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Questions Addressed

1. What assessments were made of the classroom performance of teachers taking part in the research project?
2. How, when, and by whom were these assessments made?
3. Is the information coming from these assessments of high quality, trustworthy (reliable, valid), and meaningful?

Content and Organization

Research Brief 5 opens with a discussion of the central role of information on the classroom performance of teachers in both the research project and Oregon’s design for the continuing licensure of teachers, and goes on to describe how this information is obtained. In the research project the classroom performance of participating teachers is assessed through:

- observation by experienced teachers who are trained in using a carefully developed observation protocol that reflects the demands on teaching and learning of Oregon’s standards-based schools; and
- using the observation protocol to describe and evaluate the performance of participating teachers during two separate instructional periods during site visits made late in the Fall and early in the Spring each year during the first three years of teaching.

The protocol used by classroom observers is attached to the brief, and is intended as both a source of detail and resource for further reference when reading subsequent briefs reporting findings on the classroom performance of teachers taking part in the research.

In addition to the observation protocol reasonably detailed information is provided in Brief 5 about:

- the steps taken in constructing and refining the observation system;
- selecting and training observers;
- the observation schedule and related on-site procedures followed; and
- the confidence that can be placed in information coming from the observation system.

All of the information presented in the brief should be read carefully before reading Briefs 6 through 9, or if interested in using the TEP-2 observation protocol as a source of evidence for either initial or continuing licensure.

Key Findings around Protocol Use

- The observation protocol has proved to be easy for experienced teachers to use, and is viewed by experienced teachers as incorporating essential dimensions of teaching and learning in Oregon’s standards-based schools.
- With modest training experienced teachers can become reliable observers, and through these teachers both meaningful and defensible information can be obtained on the classroom performance of early career teachers in Oregon’s 21st century schools.
- Though developed for and used with elementary teachers, the observation protocol addresses dimensions of teaching applicable to teachers at all levels of schooling.
Potential Implications for CONTINUING Licensure

1. The classroom observation protocol developed for and used in the TEP-2 research project can be used in the CTL licensing process to provide information about a candidate’s teaching that represents the perspective of someone other than the CTL candidate.
2. The information provided through the observation protocol addresses many dimensions of practice highlighted in CTL proficiencies 3, 4 and 6.
3. With modest training, experienced teachers are able to use the observation protocol reliably.

Potential Implications for INITIAL Licensure

1. Because of the properties listed above, and because the protocol includes a focus on the engagement of students with content, the TEP-2 classroom observation system could also be used for purposes of the initial preparation and licensing of teachers.
2. Because of its various properties the protocol should have particular utility in assessing the classroom performance of prospective teachers as they implement their teacher work samples.
3. While broad agreement across institutions has been reached on the essential features of teacher work samples, and a COMMON CORE is being developed as a guide to their scoring and evaluation, no comparable agreement has been reached around the assessment of teaching during the course of teacher work sample implementation. The TEP-2 observation protocol could serve as a point of departure in developing this aspect of a CORE assessment system for initial licensure.
4. If some broadly acceptable version of the TEP-2 observation protocol were used in both the initial and continuing licensing process in Oregon the continuity sought between these two levels of licensing would be enhanced and a critical element in a low-cost, longitudinal data base serving the various research and evaluation needs of the teacher education community in Oregon would be in place.
Introduction

An observational record of the classroom performance of teachers taking part in the TEP–2 research project is essential for two reasons. First, the project is investigating whether particular emphases within a teacher preparation program have traceable effects on the subsequent performance of graduates as 1st, 2nd, and 3rd year teachers in Oregon’s standards-based schools. Direct observation and recording of the performance of these teachers as facilitators and managers of student learning is the most efficient means of obtaining defensible evidence in this regard. Second, if these records of performance are reasonably detailed and focus on dimensions of teaching known to influence learning, this information can serve both an explanatory and predictive role as the impact of early career teachers on student learning is investigated.

