

**SARANAC LAKE CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT  
SARANAC LAKE, NEW YORK**

**TEACHER OBSERVATION RECORD**  
(CLASSROOM OBSERVATION)

TEACHER:

EVALUATED BY:

SCHOOL:

CLASS:

DATE:

# Philosophy Statement

The philosophy of supervision/evaluation of the Saranac Lake Central School District is two-fold: staff supervision (designed to promote professional competencies) and staff evaluation (designed to assess professional competencies).

This philosophy is based upon the following beliefs and assumptions:

1. Instructional improvement occurs as a process, not as an event
2. Individuals are motivated when they are involved in determining personal goals and objectives to guide their professional practices.
3. Individual performance can improve when standards for achievement are communicated and understood.
4. Individuals value and benefit from regular feedback regarding progress toward the achievement of goals.

Every organization has the responsibility to provide the best learning opportunities possible for its employees in order to assist them in reaching their potentials. The goal is always to improve services to children, thereby increasing the quality of education received by students. An effective development process is one, which involves a continuing, formative program of planned observation and conferencing sessions to strengthen present skills and to promote the incorporation of new skills. This process provides both teacher and supervisor the opportunities necessary to discuss teaching practices, reinforce present competencies, and introduce new skills/competencies. This cooperative effort creates a non-threatening atmosphere resulting in the best possible learning/teaching environment for all.

In addition, every organization has a responsibility to assess the performance of its employees. Effective assessment can occur when the district provides programs and opportunities for the employee to continue to learn and improve. Evaluation is an annual assessment of an individual's efforts to maintain or improve upon the competencies of his/her profession and the expectations of the district.

Supervision and evaluation are separated by an unwavering commitment to their respective aims: supervision is an on-going teaching/learning process for the enhancement of professional practices; evaluation is the judgmental appraisal of the individual's comprehensive work results.

## USING and UNDERSTANDING THE TEACHER OBSERVATION RECORD

The Teacher Observation Record is a classroom observation feedback to be used by supervisors when providing teachers feedback on the events in a single observed lesson. The process uses three (3) domains (Planning and Preparation, Classroom Environment, and Instruction), a listing of sub-categories within each domain, and a rubric description for assessing each category.

The rubrics are used to provide teachers and supervisors with narrative descriptions of assessed performance of the teacher within each category. Teachers and supervisors are encouraged to carefully reflect on these rubric descriptions because they will be used to “match” measures of quality with the teachers’ observed teaching. In most instances, the sub-categories are described using three (3) rubrics. However, a few of the categories use a 4 or 2 point rubric. All of the sub-categories contain the opportunity for the supervisor to mark “insufficient information” or “not applicable”. These options are available because some lessons observed are not well suited for the presence of each sub-category listed. These categories, when checked, should not be interpreted as negative indicators of a teacher’s behaviors.

Following each domain, a space on the form has been provided for the supervisor to make comments as needed. Comments are required by the supervisor whenever the “top” or “bottom” rubrics are marked. Comments are also required whenever the “insufficient information” box is marked. These comments should provide a brief but specific reason as to why these particular rubrics were selected.

Please remember that each Teacher Observation Record is based upon one observed teaching episode and has not been designed to encourage sweeping generalizations. Within the context of that lesson, it is possible that the supervisor and teacher will not always agree on the supervisor’s feedback. This should form a basis for a productive discussion in the conference that follows.

The Teacher Observation Record also allows the opportunity for both the teacher and supervisor to provide general closing narrative comments on the appraisal just completed. If the teacher wishes to react to the appraisal of the observed lesson, he/she can use this space to do so. The supervisor is expected to use this space to provide an overall summary of the observation, regardless of whether or not comments have been provided at any other part of the record. Consistent with Article XIII, A. 8 & 9 of the teacher contract, the signatures of both the teacher and the supervisor are required before the Observation Record is placed in the personnel file.

