

## OBSERVATION SCHEDULE

---

**Name of practicing teacher** :  
**Date** :  
**Teaching Session** :  
**Topic** :

---

### The use of English in the classroom

**This schedule is intended to capture the level of teacher's confidence in speaking English in the classroom.**

	<b>Low</b>	<b>Mid</b>	<b>High</b>
<b>English for Communication in general</b>	Only in limited occasion did the teacher speak English in communicating with the students in the classroom	The teacher spoke English in most occasions in trying to build good communication with the students.	The teacher consistently spoke English in communicating with the students.  There was only few occasion where the teacher showed hesitation in the speaking of English.
<b>English for instruction</b>	There was frequent switching to Indonesian when the teacher conducted the instruction.  The teacher seemed to be struggling so much in carrying out the instruction in English.	In general, the teacher tried to speak English in both explaining and giving examples to the students. Indonesian was used in certain condition when providing alternative explanation or examples.	The teacher was confidently spoke English in all occasion, even when providing alternative explanation and examples.

# Instructional Strategies

This scale is intended to capture the level of teacher's ability in implementing instructional strategies in the classroom.

	Low	Mid	High
<b>Effectiveness in addressing or responding to problems or difficult questions/tasks</b>	Teacher is ineffective at helping students with problems or difficult tasks or questions.	Teacher generally tries to help students who approach with problems or questions, but is not consistently effective at addressing these problems.	Teacher is consistently effective in addressing students' questions, concerns, and problems.
<b>Crafting good questions</b>	Teacher fails to craft good questions to gauge students' comprehension.	Teacher sometimes is quite successfully in using good questions to get students' comprehension.	Most of the time teacher successfully uses good effective questions to get students' comprehension.
<b>Using variety of measurement</b>	There was almost no indication that the teacher used various types of measurement to gauge the student comprehension.	Certain types of assessment were done, but there was no indication of the effective use of the measurement.	The teacher was systematically used various planned measurement types in trying to assess the students' comprehension.

<p><b>Adjusting lesson with students' individual levels or needs</b></p>	<p>Teacher failed to anticipate, was unresponsive to, and/or dismissive of students' needs and cues for support. Teacher appeared emotionally/ psychologically unavailable to students.</p>	<p>Teacher occasionally anticipated or was sometimes responsive to individual student's needs and cues for support, but at other times was more unresponsive. Teacher appeared somewhat emotionally/ psychologically available to individual students.</p>	<p>Teacher consistently anticipated and was responsive to individual student's needs and cues for support. Teacher appeared emotionally/ psychologically available to individual students.</p>
<p><b>Providing alternative explanation and examples</b></p>	<p>Teacher did not provide an example or provides an incomplete, incorrect, or age inappropriate examples to illustrate/demonstrate/explain the materials.</p>	<p>Teacher provided more than one example to illustrate/demonstrate the use of a procedure or skill, but the examples might be incomplete, incorrect, or inappropriate, or represent no variety</p>	<p>Teacher provided multiple, varied, correct, and age appropriate examples to illustrate/demonstrate the use of a procedure or skill.</p>
<p><b>Providing appropriate challenges for capable students</b></p>	<p>Teacher did not provide appropriate challenges for capable students.</p>	<p>Teacher sometimes provided spontaneous challenges for capable students.</p>	<p>Teacher most of the time provided capable students with effective encouraging challenges.</p>

## Classroom Management

**This schedule focuses on getting the information on teachers' ability in managing the class to help create positive classroom atmosphere.**

