5.1 Maximizes student learning by incorporating student centered strategies: (CO: 6.1)

| | Basic (1.0 - 1.9) | Developing (2.0 - 2.9) | Proficient (3.0 - 3.9) | Advanced (4.0) |
|------------------------------|--|---|---|--|
| Activates Prior Knowledge | No evidence OR lesson plans do not activate prior knowledge at the beginning of the lesson that 1) stimulate reflection on prior knowledge and link new ideas to familiar ones AND 2) make connections to students' experiences | Lessons consistently include plans to activate students' prior knowledge at the beginning of the lesson by: 1) stimulating reflection on prior knowledge and linking new ideas to familiar ones AND 2) making connections to students' experiences | Consistently activates students' prior knowledge at the beginning of the lesson and when appropriate during lessons by: 1) stimulating reflection on prior knowledge and linking new ideas to familiar ones AND 2) making connections to students' experiences; routinely includes activities to review prior learning | Meets the criteria for "proficient" AND uses a variety of strategies to activate prior knowledge and review prior learning (questioning, discussion, demonstration, writing, game formats, homework review) |
| General Strategies | No evidence of student-centered strategies in plans OR consistently does not effectively implement the strategies that are planned | Includes at least 3 different examples of student-centered strategies (see "advanced" for examples) in plans that are detailed enough to demonstrate understanding of how to implement the strategy | Demonstrates planning AND implementing at least 3 different student-centered strategies (see "advanced" for examples) in plans; strategies are implemented proficiently | Shows creativity and flexibility in using a variety of student-centered rather than teacher-directed strategies (inquiry approaches, discovery learning, problem solving, project-based/problem-based learning, role-playing and simulation, gaming, lab activities, technology applications such as webquests, learning or activity centers, reciprocal teaching, student led questioning) |
| quiry | No evidence of consistency in either planning or impelmenting strategies to elicit students' thinking | Includes at least one example of plans to elicit student thinking/processing but may not have evidence of implementing these plans | Consistently requires students to explain their thinking/processing (e.g., through discussion, group interaction, eliciting thinking orally and in writing); NOTE: explaining one's thinking differs from explaining information, answerng questions, etc. | Meets the criteria for "proficient" AND uses a variety of strategies to elicit students' thinking (discussion, group interaction, and eliciting thinking orally and in writing); reflects on what is learned by observations of student thinking |
| Elicits Thinking & In | No evidence of planning or providing opportunities for student inquiry/ testing of ideas or providing opportunities for students to generate own examples or apply knowledge to previous experiences OR implements strategies that are ineffective | Includes at least one example of strategy that provides opportunities for student inquiry and testing of ideas in lesson plans OR one in which students are required to generate own examples or apply knowledge to previous experiences | Consistently plans and implements strategies that provide students with opportunities for inquiry and testing of ideas AND with opportunties to generate own examples or apply knowledge to previous experiences | Mets criteria for "proficient" and shows creativity and flexibility in using a variety of strategies that provide opportunities for inquiry and testing of ideas, as well as opportunties to generate their own examples or apply new knowledge to previous experiences |
| | No evidence of modeling thinking processes or think alouds | Includes an example of modeling own thinking process through think alouds or other strategies in lesson plans but may not implement it | Demonstrates an example of modeling own thinking process through think alouds or other strategies in instruction | Demonstrates modeling own thinking processes through think-alouds or other strategies for a number of different skills |

| " | No evidence or does not use closure | Includes at least one example of closure | Frequently uses closure to effectively elicit | Meets criteria for "proficient" and shows |
|-------------|--|---|--|---|
| s Reflectio | effectively for student reflection and | that effectively elicits student reflection and | student reflection and self-assessment AND | creativity and flexibility in using a variety of |
| | self-assessment (e.g., teacher | self-assessment in lesson plans AND one | provides other frequent opportunities for | effective strategies to routinely require |
| | summarizes learning) | that requires students to engage in peer | student reflection, peer assessment, and self- | student reflection and self-assessment in |
| | | assessment/self-assessment in lesson | assessment (frequently = several times a | closure and other activities (orally, in writing, |
| cit | | plans | week) | etc.) |
| Eli | | | | |