Classroom observation within the CTL licensing process holds a similar place of significance. CTL Proficiencies #3 (Classroom Management) and #4 (Instruction) can be demonstrated only within the context of ongoing classrooms, and thus most defensibly documented through direct observation and recording. The proviso holds, of course, that WHAT is observed a) is of known significance to learning, b) can and is likely to be observed in the classrooms and teachers studied, and c) will be recognized and classified as such by different observers watching the same episode of classroom life. All of these features of an observation system combine to address the ever-present issues of data reliability, validity, and meaningfulness.

Constructing an Observation System for Standards-Based Teaching and Learning

An observation system that provides reliable and valid information takes considerable care in its construction and use. The TEP-2 observation protocol is based on a long history of theoretical and empirical work around standards-based teaching and learning by Teaching Research and Western Oregon University faculty (see page 5.6 for related references), and on two rounds of refinements made by the experienced teachers recommended by OEA and TSPC to conduct the classroom observations. Steps taken in the initial development of the protocol included: 1) An extensive review of the extant literature on both “effective” teaching and “standards-based” teaching; 2) A synthesis of the teaching practices in these literatures; 3) A survey of experienced teachers in standards-based schools as to the level of importance of these practices to standards-based teaching and learning; 4) Empirical analyses of these survey results; and, 5) A final review of each item for its observability, that is, the potential for each to actually be observed. (Please see McConney, A., & Schalock, M., 2000, for a detailed description of this process.)

Major refinements occurred in the observation protocol after its use in the first year of the study (Spring, 2000) and gaining additional input to its design through Title-II design-team review. Some minor refinements also were made after subsequent use with second year teachers, and a second cohort of 1st year teachers (Fall, 2000 and Spring, 2001). The observation system remained essentially unchanged for the 2001-2002 observations of 2nd and 3rd year teachers.

This developmental history has resulted in the use of two somewhat different versions of the observation system, one version with the first cohort of 1st year teachers, and a second in all subsequent observations. These two versions differ sufficiently in the information provided that the essential features of both need to be addressed. The version of the protocol used in the second and third year of the study is considered first.

The Current Version of the Classroom Observation System

The observation protocol as it currently is used is attached to this Brief. In inspecting the protocol you will see that the cover page is largely explanatory in nature: At the top of the page an overview of what is to be observed is provided; the middle paragraphs outline how and when observations are to be made; and space is provided at the bottom of the page to describe the content and instruction-learning activities observed.

Two separate observations are made during a site visit. Typically, each observation focuses on a school-defined instructional period that lasts from
an hour to an hour and a half, with each period involving a different subject area. A separate cover page is provided for each observation.

Pages 2 through 4 of the protocol describe the specific aspects of performance an observer is to watch for and note when it plays a prominent role in the instructional period observed.

For observational purposes these “performance indicators” have been organized into five broad teaching functions that are central to teaching and learning in standards-based classrooms, and are viewed by experienced teachers as naturally occurring functions (see the headings within each box). As such the broad, organizing headings listed are easy to use and remember as sensitizing filters or frameworks for observation.

The specific performance indicators listed under each teaching function are not intended to be exhaustive of all that a teacher might do in carrying out the function, but they are intended to convey its essential features or dimensions. In the course of a single observation period some teachers may display all or most of the indicators listed, while others may display only one or two, or none at all. Indicator use varies in response to subject taught and student progress in learning, or stage in a unit of study, as well as teacher style and proficiency in standards-based teaching. (See endnote 1).

The headings and specific indicators appearing on pages 2 through 4 of the protocol are essentially committed to memory by an observer, and used as the primary set of filters or frames of reference when observing and recording the teaching-learning process. While these provide a common substantive and conceptual focus across observers, each observer is free to use the protocol in a way that is personally preferred. Some observers, for example, check indicators as they occur and use few explanatory notes. Others prefer to make an extensive running record of what was observed and then check the indicators noted on the basis of a more holistic picture of an instructional period. So long as a comparable picture emerges of a teacher’s performance in the instructional period observed one approach is as good as another from the perspective of the observational system.

The fifth page of the observation protocol calls for summative and interpretive judgments to be made by an observer about the level of proficiency reflected in the indicators of proficiency observed. An 8-point scale is used in making these judgments that corresponds to the 8-point “common metric” advocated for use in the CONTINUING LICENSURE COMMON CORE ASSESSMENT SYSTEM, including the definitions used to anchor the various points on the scale.