<b>PLANNING AND PREPARATION</b>	
<b>DEMONSTRATING KNOWLEDGE OF CONTENT AND PEDAGOGY</b>	
<b><u>CONTENT KNOWLEDGE</u></b>	
___ Teacher's planning and preparation displayed solid content knowledge and made connections between the content and other parts of the discipline and other disciplines.	___ INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION
___ Teacher's planning and preparation displayed basic content knowledge.	___ NOT APPLICABLE
___ Teacher's planning and preparation displayed limited content knowledge.	
<b><u>PEDAGOGY</u></b>	
___ Teacher's planning and preparation displayed continuing search for best practices and anticipated student misconceptions.	___ INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION
___ Teacher's planning and preparation reflected current research of best pedagogical practices emphasized within the district.	___ NOT APPLICABLE
___ Teacher's planning and preparation displayed little understanding of pedagogical issues involved in student learning.	
<b><u>PREREQUISITE KNOWLEDGE</u></b>	
___ Teacher actively built on knowledge of prerequisite relationships when describing instruction or seeing causes of student misunderstanding.	___ INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION
___ Teacher's planning and practice reflected understanding of prerequisite knowledge among topics and concepts.	___ NOT APPLICABLE
___ Teacher's planning and preparation displayed little understanding of prerequisite knowledge important for student learning of content.	
<b><u>COMMENTS</u></b>	
<b>DEMONSTRATING KNOWLEDGE OF STUDENTS</b>	
<b><u>KNOWLEDGE OF CHARACTERISTICS OF AGE GROUPS</u></b>	
___ Teacher's planning and preparation displayed through understanding of typical developmental characteristics of age group.	___ INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION
___ Teacher's planning and preparation displayed generally accurate knowledge of developmental characteristics of age group.	___ NOT APPLICABLE
___ Teacher's planning and preparation displayed minimal knowledge of developmental characteristics of age group.	
<b><u>KNOWLEDGE OF STUDENTS' VARIED APPROACHES TO LEARNING, SUCH AS MODALITIES, INTELLIGENCES AND LEARNING SYTTLES</u></b>	
___ Teacher's planning and preparation displayed solid understanding of the different approaches to learning that students exhibit.	___ INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION
___ Teacher's planning and preparation displayed general understanding of the different approaches to learning that students exhibit.	___ NOT APPLICABLE
___ Teacher's planning and preparation displayed limited understanding of the different approaches to learning that students exhibit.	
<b><u>KNOWLEDGE OF STUDENTS' SKILLS AND BACKGROUND KNOWLEDGE</u></b>	
___ Teacher's planning and preparation displayed a thorough understanding of students' skills and background knowledge, and recognized the value of this knowledge.	___ INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION
___ Teacher's planning and preparation displayed a general understanding of students' skills and background knowledge.	___ NOT APPLICABLE
___ Teacher's planning and preparation displayed minimal understanding of students' skills and background knowledge.	

**SUITABILITY FOR DIVERSE STUDENTS**

- Goals consistently reflected the varied needs of individual students.  INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION
- The planned goal was reflective of the varied needs and abilities of all students.  NOT APPLICABLE
- The planned goal was reflective of some needs and abilities of some students.
- The planned goal did not account for the learning needs and abilities of a majority of students.

**COMMENTS****DESIGNING COHERENT INSTRUCTION****LEARNING ACTIVITIES**

- Learning activities uniquely challenged the understanding and creativity of students and were relevant to the objectives of the lesson.  INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION
- The learning activities were predictable in seeking student understanding and were relevant to the objectives of the lesson.  NOT APPLICABLE
- The learning activities were not relevant to the objectives of the lesson.

**INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS AND RESOURCES**

- All materials and resources supported the instructional objectives or engaged students in meaningful learning. There was evidence of adaptation of materials to reflect unique learning needs.  INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION
- Most materials and resources supported the instructional goals and engaged students in meaningful learning.  NOT APPLICABLE
- Materials and resources did not support the instructional goals, engaged students in meaningful learning, and/or reflected needed adaptations.

**INSTRUCTIONAL GROUPING**

- The assignment of groups was purposeful and was clearly intended to support instructional goals and learner needs.  INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION
- The assignment of students to groups appeared to lack a defined purpose and/or minimally supported instructional goals and learner needs.  NOT APPLICABLE

**LESSON AND UNIT STRUCTURE**

- The lesson or unit had a clearly defined structure which allowed for different pathways and time allocations according to student needs.  INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION
- The lesson or unit had a clearly defined structure around which the activities were organized. Time allocations were reasonable.  NOT APPLICABLE
- The lesson or unit lacked a recognizable structure and/or the time allocations were questionable.

