

Classroom 'First Responder' Series

Teacher Tools to Motivate & Support the Struggling Learner

Jim Wright, Presenter

14-15 June 2016 Peru Schools Peru, NY

Jim Wright 364 Long Road Tully, NY 13159

Email: jim@jimwrightonline.com

Workshop Materials: http://www.interventioncentral.org/peru





How To: Implement Strong Core Instruction

Teacher:	Date:	Class/Lesson:		
The checklist below summarizes the essential elements of a supported-instruction approach. When preparing lesson plans, instructors can use this resource as a 'pre-flight' checklist to make sure that their lessons reach the widest range of diverse learners.				
1. Increase Access to Inst	ruction			
Instructional Element		Notes		
☐ Instructional Match. Lesson students' abilities (Burns, Va	n content is appropriately ma nDerHeyden, & Boice, 2008)			
☐ Content Review at Lesson of concepts or material that I VanDerHeyden, & Boice, 20	have previously been presen			
☐ Preview of Lesson Goal(s) current day's lesson are sha		he goals of the		
☐ Chunking of New Material. small, manageable incremen	The teacher breaks new mants, 'chunks', or steps (Roser			
2 Dravidad 'Caaffalding' C	`upport			
2. Provided 'Scaffolding' S Instructional Element	συρροιτ	Notes		
☐ Detailed Explanations & In	structions Throughout the			
teacher provides adequate e	explanations and detailed insign graught (Burns, VanDerHeye	structions for all		
students. Verbal explanation describes and explains each alouds' (e.g., the teacher approblem or task and verbalize	When presenting cognitive the teacher describes those his include 'talk-alouds' (e.g., a step of a cognitive strategy) plies a cognitive strategy to a ses the steps in applying the soice, 2008, Rosenshine, 200	e strategies for , the teacher r) and 'think- a particular strategy)		
☐ Work Models. The teacher	makes exemplars of academ rd problems) available to stud	mic work (e.g.,		
	eacher ensures that the lesson te responding' (Skinner, Pap re student attention and to op	opas & Davis,		



	Collaborative Assignments. Students have frequent opportunities to work collaborativelyin pairs or groups. (Baker, Gersten, & Lee, 2002; Gettinger & Seibert, 2002).	
	Checks for Understanding. The instructor regularly checks for student understanding by posing frequent questions to the group (Rosenshine, 2008).	
	boosts levels of student attention by having all students respond in various ways (e.g., choral responding, response cards, white boards) to instructor questions (Rosenshine, 2008).	
	experiencing at least 80% success in the lesson content to shape their learning in the desired direction and to maintain student motivation and engagement (Gettinger & Seibert, 2002).	
	to hold student attention (Carnine,1976; Gettinger & Seibert, 2002).	
	Fix-Up Strategies. Students are taught fix-up strategies (Rosenshine, 2008) for use during independent work (e.g., for defining unknown words in reading assignments, for solving challenging math word problems).	
0	O. T. I D (
	Give Timely Performance Feedback	Mataa
	Regular Feedback. The teacher provides timely and regular performance feedback and corrections throughout the lesson as needed to guide student learning (Burns, VanDerHeyden, & Boice).	Notes
	Step-by-Step Checklists. For multi-step cognitive strategies, the teacher creates checklists for students to use to self-monitor performance (Rosenshine, 2008).	
	Provide Opportunities for Review & Practice	
	ructional Element	Notes
	Spacing of Practice Throughout Lesson. The lesson includes practice activities spaced throughout the lesson. (e.g., through teacher demonstration; then group practice with teacher supervision and feedback; then independent, individual student practice) (Burns, VanDerHeyden, & Boice).	





Guided Practice. When teaching challenging material, the teacher	
provides immediate corrective feedback to each student response.	
When the instructor anticipates the possibility of an incorrect response,	
that teacher forestalls student error through use of cues, prompts, or	
hints. The teacher also tracks student responding and ensures	
sufficient success during supervised lessons before having students	
practice the new skills or knowledge independently (Burns,	
VanDerHeyden, & Boice, 2008).	
Support for Independent Practice. The teacher ensures that students	
have adequate support (e.g., clear and explicit instructions; teacher	
monitoring) to be successful during independent seatwork practice	
activities (Rosenshine, 2008).	
Distributed Practice. The teacher reviews previously taught content	
one or more times over a period of several weeks or months (Pashler et	
al., 2007; Rosenshine & Stevens, 1995).	

References

Baker, S., Gersten, R., & Lee, D. (2002). A synthesis of empirical research on teaching mathematics to low-achieving students. The Elementary School Journal, 103(1), 51-73.

Burns, M. K., VanDerHeyden, A. M., & Boice, C. H. (2008). Best practices in intensive academic interventions. In A. Thomas & J. Grimes (Eds.), Best practices in school psychology V (pp.1151-1162). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.

