**5.2 Demonstrates a wide variety of instructional strategies that promote learning, creating and implementing plans which include all essential lesson components: (CO: 3.1)**

| | Basic (1.0 - 1.9) | Developing (2.0 - 2.9) | Proficient (3.0 - 3.9) | Advanced (4.0) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| *1. Quality Direct Instruction, Indirect Instruction, and Cooperative Learning Plans & Components* | Any of the following occur, even with some support in CSU-P courses or from coaches or faculty: | The following are demonstrated in lesson plans attached to the eportfolio and in lesson plan book (if teaching); some errors may occur in some sections and may need some support, but all sections must be included in at least 1 lesson: | The following are consistently demonstrated in lessons planned across all lessons in the eportfolio and in lesson plan book (if teaching), requiring minimal support to do so; consistency = at least 75% of lessons reviewed for each type of instruction, a minium of 4 lessons reviewed of each type: | The following are done independently and consistently; to evaluate consistency, observer must evaluate at least 4 lessons (100%) of each type or enough to meet the criteria of >90% of lessons planned and implemented in teaching over several months: |
| | 1. Direct instruction lessons lack more than one section (see "developing"); cannot clearly tell from the plan that the teacher intends a direct instruction lesson OR components are not designed effectively (e.g., independent practice = guided practice) | 1. Plans direct instruction lessons with the following components, including sufficient detail to evaluate their *effectiveness*: beginning (activation of prior knowledge, identification of lesson objective, anticipatory set/motivation), detailed and well-sequenced input and resources, checking for understanding, guided practice, independent practice, and reteaching | 1. Plans direct instruction lessons with the following components, including sufficient detail to evaluate their *effectiveness*: beginning (activation of prior knowledge, identification of lesson objective, anticipatory set/motivation), detailed and well-sequenced input and resources, checking for understanding, guided practice, independent practice, and reteaching | 1. Plans meet criteria for "proficient"and demonstrates fluency in consistent planning of direct instruction lessons |
| | 2. Indirect instruction lessons lack more than one section (see "developing"); cannot clearly tell from the plan that s/he intends an indirect instruction lesson OR components are not designed effectively (e.g., insufficient scaffolding for learning to occur) | 2. Plans indirect instruction lessons with the following components, including sufficient detail to evaluate their *effectiveness*: beginning (activation of prior knowledge, anticipatory set/motivation), development of learning task with students, clarification of learning task, scaffolding of student learning including questioning and resources, checking for understanding, closure, and reteaching | 2. Plans indirect instruction lessons with the following components, including sufficient detail to evaluate their *effectiveness*: beginning (activation of prior knowledge, anticipatory set/motivation), development of learning task with students, clarification of learning task, scaffolding of student learning including questioning and resources, checking for understanding, closure, and reteaching | 2. Plans meet criteria for "proficient"and demonstrates fluency in consistent planning of indirect instruction lessons |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **1. Quality Plans (cont.)** | 3. Cooperative learning lack more than one section (see "developing"); cannot clearly tell from the plan that the teacher intends cooperative learning; teacher confuses group activity with cooperative learning | 3. Plans lessons with cooperative learning with the following minimum detailed components: beginning (activation of prior knowledge, anticipatory set/motivation), interdependent task, resources and materials, clarification of student roles, teacher role in facilitating groups, group accountability and independent check-out or practice, reteaching strategies | 3. Plans lessons with cooperative learning with the following minimum detailed components: beginning (activation of prior knowledge, anticipatory set/motivation), interdependent task, resources and materials, clarification of student roles, teacher role in facilitating groups, group accountability and independent check-out or practice, reteaching strategies | 3. Plans meet criteria for "proficient" and demonstrates fluency in consistent planning of cooperative learning lessons |
| **2. Detailed Pre-Planning** | Does not create a written, detailed, replicable plan for a minimum of 2 lessons | Creates a written, detailed, plan for at least 2 lessons, though parts may not be replicable; detailed (i.e., all lesson components/questions on the CSU-P lesson plan template are present with enough detail to replicate the lesson) | Creates a written, detailed, replicable plan for each lesson on a daily basis for a variety of different areas that meet the criteria for "developing" (at least 75% of lessons reviewed) | Meets the criteria for "proficient" for at least 90% of lessons planned and implemented in teaching over a period of time |
