



Developed by: Daiyo Sawada, Michael D. Piburn, Kathleen Falconer, Jeff Turley, and Irene Bloom

Format: Observation protocol

Duration: N/A minutes

Focus: Interactive teaching

Level: Graduate, Upper-level, Intermediate, Intro college, High school, Middle school, Other

How to give the test

1. Download the [RTOP Training Manual](#) and print a copy for yourself and a teaching colleague whom you trust and respect, ideally familiar with teaching your subject.
2. You and a colleague should read and discuss the instrument
3. Arrange for your colleague to visit your class to observe and RTOP an hour lesson
4. While your colleague observes your class, have a student or aide videotape your lesson.
5. RTOP this videotape yourself, before discussing your colleague's RTOP score of your lesson.
6. Reciprocate —perform an RTOP observation on your colleague in turn. This will provide more needed classroom observation material for discussion and genuine meaning in this experience for both of you.
7. Meet with your colleague to discuss and attempt to reconcile the scores on each of the 25 items. Inevitably, you will disagree with your colleague. Use the differences as a focus for reexamining your own teaching practice.

How to score the test

Each of the 25 RTOP items are scored on the following scale. The exact details of the intermediate scores differ for each of the 25 items and have been rigorously defined by researchers.

0: the behavior never occurred

1: the behavior occurred at least once

2: occurred more than once; very loosely describes the lesson

3: a frequent behavior or fairly descriptive of the lesson

4: pervasive or extremely descriptive of the lesson

The total RTOP score is the sum of scores for each of the 25 items, with total score ranging from 0 to 100.

Reformed Teaching Observation Protocol (RTOP)

Daiyo Sawada
External Evaluator

Michael Piburn
Internal Evaluator

and

Kathleen Falconer, Jeff Turley, Russell Benford and Irene Bloom
Evaluation Facilitation Group (EFG)

Technical Report No. IN00-1
Arizona Collaborative for Excellence in the Preparation of Teachers
Arizona State University

I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Name of teacher _____ Announced Observation? _____
(yes, no, or explain)

Location of class _____
(district, school, room)

Years of Teaching _____ Teaching Certification _____
(K-8 or 7-12)

Subject observed _____ Grade level _____

Observer _____ Date of observation _____

Start time _____ End time _____

II. CONTEXTUAL BACKGROUND AND ACTIVITIES

In the space provided below please give a brief description of the lesson observed, the classroom setting in which the lesson took place (space, seating arrangements, etc.), and any relevant details about the students (number, gender, ethnicity) and teacher that you think are important. Use diagrams if they seem appropriate.

Record here events which may help in documenting the ratings.

| Time | Description of Events |
|------|-----------------------|
| | |

III. LESSON DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION

| | | Never Occurred | | Very Descriptive | |
|----|--|----------------|---|------------------|-----|
| 1) | The instructional strategies and activities respected students' prior knowledge and the preconceptions inherent therein. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 4 |
| 2) | The lesson was designed to engage students as members of a learning community. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 4 |
| 3) | In this lesson, student exploration preceded formal presentation. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 4 |
| 4) | This lesson encouraged students to seek and value alternative modes of investigation or of problem solving. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 4 |
| 5) | The focus and direction of the lesson was often determined by ideas originating with students. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 4 |

IV. CONTENT

Propositional knowledge

| | | | | | |
|-----|---|---|---|---|-----|
| 6) | The lesson involved fundamental concepts of the subject. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 4 |
| 7) | The lesson promoted strongly coherent conceptual understanding. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 4 |
| 8) | The teacher had a solid grasp of the subject matter content inherent in the lesson. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 4 |
| 9) | Elements of abstraction (i.e., symbolic representations, theory building) were encouraged when it was important to do so. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 4 |
| 10) | Connections with other content disciplines and/or real world phenomena were explored and valued. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 4 |

Procedural Knowledge

| | | | | | |
|-----|--|---|---|---|-----|
| 11) | Students used a variety of means (models, drawings, graphs, concrete materials, manipulatives, etc.) to represent phenomena. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 4 |
| 12) | Students made predictions, estimations and/or hypotheses and devised means for testing them. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 4 |
| 13) | Students were actively engaged in thought-provoking activity that often involved the critical assessment of procedures. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 4 |
| 14) | Students were reflective about their learning. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 4 |
| 15) | Intellectual rigor, constructive criticism, and the challenging of ideas were valued. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 4 |

Continue recording salient events here.

| Time | Description of Events |
|------|-----------------------|
| | |

V. CLASSROOM CULTURE

| Communicative Interactions | | Never Occurred | | | | | Very Descriptive | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|-----------------------|---|---|---|---|-------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| 16) | Students were involved in the communication of their ideas to others using a variety of means and media. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | | | | |
| 17) | The teacher's questions triggered divergent modes of thinking. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | | | | |
| 18) | There was a high proportion of student talk and a significant amount of it occurred between and among students. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | | | | |
| 19) | Student questions and comments often determined the focus and direction of classroom discourse. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | | | | |
| 20) | There was a climate of respect for what others had to say. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | | | | |
| Student/Teacher Relationships | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 21) | Active participation of students was encouraged and valued. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | | | | |
| 22) | Students were encouraged to generate conjectures, alternative solution strategies, and ways of interpreting evidence. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | | | | |
| 23) | In general the teacher was patient with students. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | | | | |
| 24) | The teacher acted as a resource person, working to support and enhance student investigations. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | | | | |
| 25) | The metaphor "teacher as listener" was very characteristic of this classroom. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | | | | |

Additional comments you may wish to make about this lesson.