

5.5 Provides effective verbal and written feedback that shape improvement in student performance relative to content standards. (CO: 3.6)

	Basic (1.0 - 1.9)	Developing (2.0 - 2.9)	Proficient (3.0 - 3.9)	Advanced (4.0)
Effective Feedback	<p>No evidence OR evidence indicates that s/he consistently fails to demonstrate any of the following 4 components of effective feedback for oral or written work:</p> <p>1) is as immediate as possible (both during instruction, returning assignments)</p> <p>2) constructively responds to student errors or misinformation without being punitive or embarrassing student; feedback has a positive emotional tone</p> <p>3) is "corrective" in nature; errors in knowledge or performance routinely challenged/receive feedback (e.g., continues lessons without giving feedback, even though students fail to understand content/are inattentive)</p> <p>4) is specific and informational and provides an explanation of what students do correctly (e.g., reference a specific level of skill or knowledge)</p>	<p>Demonstrates some of the 4 components of effective feedback but not all OR is inconsistent in application of any across time or for oral or written feedback:</p> <p>1) is as immediate as possible (both during instruction, returning assignments)</p> <p>2) constructively responds to student errors or misinformation without being punitive or embarrassing student; feedback has a positive emotional tone</p> <p>3) is "corrective" in nature; errors in knowledge or performance routinely challenged/receive feedback</p> <p>4) is specific and informational and provides an explanation of what students do correctly (e.g., reference a specific level of skill or knowledge)</p>	<p><u>Consistently</u> demonstrates the 4 components of effective feedback. Consistency requires fluency/repetition, including documentation of competence across time and both oral and written feedback:</p> <p>1) is as immediate as possible (both during instruction, returning assignments)</p> <p>2) constructively responds to student errors or misinformation without being punitive or embarrassing student; feedback has a positive emotional tone</p> <p>3) is "corrective" in nature; errors in knowledge or performance routinely challenged/receive feedback</p> <p>4) is specific and informational and provides an explanation of what students do correctly (e.g., reference a specific level of skill or knowledge)</p>	<p>Meets criteria for "proficient" for this dimension; to earn "advanced," the teacher would meet other "advanced" criteria for this dimension</p>
	<p>No evidence or consistently fails to demonstrate any of the components of effective praise for oral or written feedback: (genuine, praises effort, specific/ informational, praises incidental accomplishments, praise matches achievement)</p>	<p>Demonstrates some of the components of effective but not all OR is inconsistent in application of any for oral or written feedback: (genuine, praises effort, specific/ informational, praises incidental accomplishments, praise matches achievement)</p>	<p><u>Consistently</u> uses praise effectively in oral and written feedback (genuine, praises effort, specific/ informational, praises incidental accomplishments, praise matches achievement)</p>	<p>Meets criteria for "proficient" for this dimension; to earn "advanced," the teacher would meet other "advanced" criteria for this dimension</p>

Social Involvement	No evidence of involving students in giving and receiving feedback	Provides evidence in written plans of involving students in providing feedback (e.g., peer conferences, peer editing), but does not implement them; may not provide any preparation on how to give feedback	Provides evidence of planning and implementing strategies (at least 2 different strategies) to involve students providing feedback (e.g., peer conferences, peer editing) and implements the strategies effectively AND provides evidence of at least one strategy to prepare students to give feedback constructively	Demonstrates a variety of strategies (more than 2) for student involvement in giving and receiving feedback about ongoing work and implements them effectively AND provides evidence that s/he can implement a variety of strategies to prepare students to give feedback (models and role plays how to give feedback in a constructive way, utilizes tools such as checklists for peers)
Flexibility	No evidence of using a specific feedback strategy to correct errors or incorrect responses	Evidence of use of effective feedback strategies for different types of correct responses (e.g., correct, quick and firm responses; correct but hesitant); use may be limited to plans but not implemented	Consistently uses an effective feedback strategy for different type of correct responses during instruction (e.g., correct, quick and firm responses; correct but hesitant);	Demonstrates consistency and flexibility in use of a variety of effective strategies for feedback for different types of correct responses during instruction
		Evidence of use of more than one feedback strategy for incorrect responses such as careless errors or errors due to lack of knowledge (e.g., prompting partially correct answers, reviewing facts/rules needed for correct response, reexplaining, assigning remedial exercises); use may be limited to plans but not implemented	Consistently utilizes a variety of feedback strategies for incorrect responses during instruction (e.g., prompting partially correct answers, reviewing facts/rules needed for correct response, reexplaining, assigning remedial exercises); reviewing key info., explaining, calling on peer, prompting, using a different problem are exmples	Demonstrates consistency and flexibility in use of a variety of effective strategies for feedback for different types of incorrect responses during instruction
	No evidence of use of feedback strategies during student discussions	Evidence in lesson plans of videos of teaching of use of at least one feedback strategy that fosters inquiry (e.g., reorienting student to objectives/goals of the activity; providing new or more accurate information; reviewing/ summarizing/ putting together student ideas into meaningful relationship; adjusting flow of information; combining ideas to promote consensus)	Provides evidence of using different feedback strategies that foster inquiry, but may not be consistent in doing so -- some missed opportunities (e.g., reorienting student to objectives/goals of the activity; providing new or more accurate information; reviewing/ summarizing/ putting together student ideas into meaningful relationship; adjusting flow of information; combining ideas to promote consensus)	Consistently demonstrates a variety of feedback strategies that foster inquiry (e.g., reorienting student to objectives/goals of the activity; providing new or more accurate information; reviewing/ summarizing/ putting together student ideas into meaningful relationship; adjusting flow of information; combining ideas to promote consensus)

