Formal Observation Form

Please use blue or black ink.

Formal Observation # _____   Term/Year_____

Endorsement Candidate _____

Subject/Grade Level _____

Lesson Observed_____

Observed at _____ on _____ at _____
                    (School)   (Date)   (Hour)

Observation made by: _____

Instructions: The information reported on this form presents observational judgments about the endorsement candidate's performance during one formal observation. Each indicator receives <u>one</u> circled score, using this scale:

0 = No Evidence	1 = Significantly Below Standard	2 = Progressing Toward Standard	3 = Meets Standard	4 = Exceeds Standard

I. Planning					
PREPARATION: Were handouts and materials ready to use? Was any technology tested before the lesson began? Did the candidate have alternative plans if materials, technology, or circumstances did not cooperate?	0	1	2	3	4
Evidence:					
OBJECTIVES: Were the objectives aligned to both content and ELP standards? Were the instructional activities aligned to the objectives? How were the objectives shared with the students?	0	1	2	3	4
Evidence:					
ACTIVITIES: Were activities culturally responsive, age –appropriate, and linguistically accessible? Were there appropriate scaffolds to support/differentiate for ELP levels, IEPs, 504, TAG? Were the activities designed to develop authentic uses of language?	0	1	2	3	4
Evidence:					
II. Instruction					
CONTENT: How did the candidate demonstrate knowledge in the content area? Were the materials used appropriately for the content area and the students, including ELLs? Was the candidate able to bring in multiple resources/perspectives?	0	1	2	3	4
Evidence:					

ACTIVITIES: Was the effectiveness of learning activities monitored? Was the pace and/or content of instruction modified as needed to achieve lesson objectives? Were the activities student-centered? Did students, including ELLs, interact with each other? Was available technology used to enhance learning?	0	1	2	3	4
Evidence:					
LANGUAGE: How were academic language demands (vocabulary, syntax, discourse) addressed during the lesson? Were targeted supports used appropriately for ELLs, including differentiation for ELP levels? Did the candidate serve as a good language model for students?	0	1	2	3	4
Evidence:					
ENGAGEMENT: How did the candidate initially engage the learners in the lesson? How did the candidate engage all learners at higher-level thinking? Were all students, including ELLs, able to fully participate and focus on tasks to be accomplished?	0	1	2	3	4
Evidence:					
LEARNING ENVIRONMENT: Was a classroom climate of equity maintained? Were routines clearly established and followed, in ways that were appropriate for ELLs? Did the candidate take appropriate action if misbehavior occurred?	0	1	2	3	4
Evidence:					

III.   Assessment

OBJECTIVES: Were the assessments aligned with the objectives and standards? Were the assessments accessible and appropriate for all students, including ELLs? Did the candidate have clear evidence that the objectives were met?	0	1	2	3	4
Evidence:					
SELF-ASSESSMENT: Did the candidate guide students toward meaningful self-assessment? Were all learners, including ELLs, able to assess their progress based on learning objectives?	0	1	2	3	4
Evidence:					
FEEDBACK: Did learners receive specific feedback that indicated what they did well and where they need progress? Was the feedback applicable to future assignments? Was the feedback appropriate and helpful for ELLs?	0	1	2	3	4
Evidence:					

General Comments: