the topic of the editorial to support their analysis of persuasive techniques. The lesson was clearly designed to create opportunity for students to explore the art of persuasion and engage in analytical discussion with their peers and the teacher. The students were challenged to use their knowledge of persuasive techniques to respond to the editorial and choose a rhetorical strategy that would make an effective argument in a manner that gave them a lot of freedom to explore their ideas and be creative.

2.3 Lesson Assessments: The structure of the lesson included opportunities for the instructor to gauge student understanding.

This indicator captures how well the teacher structured the lesson to include opportunities to monitor student understanding of the content, both formally and informally. This can be as simple as the teacher allowing times when he/she can walk around and assess the work of individual students or groups, or the teacher carefully preparing formative assessment questions, both written and oral, to gauge student understanding. This can also be evidenced by a lesson that is structured to allow time for a lot of “student talk” around important concepts, such that the teacher can get a clear picture of what students are thinking. A lesson that would not score well on this indicator would be structured as predominantly teacher-driven with no or few opportunities planned for the teacher to get an idea of what students understand.

General Rubric

1. This item should be rated a 1 if there was little or no time structured into the lesson to assess student understanding—the teacher led the entire lesson with no or little student input regarding their thinking about key concepts.
2. This item should be rated a 2 if there were only occasional or sporadic places in the lesson where there was an opportunity for the teacher to assess or observe what students were thinking, talking about, or doing—perhaps the teacher planned time to elicit a couple of quality student contributions or occasionally did some assessment of a few students thinking based on their written work during the class period.
3. This item should be rated a 3 if there were some opportunities clearly designed in the lesson structure to allow the teacher to gauge student understanding, and there was evidence that the teacher purposefully created appropriate structures or methods for students to express their thinking. However, there may have been a few minor missed opportunities to check in with some students and/or groups.
4. This item should be rated a 4 if there were regular or frequent opportunities for the teacher to gauge student understanding, based on the way the teacher had structured the lesson. The teacher had planned for a number and variety of methods and opportunities for students to explore, propose, share, and refine their thinking.
5. This item should be rated a 5 if the lesson was structured as clearly student-centered—students were consistently and constantly trying out ideas and expressing their understanding of key concepts throughout the majority of the lesson. The teacher planned the lesson so that students spent the entire class period exploring, proposing ideas, sharing, and refining their thinking.

Specific Examples of Supporting Evidence in the Humanities

1. The students read an informational article and were given a handout, but the questions were not structured to uncover any important concepts. The answers were all multiple choice format, facilitating guessing; and the teacher did not plan time to ask questions that could promote the students’ conceptual understanding.
2. During the post-observational interview/survey, the teacher stated, “The materials for this lesson came straight from the Instructional Program Guides (IPGs)” provided by the department chair, which included the student handout and the “correct” answers. The teacher said he prepared for the lesson by going over the expected answers and thinking of an introduction because the material was “dry.” The design of the lesson with the introduction did not contain any questions to elicit student thinking or prior knowledge,

and the majority of class time was structured with the teacher reading the article aloud to the class, without stopping to check vocabulary or comprehension. The teacher said he “expected the students to take notes” for future reference. The teacher did not plan any to move around the room and check on what the students wrote in their notebooks.

3. The structure of this lesson definitely created some opportunities that allowed students to express their thinking and uncover important concepts relating to analyzing informational text while exploring an engaging and challenging activity. The warm up used probes designed to establish student prior knowledge, and then a wrap up would be employed to review and strengthen the foundational ideas students were expected to work through during the activity. However, the teacher did not plan time to address specific student questions.
4. The teacher’s planned objective for this lesson was to build on student knowledge of various structural options for writing informational text in order to analyze the author’s meaning and purpose, first in an article provided by the teacher. Then students were supposed to have brought their own example article to share and discuss with their peers. Students were then to use their notes from the discussion to write their own articles using techniques uncovered to establish meaning and purpose. This structure provided opportunity for eliciting each student’s ideas and conjectures. During the remaining part of the lesson, the teacher planned to make herself available for students with specific questions.
5. As in number 4 above, the teacher’s planned objective for this lesson was to build on student knowledge of various structural options for writing informational text in order to analyze the author’s meaning and purpose, first in an article provided by the teacher. Then students were supposed to have brought their own example article to share and discuss with their peers. Students were then to use their notes from the discussion to write their own articles using techniques uncovered to establish meaning and purpose. The teacher planned a significant amount of time to ask the students to explain their thinking and justify the techniques selected in a variety of ways—from whole-class discussion, within small groups, or as individuals.

2.4 Lesson Investigation: The lesson included an inquiry-based approach to important concepts in the Humanities.

The item assesses the degree to which inquiry-based instruction is successfully incorporated into the lesson. In an inquiry-based approach, the teacher challenges students by presenting relevant real-world problems or realistic dilemmas—often fraught with complexities requiring multiple approaches—in an effort to engage students in higher-order thinking, creativity, and innovation. In Humanities classes, an inquiry-based lesson is one where students are challenged to synthesize resources and then interpret or apply the knowledge gained from those resources in an original way.

It is also important when rating this indicator to distinguish between “inquiry-based” approaches and simply giving a bunch of tasks superficially set in “real-world” contexts. In order for a lesson to be truly inquiry-based, there must be a larger purpose or overarching conceptual understanding that unites and gives purpose to many smaller tasks. For example, if students were asked to analyze and ultimately construct their own political speeches to be delivered to a real audience, this would then be an inquiry-based scenario. However, if the students were asked to answer questions about a series of speeches and then write their own speeches, which are never delivered, this would not be a true inquiry-based lesson.

Although it may seem inappropriate to penalize a teacher for not incorporating inquiry into every single lesson, it is important that we identify the degree to which these behaviors are present. If there are absolutely no elements of inquiry-based instruction in the observed lesson, this indicator should be rated a 1. The indicator should be rated a 1 in this situation even if you feel such instructional strategies would not be appropriate or possible for this particular lesson.

General Rubric

1. This item should be rated a 1 if there were no elements of inquiry-based learning in the lesson.
2. This item should be rated a 2 if there was only a minor example of inquiry-based learning in the lesson, and it was not a focus of the lesson.
3. This item should be rated a 3 if elements of inquiry-based learning were designed to occur with moderate frequency, and/or if the inquiry-based activities were of moderate quality.
4. This item should be rated a 4 if the majority of the lesson design employed an inquiry-based approach and the activities planned were of medium to good quality. However, there may be a small missed opportunity on the part of the teacher to incorporate more aspects of inquiry-based learning into the lesson.
5. This item should be rated a 5 if the lesson was clearly designed with an inquiry-based approach, and the learning activities chosen were of high quality.

Specific Examples of Supporting Evidence in the English Language Arts

1. The lesson structure did not include any inquiry-based activities. The students were given a worksheet with a plot diagram and asked to fill in blanks with the literary terms for plot elements using their textbook as a reference.
2. The teacher's lesson structure had students listen to an audio feed of a storyteller telling a story on a particular theme. While listening, students were asked to complete a plot diagram handout giving examples of each element of the plot from the story.
3. The teacher's lesson structure had students listen to an audio feed of a storyteller telling a story on a particular theme. After listening, the teacher facilitated a discussion where students identified how the elements of the plot developed the strengths of the story. Students were then asked to write their own story on the same theme in their notebooks.
4. The teacher's lesson structure started as in number 3 above, then the students were to take turns practicing telling their story to a small group of their peers who were instructed to provide critical friend feedback based on a teacher-created rubric.
5. Within a larger project on storytelling, the teacher's lesson structure planned for students to engage in the process of analysis of effective stories in order to create the major attributes of the rubric that would be used to evaluate their storytelling performance. Students would then work in small groups to identify the specific criteria for each major element on the rubric. Using a feedback protocol, each group was to share their highest and lowest criteria with justification to the class to provide feedback for final revision to the rubric.

Specific Examples of Supporting Evidence in Social Studies

1. The lesson structure did not include any elements of inquiry-based activities. The teacher provided the students with a handout on the executive branch of government. The students are asked to fill in the blanks on the handout with vocabulary terms using their textbook.

2. The teacher's plan was to present a scenario in which she declared her intention to run for president. The students researched the qualifications for the presidency of the United States and, based on profile data she provided them, answered the question of whether she was eligible to run.
3. The teacher's lesson activity was designed to let students select a current socioeconomic issue and research the position of each presidential candidate on that issue. Each student was expected to contribute the results of the research to the class matrix on the candidates' views.
4. The teacher's lesson plan was to assign small groups of students to research a candidate, a particular current socioeconomic issue, and a target audience. Then, each group would assume roles of campaign managers to advise their candidate on how to appeal to the target audience and create a sample statement to use in an upcoming presidential debate.
5. The teacher planned a project analyzing presidential debates and had each student select a statement from one candidate on an issue of their own choosing. The students were to investigate the factual basis of the statement and the rhetorical strategies used to appeal to different demographics and provide a clarification of the statement and identification of the persuasive techniques used to help inform voters' decision-making.

2.5 Lesson Resources: The teacher obtained and employed resources appropriate for the lesson.

Resources can include visual or presentation tools, such as PowerPoint, white boards, photos, videos, models, or visual organizers. Resources can also consist of the materials the students are supplied with during the lesson, such as texts, primary source documents, artwork, music, technology tools, textbooks, construction paper, scissors, tape, etc. Other resources can include worksheets, quizzes, etc., that the teacher plans to use as part of the lesson. When rating this indicator, particular attention should be paid to the ways in which the teacher uses all kinds of technology or resources appropriately to enhance student learning.

This indicator captures the degree to which the teacher has chosen and uses appropriate resources to successfully implement the lesson. The evidence gathered should demonstrate that the teacher carefully selected resources that enhance the learning opportunities of the students, while avoiding resources that serve as distractions (i.e., the addition of unneeded or irrelevant materials to a lesson or showing videos that are visually appealing or interesting but unconnected to learning objectives) or compromise the lesson's objectives (i.e., having students read relevant text while the teacher dictates annotation to the students instead of having the students read and process through the assigned text for themselves).

We recognize that the types of resources allotted to a classroom may not always be under the teacher's control. However, raters should rate the quality and use of resources without concern for the degree of control the teacher had over what he/she was given.

