**8.10 Differentiating Instruction – Evidence from Syllabus of EDSE 471 Differentiating Instruction**

**Appendix D: Cumulative Differentiation and Impact on Student Learning Rubric. Based on evidence from individual lesson reflections evaluated with the Lesson Reflection rubric as well as case study and final defense presentations. The teacher….**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Distinguished** | **Proficient** | **Not Met** |
| **Knows students**\*adapted from Danielson, planning domain, 1B | systematically acquires information about case study students, other individual students, and for the class as a whole from several sources about levels of development, varied approaches to learning, knowledge and skills, special needs, and interests and cultural heritages. | acquires information about case study students and the class as a whole from several sources about many aspects such as levels of development, varied approaches to learning, knowledge and skills, special needs, interests and cultural heritages. | displays minimal understanding of students varied approaches to learning, knowledge and skills, special needs, interests and cultural heritages. |
| **Differentiates instruction, making appropriate adjustments**\*adapted from Danielson, instruction domain, 3E | successfully adjusts and differentiates instruction to meet the needs and interests of case study students, other students, and the class as a whole. The teacher uses an extensive repertoire of strategies and solicits additional resources from the school or community. The teacher persists in seeking effective approaches. | purposefully adjusts and differentiates instruction to meet the needs and interests of case study students and the class as a whole. Drawing on a repertoire of strategies, the teacher attempts multiple approaches for students who have difficulty learning.  | only partially accepts responsibility for differentiating to meet the needs of case study students and has only a limited repertoire of strategies to use.  |
| **Analyzes and assesses students’ learning**\*adapted Danielson, professional responsibilities domain, 4 | Does not use adequate evidence of student learning to analyze whether teaching is effective for either case study students or the class as a whole.  | In writing and oral reporting demonstrates thoughtful analysis of teaching effectiveness for case study students and the class as a whole using evidence of student learning. | With depth of written analysis and fluent discussion demonstrates thoughtful analysis of teaching effectiveness for case study students and the class as a whole using in-depth evidence of student learning. |

**Components that are used in the Cumulative Evaluation**

Student teachers demonstrate their ability to know their students, monitor their learning, differentiate instruction through in a three stage process: development of student case studies, reflection on individual lessons, and capstone interview. The Cumulative Differentiation and Impact on Student Learning rubric is the capstone assessment of this three stage process.

**Brief description of three stage elements:**

***Knowing Your Students: Two Case Studies.*** This assessment has five distinct elements. In group/individual interviews, student teachers will:

1. Briefly describe their teaching placement including school demographics and district level assessment data.

2. Provide a detailed sketch about a student with a disability.

3. Provide a detailed sketch about a student who is an English-language learner.

(For element 2 & 3, students described must be students assigned to classes they will eventually teach. The student teacher must provide evidence that they 1) fully investigated appropriate data points available, 2) have begun to understand their selected students in complex, flexible, and multiple manners (socially, emotionally, and in the cultural context of the school) and in comparison with other academic performances across the district), and can organize information according within three primary categories: **readiness, interest, and learning profile.**

4. Describe typical district delivery models of instruction that a) employ explicit and systematic literacy and content literacy instruction and assessment and b) embed ELPS and PA academic standards.

5. Answers, “What do I know about my class and placement as a whole that will be important to consider as I also focus on designing instruction for case study students?”

***Planning, Implementation and Analysis of Differentiated Instruction***

Studentteachers will demonstrate implementation of differentiation techniques into their lesson plans and to reflect upon the outcomes on students’ learning. Please see specific Lesson Reflection Template and the Lesson Reflection rubric for more detailed criteria.

***Capstone Interviews.*** Student teachers are interviewed in the final forum and answer questions about differentiation techniques and how they followed cycles of improvement over time. Co-operating teachers and university supervisors are invited to attend the event and to serve as interviewers.

