

## T-TESS Observation Evidence Sheet Middle School (Avid Lesson)

**Domain: Instruction**

Dimension	Evidence	Rating
Achieving Expectations  2.1	<p>The academic expectation was tied to AVID and other life situations. The teacher indicated that the students were “<i>engaging in debate to achieve two things: (1) to make sure that you have thought about, can clarify, and sharpen your beliefs and argue them and support your opinion with evidence from the text and (2) to improve your ability to respect different points of view. To be able to disagree—in college, you’ll be in conversations with some who disagree—disagreeing can be productive if you know how, help you listen and figure out what you want to say.</i>” Most students had the opportunity to share their positions on the automation of jobs, and the teacher restated their reasoning to ensure understanding among the class of each opinion. This, as well as the opportunities to arrive at individual decisions based on their experiences with work, pay, and need provided the opportunity for students to take initiative of their own learning.</p>	<b>Accomplished</b>
Content Knowledge and Expertise  2.2	<p>The teacher conveyed a depth of content knowledge as he lead the students through their reading, including strategy reminders, as well as through their communication and listening by modeling restating and having established the phrase “<i>I hear/see what you are saying</i>” as a method of expanding on what the previous student had stated. Although this expectation was stated, the teacher did, though, paraphrase in many instances. The lesson was connected in real-world experiences as students explained the desperation of some families to make ends meet with the jobs they have, as well as experiences with customer service. The class went on to explore the connections between pay and education and the opportunities some have or do not have for extended education. The restatement of student responses also helped alleviate student misunderstanding. Different types of thinking were used throughout the lesson; students analyzed (choosing a side, deciding why they chose the side they chose), were practical (connections to household budgets, education, pay), created (building arguments and counter-arguments), and used some research (connection to article text).</p>	<b>Accomplished</b>

Dimension	Evidence	Rating
Communication 2.3	<p>The text message voting with post-it notes as a non-tech backup allowed for all students to communicate with the teacher at the beginning of class. Then questions posed to the whole group or for students to explore in pairs extended the open communication. <i>“Before we speak [whole group], turn to a partner and discuss briefly why you chose to sit where you are.” “What has been the most interesting argument you’ve heard so far?”</i> The teacher had established and further modeled listening skills to alleviate misunderstandings during student responses. Communication of expectations, both behavioral and academic, was clear. <i>“I’m going to close voting in about thirty seconds.” “As we read, if you want to chunk the text, you can. I might chunk mine by . . . .” “Do you want me to put up the map of where we move tables? No? Okay, as we move tables, be sure we are careful of everything in the room.”</i> Questions required students to evaluate or analyze. <i>“What are some things you notice?” “Is there somebody on the pro side who would like to challenge [the opinion of the other side]?” “What has been the most interesting argument you’ve heard so far?” “If you changed/didn’t change your mind, why?” “What arguments were the most convincing to keep you there?” “Is anyone more convinced?”</i> Students were not aware that the teacher had assigned a student to collect data regarding interactions. This information proved valuable in having objective data for students to understand the implications for their decisions.</p>	<b>Accomplished</b>
Differentiation 2.4	<p>The lesson was provided one way with the only differentiation hinging on students drawing their own conclusions about the automation of jobs. While the teacher ran the conversations smoothly, there was little monitoring of the quality of the student participation and no feedback about their performance (taking turns sharing an opinion from their “side” of the issue). While the teacher had a student tallying the type of response each student made, he made no connection to that in a way that would improve the rest of the responses during class. Students did have choice in the positions they chose and how they would clarify their responses.</p>	<b>Proficient</b>
Monitor and Adjust 2.5	<p>The teacher responds to student position statements with full restating and even clarification of their points; however, this does not perpetuate notable adjustment to the instruction. Some feedback to students during partner discussion time does get nearer to monitor and adjusting (<i>“Can I call on you to say that later?”</i>), but the teacher does not revisit the student’s response with the whole group. Toward the end of class, there is a slight rumbling from students as the teacher asked about who would speak next. This subsided organically without teacher feedback. While the teacher then encouraged listening even when a student disagreed with what was being said (<i>“I know you guys disagree, but listen . .</i></p>	<b>Proficient</b>

Dimension	Evidence	Rating
	.), the next speaker participated in attention-getting behavior while standing and waiting to continue. The teacher persisted in the same model of instruction (having a student respond, restating their opinion, calling on someone of the opposing side) throughout the lesson with only three instances of peer-to-peer discussion to distinguish from the whole group cycle, and those moments were teacher-directed, not based on observed needs.	

**Domain: Learning Environment**

Dimension	Evidence	Rating
Classroom Environment, Routines and Procedures 3.1	Clear teacher directions/questions support clear and efficient procedures, routines, and transitions. <i>“I’m about to lock the vote. Is anyone having trouble?” “What do we do first?” “Make sure that your pencil or pen is in your hand.” “If you can hear me, clap once. If you can hear me, clap twice.”</i> The class moved into opinion groups in 45 seconds. Later they shared for one minute before resuming whole group presentations. Students passed out article; teacher directed them where to put extras. The classroom provided a safe environment to share opinions and even personal examples (level of education of their parents) without fear of being teased or harassed. The teacher directed the routines, so there was no evidence to support that the systems were effortless on the teacher’s part.	<b>Accomplished</b>
Managing Student Behavior 3.2	The classroom was consistently under control with no outbursts, a managed volume during discussions, and respectful sharing and responding to ideas. There was no indication that students contributed to the creation of the classroom behavior standards, but they did meet an unstated set of expected classroom behavior standards. The teacher did clarify expectations a few points during the lesson. <i>“The first thing I need you to do is make sure your phones are now put away.” “Now let’s see if everyone is in the right place.” “Don’t make things personal; don’t take things personal.” “Whoever I call on next needs to refer to the text.”</i>	<b>Accomplished</b>

Dimension	Evidence	Rating
Classroom Culture 3.3	Allowing the students to vote on the topic for discussion started the class with a connection to student interests which was continued as students voiced their opinions using real-world examples from their own lives to support their arguments. A system of starting an opposing view-point with the phrase “I see/hear what you are saying” has been established prior to this lesson. Though students were opposed to one another in opinion, the discussions were consistently positive between the teacher and students and between the students themselves.	<b>Accomplished</b>