



Common Metrics

Shared evaluation and accountability frameworks allow the public to access information about school quality across the city. Considering there are 86 district-run schools and 37 district-charter schools in Oakland Unified School District (OUSD), this level of transparency is critical to empowering families to make informed decisions on school choice. In addition, the Board of Education will use school performance frameworks to make more data-driven decisions.

Collective Measureable Pupil Outcomes (MPOs)

OUSD's Collective MPOs were developed in partnership with charter leaders from around the city that participated in three working groups during the 2014-15 school year. Collective MPOs still provide autonomy to charter schools to set individual performance thresholds and goals. In addition, it is important to note the Collective MPO content was intentionally aligned with LCAP metrics so that schools would track the types of data mandated by the state.

The Need:

The vast majority of charter schools authorized by OUSD had one or more problems with their MPOs:

- A lack of discrete goals, targets, or instruments: many MPOs listed multiple goals, targets, or instruments. This made evaluating the MPO as "met" or "not met" impossible.
- Not measureable: there was no instrument identified or the instrument identified was no longer used by the school (i.e. portfolios, standards based grading, etc.) or the state (i.e. CSTs).

In light of the transition to the Common Core and the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC), the need to update/revise charters' MPOs became more critical, as many MPOs still referenced the outdated standardized state assessment by name (CST).

Site-specific MPOs

Charter schools can opt to create site-specific MPOs that highlight unique program offerings at their site, which are not captured by the Collective MPOs.

Timeline of events:

- Final Charter Leader Working Group (February 2015)
- Collective MPO Drafts Submitted (April 2015)
- Collective MPO Material Revision Presented to the Board of Education (February 2016)

Potential Partnership Pathways: Common Metrics (2016-17)

- Adopt city-wide school performance framework
- Jointly identify and set minimum performance expectations across all schools
- Establish common assessments



OUSD's Office of Charter Schools Collective MPOs Rationales

Metric	Rationale
SBAC ELA	State renewal criteria.
SBAC Math	State renewal criteria.
Reading or ELA Assessment	Internal formative assessments are crucial to the academic success of any school. In this period of state testing transition they have become even more critical. We focused on reading assessments for two reasons: they are the least likely to change due to the transition to Common Core and are correlated with future academic success (i.e. high school graduation). We realized that it was important to allow flexibility for an ELA assessment in the place of a reading assessment, particularly for high schools where it is not as common practice to administer reading assessments.
EL Reclassification	The California English Language Development Test (CELDT) is given as an initial assessment to newly enrolled students whose primary language is not English and as an annual assessment to English learners enrolled in transitional kindergarten through grade twelve in California public schools. It is used to determine the level of English language proficiency, as well as assess the progress of English Learners (ELs). It is important that ELs receive the targeted support and resources that they need to succeed. Individual student progress tracking (growing/advancing to the next CELDT level) is key to ensuring children are on track to be reclassified. This is why this collective MPO focuses on CELDT level growth each year. It allows for schools to identify students who are not making progress and are at risk for becoming long term English Learners.
Chronic Absence	<p>National and local research clearly show that chronic absence marks a “tipping point” that has an impact on student learning and achievement, with both short-term and long-term consequences. Missing too much kindergarten, for example, affects not only kindergarten early literacy, but also predicts third grade and fifth grade reading levels. The same is true for math.</p> <p>Typically, school systems focus on Average Daily Attendance (ADA) and truancy (unexcused absences). However, ADA can hide deceptively high rates of chronic absenteeism. Oakland research showed that seven schools -- all with 95% ADA -- had chronic absence rates ranging from a low of 5.8% to a high of 17.3%. Likewise, focusing</p>



OFFICE OF CHARTER SCHOOLS

	<p>only on truancy misses those students with excused absences who are missing too much school and whose learning and academic achievement are most likely to suffer.</p> <p>Reducing school-wide chronic absence rates to just 5% or less of enrolled students means that most students are not missing so much school that their academic learning suffers. It also means that the school can provide more targeted resources and supports to increase attendance among this relatively small proportion of chronically absent students.</p>
Cohort Graduation	<p>Most high school students should be able to graduate in four years, with their ninth grade cohort. Thus, the cohort graduation rate is an indication that students are on track throughout their four years of high school. At the same time, we recognize that graduation -- whether with one's cohort or not -- is clearly an important milestone in preparing students for college, career, and life. While reducing cohort dropout rate and retaining students who need more time is important, the cohort graduation rate provides a uniform and state-calculated metric to use across all schools.</p>
Family and Student Survey	<p>Feedback from family and students is critical for continuous school improvement. While we did not require any specific survey or question(s), we did highlight three areas that must be addressed: (1) school safety; (2) academic instruction; (3) voice in school decision-making and/or opportunity for feedback.</p>



K-8 Collective MPOs	
Measurable Pupil Outcome	
1	By the end of the charter term, increase the percent of students scoring level 3 or level 4 on the ELA portion of the SBAC by at least [amount] percent or achieve a level of [amount] percent.
2	By the end of the charter term, for each [statistically significant student group],* increase the percent of students scoring level 3 or level 4 on the ELA portion of the SBAC by at least [amount] percent or achieve a level of [amount] percent.
3	By the end of the charter term, increase the percent of students scoring level 3 or level 4 on the Math portion of the SBAC by at least [amount] percent or achieve a level of [amount] percent.
4	By the end of the charter term, for each [statistically significant student group],* increase the percent of students scoring level 3 or level 4 on the Math portion of the SBAC by at least [amount] percent or achieve a level of [amount] percent.
5	Each year, [amount] percent of students will increase [amount] on the [ELA/reading assessment] or achieve proficiency.
6	Each year, for each [statistically significant student group],* [amount] percent of students will increase [amount] on the [ELA/reading assessment] or achieve proficiency.
7	Each year, [amount] percent of ELs will improve one overall proficiency level on CELDT.
8	Each year, have less than [amount] percent of students absent more than 10% of the school days (chronic absence).
9	Each year, for each [statistically significant student group],* have less than [amount] percent of students absent more than 10% of the school days (chronic absence).
10	Each year, at least [amount] percent of students and families positively rate school safety/culture: [fill in the student survey question] and [fill in the family survey question].
11	Each year, at least [amount] percent of students and families positively rate academic instruction: [fill in the student survey question] and [fill in the family survey question].
12	Each year, at least [amount] percent of students and families positively rate their voice in school decision-making and/or opportunity for feedback: [fill in the student survey question] and [fill in the family survey question].

* Subgroups: American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Pacific Islander, Filipino, Hispanic or Latino, African American, White, Two or More Races, ELLs, Foster Students, LI, Special Education.



High School Collective MPOs	
Measurable Pupil Outcome	
1	By the end of the charter term, increase the percent of students scoring level 3 or level 4 on the ELA portion of the SBAC by at least [amount] percent or achieve a level of [amount] percent.
2	By the end of the charter term, for each [statistically significant student group],* increase the percent of students scoring level 3 or level 4 on the ELA portion of the SBAC by at least [amount] percent or achieve a level of [amount] percent.
3	By the end of the charter term, increase the percent of students scoring level 3 or level 4 on the Math portion of the SBAC by at least [amount] percent or achieve a level of [amount] percent.
4	By the end of the charter term, for each [statistically significant student group],* increase the percent of students scoring level 3 or level 4 on the Math portion of the SBAC by at least [amount] percent or achieve a level of [amount] percent.
5	Each year, [amount] percent of students will increase [amount] on the [ELA/reading assessment] or achieve proficiency.
6	Each year, for each [statistically significant student group],* [amount] percent of students will increase [amount] on the [ELA/reading assessment] or achieve proficiency.
7	Each year, [amount] percent of ELs will improve one overall proficiency level on CELDT.
8	Each year, have less than [amount] percent of students absent more than 10% of the school days (chronic absence).
9	Each year, for each [statistically significant student group],* have less than [amount] percent of students absent more than 10% of the school days (chronic absence).
10	Each year, achieve a High School cohort graduation rate of at least [amount].
11	Each year, for each [statistically significant student group],* achieve a High School cohort graduation rate of at least [amount].
12	Each year, at least [amount] percent of students and families positively rate school safety/culture: [fill in the student survey question] and [fill in the family survey question].
13	Each year, at least [amount] percent of students and families positively rate academic instruction: [fill in the student survey question] and [fill in the family survey question].
14	Each year, at least [amount] percent of students and families positively rate their voice in school decision-making and/or opportunity for feedback: [fill in the student survey question] and [fill in the family survey question].

* Subgroups: American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Pacific Islander, Filipino, Hispanic or Latino, African American, White, Two or More Races, ELLs, Foster Students, LI, Special Education.



OUSD Office of Charter Schools Teaching Effectiveness Framework

Background

Throughout the 2013-2014 school year we diligently recorded the focus areas in which each school chose to be evaluated during their Annual Site Visit classroom observations. We have consolidated these focus areas into 14 discrete indicators. Our office has worked with charter leaders to align these indicators with OUSD's and Aspire's Framework for Effective Teaching, that are both based on Charlotte Danielson's *Framework for Teaching*.

Charlotte Danielson's *Framework* is a "research-based set of components of instruction, aligned to the INTASC standards, and grounded in a constructivist view of learning and teaching."¹ The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation has funded research into the effectiveness of teacher evaluation through MET - Measures of Effective Teaching. MET is a "research partnership of academics, teachers, and education organizations committed to investigating better ways to identify and develop effective teaching."² Over three years, and with the help of more than 3,000 teacher volunteers, MET's findings have proven the validity of the *Framework for Teaching*.

Annual Site Visits

The Annual Site Visits will follow the same protocol used since 2013. Each site leader will select two to three teachers (depending on the school's size) of varying skill levels. They will then choose two indicators, now specifically from the rubric, that will be observed and data collected across all of the identified classrooms. Each observation will be approximately ten (10) minutes per classroom. The annual site visit report will provide the scripted observation data, as well as a score on the identified indicators.

Renewal Site Visits

For Renewal Site Visits, each teacher will be observed on the indicators (2A.1, 2C.1, 2C.2, 2D.1, 3B.2, and 3C.2) that correspond to our renewal criteria standards 1.3 and 1.5. We will spend approximately 10-15 minutes observing each teacher.

Indicators	
2A.1	Facilitating Positive Interactions
2C.1	Managing Behavioral Expectations
2C.2	Response to Behavior
2D.1	Using Resources to Support Instruction
3B.2	Academic Discourse
3C.2	Building Engaging & Challenging Learning Experiences

¹ "Danielson Group » The Framework." Danielson Group The Framework Comments. Web. 12 July 2014.

² "Ensuring Fair and Reliable Measures of Effective Teaching: Culminating Findings from the MET Project's Three-Year Study." Measures of Effective Teaching. MET. Web. 14 July 2014.

OCS Teacher Effectiveness Rubric (OTEF)

The OCS Teacher Effectiveness Framework was derived from the OUSD Effective Teaching Framework, the Aspire TCRP Teacher Effectiveness Rubric, and Green Dot TCRP Teacher Evaluation Rubric. It will be used as an evaluation framework for Annual Site Visits and Renewal Site Visits by the Office of Charter Schools staff when conducting classroom observations. All of the indicators are outlined in the chart below and the rubric levels of practice are further described on the subsequent pages of this document.

Domain 2: Classroom Environment			
2A Promoting an Environment of Respect & Rapport	2B Establishing a Culture for Learning	2C Managing Behavioral Expectations and Routines	2D Organizing Physical Space and Resources
2A.1 Facilitating Positive Interactions	2B.1 Communicating High Expectations for Students	2C.1 Managing Behavioral Expectations 2C.2 Response to Behavior 2C.3 Managing Classroom Routines	2D.1 Using Resources to Support Instruction
Domain 3: Teaching and Learning			
3A Communicating with Students	3B Questioning and Discussion Techniques	3C Engaging & Supporting All Learners	3D Monitoring Student Understanding
3A.1 Explaining Learning Targets 3A.2 Connecting Prior and Future Learning 3A.3 Articulating Criteria for Demonstrating Mastery	3B.1 Questioning 3B.2 Academic Discourse	3C.1 Facilitating a Successful Lesson Cycle 3C.2 Building Engaging & Challenging Learning Experiences 3C.3 Ensuring Equitable Access 3C.4 Using Instructional Grouping to Maximize Learning	3D.1 Checking for Understanding 3D.2 Providing Feedback to Enhance Learning 3D.3 Providing Students with Opportunities for Self Monitoring

Domain 2: Classroom Environment

Standard: 2A Promoting an Environment of Respect & Rapport

CSTP Alignment: Element 2.1 Promoting social development and responsibility within a caring community where each student is treated fairly and respectfully

Indicators	Beginning	Developing	<i>"Exceeding" = meeting all criteria in both Proficient and Exceeding</i>	
			Proficient	Exceeding
2A.1 Facilitating Positive Interactions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teacher/student and student/student interactions are not respectful. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teacher/student and student/student interactions are generally respectful. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teacher/student and student/student interactions convey respect and caring. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teacher/student and student/student interactions demonstrate a high regard and respect for one another reflecting genuine respect, caring and warmth.

