

T-TESS Observation Evidence Sheet

3rd Grade Math Intervention

Domain: Instruction

Dimension	Evidence	Rating
<p>Achieving Expectations 2.1</p>	<p>The teacher displayed the learning objective on sentence strips on the board. She read the objective orally to the students. The day’s objective was stated as follows, “We will solve word problems using the operations multiplication and division. We will use manipulatives, charts and tools to solve math equations.”</p> <p>The teacher set academic expectations that challenge some students. Most students required prompting and clarification throughout the completion of the graphic organizer problem solving sheet – everyone completed it together step-by-step. The teacher allowed students to write on their desks using dry erase marker and use manipulatives to represent their work in multiple ways.</p> <p>The teacher did attempt to indirectly address student mistakes. For example, she stated, “Oh...Robert...how come you made eight groups when the girls made seven groups? You can’t forget Max. Now...how many groups?” Robert repeated his answer that there should be eight groups. No direct correction or connection was made to the other students (girls) who had written it incorrectly. Rather, Robert’s correct answer was reinforced.</p> <p>Limited initiative was provided for students to take initiative of their own learning other than through the use of their manipulatives. The teacher worked through the word problem together as a small group step by step.</p>	<p>Developing</p>
<p>Content Knowledge and Expertise 2.2</p>	<p>In most instances, the displayed accurate content knowledge of the math TEKS but no connections were made to other contexts or disciplines as this was an isolated intervention using small group instruction. Teacher gave confusing information regarding 6 groups or 4 groups at the beginning of the lesson and students then used manipulatives to demonstrate the groups with that incorrect information. Questions that were asked were remember/understand level. Examples include: “Can you show me with manipulatives how you would solve that?” “Why would you make 4 groups of 6?” “Draw what you made and explain to me what you did.” “How could we prove that?” “What does 4 represent in the word problem?” “What would our repeated addition problem look like?”</p>	<p>Developing</p>

Dimension	Evidence	Rating
	<p>The teacher set the objective; students had manipulatives to work the problem. Students demonstrated the multiplication equations. The teacher reviewed with students the commutative property, connected it to fact families, and then back again to the objective of using both multiplication and division to solve problems, including vocabulary related to division. The 100's charts were available for students who needed the supplemental resource.</p> <p>The teacher also allowed students to represent and solve the problem. One student drew a picture to represent the operation and solution. Another student was selected to demonstrate the number sentence (equation). In the division problem, the teacher asked about the special words tied to the parts of the division equation. The student named the dividend, divisor and quotient; the teacher wrote and repeated the terms and the student also repeated the words.</p> <p>There was a brief reference to the prior day's lesson but this was toward the end of the intervention group time. The teacher stated, "I'm going to remind you today, so you can remember what we touched on yesterday. Dividends....Divisor and Quotient....We need to remember our vocabulary, correct? Excellent." Some students responded during that brief Q & A.</p> <p>The teacher did allow students to represent and solve the problem in multiple ways. One student drew a picture to represent the operation and solution. Another student was selected to demonstrate the number sentence (equation) on the board – different types of thinking were used to solve the problems.</p>	
Communication 2.3	<p>The teacher read the objective; the students and teacher chorally read the story problems. Students were called upon to further explain to the teacher and group.</p> <p>The teacher established a setting which allowed students to interact with her in an effective way – small groups of 4 students. Students had little communication with their peers – communication was mainly two-way between the teacher and her students. The lesson was an attempt to clarify previous misunderstandings or gaps in content. Verbal communication was clear but mainly remember and understand level questions were used which promoted little deep discussion or extension.</p> <p>For example, "What do the circles represent from our word problem?...What do we need to find out....How come you have 6 groups?"</p>	Developing

Dimension	Evidence	Rating
	<p>Two students were asked to go to the Promethean board to demonstrate and explain their thinking and problem solving method. Throughout the lesson, the teacher said, "Show me." The teacher asked questions – for example, "Can you prove to me that it's 24?" "What does 4 represent?" The teacher waited for students to answer</p>	
<p>Differentiation 2.4</p>	<p>The teacher adapted the lesson to address the needs of the 4 students in the small group. All students were pulled for additional content instruction. Differentiated methods were used in a limited way through the use of different manipulatives – students were able to show their work in different ways. The students were also allowed to write on their table with markers to assist them in assigning groups – all students had the same outcome – the completion of the same word problem. The teacher did monitor the quality of student participation during the class time (there were only 4 students in the group) but did not have a formal way of ensuring that each student actively participated equally and mastered the content being taught.</p>	<p>Developing</p>
<p>Monitor and Adjust 2.5</p>	<p>Students were asked to record and show their work on the graphic organizer. Two additional students were also asked to show their work on the board. Checks for understanding were made throughout the period through the use of teacher-led Q & A. However, a large number of questions were leading questions...for example – "Do you agree? Yes? Okay." Students responded in isolation but were not required to demonstrate mastery nor did they all respond to the questions as they were asked.</p> <p>The teacher informally assessed student understanding through question and answer (whole group and individually) throughout the intervention time. Since this was a small group of 4 students, all students worked at a table with the teacher to individually complete the steps – at the same time. The teacher monitored the progress of students throughout the time while asking additional questions and providing feedback throughout. Examples included, "What do we know? Can you show me how using your manipulatives?"</p> <p>The teacher did demonstrate multiple steps on the board to further clarify learning and identify what each number represented from the word problem. However, limited instances were observed in which instruction was modified based on student input or feedback.</p>	<p>Proficient</p>

Domain: Learning Environment

Dimension	Evidence	Rating
<p>Classroom Environment, Routines and Procedures 3.1</p>	<p>Students knew the expectations in working in the small group with the teacher and followed her directions. The students used a problem solving graphic organizer to solve a word problem that they read together orally as a class. The students had their own individual copies and there was also one on the board for the students to refer to during the activity and whole group discussion.</p> <p>Students participated in the small group individual instruction with limited prompting and redirection from the teacher. The classroom seemed safe based on the visuals on the walls, clear instructions given and the observed courteous interactions between the teacher and the students – for example, “Love that....Excellent....thank you.” The students responded to the teacher’s directions and promptly organized materials at the end of the lesson (i.e., the management of supplies and materials – put manipulatives away, placing their sheets in their folders, etc.) with the teacher’s specific directions. The students did not do this on their own.</p> <p>It was evident that the students were familiar with the use of the electronic white board.</p> <p>The teacher ended the intervention time with a connection back to the learning objective and asked the students a series of questions as follows:</p> <p>“Did we do this today? Yes? How did we do this? Is the answer 1 or 2 to solve a 2 step problem?</p> <p>Did we use manipulatives?</p> <p>Did we use charts?</p> <p>Did we solve our math equations?</p> <p>Did we use tools?”</p> <p>All questions were yes/no questions which required limited student responses, although the questions do demonstrate a procedure to end the intervention time and show an example of a brief classroom closing activity.</p>	<p>Proficient</p>
<p>Managing Student Behavior 3.2</p>	<p>Students were well behaved and followed the clear routines and procedures with limited redirection. Several reminders had to be given for off task behavior - “I want everyone to stop real quick...show me using your manipulatives....Robert, what are you making with yours? Robert responded – “cookies.” Another reminder had to be given to students to listen while students were at</p>	<p>Proficient</p>

Dimension	Evidence	Rating
	<p>the board. However, no significant off-task behavior was noted that disrupted learning.</p> <p>The teacher managed behavior using clearly established guidelines and students were generally compliant. Evidence of a behavior system is in place as students followed directions and were generally respectful to the teacher and each other.</p>	
<p>Classroom Culture 3.3</p>	<p>Students participated in completing the word problem and followed the teacher's directions. The teacher repeatedly smiled at students, and responded with positive reinforcement – for example, “Yes, that is right- good!” Or in another example, “Very nice; I love that. Can you explain it?” Students smiled, shared their answers, and openly explained how they solved the problem to their teacher – in front of the peers in the small group.</p> <p>She also encouraged students to help one another during the guided practice.</p> <p>The students were engaged in meaningful learning and were able to connect the learning to their knowledge of commutative property, multiplication, division and fact families. The students worked cooperatively and were respectful to one another. The teacher smiled continually and interacted respectfully with the students.</p>	<p>Proficient</p>