| | Does not match lesson format to learning objective or all lessons direct instruction | Can match lesson format to learning objective or many lessons direct instruction, but at least one good example of indirect and cooperative learning lesson design | Usually matches lesson format to learning objective; utilizes a variety of lesson formats, with at least 4 good examples of each of the 3 designs demonstrated | Shows exceptional facility in matching lesson formats to learning objectives, using a variety of lesson formats, some within the same lesson |
| **3. Variety in Planning Instructional Strategies** | Does not plan and/or implement direct instruction, cooperative learning, and inquiry lessons effectively across different content standards | Implements direct instruction, cooperative learning, and inquiry lessons effectively in at least one content area, but has not demonstrated it across the variety of areas or content standards required for his/her teaching endorsement | Demonstrates effective direct instruction, indirect instruction, and cooperative learning lessons across at least 2 different content standards and/or areas of responsibility (e.g., for EL ED math, literacy, science, etc.) | Shows exceptional facility in planning direct instruction, cooperative learning, and inquiry lessons across different content standards in areas of responsibility |
| | No evidence of understanding/using a variety of strategies for implementing components of lessons (e.g., advance organizers, guiding practice, checking for understanding, closure) | Applies a variety of strategies for planning components of lessons (e.g., advance organizers, guiding practice, checking for understanding, closure) | Demonstrates use of use of different strategies for implementing components of direct, indirect, and coop. learning lessons (e.g., lesson beginning/closure, guiding practice, checking for understanding, closure); for example, may check for understanding by choral responding, randomly calling on stduents, think-pair-share, etc. | Meets all criteria for "proficient" and routinely uses a variety of strategies for planning components of lessons |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **4. Implementing Instructional Components** | Sometimes unprepared for lesson | Always prepared for lesson, but has not had the opportunity to plan and teach across a semester | Always prepared for lesson; shows consistency in preparation on a daily basis across at least a month of teaching | Meets criteria for proficient across time (at least 1 semester of teaching) |
| | Consistently fails to include one or more important lesson components (e.g., set, guided practice, closure) OR consistently implements components inadequately (e.g., fails to demonstrate or present sufficient input for student success) | Sometimes fails to include important lesson components OR may implement components inadequately (e.g., limited guided practice and checking for understanding in direct instruction, fails to demonstrate sufficient input for student success) | Adequately presents all important components effectively (e.g., demonstrates or presents sufficient input for student success) | Utilizes a variety of different strategies to implement components of lessons (e.g., different approaches for checking for understanding or closure) and can modify strategies during lessons based on student need |
| | No evidence of using grouping strategies for instructional purposes other than large group instruction | Demonstrates both whole group and small group strategies, but relies largely on whole group instruction | Demonstrates whole group and flexible small group strategies | Can implement a wide range of grouping strategies to meet the needs of the class and individuals; demonstrates flexibility in changing group structures to meet different needs |
| **5. Varies Role** | Plans/implements teaching activities which (a) do not provide detailed directions that would allow a colleague to replicate important teaching behaviors or (b) inaccurately describes role of teacher for a specific type of instruction (e.g., describes instructional role not as a facilitator of indirect instruction) | Meets all of the following: 1) plans lessons with more than one teaching role and implements at least two in activities with students: instructor, facilitator, coach, audience; 2) provides detailed directions that would allow replication; 3) appropriately matches role to purpose of instruction and needs of students (e.g., facilitator to cooperative learning) | Meets requirements for planning described in "developing" and implements lessons that require different teaching roles across different activities (at a minimum, instructor, facilitator, coach, audience); e.g., during indirect instruction, s/he can use advance organizers, focus students' responses, present exs. and non-exs. of generalizations, draw additional exs. from students, use questions to guide inquiry, help students evaluate their responses | Meets all of the criteria for "proficient" and provides evidence of exceptional examples of different teaching roles; examples demonstrate fluency in undertanding the roles usual for an experienced teacher |

