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# Facilitator’s Guide Overview

This Facilitator’s Guide provides resources for educators to use OPTIC as a professional development tool that supports their understanding of what culturally responsive teaching looks like in the classroom.

Using the resources in this Facilitator’s Guide, educators can plan and participate in professional development trainings in which they watch a brief video of classroom instruction on OPTIC and assess the strength of the instruction through a culturally responsive lens. Educators then come together to compare their perceptions of the instruction to benchmark scores and evidence identified by [OPTIC Content Fellows](#opticfellows), a group of Massachusetts educators with expertise in their content area and culturally responsive teaching. These discussions can support educators to build their understanding of what culturally responsive teaching looks like in the classroom and to integrate aspects of culturally responsive teaching into their own practice.

This Facilitator’s Guide includes:

* The [workshop discussion protocol](#DISCUSSION) supports educators across the state to have similar calibration discussions to strengthen their understandings of strong, culturally responsive teaching.
* The [video profiles](#TWOPAGERS) provide Fellows’ benchmark scores and the evidence they observed relative to culturally responsive practice for each video from the collection.
* [Appendix A](#appendix) includes Fellow-developed culturally responsive “look-fors,” which list specific student and teacher actions for each of OPTIC’s Focus Elements.
* Appendix B includes a complete list of the videos in the OPTIC Content Fellows Video Collection.

What is OPTIC?

**[OPTIC: The Online Platform for Teaching and Informed Calibration](http://www.ma-optic.com)** provides educators with an opportunity to calibrate their perceptions of strong, standards-aligned instructional practice and high-quality feedback through video observations and/or student work samples.

Through an online platform, groups of educators view videos of classroom instruction in relevant grades and content areas. Individually, they (1) identify evidence and score the educator’s **practice** relative to two of seven **Focus Elements** from the MA Model System Classroom Teacher Rubric ([Appendix A](#appendix)); (2) identify evidence and score practice aligned to a select number of **content** standards from the **MA Curriculum Frameworks**; and (3) draft feedback to the educator based on their observation. Collectively, participants then view real-time data displays of the scores and feedback provided by others in their group and across the state (disaggregated by role and district or organization) and use this data to facilitate a discussion of evidence and perceptions of practice. These conversations support critical sharing and norming around perceptions of high quality instructional practice.

*Continued on page 4.*

What is culturally responsive teaching?

Culturally responsive teaching happens in classrooms that foster and support students’ diverse backgrounds, identities, strengths, and challenges to deepen their learning, examine the systems in which they operate, and address systemic inequities.[[1]](#footnote-1) According to leading scholar Gloria Ladson-Billings, there are three tenets of culturally responsive teaching[[2]](#footnote-2):

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Academic Achievement** | **Cultural Competence** | **Sociopolitical Awareness** |
| Educators hold high, transparent expectations for all students, and support the development of students’ academic skills and identities as learners. | Educators understand culture’s role in education, their students’ cultures, and their own identity and biases to 1) affirm students’ backgrounds and identities and 2) foster their ability to understand and honor others’ cultures.  | Educators and students partner to identify, analyze, and work to solve systemic inequities in their communities and the world. |

It is important to spotlight a few key points about culturally responsive teaching[[3]](#footnote-3):

* **Culturally responsive teaching is synonymous with great teaching.** A teacher’s practice cannot be strong, effective, or rigorous *unless* it is culturally responsive. Historically, neither the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) nor our education system as a whole have positioned culturally responsive practice as essential to great teaching. As the Commonwealth continues to develop and strengthen its capacity to provide culturally responsive instruction to each and every student, this resource will explicitly call out and highlight culturally responsive instructional practice. However, in explicitly naming it, it is important to be clear that culturally responsive practice is not something educators do “on the side,” but is integrally woven into the concept of great teaching.
* **All students need and deserve culturally responsive teaching.** A common misconception about culturally responsive teaching is that it is only for students who have been historically marginalized. If we are to prepare and lead students to build a more just and equitable world, all students – including students with access to systems of power - need and deserve a culturally responsive education.
* **Educators exist on a continuum of culturally responsive teaching.** Culturally responsive teaching is complex and varies based on the context and circumstances. An educator might demonstrate strength in culturally responsive teaching in some ways in a specific moment, and demonstrate areas of growth in the next. The purpose of naming and focusing on culturally responsive teaching is not to reach a specific endpoint, but to strive for consistent and authentic teaching practices that embody and promote academic achievement, cultural competence, and sociopolitical awareness.
* **Educators must do a combination of adaptive and technical work** **to engage in culturally responsive teaching.** In other words, educators need to build *technical* skills, such as the ability to identify and enact teacher moves that support culturally responsive teaching. This Facilitator’s Guide is one way to support the development of those technical skills. At the same time, educators can only teach in culturally responsive ways if they are also doing the *adaptive* work: engaging in ongoing learning and self-reflection to confront their own biases and racism, and develop asset-based, anti-racist mindsets. Therefore, this Facilitator’s Guide is a small part of a much larger set of ongoing, continual work that we as educators must do in our work towards cultural responsiveness.

Who are the OPTIC Content Fellows?

The 2021 OPTIC Content Fellows are a group of MA educators and educator preparation faculty with strong expertise in subject matter content and culturally responsive teaching. Fellows independently scored videos in OPTIC, then came together to discuss evidence and establish benchmark scores on practice and content from a culturally responsive lens. We refer to this set of 17 Content Fellow-scored videos as the OPTIC Content Fellow Video Collection throughout the Facilitator’s Guide.

The Department is incredibly grateful for the important contributions each of the OPTIC Content Fellows has made to this Facilitator’s Guide, as well as their contributions to the Department’s ongoing work to define and support great, culturally responsive teaching across the Commonwealth.

|  |
| --- |
| OPTIC Content Fellows | 2021-2022 |
| ELA | Math |
| Image of Ashley Clerge | **Ashley Clerge***Grade 5 Teacher**Hugh Roe O’Donnell School, Boston* | Image of Jason Colombino | **Jason Colombino***Principal**Danvers High School, Danvers* |
| A person taking a selfie  Description automatically generated | **Joanna Ganci***ELA Program Coordinator, 6-12**Andover Public Schools* | A picture containing person, smiling  Description automatically generated | **Deatrice Johnson***District Supervisor of Math**Springfield Public Schools* |
| Image of Sarah Little | **Sarah Little***Literacy Coach**Lee Academy Pilot School, Boston* | Image of Carly Nunez | **Carly Nunez***Math Coach**Guilmette Middle School, Lawrence* |
| Image of Antonelli Mejia | **Antonelli Mejia***Director of Student Advancement**Mario Umana School, Boston* | Image of Hannah Tolla | **Hannah Tolla***Director of Data, Accountability & Financial Analytics**Andover Public Schools* |
| Image of Trevor Munhall | **Trevor Munhall***Grade 8 English Teacher**UP Academy Leonard* |  | **Marc Lewis***Network Director of Special Education and English Language Development**Phoenix Charter School Network* |
| A picture containing person, person, outdoor, jacket  Description automatically generated | **Raphael Rogers***Associate Professor of Practice**Clark University* |  |  |

# Workshop Discussion Protocol: Using a Culturally Responsive Lens to Analyze Teacher Practice

|  |
| --- |
| This workshop discussion protocol is intended to support facilitators in leading professional development workshops based on the OPTIC Content Fellows Video Collection. In this workshop, participants conduct a brief video observation of a math or ELA lesson with a specific focus on an educator’s practice using a culturally responsive lens. Together, participants discuss their perceptions of teacher practice, and compare their perceptions to OPTIC Content Fellows’ benchmark scores and evidence. In doing so, participants strengthen their understanding of what great, culturally responsive teaching looks like in practice. Some recommendations for facilitation:* We recommend that, when possible, school administrators (e.g., principals, evaluators, instructional coaches) participate in this workshop before facilitating this workshop with classroom educators.
* We also suggest facilitating this workshop with educators in mixed-content groups. Although the videos are of English Language Arts and Math instruction, this workshop can help all educators develop a shared vision and understanding of culturally responsive teaching across content areas.

This workshop is divided into six sections for a total time allocation of 2 hours whole-group, or 30 minutes pre-work and 1.5 hours whole-group. **If this is your team’s first experience calibrating on culturally responsive practice, we strongly recommend you conduct the session whole-group to build background knowledge about culturally responsive practice.** 1. Introduction (5 min.)
2. Warm Up (15 min.)
3. Observation and Scoring (30 min.)

*This section of the workshop can be completed as pre-work.*1. Calibration Discussion (20 min.)
2. Reflecting on OPTIC Content Fellows’ Benchmark Scores and Evidence (30 min.)
3. Reflection (20 min.)

This section also includes guidance for facilitator on how to prepare for the workshop.  |

Before the Workshop: Facilitator Preparation

1. **Select a calibration task from the** [**OPTIC Content Fellows Collection**](#TWOPAGERS) for participants to focus on during the workshop. When selecting a task, consider the grade level or content area for the video observation that is most relevant to your participants, as well as priority areas for professional development related to specific Focus Elements and/or content standards.
2. **Assign the calibration task on OPTIC.** Once you have selected a task, you can assign it directly from the task details page or through the “Calibration” tab of the Main Menu. To assign a task, you will select a due date and then confirm the components of the task that participants will complete, which can include:
	* 1. Scoring practice of two Focus Elements from the Standards and Indicators of Effective Teaching Practice
		2. Assessing alignment to grade-level standards based on the MA Curriculum Frameworks
		3. Drafting written feedback using the Feedback Form

If you are new to the OPTIC platform and would like additional guidance on setting up your account and assigning a calibration task, please see the step-by-step instructions in the [OPTIC Administrator Guide](http://www.ma-optic.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/TeachForward-Administrator-Guide-V20181101-2.pdf).

1. **Prepare copies of the OPTIC Content Fellows** [**video profile**](#TWOPAGERS) **on your selected task and any other supporting resources for your warm-up.** Make sure to have these resources printed and/or electronically accessible for participants during the workshop.
2. **Gather any additional materials,** such as a projector/screen or chart paper.