Standard: 2B Establishing a Culture For Learning

CSTP Alignment: Element 2.4 Creating a rigorous learning environment with high expectations and appropriate support for all students

Indicators	Beginning	Developing	<i>"Exceeding" = meeting all criteria in both Proficient and Exceeding</i>	
			Proficient	Exceeding
2B.1 Communicating High Expectations for Students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The teacher's words and actions provide little or no encouragement for student effort or convey low expectations for student ability. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The teacher's words and actions emphasize compliance and completion of work. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The teacher's words and actions communicate a belief in student ability and high expectations for student learning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The teacher's words and actions communicate a belief in effort-based learning and the belief that ALL students can achieve at high levels.

OCS Teacher Effectiveness Rubric (OTEF)

Standard: 2C Managing Behavioral Expectations and Routines

Alignment: Element 2.6: Employing classroom routines, procedures, norms, and supports for positive behavior to ensure a climate in which all students can learn.

Indicators	Beginning	Developing	<i>"Exceeding" = meeting all criteria in both Proficient and Exceeding</i>	
			Proficient	Exceeding
2C.1 Managing Behavioral Expectations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is limited evidence that the teacher has reinforced the school's standards of conduct for students. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The teacher's efforts to reinforce the school's standards of conduct are inconsistent. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The teacher supports the school's standards of conduct so that students understand and are held to the same high standards. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The teacher and students actively support the school's standards of conduct; students accept responsibility for their conduct.
2C.2 Response to Behavior	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student behavior is inappropriate; and/or, the teacher does not respond to misbehavior or the response is repressive or disrespectful of student dignity and/or fails to positively recognize students' good behavior. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student infractions of the rules are minor; and/or, the teacher's response to student misbehavior is administered to the whole class and emphasizes consequences over positive reinforcement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student behavior is appropriate; the teacher's response to student misbehavior is proactive and includes student specific redirection, feedback and positive reinforcement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student behavior is appropriate and students and the teacher provide positive reinforcement, or the teacher's response to student misbehavior is proactive and sensitive to students' individual needs. Students respond to each other's inappropriate behavior and redirect each other.
2C.3 Managing Classroom Routines	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The teacher has not established or does not enforce routines and procedures, resulting in chaotic transitions and/or loss of learning time. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The teacher has established some routines and procedures, however inconsistent implementation results in some loss of instructional time. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The teacher has established and enforces routines and procedures; transitions result in little loss of instructional time. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The teacher and students have established and enforce routines and procedures that operate seamlessly and efficiently; transitions result in no loss of instructional time.

Standard: 2D Organizing Physical Space and Resources to Support Students

CSTP Alignment: Element 2.2 Creating physical or virtual learning environments that promote student learning, reflect diversity, and encourage constructive and productive interactions among students

Indicators	Beginning	Developing	<i>"Exceeding" = meeting all criteria in both Proficient and Exceeding</i>	
			Proficient	Exceeding
2D.1 Using Resources to Support Instruction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resources and instructional materials are unsuitable to the lesson objectives, distract from or interfere with student learning, and / or do not promote cognitive engagement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resources and instructional materials are partially suitable to the lesson objectives. Resources and materials only partially promote cognitive engagement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resources and instructional materials are suitable to the lesson objectives, support attainment of the learning objective, and promote cognitive engagement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resources and instructional materials are suitable to the lesson objectives, support student attainment of learning objectives, and require cognitive engagement. Students choose, adapt or create materials to extend learning.