General Rubric

1. This item should be rated a 1 if one or more of the resources chosen for the lesson was highly inappropriate or negatively impacted student opportunity to learn.
2. This item should be rated a 2 if one or more of the resources chosen for the lesson occasionally negatively impacted student opportunity to learn and/or if there were clearly more appropriate and effective resources that could have been chosen.

3. This item should be rated a 3 if the resources were adequate for the purposes of instruction. None of the resources disrupted student learning, but none of the resources noticeably enhanced learning through their use and implementation.
4. This item should be rated a 4 if there was evidence that the specific resources selected by the teacher were appropriate and enhanced student learning. There may have been a small missed opportunity or minor problem with resource use or there may have been a small instance of limited access to the resources appropriate for each stage of the lesson.
5. This item should be rated a 5 if there was significant evidence that the teacher had carefully selected resources to enhance student learning and that these resources were effective, accessible, and appropriate for this purpose.

Specific Examples of Supporting Evidence English Language Arts

1. The teacher announced the study of Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet*, and then showed a 25-minute video, downloaded from the web, on teen suicide in America. The film emphasized the struggles of families dealing with grief. The teacher passed out a simplified version of the text and instructed the class to follow along while they listened to an audio recording of the first scene of Shakespeare's play (in which there is no reference to teen suicide). The audio recording differed widely from the version of the text provided, and students were visibly confused and disengaged. There was no time for discussion of the relation of the video to the play.
2. The teacher announced the study of Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet*, and then showed the opening sequence of the 1961 film *West Side Story*. Students giggled when the rival gangs danced in the streets. The teacher then showed the opening sequence of a recent film of Shakespeare's play, including an exciting gun battle between Montagues and Capulets in a modern American city and some dialogue from Shakespeare's play. Just before class ended, the teacher coaxed students to name similarities between the two movies. The students spent 45 minutes watching videos, five minutes in a reluctant discussion, and no time actively engaged with the words of the literary text.
3. The teacher passed out texts of the Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet*, with a paraphrase of each scene on the page facing the text. The teacher assigned students to take roles in reading the first scene aloud, first in the paraphrased version and then in Shakespeare's language. Then she showed a 10-minute video clip of the same scene from a traditional performance. In the last minutes of the class, she asked the students which experience they liked best—reading the paraphrased or original text or watching the performance of the original text. There was not much enthusiasm, but a tacit agreement with the teacher's suggestion to mix the three.
4. The teacher announced that the class would use a mix of performance and reading to approach Shakespeare's play as a text for actors. As a first step, actors and readers have to figure out what the words mean. To show how some actors interpret words, the teacher showed the opening sequence of a recent film of Shakespeare's play set in a modern American city, including an exciting gun battle between Montagues and Capulets. Then the teacher assigned roles for reading the same scene aloud in Shakespeare's words, with the assigned task of finding parts that are hard to understand. She then instructed student pairs to use the footnotes to paraphrase pairs of difficult lines they had chosen. She had them read aloud, first their paraphrases and then the original lines, with the question, "Does the original ever *sound* better?" emphasizing that the poetic sound of the original text might have performance value beyond the decoding of the hard-to-understand parts.

5. The teacher posted an agenda on the overhead projector under the title “Play Means Play,” assigning students to working groups to prepare to perform readings of short scenes from *Romeo and Juliet*. As they evidently had practiced in prior lessons, groups used footnotes and dictionaries to figure out meanings of their own lines and discussed staging ideas. The teacher made three different videos available, and student groups took turns using the two classroom computers to watch different versions of their scenes. The teacher encouraged students to observe how professional actors solve problems of interpretation, and to borrow or adapt ideas freely. While some groups did video research, others rehearsed scenes as the teacher circulated, answered questions, and kept groups on task.

Specific Examples of Supporting Evidence in Social Studies

1. In studying World War II, the teacher showed an episode of a TV series that described a soldier’s life during the Korean War. Although entertaining, neither that episode nor the teacher made any connections to the American soldier’s experience in WWII.
2. The teacher provided a map of the locations of concentration camps across Europe, but the map was a black-and-white copy of the color original and the legend was uninformative. Students were unable to complete the task because they could not distinguish areas of different color.
3. The teacher showed an episode of a TV series that charted the progress of a military unit from the invasion at Normandy to the conclusion of the WWII in Europe. Included in the show were actual interviews with veterans who were members of that unit. Students tracked the progress of the military unit on a map after the segment was shown to the class. Using Internet resources, students maintained a log of the unit’s progress through Europe in WWII (ending with the liberation of a concentration camp).
4. Using an overhead projection device, the teacher displayed a series of primary source documents, including letters from servicemen, military campaign maps, and additional interviews, while students brainstormed an evidenced-based explanation of the nature of the American soldier’s experience in Europe in WWII in their interactive notebooks.
5. Students created a class website or blog where each student curated video, primary sources, images, etc. to present an evidenced-based explanation and illustrate the nature of the American soldier’s experience in Europe in WWII.

2.6 Lesson Reflection: The teacher was critical and reflective about his/her practice after the lesson, recognizing the strengths and weaknesses of his/her instruction.

This indicator is evidenced by the teacher’s response to post-lesson interview questions such as “What were the strengths/weaknesses of the lesson?” and “If you had a chance to teach this lesson to the same group of students, what would you do differently? Why?” This indicator measures the degree to which the teacher is reflective and critical about the overall planning and structuring of the lesson, as well as the instructional decision making during the lesson. The teacher should be able to identify some of the strengths and weaknesses of the observed lesson that were identified by you, the observer, when using the UTOP. Keep in mind that the UTOP *does* assess instructional choices like resource use, classroom management, and time management.

This item is rated Not Applicable (NA) if there is no post-interview or reflection data available with the lesson.

General Rubric

1. This item should be rated a 1 if the teacher did not discuss or recognize any strengths or weaknesses of instruction.
2. This item should be rated a 2 if the teacher identified strengths and weaknesses that were unimportant and/or that were only related to tangential or insignificant procedural elements of the lesson. These strengths and weaknesses were unrelated to what is assessed on the UTOP.
3. This item should be rated a 3 if the teacher discussed and recognized one or two important strengths of instruction captured by the UTOP, but perhaps did not acknowledge or recognize any of the major weaknesses.
4. This item should be rated a 4 if the teacher recognized a fair portion (but not all) of the strengths and weaknesses the rater identified.
5. This item should be rated a 5 if the teacher recognized many of the strengths and weaknesses of the lesson that the rater recognized while evaluating the lesson with the UTOP. This item should also be rated a 5 if the teacher recognized the most important strengths and weaknesses of the lesson.

Specific Examples of Supporting Evidence in the Humanities

1. The teacher described as a strength of the lesson the fact that students were showing understanding by raising their hands to give steps when prompted. The observer did not document evidence of students showing understanding on the UTOP record, instead noting that the limited ways in which students were able to express their ideas and participate was actually a weakness. The teacher said his lesson did not have any weaknesses—he would do the same thing again.
2. The teacher noted as a weakness that he should have written instructions on the board as he prepared for his lesson; however, there were much more significant and important issues with this lesson that he did not identify but that were documented in the UTOP record by the observer, such as the lack of any productive work done by the students during the class session. The teacher also claimed it was a strength of his lesson when he called on the students “who were paying attention” that they could answer his questions. However, the observer noted that the teacher had offered no follow-up questions to get them to explain their thinking. The teacher responded that he “did not see the point in that kind of questioning. They got it right, for the most part.” In addition, he felt another strength of the lesson was that he allowed the students to “move around” the classroom; however, simply allowing students to move is not significant in and of itself and the observer noted that this activity was counterproductive to student learning.
3. The teacher said a strength of his lesson was that it was very “content focused,” and he had a specific lesson plan prepared. His level of preparation included some questions he had ready to use when students got “stuck,” which he felt was another strength of the lesson. He said that if he were to teach the lesson again, he’d make greater use of visual examples, yet this was not noted as a particular weakness—his resources and interaction levels allowed students to work productively.
4. The teacher described one strong point of his lesson as the students being able to work at their own pace, not his. This was noted by the observer and documented on the UTOP as evidence for Indicators 2.4 and 3.3, supporting this assertion. The teacher said that, as a weakness, a few of the students finished quickly and became bored, and he should have been prepared to challenge them further or encouraged them to continue participation by

helping others. This was a weakness and was also noted in evidence collected with Indicator 1.3.

5. The teacher said the strongest point of his lesson was the depth of student engagement in the economic market simulation that required students to rapidly try out different trading scenarios and observe what happens in each case. The observer also noted that student engagement was definitely the most important strength and documented several instances throughout the UTOP record. The teacher said an important weakness was that there was too much teacher talk and the students didn't seem to have a chance to process the outcome of the simulation by the end of the class and get to a deeper understanding of the fundamental concept. This was definitely the most important weakness, as described in the evidence for Indicator 3.4.

Implementation—Section 3

3.1 Implementation Questioning: The teacher used questioning strategies to encourage participation, check on skill development, and facilitate intellectual engagement and productive interaction with students about important content and concepts.

Questioning strategies can be successfully employed by teachers in order to manage student attention, encourage intellectual engagement, and ensure active participation in the lesson activity. Questioning strategies can also develop students' procedural skills by helping to remind or cue them to steps in a known process or to scaffold the development and use of an accepted explanation. Questioning strategies can serve as a way to engage students in the review of concepts the class has already covered, reminding them of what they learned in recent activities or lectures. Questioning may also be used to introduce students to the focus and purpose of the lesson, especially when new concepts or ideas are to be explored and when the teacher needs to draw upon students' prior knowledge. Effective questioning strategies include appropriately using "wait time," and validating all responses to maintain rapport in a low-risk, collegial classroom environment.

The types of questions a teacher may use range from simple procedural checks on understanding to more challenging probes that force students to think critically and to synthesize what they already know and apply it to novel situations. Intellectually engaging and challenging questions can be used to facilitate students' development of conceptual understanding as well as identify prior conceptions and uncover misconceptions by investigating incorrect answers through follow-up questioning. This indicator assesses the degree to which the teacher uses appropriate questioning strategies for any and all of these purposes.