Talking about systems of power and oppression can be challenging. As you prepare to facilitate this workshop about culturally responsive teaching with educators, ensure you have done your own reflection and are ready to address harmful dynamics if they arise. Reflect in advance:

**What is my own comfort level discussing systems of power and oppression,** [**including along lines of race**](https://www.learningforjustice.org/magazine/spring-2016/begin-within) **and culture?**

**What** [**power dynamics**](https://interactioninstitute.org/power-dynamics-the-hidden-element-to-effective-meetings/) **exist among workshop participants, including along lines of race, gender, class, ability, or access? How can I acknowledge these dynamics and minimize their harm in our workshop?**

**What** [**group agreements**](https://www.citybureau.org/notebook/2019/12/19/safe-spaces-brave-spaces-and-why-we-gon-be-alright) **do we need to establish to create a brave space?**

**How will I** [**call in or call out**](http://www.racialequityvtnea.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/Interrupting-Bias_-Calling-Out-vs.-Calling-In-REVISED-Aug-2018-1.pdf) **harmful statements or actions ? How will I support our community to hold each other accountable for these moments and repair any harm?**

I. Introduction (5 min.)

* Share an agenda, as well as the goals of today’s workshop:
	+ The goal of this workshop is to understand what great, culturally responsive teaching does and does not look like in a classroom observation.
	+ Using a culturally responsive lens, we will:
		- Identify observable evidence of two Focus Elements from the Classroom Teacher Rubric.
		- Develop and refine a shared understanding of effective, standards-aligned instructional practice.
* Share any group agreements or norms.

II. Warm Up (15 min.)

* Provide an opportunity for participants to activate their background knowledge about culturally responsive teaching. Depending on the group’s previous learning, you might:
	+ Read the [Culturally Responsive Look-Fors](#appendix) developed by the Content Fellows for the task’s Focus Elements.
	+ Collectively brainstorm characteristics of culturally responsive teaching.
	+ Read one of the resources on DESE’s [Culturally Responsive and Sustaining Schools and Classrooms](https://www.doe.mass.edu/instruction/crdw/) webpage.
	+ Present a high-level definition of culturally responsive teaching, such as the definition in this resource’s [Overview.](#OVerview)
* Instruct participants to read the content standard(s) addressed in the video and the proficient descriptors for each Focus Element ([Appendix A](#appendix)). Participants will work in pairs or small groups to identify 4-5 Teacher and Student Look-Fors for each Focus Element. Look-Fors are the core observable practices that you would expect to see as evidence of effective, culturally responsive, content-specific pedagogy in a classroom observation. What might the teacher be saying or doing? The students?
	+ If participants read the [Culturally Responsive Look-Fors](#appendix) for the task’s Focus Elements, ask them to brainstorm *additional* culturally responsive look-fors pertaining to their content area and/or grade level.
* Chart responses as a whole group, highlighting common responses. As a group, narrow down to the 2-3 most critical Look-Fors for teachers and students for each Focus Element.
* *Additional opportunity:* If you did not initially share the [Culturally Responsive Look-Fors](#appendix) with participants as part of the warm-up, consider comparing your group’s culturally responsive look-fors to those of the OPTIC Content Fellows, and discuss similarities and differences.

III. Observation and Scoring (30 min.)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Whole-Group Training[Recommended for initial calibration training workshops] | Hybrid (Virtual + Whole-Group) Training [Recommended for follow-up calibration training workshops] |
| *Use or adapt the following instructions as a guide during the session.** Today we will be conducting a brief video-based observation of a [*insert brief context, e.g. 10th grade ELA classroom where students are working on analyzing a poem in small groups*] using a culturally responsive lens*.*
* As you observe, use the Look-Fors we just developed to identify evidence related to the two Focus Elements relative to culturally responsive practice.

[*From the projected screen, start the video by opening the assigned calibration task (through the “Calibration” tab) and selecting “Begin.”*]* [*After the video ends*] Log into OPTIC, open the assigned calibration task (from your homepage or through the “Calibration” tab), select “begin” and then “score work.”
* You will be prompted to score practice aligned to the Focus Elements on a scale of 1-10, assess the extent to which the instruction as at, above, or below grade level standards (a 3-point scale), and then draft written feedback. Please complete this independently. After you’re finished, select “Submit.”
 | *Use or adapt the following instructions to assign the calibration task as pre-work prior to the session.*As pre-work before our professional development session on [*date*]*,* please complete the following calibration task. This is expected to take approximately 30 minutes.* Log-in to OPTIC by visiting [www.ma-optic.com](http://www.ma-optic.com). Register for an account if you have not yet done so.
* Once logged in, you will see an invitation to join our group (if applicable) and to complete a calibration task.
* To complete this task, you will be first watching a brief video of a [*insert grade-level/content area*] lesson in which students are [*insert brief context*]*.* The focus for this observation will be on [insert content standard(s) and Focus Elements] using a culturally responsive lens.
* As you observe, look for evidence of practice related to the two Focus Elements relative to **culturally responsive practice**. As you watch, pause the video to “tag” evidence to specific moments in the lesson.
* To start the video, open the assigned task and select “Begin.”
* After the video ends, select “Score Work.” You will be prompted to assess the extent to which the instruction as at, above, or below grade level standards (a 3-point scale), and then score practice aligned to the Focus Elements on a scale of 1-10. Once you’re finished, select “Submit.”
 |

**Facilitator’s Notes:**

* The videos in OPTIC are brief, 8-12 minute *snapshots* of classroom instruction. Observers will not have additional context about what happens before or after the observation, nor will they know the details of the classroom composition or the teacher’s lesson plan. Observers should instead focus on what they see and hear during the observation in order to calibrate with their colleagues on what high-quality instruction does, and does not, look like from a culturally responsive lens.
* OPTIC uses a 10-point scale for scoring practice in the Focus Elements, rather than the 4-point scale used in the MA evaluation framework. This is an intentional design feature. The 10-point scale promotes a more nuanced conversation about differences in perceptions of practice that would not be possible with a 4-point scale. The performance labels (Unsatisfactory, Needs Improvement, Proficient, Exemplary) are intended to serve as guideposts within this scale. It’s also important to remember that OPTIC is a professional development tool for the purpose of calibrating around high-quality instruction and feedback, not a training tool for conducting observations or evaluations. “Rating” individual observations is not recommended, nor is it commensurate with an educator evaluation framework that promotes a holistic assessment of practice informed by multiple sources of evidence.
* While participants are completing the scoring portion of the task, the facilitator can monitor their completion status by opening the task from the “Calibration” page and selecting the Assignees tab.
* For additional support in navigating the OPTIC platform, you can refer to the [Administrator User Guide](http://www.ma-calibration.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/TeachForward-Administrator-Guide-V20181101-2.pdf) for more detailed instructions and screen-shots.

IV. Calibration Discussion (20 min.)

* Project the Results page in the OPTIC platform. Briefly discuss initial take-aways from the data as a whole-group (5 min).
	+ The blue circle indicates your individual score and the green circles represent the consensus score of the group. The larger the circle, the greater the consensus around that score. Reflecting on the *range* of scores, how calibrated are you as a group?
	+ Use the “Analyze by” filter to view and compare results by role, school, organization, with the state as a whole. Are there differences in how you interpret practice by individual roles or schools? Do you interpret practice differently than others across the state?
	+ Use the “Report” filter to review the results associated with alignment to grade-level standards.
* Dive deeper into the results. Depending on the size of your group, you may consider breaking into smaller groups or pairs to discuss these questions before debriefing as a whole group. (15 min).
	+ *What evidence did you use to arrive at your score for each element? Using a culturally responsive lens, what strengths did you observe? Areas of growth?*
	+ *What evidence did you use to arrive at your score for alignment to grade-level content standard(s)? Using a culturally responsive lens, what strengths did you observe? Areas of growth?*
	+ *What would our consensus score be for each element? For alignment to content standard(s)?*

V. Reflecting on OPTIC Content Fellows’ Benchmark Scores and Evidence (30 min.)

The video two-pagers provide OPTIC Content Fellows’ consensus scores and the evidence they used to make sense of the observable evidence in the video using a culturally responsive lens. Please note, while this resource does provide exemplar evidence, it is not meant to serve as an “answer key.” The scores and evidence in the two-pagers represent the perceptions and feedback of one group of MA educators and educator preparation faculty with strong expertise in subject matter content and culturally responsive teaching, but there may be additional important takeaways that your group identifies from the videos.

* Instruct participants to read the [video profile](#TWOPAGERS) that corresponds with the OPTIC task your group scored (10 min).
* Dive deeper into your group’s results in comparison to the OPTIC Content Fellows’ scores and evidence. Depending on the size of your group, you may consider breaking into smaller groups or pairs to discuss these questions before debriefing as a whole group (20 min).
	+ *How do our scores compare to the Content Fellows’ benchmark scores? Why might that be?*
	+ *How does our group’s evidence compare to the evidence Content Fellows used to inform their scores?*
		- *What evidence did we use that Content Fellows did not prioritize?*
		- *What evidence did Content Fellows focus on that we did not notice as a group?*
	+ *How does our group’s feedback to the educator compare to the selected Content Fellow feedback?*
	+ *What do you notice and wonder about the Content Fellows’ evidence?*
		- *What resonates with you as evidence related to culturally responsive practice?*
		- *What is something in the video that feels important to culturally responsive practice, but is not reflected in the Content Fellows’ evidence?*

VI. Reflection (20 min.)

* Recap key takeaways from this activity.
	+ *Now that we’ve reviewed the Content Fellows’ benchmark scores and evidence, would we change our group’s consensus score? Why or why not?*
	+ *What is one takeaway you have from this activity about culturally responsive practice?*
		- *What is one thing you’re wondering about culturally responsive practice?*
		- *What is one new thing you’ve learned about culturally responsive practice?*
		- *What is one thing you want to learn more about after this calibration exercise?*
* Building one’s capacity for culturally responsive teaching is an ongoing process that requires deep, internal reflection over time. While this calibration training supports educators to identify elements of great teaching from a culturally responsive lens, it is not a “one-and-done” professional development experience. Support participants to build reflection and action into their work moving forward:
	+ For educators: *What is one strategy you commit to interrogating, adding, or changing in your own practice to work towards culturally responsive practice?*
	+ For coaches, administrators and evaluators: *What is one strategy relative to culturally responsive practice that you’d like to support educators with moving forward?*
	+ *Consider having participants share their commitment with a trusted “accountability buddy,” and provide space in a future professional development to return to and reflect on their commitments.*

# OPTIC Content Fellows Collection: Video Profiles

|  |
| --- |
| The video profiles provide OPTIC Content Fellows’ benchmark scores, evidence, and feedback for a subset of videos in the OPTIC Content Fellows Video Collection. Each video profile consists of:1. A brief description of the video
2. Sections focused on the Focus Elements and one content standard, including Fellows’:
	1. Benchmark consensus scores

*Please note that these scores reflect the Fellows’ consensus scores after independently scoring the video and having calibration discussions similar to the kind outlined in the Workshop Discussion Protocol. For this reason, Content Fellows’ individual scores displayed on the OPTIC platform may vary from this consensus score.* * 1. Evidence of strength from a culturally responsive lens
	2. Evidence of areas of growth from a culturally responsive lens
1. Exemplars of high-quality feedback

