

# Report on Classroom Observations:

## Curriculum 2.0

Montgomery County Public Schools, Maryland

Prepared by:

Student Achievement Partners

# Table of Contents

Methodology and Process.....	Page 1
The Enacted Curriculum: Classroom Observations	
- Mathematics.....	Page 2
- ELA/Literacy.....	Page 6
Appendix: Data Collection Tools - Classroom Observations.....	Page 10

# The Enacted Curriculum: Classroom Observations

Classroom observations were conducted in order to better understand the enacted curriculum at Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS). This section presents the results of observing a sample of Mathematics and ELA/Literacy lessons in MCPS classrooms.

## **Methodology and Process:**

The classroom observations were conducted using a modified version of the [Instructional Practice Guide \(IPG\)](#), a college- and career-readiness, standards-aligned observation rubric created by Student Achievement Partners in 2012. The IPG names a short list of observable classroom practices that indicate whether standards-aligned instructional content is present and whether teachers and students are engaging with that content in ways that address the expectations of college- and career-ready standards. The modified version of the IPG used for this project, the *MCPS Enacted Curriculum Observation Tool* ([Mathematics](#) and [ELA/Literacy](#)), was created from the IPG by selecting indicators most relevant to the purpose of this project. Several indicators were also added to the IPG to understand the degree to which the taught curriculum aligns to the resources in *Curriculum 2.0*.

Student Achievement Partners experts conducted observations in 20 schools across the district; 14 elementary schools and 6 middle schools. The schools and grade levels for observation were selected as a representative sample by the JHU project team. School leaders were notified in advance of the grade levels to be observed, but individual classroom teachers were not identified until the time of the visit. In total, there were 77 classrooms observed for 20–30 minutes each: 38 classrooms in ELA/Literacy (K–2: 13; 3–5: 13; 6–8: 12) and 39 classrooms in Mathematics (K–2: 14; 3–5: 13; 6–8: 12). All data from these observations have been de-identified for reporting purposes, so as to not tie any data to specific schools or classrooms. Note: The original sampling plan indicated 80 classroom observations in total; however, due to unplanned school scheduling and staffing changes, three classrooms could not be observed.

The following sections present a brief summary of what was observed in each subject, followed by specific data and evidence for the indicators in the observation tool. When ratings are referred to as being on a 3-point scale, the possible point values are 0, 1, and 2 (with 0 being the lowest rating and 2 being the highest).

## Mathematics

### Summary

In most observed K–8 lessons, learning goals and some resources from *Curriculum 2.0* were evident. Lessons observed were almost all about grade-level content but did not get to the full intended depth of the mathematics. Checks for understanding occurred for some students, although lessons were less often adapted to meet students’ needs. In most of the lessons observed, there were missed opportunities for engaging students in talking about each other’s mathematical ideas.

### *Fidelity to Curriculum 2.0*

Across grades K–8, most lessons used the learning goals and some resources from *Curriculum 2.0*.

- In grades K–5, 74% of observed lessons (20 out of 27) used the exact language of the learning goal from the Sample Learning Task (SLT) in *Curriculum 2.0*. In grades 6–8, 58% of observed lessons (7 out of 12) used the exact language of the learning goal. An additional 17% of observed lessons (2 out of 12) in grades 6–8 used a learning goal that was somewhat aligned to the SLT.
- Lessons observed in grades 6–8 included resources from *Curriculum 2.0* 75% of the time (9 out of 12), while lessons observed in grades K–5 included resources from *Curriculum 2.0* 59% of the time (16 out of 27).
- When lessons were rated as “somewhat” or “not” using *Curriculum 2.0* resources in grades 6–8, the observed lesson often did not get to the depth of the content in the SLT. Sample evidence:
  - *Learning goal on Unit 2, Topic 1, SLT 2 is "Reason about distance and direction on the number line to add rational numbers." Focus of the lesson was on using the number line to add rational numbers, some attention was given to reasoning about direction, but students were not asked to reason about distance.*
- Two indicators (2Ai and 2B) had higher average ratings (on a 3-point scale) in classrooms that were using *Curriculum 2.0* resources, compared with classrooms that were not using *Curriculum 2.0* resources. This correlation did not exist in K–5 lessons.
  - In grades 6–8, the average rating for 2Ai in observed lessons that aligned to resources in SLT was 1.4, while the average in this same grade band for observed lessons that were not aligned was 0.5.
  - In grades 6–8, the average rating for 2B in observed lessons that aligned to resources in SLT was 2.0, while the average in this same grade band for observed lessons that were not aligned was 1.5.

### *Focus and Rigor*

1A	<i>The lesson focuses on grade-level cluster(s), grade-level content standard(s) or part(s) thereof.</i>
1B	<i>The lesson intentionally targets the aspect(s) of rigor (conceptual understanding, procedural skill and fluency, application) called for by the standard(s) being addressed.</i>
2A	<i>The teacher makes the mathematics of the lesson explicit through the use of explanations, representations, tasks, and/or examples.</i>
	<i>The mathematics presented is clear and correct.</i>
2B	<i>The teacher provides opportunities for all students to work with and practice grade-level problems and exercises.</i>

Most observed lessons were focused on grade-level content, but the intended depth of mathematics was not consistently reinforced by teacher explanations and representations of the mathematics.

