Indicator Explanation

DOMAIN	EFFECTIVE PRACTICE	INDICATOR
Instruction	Provide rigorous evidence-based instruction	3B.3 Teachers develop weekly lesson plans based on aligned units of instruction.

Research on effective classroom instruction can be found within the fields of cognitive science (i.e., how the brain acquires and uses information), the instructional practices of master teachers (i.e., teachers whose students exhibit high levels of learning and growth), and the cognitive supports that help students learn complex tasks (e.g., teachers' use of think-aloud and modeling strategies; Rosenshine, 2012). While these types of research may differ from one another, all three recommend sound instructional strategies that supplement and complement each other at each stage of the lesson delivery process (see Rosenshine, 2012 for a complete description of sound, evidence-based instructional strategies). Instructional strategies must be woven into standards-aligned units of instruction that are then segmented by teachers into daily lesson plans that address the targeted learning processes and content. Research shows that effective lesson preparation based on aligned instructional units is a key teacher skill that contributes to student learning (Hattie, 2012; Marzano. & Pickering, 2010), and well as student behavior (Cooper & Scott, 2017; Nagro et al., 2019).

General Methods for Developing Daily Lesson Plans to Align with Instructional Units
Recent meta-analyses have led researchers to advocate for the creation of collaborative approaches to lesson development, such as instructional teams that regularly collaborate to solve learning dilemmas, examine impact of curricula and teaching on students, and cooperatively plan and critique lessons, objectives and success criteria (e.g., Hattie, 2012).

Teachers and instructional teams should be guided in their planning by a document that clearly aligns standards, curriculum, instruction, and assessment; often a district provides this document in order to keep all schools in the district focused in the same direction, but in some cases schools may need to develop their own (District Administration, 2004; Redding, 2006). Instructional teams should work to "build the curriculum from learning standards, curriculum guides, and a variety of resources [and] organize the curriculum into unit plans that guide instruction for all students and for each student" (Redding, 2007, p. 95). Plans for each standards-aligned unit of instruction, which typically involve three to six weeks of academic work within a given subject area or grade level, are developed by instructional teams and shared with all teachers that teach the corresponding unit (Hattie, 2012). Once unit planning has taken place, then teachers can either together, or individually, develop lesson plans based on each unit of instruction; in some cases, districts or schools can provide lesson plan templates to ensure quality and standardization (Redding, 2006). Balancing teaching strategies (e.g., whole-class discussion or visual presentation of new material) with student-initiated learning strategies (e.g., pre-writing strategies such as brainstorming or creating an outline to organize ideas) maintains active engagement by both teachers and students (Finley, 2016). Formative assessment has been shown to have strong positive effect sizes on student learning across most studies (Hanover Research,

2014; Kingston & Nash, 2012; Rich et al., 2008; Wiliam et al., 2004). Part of the lesson planning process must include careful and regular incorporation of formative assessments to determine student mastery of learning objectives. Learning objectives, or intentions, convey "what you want students to know and be able to do by the end of one or more lessons" (see Fisher & Frey, 2018 for examples). Teachers should develop objectives-based pre- and post-tests as a key method of formative assessment to determine student mastery of objectives prior to the introduction of units or lessons, and determine their learning at the end of the unit or lesson (Redding, 2007). Pretests inform the teacher about each student's level of understanding of the concepts in the upcoming lesson, allowing the teacher to subsequently differentiate assignments and supports as needed (Tomlinson et al., 2003). Effective teachers design these assessments before developing instructional content, and build in performance task checkpoints to determine when and why students fail to learn skills and content and make adjustments as necessary (Finley, 2016).