Please note, while this resource does provide exemplar evidence, it is not necessarily meant to serve as an “answer key.” The scores and evidence in the video profiles represent the perceptions and feedback of one group of MA educators and educator preparation faculty with strong expertise in subject matter content and culturally responsive teaching, but there may be additional important takeaways that your group identifies from the videos.OPTIC Content Fellows also provided benchmark scores for several other videos, which do not have associated video profiles. Only benchmark scores are available for these additional videos. You can learn more about these videos in [Appendix B](#AppB). |

|  |
| --- |
| Video Profiles*There are four video profiles for ELA and four video profiles for Math. The table on p. 13 provides more information about each video’s 1) tagged Focus Elements and 2) tenet(s of culturally responsive practice that are especially relevant to the observed practice.* |
| **ELA** | **Math** |
| [**Grade 4 | Evidence Based Discussion - Yes Ma’am - Task 1**](#ELAYesMaam) | [**Grade 2 | Number Talk - Task 2**](#MathNumberTalk2) |
| [**Grade 6 | Fishbowl Egyptian Artifacts – Task 1**](#G6ELA) | [**Grade 5 | Graph and Analyze Relationships - Task 1**](#g5Math) |
| [**Grade 7-8 | Socratic Discussion – Eugenics – Task 2**](#G78ELA) | [**Grade 6 | Math | Equivalent Expressions - Task 1**](#g6math) |
| [**Grade 12 | Collaboration Annotation – Hamlet – Task 1**](#G12ELA) | [**Grade 10-12 | Functions and Exponential Equations – Task 1**](#g1012math) |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *Click on a video title below to navigate to its Video profile:* | Focus Elements of Practice*This video is tagged to the following elements of practice from the Classroom Teacher Rubric:* | Culturally Responsive Focus*OPTIC Content Fellows’ Scores and Evidence Particularly Speak to:* |
| I-A-1 Subject Matter Knowledge | I-A-3 Well-Structured Units and Lessons | I-B-2 Adjustments to Practice | II-A-2 Student Engagement | II-A-3 Meeting Diverse Needs | II-B-1 Safe Learning Environment | II-E-1 High Expectations | Academic Achievement | Cultural Competence | Sociopolitical Awareness |
| ELA | [**Grade 4 | Evidence Based Discussion - Yes Ma’am - Task 1**](#ELAYesMaam) | X |  |  |  |  |  | X | X | X |  |
| [**Grade 6 | Fishbowl Egyptian Artifacts – Task 1**](#G6ELA) | X | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| [**Grade 7-8 | Socratic Discussion – Eugenics – Task 2**](#G78ELA) |  | X |  |  |  | X |  |  |  | X |
| [**Grade 12 | Collaboration Annotation – Hamlet – Task 1**](#G12ELA) | X |  |  |  | X |  |  | X |  |  |
| Math | [**Grade 2 | Number Talk - Task 2**](#MathNumberTalk2) |  |  |  |  |  | X | X |  | X |  |
| [**Grade 5 | Graph and Analyze Relationships - Task 1**](#g5Math) |  |  |  | X |  |  | X |  | X |  |
| [**Grade 6 | Math | Equivalent Expressions - Task 1**](#g6math) |  |  | X |  | X |  |  | X |  |  |
| [**Grade 10-12 | Functions and Exponential Equations – Task 1**](#g1012math) |  |  |  |  |  | X | X |  | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| ELAGrade 4 | Evidence Based Discussion - Yes Ma’am - Task 1 |



*“This video shows a 4th-grade ELA class getting ready to engage in a Socratic seminar to discuss the main lesson in the story using evidence for the text “Thank you, Ma'am” by Langston Hughes. The teacher on the video demonstrates clear directions and expectations for learning for all students. She also shows some adjustment to her practice as a response to students' discussions.* *However, not all students were able to fully engage in the learning in a consistent manner and* *it was not evident that all students were able to make and assess evidence-based claims and arguments on their own.”*

* + - *Antonelli Mejia, OPTIC Content Fellow*

|  |
| --- |
| Calibrating on Perceptions of Practice |
| Number line to show scoringPRACTICE | I-A-1**7/87/8****Subject Matter Knowledge**Content Fellow Consensus Score |
| EVIDENCE OF **Strength** | * Students used evidence from the text to support their thinking.
* The teacher used open-ended questioning to help students develop and clarify their ideas.
	+ *One Content Fellow described the teacher’s questioning as “relentless.”*
* The students did most or all of the thinking in the lesson.
	+ *The teacher did not impart her own ideas about the text on students or position herself as the “holder of knowledge.” Instead, in her framing, she positioned herself as a question asker, and students as the holders of knowledge.*
* Students used academic vocabulary to engage in the dialogue.
	+ *Students used language stems (“I agree/disagree with \_\_\_”) to begin having collaborative discussions about the text.*
 |
| EVIDENCE OF **Areas for Growth** | * Students could have engaged in a more collaborative dialogue with one another.
	+ *The conversation focused on a back-and-forth between the teacher and the students. There was an opportunity to build more of a collaborative dialogue and ownership of the conversation for students.­­*
* The teacher could have asked questions that pushed the class to engage in deeper thinking and craft a more cohesive, synthesized claim in response to the focus question.
 |
| Number line to show scoringPRACTICE | I-A-3**7/87/8**Content Fellow Consensus Score**High Expectations** |
| EVIDENCE OF **Strength** | * The teacher clearly states her expectations of students and her own role in the discussion (“the five guidelines”).
* The students generally met the stated expectations throughout the discussion.
* The teacher consistently asks tailored questions to help students elaborate or clarify their response to the focus question.
* The students consistently refer back to the text to find evidence to support their answers.
 |
| EVIDENCE OF **Areas for Growth** | * The teacher did not always provide adequate wait time and accountability for some students
	+ *For example, the teacher asked one student clarifying questions about their responses, but then moved to a different student to answer those questions.*
* The teacher did not always provide opportunities for all students to share their thinking.
	+ *Students who were not raising their hand did not participate and share their ideas. A stop-and-jot or turn-and-talk structure may have supported them.*
* The teacher could have asked clearer questions at times that supported students to have a deep understanding of the purpose of the task.
	+ *“In one example, a student was initially asked what lesson Mrs. Jones was trying to teach, the student stated, "to teach him not to steal." Then the teacher asked, "What makes you think Roger learned that lesson?" The student cites p. 13 as evidence. Then the teacher asked the student, "What does this make you think?" "This makes me think he learned the lesson." She asks, "What lesson?" and the student seemed confused because he had already stated the lesson he thought Roger learned.”*
 |
| Calibrating on Perceptions of Content |  |
| CONTENT | ELA.RL.4.03**Describe in depth a character, setting, or event in a story or drama, drawing on specific details in the text (e.g., a character’s thoughts, words, or actions).** | Number line to show scoringAt Grade LevelContent Fellow Consensus Score |
| EVIDENCE OF **Strength** | * The teacher pushed students to defend their answers with text evidence.
	+ *“The teacher asked every student to qualify their assertions that the main character "learned his lesson" or "felt guilty" by finding evidence in the text.”*
* Students centered their discussion on the character’s thoughts and actions.
	+ *Students generally described the event of Roger snatching Mrs. Jones’s purse. They also generally described Mrs. Jones’s response to that action by quoting her.*
 |
| EVIDENCE OF **Areas for Growth** | * The teacher could have pushed students’ thinking above grade level by asking about the deeper motives for characters’ actions. For example, why did Mrs. Jones want to teach Roger a lesson in the first place?
 |

|  |
| --- |
| Calibrating on High-Quality Feedback |
| **Questions**FOR THE EDUCATOR | * “Are there strategies and routines you feel that could help all students be prepared to feel comfortable articulating their thinking, such as stop and jot?”
* “Wondering if it would be more beneficial for the students to challenge each others’ responses, rather than direct questions asked by the teacher. How are you preparing for equitable participation among the students to respond?”
 |
| RECOMMENDED**Next Steps** | * “This lesson allows for in depth analysis of character's motivations and actions. This would be an opportunity to connect this lesson to real-world situations and interrogate why or how some of the same dilemmas appear in our society.”
* “As you continue to engage students in these shared inquiry discussions, use the five guidelines as a check for yourself and your students. Almost like a self-assessment. Think about each of the guidelines and ask yourself, how are we doing here?”
* “Next steps, perhaps students can be asked to play a role that the teacher did, asking for more, asking for clarity. So that the lesson becomes a whole class dialogue where students play a bigger role in questioning and asking for clarity.”
 |

|  |
| --- |
| ELAGrade 6 | Fishbowl Egyptian Artifacts – Task 1 |



This video depicts a well-structured fishbowl discussion, in which sixth grade students synthesize their learning from past lessons to craft an argument answering the question, “Who owns the Egyptian artifacts?” This lesson is an opportunity to discuss ways to support students’ skill in interrogating texts’ biases and understanding the sociopolitical context of a real-world issue.

|  |
| --- |
| Calibrating on Perceptions of Practice |
| Number line to show scoringPRACTICE | I-A-1**Subject Matter Knowledge**Content Fellow Consensus Score |
| EVIDENCE OF **Strength** | * The teacher provides a grade-level, open-ended discussion question.

**4*** The teacher provides a range of texts with various perspectives for students to use as evidence.
* The teacher provided a scaffolding question to support students to use evidence from the text to support their thinking.
	+ *“The teacher jumped in and tried to reframe the discussion by asking students to cite the evidence and celebrated those who did so.”*
* Students have an academic conversation with one another, elevating student voice.
* Students use precise academic vocabulary to discuss the content.
 |
| EVIDENCE OF **Areas for Growth** | * The teacher missed several opportunities to interrogate the sources’ perspectives and biases or to build students’ socio-political awareness about the content.
	+ *“The claims [students] are making are grounded in some problematic discussions of ownership and white savior mentality. Some students are heard saying that the English and French are the ones who "figured out" the Rosetta Stone and that the Egyptians would never have figured it out and it would still be "sitting there" without the discovery of the English and French.”*
	+ *“I am concerned that the teacher did not encourage students to examine and discuss common examples and occurrences of stereotypes and biases (ex. student, @9.26 they would know what the hieroglyphics meant if the English and French didn't discover it, it still could have been a rock. student @ 9.44, I agree with her, with Abby and Grace, because if it wasn't for the French and British, the Egyptians even though it is a part of their culture they would not know what it would mean, they would just have it sitting there not knowing what it meant.”*
* The students seem to have a surface-level discussion, struggling to synthesize evidence to come to a complex or rich argument about the content.
	+ *“Students quickly went in circles using the same two opposing claims and pieces of evidence from the article and video…it was not clear whether all students understood the critical points of the side they were defending and were unable to provide thorough reasoning to support their claim and responses.”*
 |
| Number line to show scoringPRACTICE | I-A-3Content Fellow Consensus Score**Well-Structured Units and Lessons** |
| EVIDENCE OF **Strength** | * The teacher provides strong intentional scaffolds and supports to help students access the content.

