

Check for Understanding and Choose the Next Step

T03 · v0.1.3 · Teacher guide: sample responses and evidence-based next steps

Use a brief response as one piece of evidence for a specific next instructional move. Separate the learner's observable response from your interpretation, name what the evidence does and does not show, and recheck the same target after the next step. One short response is not a diagnosis or a general measure of mastery.

Scope and safe use

Teacher-facing tool; Grade 6 ELA is provisional portfolio metadata. The invented passage and response patterns do not validate grade fit, local curriculum alignment, or use in other subjects.

Estimated preparation: 3 minutes. Estimate to select a narrow target, give the short check, and prepare a blank record; not tested.

Estimated review and next-step planning: 10 minutes. Estimate to review one response, choose a brief next move, and plan a recheck; not tested in a classroom.

Set the target before looking at a response. For this example, the target is a supported inference about how Milo responds to a problem, using one earlier detail, one later detail, and reasoning that connects them.

Give the quick check individually if you want individual evidence. Copy only a brief de-identified response into the record. Pair discussion or participation can support learning, but does not replace individual evidence for this target.

Name what the response shows on this task and what remains uncertain. A correct detail without an inference link is different from an unsupported inference; a blank response is not evidence of a specific misconception.

Choose the smallest next move that fits the evidence: reteach a missing evidence-to-inference move, guide practice when the detail is present but the connection is weak, extend when the complete chain appears, or clarify conditions and gather usable evidence when the response is uninterpretable.

After the next move, use the supplied different passage and prompt T03-CHECK02 as a fresh independent response on the same target. The completed records provide the brief teaching prompts; no additional passage is needed for this first follow-up. Do not reuse the exact practiced response as proof that instruction worked. Compare the new evidence with the target and consider other work before broad conclusions.

The sample responses are invented patterns, not actual student work or a class data set. Do not diagnose reading, language, disability, motivation, effort, or home circumstances from this tool. Check local curriculum and individual support plans with the appropriate people.

Quick check · The Missing Garden Label

Invented instructional example.

Before the garden club met, Milo noticed that a label had fallen from one seedling tray. He shrugged and said, "It can wait until next week." During the meeting, two students asked which trays were ready to move. Milo compared the trays with the planting chart, found the missing label in a supply drawer, and wrote it on a new card. Then he asked one student to check whether the card matched the right tray. At the end, he placed a pencil beside the chart for the next check.

Quick check · Read "The Missing Garden Label." In 2–3 sentences, describe what Milo's actions suggest about how he responds to an unclear problem. Include one detail from before he acts and one from after, and explain how both details support your idea.

Fresh recheck · The Tray at the Table

Invented instructional example.

Before the after-school art table opened, Ana saw pencils rolling off the edge. She said, "The box is probably enough." During the first activity, she picked up three pencils twice. She put a shallow tray beside the box and asked a classmate to check whether it stayed in place. At the end, only one pencil had rolled away.

Fresh recheck · Read "The Tray at the Table." In 2–3 sentences, describe what Ana's actions suggest about how she responds to a small problem. Include one detail from before she acts and one from after, and explain how both details support your idea. Use this different passage after the next step rather than reusing the original response.

Four invented response patterns and completed records

Pattern 1 · Extend

Invented sample response and completed decision record; not actual learner work or class data.

1 · Target, task, and stimulus reference: Target: infer how a person responds to a problem, using one earlier detail, one later detail and an explanation. Exact prompt: Quick check · Read “The Missing Garden Label.” In 2–3 sentences, describe what Milo’s actions suggest about how he responds to an unclear problem. Include one detail from before he acts and one from after, and explain how both details support your idea. Stimulus: the complete original passage “The Missing Garden Label” under Quick check in this guide and the blank-tool copy.

2 · Check conditions: Invented example: read individually; prompt and passage visible; written response; no time pressure noted.

3 · Observable response evidence: Invented sample response: “At first Milo thinks the missing label can wait, since he says that. Later he writes a new card and asks someone to check it. He changes from putting off the problem to making the tray identifiable and checking his fix.”

4 · What does it show—and not show?: The response gives an accurate earlier statement, later actions, and a supported inference about responding to the problem. It shows this response can connect details on this passage; it does not establish general mastery or how the learner will respond to a different text.

5 · Provisional next step: Extend: compare a second defensible interpretation of Milo’s actions, such as becoming more careful about checking information, and cite which details support each reading.

6 · Evidence-based reason: The student includes both time points and explains the relation between Milo’s first delay and later repair/check. The evidence supports a move to deeper interpretation on this task.

7 · Next move and recheck: Ask: “Does Milo become quicker to address the problem, more careful about checking information, or both? Support each possible inference with passage details and name what remains uncertain.” Accept either defensible interpretation. Then use the supplied fresh passage and prompt T03-CHECK02 independently: require an inference, an earlier detail, a later detail and their connection.

8 · Review the interpretation: This response is an invented pattern. Before extending a real learner, check other work and whether the prompt and text were accessible. One successful response is not a permanent mastery label.

