

Emily Trumble

InTASC 2 Reflection

3/2/18

## InTASC 2 Reflection

This lesson was the second day that students in this Academic Math 6 class learned about evaluating expressions. To practice what they learned on the first day, they did a drill that had step by step instructions on it, followed by a game called Around the World where students evaluated different expressions on white boards by substituting in various values. Students then chose a problem they wanted me to remodel for them as a review of order of operations. After a check for understanding, students were put into heterogeneous pairs to do more practice writing and evaluating expressions. Then as a closure they self-reflect and did a GUS (G-guessing, U-unsure, S-sure/confident) version of 4 corners followed by a quick assessment of the objective.

During the game of Around the world, there were quite a few differentiation techniques. The flash cards used during the game had a large written font so that students in the back of the room and those who may have been visually impaired could see them. If students did compete in the game and they lost, they were given the option of communicating quietly with other students to go back to their original seats if they were uncomfortable with sitting in a seat that was not theirs. During implementation, some students did not wish to participate verbally/competitively in Around the World. This was an option given to them as a differentiation; they simply said “pass” and the round would go to the next person who wanted to participate. This did not mean those students were not actively engaged however, because they had a worksheet with the expressions already on it; the expressions were also presented in the order they were in on the worksheet.

The next part of the lesson was heavily differentiated based on previous homework scores, because many students did not do well. There were two types of grouping done during

this portion of the lesson. It started with homogeneous grouping, where students who got a higher homework score, anywhere between a 3 and 5 out of 5, were ushered to one side of the room while students who received a lower score went to the other side of the room. The higher scoring students were put with me, while the lower scoring students were put with my mentor teacher. She did a heavily guided practice with those students. The students who received a higher score were put into prepared heterogeneous pairs where no two students in a partnership got the same score. Then they worked together writing on the desks with dry erase markers to communicate and solve problems as a team. Both the lower and higher scoring groups worked on the same problems about writing and evaluating expressions. While the students with my mentor teacher were talked through the problems together, the students with me worked in groups and then were shown the answers with a quick review of anything they had questions about.

In the lesson plan, the next activity is the creation of a word problem. Unfortunately we did not have enough time for this part of the lesson plan during execution, but if we had there would have been some differentiation. Writing word problems and being creative is easy for some students, and hard for others. Therefore I would have written a few word problems and projected them on the board as a model of what I wanted theirs to look like, as well as giving them the option of simply changing names, actions, and numbers of the ones I had already written if they chose to.

As a closure of evaluating expressions, in reflection for future implementations of this lesson when students get into their corners of G, U, or S this could be homogeneous grouping and students in U or S could ask S students questions they have. It would be wonderful if students from the same group had the answers, but confident students would be able to answer as

well. Overall, this lesson was a fantastic success for students practicing evaluation of expressions and for the teachers in differentiation.