- Ninety percent of lessons focused on grade-level content. (For indicator 1A, 89%—24 out of 27 lessons—in K-5 receive a “Yes” rating, and 92%—11 out of 12 lessons—in 6-8 received a “Yes” rating.)
- Most observed lessons were aligned to the aspect of rigor targeted in the given standard (89%—24 out of 27 lessons—in K-5, and 75%—9 out of 12 lessons in 6-8).
- The majority of lessons were focused on Major Work of the Grade, with exceptions in grade 6 and grade 1. In both of these grades, the scope and sequence of *Curriculum 2.0* targets supporting work during the weeks that were observed (compute fluently with multi-digit numbers in grade 6, represent and interpret data in grade 1).
- The average rating for 2B—*Students spending time on grade-level problems and exercises*—was the highest average rating of all indicators rated on a 3-point scale (1.7 in K-5 lessons and 1.58 in 6-8 lessons).
- In 18% of K-8 observed lessons (7 out of 39), teachers made significant mathematical errors that could impact student understanding of the mathematics. In another 23% of observed lessons (9 out of 39), minor mathematical errors were made by the teacher.
- Ratings were considerably lower in the degree to which teachers were able to make the mathematics of the lesson clear (2Ai) (0.92 on a 3-point scale in K-8 lessons).

Sample evidence:

- *There were a lot of strategies and models given to students. They were asked to use a Part/Part/Whole diagram and use “P” and “W” to label the parts and wholes. Then they were shown a fact family, and although that was connected to parts and wholes, it was more about putting the right number in the right place. (The teacher said, “the biggest number goes on top.”)*
- *Although bar diagrams were used, the language the teacher used was more about filling out the worksheet (and sometimes the bar diagram) than the connection between multiplication and division. For example:*
  - *T: Which one of these equations matches up?*
  - *Students turn and talk; pair chooses the wrong equation.*
  - *T: Do you see an 8 anywhere in here? Then how could it be the right equation? Look for the equation that has the numbers in the problem.*

## Coherence

**1C** *The lesson intentionally relates new concepts to students’ prior skills and knowledge.*

The majority of lessons included connections to previous content. The percent of lessons receiving a “Yes” rating for 1C was higher in grades 6-8 (83%, 10 out of 12 lessons) than in K-5 (70%, 19 out of 27 lessons).

- Connections in lessons ranged from short, explicit statements by teachers to more significant mathematical coherence built into lesson design. Sample evidence:
  - *The teacher stated that they’ve been working on solving word problems, but that was as much of a connection as was stated.*
  - *Teacher reminded students about inverse operations: “What’s the inverse of dividing by 2? Remember...inverse operations.” Teacher invites students to have notes from prior day available, as well as last night’s homework for reference as they work through problems today.*

## Standards for Mathematical Practice

3A	<i>The teacher poses high-quality questions and problems that prompt students to share their developing thinking about the content of the lesson.</i>
3D	<i>The teacher creates the conditions for student conversations where students are encouraged to talk about each other's thinking.</i>

Some lessons provided opportunities for students to share their thinking on high-quality questions and problems. Fewer lessons provided opportunities for students to talk about each other's thinking.

- There was no difference between K-5 lessons and 6-8 lessons in the average rating for prompting students to share their mathematical thinking (3A). Lessons in K-8 had an average rating of 1 on a 3-point scale.
- In comparing results on indicators 3A and 3D, the average rating on 3D was lower than the average rating on 3A across K-8. Lessons in K-5 had an average rating of 0.63, and lessons in 6-8 had an average rating of 0.83, both on a 3-point scale. Sample evidence from the same lesson:
  - *3A: The teacher circulated from table to table and checked in with individual students. At a table she asked a student, "How did you know that was 6 so quickly?" The student said he just knew, and the teacher continued to probe until he said, "There were two lines of three." There were at least four conversations with students or groups of students where the teacher probed to encourage students to make their thinking explicit.*
  - *3D: While the centers provided many opportunities for interaction, the students generally completed tasks independently with minimal sharing of each other's ideas.*

## Supporting All Students

2D	<i>The teacher deliberately checks for understanding throughout the lesson.</i>
	<i>The teacher adapts the lesson according to student understanding.</i>

Lessons generally had teachers checking for understanding with some students, but not consistently with all students or adapting the lesson based on student needs.

- In K-5, teachers were more consistently checking for understanding (average of 1.3 on a 3-point scale) than adjusting instruction based on student need (average of 0.8 on a 3-point scale). Sample evidence from the same elementary lesson:
  - *2D(i): During the turn-and-talk discussions in the whole-group instruction, the teacher did not circulate and respond to the partner conversations. During small-group time, the teacher checked each student's work and asked them to explain their thinking, and also simply checked answers and told students "good job" and moved them to their next activity.*
  - *2D(ii): Several students in the small group completed the tasks quickly. There was no additional work or extension provided. Several students seemed unsure of which strategies to use for different problems. One student asked, "What if I don't want to use arrays or groups?" The teacher responded that today's lesson was about practicing only these two strategies.*
- This difference was not found in grades 6-8; lessons rated slightly higher on adapting instruction (average of 1.3 on a 3-point scale) than on checking for understanding of all students (average of 1.1 on a 3-point scale). Sample evidence from the same middle school lesson:
  - *2D(i): Teacher circulated the classroom as students worked in silence on the task. Occasionally, a student would stop the teacher and ask for guidance, and the teacher*

*stopped to work with that student. When going over the worksheet with the whole class, the teacher would select a student at random and student shared response with whole class. Teacher then summarized /restated student's response.*

- *2D(ii): When a partial response was shared, teacher pushed for more precision of language and/or notation. A student response to "What are the values of the domain?" was "0, 2, 4, 6, 8, and 10." Teacher directed student attention to the graph to highlight that any number from 0 to 10 could work through a couple of yes/no questions. Teacher then concluded this segment by writing  $\{0 \leq x \leq 10\}$ .*

## ELA/Literacy

### Summary

In most K–8 lessons, learning goals and some resources from *Curriculum 2.0* were used. Text was at the center of a majority of lessons; however, the majority of questions and tasks did not require students to use text evidence. Content knowledge did not appear to be a goal of lessons, which led to limited vocabulary instruction. There were few opportunities for students to read for themselves. In K–2 classrooms, there was not a clear focus on foundational skills.

### ***Fidelity to Curriculum 2.0***

Across grades K–8, most lessons used the learning goals, and some lessons used resources from *Curriculum 2.0*.

- 84% of observed lessons in grades 3–8 (21 out of 25) and 69% of lessons in grades K–2 (9 out of 13) included a learning goal exactly or somewhat aligned to one provided in *Curriculum 2.0*.
- 58% of observed lessons in grades K–5 (15 out of 26) included resources or activities provided in the Sample Learning Task (SLT) in *Curriculum 2.0*, while none of the 12 lessons observed in grades 6–8 aligned to an SLT.
- Only 12% of texts used in observed lessons (3 out of 25) were identified as coming from *Curriculum 2.0*—possible reasons include that the texts were teacher-selected, or the texts are recommended in one of the many text resource lists linked in *Curriculum 2.0* and observers were unable to identify them.

### ***Text-based Instruction***

<b>1A</b>	<i>A majority of the lesson is spent listening to, reading, writing, or speaking about text(s).</i>
<b>1B</b>	<i>The text(s) are at or above the complexity level expected for the grade and time in the school year.</i>
<b>1C</b>	<i>The text(s) exhibit exceptional craft and thought and/or provide useful information.</i>

Text was at the center of many observed lessons across grades K–8. Elementary lessons focused on a text or multiple texts more often than middle school lessons did. In K–5, 73% of observed lessons (19 out of 26) focused on texts. In 6–8, 50% of observed lessons (6 out of 12) focused on texts.

- During the text-based lessons, the majority of time was spent listening to, talking about, or writing about text, while less time was spent reading texts. Sample evidence:
  - *About 60% of the lesson was spent listening to and writing about the text. The rest of the time was spent reviewing how to write a summary and providing directions.*
  - *For a majority of the observation, teacher read aloud “An Hour with Abuelo” by Judith Ortiz Cofer and class engaged in a whole-class discussion.*
- There was inconsistency with the complexity of text across grades 3–8. Approximately half of the texts used were at or above grade-level, and half were below grade-level. However, in middle school, text was used in lessons only 50% of the time, which means just 3 out of 12 observed lessons included a text that was at or above grade level. Sample evidence from grades 6–8:
  - *According to Lexile levels given by the teacher, the texts are below the quantitative complexity expectations for 7th grade (925–1185): Red Glass (Lexile 800), Red Kayak (Lexile 800), The Red Umbrella (Lexile 590).*
  - *Lexile 860 (below 925–1185 for 6–8th grade) and only slightly complex on qualitative features.*

- Across grades K–8, 76% of texts used in text-based lessons (19 out of 25) were of high quality. Sample evidence:
  - *The text is well-written and provides useful information about well-known photographer and American icon Dorothea Lange.*
  - *This series of texts presented rich and abundant information for students to use for their state research.*
  - *The text does provide some good information about animal defense systems.*
  - *The text is really interesting in terms of the structure (non-prose) and the story is compelling and relevant to students (a student getting in trouble for humming during the national anthem when he is supposed to be silent).*

### Foundational Skills (K–2 only)

<b>1D</b>	<i>Instruction and materials address foundational skills by attending to phonological awareness, concepts of print, letter recognition, phonetic patterns and word structure.</i>
-----------	---

Less than half the lessons in grades K–2 addressed foundational skills instruction.

- Five out of 11 lessons in K–1 addressed foundational skills, and none of the 2nd grade observed lessons addressed foundational skills.
- Foundational skills instruction primarily targeted high-frequency words.
- Just one out of 13 observed lessons in K–2 included instruction of a sound-spelling pattern. In this lesson, the sound spelling patterns (sh- and -ing) addressed were based on the words that happen to appear in the text. Evidence observed from this lesson:
  - *During the guided reading lessons, the teacher listened to students read and prompted decoding and comprehension strategies relevant to K–2 foundational skills (e.g., segmenting sounds, identifying digraphs, short and long vowels). She also engaged students in wipe board word work activities that addressed these skills. Teacher said: "What does sh- say in a word? It is push. What about this word? Rush. Good. This was in our other book. Shove. Very very good. What does -ing say in a word? String. Swing. Thing. What happens when I add an s? Good. Things."*

### Use of Evidence

<b>2B</b>	<i>Questions and tasks require students to use evidence from text to demonstrate understanding and to support their ideas about the text.</i>
<b>3B</b>	<i>The teacher expects evidence and precision from students and probes students' answers accordingly.</i>

While the majority of lessons across K–8 were text-based, the majority of questions and tasks were not text-dependent and did not require evidence to complete.