**6*** + *“The teacher scaffolds the lesson with strategies for note taking like Cornell notes, fish-bowl discussion rules and stems, annotation sheets, and accountable talk stems.”*
	+ *“The lesson allowed for differentiation by having students "partnered" where they can observe strong discussion strategies and take time to process and answer through ‘fish food’.”*
* The teacher implemented a lesson in which students worked gradually towards grade-level learning and language objectives.
	+ *“The review of resources and prior tasks students have engaged with in preparation for the discussion provides ample evidence that not only is this particular lesson well-structured but that it is the culmination of thoughtfully structured curriculum over multiple days.”*
 |
| EVIDENCE OF **Areas for Growth** | * A debate may not have been the most appropriate structure for the content, which was otherwise rich in opportunities to build students’ sociopolitical awareness.
	+ *“The teacher and majority of students in the class appear to be white and the discussion is centered on the plundering of resources and cultural artifacts from Africa by white Europeans. This fact was not made evident in student responses, which, in some ways, undermines the validity of any other argument. While the ethical problems of colonialism seem to be implied in the resources and discussion topic, I think this lesson would be more powerful if both the teacher and students were able to make those points explicitly.”*
	+ *“There might be opportunity to approach this topic in a more interesting way. For example, ‘There are European museums who refuse to give back stolen artifacts. Let’s analyze their arguments that defend their actions.’”*
* The teacher could have increased student engagement by limiting teacher talk in the beginning of the lesson and adding in additional checks for understanding.
	+ *“The teacher spent a long time framing the learning for the day and missed opportunities to check for students' understanding, she could have asked them to demonstrate their content knowledge and understanding of the process.”*
 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Calibrating on Perceptions of Content |  |
| CONTENT | ELA.SL.6.1.c**Pose and respond to specific questions with elaboration and detail by making comments that contribute to the topic, text, or issue under discussion.** | Number line to show scoringBelow Grade LevelContent Fellow Consensus Score |
| EVIDENCE OF **Strength** | * Students respond to the lesson’s open-ended questions with on-topic content.
* Students engage in discussion without much teacher prompting.
 |
| EVIDENCE OF **Areas for Growth** | * Students struggle to use sophisticated or nuanced arguments.
* Students struggle to respond to and elaborate on each other’s comments.
	+ “*Students struggle to elaborate and ask each other questions and invite each other to participate.”*
	+ *“Student arguments are frequently "I agree because [cites evidence]” without much rationale or elaboration.”*
 |

|  |
| --- |
| Calibrating on High-Quality Feedback |
| **Questions**FOR THE EDUCATOR | * “What might the ramifications be in a predominantly white classroom to repeatedly hear, "The Egyptians wouldn't have figured out the stone if the English and French hadn't discovered it?" What message is that sending to students about who has knowledge and power?”
* “Is there an opportunity to push the discussion deeper by framing the discussion question more explicitly as a question of ethics?”
 |
| RECOMMENDED**Next Steps** | * “Review of the sources that were used for this activity. Consider how to interrogate Eurocentric source materials with students.”
* “[You] should start to use questioning as a way to push students' thinking and prompt them to make connections between what they have previously learned and what they have to do in the new task. [You] can ask questions such as "what about this...relates to that?" or "Student A shared this... who else has a similar example?" This will ensure that all students have opportunities to build on each other's ideas since the beginning of the lesson while also demonstrating their conceptual understanding.”
 |

|  |
| --- |
| ELAGrade 7-8 | Socratic Discussion – Eugenics – Task 2 |



*“In this video, students discuss the history of eugenics and modern genetic testing. The topic is one that is ripe for analysis at this grade level. However, there are missed opportunities to contextualize this topic as it relates particularly to communities of color and other marginalized groups. Many of the students seem prepared and engaged in the discussion, but this teacher might have gone further with the materials she provided to help them have a more nuanced and sophisticated understanding of the cultural and ethical implications of eugenics and genetic science.”*

* *Trevor Munhall, OPTIC Content Fellow*

|  |
| --- |
| Calibrating on Perceptions of Practice |
| Number line to show scoringPRACTICE | I-A-3**Well-Structured Units and Lessons**Content Fellow Consensus Score |
| EVIDENCE OF **Strength** | * The teacher provides a higher-order thinking question to support students to reach a grade-level learning target.

**4/5*** + *“The task of discussing eugenics and prenatal testing seemed to be a challenging one.”*
* The teacher implemented a lesson in which students worked gradually towards grade-level learning and language objectives.
	+ *“There was evidence that students first read informational texts about the topic, annotated that text and found evidence to support their thinking (reading was highlighted, students were referring specifically to pages, paragraphs and sentences). Students then used that evidence to support their thinking, so evidence of a sequence of lessons and development of knowledge and thinking are present.”*
* Some students were engaged and had opportunities to contribute their own knowledge.
	+ *“Within the 10 minute video, 7 student voices were heard, which speaks to appropriate student engagement strategies.”*
 |
| EVIDENCE OF **Areas for Growth** | * Teacher scaffolds do not support students to build a deeper understanding of the content.
	+ *There are moments where students raise points that are unclear or should be unpacked that aren't. One student says the "deeper we get into science, the more confusion it causes." This statement is unclear and the teacher should insert herself in this moment to unpack.*
	+ *The teacher's question partway through the video [“where is the line?”] actually seems to derail the focus of the discussion instead of providing more focus to it.*
* There may have been additional opportunities to support all students to contribute their thinking. Some students took up a great deal of air time, and not all voices were heard.
 |
| Number line to show scoringPRACTICE | II-B-1Content Fellow Consensus Score**Safe Learning Environment** |
| EVIDENCE OF **Strength** | * The teacher appears to use consistent, predictable routines to support a Socratic discussion.

**3/4*** At times, students take academic risks and support each other’s learning without teacher prompting.
	+ *“Students felt comfortable correcting each other and being corrected (example: first student to speak used the wrong name initially but was corrected by a classmate) and students felt free to give and take suggestions (at the end when a student suggested the word "idiotic" to his classmate and his classmate used it).”*
 |
| EVIDENCE OF **Areas for Growth** | * The teacher did not always implement routines that supported students to take academic risks and focus on their learning.
	+ *“The first student who speaks is interrupted by what sounds like multiple students who are attempting to challenge or clarify his point, but he becomes confused and/or defensive about this interruption.”*
	+ *“There was a significant amount of noise and the teacher did not stop behaviors that could interfere with student learning. For instance, @ 6:34, one student was talking to another while another was attempting to answer the teacher’s guiding question.”*
	+ *“It's difficult to say for certain how comfortable all students feel engaging…most students either sit listening passively or even have their heads down.”*
* There was no evidence that the teacher created space to acknowledge the relationship that her students’ communities may have with the topic of eugenics, or to build their sociopolitical awareness about the topic.
	+ *“The topic of eugenics alone was given to students of color to debate and I did not hear anywhere in student responses the history of eugenics with communities of color.”*
	+ *There did not seem to be a discussion of the moral context of the topic of eugenics. This “neutrality” or focus on an “intellectually detached” conversation can be harmful.*
 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Calibrating on Perceptions of Content |  |
| CONTENT | ELA.SL.7-8.4.1**Present claims and findings, emphasizing salient points in a focused, coherent manner with relevant evidence, sound valid reasoning, and well-chosen details; use appropriate vocabulary, eye contact, volume, and pronunciation.** | Number line to show scoringBelow/At Grade LevelContent Fellow Consensus Score |
| EVIDENCE OF **Strength** | * Students independently provided evidence and rationale to make a claim, citing their sources.
	+ *“Students who were speaking started with a claim and then supported that claim with relevant evidence. We were able to hear every student speaking. They were talking to each other. They seemed to be looking at each other when talking.”*
 |
| EVIDENCE OF **Areas for Growth** | * Not all students are provided with opportunities to demonstrate skills related to this standard.
	+ *“Most of the students who speak do demonstrate proficiency at this standard, but it's unclear if everyone is held accountable for this in the same way. Since the discussion ends with the teacher calling on a student by saying, "I haven't heard from you yet," we are led to assume that multiple students have not had the opportunity to demonstrate their proficiency.”*
* The teacher does not provide scaffolds to support students to meet this standard.
	+ *“Limited support/guidance from the teacher to help them achieve the goals in this area.”*
	+ *“I saw evidence of all these things [in the standard] for the students who spoke, but I don’t think the teacher had anything to do with it.”*
 |

|  |
| --- |
| Calibrating on High-Quality Feedback |
| **Questions**FOR THE EDUCATOR | * “How could you have held all students accountable for their learning during this discussion?”
* “I am wondering what discussions could be had with a classroom of what seemed like mostly non-white students around the history of eugenics and race/ethnicity. There were not any comments connecting eugenics with race and I wonder what students have learned about it or what they would think about that socio-cultural/historical context.”
 |
| RECOMMENDED**Next Steps** | * “I recommend that you come prepared with a series of follow-up questions that help students focus their ideas on the main question. This will allow you to better facilitate and steer the discussion toward a deeper understanding of the topic and will allow you to bring quieter voices into the conversation in a productive way.”
* “Students seem ready to take on more of a facilitation role. In future Socratic seminars, could a student or group of students take on the role of facilitator? The next challenge for students would be able to listen to the discussion, synthesize the contents of the discussion, and ask probing questions based on the topic/text to move the discussion forward. I wonder what kinds of discussion questions students could create if asked to rise to the challenge.”
 |

|  |
| --- |
| ELAGrade 12 | Collaboration Annotation – Hamlet – Task 1 |



*“In this video, the teacher has students working in small groups to create a poster that reflects their observations about a passage from* Hamlet*. Something to ask as you watch this class is, ‘How much of the thinking is being done by students?’ This teacher is clearly knowledgeable and passionate about the content, but it is not always clear how well that is transferred to his students. If we assume that rigorous academic expectations for all students is an important part of equity work, this video raises questions about how teachers can effectively shift critical thinking to their students.”*

* *Trevor Munhall, OPTIC Content Fellow*

|  |
| --- |
| Calibrating on Perceptions of Practice |
| Number line to show scoringPRACTICE | I-A-1**Subject Matter Knowledge**Content Fellow Consensus Score |
| EVIDENCE OF **Strength** | * The teacher used questioning to push student thinking toward learning goals.