General Rubric

1. This item should be rated a 1 if the teacher used little or no appropriate questioning strategies that engaged students with important content or concepts at any level during the lesson.
2. This item should be rated a 2 if the teacher occasionally or sporadically questioned a few students to refocus attention, encourage participation, or check on skill development, but there were no instances of questions that challenged students to think critically about important content or concepts.
3. This item should be rated a 3 if the teacher regularly used questioning techniques to encourage and maintain participation and to check on skill development and progress with the lesson activity during some portions of the lesson, especially the introduction and wrap

up. The teacher asked appropriate procedural and factual questions about important content or concepts but rarely challenged student thinking with question probes for deeper understandings or misconceptions.

4. This item should be rated a 4 if the teacher frequently used questioning techniques to encourage and maintain participation and develop skills throughout the class period. Some questions were asked that probed student thinking about important content or concepts, uncovering alternatives or misconceptions that were then appropriately used by the teacher to get students to reflect and expand further on this content or concepts.
5. This item should be rated a 5 if the teacher consistently and continually used multi-level questioning strategies to encourage and maintain participation and to check on skill development and students' progress with the lesson activity throughout the class period. In addition, the majority of questions asked probed students' thinking about important content or concepts deeply, challenging preconceptions and assumptions and pushing students to draw their own conclusions.

Specific Examples of Supporting Evidence in English Language Arts

1. There were few or no examples of appropriate questioning strategies used in this lesson. For example, in an English class, the teacher called on students in alphabetical order, expecting them to pronounce a word and read a definition out loud to the class. If a student did not respond with the correct pronunciation, the teacher ignored the response and moved on to the next student. The teacher used no wait time and, when frustrated by the hesitation of the students' response times, simply read the word himself. Even if other students called out responses, the teacher continued without acknowledging what the students were saying.
2. The majority of the teacher's questions were closed-ended and structured to ensure that the students responded with the one and only correct answer. For example, in an English class, the teacher called out words from the vocabulary list and asked students to identify the parts of speech. If students gave incorrect responses, the teacher corrected them but missed multiple opportunities to ask follow-up questions of students about their mistakes to see what misconceptions might have led to their error. One student asked if a word could be used as a different part of speech, "like drawl," and the teacher responded, "Yes, we'll get to that later." The teacher did not consistently use an adequate amount of wait time and talked extremely fast so that all words could be covered in the amount of time allotted for this part of the lesson.
3. The teacher asked the students a lot of questions to prompt interaction and response, but the questions were frequently more procedural than conceptual. For example, in an English class, the teacher assigned a set of vocabulary words to each group of three students. The groups were to explore all the different ways a word could be used and the ways in which the different uses change the identified parts of speech. The groups were also expected to write example sentences for each use. The teacher did maintain the student-focused integrity of the group learning activity by asking questions rather than telling them the expected answers, but much of his questioning dealt with directing the students to consider additional uses to expand their list, rather than probing for student ideas about the underlying implications the activity was designed to uncover.
4. The teacher asked students to revise drafts of their current papers by referring to the vocabulary word wall with a focus on improving word choice in their essays. If a student appeared stumped, the teacher sometimes gave more information than necessary for them to move forward with their revisions instead of asking questions to probe more deeply into

their thinking and why they were struggling. However, overall, the teacher asked thought-provoking, higher-level questions of all of the students when checking in with them, and some students were able to explain their changes in word choice and how it improved their paper.

5. The teacher purposefully and consistently used multiple probing questions to allow students to uncover incomplete understandings by examining their own work or conclusions. The teacher’s questions also prompted students to explain and clarify their choices and the thinking behind them. For example, in the English class task described above, the teacher asked the students to get into groups of three and to review and give feedback to each other on the value of the changes they made to their drafts. The teacher encouraged students to critique and question their classmates’ work in order to extend upon their ideas. He used follow-up, probing questions about these student-derived revisions and feedback in order to develop the “big picture”—understanding of writers’ options with parts of speech and the impact of word choice. The teacher relied on direct instruction only when absolutely necessary, instead using student-derived artifacts with questioning strategies to skillfully guide students to explore, explain, and develop their own understanding of the fundamental concepts of parts of speech that form the basis for effective communication.

3.2 Implementation Involvement: The teacher involved all students in the lesson (calling on non-volunteers, facilitating student–student interaction, checking in with hesitant learners, etc.).

This item assesses the degree to which the teacher actively works to ensure that all students are participating and intellectually engaged in the lesson. This indicator can be evidenced by the teacher encouraging students who are not volunteering to participate, providing multiple entry points into the lesson for students with different knowledge levels and allowing various modes of participation (whole class, small group, individual work), or walking around the room and verbally engaging students in an effort to monitor class participation. If the teacher simply calls on several volunteers to give short, factual answers, it is not considered evidence for high scores on this indicator—the teacher should be involving students whether they volunteer or not and should be finding important and authentic ways for them to contribute. This indicator can be evidenced by his or her movement about the classroom to interact with and spend time with all students, not just the ones actively asking for assistance.

General Rubric

1. This item should be rated a 1 if the teacher did not attempt to involve all students in the lesson. This means the teacher only called on volunteers during whole-class portions of the lesson or only checked in with groups who specifically requested help during group-work portions of the lesson.
2. This item should be rated a 2 if the teacher occasionally or sporadically made an attempt to involve all students in the lesson. Perhaps the teacher occasionally called on non-volunteers, or only checked in with some groups not requesting help when she had responded to all other student requests for assistance.
3. This item should be rated a 3 if the teacher made moves to involve all students in the lesson but ultimately did not do enough such that all students were able to participate. This item should also be rated a 3 if the teacher is not seen making any specific moves to involve all students in the lesson, but all students seem to be involved anyway. The teacher

may have made moves previously (throughout the school year) to set up and ensure a classroom culture where all students are expected to actively participate.

4. This item should be rated a 4 if the teacher made clear attempts to involve a wide variety of students in the lesson and was actively working to ensure the participation of all students. Occasionally, the teacher may have missed an opportunity to maintain participation with struggling students who stopped working, or the teacher may not have appropriately challenged uninvolved students who finished early during some portion of the lesson.
5. This item should be rated a 5 if, throughout the lesson, the teacher was actively and consistently working to involve, challenge, and maintain intellectual engagement and participation in the lesson activities with every student, including shy students, hesitant learners, bored/disruptive students, struggling students, and students with special needs.

Specific Examples of Supporting Evidence in the Humanities

1. The teacher made no attempt to involve all students in the lesson. She heard only from volunteers, and a number of students who were not engaged or did not understand what to do stopped participating. During the group-work portion of the lesson when students were filling out responses on a worksheet, the teacher assisted only groups close to her desk at the front who asked for help. She said a few times that everyone in the group needed to be able to understand and explain the information the class was writing down on the worksheet, but no attempts were made to check on each group member's progress, and some students were continuously off-task.
2. Most of the time, the teacher focused her attention on only those students who were being disruptive or off-task. Occasionally, the teacher interacted with or called on a non-volunteer or group who appeared to be working, but the interaction was superficial and provided little information about what the students thought or knew. The teacher did not attempt to monitor the progress of all students or to check on their understanding of the content; she was too busy managing off-task behavior and trying to push the class through the steps of the activity before the class session ended. Some groups of students were left on their own to fill out a worksheet and, when confused, raised their hands to ask the teacher a question, but her back was turned and she was therefore not able to answer them.
3. The majority of students were involved in the lesson, functioning without explicit intervention or encouragement by the teacher. The teacher had established the classroom environment and implemented a lesson activity such that an adequate number of students worked to complete a Venn diagram comparing the political approaches of Malcolm X and Martin Luther King, Jr. for obtaining African Americans' civil rights. Throughout the lesson, the teacher walked around to monitor various groups, asking questions to check for completion and redirecting off-task behavior. However, she didn't engage directly with a couple of struggling students who subsequently disengaged and stopped working. In addition, one student who finished the worksheet quickly worked on assignments for another class, and the teacher didn't make specific attempts to challenge the student to expand his understanding beyond the completion of the worksheet.
4. The teacher circulated throughout the classroom constantly and spoke with different students in each group, asking them multiple-level questions—from procedural to conceptual—to check for completion and understanding of their work. The students were assigned meaningful group roles, so they all were required to contribute to the activity in different ways. For example, in this lesson about different protest strategies in the Civil Rights Movement, the teacher challenged each group to create a visual display to

summarize what they had learned and share with the whole class. However, when the final presentations were made, the teacher did not consistently follow up with each group member, asking them to explain what they thought of or had contributed to the group's final product.

5. The teacher used a specific strategy, such as discussion protocol, during this class period to get all students, especially the quiet or shy students, to share their thinking. First, students discussed their ideas in pairs so that they could get feedback from their partner. Then students were assigned to small groups with meaningful group roles and held each other responsible for the work of the group. Next, the teacher listened to the group's discussions guided by the protocol, and consistently probed group members to dig for deeper understanding, as well as validated their thinking before inviting each group to share their ideas in front of the class. The teacher frequently called on non-volunteers in non-threatening ways and encouraged all to explain their reasoning throughout, purposefully and successfully involving all students in the lesson.

3.3 Implementation Modification: The teacher used formative assessment effectively to be aware of the progress of all students and modified the lesson appropriately when formative assessment demonstrated that students did not understand.

This indicator assesses the degree to which the teacher uses formative assessment techniques to gain awareness of his or her students' progress and understanding and makes appropriate adjustments and modifications to address student instructional needs throughout the progression of the lesson. Evidence of this item can be observed during the class or directly obtained by asking the teacher about lesson modifications during a post-observation interview. An effective teacher may utilize a variety of formative assessments of student progress, including written assessments like quizzes, warm ups, journals, and reflections, as well as informal assessments, such as any evaluation based on discussion, questioning, and observation.

This indicator assesses how effectively the teacher monitors the student's progress in order to further inform his or her instructional needs. The observer should analyze the various assessments used by the teacher, examine how the assessments influenced the teaching in the classroom, and determine how the information gained was used by the teacher to alter or adapt instruction "in the moment" to change either the path of the lesson or the time devoted to a specific portion of the lesson. This indicator should capture the frequency and the quality of the teacher's formative assessments and modifications made based on the information gained throughout the class session.