- Few questions and tasks required students to cite evidence from the text and to demonstrate understanding and to support their ideas about the text (average rating of K–8 lessons: 0.77 on a 3-point scale). Sample evidence:
  - *The tasks did not require any use of any text, but rather student's background/previous knowledge. The teacher gave the prompt: "Describe the difference between a concrete process and an abstract process. Then provide one example of a concrete process and one example of an abstract process." Then the teacher told students that they may not use an example discussed previously in class that they must come up with their own.)*
- Questions mostly focused on general comprehension skills or strategies; not on building understanding of the text. Sample evidence:
  - *No questions required evidence. Students were only asked to think of questions they want answered when they use text features from the book this week.*

- Teachers expect evidence and precision from few students and rarely probe students' answers accordingly (average rating of K–8 lessons: 0.71 on a 3-point scale). Sample evidence:
  - *While the focus of the lesson was on finding supporting details for the main idea, the teacher did not require students to go into the text to find evidence. To answer questions, they would supply a general idea and she provided the detail. In addition, the teacher asked the students to identify the main idea of each text under consideration. In all three cases observed, the students gave the title of the article/book as the main idea and the teacher accepted that answer.*

### **Building Knowledge and Vocabulary**

<b>2C</b>	<i>Questions and tasks attend to the words (academic vocabulary), phrases, and sentences within the text.</i>
<b>2D</b>	<i>Questions are sequenced to build knowledge by guiding students to delve deeper into the text and graphics.</i>

There was minimal or inconsistent vocabulary instruction, and lessons did not focus on building content knowledge in grades K–8. These components of aligned instruction were displaced by instruction about comprehension strategies, as detailed in the *Use of Evidence* section.

- These are the lowest rated indicators across K–8 lessons. (2C had an average rating of 0.21; 2D had an average of 0.13, both on a 3-point scale.)
- There were few specific content goals for the lessons; most lesson objectives were skill based. Samples of lesson objectives stated orally or written on the board:
  - *Examine text features of informational texts*
  - *Ask and answer questions about text*
  - *Students use structure and key words from texts to identify the text type*
  - *Today we will answer the questions: What is a stanza? What is the difference between narrative poems and narrative stories?*
  - *Today we will answer: What does an author have to include to create a great story?*
- Few questions and tasks within lessons were sequenced to support building knowledge. Sample evidence:
  - *Students read the text once then completed the summarizing task. There were no other text-dependent questions to engage students in specific words, phrases, or ideas from the text.*
  - *Although two related texts were used, students listened to the text defining tobacco AFTER reading the text about why smoking stinks. The sequence did not allow students to build knowledge, and there were no questions asked that had students connecting details between texts.*

### **Supporting All Students**

<b>3D</b>	<i>The teacher demonstrates awareness and appropriate action regarding the variations present in student progress toward reading independently.</i>
-----------	---

While the majority of lessons were text-based, there were few opportunities for students to actually read; therefore opportunities for teachers to adjust instruction based on variation in student progress toward reading independently was infrequently observed.

- In grades 6–8, this indicator had an average rating of 0.22 (on a 3-point scale); in grades K–5, an average rating of 0.56 (on a 3-point scale).
- In many lessons 1) student reading did not occur in the lesson; 2) the teachers read the text to students; or 3) when students read, there was no awareness or appropriate action toward students reading independently (and proficiently). Sample evidence:

- Grades K-2:
  - *The text was appropriate for first-grade students to read either independently or with support; however, the teacher read the text out loud and students were not provided with an opportunity to read the text themselves.*
  - *One student pointed out a familiar sound spelling pattern (-ing) in the teacher's model writing. The teacher did not take the opportunity to note or extend his comment by discussing other words with the same sound spelling pattern or ask him to identify other words.*
- Grades 3-5 :
  - *Both texts were read aloud to students. The texts were projected on the SMARTboard and students did not have copies of them.*
  - *For the reading of "Jimmy Jet and His TV Set," the teacher calls on students randomly to read, some of whom do not read fluently. For the reading of the second poem, "Jimmy Goes to the City," the teacher asks students to "whisper read" and stated, "We have never done this before so I hope it goes well," provides no directions on what whisper reading is, and then engages students in choral reading.*
- Grades 6-8:
  - *Teacher completes whole read-aloud (with a below-grade-level text)*
  - *Students were taking turns reading aloud. It was unclear how students were chosen to read and there was no feedback on fluency. There were three times when the student who was reading aloud said, "I don't know that word," and skipped it while reading aloud. There was no response from the teacher.*

## **Appendix: Data Collection Tools**

# MCPS Enacted Curriculum Observation Tool - Mathematics

(Based on Student Achievement Partners' [Instructional Practice Guide Coaching Tool](#))

School:

Grade Level:

Learning Goal (posted or stated): \_\_\_\_\_

Indicators based on the Instructional Practice Guide (IPG)	Evidence Observed
<p><b>1A. The lesson focuses on grade-level cluster(s), grade-level content standard(s) or part(s) thereof.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Yes – The lesson focuses only on mathematics within the grade-level standards.</li> <li>- No – The lesson focuses on mathematics outside the grade-level standards.</li> </ul>	<p>Standard(s) addressed: _____</p>
<p><b>1B. The lesson intentionally targets the aspect(s) of rigor called for by the standard(s) being addressed.</b></p>	<p>Aspect(s) of Rigor targeted by the above standard:_____</p> <p>Aspect(s) of Rigor addressed in the lesson:_____</p>
<p><b>1.B.i Conceptual understanding is called for in the standard and the lesson intentionally targets conceptual understanding.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Yes – The lesson intentionally targets conceptual understanding.</li> <li>- No – The lesson does not intentionally target conceptual understanding.</li> <li>- N/A – The standard does not require conceptual understanding.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>1.B.ii Procedural skill and fluency is called for in the standard and the lesson intentionally targets procedural skill and fluency.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Yes – The lesson intentionally targets procedural skill and fluency.</li> <li>- No – The lesson does not intentionally target procedural skill and fluency.</li> <li>- N/A – The standard does not require procedural skill and fluency.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>1.B.iii Application is called for in the standard and the lesson intentionally targets application.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Yes – The lesson intentionally targets application.</li> <li>- No – The lesson does not intentionally target application.</li> <li>- N/A – The standard does not require application.</li> </ul>	

Indicators based on the Instructional Practice Guide (IPG)	Evidence Observed
<p><b>1C. The lesson intentionally relates new concepts to students' prior skills and knowledge.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Yes – The lesson explicitly builds on students' prior skills and knowledge.</li> <li>- No – The lesson contains no meaningful connections to students' prior skills and knowledge.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>2A.i. The teacher makes the mathematics of the lesson explicit through the use of explanations, representations, tasks, and/or examples.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 2 – A variety of instructional techniques and examples are used to make the mathematics of the lesson clear.</li> <li>- 1 – Examples and instructional techniques are used to make the mathematics of the lesson clear.</li> <li>- 0 – Instruction is limited to showing students how to get the answer.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>2A.ii. The mathematics presented is clear and correct.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 2 – The teacher makes no serious mathematical errors.</li> <li>- 1 – Any mathematical errors made by the teacher are minor and do not detract from the overall mathematical goals of the lesson.</li> <li>- 0 – Mathematical errors are made by the teacher that affect students' understanding of the mathematical goals of the lesson.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>2B. The teacher provides opportunities for all students to work with and practice grade-level problems and exercises.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 2 – Students are given opportunities to work with grade-level problems and exercises.</li> <li>- 1 – Students are given limited opportunities to work with grade-level problems and exercises.</li> <li>- 0 – Students are not given opportunities to work with grade-level problems and exercises.</li> </ul>	

Indicators based on the Instructional Practice Guide (IPG)	Evidence Observed
<p><b>2D.i The teacher deliberately checks for understanding throughout the lesson.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 2 – There are checks for understanding used throughout the lesson to assess progress of students.</li> <li>- 1 – There are checks for understanding to assess progress of some students.</li> <li>- 0 – There are few or no checks for understanding, or the progress of only a few students is assessed.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>2D.ii The teacher adapts the lesson according to student understanding.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 2 – Adjustments to instruction are made in response to student understanding, as needed.</li> <li>- 1 – Minimal adjustments are made to instruction, even when adjustments are appropriate.</li> <li>- 0 – Instruction is not adjusted based on students’ needs.</li> <li>- N/A</li> </ul>	
<p><b>3A. The teacher poses high-quality questions and problems that prompt students to share their developing thinking about the content of the lesson.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 2 – Teacher provides many opportunities.</li> <li>- 1 – Teacher provides some opportunities.</li> <li>- 0 – Teacher provides few or no opportunities.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>3D. The teacher creates the conditions for student conversations where students are encouraged to talk about each other’s thinking.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 2 – Teacher provides many opportunities.</li> <li>- 1 – Teacher provides some opportunities.</li> <li>- 0 – Teacher provides few or no opportunities.</li> </ul>	

Additional Notes:

--

**Use of Curriculum 2.0 (to be completed post-observation):**

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Additional Notes</b>
<b>Does the learning goal align to an SLT in Curriculum 2.0?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Yes</li><li>- Somewhat</li><li>- No</li></ul>	
<b>Does the portion of the lesson observed align to an SLT in Curriculum 2.0?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Yes</li><li>- Somewhat</li><li>- No</li></ul>	
<b>Are student-facing materials used by the teacher from Curriculum 2.0 resources? (check all that apply)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Yes, they are directly from Curriculum 2.0.</li><li>- Yes, they are adapted from Curriculum 2.0 resources.</li><li>- Yes, and the teacher is also using supplementary resources.</li><li>- No, the teacher doesn't appear to be using resources from Curriculum 2.0.</li><li>- Unable to determine</li></ul>	

# MCPS Enacted Curriculum Observation Tool - English Language Arts

(Based on Student Achievement Partners' [Instructional Practice Guide Coaching Tool](#))

School:

Grade Level:

Learning Goal (posted or stated): \_\_\_\_\_

Indicators based on the Instructional Practice Guide (IPG)	Evidence Observed
<p><b>1A. A majority of the lesson is spent listening to, reading, writing, or speaking about text(s).</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Yes - The lesson is focused on a text or multiple texts.</li><li>- No - There is no text under consideration in this lesson.</li></ul>	
<p><b>1B. The text(s) are at or above the complexity level expected for the grade and time in the school year.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Yes - The text(s) are at or above both the qualitative and quantitative complexity expected for the grade and time in the school year.</li><li>- No - The text(s) are below the qualitative and/or quantitative complexity expected for the grade and time in the school year.</li></ul>	<p>Text used: _____ See Appendix: Text Complexity analysis</p>
<p><b>1C. The text(s) exhibit exceptional craft and thought and/or provide useful information.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Yes - The quality of the text(s) is high - they are well written and/or provide useful information.</li><li>- No - The quality of the text(s) is low - they are poorly written or do not provide useful information.</li></ul>	

Indicators based on the Instructional Practice Guide (IPG)	Evidence Observed
<p><i>(To be used only for K-3 Foundational Skills lessons)</i></p> <p><b>1D. Instruction and materials address foundational skills by attending to phonological awareness, concepts of print, letter recognition, phonetic patterns and word structure.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Yes - There is targeted work on foundational skills.</li> <li>- No - There is no targeted work on foundational skills.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>2B. Questions and tasks require students to use evidence from text to demonstrate understanding and to support their ideas about the text.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 2 - Most questions and tasks require students to cite evidence from the text.</li> <li>- 1 - Some questions and tasks require students to cite evidence from the text.</li> <li>- 0 - Few questions and tasks require students to cite evidence from the text.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>2C. Questions and tasks attend to the words (academic vocabulary), phrases, and sentences within the text.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 2 - Vocabulary questions and tasks consistently focus students on the words, phrases, and sentences that matter most and how they are used in the text.</li> <li>- 1 - Vocabulary questions and tasks sometimes focus students on the words that matter most and how they are used in the text.</li> <li>- 0 - Vocabulary questions and tasks rarely focus students on the words that matter most and how they are used in the text.</li> <li>- Not observed</li> </ul>	

Indicators based on the Instructional Practice Guide (IPG)	Evidence Observed
<p><b>2D. Questions are sequenced to build knowledge by guiding students to delve deeper into the text and graphics.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 2 – Most questions are intentionally sequenced to support building knowledge.</li> <li>- 1 – Some questions are intentionally sequenced to support building knowledge.</li> <li>- 0 – Few questions are intentionally sequenced to support building knowledge.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>3B. The teacher expects evidence and precision from students and probes students' answers accordingly.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 2 – Teacher provides many opportunities.</li> <li>- 1 – Teacher provides some opportunities.</li> <li>- 0 – Teacher provides few or no opportunities.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>3D. The teacher demonstrates awareness and appropriate action regarding the variations present in student progress toward reading independently.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 2 – Teacher provides many opportunities.</li> <li>- 1 – Teacher provides some opportunities.</li> <li>- 0 – Teacher provides few or no opportunities.</li> </ul>	

Additional Notes:

--

**Use of Curriculum 2.0 (to be completed post-observation):**

<b><u>Indicator</u></b>	<b><u>Additional Notes</u></b>
<b>Is the text used from MCPS recommended text list?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Yes</li><li>- No</li></ul>	
<b>Does the learning goal align to one provided in Curriculum 2.0?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Yes</li><li>- Somewhat</li><li>- No</li></ul>	
<b>Does the portion of the lesson observed align to an SLT in Curriculum 2.0?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Yes</li><li>- Somewhat</li><li>- No</li></ul>	
<b>Are student-facing materials used by the teacher from Curriculum 2.0 resources? (check all that apply)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Yes, they are directly from Curriculum 2.0.</li><li>- Yes, they are adapted from Curriculum 2.0 resources.</li><li>- Yes, and the teacher is also using supplementary resources.</li><li>- No, the teacher doesn't appear to be using resources from Curriculum 2.0.</li><li>- Unable to determine</li></ul>	

## Text Complexity Analysis

### 1. Quantitative Measure

Use <http://www.lexile.com/> to determine Lexile level. Most texts will have a Lexile, measure in this database.



Use this chart for quick reference:

2-3 band	420-820L
4-5 band	740-1010L
6-8 band	925-1185L
9-10 band	1050-1335L
11-CCR band	1185-1385L

### 2. Qualitative Features

Use the Text Complexity: Qualitative Measures Rubric for [Informational Text](#) or [Literature](#) to provide evidence on each dimension of the qualitative text complexity.

	Meaning/Purpose	Structure
	Language	Knowledge Demands

# Report on Student Work:

## Curriculum 2.0

Montgomery County Public Schools, Maryland

Prepared by:

Student Achievement Partners

# Table of Contents

Methodology and Process.....	Page 1
The Learned Curriculum: Student Work	
- Mathematics.....	Page 2
- ELA/Literacy.....	Page 4
Appendix: Data Collection Tools – Student Work.....	Page 7

# The Learned Curriculum: Student Work

Student work was reviewed in order to better understand the taught curriculum at Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS). This section presents the results of rating student work collected from schools where classroom observations were conducted.

## **Methodology and Process:**

The review of student work was conducted using a modified version of the Student Work Analysis Tool that is part of Student Achievement Partners' Instructional Practice Toolkit ([IPT](#) or "Toolkit"). The Student Work Analysis Tool is designed to help answer the question: "*We think we taught x. What did the students actually learn?*" The Tool was modified to include key questions that were most relevant to the purpose of this review, including adding numeric scales to quantify the data for reporting. Templates for the analysis are included in the appendix of this report ([Mathematics](#) and [ELA/Literacy](#)).