**5/6*** Students used precise, academic vocabulary and evidence from the text to support their thinking.
* The teacher provided some scaffolds to support academic skill development.
	+ *“The teacher consistently supported students in their literary analysis of the texts by providing clarity about vocabulary and targeted questioning.”*
* The teacher connected the content to students’ lives and experiences.
 |
| EVIDENCE OF **Areas for Growth** | * Students did not always do most of the thinking in the lesson.
	+ *“While the students were engaged directly with quotes from the text (Hamlet), it seemed as though the students that the teacher was working with were not doing the bulk of the analysis of the quotations from the play. For example, when the students were asked to analyze the quote about how "conscience does make cowards of us all," the teacher kept asking questions to try to press the students for what "conscience" meant in this context (referring them to the footnote), but the actual analysis of this quote was done by the teacher. [Students] give him 1-3 word responses to his questions (Like "what does it mean to be smart?"), but the analysis and arguments are made by the teacher.”*
* It was not clear that students could demonstrate deep comprehension of the content.
	+ *“It's unclear in the rest of the video that students are engaged in purposeful or grade-level meaning-making of the text. Judging from student body language, engagement seems moderate to low and it's difficult to say whether this is a result of a task that is too simple in design or a larger issue of expectations and classroom climate.”*
 |
| Number line to show scoringPRACTICE | II-A-3Content Fellow Consensus Score**Meeting Diverse Needs** |
| EVIDENCE OF **Strength** | * The teacher helped students make connections between their learning and their individual backgrounds and contexts.

**4/5*** The teacher provides scaffolds and supports, although it is not clear from the video how the teacher uses student data to inform those supports.
	+ *“The teacher did a decent job to attend to the needs of some of his students via frequent one-to-one check-ins and providing students with an opportunity to discuss the texts and work collaboratively on sharing the elements of their analysis on a large poster paper…”*
	+ *“Teacher had strong routines that facilitated his ability to check in with each group and support learning.”*
* Students appear engaged in the task.
* Students can access peer support when they are stuck.
 |
| EVIDENCE OF **Areas for Growth** | * The scaffolds that the teacher provides do not always seem to support student learning.
	+ *“When students were having difficulty analyzing the quotes from the text, the teacher's questions and scaffolds did not seem to meet their intended purpose of scaffolding, probing, and supporting students to come to the analysis themselves. There was a point where one student said, "I don't know where you're going with this" showing that the teacher’s prompts and scaffolds were not supportive for her. In another instance, the teacher asked a student what it meant to "bear a burden," the student shrugged and then the teacher told her the answer "the weight you have to carry" rather than supporting the student to discover the answer on her own.”*
	+ *“The teacher ends up telling the students often what to think. He asks them questions and then ends up walking around from group to group and writing on their collaborative easel paper. He gives up even asking them some questions. He doesn't engage the group as a whole, but specific members of the group.”*
* It is not clear that students can demonstrate that they have met the learning target.
 |
| Calibrating on Perceptions of Content |  |
| CONTENT | ELA.SL.11-12.1**Come to discussions prepared, having read and researched material under study;** **explicitly draw on that preparation by referring to evidence from texts and other research on the topic or issue to stimulate a thoughtful, well-reasoned exchange of ideas.** | Number line to show scoringBelow Grade LevelContent Fellow Consensus Score |
| EVIDENCE OF **Strength** | * The teacher had grade-level expectations for the level of literary analysis students should demonstrate.
	+ *Based on exchanges between the teacher and students, “he has these high hopes for the brilliant analysis that kids are going to do, almost above grade level.”*
* It was clear that students have prepared and are familiar with the material under study and could use evidence from the text.
	+ *“While this activity was not meant for students to fully demonstrate their comprehension in a whole-class discussion, it was clear that they have read the text before and have prepared to be able to analyze the specific parts of the story.”*
 |
| EVIDENCE OF **Areas for Growth** | * Students did not seem to discuss the content.
	+ *“While students appear to be writing their ideas on the poster in front of them, actual conversation is mostly limited to social talk and off-task behavior. If there is a purpose or goal or expectations for what discussions should look and sound like, there is no evidence of any of these things and none of the student groups seems to be communicating effectively about the task.”*
* It was not clear that students could independently exchange ideas in a thoughtful, well-reasoned manner.
 |

|  |
| --- |
| Calibrating on High-Quality Feedback |
| **Questions**FOR THE EDUCATOR | * “Can you think of other ways to connect the text to your student's lives in other ways? Have you consider exploring race and gender through the text?”
* “For these collaborative groupings, are students tasked with individual roles? Are these homogeneous or heterogeneous groups?”
 |
| RECOMMENDED**Next Steps** | * “When a student needs scaffolding and support to understand a piece of text, think about where their understanding is breaking down. Is it at the word level? Is at the larger meaning level? Ask yourself what does this learner need to go up one level of understanding; then what does she need to get to the next step? And how can I help her come to that understanding on her own? For example, when the one student was struggling with the "conscience does make cowards" quote, she was helped to build some understanding at the word level, but then was not given the opportunity to come to a larger, broader understanding on her own.”
* “Although there was thorough teacher to student attention given during this lesson, it would challenge student groups to think more critically if those clarifying questions were posed to members of their group. This would push students to challenge each other's understanding of the texts and would also [allow you to conduct] formative assessments based on student responses to each other.”
 |

|  |
| --- |
| MATHGrade 2 | Number Talk - Task 2 |



This task depicted a number talk focused on solving a word problem, including whole group and small group discussions. The educator facilitated a number of positive routines that showed academic risk-taking and skill-building, but missed opportunities to more holistically support students who were less engaged in the lesson.

|  |
| --- |
| Calibrating on Perceptions of Practice |
| Number line to show scoringPRACTICE | II-B-1**Safe Learning Environment**Content Fellow Consensus Score |
| EVIDENCE OF **Strength** | * The teacher provided scaffolds and checks for understanding.

**6*** + *The teacher supported students to understand the problem by patiently answering a confused students’ question at the start of the video.*
* Students collaborated with one another and supported one another’s learning.
	+ *“Students knew how to ask questions of their peers after. Did anyone get something else? Does anyone disagree? Does anyone have a different strategy?”*
	+ *“The class clapping for students who shared their thinking with the whole group is evidence of a safe learning environment.”*
* Students appeared engaged with the problem.
	+ *“Sharing a real-life example and asking non-math entry questions. The impact on students was engagement-students looking forward, all hands raised.”*
* Students appeared to be comfortable taking academic risks.
	+ *“Students are seen taking academic risks at 5:10 and 6:16 when two different students go up to the board to perform a think aloud about how they solved the problem.”*
* The teacher facilitated predictable routines that supported student learning.
	+ *“There were clear routines established within the classroom that students were used to: "eyes on me, 1-2-3" for attention; turn and talk with a partner; the first student at the board asked if anyone agreed/disagreed or had another strategy.”*
 |
| EVIDENCE OF **Areas for Growth** | * The teacher did not recognize that the learning materials (the context of the problem) may not represent students’ experiences.
	+ *The teacher did not seem to realize that some students may not understand the context of the problem: specifically, that you can buy sweatshirts or food at a sports game*.
* The teacher could have provided additional scaffolds.
	+ *The teacher did not provide many visuals to support students with the problem.*
	+ *“When one student answers a question incorrectly, the educator’s response is No, No. She re-explains the task but does not ask the student questions to unpack her thinking.”*
* The teacher interacted with one student in a way that prioritized compliance over academic growth (“make sure you are sitting in your seat”).
 |
| Number line to show scoringPRACTICE | II-E-1Content Fellow Consensus Score**High Expectations** |
| EVIDENCE OF **Strength** | * The teacher shared expectations for student roles in the activity (*accountable talk*).

**5/6*** The teacher provided opportunities for students to demonstrate their conceptual understanding.
	+ *“She does not interrupt their thinking but rather asked questions after they are finished…All students arrived at 90 before she released them but she was more invested in the how.”*
* The teacher praised students’ academic risk-taking and effort.
* Students engaged in productive struggle with support from the teacher.
	+ *“When one student runs into a brief challenge at the board, the teacher does not immediately step in, but rather provides the student with time to figure out the correct approach.”*
* Students use precise, mathematical vocabulary to explain their thinking.
 |
| EVIDENCE OF **Areas for Growth** | * The teacher could have provided additional checks for understanding.
	+ *The teacher did not gauge whole group understanding, beyond those who participated and shared whole-group.*
* The teacher did not ensure that all students were engaged in the material, raising some concerns around racial equity in the classroom.
	+ *“Three students appeared disengaged during Think Time. The educator ignored and did not redirect the one student who walked around during the Number Talk lesson. The educator did not address the student or show any sign that she had expectations for him to participate in the learning activity.”*
	+ *“Two students in the front left were not fully engaged, one leaning with head in hand; the other looking around, neither appeared to follow the Think Time protocol. The educator made a sign for the student (a Black girl) to sit properly, the student complied.* *Also, during the Turn & Talk time, [the same girl] did not appear to be involved in the discussion or sharing a strategy. She turned and looked at the board several times when talking to group members (not heard), but through body language (head on desks, head in hands, back was turned to the board when the other students share on the board, it did not appear she was understanding or engaged). It appeared that the educator did not hold high expectations for this student.”*
 |
| Calibrating on Perceptions of Content |  |
| Number line to show scoringCONTENT | 2.NBT.5**Fluently add and subtract within 100 using strategies based on place value,****properties of operations, and/or the relationship between addition and subtraction** | Content Fellow Consensus ScoreAt Grade Level |
| EVIDENCE OF **Strength** | * Students used multiple strategies to solve the problem.
	+ *The teacher used notation of splitting the numbers, which was replicated by many students.*
	+ *The teacher and students used number lines as a strategy, which showed students had the ability to chunk numbers.*
* Students were expected to explain why their addition and subtraction strategies worked.
	+ *“The teacher focused more on the strategies students used to arrive at their solution which exemplifies the conceptual understanding behind the standard.”*
 |
| EVIDENCE OF **Areas for Growth** | * The teacher did not place emphasis on place value knowledge.
* The students did not necessarily demonstrate *fluency* with using multiple strategies to add and subtract within 100.
* The teacher told students what operation to use, instead of letting students figure out what operation is best for solving the problem.
 |

|  |
| --- |
| Calibrating on High-Quality Feedback |
| **Questions**FOR THE EDUCATOR | * “What effect did the scenario of the game have on the students’ interaction with this number talk?”
* “How are you ensuring that you are assessing EACH student's understanding during the learning activity and supporting those students who have misconceptions?”
* “I am wondering how students who are having more difficulty are supported in the classroom. I noticed some students using whiteboards - do all students have whiteboards available to them as a resource? There was a group of students who didn't seem to be discussing during their partner talk time, is there a way to check their understanding?”
 |
| RECOMMENDED**Next Steps** | * “During this lesson, when one student shared an answer, your response was No, No, and you repeated the instructions. In future lessons, be sure to acknowledge each student's contribution and efforts. Take time to unpack student's thinking either with the whole group or individually to encourage a safe learning environment. Dismissing a student may result in students refraining from taking academic risks.”
* “I am wondering how students who are having more difficulty are supported in the classroom. I noticed some students using whiteboards - do all students have whiteboards available to them as a resource? There was a group of students who didn't seem to be discussing during their partner talk time, is there a way to check their understanding?”
 |

|  |
| --- |
| MATHGrade 5 | Graph and Analyze Relationships – Task 1 |



This video depicts a 5th grade math lesson on analyzing relationships using coordinate planes. While the teacher provided supports for students to do grade-level work, she also did not demonstrate mutual respect or high expectations towards all students, including for students of color.

|  |
| --- |
| Calibrating on Perceptions of Practice |
| Number line to show scoringPRACTICE | II-A-2**Student Engagement**Content Fellow Consensus Score |
| EVIDENCE OF **Strength** | * The teacher situated the mathematical concepts and processes in a realistic context to help students connect the learning to their lives.