General Rubric

1. This item should be rated a 1 if the teacher did not attempt to formatively assess student understanding during the lesson. This item should also be rated a 1 if it was clear that modifications to the lesson were needed to support student understanding, but the teacher did not make modifications.
2. This item should be rated a 2 if the teacher made only occasional or sporadic attempts to formatively assess student understanding and the information was not used to modify instruction.
3. This item should be rated a 3 if the teacher made regular attempts at formative assessment, but some of these attempts were of poor quality and the teacher missed opportunities to fully elicit student understanding. The teacher should have made some modifications to the lesson based on formative assessment of student understanding, and these modifications may have been somewhat successful. This item should also be rated a 3 if

the teacher made no modifications to the lesson, but the teacher’s formative assessments suggested that no modifications were needed.

4. This item should be rated a 4 if the teacher consistently used formative assessments to monitor student progress during the lesson, and these assessments were of sufficient quantity to allow the teacher to obtain a clear picture of student understanding. The teacher also adjusted the lesson based on formative assessment as appropriate throughout the class period. There may have been a small missed opportunity to modify the lesson or a modification that was not completely successful.
5. This item should be rated a 5 if the teacher consistently used high-quality formative assessment throughout the class period to monitor student understanding and was able to modify his or her teaching or carefully target instruction based on the results of this assessment. The teacher successfully and consistently adjusted the lesson based on formative assessment of student understanding as appropriate throughout the class period.

Specific Examples of Supporting Evidence in the Humanities

1. The teacher did not circulate during the portion of the lesson when the students were working in groups, and no instructional modification was evident. At the front of the room, the teacher seemed to be spending most of his time entering grades on his computer or preparing for the next class. The teacher moved from the front of the room only in one instance—to a group that loudly and disruptively demanded her help and were unwilling to come to him.
2. During the introduction and warm up, the teacher called on a few students to repeat the instructions for the day’s activity to check for understanding of the procedures. Once students began working in groups, the teacher circulated infrequently and did not appear to assess progress or monitor student thinking in each group, so there was no evidence of modification of instruction based on formative assessment. The teacher did assist students who came up to her desk and explicitly asked for help, but the teacher’s responses were limited to repeating the instructions and showing students the procedural steps to filling in the vocabulary words on the worksheet. Students who did not seek the teacher out did not get assessed and received no modification of instruction to meet their specific learning needs.
3. The teacher regularly checked on each group’s progress on a worksheet and verified that their work was correct at each checkpoint before groups continued to the next section. Sometimes the teacher quickly stamped correct answers for completion but did not take the opportunity to ask the students questions to probe their rationale for their responses. Sometimes the teacher asked scaffolding questions to help students who struggled or had incorrect responses; when students asked questions, the teacher responded with another question that guided students to the correct response. Most of the time, however, the teacher asked only lower-order questions of the students, then checked off that they’d completed their work and moved on to the next group. There was some evidence of altering or modifying instruction when students were clearly frustrated, but the teacher missed opportunities to ask questions that would unpack their misconceptions or gaps in knowledge.
4. The teacher consistently circulated around the room to assess student progress, probing with questions about what sources their Internet searches on selected research topics had produced. After addressing each group of students, the teacher had determined that their search questions were too broad to garner useful sources. The teacher decided to call one member of each group to join her at the front of the room for a brief tutorial and showed

these students how to construct a more targeted key word search. She sent them back to their groups to share what they learned and charged them with the task of supporting each other in reconstructing their search questions. The teacher continued monitoring students' ability to find useful sources by asking questions about the sources their key word search uncovered.

5. The teacher implemented the lesson as described above, requiring students to develop key word searches to uncover meaningful Internet resources to address their research questions. Noting that most students were able to successfully complete this part of the assignment, the teacher challenged completers to choose one of their sources and prepare a detailed set of annotated notes containing information that would allow them to answer their research questions. While the completers worked on this, the teacher gathered those who were still confused at the front desk to discuss and work through an example of how to create key words in order to narrow a search to get useful information. After this teacher-led workshop, the students were able to refine their search terms and find better resources. The teacher continued circulating, monitoring student work and asking probing questions throughout the period. Depending on the student responses, the teacher alternated between challenging students to think more deeply about their annotations and supporting students' attempts to narrow their searches.

3.4 Implementation Timing: An appropriate amount of time was devoted to each part of the lesson.

This indicator analyzes the pace and flow of the lesson. It is important to note whether the amount of time devoted to each part of the lesson is sufficient, with portions of the lesson neither becoming overly repetitive nor being rushed through. This indicator should be evidenced by examining the progress of the students (i.e., whether their needs are being met by the pace of the instruction) and the amount of time dedicated to important and less crucial aspects of the lesson (e.g., most of the time devoted to an activity should allow the students to carry it out rather than the teacher giving procedural directions). Even if the lesson is an extended inquiry that is designed to continue for several days, some time for introduction at the beginning and wrap up and reflection at the end of the class period is appropriate.

General Rubric

1. This item should be rated a 1 if there was a significant amount of wasted time during the class period where students were unengaged or off task, or if there was another major timing issue that disrupted student learning.
2. This item should be rated a 2 if there were several instances of wasted time during the class period where students were off task, and/or if an appropriate amount of time was not devoted to key portions of the lesson, leading to confusion or frustration on the part of the students.
3. This item should be rated a 3 if there were no major timing issues or wasted time during the lesson, but perhaps an appropriate amount of time was not devoted to more important parts of the lesson, like the time allotted for student work was not sufficient, or the wrap up portion of the lesson was missing. A few students disengaged early or were left trying to finish when the bell rang.
4. This item should be rated a 4 if sufficient amounts of time were devoted to the most important portions of the lesson and appropriate amounts of time for introduction, instructions, and wrap up were evidenced because most of the students were engaged and productively on-task throughout the lesson. There may have been one instance of wasted

time, or one portion of the lesson might have been slightly more rushed or allotted more time than it should have been, but the overall flow and timing allowed most students to accomplish the work of the lesson activity.

5. This item should be rated a 5 if the appropriate amount of time was devoted to all portions of the lesson, including introduction, instructions, and wrap up. All students were productively on-task, as there were no instances of wasted time during this lesson, and all parts of the lesson proceeded at an appropriate pace.

Specific Examples of Supporting Evidence in English Language Arts

1. The teacher began a writing workshop, asking students to choose partners and exchange paragraphs written in a previous class. Several students did not bring their writing, and they were told to write new paragraphs quickly. Some complied. Other pairs exchanged papers but had to wait a half hour while the other writers caught up. Once every pair had exchanged papers, the teacher placed instructions on the overhead, introducing the concept of an appealing “hook” in the first sentence. The class ended before any actual peer editing took place. As students filed out, the teacher shouted a reminder to bring their writing to the next class in two days.
2. The teacher passed out paragraphs written in the previous class for peer editing. Several minutes passed as students found partners and the teacher had to spend some time circulating and prompting some to form pairs. She then passed out a rubric to each student, and placed a copy on the overhead to guide initial steps like filling in their names in the appropriate blank. Then the teacher read aloud each part of the rubric: thesis statement, supporting examples (1 to 3), and concluding statement. Finally, she asked for volunteers to identify the thesis, etc. Four students provided the answers while the rest more or less sat quietly. In the last ten minutes of class, students hastily marked up their partners’ papers and, as class ended, returned them to the teacher before discussing them with their partners.
3. The teacher began a peer-editing workshop by passing out papers written in a previous class and arranging students in pairs of nearest neighbors. She led a quick review of how to identify thesis statements, demonstrating how to use the rubric by showing two examples from student papers from this class. She then gave editing partners ten minutes to identify each other’s thesis statements and to make suggestions for clarification. The teacher then called volunteer pairs to come forward to explain each other’s thesis statements to the class, using the document camera. The teacher then used a volunteer’s paper to lead a group review of supporting examples. The editing partners had less than ten minutes to underline and number the supporting examples in each other’s papers before class ended.
4. As they arrived, students went straight to a writing file to retrieve writing done in a previous class. They settled in pre-assigned writing pairs and chatted until the bell rang to begin class. The teacher announced that the focus for editing would be smooth transitions between paragraphs, and she used the doc-cam to show some examples of clear transitions chosen from student papers. She gave student partners ten minutes to identify and discuss transitions and to improve as needed. She called volunteers to show successful examples and also to suggest needed revisions. Students had ten more minutes to make revisions and to get editors to evaluate them. Class ended with the announcement that in the next meeting they would look at strong concluding statements.
5. As they arrived, students went directly to retrieve writing-in-progress from a master file. At the bell the teacher welcomed them and called attention to instructions on the overhead,

prompting them to read and edit for memorable concluding sentences. While students worked in pairs, the teacher circulated. After ten minutes the teacher asked two editors to present their partners' work as inspiring examples on the document camera, and for ten minutes the class discussed these before returning to editing. Most pairs completed their work within the next ten minutes, turned in their papers, and collected the next assignment from the master file. Students worked individually on journaling and outlining for this new assignment while the last editing pairs, prompted by the teacher, completed their revisions. By the end of the class period, every student had submitted a revised assignment and begun the next project.