Two comments need to be made here about the summative ratings called for in the system that are dealt with in greater detail in Research Brief 6. First, the dimensions of teacher performance to be rated do not map one-to-one with the five broad teaching functions used to cluster the specific indicators of performance that guide observation. Second, to date at least, neither the number of performance indicators checked, nor the specific indicators checked, map one-to-one with the summative ratings provided. As noted earlier, the labeling of teaching functions and the clustering of indicators within a particular function are governed primarily by observation concerns rather than analytic concerns.

**The Initial Version of the Observation System**

The version of the observation system used with 1st year teachers in the first year of the study was somewhat less complex than the current protocol, somewhat less comprehensive in focus, and somewhat less precise in summative assessments. Specifically, on page 1 of the protocol attached

- only six dimensions of standards-based teaching were listed at the top of the page instead of seven (“How the teacher varies content, and engages students with content to help them in their learning” was added as a focus for 2nd and 3rd year observations);
- the middle section of the cover page was less specific around procedures to be followed;
- information pertaining to the description of the content and instructional activities observed was less focused, and the learning tasks in which students are engaged during the class period observed (see the box at the bottom of the cover page) were not included.
In keeping with the addition to the system of a dimension of teaching focusing on a teacher’s mastery of content, the specific indicators pertaining thereto that appear on page 3 of the current protocol also were added.

With the exception of these few additions, pages 2 through 4 of the current protocol remained essentially unchanged from year 1 to year 2.

Two other changes having important consequences for differences in observational data collected in year 1 of the study from that collected in years 2 and 3 were 1) a shift from a 5-point to the 8-point rating scale appearing on page 5 of the current protocol, with an accompanying change in anchoring definitions, and 2) the addition of two dimensions of performance to be rated that were not included in the initial version of the observation system:

✓ “How well did this teacher promote understanding and exploration of meaning within the content area observed?”
✓ “How well, in a holistic view of the classroom, did this teacher generate student interest in content to be learned?”

The implications of shifting from a 5- to an 8-point rating scale in conveying level of proficiency around the various dimensions of teaching assessed are presented in Research Brief 6.

Selecting and Training Observers

Teachers conducting classroom observations for the research study were selected by TR faculty from a pool recommended by OEA and TSPC personnel. These “ReDAT” (Regional Data Assistance Team) teachers were to serve a variety of tasks within the TEP-2 project and its Title II funded partner project to develop a common core assessment system for continuing licensure. In this partnership role findings and methodology from the research study were to inform the design of the core assessment system, and work on the core assessment system was to inform the methodology of the research project. Teachers carrying out the classroom observations called for in the research project also were to carry out a number of Title II related tasks, including the design and testing of responsibilities embedded in the concept of Regional Data Assistance (ReDAT) teams.

Master teachers on the current and recently retired OEA mailing lists that were known to both OEA and TSPC personnel were contacted about the project. The first contact involved a letter from the Executive Director of the Teacher Standards and Practices commission. OEA and TR project coordinators sent follow-up letters to those expressing interest. Final selection was made by the ReDAT coordinator at Teaching Research, with review and approval by OEA and TSPC personnel. Selection criteria included related experience, expressed interest and availability, and geographical proximity to the early career teachers participating in the research. These master teachers had three major roles and responsibilities:

✓ collect observational data for each participating teacher in the research project;
✓ coach and assist teachers taking part in the research around matters pertaining to the emerging design of CTL programs, including the collection, organization, and reporting of evidence around proficiencies to be demonstrated for a continuing license to teach;
✓ provide feedback on, and suggestions for improving, either or both the research project and the Title II continuing licensure project.

The formal training of observers in the details of the observation system, and obtaining data on the agreement between independent observers on indicators checked and interpretive ratings made, was less extensive than planned. This was due to the late start-up of the Title II project through which the ReDAT teachers were funded (November, 1999), and the considerable time required to complete the observer selection process.

The initial day of observer orientation and training involved

✓ an overview of the observation system, and an opportunity for the observers-in-training to read and clarify questions they had about the system and its use;
✓ an opportunity for each observer to apply the system in 10 to 15 minute observations of video-tapes of elementary classrooms;
an opportunity to compare observation records made from these brief observations, identify agreements and disagreements, and refine the various elements within the system around which disagreements centered. This process continued until no further questions existed on the part of the observers, and they expressed confidence they were ready to observe in a “reliable” manner. Their confidence in this regard was bolstered by the fact that all had been or were still involved as supervisors of student teachers and/or mentors of new teachers in their districts. While this confidence was probably justified time did not permit formal inter-observer reliabilities (agreements between 2 or more observers on indicators of performance observed and ratings of performance made) to be calculated during these training observations, so there was no absolute assurance that each of the 13 observers taking part in the first year of the study would view and evaluate the classroom performance of TEP-2 teachers in exactly the same way. The absence of such information prior to observation has led to several post-observation analyses of observer reliability. These analyses are described under the heading “Trustworthiness of Data Obtained”.

Observation Schedule and Procedures

Each ReDAT observer was assigned from four to five TEP-2 teachers to observe each year of the project, with the assignment of observer to teacher being rotated each year to protect against uncontrolled observer bias. The day and time of each site visit was arranged by the ReDAT observer, though all observers were asked to schedule their observations if possible in the morning of a normal school day. Each observer obtained from the participating teacher a copy of his or her schedule for the day, and then arranged to conduct an observation of at least an hour in length around each of two subject areas taught during the morning. In cases where only one subject was taught in the morning, for example reading, or unexpected interruptions occurred, the second observation taken during a site visit was to be shifted to the afternoon.

ReDAT observers were instructed not to talk to a teacher’s students during an observation period. They were introduced by the teacher as “This is Mr. /Mrs. Blank. She/he will be sitting in our classroom this morning observing us do our work. Please don’t pay any attention to him/her, and don’t talk to him/her. He/she will be very quiet and will not talk to you.” The ReDAT observers were given no information about the backgrounds or preparation experiences of the teachers they were to observe.

The Sample of Teaching Performance Obtained

Due to the late start-up of the Title II project observations of the first cohort of 1st year teachers (1999-2000) could be made only in Spring term. The design of the TEP-2 study called for observations to be made in both Fall and Spring, but during the first year of the study this was not possible.

Both Fall and Spring observations were made in the second year of the study, for both the first cohort of teachers as 2nd year teachers and a second cohort of 1st year teachers. Two observations also are being made in the third year of the study (the first cohort of teachers as 3rd year teachers, and the second as 2nd year teachers). This combined pattern of observation yields a sample of performance observed for each teacher that totals to at least 5 hours distributed over a 2 ½ year period of time and across at least two subject areas.

The Trustworthiness of Data Obtained

Given the method and procedures that have been described a number of factors bear upon this judgment. These are considered briefly in the paragraphs which follow.

Concern over the reliability of observers. How reliable are data coming from different observers (inter-observer reliability?). Two post-observation analyses of data collected have been made which bear directly upon this issue.

Intra-Rater Analyses. This analysis focused on the consistency and variability of performance indicators noted, and summary ratings provided, by an observer. This analysis found that practices noted and ratings of performance provided by an observer varied a great deal across the various TEP-2 teachers they observed. This meant that an observer was
making nuanced and contextually sensitive judgments around the performance being observed. (See endnote 2).

Inter-Rater Analyses. This analysis focused on the comparability of performance ratings assigned a TEP-2 teacher from one set of observations to the next (Spring to Fall, Fall to Spring) by different observers. This analysis found considerable agreement across observers, indicating that there is continuity in the general performance levels of teachers across time and different observers were consistent in detecting and recording this continuity.

In combination these two findings lend support to the reliability of the ratings given by ReDAT observers, and thus the trustworthiness of the data they have collected.

Concern over the adequacy of the sample of classroom performance taken. While 5 hours of classroom observation spread over a period of 2½ years is not a large sample of an early career teacher’s work, it is a sizeable sample compared to most research studies on teaching. It also is a carefully delineated sample, occurring at approximately the same time of day on each site visit, and, in most cases, around the same two subject areas to the extent there is consistency in classroom schedules from one year to another. Again, while two subject areas represent a limited sample of all the subjects taught by elementary teachers, having two is better than one, and probably better than having six different subject areas observed on only one occasion. The description by the observers of the subject areas observed permits an analysis of consistency of performance across time within the context of subject areas that would not otherwise be possible.