Why this next step fits: Use an extension because the response already supplies the target evidence, not because the learner finished quickly. Keep the extension on evidence and interpretation; do not infer broad proficiency from this one check.

Pattern 2 • Practice

Invented sample response and completed decision record; not actual learner work or class data.

1 • Target, task, and stimulus reference: Target: infer how a person responds to a problem, using one earlier detail, one later detail and an explanation. Exact prompt: Quick check • Read “The Missing Garden Label.” In 2–3 sentences, describe what Milo’s actions suggest about how he responds to an unclear problem. Include one detail from before he acts and one from after, and explain how both details support your idea. Stimulus: the complete original passage “The Missing Garden Label” under Quick check in this guide and the blank-tool copy.

2 • Check conditions: Invented example: passage and prompt were available; written response requested individually. Conditions are otherwise unknown.

3 • Observable response evidence: Invented sample response: “Milo writes the missing label on a card and puts a pencil beside the chart.”

4 • What does it show—and not show?: The details are accurate and from after the problem is noticed. The response does not state what Milo’s actions suggest, include an earlier detail, or connect evidence to an inference. It may reflect an incomplete response; it does not show why the link is missing.

5 • Provisional next step: Guided practice: model the difference between naming an action and inferring from it, then complete one before/after evidence-to-inference example together.

6 • Evidence-based reason: The response names later actions but lacks the requested inference and earlier comparison detail. A guided bridge directly practices the missing relation while retaining the target.

7 • Next move and recheck: Use the supplied Milo passage. Say: “He first says the label can wait. Later he replaces it and asks someone to check. Those details suggest he moves from delaying the problem to fixing it carefully.” Ask the learner to point to each detail and explain the connection in their own words. Then give the supplied Ana passage and T03-CHECK02 independently, requiring both time points and the reasoning link.

8 • Review the interpretation: The sample is invented. For real work, check whether the learner had enough time and understood the request for an earlier detail. Review another response before describing this as a persistent need.

Why this next step fits: Choose guided practice rather than a broad reteach because accurate later details are present but the response omits the inference and earlier comparison. Recheck independently after the scaffold.

Pattern 3 · Reteach

Invented sample response and completed decision record; not actual learner work or class data.

1 · Target, task, and stimulus reference: Target: infer how a person responds to a problem, using one earlier detail, one later detail and an explanation. Exact prompt: Quick check · Read “The Missing Garden Label.” In 2–3 sentences, describe what Milo’s actions suggest about how he responds to an unclear problem. Include one detail from before he acts and one from after, and explain how both details support your idea. Stimulus: the complete original passage “The Missing Garden Label” under Quick check in this guide and the blank-tool copy.

2 · Check conditions: Invented example: passage and prompt were presented together; learner wrote independently. Other conditions are unknown.

3 · Observable response evidence: Invented sample response: “Milo probably wants to be the garden club leader because he likes being in charge.”

4 · What does it show—and not show?: The response proposes an idea about Milo’s role and motive, but the passage does not state that he is a leader or likes being in charge. It does not include the requested before/after details. This response lacks the target evidence; it does not establish why.

5 · Provisional next step: Reteach the evidence-to-inference move briefly, then gather another response. First ask the learner to point to an action that supports an idea before choosing an inference.

6 · Evidence-based reason: The stated reason is unsupported by the passage and the requested details are absent. A model that distinguishes text evidence from an added assumption directly addresses that observable gap.

7 · Next move and recheck: Use the supplied Milo passage. Say: “Writing a new label and checking it suggest careful problem solving. These actions do not tell us that Milo wants to lead the club.” Ask: “What does his earlier ‘can wait’ statement add to the inference?” Guide a comparison from delay to a checked fix. Then give the supplied Ana passage and T03-CHECK02 independently, requiring an inference, earlier and later details, and the connection.

8 · Review the interpretation: The sample is invented. Check comprehension of the prompt, text access, vocabulary, and response conditions. Do not label the learner as a guesser or infer motivation from this one answer.

Why this next step fits: A brief reteach is reasonable because the response supplies an unsupported role/motive and no requested evidence. The sample does not identify the cause; use the follow-up response and other work to decide what to do next.

Pattern 4 • Clarify

Invented sample response and completed decision record; not actual learner work or class data.

1 • Target, task, and stimulus reference: Target: infer how a person responds to a problem, using one earlier detail, one later detail and an explanation. Exact prompt: Quick check • Read “The Missing Garden Label.” In 2–3 sentences, describe what Milo’s actions suggest about how he responds to an unclear problem. Include one detail from before he acts and one from after, and explain how both details support your idea. Stimulus: the complete original passage “The Missing Garden Label” under Quick check in this guide and the blank-tool copy.

2 • Check conditions: Invented example: a written response was requested. Whether the learner read the passage, understood the directions, or had enough time is not known.

3 • Observable response evidence: Invented sample response: no response was written.

4 • What does it show—and not show?: There is no interpretable response evidence about the target. A blank alone does not show whether the learner was confused, unable to access the text, short on time, reluctant to write, or did not know the answer.

5 • Provisional next step: Clarify conditions and gather another check before choosing a content reteach. Ask neutrally whether the prompt and text were available and understood.