Specific Examples of Supporting Evidence in Social Studies

1. The teacher began the class by displaying an excerpt from the Federalist Papers illustrating some key ideas of republicanism. Several students raised their hands to ask questions, but the teacher did not call on them and told them to just copy the underlined passages into their notebooks. A few students at the back of the room called out "Why are we doing this?" but the teacher ignored them. After 45 minutes of the teacher reading and underlining passages, most students had closed their notebooks and disengaged—chatting with each other, applying makeup, or sleeping. This continued until the bell rang and the students simply gathered their belongings and walked out the door.
2. The teacher assigned a different passage from Federalist Paper 10 to each student group and told them to annotate their selection in support of the key idea of republicanism on the provided graphic organizer to present to the class. The teacher took 25 minutes at the beginning of the class period getting the student groups organized. Once the groups started working, the teacher circulated to monitor progress but spent a lot of time at two of the six groups, repeating the directions and identifying key phrases for the students. Groups who were not in contact with the teacher struggled with the language and disengaged quickly, becoming frustrated. As a result, the class ended before all student groups had a chance to complete the assignment.
3. The teacher spent five minutes at the beginning of the class demonstrating how to complete the graphic organizer. The time devoted to introduction, group work, and student presentation portions of this lesson seemed to be adequate for most students, but when one group finished early, the teacher did not challenge them with another task. One group monopolized most of the teacher's time, so that not all groups were able to present their responses and the teacher did not have time to summarize or provide a wrap up at the end of class.
4. As the students entered the classroom, the teacher handed them a group assignment and sent them to a pre-arranged set of desks to work. As soon as the class started, the teacher showed the students how to annotate and complete the graphic organizer. The teacher used an overhead timer and announced that the groups would have ten minutes to review and annotate the passage assigned to their group, then they would begin presenting their work and explain how their selection supports the idea of republicanism to the whole class. The teacher moved to monitor each group's work frequently, keeping students engaged and on-task while moving on to the next group within 30 seconds. Although all groups managed to present their work to the whole class, time ran out and the teacher offered no wrap up of the content taught during this lesson.
5. Students entered the classroom and took seats in previously assigned groups. The teacher showed the students how to annotate and complete the graphic organizer and then gave groups different passages from Federalist Paper 10 as well as poster paper on which to

record their chosen quote and create a visual representation for presentation in a gallery walk. The teacher used an overhead timer and announced that the groups would have ten minutes to choose their quotes and make their posters, then they would begin presenting their work by posting their papers around the classroom. The teacher allowed early finishers to support groups that were struggling with the language or an image. The teacher explained how the gallery walk would work and the students took turns explaining how their quote exemplified republicanism to other students who came by their posters. All student groups had time to share their understanding during the gallery walk, and the teacher used the last group's work to summarize for the whole class how Federalist 10 highlights the ideas of republicanism.

3.5 Implementation Connections: The instructional strategies and activities used in this lesson clearly connected to students' prior knowledge and experience.

This indicator captures the degree to which the classroom instruction takes into consideration the students' prior knowledge of English or social studies concepts or students' experiences with English and social studies in their everyday lives. The teacher may begin a lesson by explicitly connecting concepts the students have already learned to concepts the class will be exploring that day. Alternatively, the teacher may wait until a particular point during the course of a lesson where it becomes important—i.e., there is a “need to know”—to remind students of how a concept they're learning relates to prior content, in that class or other classes.

The teacher might purposely solicit students' prior knowledge or their experiences with English and social studies concepts that appear in everyday life to launch the lesson. To score highly on this indicator, the teacher must not only make efforts to elicit students' prior knowledge and experience, but he or she also must use this prior knowledge to reach the objectives or enrich the students' interest and understanding of the concepts being taught.

General Rubric

1. This item should be rated a 1 if there was no evidence of the teacher making any attempt at connecting instruction to students' prior knowledge and experiences.
2. This item should be rated a 2 if the teacher made a small or passing reference to a previously learned English or social studies concept and/or students' everyday experiences with the Humanities.
3. This item should be rated a 3 if the teacher made at least one explicit attempt to draw upon students' prior knowledge of previously learned English or social studies concepts and students' everyday experiences with the Humanities, seeking and getting input from students in the class.
4. This item should be rated a 4 if the teacher made several attempts throughout the class period to draw upon students' prior knowledge of previously learned English or social studies concepts and students' everyday experiences with the Humanities, getting input from a majority of students in the class.
5. This item should be rated a 5 if the lesson was built purposefully and explicitly from the perspective of the students' prior knowledge of the concepts being covered. This included both their prior school knowledge of related English or social studies concepts, and their prior knowledge of using or experiencing Humanities concepts in everyday life. In addition, the teacher made a significant effort to get input from all students related to their experiences and prior knowledge with the English or social studies content and concepts

explored in the lesson. This item should also be rated a 5 if the teacher engaged the class in an extended discussion relating to their prior knowledge and experience, making it a focus of instruction.

Specific Examples of Supporting Evidence in English Language Arts

1. After announcing a lesson on writing with correct subject–verb agreement, the teacher presented a pair of rules: “If the subject ends in –s, the verb does not” and “If the verb ends in –s, the subject does not.” He gave two examples in one sentence: “The **teacher is** always right and the **students are** bright.” Students then made corrections on a worksheet of 20 sentences, most with errors students are unlikely to make. Class ended with no attempt to connect the lesson to editing and correcting any actual writing experience, prior or current, by these students.
2. The teacher announced that students would practice correcting commonly confused words: *affect/effect*, *conscious/conscience*, and *advice/advise*. Students completed a worksheet, and then checked their results together. Students called on seem to be guessing at the answers. They ended the lesson composing new sentences with each of the confusing words. No attempt was made to relate the lesson to previous lessons, or to other current student writing projects.
3. The teacher dictated a short passage that used the words “its” and “it’s” several times, reminding students of how this confusing problem has been a common error since elementary school. She then called a student to place his version of the dictation on the doc-cam, and students discussed his answers one at a time as they corrected their own copies. The teacher reminded students to think of “its” as being like “his,” a familiar possessive without an apostrophe. She added that the apostrophe in “it’s” is a sign of a contraction, as in the easier-to-remember “can’t” and “don’t.” Students then practiced correcting multiple uses of “its” and “it’s” in a worksheet passage that plausibly resembled student writing.
4. Students exchanged drafts of a descriptive assignment they had already edited for specific detail and reader appeal. The announced focus for the day was editing common errors in spelling and grammar. The teacher distributed a proofreading checklist students had used in previous workshops, and each student editor used it to check for common errors. The teacher reminded students of recent lessons on “it’s/its” and the problem with using “me” in a compound subject (as in “me and my friend went to . . .”). The teacher circulated, checking as student editors found and marked errors (or missed others). He occasionally reminded the whole class when he noted recurring problems they had worked on in previous workshops (e.g., “Remember when we did ‘I before E except after . . .’”).
5. Students exchanged drafts of a persuasive essay with editing partners who had already worked on thesis and argument. The teacher announced that editors and writers were mutually responsible for producing a text completely free of spelling errors. He reminded them of the Spelling Wall, where students had posted brightly written problem words from previous writing workshops (e.g., “Peace on *Earth*” and *Piece of Pie*”). Editors raised their hands to check on words they were not sure about, and the teacher directed them either to the classroom dictionaries or the two classroom computers. When a student found a new problem word not yet on the Spelling Wall, she made a new entry, called the class’s attention to it, and posted it. Half a dozen words were added to the wall during the class period (e.g., *friend*, *except*, *appearance*, *necessary*), and the teacher checked each written entry before it was posted. When an editor finished reading and correcting a piece, he

signed it and returned it to the writer, who usually exercised the option to find a second editor.

Specific Examples of Supporting Evidence in Social Studies

1. In this lesson, the U.S. History teacher displayed notes on Westward Expansion on the doc-cam and instructed the students to copy the notes into their notebooks. No attempt was made to place the information in a larger context or connect to previous lessons on the growth of the nation.
2. In this U.S. History lesson about Westward Expansion and its effect on the growth of the nation, the instructor simply stated that the key American belief that led people to move west was Manifest Destiny. When a student asked, “What is Manifest Destiny?” the instructor stated emphatically, “I know you know this! I’m sure it was covered in eighth grade!”
3. In a lesson about Westward Expansion, the instructor attempted to elicit students’ ability to connect with the idea of Manifest Destiny by showing a series of aerial photographs of their town over the past 20 years and asking them to make observations about the changes they noticed in the images. Although this discussion was a fair effort to engage students in an abstract concept of growth in their own community and establish a context for learning, the primary objective of the lesson, Westward Expansion, was not developed further to raise questions about the consequences of expansion, even though there were multiple instances where the continuation of this discussion would have been appropriate.
4. In the lesson about Westward Expansion described above, in addition to sharing images of the growth in their town over time, the teacher shared a series of maps showing changes in land use during the time of Westward Expansion. These images were used to seed a discussion about displacement of native peoples as a consequence of growth. The teacher told the students that they could use their textbook, the Internet, or the maps she provided as resources to create a map or a timeline of the movement of a specific Native American tribe over the time period 1850–1900.
5. In the lesson described above, the teacher repeatedly came back to the “How has our town grown and who has been impacted?” scenario to help students understand the modern-day consequences of expansion. During class discussion, they explored the recurring pattern of growth, displacement of native peoples and local communities, and relocation both in their town and across the country.

Humanities (English and/or Social Studies) Content—Section 4

4.1 Content Significance: The English or social studies content chosen was significant, worthwhile, and developmentally appropriate for this course (includes the content standards covered, as well as examples and activities chosen by the teacher).

In this item, the emphasis on *worthwhile* captures the degree to which important English and social studies ideas are central to the lesson. Since the significance of content is highly context-specific and based upon the intended goals of the course being observed, the rater should rely on his or her judgment as an expert in the content area in order to determine whether the content was truly worthwhile for the students. Further, the rater should use knowledge of applicable national and state standards, as well as the developmental appropriateness (i.e., whether it is appropriate for the grade level of the class) of the content presented. Beyond just considering the content’s connectedness to accountability standards, the rater should consider the significance of the examples and activities the teacher used to cover these standards, and

whether these examples incorporate worthwhile English or social studies concepts appropriately.

General Rubric

1. This item should be rated a 1 if the content covered and/or tasks, examples, or activities chosen by the teacher were unrelated to the English and social studies content of the course.
2. This item should be rated a 2 if the content covered and/or tasks, examples, or activities chosen by the teacher were distantly or only sometimes related to the English and social studies content of the course. This item should also be rated a 2 if the content chosen was developmentally inappropriate—either too low-level or too advanced for the students.
3. This item should be rated a 3 if the content covered was significant and relevant to the English and social studies content of the course, but the presentation, tasks, examples, or activities chosen were prescriptive, superficial, or contrived and did not allow the students to make meaningful connections to English and social studies ideas. This item should also be rated a 3 if the content covered was focused toward general standardized test preparation in English and social studies for the grade level rather than the specific content objectives of the course.
4. This item should be rated a 4 if the content covered and/or tasks, examples, or activities chosen by the teacher were clearly related to the significant English and social studies content of the course, and the tasks, examples, or activities that were used allowed for some student development of worthwhile connections to the English and social studies ideas.
5. This item should be rated a 5 if the content covered and/or tasks, examples, or activities chosen by the teacher were clearly and explicitly related to significant English and social studies concepts in ways that allowed students to gain a deeper understanding and make worthwhile connections to the English and social studies ideas.