Carnine, D.W. (1976). Effects of two teacher presentation rates on off-task behavior, answering correctly, and participation. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 9, 199-206.

Gettinger, M., & Seibert, J.K. (2002). Best practices in increasing academic learning time. In A. Thomas (Ed.), Best practices in school psychology IV: Volume I (4th ed., pp. 773-787). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.

Pashler, H., Bain, P., Bottge, B., Graesser, A., Koedinger, K., McDaniel, M., and Metcalfe, J. (2007) Organizing Instruction and Study to Improve Student Learning (NCER 2007-2004). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Research, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from http://ncer.ed.gov.

Rosenshine, B. (2008). Five meanings of direct instruction. Center on Innovation & Improvement. Retrieved from http://www.centerii.org

Rosenshine, B., & Stevens, R. (1995). Functions for teaching well-structured tasks. Journal of Educational Research, 88, 262-268.

Skinner, C. H., Pappas, D. N., & Davis, K. A. (2005). Enhancing academic engagement: Providing opportunities for responding and influencing students to choose to respond. Psychology in the Schools, 42, 389-403.

How To: Define Intervention-Related Terms: Core Instruction, Intervention, Instructional Adjustment, Modification

Educators who serve as interventionists should be able to define and distinguish among the terms *core instruction*, *intervention*, *instructional adjustment*, and *modification*. (In particular, interventionists should avoid using modifications as part of an intervention plan to support a general education student in core instruction--as they can be predicted to undermine the student's academic performance.) Here are definitions for these key terms. (Tindal & Fuchs, 1999; Wright, 2007).

Intervention-Related Terms & Definitions

Core Instruction. Those instructional strategies that are used routinely with all students in a general-education setting are considered 'core instruction'. High-quality instruction is essential and forms the foundation of classroom academic support. NOTE: While it is important to verify that a struggling student receives good core instructional practices, those routine practices do not 'count' as individual student interventions.

Intervention. An academic *intervention* is a strategy used to teach a new skill, build fluency in a skill, or encourage a child to apply an existing skill to new situations or settings. An intervention can be thought of as "a set of actions that, when taken, have demonstrated ability to change a fixed educational trajectory" (Methe & Riley-Tillman, 2008; p. 37). As an example of an academic intervention, the teacher may select question generation (Davey & McBride, 1986.; Rosenshine, Meister & Chapman, 1996), a strategy in which the student is taught to locate or generate main idea sentences for each paragraph in a passage and record those 'gist' sentences for later review.

Instructional Adjustment (Accommodation). An instructional adjustment (also known as an 'accommodation') is intended to help the student to fully access and participate in the general-education curriculum without changing the instructional content and without reducing the student's rate of learning (Skinner, Pappas & Davis, 2005). An instructional adjustment is intended to remove barriers to learning while still expecting that students will master the same instructional content as their typical peers. An instructional adjustment for students who are slow readers, for example, may include having them supplement their silent reading of a novel by listening to the book on tape. An instructional adjustment for unmotivated students may include breaking larger assignments into smaller 'chunks' and providing students with performance feedback and praise for each completed 'chunk' of assigned work (Skinner, Pappas & Davis, 2005).

Modification. A modification changes the expectations of what a student is expected to know or do—typically by lowering the academic standards against which the student is to be evaluated. Examples of modifications are giving a student five math computation problems for practice instead of the 20 problems assigned to the rest of the class or letting the student consult course notes during a test when peers are not permitted to do so. Instructional modifications are essential elements on the Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) or Section 504 Plans of many students with special needs. Modifications are generally not included on a general-education student's classroom intervention plan, however, because the assumption is that the student can be successful in the curriculum with appropriate interventions and instructional adjustments alone. In fact, modifying the work of struggling general education students is likely to have a negative effect that works against the goals of intervention. Reducing academic expectations will result in these students falling further behind rather than closing the performance gap with peers

References

Davey, B., & McBride, S. (1986). Effects of question-generation training on reading comprehension. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 78, 256-262.

Methe, S. A., & Riley-Tillman, T. C. (2008). An informed approach to selecting and designing early mathematics interventions. School Psychology Forum: Research into Practice, 2, 29-41.

Tindal, G., & Fuchs, L. (1999). A summary of research on test changes: An empirical basis for defining accommodations. Lexington, KY: Mid-South Regional Resource Center, University of Kentucky. Retrieved on January 25, 2013, from http://www.specialed.us/discoveridea/topdocs/msrrc/Tindal%26Fuchs.PDF

Wright, J. (2007). *The RTI toolkit: A practical guide for schools*. Port Chester, NY: National Professional Resources, Inc.