Teachers and instructional teams should plan lessons that include differentiated learning activities that are leveled and aligned with standards and objectives to provide a menu of options for individual students (Redding, 2007). Post-tests given at the end of the unit or lesson then provide a measure of how well the instruction closed the gap between what students knew prior to the lesson and where the teacher wanted students to be at the end of instruction. Instructional teams can use the results of the post-test to shape how they re-teach the lesson for those who did not understand the first time around, or if this is a large number of students, perhaps reexamine how the unit was taught overall. Teachers must closely monitor students' mastery of learning objectives and keep explicit and easily accessible daily records to be able to compare student progress to the rate of improvement necessary to meet annual learning goals (Safer & Fleischman, 2005).

Building Student Engagement into Lesson Plans Proactively

Student engagement during classroom instruction is essential for learning, and requires students' close focused attention on lesson content (Rosenshine, 2012). Research shows that when teachers provide an abundance of opportunities for students to respond to instruction, active engagement and, subsequently, learning increase (Hattie, 2012; Tincani & Twyman, 2016; Twyman & Heward, 2018), and behavioral disruptions decrease (Heward & Wood, 2015; Menzies et al., 2017). Active student response (ASR) or opportunities to respond (OTR) techniques have been used successfully with students from preschool through secondary grades (Twyman & Heward, 2018), and with both general education students (e.g., Christle & Schuster, 2003), and students with disabilities (e.g., Didion et al., 2018). ASR occurs when a student responds to ongoing instruction by providing a detectable response, such as hand-raising, providing a written or verbal answer, or some other detectable response following a teacher posed question or other instructional cue (Tincani & Twyman, 2016). ASRs are alterable variables (within the teachers' control) that offer the benefits of being readily available and easy to implement (Marsicano, & Scott, 2013), providing access for students with disabilities (Didion et al., 2018), and easily integrated within a school-wide system such as School-wide Positive Behavioral Support (Bradshaw et al., 2015; Tincani & Twyman, 2016). Several high-ASRs strategies have been shown to invoke high rates of active participation during small- or whole-group instruction, including response cards, choral response, and guided note-taking strategies (see Tinani & Twyman, 2016, for additional detail on these strategies).

- In a review of research addressing how to make lesson plans that build engagement, Nagro et al (2019) advocate many of the ASR strategies discussed previously, and suggest that building an element of stu- dent choice about learning processes (how students engage) and products (how they show what they learned) into lessons is also highly effective. They advocate that many of these strategies be incorporated into traditional lesson plan components:
- Lesson standards and objectives to set lesson expectations: e.g., have students repeat learning objective and how it fits into curriculum using choral response
- Warm-up activities that activate prior knowledge and build background information: e.g., thinkpair-share review of what students learned the day before
- Teacher-led instruction that includes modeling and guided practice: e.g., students gesture during response to teacher questioning

- Student-led learning to include independent work and/or partner/group work: e.g., students choose how to demonstrate understanding (e.g., on board, computer, graphic organizers)
- Wrap-up/closure activities to check in with students, repeat the main takeaway from the lesson, and administer quick formative assessments to monitor progress: e.g., students can choose one L to share from their KWL chart

The researchers note the benefits of incorporating student engagement strategies into lesson plans: In addition to sustaining student engagement during instruction, embedding research-based proactive strategies can increase the quality of instructional time by promoting active rather than passive learning [and], with careful planning, these strategies can be easily implemented in classrooms with minimal need for additional resources and are applicable across grade levels and content areas. (Nagro et al., 2019, p. 138).

See: http://trackstudentlearning.weebly.com/lesson-plan-templates.html for lesson planning templates that include proactive classroom management strategies.

References

Bradshaw, C. P., Waasdorp, T. E., & Leaf, P. J. (2015). Examining variation in the impact of school-wide positive behavioral interventions and supports: Findings from a randomized controlled effectiveness trial. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 107*(2), 546–557.

Christle, C. A., & Schuster, J. W. (2003). The effects of using response cards on student participation, academic achievement, and on-task behavior during whole-class, math instruction. *Journal of Behavioral Education, 12*(3), 147–165.

Cooper, J. T., & Scott, T. M. (2017). The keys to managing instruction and behavior: Considering high probability practices. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 40*, 102–113.