Assignments and related student work samples were collected from the same schools that were observed during the Enacted Curriculum Review. For the mathematics lessons observed, 36 assignments were reviewed by Student Achievement Partners experts for alignment to grade-level topics, as well as alignment to the intended aspect of rigor of the targeted standard. For these 36 assignments, a total of 530 student work samples were rated for mastery. For the ELA/literacy lessons observed, 34 assignments were reviewed by Student Achievement Partners experts for alignment to the targeted standard, as well as for the correct level of text complexity. For these 34 assignments, a total of 455 student work samples were rated for mastery.

## Mathematics

Student assignments were evaluated for their alignment to grade-level topics, as well as alignment to the intended aspect of rigor.

In K-8, 47% of assignments (17 out of 36) were found to be aligned to grade-level topics, and another 36% of assignments (13 out of 36) were found to be somewhat aligned.

### How aligned is the assignment to a grade-level topic?

<u>Grade Band</u>	<u>Frequency of Rating</u>				<b>Total</b>
	<b>0 Not Aligned</b>	<b>1 Slightly Aligned</b>	<b>2 Somewhat Aligned</b>	<b>3 Aligned</b>	
<u>K-2</u>	1	1	5	5	12
<u>3-5</u>	0	1	6	7	14
<u>6-8</u>	0	3	2	5	10
<u>Total</u>	1	5	13	17	36

In K-8, 67% of assignments (24 out of 36) were found to be aligned to the intended aspect of rigor of the targeted standard, and another 11% of assignments (4 out of 36) were found to be somewhat aligned to the correct aspect of rigor.

### Is the assignment aligned to the correct aspect of rigor for the targeted assignment?

<u>Grade Band</u>	<u>Frequency of Rating</u>				<b>Total</b>
	<b>0 Not Aligned</b>	<b>1 Slightly Aligned</b>	<b>2 Somewhat Aligned</b>	<b>3 Aligned</b>	
<u>K-2</u>	1	0	1	10	12
<u>3-5</u>	1	1	3	9	14
<u>6-8</u>	3	2	0	5	10
<u>Total</u>	5	3	4	24	36

Student work was also analyzed for evidence of mastery of the targeted standards. In K-2, 31% of student work samples (38 out of 123) showed full or close to full mastery. In 3-5, 30% of student work samples (54 out of 180) showed full or close to full mastery. In 6-8, 13% of student work samples (30 out of 227) showed full or close to full mastery.

**What does the student work show about the student's mastery of the targeted standard(s)?**

<u>Grade Band</u>	<u>Student Mastery</u>			
	<b>0</b> <i>No Evidence of Mastery</i>	<b>1</b> <i>Little Evidence of Mastery</i>	<b>2</b> <i>Some Evidence of Mastery</i>	<b>3</b> <i>Evidence of Close to or Full Mastery</i>
<u>K-2</u>	22%	22%	25%	31%
<u>3-5</u>	19%	13%	38%	30%
<u>6-8</u>	42%	28%	16%	13%

**ELA/Literacy**

Student assignments were evaluated for their alignment to the targeted standard, as well as the quantitative and qualitative complexity of the text used.

In K-8, 26% of assignments (9 of 34) were found to be aligned to the targeted standard and another 21% of assignments (7 of 34) were found to be somewhat aligned.

**How aligned is the assignment to the targeted standard?**

<u>Grade Band</u>	<u>Frequency of Rating</u>					<u>Total</u>
	<u>0 Not Aligned</u>	<u>1 Slightly Aligned</u>	<u>2 Somewhat Aligned</u>	<u>3 Aligned</u>	<u>Other<sup>1</sup></u>	
<u>K-2</u>	0	5	2	4	2	13
<u>3-5</u>	3	1	2	5	0	11
<u>6-8</u>	3	2	3	0	2	10
<u>Total</u>	6	8	7	9	4	34

Of the texts used in student assignments, in K-2, 50% of texts were found to be quantitatively complex for the grade level (2 out of 4). In 3-5, 56% of texts were found to be quantitatively complex for the grade level (5 out of 9). In 6-8, 0% of texts were found to be quantitatively complex for the grade level (0 out of 1).

**Does the text meet the appropriate level of QUANTITATIVE complexity for the particular grade?**

<u>Grade Band</u>	<u>Frequency of Rating</u>			<u>Total</u>
	<u>No</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Other<sup>2</sup></u>	
<u>K-2</u>	2	2	9	13
<u>3-5</u>	4	5	2	11
<u>6-8</u>	1	0	9	10
<u>Total</u>	7	7	20	34

<sup>1</sup> "Other" includes responses such as "Could Not Be Determined," "N/A," or blank. In these instances, there was no targeted standard identified or the reviewer was unable to evaluate whether the assignment was aligned to the targeted standard.

<sup>2</sup> "Other" includes responses such as "N/A" or "No Related Text." In most instances, there was no related text, so reviewers were unable to evaluate whether the text met the appropriate level of quantitative complexity for the particular grade.