OCS Teacher Effectiveness Rubric (OTEF)

Domain 3 - Teaching and Learning

Standard: 3A Establishing Purpose for Learning

Indicators	Beginning	Developing	<i>"Exceeding" = meeting all criteria in both Proficient and Exceeding</i>	
			Proficient	Exceeding
3A.1 Explaining Learning Targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The learning target is not provided, and/or the teacher does not explain the learning target. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The teacher states the learning target, but does not refer back to it within the lesson. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The teacher strategically shares learning targets with students at the appropriate time (e.g., at the beginning of a lesson, or after a "hook," mystery experience, or discovery period) and refers to it within the lesson. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The teacher invites students to collaboratively generate learning targets. The teacher ensures that students can articulate what they are learning
3A.2 Connecting Prior and Future Learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The teacher makes limited connections to students' prior learning and future learning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The teacher may connect learning to task or object but connection to prior learning, big ideas, and essential questions/unit goals is vague. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The teacher situates lesson within broader learning creating connection to students' prior knowledge, discipline's big ideas, essential questions/unit goals and real-life applications, with an emphasis on college and career readiness. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The teacher provides students with opportunities to make personal connections to new content and establish their own authentic purpose for learning.
3A.3 Articulating Criteria for Demonstrating Mastery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The teacher does not articulate the criteria for successfully demonstrating mastery of the learning targets. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The teacher mentions, but does not clearly explain, the criteria for successfully demonstrating mastery of the learning targets. Exemplars and models may not be provided. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The teacher clearly articulates the criteria for successfully demonstrating mastery of the learning targets and provides models/exemplars. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The teacher collaborates with students to develop the criteria for demonstrating mastery and uses student exemplars to model mastery.

OCS Teacher Effectiveness Rubric (OTEF)

Standard: 3B Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques

CSTP Alignment: Element 1.5 Promoting critical thinking through inquiry, problem solving, and reflection (3b)

Indicators	Beginning	Developing	<i>"Exceeding" = meeting all criteria in both Proficient and Exceeding</i>	
			Proficient	Exceeding
3B.1 Questioning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The teacher poses low-level, rote recall questions that require little cognitive challenge. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The teacher poses scaffolded questions that do not move students toward mastery of the learning objectives. The teacher poses a combination of low and mid-level questions that require inconsistent levels of cognitive challenge. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The teacher poses scaffolded questions that move student thinking towards mastery of the learning objective. Teacher requires students to fully answer questions and uses probing questions to extend students' ideas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students pose questions that require consistent cognitive challenge. Students respond to questions in a way that engages one another and respond to questions without prompting from the teacher. Students initiate questions to further their understanding of the content.
3B.2 Academic Discourse	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conversations in whole and small group settings are moderated by the teacher and elicit little academic discourse (e.g., content vocabulary, scholarly language, or students justifying, explaining, or defending their answer) among students. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> During conversations in whole and small group settings, discussion is facilitated by the teacher, and academic discourse among students is inconsistent and/or students inconsistently use content vocabulary, justification, explanation, or defense of their answers. Discourse may also be limited to a small number of students. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conversations in whole and small group settings are facilitated by the teacher and involve students in consistent levels of academic discourse; students display some, but not all of the following: initiating and talking about an academic idea, using academic vocabulary, supporting ideas with evidence, referencing text, etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conversations are facilitated by students. Students talk without prompting about an academic idea, using academic vocabulary and support ideas with evidence.

OCS Teacher Effectiveness Rubric (OTEF)

Standard: 3C Supporting All Learners

CSTP Alignment: Element 2.7 & Element 1.3 Using instructional time to optimize learning and engage students in learning & Connecting subject matter to meaningful, real-life contexts

