

WASHINGTON STATE TEACHER CRITERION

- **Criterion 2:** Demonstrating effective teaching practices
- **Criterion 4:** Providing clear and intentional focus on subject matter content and curriculum
- **Criterion 5:** Fostering and managing a safe, positive learning environment

HIGH-LEVERAGE PRACTICE #7

Teaching a lesson or segment of instruction. During a lesson or segment of instruction, the teacher sequences instructional opportunities toward specific learning goals and represents academic content in ways that connect to students' prior knowledge and extends their learning. In a skillfully enacted lesson, the teacher fosters student engagement, provides access to new material and opportunities for student practice, adapts instruction in response to what students do or say, and assesses what students know and can do as a result of instruction.

TARGET AUDIENCE

K–12; suggested group size fewer than 3; no larger than 10 participants

READ MORE

<http://www.teachingworks.org/work-of-teaching/high-leverage-practices>

Entry (1–2 min)

Entry write: Participants read the description of the high-leverage teaching strategy and underline or highlight phrases that are most significant as part of a learning sequence.

Review Protocol and Rationale (1 min)

Purpose: To identify the cause-and-effect relationships between highly effective teacher practice and student conversation, thinking, and learning

Rationale: To understand best practice and why it affects student learning

Watch the Video (5–6 min)

As participants watch, complete “The Three” portion of the graphic organizer, specifically looking for student actions or teacher actions in the video that connect to the phrases you underlined or highlighted previously.

Discussion of “The Three” (6–8 min)

Each participant shares his or her “three” (pair-share option in larger group).

Suggested questions for facilitator to pose:

- What observable student learning or action resulted from these exceptional actions and why?
- Why did the teacher perform these exceptional actions?

Independent Quickwrite About “The Two” (1–2 min)

On the handout, the participant will independently write two things you observed students doing as a direct result of the teacher's effective practice.



Primary: Constructing Meaning Through Reading (continued)

Discussion About "The Two" (6–8 min)

Each participant shares her or his "two" (pair-share in larger group).

Suggested questions for facilitator to pose:

- Why would these affect student understanding/thinking?

Quickwrite Individually About "The One" (1–2 min)

Participant will identify one question he or she has about student understanding or thinking (on the basis of this video).

Suggestions for the facilitator if the participants have no questions:

- What evidence or signs did you see that the students understood the concept?
- What else could the teacher have done to further draw out student understanding?
- What is something you wonder about in this segment of instruction, or in what came before it?
- What could you anticipate or predict might have resulted in subsequent lessons?

Open Floor (If Time Permits)

Participants can opt to share questions and respond to one another's questions (no formal protocol).

Closure (2–3 min)

Quickwrite options (facilitator or group select one):

- What is one strategy or teaching move that you can apply in your own classroom, and in what upcoming lesson or unit will you experiment with this new strategy?
- What could you take away from this lesson if you were a high school teacher, middle school teacher, or specialist that you could embed in your current practice? Why?

Whiparound (Time Permitting)

Each person briefly share their closure quickwrite commitment to practice this skill.

REFLECTIONS ON FRAMEWORK

The following activities are designed to have teachers reflect on the connections between the Protocols and Washington's Instructional Frameworks.

CEL 5D+ Teacher Evaluation Framework by Paulette Johnson | Michelle Kuss-Cybula

Reflective Questions:

1. After discussing the video and the parts of the protocol with your Professional Learning Community (PLC), decide as a group which sub dimension on the CEL5D+ Rubric best matches the protocol and which one you would like to focus on.

Using the framework's vision and guiding questions discuss the following with your Professional Learning Community (PLC):

- A. What connections do you see to the indicators in the sub-dimension you chose as it relates to the video clip?
- B. How does the information you have connect to your area of focus?
- C. What instructional changes would you like to implement as a result of the work you have done with the protocol?

Primary: Constructing Meaning Through Reading (continued)

D. What other dimension/s did the group observe in the video and what are the implications and/or connections to student learning?

Facilitator Notes:

Each of the questions above can be facilitated in many different ways. Below are a few suggestions for small and large group activities that are focused on collective thinking.

- **Think, Pair, Square (with a larger group):** This strategy is initially a think (quiet individual think time), pair (find a content alike or elbow partner to share thinking), square (duo finds another duo to share their thinking as a group of four).
- **Snowball activity:** Link two people together to share out then, those two link with two more and then the group of four links with two more, until one continuous chain is formed. This activity allows for flexible group work to continue shaping viewpoints and challenges answers in a constructive fashion.
- **World Cafe:** This will require poster paper or butcher paper for each table group. Each table group collectively writes down their answers to the questions on a large piece of paper and hangs it on the wall, or leaves it on the table. One member stays at the table as a guest speaker, while the other group members rotate to the next table group. Each time they rotate, one person from the group stays behind and takes over as the spokesperson- while the guest groups add the poster. Repeat once all participants have the chance to rotate around to each table group. The original team reads the comments on their poster and debriefs as a table group. Feedback or comments should be both kind and constructive.

Danielson Framework for Teaching by Allison Bennett | Rosalyn O'Donnell

Facilitator Notes:

Before moving into the final reflection on the protocol, consider this lesson's alignment to the components in the Danielson Framework for Teaching. As a group, select one component as a focus. Then, pose the reflection questions one at a time. For each, offer a moment of quiet think time and then choose one of the recommended strategies to share out.

Reflective Questions:

1. Referring to the rubrics, critical attributes, and examples found in the Framework for Teaching Evaluation Instrument for guidance, what evidence did you see during the video that aligns with your chosen component?
2. What are the implications of the observed instruction on student learning?
3. Consider your own practice. What instructional changes to improve your practice might you make as a result of what you have seen and discussed?

Options for Sharing Out:

- **Whip Around:**
 1. Turn and talk with a partner. Choose a few key ideas to share out with the group.
 2. Do a "whip around" where each person shares an idea until no more are left.
- **Concept Map:** Give each small group a piece of chart paper and have them create a quick concept map of the key ideas.
- **Write & Share:** Have everyone write for two minutes, and then share out.
- **Take-Away T-Chart:**
 1. Make a t-chart individually or as a group with responses to the question on the left and personal take-aways on the other.
 2. If appropriate, capture teachers' thinking on chart paper or type up for future reference.

Primary: Constructing Meaning Through Reading (continued)

Marzano Teacher Evaluation Framework by Shannon Lawson | Annie Wolfley

Reflective Questions:

1. What element did you observe in the Routine Segment?
How was it going?
Based on what evidence?
2. What element did you observe in the Content Segment?
How was it going?
Based on what evidence?
3. What element did you observe in the Enacted on the Spot Segment?
How was it going?
Based on what evidence?

Questions to guide your thinking:

1. How was the teacher monitoring whether or not the strategy was effective with students?
2. How was the teacher differentiating or using a macro-strategy?

Facilitator Notes:

1. Make sure participants have their Marzano rubrics with them. As they are talking about the two follow up questions for each lesson segment teachers can use the rubric to guide their discussion.
2. Talk about what the teacher moves could be to move from a one level to another.
3. Have teachers make a non-linguistic representation of their thinking after watching and discussing the lesson.
4. Have teachers write a five word summary to close out the discussion.



Washington Office
of Superintendent
of Public Instruction

360-725-6116

PO Box 47200
Olympia WA 98504

www.tpep@k12.wa.us
www.tpep-wa.org



253-752-2082

PO Box 7052
Tacoma, WA 98417

www.cstp-wa.org



Center for Strengthening
the Teaching Profession



@WACSTP
and
@stories_school