

Mr. Leede and I conferenced to discuss (1) his Mathematics lesson which I observed on January 29, 1981, 12:30 - 1:12 and (2) my recommendation that he teach the prescribed 6th grade mathematics curriculum instead of the 8th grade Algebra curriculum from Leota Junior High School.

(1) His Mathematics lesson consisted of his explaining that everyone was to work quietly on a "school-related activity". During the 42 minute period of observation some students were observed talking to Mr. Leede, some reading a ski magazine, "doodling", writing a classroom newspaper article, working on a spelling assignment, and some talking to each other. He reminded the class to quiet down four times (with an ultimatum comment on the third time) and directed comments to particular students three times. During our discussion of this lesson, Mr. Leede said that he didn't care what the students were doing during this Math. time - that he offered the time for those who wished to use it and that if students talked about "who-likes-who" - recess-type personal things that he wants them to do so without bothering anyone else. I suggested that he make more productive use of Math. time and that he enforce the expectations he sets (e.g. quietness and working on a particular task). I want to see Math work time utilized for student skill development where Mr. Leede is checking to see that all students are completing the assignment(s) correctly.

(2) I asked Mr. Leede to cease the teaching of Leota's 8th grade Algebra skill progression. (as per conversation of January 23, 1981 - Mr. Leede told me that he obtained Leota's 7th grade district adopted Algebra program from Mr. Farquhar, a teacher at Leota. This was done without checking with me.) I pointed out to him that this Algebra program was adopted for 8th graders and that it is district's intent for it to be taught at 8th grade, not 6th grade. I asked that he put into effect what he had agreed to do in our January 26, 1981 conversation: which was to teach his Math students using the concepts covered in the 6th grade district adopted MacMillan textbook (i.e. moving horizontally to enrich the adopted curriculum). Since his 38 Math students are the highest achieving Math students in the school, he insisted that the only way to extend their learning is to move vertically to the next grade's concepts. He told me that if I wanted him to teach anything other than vertically then I should get him the materials and plan the program. I reminded him that it is his responsibility as a teacher to teach children at their ability level within the adopted curriculum and that is what I expect him to do.

He told me that he "would go back to the book tomorrow" and abruptly left.

Within the next ten minutes which had been scheduled for this conference, I had planned to discuss the following things with him:

1. Further explore some activities which could be used at these students ability level and still remain within the adopted curriculum for the 6th grade.
2. Go over his scope and sequence (i.e. skill development and time line) of Math units for the remainder of the year which, in our January 26th conversation he had agreed to provide and which he was requested to bring to this conference (see informal observation form, January 29, 1981)
3. Look at his lesson plan book to observe the written planning of each lesson with a clear statement of the (a) lesson objective (b) activitie(s) for in-class student practice and teacher checking for accuracy and understanding and (c) independent assignment(s), if any.

In our next conference I will ask again for his Math scope and sequence (#2 above) and look at his lesson plan book (#3 above).