**3*** + *“The teacher provided the students with a word problem that focuses on amounts of water and coco mix powder needed to make hot chocolate. The teacher asks how many students are familiar with making hot chocolate to which the entire class raises their hand. The relevancy of the word problem helps engage students and tap into their prior knowledge to make sense of the problem.”*
	+ *“Students were asked for another word for hot cocoa (hot chocolate) to ensure most students were familiar with the context of the problem.”*
* The teacher provided multiple supports to help students access the content.
	+ *“The teacher has a visual on the board for students to follow along with. The teacher uses the visual to perform brief think aloud to provide students with access points for their work along with modeling.”*
* The students collaborate with one another.
 |
| EVIDENCE OF **Areas for Growth** | * The teacher did not demonstrate mutual respect for her students and their learning processes.
	+ *“Around one minute into the observation the teacher was checking in at a table and spoke to two male students who appeared to be African American and said " What are you working on? That doesn't make sense. It is fine for now, it just doesn't make sense." Around 4 minutes into the observation the teacher again had a negative tone when interacting with a male student and around 5 minutes in, the teacher responded to a group saying "it’s the 6? No." and then walked away from the group…the teacher’s responses to some students, most of whom were male and/or African American, left some students uninvolved and passive participants.”*
	+ *“The educator does not acknowledge or reward the students for effort, but often says, “That doesn’t make sense.”(4:55) Damaging to mathematical identities.”*
* The teacher did not create opportunities for students to lead their own learning process.
	+ *“She went to one student in the front and said, "I want to hear your voice." Before he was able to say much of anything, she immediately asked him to look at what she had shown them before. It was like she wanted him to follow a pattern and answer based on problems they solved as a class rather than ask him questions to guide him so she can hear his thinking.”*
* Students did not do most or all of the thinking in the lesson.
	+ *“The educator was doing the heavy lifting in effort to reach the student understandings. When the educator circulated and addressed a group of students, she asked questions to get them to her way of thinking, but did not take time to focus on what they knew and understood to build to the objective.”*
 |
| Number line to show scoringPRACTICE | II-E-1Content Fellow Consensus Score**High Expectations** |
| EVIDENCE OF **Strength** | * The teacher shared the grade-level learning target with students.

**4*** The teacher pushes students to use precise, academic vocabulary.
	+ *“At 7:48 when a student is giving their response, the teacher pushes for the student to state "12 fluid ounces of water" rather than saying "12 water".*
 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| EVIDENCE OF **Areas for Growth** | * The teacher did not provide appropriate scaffolds to help students use precise, academic vocabulary.
	+ *“When a student gave an answer the teacher said "...not very good, we need to use proper mathematical language" but she didn't restate the student's idea with mathematical language to demonstrate what she was looking for.”*
	+ *“The educator communicates certain expectations, but the manner of communication is punitive and threatening.”*
* The teacher did not provide opportunities for all students to share their thinking, instead communicating that she had different expectations for different students.
	+ *“(1:04) E – ‘Who are you working with? (boy points to the other student and their two books) That doesn’t make much sense. I guess Andy’s gone.’ This communicates to the students that there were a different set of performance expectations oi individual students.”*
	+ *“I saw her check in with students that were on the right side of the classroom and shook her head in disapproval and annoyance when a student didn't answer how she wanted. Rather than ask guiding questions to support student thinking, she put a worksheet in front of a student to reference, which is showing she wanted him to follow a pattern and her thought process in order to answer the question.”*
* The teacher did not provide positive feedback to encourage student effort.
	+ *“(5:00), she asked the class what mistake a student who had just volunteered although she started positively: E- I think you’re on the right track. (to class) Is the cocoa mix two times the water? (choral No) E – What mistake did Arlette make?" The educator says No at least four times in response to student answers. The emphasis was placed on correct responses, not on effort. Only once did the educator acknowledge thinking by saying, I think you were on the right track, but most times she did not celebrate effort”*
 |
| Calibrating on Perceptions of Content |  |
| CONTENT | Math.5.OA.B.3**Generate two numerical patterns using two given rules. Identify apparent relationships between corresponding terms. Form ordered pairs consisting of corresponding terms from the two patterns, and graph the ordered pairs on a coordinate plane. For example, given the rule "Add 3" and the starting number 0, and given the rule "Add 6" and the starting number 0, generate terms in the resulting sequences, and observe that the terms in one sequence are twice the corresponding terms in the other sequence. Explain informally why this is so.** | Number line to show scoringAt Grade LevelContent Fellow Consensus Score |
| EVIDENCE OF **Strength** | * Students generated numerical patterns.
	+ *“During the class students were observed to be generating numerical patterns with a rule describing the relationship between the amount of hot cocoa and amount of hot water to make hot cocoa.”*
* The task also prepared students to focus on ratios and proportional relationships, which is a 6th grade standard.
	+ *“The 6RP1 and 6RP3 standards were somewhat addressed as the math task focused on understanding the concept of a ratio including the distinctions between part:part and part:whole and the value of a ratio; part/part and part/whole in the context of cocoa mix and water. Although the terms ratio and proportion were not used, the activity included completing tables of equivalent ratios relating quantities with whole-number measurements.”*
 |
| EVIDENCE OF **Areas for Growth** | * The teacher did not always use precise academic vocabulary (*“line graph” instead of “coordinate plane”*).
* The video did not show students using a coordinate plane to make sense of the numerical patterns.
	+ *“Where I did not see the rigor of the standard come through is that during the snapshot of the lesson I didn't not see how she connected the variables as ordered pairs on a coordinate grid. Students were asked to complete a table but did they see them as ordered pairs and how that would impact the graph? This very well could have happened later in the lesson.”*
 |

|  |
| --- |
| Calibrating on High-Quality Feedback |
| **Questions**FOR THE EDUCATOR | * “Speaking on ratios and relationships, I wonder about the frequency and valence (positive/negative) you provide feedback to students in small groups? I have this question based on observations that many of the more negative comments you made were to male and/or students from traditionally marginalized groups.”
* “At about 3:55 you addressed a group of three students who could not seem to grasp the concept in spite of your examples and questions. You walked away from the group with all 3 students still confused. How might you have supported these 3 students instead of leaving them confused? What strategies or scaffolds might you have provided to advance their conceptual understanding? How might use data and purposeful grouping to support students?”
 |
| RECOMMENDED**Next Steps** | * “In the future, use questions and strategies that unpack what students do know and gives all students an entry into problems. For example, use white boards to collect all student thinking; use Notice and Wonder as both and engagement and assessment strategy.”
* “Pre-plan questions to ask students based around preconceived misconceptions. This will push students to do the heavy lifting and not follow a pattern based on the examples you had given prior.”
 |

|  |
| --- |
| MATHGrade 6 | Equivalent Expressions – Task 1 |



*“This video shows a 6th grade class determining if a number of different expressions are equivalent to a target expression. It is particularly valuable to observe examples of providing students with equitable opportunities for engagement. While there were multiple entry points and rich student collaboration in class, providing more constructive feedback to students is a next step for growth.”*

* *Jason Colombino*

|  |
| --- |
| Calibrating on Perceptions of Practice |
| Number line to show scoringPRACTICE | I-B-2**Adjustments to Practice**Content Fellow Consensus Score |
| EVIDENCE OF **Strength** | * The teacher asked responsive questions.

**6*** + *“The educator asked meaningful questions and used prompts that increases student thinking and yes/no questions were followed by “why” prompting students to defend and justify their answers. Examples: You say yes I wonder why. You say yes, you say no. I don’t know, figure it out. Can you explain it back to me. So which strategy are you guys using?”*
* The teacher collected data throughout the lesson on student understanding
	+ *“The teacher's primary method for collecting data while the students are determining which expressions are equivalent to the expression written on the board is circulating around the room while check-in with individual students or whole groups.”*
* Students had opportunities to self-assess their learning and progress.
	+ *“Students conducted self-assessments. After the group work, the teacher put the answers on the board and gave the directive "let's do some checking" where students corrected their work and then asked questions to the class about specific questions they had.”*
* The teacher provided in-the-moment feedback to students.
	+ *“The teacher deliberately summarized conversations with individual and small groups of students as a form of feedback. For example, around 8 minutes into the observation the teacher said that a student's strategy worked your (other student) strategy worked around collecting like terms.”*
 |
| EVIDENCE OF **Areas for Growth** | * In some cases, the teacher did not always seem to provide the most effective feedback to support student learning.
	+ *“Although she did a lot of questions to move students along, but not sure she was getting the right temperature check at each table. One table students were split, she walked away quickly instead of following through to make sure the conversation moved to completion.”*
 |
| Number line to show scoringPRACTICE | II-A-3Content Fellow Consensus Score**Meeting Diverse Needs** |
| EVIDENCE OF **Strength** | * The teacher provided multiple options for students to engage in learning.