Indicators	Beginning	Developing	"Exceeding" = meeting all criteria in both Proficient and Exceeding	
			Proficient	Exceeding
3C.1 Facilitating a Successful Lesson Cycle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The teacher's pacing of the lesson is too slow or rushed and tasks are not sequenced to build students' depth of understanding. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The teacher's pacing of the lesson is partially appropriate, and/or tasks are partially sequenced to build students' depth of understanding. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The teacher's lesson structure and pacing are developmentally appropriate and tasks are sequenced to build students' depth of understanding. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tasks are sequenced not only to build students' depth of understanding, but also to require student reflection and synthesis of the learning.
3C.2 Building Engaging & Challenging Learning Experiences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tasks and/or text require only rote responses, do not result in active engagement and do not challenge student thinking. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The teacher selects tasks, text, and materials that require little active engagement, minimally challenge student thinking and result in inconsistent student engagement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The teacher selects tasks, text, and materials that are complex, challenge student thinking and result in active engagement for most students. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The teacher selects tasks, text, and materials that challenge all students and promote student engagement and mastery through inquiry and choice.
3C.3 Ensuring Equitable Access	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The teacher does not differentiate learning experiences. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The teacher may differentiate learning experiences but inconsistently applies strategies to address historically underserved student groups (ELL, AAM, PEC, etc.). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The teacher differentiates learning experiences, incorporating scaffolds, instructional strategies and supports with a focus on ensuring access for historically underserved student groups (ELL, AAM, PEC, etc.). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The teacher differentiates learning experiences, incorporating scaffolds, strategies and supports to ensure that every student has equitable access to the curriculum.
3C.4 Using Instructional Grouping to Maximize Learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a mismatch between the grouping structure and instructional objective/student needs. Teacher does not hold students accountable for individual/group work. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Instructional grouping arrangements are partially successful in maximizing student learning (i.e. structure, roles, duration). The teacher may not hold students accountable for individual/group work. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Instructional grouping arrangements maximize student learning (i.e. structure, role, duration, etc.). Teacher holds students accountable for individual and group work. Every student has a clear role and/or a responsibility for producing something that shows his or her thinking. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The teacher provides structures for students to flexibly group themselves during the lesson to meet individual student needs. The teacher enables students to rely on each other to work through challenging activities and hold themselves and each other accountable.

OCS Teacher Effectiveness Rubric (OTEF)

Standard: 3D Monitoring Student Understanding

CSTP Alignment: Element 5.4 Using assessment data to establish learning goals and to plan, differentiate, and modify instruction.

Indicators	Beginning	Developing	<i>"Exceeding" = meeting all criteria in both Proficient and Exceeding</i>	
			Proficient	Exceeding
3D.1 Checking for Understanding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The teacher does not check for understanding and does not make adjustments to instruction based on the data. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The teacher makes limited checks for understanding during the lesson and/or inconsistently uses data to make adjustments to instruction. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The teacher makes varied checks for understanding (e.g. questioning techniques, 1-1 conferences, hand-signals, white-boards, exit tickets, etc.) during the lesson and makes adjustments to instruction based on the data to address student learning needs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The teacher fully integrates checks for understanding into instruction, monitoring progress for all students throughout the lesson. The teacher confers 1-1 with students about their learning.
3D.2 Providing Feedback to Enhance Learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The teacher does not provide feedback to students or provides feedback that focuses on compliance or completion of work. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The teacher inconsistently provides feedback to students throughout the lesson OR feedback is general and does not advance students towards mastery of the learning objective. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The teacher provides feedback throughout the lesson that is specific, timely and advances students towards mastery of the learning objective. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The teacher enables students to provide feedback for one another to advance them towards mastery of the learning objective.
3D.3 Providing Students with Opportunities for Self-Monitoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The teacher does not provide students with opportunities to monitor their progress against criteria for mastery. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The teacher provides students with few opportunities for monitoring progress and/or doesn't connect it to criteria for mastery. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The teacher provides students with opportunities to monitor the progress of their work against the criteria for mastery and provides guidance in determining the appropriate next steps for the student to advance their own learning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The teacher enables students to engage in ongoing monitoring of their work against the criteria for mastery and in establishing the next steps for advancing their own learning.

SAVE THE DATE

LAUSD & OUSD Blended Learning Collaboration PD

OUSD's Office of Charter Schools will be hosting the LAUSD & OUSD Blended Learning Collaboration Professional Development (PD) on October 13th-14th from 9am-4pm. The purpose of the interactive Blended Learning PD is to introduce blended learning to schools interested in implementation, identify best practices and pitfalls based on research, identify clear next steps to establish blended learning at each school site, and develop a support plan to ensure successful and effective implementation.

To participate in the PD, complete [this sign-up form](#) by September 30, 2016. Please note space is limited and reservations will be granted on a first come first serve basis. Selected participants will receive an invitation, which will include the meeting location and other details about the event. Breakfast and lunch will be provided.

Please read below for a short biography on the PD facilitator, Stepan Mekhitarian.

Stepan Mekhitarian has been passionate about instructional technology for over a decade of public education service. He completed his doctorate on the skills and training needed to effectively implement blended learning and currently serves as the Blended Learning and Data Coordinator at Los Angeles Unified School District. He has experience in a charter management organization as well as in a traditional school district and holds degrees from UCLA, Harvard, and Loyola Marymount University. In his spare time, he enjoys international travel and racing on track days.