Didion, L. A., Toste, J. R., & Wehby, J. H. (2018). Response cards to increase engagement and active participation of middle school students with EBD. *Remedial and Special Education*, 1-13.

District Administration. (2004, July). *The benefits of curriculum alignment: Essentials on education data and analysis from research authority AEL*. https://www.districtadministration.com/article/benefits-curriculum-alignment

Finley, T. (2016, July 27). *9 ways to plan transformational lessons: Planning the best curriculum unit ever.* https://www.edutopia.org/blog/9-ways-plan-transformational-lessons-todd-finley

Fisher, D., & Frey, N. (2018). Show & tell: A video column/A map for meaningful learning. *Educational Leadership, 75*(5), 82–83. http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership/feb18/vol75/num05/A-Map-for-Mean- ingful-Learning.aspx

Hanover Research. (2014). *The impact of formative assessment and learning intentions on student achievement*. District Administration Practice. http://www.hanoverresearch.com/media/The-Impact-of-Formative-Assessment-and-Learning-Intentions-on-StudentAchievement.pdf

Hattie, J. (2012). *Visible learning for teachers: Maximizing impact on learning*. Routledge.

Heward, W. L., & Wood, C. L. (2015). *Improving educational outcomes in America: Can a low-tech, generic teaching practice make a difference?* Wing Institute for Evidence Based Practice. https://autism.outreach.psu.edu/sites/default/files/80.Handout 5.pdf

Kingston, N., & Nash, B. (2012). Formative assessment: A meta-analysis and a call for research. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice, 30*(4), 28–37.

Marzano, R. J., & Pickering, D. J. (2010). *Classroom Strategies: The Highly Engaged Classroom*. Marzano Research.

Menzies, H. M., Lane, K. L., Oakes, W. P., & Ennis, R. P. (2017). Increasing students' opportunities to respond: A strategy for supporting engagement. *Intervention in School and Clinic, 52*, 204–209.

Nagro, S. A., Fraser, D. W., & Hooks, S. D. (2019). Lesson planning with engagement in mind: Proactive classroom management strategies for curriculum instruction. *Intervention in School and Clinic, 54*(3), 131–140.

Redding, S. (2006). *The mega system: Deciding. Learning. Connecting: A handbook for continuous improvement within the community of a school*. Academic Development Institute. http://www.adi.org/mega/

Redding, S. (2007). Systems for improved teaching and learning. In H. Walberg (Ed.), *Handbook on restructuring and substantial school improvement* (pp. 91–104). Center on Innovation and Improvement. http://www.adi.org/about/downloads/Restructuring%20Handbook.pdf

Rosenshine, B. (2012). Principles of instruction: Research-based strategies that all teachers should know. *American Educator,* 12-39. https://www.aft.org/sites/default/files/periodicals/Rosenshine.pdf

Safer, N., & Fleischman, S. (2005). Research matters/How student progress monitoring improves instruction. *Educational Leadership, 62*(5), 81–83.

Tincani, M., & Twyman, J. S. (2016). *Enhancing engagement through active student response*. Temple University, Center on Innovations in Learning. http://www.centeril.org/publications/Active Student Response (Final).pdf

Tomlinson, C. A., Brighton, C., Hertberg, J., Callahan, C. M., Moon, T. R., Brimijoin, K., Conover, L. A., & Reynolds, T. (2003). Differentiating instruction in response to student readiness, interest, and learning profile in academically diverse classrooms: A review of the literature. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 27*(2/3), 119–145. http://files.eric. ed.gov/fulltext/EJ787917.pdf

Twyman, J. S., & Heward, W. L. (2018). How to improve student learning in every classroom now. *International Journal of Education Research, 87*, 78–90. https://autism.outreach.psu.edu/sites/default/files/80.Handout 8.pdf

Wiliam, D., Lee, C., Harrison, C., & Black, P. J. (2004). Teachers developing assessment for learning: Impact on student achievement. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy and Practice, 11*(1), 49–65.