PEP Classroom Observation Protocol

Project # District	School							
Teacher	Grade Level (K-8)/Course (HS)							
Subject area: mathematics science Lesson Topic								
Observer Date								
Portion of the class period observed: All or most Ov				-				
1. Is the lesson topic connected to the content focus of the PEP? Yes No								
2. Is the lesson from instructional materials received from or emphasized by the PEP? See No Not Applicable								
 3. Role of manipulatives in the lesson (mark all that apply) Demonstrate or confirm known concepts/procedures Explore ideas, test conjectures, look for patterns Not used in this lesson during the time observed 4. Role of calculators in the lesson (mark all that apply) Demonstrate or confirm known concepts/procedures Not used in this lesson during the time observed 								
During the lesson, take notes describing noteworthy aspects of the lesson and then complete this portion of the instrument. Each of the items 5-14 should be rated 'globally'; the descriptors are possible indicators, not a required 'check-off' list.Not Characteri ObservedCharacteri the Lesson the Lesson								
5. This lesson encouraged students to seek and value various problem solving. (Focus: Habits of Mind)	s modes of investigation or N.	/0 1	2	3	4			
Teacher:	Students:							
Presented open-ended questions Encouraged discussion of alternative explanations	Discussed problem-solving strategies Posed questions and relevant means for	investigat	ing					
Presented inquiry opportunities for students	Shared ideas about investigations	mvestigut						
Provided alternative learning strategies								
	· .	10 1	2	2	4			
6. Teacher encouraged students to be reflective about their I (Focus: Metacognition – students' thinking about their own to	8	/O 1	2	3	4			
Teacher:	Students:							
Encouraged students to explain their understanding of concepts	Discussed what they understood from	the class a	and how	v the	у			
Encouraged students to explain in own words both what and learned it								
how they learnedIdentified anything unclear to themRoutinely asked for student input and questionsReflected on and evaluated their own progress toward								
understanding								
 7. Interactions reflected collaborative working relationships students and between teacher/instructor and students. (Focus: Student discourse and collaboration) 	and productive discourse among NA	/O 1	2	3	4			
Teacher: Students:								
	poratively or cooperatively to accomplish	work rele	evant					
Interacted with small groupsto taskProvided clear outcomes for groupExchanged ide	eas related to lesson with peers and teach	er						
8. Intellectual rigor, constructive criticism, and the challeng (Focus: Rigorously challenged ideas)	ing of ideas were valued.	/O 1	2	3	4			
	udents:							
	ovided evidence-based arguments istened critically to others' explanations							
	iscussed/Challenged others' explanations	8						

C	Not bserved	Not bserved		Characterizes the Lesson					
9. The instructional strategies and activities probed students' existing knowledge and preconceptions. (Focus: Student preconceptions and misconceptions)	N/O	1	2	3	4				
Teacher: Students: Pre-assessed students for their thinking and knowledge Expressed ideas even when incorrect or different from the ideas of other students Helped students confront and/or build on their ideas Expressed ideas of other students Refocused lesson based on student ideas to meet needs Responded to the ideas of other students									
10. The lesson promoted strongly coherent conceptual understanding in the context of clear learning goals. (Focus: Conceptual thinking)	N/O	1	2	3	4				
Yeacher: Students: Asked higher level questions Asked and answered higher level questions Concouraged students to extend concepts and skills Related subordinate ideas to broader concept Related integral ideas to broader concepts Related subordinate ideas to broader concept									
11. Students were encouraged to generate conjectures, alternative solution strategies, and ways of interpreting evidence. (Focus: Divergent thinking)	N/O	1	2	3	4				
Teacher:Students:Accepted multiple responses to problem-solving situationsGenerated conjectures and alternate interpretationsProvided example evidence for student interpretationCritiqued alternate solution strategies of teacher and peersEncouraged students to challenge the text as well as each otherFind the solution strategies of teacher and peers									
12. Appropriate connections were made between content and other curricular areas. (Focus: Interdisciplinary connections)	N/O	1	2	3	4				
Teacher:Students:Integrated content with other curricular areasMade connections with other content areasApplied content to real-world situationsMade connections between content and personal life									
13. The teacher/instructor had a solid grasp of the subject matter content and how to teach it. (Focus: Pedagogical content knowledge)	N/O	1	2	3	4				
Selected strategies that made content understandable to students Students: Was able to field students' ideas even when vaguely articulated Students Selected strategies that made content understandable to students Responded to instruction with ideas Comparison of the student of									
14. The teacher/instructor used a variety of means to represent concepts. (Focus: Multiple representations of concepts)	N/O	1	2	3	4				
<u>Teacher:</u> Used multiple methods, strategies and teaching styles to explain a concept Used various materials to foster student understanding (models, drawings, graphs, concrete materials, manipulatives, etc.)									
CAPSULE DESCRIPTION									
15. For each pair of statements below, mark the one that best describes what you observed in the lesson Teacher-as-facilitator Active student role in lesson Teacher-as-expert Passive student role in lesson Emphasis on developing conceptual understanding Emphasis on learning factual knowledge, skills/procedures									
16. Overall, how well did this lesson exemplify effective use of an inquiry approach to mathema Not at all Beginning Progressing Proficient	_	e nce i compl			?				
(adapted from Oregon Teacher Observation Protocol, L. Flick, P. Morrell, C. Wainwright – 2004)									