**6*** + *“The class assignment had multiple entry points and had yes or no answers which provided students with a variety of learning profiles the ability to answer each question and access the assignment. However, the expectations were high because the teacher expected students to explain their thinking, and use tier 3 academic vocabulary terms (associative property, for example) throughout the lesson.”*
* The teacher provided equitable opportunities for engagement.
	+ *“Students read the instructions aloud so they were "all on the same page" which provided additional processing time and attentional cues for students to understand and own the goals for the lesson.”*
* Students accessed multiple supports beyond the teacher when they were stuck (collaborative groups).
	+ *“The students worked in collaborative groups and on at least three occasions the educator told one student in the group to assist another, explain their view or figure it out.”*
	+ *“The educator provided a basket of tools at each table including an angry birds sheet to support with the properties.”*
 |
| EVIDENCE OF **Areas for Growth** | * Students were not consistently on task.
	+ *“At 1:09, when the teacher begins discussing the task, there are still side conversations going on and the teacher is not succinct with what she is explaining to the student. This issue with loud side conversations continues throughout the lesson at 8:40 and up until the teacher brings the class back to debrief.”*
* The teacher did not always identify opportunities for acceleration.
	+ *“It seemed like the student that understood it, had a significant amount of down time. What could she have put in place to accelerate these students and allow the others in the group to do the heavy lifting.”*
* There was not evidence that the teacher considered student interests and learning styles to plan tasks.
 |
| Calibrating on Perceptions of Content |  |
| CONTENT | Math.6.EE.A.4**Identify when two expressions are equivalent (i.e., when the two expressions name the same number regardless of which value is substituted into them). For example, the expressions y + y + y and 3y are equivalent because they name the same number regardless of which number y stands for.** | Number line to show scoringAt Grade LevelContent Fellow Consensus Score |
| EVIDENCE OF **Strength** | * The learning objective aligned to the standard (*“"By the end of the lesson, we will be able to identify and create equivalent expressions using number properties.”*)
* The task was aligned to the standard (“*Students had to identity whether or not nine other expressions were equivalent to 2n + 2 and also explain their thinking.”*)
* The teacher emphasized the use of properties.
	+ *“Although she was allowing for multiple strategies, when providing feedback to students, she was asking them to think about how they could use the properties instead. (distributive property, associative property, and combining like terms).”*
 |
| EVIDENCE OF **Areas for Growth** | * Students appeared to prefer the plug-in method to determine whether expressions were equivalent, which suggests a gap in conceptual understanding.
	+ *“I'm not convinced they understood that they would get the same solution when they substituted the same number in for n in the original expression (2n + 2) and the other given expressions. Also, not sure they understood the concept that when they then substituted, came to the same solution, that meant the expressions were equivalent.”*
 |

|  |
| --- |
| Calibrating on High-Quality Feedback |
| **Questions**FOR THE EDUCATOR | * “What data did you use or information about the students to place them in their groups? In other words, did you include IEP, ELL recommendations, or students' learning styles, interests while planning groups and tasks?”
* “You ran out of time for the exit ticket today, what do you normally do with that data? How will you check for students' understanding tomorrow?”
 |
| RECOMMENDED**Next Steps** | * “Prior to the lesson, map out how much time you want to spend on each part of your class and use a timer to support with pacing. Students could have had less time on the independent practice so that you could do a whole class debrief and still have time for an assessment to check for understanding.”
* “A number of students seemed to be struggling with using the properties instead of plugging in a number to the expression to check for equivalence. How are you going to continue to support the use of properties and variables?”
 |

|  |
| --- |
| MATHGrade 10-12 | Functions and Exponential Equations – Task 1 |



*“In this pre-calculus class, students focus on solving logarithmic functions. This video is especially helpful to see an example of a safe learning environment in action. While the teacher established an environment of students taking academic risks and supporting each other’s learning, there were missed opportunities to provide multiple ways so that all students could fully explain their thinking.”*

* *Jason Colombino*

|  |
| --- |
| Calibrating on Perceptions of Practice |
| Number line to show scoringPRACTICE | II-B-1**Safe Learning Environment**Content Fellow Consensus Score |
| EVIDENCE OF **Strength** | * The teacher provides positive feedback to students.

**7*** + *Throughout the lesson, after each correct response, the educator states “good job, very good, outstanding.” One example of the educator praising student efforts, (8:00) “Anybody use a calculator? (no hands raised) Impressive! So, you all did it graphically!” The impact of the educator's efforts was observed as each student who volunteered or was called upon participated willingly and displayed enthusiasm when explaining their answers.*
* Students showed joy and curiosity.
	+ *“Overall, I would say about 3/4th of the class appeared to enjoy the class through their open forum discussion and their laughter.”*
* Students took academic risks.
	+ *“I noticed 8 of about 22-24 students appeared feel safe taking academic risks. Most of these students appeared to be truly confident in their answer.”*
* The teacher facilitated predictable and purposeful classroom routines to support student learning.
	+ *“There was evidence of routines in place. Students all were attentive in the whole group discussion and each group was able to answer the questions posed by the teacher, indicating the small group work that happened before was productive.”*
	+ *“Hand-raising to share out appears to be a common practice as there were no moments of shouting out. Students feel comfortable volunteering to share their answers and being cold-called.”*
* Students supported one another’s learning.
	+ *The teacher and students demonstrated a common method to show praise with a slow hand clap.”*
 |
| EVIDENCE OF **Areas for Growth** | * The teacher did not always provide consistent feedback to all students.
	+ *“The educator’s contrasting reactions to the three students’ responses from 13:25 –16:00 is concerning. While she claims she was looking for different methods, she did not commend the first student for effort but expressed extreme praise to the other two students.”*
 |
| Number line to show scoringPRACTICE | II-E-1Content Fellow Consensus Score**High Expectations** |
| EVIDENCE OF **Strength** | * The lesson was designed to meet a grade-level learning target.

**6*** The teacher communicates clear expectations about student roles.
	+ *“She announced participation expectations: :08). “Somebody in each group should be able to answer a question.”*
	+ *“Students clearly understood what they were working on and what was expected of them in class.”*
* The teacher provided checks for understanding to ensure that all students were accessing the content.
	+ *“She also frequently circled back with students who initially had trouble understanding something to make sure they could explain their new learning and thinking to the rest of the class. This showed that she expected students to be learning from their mistakes and was also checking back in with them to make sure they understood.”*
	+ *“I counted 14 times in which the teacher checks for understanding by saying who gets it? Do you agree? Everything ok? Are we good? Make sense?”*
* Students engaged in collaborative dialogue and learning.
 |
| EVIDENCE OF **Areas for Growth** | * The students were not always doing most or all of the thinking.
	+ *“The type of questions asked of students during the discussion itself were not challenging, required one word or phrase response and mostly leading questions. For example, (@1:05) “Where is the asymptote and what kind is it?” (@3:30) “Did you notice that it starts where on the x axis? When she asks, Does that make sense?” she doesn’t wait for a response to this question, but immediately adds leading questions to get what she is looking for as a response: “What happens if you look at the table of values? Can we get negative values?” This diminishes the question and takes away the responsibility of the students to do the critical thinking.”*
* The teacher did not seem to provide opportunities for every student to share their thinking.
* The teacher did not always provide adequate wait time to support student learning.
	+ *“I also noticed that it was a completely open forum in which the teacher kept firing questions at a fast pace without appropriate wait time. Students raised their hands when they wanted to answer, but there was one moment when she cold called the girl in the pink in the back. I could instantly see her clamp up. Was this an appropriate move considering this wasn't the structure or routine happening before that moment. It seemed as though she needed to digest the question first but didn't have a whole lot of time.”*
 |
| Calibrating on Perceptions of Content |  |
| CONTENT | Math.F-BF.2.3**Identify the effect on the graph of replacing f(x) by f(x) + k, kf(x, f(kx), and f(x + k) for specific values of k (both positive and negative); find the value of k given the graphs.** | Number line to show scoringAt Grade LevelContent Fellow Consensus Score |
| EVIDENCE OF **Strength** | * Students demonstrated understanding of logarithmic and trigonometric functions.
	+ *“Students expand their understanding of functions to include logarithmic and trigonometric functions. They investigate and identify the characteristics of exponential and logarithmic functions in order to graph these functions and solve equations and practical problems. This includes the role of e, natural and common logarithms, laws of exponents and logarithms, and the solutions of logarithmic and exponential equations. The lesson was focused on this topic so it was within the realm of the standard and grade level.”*
 |
| EVIDENCE OF **Areas for Growth** | * The task could have been adjusted to focus more on the conceptual understandings behind the procedures.
	+ *“The task was very procedural and the questions didn't open students up to talking about how manipulating the above would have an effect on the graph. For instance, how does graph one relate to graph 2? Describe the difference between this graph and that graph given equations. How can you sketch the graph of the following? Should graphs been projected for reference?”*
 |

|  |
| --- |
| Calibrating on High-Quality Feedback |
| **Questions**FOR THE EDUCATOR | * “This class example leans heavily on auditory processing (listening). How could we support all learners by providing more visual supports?”
* “Do you feel like you were able to identify whether all students had mastered the skill? If so, what data from that segment supports that? If not, what could you have done to get a better sense of whether all students hit mastery?”
 |
| RECOMMENDED**Next Steps** | * “As a next step, I would think about ways to shift the heavy lifting from you to the students. Strategies like a gallery walk where students can analyze and comment on the work of their peers may be one way to include more students throughout the instructional time.”
* “It would be helpful to bring the graphing element into the models within the classroom (shared on the board). There are many times you instructed the students to look at a graph, but it would have been made even more powerful to look at it together. Additionally instead of so much oral response, backing up that oral response with written work (either ask a student to scribe or show their work on the projector, or write on the whiteboard.”
 |