The validity of the data collected. As in the case of any collection of evidence pertaining to the performance of a teacher in a particular context the question of validity is uppermost, and assumes many dimensions.

Face validity. In the present case this is not an issue of concern as the observation system clearly focuses on two major dimensions of the classroom work of teachers, instruction and classroom management.

Construct validity. Again, in the present case, this should not be an issue of concern as the observation system has been structured around teaching and learning in Oregon’s standards-based schools to the extent that current knowledge, theory and empirical findings permit. In time our picture in this regard may change, but for now the construct of standards-based teaching is well represented.

Variability and stability in performance observed. Data reported in Research Briefs 6 through 9 provide evidence of both variability and stability in performance observed across time and contexts. The observation data collected clearly differentiates performance among teachers, and clearly shows stability of performance on the part of particular teachers. Without these two properties classroom observation data is suspect.

For all the reasons reviewed we believe that the observation data collected in the TEP-2 project are trustworthy.

Endnotes

1. It should be noted that the purpose of these observations was not to provide a comprehensive picture of the teaching performance of these teachers. Indeed, such a picture would require weeks, if not months, of classroom observation time with each teacher. Rather, the observations conducted were intended to and did provide accurate “snapshots” of teaching at specific and comparable points in time. As such, when the observations are compiled, they provide both an aggregate view of change and progress over time for the sample of teachers observed as well as an opportunity to track progress of individual teachers toward becoming proficient in a standards-based learning environment.

2. There was a tendency on the part of some observers to consistently rate teachers either higher or lower than other observers, even after their assignments were rotated. Even so these observers showed both variability and consistency in their ratings, and the teachers they observed showed discernable patterns of progress.
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This instrument is designed as an observation tool to assess the extent to which teachers engage in classroom practices consistent with “standards-based” teaching, including:

1. How the teacher communicates to students what is to be learned (learning outcomes desired);
2. How the teaching and learning activities align with and support the communicated outcomes;
3. How the teacher varies instructional activities, materials and procedures to support student in their learning;
4. How the teacher varies content, and engages students with content to help them in their learning;
5. How the teacher monitors student work to adapt instruction;
6. How the teacher provides feedback to students about their work;
7. How the teacher creates a classroom environment that supports student learning to high standards.

The instrument consists of two sections and is intended for use by a trained observer present in the classroom. Part one asks the observer to identify whether specific teacher behaviors were observed, and provides space to describe what the teacher actually did. Part two asks the observer to make a summative rating around each cluster of teacher behaviors observed.

The observation should span two entire instructional periods during a school day that have a clearly identifiable subject matter focus. These may be in the morning, in the afternoon, or one in the morning and one in the afternoon. A SEPARATE OBSERVATION FORM AND RATING PACKET, HOWEVER, NEEDS TO BE PREPARED FOR EACH OBSERVATION MADE.

Observer’s Name:  Date of observation:

1st observation:  From:  To:  2nd observation:  From:  To:

Teacher’s name:  Grade:  # of students:

Content focus of observation 1:  Content focus of observation 2:

Please provide a brief summary description of the content and instructional activities you observed during this time period. If additional space is needed, attach a separate page. Also circle the learning tasks listed below in which students were engaged during the class period observed, and under each task circled provide a rough estimate of the proportion of class time spent in each task.