**PLANNING AND PREPARATION – continued**

**ASSESSING STUDENT LEARNING – CRITERIA AND STANDARDS**

- Assessment criteria and standards were clear and were effectively communicated to students. It was evident that students internalized the criteria and standards, and they demonstrated ability to self-evaluate.  INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION  
 NOT APPLICABLE
- Assessment criteria and standards were clear and were effectively communicated to students.
- Assessment criteria and standards were somewhat developed, but were neither clear nor clearly communicated to students.

**CONSISTENCY**

- Goals were clearly articulated and related to available curriculum frameworks and state standards.  INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION  
 NOT APPLICABLE
- Goals were appropriately related to curriculum frameworks and standards.
- Goals did not consistently align with curriculum and standards.

**CLARITY**

- Goals were clear, written in the form of student learning and permitted viable methods of assessment.  INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION  
 NOT APPLICABLE
- Goals were clear and permitted viable methods of assessment.
- Goals were not clear or were stated as student activities. Goals did not permit viable methods of assessment.

**COMMENTS**

**IMPORTANCE OF CONTENT**

- Teacher conveyed genuine enthusiasm for the subject and repeatedly emphasizes the importance of the content to the students.  INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION  
 NOT APPLICABLE
- Teacher communicated the importance of the content to students.
- Teacher conveyed a negative attitude toward the content, suggesting that the content was not important or is mandated by others.

**EXPECTATION FOR LEARNING AND ACHIEVEMENT**

- Instructional goals and activities, interactions, and the classroom environment actively promoted the best attitude within each student.  INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION  
 NOT APPLICABLE
- Instructional goals and activities, interactions, and the classroom environment conveyed high expectations for student achievement.
- Instructional goals and activities, interactions, and the classroom environment conveyed only limited expectations for student achievement.

**MANAGEMENT OF TRANSITIONS**

- Transition instructions are exceptionally clear and specific, resulting in no loss of instruction time.  INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION  
 NOT APPLICABLE
- Transition instructions are clear, resulting in little loss of instructional time.
- Transition instructions are non-specific and/or confusing to students.

**MANAGEMENT OF MATERIALS AND SUPPLIES**

- Routines for handling materials and supplies were consistently reinforced and all necessary supplies and materials were readily available.  INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION  
 NOT APPLICABLE
- Routines for handling materials and supplies occurred smoothly, with minimal loss of instructional time.
- Routines for handling materials and supplies did not appear to be communicated and materials were not readily available.

**SAFETY AND ARRANGEMENT OF FURNITURE**

- Classroom safety issues were addressed. Furniture arrangement was suited to lesson activities.  INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION  
 NOT APPLICABLE
- Classroom was unsafe. Furniture arrangement was not suited to lesson activities.

**COMMENTS**

**MANAGING STUDENT BEHAVIOR**

**EXPECTATIONS**

- Standards of conduct were clearly communicated to all students, and these standards were frequently referenced, as needed.  INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION
- Standards of conduct were clearly communicated to all students.  NOT APPLICABLE
- Standards of conduct appeared not to have been established or understood.
- The students appeared confused as to what the standards were.

**MONITORING AND ADJUSTING OF STUDENT BEHAVIOR**

- Monitoring of student behavior by teacher was subtle and preventative, and the teachers' response to misbehavior was highly effective and sensitive to students' individual needs.  INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION
- Teacher was successfully responsive to misbehavior and was respectful to the student's dignity.  NOT APPLICABLE
- Teacher did not respond to misbehavior, or the response was inconsistent, overly reactive, and/or did not respect students' dignity.

**RESPECT AND RAPPORT**

- Student interactions were totally appropriate, polite and respectful.  INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION
- Student interactions were generally polite and respectful.  NOT APPLICABLE
- Student interactions were characterized by conflict or put-downs.