Of the texts used in student assignments, in K-2, 60% of texts were found to be qualitatively complex for the grade level (3 out of 5). In 3-5, 44% of texts were found to be qualitatively complex for the grade level (4 out of 9). In 6-8, 100% of texts were found to be qualitatively complex for the grade level (3 out of 3).

**Does the text meet the appropriate level of QUALITATIVE complexity for the particular grade?**

<u>Grade Band</u>	<u>Frequency of Rating</u>			
	No	Yes	Other <sup>3</sup>	Total
<u>K-2</u>	2	3	8	13
<u>3-5</u>	5	4	2	11
<u>6-8</u>	0	3	7	10
<u>Total</u>	7	10	17	34

Student work was analyzed for evidence of mastery of the targeted standards. In K-2, 25% of student work samples (30 out of 119) showed full or close to full mastery. In 3-5, 18% of student work samples (28 out of 153) showed full or close to full mastery. In 6-8, 3% of student work samples (5 out of 182) showed full or close to full mastery.

**What does the student work show about the student's mastery of the targeted standard(s)?**

<u>Grade Band</u>	<u>Student Mastery</u>				
	0 <i>No Evidence of Mastery</i>	1 <i>Little Evidence of Mastery</i>	2 <i>Some Evidence of Mastery</i>	3 <i>Evidence of Close to or Full Mastery</i>	Other <sup>4</sup>
<u>K-2</u>	7%	28%	40%	25%	0%
<u>3-5</u>	26%	42%	14%	18%	0%
<u>6-8</u>	64%	27%	5%	3%	1%

<sup>3</sup> "Other" includes responses such as "N/A" or "No Related Text." In most instances, there was no related text, so reviewers were unable to evaluate whether the text met the appropriate level of qualitative complexity for the particular grade.

<sup>4</sup> "Other" includes the response of "N/A": The assignment reviewed was different from the class set provided.

Student work was also analyzed to see how it reflected students' comprehension of the text. In K-2, 28% of student work samples (13 out of 47) showed full or close to full mastery. In 3-5, 31% of student work samples (35 out of 114) showed full or close to full mastery. In 6-8, 1% of student work samples (1 out of 72) showed full or close to full mastery.

**What does the student work show about the student's comprehension of the text?**

<u>Grade Band</u>	<u>Student Mastery</u>				
	<b>0 No Evidence of Mastery</b>	<b>1 Little Evidence of Mastery</b>	<b>2 Some Evidence of Mastery</b>	<b>3 Evidence of Close to or Full Mastery</b>	<b>Other<sup>5</sup></b>
<u>K-2</u>	0%	11%	18%	11%	61%
<u>3-5</u>	17%	24%	10%	23%	25%
<u>6-8</u>	21%	18%	0%	1%	61%

<sup>5</sup> "Other" includes responses such as "N/A": The assignment was not designed to evaluate comprehension of specific texts.

## **Appendix: Data Collection Tools**

# MCPS – Student Work Analysis Template – Mathematics

<b>Lesson Information</b>	
Content Area:	
Grade/Course:	
Assignment Title:	

<b>Analyzing the Assignment</b>	
Targeted Standard	
How aligned is the assignment to the targeted standard?	
Is the assignment aligned to the correct aspect of rigor?	

*Rating scale: 3 – Aligned; 2 – Somewhat Aligned; 1 – Slightly Aligned; 0 – Not Aligned*

<b>Analyzing Student Mastery</b>	What does the student work show about the student's mastery of the targeted standard(s)?
Student A	
Student B	
Student C	
Student D	
Student E	
Student F	
Student G	
Student H	
Student I	
(Add more rows as needed)...	

*Rating scale: 3 – Evidence of Close to or Full Mastery; 2 – Some Evidence of Mastery; 1 – Little Evidence of Mastery; 0 – No Evidence of Mastery*

# MCPS – Student Work Analysis Template – ELA/Literacy

<b>Lesson Information</b>	
Content Area:	
Grade/Course:	
Assignment Title:	

<b>Analyzing the Assignment</b>	
Targeted Standard	
How aligned is the assignment to the targeted standard?	
<i>Rating scale: 3 – Aligned; 2 – Somewhat Aligned; 1 – Slightly Aligned; 0 – Not Aligned; Other</i>	
Related Text	
Does the text meet the appropriate level of QUANTITATIVE complexity for the particular grade?	
Does the text meet the appropriate level of QUALITATIVE complexity for the particular grade?	
<i>Rating scale: Yes; No; Other</i>	

<b>Analyzing Student Mastery</b>	What does the student work show about the student's mastery of the targeted standard(s)?
Student A	
Student B	
Student C	
Student D	
Student E	
Student F	
Student G	
Student H	
Student I	
(Add more rows as needed)...	

*Rating scale: 3 – Evidence of Close to or Full Mastery; 2 – Some Evidence of Mastery; 1 – Little Evidence of Mastery; 0 – No Evidence of Mastery; Other*

<b><u>Analyzing Student Mastery</u></b>	<b>What does the student work show about the student's comprehension of the text?</b>
Student A	
Student B	
Student C	
Student D	
Student E	
Student F	
Student G	
Student H	
Student I	
(Add more rows as needed)...	

*Rating scale: 3 - Evidence of Close to or Full Mastery; 2 - Some Evidence of Mastery; 1 - Little Evidence of Mastery; 0 - No Evidence of Mastery; Other*