	<b>Low</b>	<b>Mid</b>	<b>High</b>
<b>Controlling disruptive behaviors</b>	Teacher did not show efforts in controlling disruptive behaviors of the students.	Teacher did not significantly show continuous efforts to control disruptive behavior. Some non-disruptive off-task behaviors were left unattended.	Teacher dealt well with both students' non-disruptive off-task and disruptive behaviors.
<b>Disruptions</b>	Teacher allowed irrelevant conversation and other interruptions to interfere with learning activities.	Teacher generally maintained focus on learning activities, but might occasionally allow distractions to interfere with time for learning.	Teacher did not allow disruptions/ distractions to compete with time for learning.
<b>Establishing classroom rules to keep activities run smoothly</b>	Teacher was either not aware of the importance of standards and rules for the class or did not try to set them up.	Teacher tried to set up standards and rules but failed to notice the consequences of unnecessary standards.	Teacher established classroom standards and rules successfully and brought them to create positive atmosphere for students to learn.
<b>Routines</b>	There was no evidence of clear, established classroom routines.	Some classroom routines were clearly in place, but there were also times of uncertainty and disorganization.	The classroom resembled a "well-oiled machine" where everybody knows what was expected of them and how to go about doing it.

## Student Engagement

**This scale is intended to capture the degree to which the teacher make all students in the class focus on and participate in the learning activity presented or facilitated by the teacher. The difference between passive engagement and active engagement is of note in this rating.**

	<b>Low</b>	<b>Mid</b>	<b>High</b>
<b>Promoting learners active engagement</b>	The majority of students appeared distracted or disengaged.	The majority of students were passively engaged, listening to, or watching the teacher.	Most students frequently volunteered information or insights, responded to teacher prompts, and/or actively manipulated materials.
<b>Sustaining students' engagement</b>	Low engagement levels were sustained over activities and lessons.	Some students were engaged but others were engaged for only parts of the activity or lesson.	High engagement was sustained throughout different activities and lessons.

## Curriculum Implementation

**This scale is intended to measure the degree of teachers' practices in implementing Curriculum 2004 in the classroom. Aspects measured in this scale are devised specifically on the philosophical basis of Curriculum 2004 in Indonesia.**

	<b>Low (1,2)</b>	<b>Mid (3,4,5)</b>	<b>High (6,7)</b>
<b>Preparation of the lessons</b>	Teacher did not prepare himself/herself with comprehensive syllabus and lesson plans	Teacher was equipped with a lesson plan but failed to implement most of the planned-activities in the classroom.	Teacher was equipped with a comprehensive syllabus and lesson plan, and successfully implemented most of the planned activities.
	Teacher was not prepared for lessons and tasks.	Teacher was mostly prepared for lessons and tasks, but occasionally lost time from instruction in last minute preparation, gathering materials, searching notes for information, etc.	Teacher was fully prepared for lessons and tasks—including high degree of familiarity with content, procedures, etc.
<b>Contextualization of the instruction</b>	There was no indication that teacher tried to relate classroom activities with students' daily life to bring context and meaning of the activities.	There was some indications that teacher tried to relate classroom activities with students' daily life to bring context and meaning of the activities.	Teacher always tried to relate classroom activities with students' life to bring context and meaning of the activities.
<b>Implementation of genre-based teaching</b>	There were a few indications that the teacher designed the teaching based on a specific genre or a text type.	To some extent, teacher tried to design the class activities based on a specific genre/text type.	Teacher consistently presented the teaching in a design based on a specific genre or text type.

<b>Stimulating inquiry among students</b>	Teacher failed to stimulate the students in inquiry-based activities that most classroom activities were from teacher to students.	In some occasions, teacher tried to stimulate inquiry among students.	Very frequently, teacher tried to stimulate inquiry among students and help students initiate themselves in solving the problems.
<b>Providing model for the students</b>	Teacher failed to model the students with the expected targeted behavior.	Teacher occasionally modeled the students the expected behavior.	Teacher always modeled the behavior to the students to support the students' achievement.
<b>Promoting interaction among learners</b>	Students rarely, if ever, engaged in positive interactions with one another.	Although there was not clear evidence of a strong emotional connection among students, there was an underlying positive tone to their interactions.	Students were clearly positively connected to one another in planned activities to support understanding.
<b>Using authentic assessment to assess students' achievement</b>	Teacher did not seem to authentic assessment to assess students' achievement.	Teacher tried to use authentic assessment but it was often of low relevant with students' activities in real world.	Most of the time, teacher appropriately used authentic assessment to assess students' achievement.