Check one: 1st observation period  2nd observation period
## Part 1: Identifying Specific Teaching Behaviors and Activities

*In this section, please check the specific teaching behaviors or activities you see during an observation period, and describe what the teacher (or students) does.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communicating to students what is to be learned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>____ makes it clear to students what they are to learn (content or other outcomes desired)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____ makes it clear to students what level of performance is expected and acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____ lets students know how they are progressing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____ reinforces the belief that all students can learn what is being taught</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____ reinforces with students the importance of what is being learned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____ other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aligning and varying instructional activities, materials and procedures to support students in their learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>____ instructional activities seem clearly targeted to lesson/unit outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____ students are given opportunities to practice skills they will be expected to demonstrate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____ pace and/or content of teaching is altered “in-flight” to meet students’ needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____ instruction is varied to address differences in learning progress, strengths, or styles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____ adaptations are evident for exceptional learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____ other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Aligning and varying content to support students in their learning**

- EFFECTIVELY AND ACCURATELY COMMUNICATES CONTENT
- VARIES CONTENT TO ACCOMMODATE DIFFERENCES IN LEARNERS
- CONNECTS CONTENT TO REAL-LIFE SITUATIONS
- CONNECTS CONTENT ACROSS DISCIPLINES
- ENGAGES STUDENTS IN MULTIPLE-LEVEL AND/OR HIGHER ORDER THINKING TASKS INVOLVING CONTENT
- IDENTIFIES AND ADDRESSES MISCONCEPTIONS ABOUT CONTENT
- DEMONSTRATES COMMAND OF SUBJECT MATTER KNOWLEDGE WITHIN THE INSTRUCTIONAL PERIOD OBSERVED
- OTHER

---

**Assessing student progress in learning and providing feedback on their learning**

- DETERMINES WHAT STUDENTS ALREADY KNOW WITH RESPECT TO THE INSTRUCTIONAL PERIOD OR ACTIVITY PLANNED
- USES A VARIETY OF WAYS TO REGULARLY CHECK STUDENTS’ UNDERSTANDING DURING TEACHING
- EVALUATES STUDENTS’ WORK IN A Consistent MANNER
- SHares EXAMPLES TO LET STUDENTS KNOW WHAT IS EXPECTED
- INVOLVES STUDENTS IN SELF- AND PEER-ASSESSMENT AND FEEDBACK
- GIVES CLEAR, DIRECT FEEDBACK ABOUT HOW STUDENTS ARE DOING AND HOW THEY CAN IMPROVE
- OTHER
Creating a classroom environment that supports students in their learning

___ maintains a positive, learning focused classroom environment

___ monitors and manages individual and group behavior to maximize learning for all students

___ manages time and resources to maximize learning for all students

___ quickly and effectively resolves conflicts between students if they arise

___ creatively interweaves content, activities, and discourse to engage students in their learning

___ students help other students in their learning, and help their teacher as needed or requested

___ students engage in self-directed learning

___ students ask clarifying questions

___ physical features of the classroom provide an inviting and supportive context for learning

___ other

* * *

BE SURE TO COMPLETE PART TWO OF YOUR PACKET FOR EACH OBSERVATION
Part 2: Summative Ratings

Based on your observations, please provide a summative rating on each of the dimensions listed below by circling the appropriate number on the scale provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Observed</th>
<th>Emerging 1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Novice 3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Advanced 5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Distinguished 7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1-2 Appears to be aware of good teaching practice, and what students are expected to know and be able to do, but limited in ability to connect the two.

3-4 Clearly knows what to do, and attempts to implement, but is inconsistent across students and situations in both practice and results achieved.

5-6 Has a strong knowledge and skill base, with consistent implementation and good results for most students in most situations.

7-8 Has a thorough knowledge and skill base, and is exemplary as a model of implementation and effectiveness with almost all students in almost all situations.

Performance at the level represented by a 3, with some accompanying 4’s, is the performance level expected for INITIAL licensure. Performance at the level of 5, with some accompanying 6’s, is the level expected for CONTINUING licensure.

How well did this teacher communicate to students what was to be learned (outcomes expected from the lesson or activity)?

How well did this teacher align instruction and activities with communicated outcomes?

How well did this teacher vary activities and/or material for students?

How well did this teacher promote understanding and exploration of meaning within or across disciplines?

How well, in a holistic view of the classroom, did this teacher generate student interest in content to be learned?

How well did this teacher engage students in learning activities generally?

How well did this teacher assess/monitor student progress in learning, and adapt instruction accordingly?

How well did this teacher provide feedback to students about their work?

How well did this teacher manage the classroom to maximize learning?

MAKE ANY COMMENTS YOU WISH ABOUT YOUR RATINGS ON THE BACK OF THIS PAGE