Operationalization/Criteria:

Guidelines for Admission to Education:

- 1. Benchmarks for admission include: Demonstrates developing knowledge and skills concerning planning and implementing activities that incorporate utilizing students' prior knowledge and encouraging active learning
- 3. Following the inventory (above), a student should earn a rating of "2" on lesson plans and their evaluations; a rating of "1" must include written comments and result in a support plan.

Evidence to be Evaluated: 2 lesson plans, field experience teacher's evaluation form, evaluations by peers and self of less presentation

Guidelines for Admission to Student Teaching:

- 1. Benchmark for admission is a rating in the "developing" range on all dimensions of the standard.
- 2. OVERALL rating is an average of ratings for all dimensions.

Evidence to be Evaluated:

Lesson plans in the portfolio (direct instruction, cooperative learning, inquiry/indirect instruction), field experience teachers' feedback, reflections, videoclips 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. Observe student engagement and participation during a variety of lesson formats: during collaborative learning, direct instruction, and inquiry lessons.
- 4. Observe teacher's ability to utilize a variety of strategies (per criteria in inventory), as well as frequency and consistency.
- 7. Evaluate teacher reflections for understanding of student-centered strategies.
- 8. Consistency = requires fluency/repetition, including documentation of competence in different content areas, with different lesson formats.
- 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.: Utilized the following student-centered strategies in her TWS: project-based learning, webquests, peer editing, and frequent use of reflection through write-to-learns.

Examples of Evidence:

Records of evaluation forms of previous field experience teachers and those of university faculty, observation of teaching, lesson plan book/lesson plans, TWS, unit plans, videotapes of teaching, interviews with school personnel (e.g., cooperating teacher), reflections of teaching

Rationale:

Carnine, D. (1990). New research on the brain: Implications for instruction. Phi Delta Kappan, 71, 372-377.

Casey, M.B., & Howson, P.(1993). Educating preservice students based on a problem-centered approach to teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education,* 361-370. Borich, G.D. (2007). *Effective teaching methods*, 6th ed. Teaching effective methods. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill/Prentice Hall.

Kauchak, D.P., & Eggen, P.D. (1998). Learning & teaching: Research based methods, 3rd ed. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

- McCaslin, M., Bozack, A. R., Napoleon, L., Thomas, A., Vasquez, V., Wayman, V., & Zhang, J. (2006). Self-regulated learning and classroom management: Theory, research, and consideration for classroom practice. In C. Evertson, C. M. Weinstein, & C. S. Weinstein (Eds.), Handbook of classroom management: Research, practice, and contemporary issues (pp. 223–252). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- McCombs, B. L. (2001). Self-regulated learning and academic achievement: A phenomenological view. In B. J. Zimmerman & D. H. Schunk (Eds.), Self-regulated learning and academic achievement: Theoretical perspectives (2nd ed., pp. 67–124). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Orlich, D.C., Harder, R.J., Callahan, R.C., Trevisan, M.S., & Brown, A.H. 2004). Teaching strategies: A guide to effective instruction. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. Ornstein, A.C., & Lasley, II, T.J. (2004). Strategies for effective teaching, 4th ed. Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Pressley, M., Wood, E., Woloshyn, V., Martin, V., King, A., & Menke, D. (1992). Encouraging mindful use of prior knowledge: Attempting to construct explanatory answers facilitates learning. *Educational Psychologist, 27,* 91–109.

Rosenshine, B., & Stevens, R. (1986). Teacher functions. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.). *Handbook of research on teaching,* 3rd ed. (pp. 376-391). New York: Macmillan. Shostak, R. (1986). Lesson presentation skills. In J. Cooper (Ed.). *Classroom teaching skills* (pp. 111-136). Lexington, MA: Heath.