# Appendix A: Focus Elements & OPTIC Content Fellows’ Culturally Responsive Look-Fors

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Focus Element & Proficient Descriptor from the Classroom Model Rubric | Teacher Look-Fors | Student Look-Fors |
| **I-A-1 Subject Matter Knowledge***Demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of the subject matter and the pedagogy it requires by consistently engaging students in learning experiences that enable them to acquire complex knowledge and subject-specific skills and vocabulary, such that they are able to make and assess evidence-based claims and arguments.* | * Implements questions, tasks, and activities that are aligned to grade-level standards
* Uses culturally responsive curricular materials and instructional supports that allow students to synthesize content and connect it to their own lives
* Facilitates academic conversations that center student voice and leadership
* Uses open-ended questioning to push student thinking toward learning targets
* When needed, provides direct instruction and scaffolds to support academic skill development
* Provides just-in-time supports to scaffold grade-level content, as opposed to spending large amounts of time teaching pre-grade standards
* Implements lessons that will support students’ grade-level work
* Implements lessons that help students build sociopolitical awareness (e.g., connecting content to relevant systems of power and oppression)
* **In ELA:** Implements tasks and questions to support students to interrogate the sources, perspectives, and biases of a text, and interrogates the texts themselves prior to delivering content
* **In Math:** Attends to the conceptual and procedural language of a content standard
 | * Do most or all of the thinking in the lesson
* Engage in a collaborative dialogue with one another about the content
* Use precise, academic vocabulary
* **In ELA:** Interrogate the sources, perspectives, and biases of the text
* **In ELA:** Use evidence from the text to support nuanced, grade-level reasoning
* **In ELA:** Read, write, and discuss content that demonstrates comprehension of content from various perspectives
* **In Math:** Understand the “why” of math procedures, demonstrating a conceptual understanding
 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Focus Element & Proficient Descriptor from the Classroom Model Rubric | Teacher Look-Fors | Student Look-Fors |
| **I-A-3 Well-Structured Units and Lessons***Adapts as needed and implements standards-based units comprised of well-structured lessons with challenging tasks and measurable outcomes; appropriate student engagement strategies, pacing, sequence, resources, and grouping; purposeful questioning; and strategic use of technology and digital media; such that students are able to learn the knowledge and skills defined in state standards/local curricula.* | * Implements lessons to meet grade-level learning targets
* Implements lessons that increase student engagement and leverages students linguistic, cultural, experiential and social- emotional assets
* Helps students understand how the content is relevant to their lives
* Asks higher-order thinking questions to ensure students reach the learning target by the end of the lesson
* Implements lessons that are well-paced with activities that build towards learning targets
* Builds frequent checks for understanding into lessons
* Builds in opportunities for students to contribute their own knowledge
* Provides intentional scaffolds and supports (e.g., question sequences, rubrics, sentence stems)
 | * Work collaboratively in flexible groupings
* Reflect on their learning with limited teacher support
* Understand and can articulate the purpose of the lesson and unit
* Can access the content and achieve the learning targets
* Demonstrate gradual progress toward grade-level learning targets
* When needed, demonstrate they are prepared for the lesson or activity
 |
| **I-B-2 Adjustments to Practice***Analyzes results from a variety of assessments to determine progress toward intended outcomes and uses these findings to adjust practice and identify and/or implement differentiated interventions and enhancements for students.* | * Collects meaningful data throughout the lesson on student understanding
* Uses the data to provide targeted scaffolded supports and opportunities to accelerate learning, when needed
* Uses the data to co-create student learning goals
* Asks responsive questions
* Provides in-the-moment feedback to students
* Provides a variety of ways for students to demonstrate learning
* Adjusts tasks to meet the needs of individual learners to demonstrate mastery of skill
* **In Math:** Highlights and provides support for students to work through common misconceptions
 | * Self-assess their learning and progress
* Advocate for themselves when they need additional supports, and can explain specifically where they need support
* Provide feedback to the teacher on their learning and experience in the class
* Regularly receive academic feedback from the teacher
 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Focus Element & Proficient Descriptor from the Classroom Model Rubric | Teacher Look-Fors | Student Look-Fors |
| **II-A-2 Student Engagement***Consistently uses instructional practices that are likely to motivate and engage most students in the content of the lesson.* | * Provides multiple options for students to engage in learning and demonstrate their progress
* Provides opportunities and supports for students to lead or design their own learning
* Provides positive feedback to encourage student effort
* Communicates warmth and mutual respect in interactions with students
* **In ELA:** Chooses texts that draws on students cultural and linguistic experiences where students independently and collaboratively make connections to their own lives
* **In Math:** Situates the mathematical concepts and processes within a realistic context to help students connect the learning to their lives
 | * Build their own positive identities as learners in the classroom
* Do most or all of the thinking in the lesson
* Collaborate with one another
* Ask questions about what they are learning
* Actively and curiously participate in their own learning through questioning
* Take academic risks
 |
| **II-A-3 Meeting Diverse Needs***Uses appropriate inclusive practices, such as tiered supports and scaffolded instruction, to accommodate differences in students’ learning needs, abilities, interests, and levels of readiness, including those of academically advanced students, students with disabilities, and English learners.* | * Provides scaffolds and supports based on student data, as opposed to preconceived notions and/or biases
* Provides equitable opportunities for engagement (i.e., all students have opportunities to participate, share with the class, receive academic and behavioral feedback)
* Provides multiple options for students to engage in learning and demonstrate their progress
* Considers student interests and learning styles to plan diverse, developmentally appropriate tasks
* Provides multiple options for students to engage in learning and demonstrate their progress
* Identifies opportunities for acceleration, when appropriate
* **In ELA:** Provides opportunities for students to engage with a variety of texts (genre, content, perspective)
* **In ELA:** Names what is not known and demonstrates critical thinking about a text
 | * Build their own positive identities as learners in the classroom
* Make connections between their learning and their individual backgrounds and contexts
* Access multiple supports beyond the teacher when they are stuck (e.g., peer collaboration, anchor charts, manipulatives)
* Successfully demonstrate their own learning toward the learning target
* Remain on task, fully participating and accessing content
 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Focus Element & Proficient Descriptor from the Classroom Model Rubric | Teacher Look-Fors | Student Look-Fors |
| **II-B-1 Safe Learning Environment***Uses rituals, routines, and appropriate responses that create and maintain a safe physical and intellectual environment where students take academic risks and most behaviors that interfere with learning are prevented.* | * Provides positive feedback to celebrate big and small successes for all students
* Provides scaffolds, probing questions, wait time, and checks for understanding to help students move forward in their learning
* Facilitates and holds students accountable for co-created, predictable, and purposeful classroom norms, routines, and procedures that support student learning (as opposed to a compliance-based approach)
* Spotlights artifacts that connect to students’ experiences, cultures, and identities
* Creates a respected learning environment where students are consistently challenged and are comfortable taking risks
* Uses learning materials that represent and foster students’ cultural identities
* Leverages opportunities to build students’ sociopolitical awareness (e.g., creating space to discuss the ways individuals from different communities and identities might relate to the content)
* Communicates warmth and mutual respect in interactions with students
 | * Enthusiastically engage in productive struggle
* Collaborate with one another
* Support one another’s learning and well-being without prompts from the teacher
* Take ownership of and demonstrate investment in the classrooms’ norms, routines, and procedures
* Show joy and curiosity
* Take academic risks
 |
| **II-E-1 High Expectations***Clearly communicates high standards for student work, effort, and behavior, and consistently reinforces the expectation that all students can meet these standards through effective effort, rather than innate ability.* | * Designs lessons to meet a grade-level learning target
* Communicates clear, co-created classroom norms, routines, procedures, and expectations about teacher and student roles for each activity
* Clearly explains the purpose of the lesson, activities, and follow-up questions to student responses
* Provides adequate wait time to allow students to process and answer questions
* Provides scaffolds and supports based on student data, as opposed to preconceived notions and/or biases
* Provides opportunities for students to share their thinking, including those who are not volunteering to participate
* Provides positive feedback to encourage student effort
* Provides frequent checks for understanding
* Holds students accountable for their learning
* **In ELA:** Challenges students to analyze complex texts and creates tasks that allow them to think critically and examine context, credibility and bias
* **In Math:** Exposes students to unfamiliar tasks to assess conceptual understanding
 | * Understand and can share the learning target and its purpose
* Engage in collaborative dialogue and learning
* Ask questions to support their own learning
* Engage in productive struggle
* Use precise, academic vocabulary
* **In ELA:** Create, ask and answer text-dependent questions
* **In ELA:** Explore and ask questions about multiple perspectives to uncover assumptions and biases in the text
* **In Math:** Understand the “why” of math procedures, demonstrating a conceptual understanding
 |

# Appendix B: OPTIC Content Fellows Video Collection

The OPTIC Content Fellows Video Collection is a subset of 17 videos on the OPTIC platform with benchmark scores and written feedback provided by the [OPTIC Content Fellows](#opticfellows), a group of MA educators with expertise in culturally responsive teaching and their content area. This appendix lists each video in the collection and their tagged Focus Elements from the Classroom Teacher Rubric.

* Some videos in the collection have in-depth video profiles available, which contain Fellows’ consensus scores and written feedback. These videos are highlighted in blue (ELA) and green (Math) in the table below. Video profiles can be found earlier in this Facilitator’s Guide and are linked within the table.
* Other videos in the collection do not have associated video profiles. These videos are listed below (highlighted in white). While written feedback is not available for these videos, you can access Fellows’ benchmark scores for these additional videos by:
	+ Navigating to your group’s Results for the video.
	+ Next to “Analyze,” click “Group to Role Comparison.”
	+ See the row labeled “Content Fellow” for the range of individual scores that OPTIC Content Fellows when scoring the observable practice and content.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Video Profile Available | Focus Elements of Practice*This video is tagged to the following elements of practice from the Classroom Teacher Rubric:* |
| I-A-1 Subject Matter Knowledge | I-A-3 Well-Structured Units and Lessons | I-B-2 Adjustments to Practice | II-A-2 Student Engagement | II-A-3 Meeting Diverse Needs | II-B-1 Safe Learning Environment | II-E-1 High Expectations |
| ELA | Kindergarten | Same, Same, Different – Task 2 |  | X |  |  |  | X |  |  |
| Kindergarten | Tools of the Trade – Task 2 |  |  |  |  | X |  |  | X |
| Grade 2 | Reading Comprehension, Cloudy with a Chance of Meatballs – Task 1 |  |  | X |  |  |  | X |  |
| [**Grade 4 | Evidence Based Discussion - Yes Ma’am - Task 1**](#ELAYesMaam) | x | X |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| Grade 5 | Alvin Exploration – Task 1 |  |  |  |  | X | X |  |  |
| [**Grade 6 | Fishbowl Egyptian Artifacts – Task 1**](#G6ELA) | x | X | X |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Video Profile Available | Focus Elements of Practice*This video is tagged to the following elements of practice from the Classroom Teacher Rubric:* |
|  | I-A-1 Subject Matter Knowledge | I-A-3 Well-Structured Units and Lessons | I-B-2 Adjustments to Practice | II-A-2 Student Engagement | II-A-3 Meeting Diverse Needs | II-B-1 Safe Learning Environment | II-E-1 High Expectations |
| ELA | [**Grade 7-8 | Socratic Discussion – Eugenics – Task 2**](#G78ELA) | x |  | X |  |  |  | X |  |
| Grade 10 | Building Arguments – Task 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  | X | X |
| [**Grade 12 | Collaboration Annotation – Hamlet – Task 1**](#G12ELA) | x | X |  |  |  | X |  |  |
| Math | Kindergarten | Decomposing Numbers – Task 1 |  | X |  |  |  |  | X |  |
| [**Grade 2 | Number Talk - Task 2**](#MathNumberTalk2) | x |  |  |  |  |  | X | X |
| [**Grade 5 | Graph and Analyze Relationships - Task 1**](#g5Math) | x |  |  |  | X |  |  | X |
| Grade 5 | Adding Fractions – Task 1 |  |  | X |  |  | X |  |  |
| [**Grade 6 | Math | Equivalent Expressions - Task 1**](#g6math) | x |  |  | X |  | X |  |  |
| Grade 8 | M&M and Hershey’s Equations – Task 1 |  |  |  | X |  | X |  |  |
| [**Grade 10-12 | Functions and Exponential Equations – Task 1**](#g1012math) | x |  |  |  |  |  | X | X |
| Grade 10-12 | Trigonometry – Task 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | X | X |

1. MA Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, [“Cultural Responsiveness Continuum.”](https://www.doe.mass.edu/odl/e-learning/culturally-resp-sust/content/index.html#/lessons/S9HvUB-Dj3clwF_UuEN5F5vwDi2jv8w4) [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Gloria Ladson-Billings, “[But That’s Just Good Teaching! The Case for Culturally Relevant Pedagogy](https://nationalequityproject.files.wordpress.com/2012/03/ladson-billings_1995.pdf).” [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. [Overcoming Racism](https://www.overcomeracism.com/); Geneva Gay, *Culturally Responsive Teaching*. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)