**Planning & Implementing Research Based and Assessment Informed Differentiated Instruction Template (completed 3 times for different research-based strategies)**

NAME: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Highlight one: Learning Env. Affect Process Product Content

PRE-LESSON

Briefly describe RECENT findings from formative/summative assessments for all students (including case study students).

|  |
| --- |
| Briefly describe one instructional strategy you plan to implement based on your knowledge of students with diverse learning needs. Why did you choose/design this strategy? What do you plan to accomplish? |

POST-LESSON

Describe the feedback and perspectives of others (co-op, supervisor, students, other teachers, etc.) regarding your lesson (particularly effective the strategy was/how it could be improved).

Describe what kinds of formative assessment you collected.

Knowing all of this (feedback/assessment) what is your planned teacher response?

**Appendix D: Individual Lesson Reflection Rubric. The teacher candidate….**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not Met** (teacher centered, repetition, blame focused, or poor explanation) | **Partially Met** (Good whole-class engagement but with limited differentiation or analysis of learning) | **Proficient**(Uses knowledge of students to differentiate and analyzes impact on student learning) | **Distinguished**(Proficient + persistent, positive, strong academic challenge) |
| **Knowledge of Case Study Students**(strengths as well as needs) | Very limited information, or repeated information from earlier reflections, or information not useful to a teacher, or shows a clear belief that student cannot learn. | New information about case study students’ academic readiness related to content, observations about approach to learning, special needs, interests, or cultural heritage. Insights are not specific to content. Information is useful for teachers generally, but not specific to lesson or content. | Partially Met + information is specifically useful for these students and the content area being taught. | Proficient + clear and insightful appreciation of students’ positive abilities. |
| **Learning Objectives**(measurable and important) | Learning objectives describe instructional activities rather than learning outcomes for students (e.g. “students will get into groups”). | Learning objectives describe learning outcomes for students, but are not clear / measurable (for example “students will understand…”) | Learning objectives describe learning outcomes for students that are clear and measurable. | Proficient + high expectations central to the discipline. |
| **Differentiation Strategy**(different paths within the same lesson) | Focuses on teacher centered strategy that predictably would not be effective with the majority of the class (e.g. a lengthy lecture without active learning). Or demonstrates little variety over time.  | Uses active engagement strategies that predictably engage a good portion of the class, but without different paths for different students. | Uses active engagement plus builds different paths for different students within the same lesson (for example student choice of products or activities, tiered activities, differentiating materials). | Proficient + Finds strategies to build on student strength as well as scaffold student needs. |
| **Justification for Strategy**(based on knowing students) | Very limited or illogical explanation of connection between knowledge of students and differentiation strategy. | Connection is made but is only partially related to knowledge of case study student. Often characterized by an explanation that would be true of any student (“learns better when I use an engagement strategy”) | Connection is explicit between strategy andreportedacademic readiness related to content, approach to learning, special needs, interests or cultural heritage of case study students. | Proficient + justifies strategies using evidence in cycles of learning more about students and improving differentiation over time. |
| **Formative Assessment Data**(uses evidence of learning) | Does not describe student learning. Often characterized by description of student participation (“student were busy for the whole lesson!”) or assertions without evidence (“the whole class really got it”) | Describes student learning related to learning outcomes with evidence (either substantive description or quantitative data such as quiz results) for whole class **or** for case study students  | Describes student learning related to learning outcomes with evidence (**either** substantive description or quantitative data such as quiz results) for whole class **and** for case study students | Proficient + uses **both** substantive description and quantitative data such as quiz results). |
| **Feedback**(seeks input) | Very limited feedback reported from others (could be students, supervisor, mentor). | Substantial feedback reported, but not related to differentiation strategy (e.g. “mentor said I seemed more confident today”) | Substantial feedback reported related to differentiation strategy. | Proficient + substantive feedback from more than one source (students, supervisor, mentor)  |
| **Evaluation**(synthesizes, evaluates, learns from) | Evaluation is blame focused, very limited, or does not fit with rest of lesson reflection.  | Evaluation summarizes evidence from rest of lesson reflection, but with limited new insight , questions, or goals. | Evaluation makes substantial connections between different sections of reflection and uses for new insight, questions, or goals to improve instruction. | Proficient + Uses to build more knowledge of students and develop ideas for future lessons to build on their strengths and meet their needs. |

**\*Less than 4 Proficient or any Not Met requires a new lesson reflection. Must reach proficient at least once on all elements by the end of the semester.**