**COMMENTS**

**INSTRUCTION**

**DIRECTIONS AND PROCEDURES**

- Teacher directions and procedures were effectively communicated to students by more than one method, and student understanding was checked.  INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION
- Teacher directions and procedures were clear to students and contained an appropriate level of detail. Possible student misunderstandings were anticipated.  NOT APPLICABLE
- Teacher's spoken language was inaudible, and/or written language was illegible.

**ORAL AND WRITTEN LANGUAGE**

- Teacher's spoken and written language was correct and expressive, with well-chosen age appropriate vocabulary that enriched the lesson.  INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION
- Teacher's spoken and written language was clear and correct. Vocabulary was appropriate to students' ages and interests.  NOT APPLICABLE
- Teacher's spoken language was inaudible and/or written language was illegible.
- Expressive errors in grammar, syntax and vocabulary occurred frequently.

**QUALITY OF QUESTIONS**

- Teacher consistently asked developmentally appropriate questions to promote higher order student-thinking skills.  INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION
- Teacher consistently asked questions with levels of thinking that were consistent with the task.  NOT APPLICABLE
- Teacher occasionally asked questions with levels of thinking that occasionally reflected task.
- Teacher's questions were of poor quality.

**DISCUSSION TECHNIQUES**

- Classroom interaction was vivid and designed to promote an enriched discussion among all students.  INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION  
 Teacher prompts facilitated developmentally appropriate discussion, encouraging student contributions.  NOT APPLICABLE  
 Teacher prompts failed to initiate developmentally appropriate discussion with students.

**COMMENTS****ENGAGING STUDENTS IN LEARNING****PRESENTATION OF CONTENT**

- Presentation of content was consistent in quality and linked well with students' knowledge, abilities and experiences. Student contributions were integrated into the presentation.  INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION  
 Presentation of content was consistent in quality and linked well with students' knowledge and experience.  NOT APPLICABLE  
 Presentation of content was inconsistent in quality and portions were difficult to follow.

**ACTIVITIES AND ASSIGNMENTS**

- Activities and assignments consistently challenged students to refine and to enrich their understanding of the content.  INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION  
 Activities and assignments were appropriate to students and were designed to cognitively engage students.  NOT APPLICABLE  
 Activities and assignments were inappropriate for students.

**INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS AND RESOURCES**

- Teacher consistently provided materials and resources that supported the instructional objectives, enabling students to extend and enrich their learning.  INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION  
 Materials and resources supported the instructional objectives and engaged students in meaningful learning.  NOT APPLICABLE  
 Materials and resources did not support the instructional objectives, engage students in meaningful learning and/or reflect needed adaptations.

**STRUCTURE AND PACING**

- A clearly defined lesson structure was followed which allowed for different pathways and time allocations according to student needs.  INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION  
 The teacher followed a structure around which the activities were organized with appropriate time allocations.  NOT APPLICABLE  
 The lesson lacked structure and time allocations were unrealistic or inappropriate.

**QUALITY OF FEEDBACK**

- Feedback was consistent, accurate, timely, specific and constructive.  INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION  
 Feedback was inconsistent and ambiguous.  NOT APPLICABLE

**LESSON ADJUSTMENT**

- Teacher monitored and skillfully adjusted the lesson to meet the needs of the students  INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION  
 Teacher made smooth adjustments within a lesson as needed.  NOT APPLICABLE  
 Teacher adhered rigidly to an instructional plan, even when changes would have improved the lesson.

**RESPONSE TO STUDENTS**

- Teacher successfully accommodated students' questions or interests, building on spontaneous events to expand the learning experience.  INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION  
 Teacher attempted to accommodate students' questions or interests with some success.  NOT APPLICABLE  
 Teacher made no attempt to acknowledge/accommodate students' questions or interests.

**COMMENTS**

- This was a satisfactory evaluation
- This was an unsatisfactory evaluation
- A Teacher Remediation Plan is recommended

**ADMINISTRATOR SUMMARY COMMENTS:**

**TEACHER COMMENTS (OPTIONAL):**

---

Teacher Signature

---

Date

---

Administrator Signature

---

Date