6 • Evidence-based reason: No response means the target thinking was not observed in this sample. It supports checking task/access conditions; it does not support a claim about the cause or the learner’s ability.

7 • Next move and recheck: Confirm access to the supplied Milo passage and prompt. If writing is not the target and local supports allow, invite an oral inference with earlier/later details and an explanation; pointing alone does not show the reasoning link. Record the response mode. After any needed teaching or support, use the supplied Ana passage and T03-CHECK02 as the fresh independent check of the same target.

8 • Review the interpretation: The blank is an invented pattern, not actual learner data. Check the learner’s normal access supports and directions privately with the appropriate people; do not add personal or identifying details to this record.

Why this next step fits: Do not choose reteach from a blank response alone. Check the conditions first and collect interpretable evidence under an appropriate response mode while preserving the target.

Fresh recheck · completed example

Invented recheck response and completed record; not actual learner work or class data.

1 · Target, task, and stimulus reference: Target: infer how a person responds to a problem, using one earlier detail, one later detail and an explanation. Exact prompt: Fresh recheck · Read “The Tray at the Table.” In 2–3 sentences, describe what Ana’s actions suggest about how she responds to a small problem. Include one detail from before she acts and one from after, and explain how both details support your idea. Use this different passage after the next step rather than reusing the original response. Stimulus: the complete original passage “The Tray at the Table” under Fresh recheck in this guide and the blank-tool copy.

2 · Check conditions: Invented example: the new passage and prompt were visible after a guided evidence-to-inference practice. Individual written response requested; other access conditions are unknown.

3 · Observable response evidence: Invented sample response: “At first Ana thinks the box is enough. Later she puts a tray beside it and asks someone to check it. She changes her first plan after pencils keep rolling.”

4 · What does it show—and not show?: The response includes an earlier statement, later action, and a plausible link between the problem and adjustment. It shows the target on this new passage after practice; it does not establish long-term or general mastery.

5 · Provisional next step: Continue with planned independent practice on the same target and revisit with other work before making a broader decision.

6 · Evidence-based reason: The response on a different passage contains both time points and explains a change in response to the problem, so the target evidence is present on this check.

7 · Next move and recheck: Ask for an independent response to another short passage later, without the just-used modeling prompt. Compare whether the learner still selects relevant details and connects them to an inference.

8 · Review the interpretation: The sample is invented. For actual follow-up, compare the new response with the first check and other available work. One successful recheck is useful evidence, not a permanent label.

Why this next step fits: This invented recheck response includes the target evidence on a different passage after practice. Continue planned practice and gather other evidence; do not call one response proof of general mastery.

Decision checklist

T03-C01 · check

The target names the intended learning and matches what the check asks the learner to show.

Example: The prompt asks for before/after details and an inference; the target includes those same elements.

A target may be stated in local curriculum language, but verify it locally and keep the response demand visible.

T03-C02 · check

The recorded response evidence describes what the learner actually said, wrote, selected, or did before interpreting it.

Example: Record the excerpt “Milo writes the label” before deciding what it means.

A brief accurate description can be enough; do not copy personal information into the record.

T03-C03 · check

The interpretation links evidence to the target and names what remains missing or uncertain.

Example: The student gives later actions but no inference or earlier detail in this response.

Accept different text-supported inferences and accurate details; the tool should not enforce one preferred sentence.

T03-C04 · check

The next step addresses the evidence shown, rather than completion, speed, behavior, or an assumed cause.

Example: Practice the missing reasoning link when details are present but not connected.

A second check or access clarification may be the appropriate first step when the response is uninterpretable.

T03-C05 · check

A blank, partial, or unsupported response is treated as limited evidence, not proof of a stable ability or misconception.

Example: Check directions and text access before interpreting a blank response.

Combine evidence across tasks before making broader instructional decisions.

T03-C06 · check

Any alternate response mode preserves the target or clearly names what it no longer measures.

Example: An oral inference may show text reasoning when handwriting is not the target; it does not show written composition.

Use the learner's local supports and keep the intended cognitive demand.

T03-C07 · check

The next move includes a fresh recheck of the same target after instruction or support.

Example: Use a new short passage to check whether the evidence-to-inference link appears independently.

Do not reuse the exact prompted response as proof that a new skill has been learned.

T03-C08 · check

The teacher checks context and access conditions and avoids diagnosis or broad claims from one short response.

Example: Confirm the prompt was readable and understood before attributing a blank to missing content knowledge.

Follow local curriculum and support procedures; this general tool does not replace them.

Adaptation notes and sources

Support

If a written response does not provide interpretable evidence and writing is not part of the target, check the learner's existing supports and local procedures. A neutral oral explanation or pointing to a detail while explaining it may help clarify the same thinking demand. Record the mode and what it can show; it does not establish written-composition skill.

Extension

When a response already includes an inference, relevant earlier and later details, and reasoning, invite a second defensible interpretation of the same passage. Ask which details support each reading and what remains uncertain. Do not assign the extension solely because a learner finished quickly.

Original T03 teacher tool. Its passage and sample responses are invented instructional examples, not classroom data.