Specific Examples of Supporting Evidence in the Humanities

1. The teacher showed the movie *Forrest Gump* to the class while she sat at her desk not interacting with the students. No guidelines for viewing or discussion of how the movie related to the content, concepts, or specific objectives of the course were provided. Some students watched the movie, while others had their heads down on their desks or chatted/texted each other.
2. The teacher covered English III concepts with beginning English I students. She said she wanted to see what would happen if she tried to cover this more advanced material. The students were confused and had difficulty participating in the lesson.
3. The teacher told the students that the objectives for this lesson were for them to be able to identify and describe the causes of the Great Depression. The material was aligned with state standards, and questions on the high-stakes state tests often ask students questions related to this objective. Although the information was relevant to understanding the time period, the students were observed simply copying notes from a PowerPoint presentation. Both students and the teacher asked questions that were focused on logistics, such as, “Should we put these notes in our folder and turn them in to you at the end of class?” [Student question] or “How does the stock market work?” [Teacher answered her own leading question by reading bullet points from the slide to illustrate what information the students should be putting into their notes].

4. The teacher provided each group with a topic that was related to causes and consequences of the Great Depression. Students were instructed to research their topic and make a poster that represented how this issue related to or contributed to the Great Depression or how it helped to eventually bring the country out of it. Students then presented their posters to the class, while their peers took notes over the information; however, there was no follow-up discussion of how these topics may have related to one another.
5. During this English lesson, students worked in groups to create a storyboard that summarized the main events in a short story. The teacher then led a discussion, using selected passages, about how the author used tone and point of view to influence the reader's feelings about these events. The students were able to draw conclusions based on text evidence about author's tone and point of view. This process of developing an inference and supporting it with text evidence deepens the students' skills with reading comprehension. The teacher made it clear that the assignment was designed directly from the state standards and focused on an area that students often struggled with.

4.2 Content Fluency: Content communicated through direct and non-direct instruction by the teacher is consistent with deep knowledge and fluency with the English and social studies concepts of the lesson (e.g., fluent use of examples, discussions, and explanations of concepts, etc.).

This indicator assesses the degree to which the teacher demonstrates deep knowledge and fluidity with the content, as evidenced by the teacher giving detailed and clear explanations, using the big ideas of the content area as a unifying theme, calling attention to applications of the concepts being taught, and fluidly using examples and connections within the subject area. The rater can also assess the teacher's depth of subject matter knowledge by observing how his or her understanding of student mistakes, common misconceptions, or alternative ways of thinking about and solving problems are used to help build student knowledge. The teacher's fluency with the discipline can also be evidenced by skillful facilitation of group discussions using probing questions to guide students' thinking, as well as the ability to give clear and, if needed, multiple examples and to use different methods for the explanation of concepts.

General Rubric

1. This item should be rated a 1 if there was a significant issue with the teacher's understanding and/or communication of the content that negatively impacted student learning during the class period.
2. This item should be rated a 2 if there were several smaller issues with the teacher's understanding and/or communication of the content that sometimes had a negative impact on student learning.
3. This item should be rated a 3 if there were no issues with the teacher's understanding of the content and its accuracy, but the teacher was not always fluid or did not try to present the content in multiple ways. When students appeared confused, the teacher was unable to reteach the content in a completely clear, understandable, and/or transparent way so that most students understood.
4. This item should be rated a 4 if the teacher clearly understood the content and how to successfully communicate the content to most students in the class. The teacher used multiple examples and strategies to engage students with the content. The teacher's depth of content knowledge enhanced student learning.
5. This item should be rated a 5 if the teacher clearly understood the content and how to successfully communicate the content to *all* students in the class. The teacher was able to

present interesting and relevant examples, explain concepts in multiple ways, facilitate discussions, connect the content to the big ideas of the discipline, use advanced questioning strategies to guide student learning, and identify and use common misconceptions or alternative ideas as learning tools. The teacher's depth of content knowledge greatly enhanced student learning.

Specific Examples of Supporting Evidence in the Humanities

1. The teacher's lecture was very confusing; he kept changing what he was saying and correcting himself and was constantly referring to the example from the teacher's guide, which he had presented on the overhead projector. The teacher did not check if the students understood, and, even though some of the students called out questions or made observations about key phrases, the teacher did not appear to listen or respond to them.
2. The teacher delivered the lecture and projected the notes—using a pre-printed overhead master from the teacher's guide materials provided by the publisher. However, when the students asked the teacher to explain the homework, the teacher confused himself and the students because he kept incorrectly identifying the historical era being covered, referring instead to the time period covered in the last unit.
3. The teacher illustrated how to identify and analyze tone in literature clearly and accurately. The teacher was able to answer students' questions by using an excerpt from a novel they were studying, talking through the process of analysis. Some students seemed unable to identify tone appropriately in sample texts they were given, and the teacher did not address this by connecting to previous examples; he simply repeated, with emphasis, each step that he had written on the board.
4. Before beginning to illustrate how to analyze tone in literature with the whole class, the teacher had each group of students complete a warm up activity that focused on the connotations associated with certain words and the types of feelings certain words can convey. Once most of the students successfully demonstrated this ability, the teacher had students examine short sample texts, pulling out words and phrases they felt indicated the tone of the piece. The teacher had each group explain their analysis to the class and missed only one or two opportunities to address any misconceptions.
5. The teacher began the lesson with a warm up activity that connected to and assessed students' ability to identify connotations of SAT-level words from the previous night's reading. Once all of the students successfully demonstrated this skill, the teacher introduced the concept of tone by asking students a question varying the word choice in such a way that each version of the sentence conveyed a unique meaning. She then gave student groups short example texts, and had them identify the tone of their assigned piece. The teacher monitored each group's work, facilitated with questions to the groups as they presented their analysis to the class as well as questions for the audience. She then used the student examples to explain and correct any mistakes.

4.3 Content Accuracy: Teacher written and verbal content information was accurate.

Written content information can include information provided by the teacher on tests, quizzes, worksheets, handouts, dry erase boards, PowerPoint presentations, overheads, etc. Verbal content information is anything the teacher says out loud during the class period. Since it is essential that content information be communicated in a clear, accurate, and unproblematic manner, this item assesses the teacher's ability to provide accurate written and verbal content information.

In social studies, an example of ambiguous or unclear written content that would be applicable to this indicator would be if the teacher mislabeled a map or graph. If no errors, ambiguities, or other issues are observed in the written or verbal content information of the lesson, this indicator should be rated as a 5. If there are errors with the written or verbal content of the lesson, the rating for this indicator may be reduced based on the severity of the violation of content accuracy, the negative impact on student learning and/or the level of ambiguity. When considering worksheets, it does not matter whether teachers actually wrote the content information themselves; they are responsible for the accuracy and clarity of the written content communicated during the class period. This indicator does not include written content in a textbook, but, as shown on the rubric, it is important to note whether the mistake was caught and corrected when determining a rating.

General Rubric

1. This item should be rated a 1 if there was a major instance of incorrect written or verbal content information communicated by the teacher that was not corrected, and this mistake had a large negative impact on student learning.
2. This item should be rated a 2 if there was a major instance of incorrect written or verbal content information that the teacher caught and corrected, or if there were a number of minor written or verbal content mistakes, inconsistencies, and/or ambiguities that negatively impacted learning.
3. This item should be rated a 3 if there were minor written or verbal content issues, and the teacher did not correct or catch all of them.
4. This item should be rated a 4 if there were only minor content mistakes or ambiguities that were corrected by the teacher.
5. This item should be rated a 5 if there were no examples of incorrect or ambiguous written or verbal content information communicated by the teacher during the class period.

Specific Examples of Supporting Evidence in the Humanities

1. During this economics lesson, the teacher incorrectly labeled the axis of a graph charting supply and demand. As a result, the students learned an incorrect relationship between these two variables. The mistake was not caught nor corrected.
2. The teacher made one major mistake in a PowerPoint over the Vietnam War as background to reading a short story, but the mistake was eventually caught. When a student brought it up, the teacher seemed to know what the student was talking about and was then willing to address the mistake.
3. The teacher was using a crossword puzzle activity that she found online to help students review the unit. The exercise had two questions about information that she did not cover because they were for a different state's standards and one of the answers had a spelling error. She gave verbal instructions for how to answer those questions, but some students did not hear her and she did not notice that they couldn't answer those questions.
4. There was a single mistake in the test review where the social studies teacher had listed the wrong name of a federal act or the English teacher had confused the names of two male characters in *The Scarlet Letter*. The teacher corrected this mistake quickly with the class, and all other written content information was accurate.
5. The examples the teacher worked on the board were correct. The handouts were clear and well organized. There were no examples of written inaccuracies during this lesson.

4.4 Content Assessments: Formative and summative assessments used by teacher (if available) were consistent with content objectives (products, projects, performances, homework, tests, quizzes, etc.).

An assessment is interpreted as any work by the student that the teacher either collects for later evaluation or checks for correctness during the class period. Assessments can include homework assignments, group assignments, journals, tests, quizzes, and worksheets, as well as teacher rubrics for student presentations, papers, or projects. This indicator measures how well the assessments are aligned with the objectives of the instruction. The degree to which the content is covered, in what depth, and with what emphases should all be considered when evaluating the quality of the assessments.

An N/A should be chosen in the case where the teacher uses no assessments during the lesson.

General Rubric

1. This item should be rated a 1 if there was an assessment during the lesson, but this assessment was highly inappropriate and not matched with the content objectives.
2. This item should be rated a 2 if there was an assessment during the lesson, but the assessment was poorly designed or not entirely consistent with content objectives.
3. This item should be rated a 3 if there was an assessment during the lesson, and this formal assessment was generally appropriate and matched with content objectives.
4. This item should be rated a 4 if there was an assessment during the lesson, and this assessment was well designed to evaluate student understanding of important Humanities concepts that had been central components of instruction in the classroom.
5. This item should be rated a 5 if there was an assessment during the lesson, and this assessment was well designed to evaluate student understanding of important Humanities concepts that had been central components of instruction in the classroom. The assessment was also designed to push students' thinking to the next level and provide opportunities for challenge and additional learning.

