

TEAM Scores: (Algebra I, March 2026)

Instruction Indicator	Score	Evidence Notes
Standards and Objectives	4	<p>The teacher clearly communicated learning goals at the beginning of the lesson through three posted "I can" statements that were read aloud and aligned to state content standards. The teacher made connections between the learning goals and instruction by referencing objectives at the start of each lesson segment (review, whole group instruction, individual work, and group work) and connected to prior learning from the previous day. Student work and learning activities were consistently aligned with the learning objectives, as evidenced through whole-group work, table-group work, and individual work in lesson packets. The teacher monitored student progress toward mastery through circulation during work time, checkpoints throughout the lesson, and an exit ticket requiring students to list three things they can do now, two real-world applications, and one remaining question.</p>
Motivating Students	4	<p>The teacher demonstrated enthusiasm about the content throughout the lesson and maintained a positive, respectful tone in all student interactions. Content was organized to be personally meaningful through scenarios relative to students, including an end-of-year celebration context and real-life applications (pizza party example, real-world word problems). The teacher valued and encouraged student effort through verbal affirmation ("good job"), one-on-one support during group work, and consistent praise for correct responses. Students were actively engaged in learning conversations about content and worked collaboratively to solve math problems. However, some students remained passive during portions of the lesson, indicating inconsistent engagement across all learners. The teacher valued inquiry and created opportunities for collaborative problem-solving, though engagement strategies were not universally effective for all students.</p>
Presenting Instructional Content	4	<p>The teacher used technology and visual representations effectively, including smart board and iPad projections to display objectives, questions, problems, lesson review, models for slope and y-intercept, and modeled solutions. The teacher clearly demonstrated performance expectations by walking through problems step-by-step and modeling solution processes. A gallery walk activity showcased student work and provided opportunities for peer critique. The lesson was logically sequenced with clear connections between segments. However, instruction relied heavily on oral explanations with limited use of visuals to establish purpose, organize content, or provide internal summaries beyond projected materials.</p>

TEAM Scores: (Algebra I, March 2026)

Lesson Structure and Pacing	5	The lesson had a clearly defined beginning, middle, and end, including an anticipatory set, introduction of new content, whole-group instruction, guided practice, individual work, and group work. Pacing was brisk and the lesson moved seamlessly with clearly defined checkpoints throughout. Each segment was introduced by explicitly connecting it to the relevant "I can" statement, demonstrating alignment between structure and learning goals.
Activities and Materials	3	Activities were challenging and aligned with stated learning goals, requiring students to apply learning to real-world contexts through relevant word problems. The teacher used a variety of high-quality instructional materials including course text, technology (smart board, iPad), manipulatives, whiteboards, colored pencils, and student packets. Activities were logically sequenced and included direct instruction, individual work, and collaborative group work. Students solved assigned math problems for a gallery walk activity that involved critique of work from other groups. However, most activities required students to follow procedures directly modeled by the teacher, emphasizing rote practice rather than exploration, inquiry, or student-generated approaches. While activities built on prior student knowledge and provided real-world applications, there was no evidence that activities provided choice or that they consistently required higher-order cognitive demand beyond application of demonstrated procedures.
Questioning	3	The teacher asked questions with high frequency throughout the lesson, addressing both individual students and the whole class. Questions were regularly sequenced with attention to instructional goals and required active responses. The teacher used a student list to ensure a variety of students had opportunities to respond and clearly stated whether she would call on volunteers or non-volunteers, demonstrating attention to balanced participation. Open-ended questions required students to rely on previously learned content and background knowledge, and there was evidence of students asking one another questions during group work, which supports inquiry. However, the majority of questions were knowledge-level, comprehension, or procedure-based with single correct answers (e.g., "Can someone tell me an ordered pair that would be a solution to this?", "What do we know about the slope on these?"). Wait time was sometimes insufficient and inconsistently provided (not the consistent 3-5 seconds required for Level 4-5). There were limited instances where students were prompted to justify their thinking (e.g., "Why?" or "How do you know?"), and few questions required analysis, evaluation, or synthesis. The gallery walk presented opportunities for higher-level questioning that could have led to further inquiry and self-directed learning, but these opportunities were not fully realized.