Flexibility	No evidence of tool development or tool use in giving feedback	Provides evidence in written lesson plans of tools for giving feedback (e.g., checklists, rubrics) but may not implement tools or reflect on their adequacy	Meets criteria for "developing" and provides evidence of <u>using</u> at least one tool for feedback to students; eportfolio includes tools that are teacher developed and are located from published sources (citations included)	Provides evidence of development of a variety of different tools for giving feedback and their actual use (e.g., checklists, rubrics, rating scales); includes evidence of use of external resources in tool development
--------------------	--	---	--	--

Operationalization:

Guidelines for Admission to Education:

1. Benchmark for admission is: *Demonstrates developing knowledge and skills concerning giving students effective verbal feedback based on cooperating teacher report.*
2. Benchmark for admission is a rating of "developing" on evaluation form completed by the K-12 classroom teacher who has worked with the student; additional evidence in lesson plans and self and peer evaluations can also be evaluated.
3. Following the inventory (dimension 1), a student should earn a rating of "2" on the standard; ratings below "2" must include remarks.

Evidence to be Evaluated: Field experience teacher's evaluation form (required); other possible evidence includes evaluations by self, peer, and teacher of performance during lesson presentation, videoclip

Guidelines for Admission to Student Teaching:

1. Benchmark for admission to student teaching is a rating in the "developing" range in all dimensions of the standard.
2. To evaluate, supervisors should review the material in the portfolio that is attached to the standard, as well as field experience evaluations.

Examples of Evidence: Field experience teacher's evaluation form, evaluations by self or peers, lesson plans, video clips of teaching

Guidelines for Program Completion/Student Teaching:

1. Required for program completion is a rating in the "proficient" range in all dimensions of the standard.
2. To evaluate, supervisors should observe written plans and directly observe both teacher and student behavior and participation during both independent and group activities.
3. The OVERALL rating for the standard should be an average of the rating on all dimensions.
4. The narrative for the Inventory should specify an example of a skill/observation that led to the rating, e.g.: *Throughout the semester he consistently demonstrated the 4 components of effective feedback and taught students to serve as effective peer tutors and peer editors.*

Examples of Evidence:

Observation of teaching, lesson plan book, Portfolio: TWS, lesson plans, unit plans, interviews with school personnel (e.g., cooperating teacher), student work samples

Rationale:

Bangert-Drowns, R. L., Kulik, C. C., Kulik, J. A., & Morgan, M. (1991). The instructional effects of feedback in test-like events. *Review of Educational Research*, 61(2), 213–238.

Borich, G.D. (2007). *Effective teaching methods: Research-based practice*, 6th ed. Upper Saddle Rivers, NJ: Merrill/Prentice Hall.

Brophy, J. E. (1981). Teacher praise: A functional analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 51, 5–32.

Butler, D. L., & Winne, P. H. (1995). Feedback and self-regulated learning: A theoretical synthesis. *Review of Educational Research*, 65(3), 245–281.

Cameron, J., & Pierce, W. D. (1994). Reinforcement, reward, and intrinsic motivation: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 64(3), 363–423.

- Good, T., & Brophy, J.E. (2003). *Looking in classrooms*, 9th ed. New York: Harper Collins.
- Kauchak, D.O., & Eggen, P.D. (1998). *Learning and teaching: Research-based methods*, 3rd ed., Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Lysakowski, R. S., & Walberg, H. J. (1982). Instructional effects of cues, participation, and corrective feedback: A quantitative synthesis. *American Educational Research Journal*, 19(4), 559-574.
- Marzano, R.J. (2007). *The art and science of teaching: A comprehensive framework for effective instruction*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Marzano, R. J., Pickering, D. J., & Pollock, J. E. (2001). *Classroom instruction that works: Research-based strategies for increasing student achievement*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Rosenshine, B.(1987). Explicit teaching. In D. Berliner & B. Rosenshine (Eds.), *Talks to teachers*. New York: Random House.
- Rosenshine, B., & Stevens, R.(1986). Teaching functions. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed., pp. 376-391). New York: Macmillan.