

T-TESS Observation Evidence Sheet 2nd Grade ELA (Making Predictions)

Domain: Instruction

Dimension	Evidence	Rating
Achieving Expectations	<p>The lesson’s objectives were not articulated to the students, and the focus of the lesson was not clear. Therefore, there was not clear evidence that the majority of the students mastered the lesson’s objectives. Rather than provide students a preview of the lesson’s objective and engage the students in the lesson, the teacher began by immediately asking questions, i.e., “Who can tell me the title? Who in the story goes grrrr grrrr?” She then moved to a review of vocabulary words, stating, “I tricked you a lot yesterday. Let’s see if I can trick you today.” Students were asked to identify vocabulary terms based on the cues and descriptions provided by the teacher. Content was presented using visuals. However, these visuals did not depict the organization of the lesson. The teacher did not model her expectations for partner reading, and therefore many of the students did not participate. Since the objectives were not clear, the activities and materials offered little support. Although students were provided limited opportunity to take initiative for their own learning in small groups, the reading lesson and the vocabulary activity did not sustain the students’ attention, and few students were involved and challenged.</p>	Improvement Needed
Content Knowledge and Expertise	<p>Because the teacher did not convey the standards and objectives for the lesson, the teacher displayed under-developed content knowledge, as her lesson progressed in a disconnected way. She began with knowledge/remember level questions and then proceeded to vocabulary work. She then moved to reading the text and ended with checking their predictions. Teacher displayed adequate knowledge, but did not teach according to best practices in ELA. (ex: lacked differentiated instruction, active involvement, choice in activities).</p> <p>Students were asked to check their predictions. However, the predictions were pre-recorded on chart paper before the lesson began. One is left to wonder who made the predictions, the teacher or the students. Occasionally, the students were encouraged to justify their answers. The lesson was not connected to other disciplines.</p>	Developing

Dimension	Evidence	Rating
Communication	<p>The level of questioning and activities did not elicit a wide variety of thinking skills and focused mostly on remember and understand. There was no evidence that the students had to create, design, or analyze during this lesson. There were very few opportunities for students to generate ideas and alternatives, or use different types of thinking. Little wait time was given. The teacher would often ask a question and if the student did not answer immediately, she would follow-up with a different question. The questions were not sequenced to the lesson's objectives.</p> <p>There was no evidence of multimedia and technology use in the lesson. There was some opportunity for student-to-student interactions during the partner reading activity. The prediction activity was relevant to the objectives and required some student participation and thought.</p> <p>Much of the feedback was behavior related ("shh", "take your finger out of your mouth..."). There were a few examples where the teacher provided academic feedback. "That's good, you're thinking of two definitions."</p>	Improvement Needed
Differentiation	<p>Although there was evidence of large and small group activities, the grouping did not enhance student learning. Students did not understand their roles for the task. Many students were not on task during the partner reading. The teacher displayed minimal knowledge of students' anticipated learning difficulties. The text was difficult for most students impacting participation and performance. She did not differentiate instruction to address individual student needs.</p>	Improvement Needed
Monitor and Adjust	<p>The lesson had some structure but was missing both a preview of the lesson and a closing. Students became bored while the teacher assisted struggling students. The lesson's time frames depict issues with pacing during the vocabulary lesson, since this was a review from the prior day. The students spent very little time actually reading the text and discussing the objectives for the lesson. Pacing was not adjusted based on students' individual needs. The teacher circulated during the lesson and offered assistance and support to struggling students. Students provided feedback to the teacher that the lesson was 'too fast' the day before. She responded with, "I'll go slower today."</p>	Improvement Needed

Domain: Learning Environment

Dimension	Evidence	Rating
Classroom Environment, Routines and Procedures	Students raised their hands throughout the lesson as cues to provide responses to the teacher. Students waited on teacher responses and cues to determine the next steps in the lesson sequence. The classroom procedures and routines were teacher-directed, including calling on students to respond to questions, asking students to walk to the front of the room to answer responses on the white board, etc.	Developing
Managing Student Behavior	There was limited evidence that the content was personally meaningful to students. Students were allowed to check predictions at the end of the lesson. However, very few students appeared to be actually reading the material. The teacher did reward student effort with praise. The teacher used verbal cues such as “Read the next paragraph, then put your finger on your mouth. Read the second paragraph, then put your finger on your mouth.” She used the “shhhh” verbal and physical cues throughout the lesson, rather than varying teaching strategies to keep the students on task and motivated. A clear and consistent behavior management system was not evident or communicated, but no significant behavior issues were noted. Students were in and out of their seats during the lesson and not always focusing on the teacher or student who was responding.	Developing
Classroom Culture	There was no evidence that the content was personally meaningful to students. Students were allowed to check predictions at the end of the lesson. However, very few students appeared to be actually reading the material. The teacher did reward student effort with praise and simply proceeded with the lesson when students responded to questions or instructional directives.	Developing