TEAM Scores: (Algebra I, March 2026)

Academic Feedback	3	<p>The teacher provided feedback throughout the lesson through multiple channels: whole-group affirmation, individual checks for understanding recorded in notes, one-on-one support during circulation, immediate verbal feedback during the gallery walk, and an exit ticket. The teacher regularly circulated during independent and group work to assess student progress toward mastery and followed up with "why" questions to probe understanding. Students provided feedback to each other during the gallery walk activity, creating opportunities for peer assessment. However, feedback was often general (e.g., "good job," "okay," "great") rather than specific and academically focused. There were few instances where feedback was used to advance student learning beyond affirmation or where the teacher provided guidance on how students could improve their work. While feedback was timely and frequent, it did not consistently meet the Level 4-5 criteria for being academically focused, frequent, and high quality with specific information on how to improve performance.</p>
Grouping Students	3	<p>Students were arranged in groups of four and engaged in collaborative work to solve math problems and participate in the gallery walk activity. Most students participated throughout the lesson, and group boards were used. Students worked and talked in their groups with clear evidence of collaboration, and students assessed one another's work during the gallery walk. The teacher quickly followed up with questioning, group support, or individual support when students were not participating or engaged. However, most instruction occurred in a whole-group format, and there was limited evidence that grouping arrangements were strategic or specifically designed to enhance student understanding and learning efficiency. While students appeared to know their roles and responsibilities during group work, there was limited evidence of varied group composition (e.g., by ability, gender) to accomplish lesson goals or that all students were held accountable for both group work and individual work. There was minimal evidence of students setting goals, reflecting on, or evaluating their learning within the group structure, which is required for Level 5.</p>
Teacher Content Knowledge	4	<p>The teacher displayed accurate and extensive content knowledge of Algebra I concepts without significant errors or confusion. The teacher clearly explained mathematical concepts and standards, highlighted key concepts (inequalities and intercepts) throughout the lesson, and used them as bases to connect other powerful ideas. The teacher explicitly linked each learning moment to the stated objectives and remained focused on key concepts. The teacher provided clarification and information throughout the entire lesson, displayed visuals using technology during instruction, and responded effectively to student questions, demonstrating solid command of content. Occasional</p>

TEAM Scores: (Algebra I, March 2026)

		errors during modeling were used as learning opportunities. The teacher regularly implemented subject-specific instructional strategies (modeling, visual representations, manipulatives) to enhance student content knowledge. However, due to limited higher-order thinking opportunities in some portions of the lesson, there was minimal evidence of connections to deeper concepts or big ideas beyond the stated objectives, which distinguishes Level 5 performance.
Teacher Knowledge of Students	3	The teacher called students by name, used proximity, and provided individual support when struggles with content were observed. The teacher used a variety of instructional strategies (direct instruction, guided practice, collaborative work, manipulatives, technology) so students could access the content and respond to student answers, adjusting instruction when misunderstandings arose. The teacher capitalized on opportunities for movement and engagement through the gallery walk activity, demonstrating awareness of student needs for active learning. However, instruction was primarily whole-group with limited evidence of differentiation of instructional methods or content to ensure all children have the opportunity to master what is being taught. There was little evidence of scaffolding for struggling learners or extensions for advanced students who had already demonstrated mastery. While the teacher demonstrated understanding of some students' anticipated learning difficulties through circulation and individual support, there was minimal evidence that practices regularly incorporated student interests or cultural heritage or that the teacher systematically differentiated to address varied learning needs.
Thinking	3	Students were required to analyze math problems, solve for unknown variables, and apply learning to real-world word problems, which represents analysis and drawing conclusions (Level 3 thinking types). Students were required to clarify their responses and provide explanations and were encouraged to extend their thinking during group work through discussion and group board work. The gallery walk activity required students to solve math problems and critique the previous group's work, which could involve evaluation. However, this portion of the lesson was "teacher-heavy" with the teacher doing most of the talking and cognitive lifting. The activity could have led to student presentations of critiques, possible solutions and revisions, and identification of missteps, but these opportunities were not realized. In other portions of the lesson, students primarily followed steps demonstrated by the teacher with few opportunities to deepen their thinking. There was limited evidence of students generating a variety of ideas or alternatives, analyzing from multiple perspectives, or monitoring their own thinking (Level 4-5 thinking types). Releasing cognitive load to students for them to do the talking and lifting could

TEAM Scores: (Algebra I, March 2026)

		have provided opportunities for creative thinking, evaluation, and research-based thinking.
Problem Solving	3	Students engaged in categorization of different types of math equations (equalities and inequalities), drew conclusions, and demonstrated evidence of predicting outcomes, observing, improving solutions, and justifying solutions during small group work. Small group work was strong, with students working together to solve problems and discuss reasoning. However, tasks emphasized a single method (as modeled by the teacher) to reach the correct answer with no observed opportunities for students to explore multiple strategies. At times, the teacher led students directly to answers without allowing sufficient time for independent thinking, analysis, or prediction. While three or more problem-solving types may have been present (categorization, drawing conclusions/justifying solutions, predicting outcomes), the level of teacher direction versus student independence suggests students were not consistently applying problem-solving types independently (required for Level 4-5). The gallery walk activity presented opportunities that could have addressed more types of problem solving, including student-led presentations, revisions based on peer critique, and exploration of alternative solution methods, but these were not fully implemented.