Specific Examples of Supporting Evidence in the Humanities

1. The worksheet the teacher gave out to students was filled with mistakes, and the students complained that they had not really covered any of the material on it before. The teacher insisted that the students keep working and refer to their textbooks when they had issues, but most students simply stopped working.
2. The quiz that the teacher gave out in class seemed to be too difficult for students, and many students raised their hands and said they didn't understand what they were being asked to do. The teacher responded by having the class do the quiz as a whole-class activity.
3. The teacher announced to the students that the classwork from this class period would be a formal assessment and told them they would have to turn it in. The graphic organizer seemed to be adequately in line with her instructional objectives of having the students read and annotate primary source documents, although the antiquated language caused confusion and frustration for some students. Nonetheless, the teacher provided support for these students and answered their questions so they could complete the organizer.
4. Students were given a document-based question related to the unit they had just covered as well as a sheet with relevant images or excerpts from readings that should be used to

address the question in an in-class essay. Students were able to choose at least four of seven items to use for support and had to describe in detail how each of these pieces of evidence related to the driving question. Most students were able to construct a well-organized essay that made significant connections between the evidence and the driving question. Some students who struggled were allowed to rely on an outline template that the teacher had given to them in a previous class, and if necessary students were allowed to come in and finish the essay over their lunch period.

5. Students were asked to revisit a questionnaire that they had filled out at the launch of a project. The questionnaire had asked students whether they agreed or disagreed with statements that were actually key questions they would investigate in their readings such as “War is a necessary part of society.” “Governments always know what is best for their people.” “Weapons increase the chance of peace.” After reading several works of dystopian literature and studying the Cold War, students were asked to pick one statement from the questionnaire to write a one-page journal entry about it. They were to address whether their views changed from the beginning of the project or stayed the same and to give examples that support their views as well as examples that may have challenged their opinions and why those were less aligned to the student’s philosophy.

4.5 Content Abstraction or Content Analysis: Elements of conceptual abstraction [OR analysis] were used appropriately to reveal patterns and structures that provide explanatory power both in and beyond a text or task in class.

The teacher facilitates abstraction through multiple forms of representation (e.g. verbal, graphic, and symbolic visualizations, simulations, or models). This indicator captures how well the teacher equips students to make connections between general critical concepts and the details of a given text or problem, using terms or symbols important for the analysis of any text or problem.

*It’s possible that this indicator was not applicable to the observed lesson. You may rate NA in this case.

English Language Arts–Specific Instructions

This indicator highlights the difference between using language competently and using language critically. Students practice abstraction by applying the analytical terminology of grammar, logical argument, literary device, genre structure, thematic archetype, and rhetorical effect to reading texts and explaining how they work.

Social Studies–Specific Instructions

Social studies students practice abstraction in the use of analytical and interpretive terms that explain raw data of human behavior and circumstances in broadly recognizable and useful categories. For example, comparing and contrasting one historical narrative or political model to another requires the application of general analytical terminology that reveals common features and critical differences. The terms of analysis are often specific to a discipline, but reach beyond specific information to reveal major patterns in human social interactions.

General Rubric:

1. This item should be rated a 1 if there was a major issue with the teacher’s use of abstraction that had a negative impact on student learning during the class period.

2. This item should be rated a 2 if the teacher neglected important explanation and discussion of abstraction that was being used during the class period, and this missed opportunity had a negative impact on student learning.
3. This item should be rated a 3 if the teacher’s use of abstraction was adequate—the teacher allowed for some discussion or explanation and did not use abstraction inappropriately.
4. This item should be rated a 4 if abstraction was used during the class period for a relevant and useful purpose. The teacher explicitly engaged students in some discussion of the meaning of the representation and/or successfully connected different representational forms. Perhaps there was a small missed opportunity with respect to facilitating some students’ understanding of abstraction.
5. This item should be rated a 5 if abstraction was being used for a relevant and useful purpose, like modeling, supporting an argument, or progressively generalizing important ideas in social studies or English Language Arts, AND if the teacher engaged students in a discussion of the meaning and purpose of the representation. The abstractions were presented in a way such that they were understandable and accessible to all students in the class.

Specific Examples of Supporting Evidence in the Humanities

1. The geography teacher required the class to read a two-page text about how Dr. John Snow used a map to plot the outbreak of cholera in London in 1854, and so to trace a clustering correlation to the Broad Street Pump, which delivered contaminated water. Discussion of the story emphasized how the physical plotting of two apparently unrelated variables may lead to a correct conclusion about cause and effect, but the lesson did not include any synthesis of general rules of cause and effect that could be applied reliably to other data. Therefore students left the class clearly at risk of assuming that correlation explains causation.
2. An economics teacher showed the class how to plot a demand curve from a table of price and demand statistics. The goal of the lesson seemed to be to get all the students to produce identical graphs by transfer of data onto graph paper. No attempt was made to explain underlying principles or implications that can be abstracted from the practice to apply to other data. In the follow-up questions, students revealed they could not explain the effect of rising or falling prices on demand, or vice versa.
3. The English teacher reviewed a diagram of the **generic elements** of drama (conflict, rising action, climax, denouement). The teacher organized student groups to find the elements from the diagram in the play the class was currently reading. One group had the special task of identifying parts of the play that did not clearly fit into the diagram’s concepts. Groups reported their findings, with the teacher questioning how the specific examples from the play corresponded to the generic categories. There was a competent matching of analytical categories and textual examples, but no discussion of the possible usefulness of the genre diagram: How does it explain the experience of reading this play or any other?
4. The U.S. history teacher introduced the concepts of the four Cs model of analysis of an event or period in history: Continuity, Change, Cause, and Consequence. In a class review of the Constitutional Convention, he assigned one “C” to each of four groups to analyze the controversial inclusion of the Senate in the Constitution and to draw comparisons to the precedent of the bicameral British Parliament: What changed? What continued? What caused the change? How did it matter? The lesson required knowledge (What happened in

1787?), but also application of abstract categories to that knowledge (How did change happen? What can we say *in general* about how change happens?).

Or

4. The English teacher led a revising workshop in which students edited each other's writing in groups of three. The teacher reminded the class of previous lessons on the concept of **agreement** and led a review exercise on subject–verb agreement, asking students to circle subjects and verbs in the first three sentences of the manuscripts and to check and if necessary correct agreement, as they had done in previous workshops. The teacher then extended the concept of agreement to pronouns and their antecedents, with illustrations taken from the class's own writing, showing both errors and corrections. Finally, the students returned to the stories, finding every pronoun in the first five sentences and checking it for agreement with its referent or antecedent.
5. The world history teacher placed on the screen the list of causes of World War I, studied in prior lessons. She then gave a brief lesson on the analytical concepts of *political*, *economic*, and *cultural* histories, and discussed the very different questions that each approach brings to the same historical information. The class practiced applying these approaches to the list of causes of the war. Some students noted that the rise of nationalism had cultural causes, while others located it in power struggles of nation states. A lively debate ensued about whether the rise of militarism was primarily economic—a result of industrialization—or political, and one student argued that it was instead a cultural phenomenon growing out of old traditions of educating elite males as military leaders. The teacher concluded the discussion by assigning students a document analysis: Analyze the political, economic, and cultural elements in a British recruiting poster advertising German atrocities in Belgium.

4.6 Content Relevance: During the lesson, it was made explicit to students why the content is important to learn.

This indicator assesses the degree to which the teacher explicitly places the content into the big picture of the associated discipline, making it clear why these concepts are significant and important to learn. This indicator may be evidenced by the teacher discussing the significance of the content with the students during the class period or giving the students activities that explicitly bring out the big picture and/or significance of the material and facilitate students' understanding of why this content is fundamental. One example of such a strategy would be focusing student work for a given week through several guiding questions about why the class is learning the content. If the teacher simply gives the students some problems that happen to be contextualized, this is not the same thing as engaging students in a discussion about why they are learning the content, and thus is not important evidence for this indicator. Also, simply telling students that they need to learn the content for future classes, future topics in this class, or for a test is not what we are trying to capture with this indicator.

Although it may seem inappropriate to penalize a teacher for not incorporating this indicator into every single lesson, it is important that we identify the degree to which these behaviors are present. If there is absolutely no mention or discussion of why the content being covered during the lesson is important to learn, this indicator should be rated as a 1. The indicator should be rated a 1 in this situation even if you feel such discussion would not be appropriate or possible for this particular lesson.

General Rubric

1. This item should be rated a 1 if there were no instances of it being made explicit to students why the content is important to learn.
2. This item should be rated a 2 if the teacher made only a brief reference to the importance of the content, and there was no elaboration or discussion. This item should also be rated a 2 if the teacher did not explicitly discuss content significance, but the significance was clearly implicit or obvious in the work students were doing.
3. This item should be rated a 3 if the teacher made some moves to tie in the significance of the content during the class period, perhaps mentioning it more than one time.
4. This item should be rated a 4 if the teacher engaged students in a discussion of why the content was important to learn.
5. This item should be rated a 5 if the importance of the content was a central theme that was discussed and expanded upon throughout the class period.

Specific Examples of Supporting Evidence in the Humanities

1. This lesson was on learning to properly list sources in a Works Cited page; however, the teacher did not suggest any reason to students about why it was important to do this properly.
2. This was a lesson on how to create an outline for a persuasive essay. The teacher briefly mentioned that making an outline would help the students create well-organized papers but did not elaborate on this during the class period.
3. During a unit on science fiction, the teacher had a guiding question on the board for the week, which was “Just because we can, should we?” The teacher mentioned the question on the board at two points—once when the students discussed the plot of a short story they read for homework the night before, and once when a student brought up the idea of Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs) which they were studying in chemistry.
4. As students were studying protest movements of the 1960s, the teacher brought in music that was popular during that era to play for the students. He then gave them copies of the songs’ lyrics and they discussed how music and the arts can influence change in the society.
5. The teacher began a class activity by telling students that they are exposed to over 3,000 advertising messages every day. In groups, students were given an advertisement to deconstruct and discuss what techniques were being used to persuade or manipulate a particular audience. This led to a discussion where the teacher asked students how they could recognize the ways that ads use different methods, and why it was important to think critically in order to be a savvy consumer.