## Operationalization/Criteria:

**Guidelines for Admission to Education:**

1. Benchmarks for admission include:

   *Writes detailed lesson plans that include all components in each of the following formats: direct instruction, inquiry, and cooperative groups*

   *Demonstrates developing knowledge and skills in implementing all lesson components in direct instruction, inquiry, and cooperative lessons*

2. Benchmark for admission is a rating of "developing" for <u>dimensions 1 and 2</u> based on review of lesson plans, evaluations, and a possible video clip of teaching.

3. A score of "basic" must be followed up with specific feedback about the low mark and indicate whether additional support is needed.

4. the OVERALL rating should be an average of ratings across the criteria in these dimensions.

**Evidence to be Evaluated:**

Field experience teacher's evaluation; 2 or more lesson plans that include direct instruction, indirect/inquiry, an cooperative learning; evaluations by self, peer, and teacher of performance
   during lesson presentation, videoclip

**Guidelines at Admission to Student Teaching:**

1. Benchmark for admission is a rating in the "developing" range on all dimensions of the standard: *S/he can plan instruction with all quality components for*
   *direct instruction, inquiry, and cooperative learning and demonstrates some evidence of impementing strategies effectively*
2. Evaluation requires review of all materials in the portfolio linkled to the standard and a review of evaluations by field experience teachers.
3. A score of "basic" must be followed up with specific feedback about the ratings and indicate whether additional support is needed.
4. The OVERALL rating should be an average of ratings across the criteria in these dimensions.

**Evidence to be Evaluated:**

Lesson plans in the portfolio (direct instruction, cooperative learning, inquiry), field experience teachers' feedback (TEIMS), reflections, videoclips of teaching

**Guidelines for Program Completion/Student Teaching:**

1. Required for program completion are ratings of "proficient" across all dimensions of the standard.
2. To evaluate, observe a variety of collaborative learning, direct instruction, and inquiry lessons to assure his/her thoroughness and fluency in planning.
3. Observe his/her ability to utilize a variety of strategies (per criteria in inventory) to implement each type of lesson effectively.
4. Observe for consistency; interview others who have observed instruction to evaluate consistency.
5. Evaluate his/her reflections for understanding of planning strategies.
6. Evaluate the teacher  implementing lessons to determine skills at applying formats.
8. Consistency =  fluency/repetition, including documentation of competence in different content areas of responsibility, 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.: *In her TWS she planned and implemented lessons using direct instruction,*
   *project-based learning (indirect instruction), cooperative learning (in a webquest and jigsaw activity), including all essential components in each lesson.*

Rationale:

Ames, C. (1984). Competitive, cooperative, and individualistic goal structures: A cognitive-motivational analysis. In R. Ames & C. Ames (Eds.), *Research on motivation in education:*
   *Vol. 1. Student motivation*  (pp. 177–207). New York: Academic Press.
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.
Gentile, J., & Lalley, J. (2003). *Standards and mastery learning.*  Thousan Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
Good, T.L., & Brophy, J.E. (2000). *Looking in classrooms,* 8th ed. New York: Longman.
Hunter, M. (1982). *Mastery learning.*  El Segundo, CA: Instructional Dynamics.
Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1999). *Learning together and alone: Cooperative, competitive, and individualistic learning*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
Kauchak, D.P., & Eggen, P.D. (1998). *Learning & teaching: Research based methods*, 3rd ed. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
Marzano, R.J., Pickering, D.J., & Pollock, J.E. (2001). *Clasroom instruction that works: Research-based strategies for increasing student achievement.*  Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
Orlich, D.C., Harder, R.J., Callahan, R.C., Trevisan, M.S., & Brown, A.H. 2004). T*eaching strategies: A guide to effective instruciton.*  Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
Ornstein, A.C., & Lasley, II, T.J. (2004). *Strategies for effective teaching,*  4th ed. Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Redfield, D. L., & Rousseau, E. W. (1981). A meta-analysis of experimental research on teacher questioning behavior. *Review of Educational Research, 51* (2), 237–245.

Richardson, V. (1997). Constructivist teaching and teacher educaiton: Theory and practice, In V. Richardson (Ed.). *Constructivist teacher education: Building new understandings* (pp. 3-14). Washington, DC: Falmer Press.

Rosenshine, B. (1986). Synthesis of research on explicit teaching. *Educational Leadership, 43* (7), 60-69.

Rosenshine, B. (1995). Advances in research on instruction. *Journal of Educational  Research, 88* (5), 262-268.

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.

Slavin, R. (1993). *Student team learning: An overview and practical guide.* Washington DC: Natinal Education Association.

Tobin, K. (1987). The role of wait time in higher cognitive level learning. *Review of Educational Research* , 57, 69–95.