4.7 Content Interconnections: Appropriate connections were made to other areas of English and social studies and/or to other academic disciplines.

Connecting English and social studies concepts across the disciplines facilitates generalizations that make the content more coherent and meaningful for students. A social studies lesson on social conditions in a particular era and culture could be connected with a novel written in the time period that describes characters encountering these social conditions or culture. A language arts lesson on constructing persuasive arguments could be illustrated by discussion of how persuasive arguments gave rise to a particular historical event and its impact on our nation.

This indicator assesses the degree to which the teacher connects the English and social studies content in the lesson to other areas of the disciplines or to other academic disciplines.

This indicator also assesses whether the teacher connects English and social studies concepts in an interdisciplinary fashion. For example, a lesson on the social/political/economic choices that led to the Great Depression and the Dust Bowl could be related to the current issues of climate change as discussed and studied in an Environmental Science class. Likewise a language arts lesson on satire in literature could be connected to how political issues have been exploited and “spun” by comedians, editorialists, playwrights, and movie directors to make political statements or present positions of advocacy for socio/political/economic change. Similar illustrations of the impact of satire can be made in social studies through study of political cartoons and the literature of the time period.

It is important that we identify the degree to which these behaviors are present. If absolutely no connections between the concepts being learned and other disciplines or other areas of mathematics/science are made during the class period, this indicator should be rated a 1. The indicator should be rated a 1 in this situation even if you feel such connections would not be appropriate or possible for this particular lesson.

General Rubric

1. This item should be rated a 1 if no connections were made to other areas of English or social studies or other academic disciplines, or if connections were made that were inappropriate or incorrect.
2. This item should be rated a 2 if a subtle connection was made to another area of English or social studies or to another academic discipline, but the teacher did not explicitly discuss this connection with the class.
3. This item should be rated a 3 if the teacher explicitly connected the content being learned to another area of English or social studies or another academic discipline, and if the teacher brought this connection to students’ attention.
4. This item should be rated a 4 if the teacher included one or more connections between the content and other areas of English or social studies, other academic disciplines, or problems that professionals actually encounter AND the teacher engaged the students in an extended discussion or activity relating to these connections.
5. This item should be rated a 5 if, throughout the class period, the content was taught in the context of its use in or connection to other academic disciplines, other areas of English or social studies, or the work of professionals AND the teacher clearly deepened students’ knowledge about disciplines involved through well-developed connections.

Specific Examples of Supporting Evidence in the Humanities

1. In this lesson, students were shown an excerpt from *Common Sense* as a model for persuasive writing. The teacher made no attempt to explain where the excerpt came from or to connect the purpose or content to other topics covered in the U.S. history course or to other disciplines.
2. In this lesson, the teacher named the document, *Common Sense*, from which a model passage was taken. Thomas Paine was acknowledged as an accomplished American thinker and writer from the Revolutionary period, but there was no explanation of the purpose of his writing, the intended audience, or the impact his work had on the

development of a nation, nor was there a connection to where or how persuasive pieces are published in today's society.

3. The teacher opened this lesson with a series of photos of paintings of the founding fathers along with excerpts of writing produced by each. The students worked in small groups, each with a different writer and excerpt, to analyze content, diction, and rhetorical strategies their author employed. The students shared what they had discovered about selection of content, diction, and rhetorical strategies. The rest of the lesson was devoted to selecting a rhetorical device and applying the knowledge to their own persuasive piece on a topic of their choosing.
4. During the activity described above, the teacher collected the students' observations on a chart. The teacher then posed the question of who the intended audience and purpose of each selection from the Founding Fathers might be, based on the evidence of content, diction, and rhetorical strategies. The groups worked together to come to their own conclusions and share with their classmates. As each group shared, the students completed a note chart, which captured the aspects of style in relation to intended audience, publishing style and purpose. The students were to consider the purpose and audience for their own pieces and worked to revise their writing for the remainder of the period.
5. The teacher conducted the class as described above; however, at the point the students shared their analysis based on the evidence, the teacher then challenged the students to make revisions of their own pieces based on the real impact they hoped to make through their writing for their selected audience. Finally the students were required to find a publishing pathway or media to reach their intended audience for maximum impact.

4.8 Societal Impact: During the lesson, there was discussion about the content topic's role in current society or events.

Concepts in English and social studies are continually being developed, validated, revisited, and modified based on human society's changing body of knowledge and understanding, as events unfold in the world. This indicator assesses the degree to which the teacher discusses or helps students develop their thinking about the historical development of concepts in English and social studies, as well as how concepts from English and social studies are important to current events, current human activity, and current decision-making (i.e., "real-world" contexts).

In the study of both English and social studies, students need to understand that the body of knowledge representing these disciplines is the work of human beings who have experienced events, conducted research, and/or created pieces while being influenced by their personal habits of mind, the culture in which they lived, recognition of the needs of their society, and the technologies available to them. Thus the collective reference to these disciplines is *Humanities*.

Although it may seem inappropriate to penalize a teacher for not incorporating these connections into every single lesson, it is important that we identify the degree to which these behaviors are present. If absolutely no connections to current human events are made during the class period, this indicator should be rated as a 1. The indicator should be rated a 1 in this situation even if you feel such connections would not be appropriate or possible for this particular lesson. If there was some mention of history or current events during the lesson, this indicator should be rated between a 1 and a 5, depending on the quality of the discussion, the depth of knowledge of the teacher about these issues, the timeliness and relevance of the discussion, and the level of student interest.

General Rubric

1. This item should be rated a 1 if there was no discussion about the content topic's role in history, current events, or relevant real-world contexts during the class period, or if there was a discussion, but it was inappropriate or incorrect.
2. This item should be rated a 2 if a connection was made to history, current events or relevant real-world contexts that the teacher did not specifically mention or call attention to (i.e., it was written on a worksheet), or if the teacher made a *general* and brief comment about a possible connection to history or current events that was not expanded upon.
3. This item should be rated a 3 if the teacher explicitly called attention to how the content was specifically connected to history, current events, or relevant real-world contexts but did not fully expand upon this idea with the class.
4. This item should be rated a 4 if the teacher explicitly called attention to how the content was connected to history, current events, or relevant real-world contexts and engaged the class in discussion or reflective writing about this connection.
5. This item should be rated a 5 if, throughout the class period, the students were doing activities and/or having discussions related to the content topic's role in history, current events, or relevant real-world contexts and if the teacher clearly demonstrated deep knowledge about how this topic was connected to history and current events.

Specific Examples of Supporting Evidence in English Language Arts

1. In this lesson, the teacher shared a passage from Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*. There was no mention of the concept of making a pilgrimage, the historical impact of religion on literature, or current examples.
2. In this lesson, the teacher shared a passage from Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*. The teacher explained that the sequence of tales were told by characters on a pilgrimage and explained what a pilgrimage was. The teacher commented that some people make pilgrimages today; however, there was no explicit example or discussion about what such a pilgrimage might entail or who might undertake a pilgrimage.
3. The teacher began the class with a journal prompt: "What is a pilgrimage? Do people make them today? What qualifies as a pilgrimage? Is it the destination, the journey, or for some spiritual purpose?" After the students had written in their journals for ten minutes, the teacher asked the class to put their writing away, and they began their reading of Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*.
4. The teacher began the class with a brief slide show showing modern day pilgrimage sites then shared a quick-read article on the pilgrimage concept in today's society. During the ensuing class discussion, the teacher recorded what the students believed about what a pilgrimage is, what misconceptions they had, and what questions they would like answered. The class then read excerpts from the Prologue of the *Canterbury Tales* in small groups. Based on the discussion and their reading, their task was to identify elements of a pilgrimage as well as any insights. The lesson concluded with a discussion of the nature of the setting—as in the pilgrimage for the *Canterbury Tales*—for the upcoming literature exploration.
5. The teacher conducted the class in much the same manner as item 4 above describes but also assigned the student groups to note similarities and differences in the pilgrimages of the middle ages represented by the *Canterbury Tales* and those people choose to make today. The groups were also asked to review teacher-selected research pieces concerning

the likely sociopolitical circumstances of particular characters from the Prologue and then add these specific examples to their descriptions of the similarities and differences of past and present pilgrimages, ranging from religious pilgrimages (such as the Haj) or even pop culture pilgrimages (such as family reunions to Disneyworld).

IV. Summary Comments

Information included in the “Summary Comments” section of the UTOP provides readers with a snapshot of the observer’s evaluation of the quality of the lesson. When filling in this section, the observer should consider all available information concerning the lesson and its context and purpose, as well as his or her own judgment of the relative importance of the ratings given. The summary is intended to be freeform and can also include comments that did not fit into any of the preceding sections.

V. Post-Observational Teacher Interview/Survey

The Post-Observational Teacher Interview can be carried out face-to-face, via video-conferencing, through email or other online communication, or over the phone, and should take place very soon after the observation.

The Post-Observational Teacher Survey can be administered electronically if there is no opportunity to conduct the interview face-to-face. If the observer intends to remain blind to the educational background of the teacher while the interview is being conducted, it is important to instruct the teacher, prior to the interview, not to reveal this information directly or indirectly.

The responses the observer obtains to the interview questions may often overlap considerably, as a teacher may answer some questions partially or fully before the question formally comes up in the interview protocol. The teacher may also add more to his/her explanation of one question while answering a later question. For this reason, it is important to look at the entire interview when examining the answer to any single question. The observer also needs to make a judgment about whether to ask a question if the teacher has already answered it during a different portion of the interview.

During the interview, teachers may refer to and elaborate on what occurred in other related lessons they have taught. It is important to remember to take into account the teacher’s comments only as they relate to the lesson that was actually observed, unless otherwise indicated in the manual. The Post-Observational Teacher Interview may also be used as an opportunity for the teacher being observed to reflect on his or her own practice. The goals and interests of interviewer will influence the degree to which this reflection is encouraged and facilitated.

VI. Teacher Demographic Questionnaire

Relevant information relating to the teacher’s background and professional and educational experiences that was not collected earlier (to allow observers to remain “blind” to this information if they wished) is collected in a demographic questionnaire. Examples of this information include the teacher’s age, race/ethnicity, school, classes and grades taught, education, years teaching, and relevant professional experiences.