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**Telephone:** 781-551-9120 (*to reach the instructor, you need to call their phone number*)
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**Instructor Info:** See biographies at [www.ribasassociates.com](http://www.ribasassociates.com/) (under About Us).

**Instructor Email Phone:** This will be provided in an email from the instructor

**Instructor Contact:** Weekly office hours for each course taught will be established for telephone contact with the instructor. All participants are provided with the instructors email for contact at other times.

***Ask the author***: There will be an “**optional**” monthly chat time set up for course participants to have an online chat session with one of the author’s of the text. The dates and times are posted online.

Synchronous chat sessions with the instructor and other students from your district.

All instructors are expected to review and respond to bulletin board postings within 24 hours (1 business day).

## COURSE DESCRIPTION:

The course is designed to provide teachers with the skills to increase the number of students who succeed in their classes by designing a learning environment that meets their diverse needs. The course is divided into the following parts.

Part 1 of the course provides the participants with an understanding of the components of differentiated instruction (content, process, and product). It applies these concepts to a tiered system of supports including UDL and social-emotional learning. Participants learn about the varied needs of students and determine the best strategies to differentiate by learning style, English language proficiency, special needs, cultural influences, gender, effects of poverty, and brain development.

Part 2 looks at the skills teachers need to manage a differentiated instruction classroom. Many teachers struggle with differentiated instruction because their management skills do not enable them to teach students to work effectively with partners and in groups. They continue to frequently teach using direct instruction to the entire class as the primary mode of instruction. Because the teacher is teaching the

same concepts to all the students at the same time, there is little opportunity to differentiate for individuals and subgroups

Part 3 of the course addresses effective assessment of student learning for differentiation. A teacher is not able to differentiate until he or she is able to pre-assess at the outset of the lesson and then formatively assess the level of mastery of each student during the lesson and at the conclusion of the lesson. It is only through effective assessment that a teacher is able to determine each student’s zone of proximal development and teach that student in the appropriate manner and at the appropriate level.

Participants learn to develop differentiated assessments that allow students to demonstrate their level of mastery in several ways. This part also includes the most current research and practice on effective classroom questioning techniques and the development of higher order thinking skills.

Part 4 teaches the participants to effectively plan a differentiated instruction lesson that includes a tiered system of supports. It uses the concepts of understanding by design lesson planning that address the multiple needs of a diverse group of learners. Participants learn to plan differentiated activities that meet the needs of students at all levels of mastery (i.e. introductory, guided practice, immediate mastery, mastery, and application mastery).

Part 5 teaches the participants to use the myriad of differentiated instruction strategies that are available to meet the needs of varied learners. It includes strategies for closing the achievement gap between Black, Hispanic, White and Asian students, between students from high and low socio-economic homes, general education and special education, native English speakers and English language learners, gifted students and strategies for building a sense of efficacy among all low performing learners.

Part 6 looks at the brain and learning and theories of learnable intelligence. Participants are taught the most current research on the function of the learner’s brain including development variations that may exist for students of poverty. They learn to use brain compatible learning strategies (e.g. developing the cognitive context for learning) to maximize student mastery. They also learn effective effort strategies for working with low motivation learners and students from poverty.

The course is designed to provide teachers with the instructional competencies proven to increase student achievement. For each topic identified in the objectives, the course developer has compiled a comprehensive review of the most recent literature.

## Massachusetts Tiered System of Supports

Below we have listed the district standards and indicators related the Massachusetts System of Tiered Support. After each we have indicated in italics how this course supports each area. We have taken the section below from the ESE document titled “District Standards and Indicators” found at the link <http://www.mass.gov/edu/government/departments-and-boards/ese/programs/accountability/tools-and-> resources/massachusetts-tiered-system-of-support/blueprint.html.

The MTSS blueprint describes the flexible tiers, academic and non-academic core components and school and district system of supports.

The flexible tiers represent a robust and responsive educational environment that provides students with a continuum of multiple supports to meet their needs. The tiers represent increasing intensity of

academic and non-academic support and interventions. There is flexibility of the system and the programming to allow movement between the tiers (to both a more or less intensive type of support/intervention). To ensure that students eligible for special education services are able to access fully the system of tiered support, relevant information from their Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) is to be incorporated into the design and implementation of instruction and assessments in all tiers.

The academic and non-academic core components of MTSS are:

* high-quality core curriculum and instruction implemented with fidelity; *In this course teachers learn to plan differentiated instruction lessons that are directly derived from the common core and the curriculum frameworks. Teachers are required to consider the diverse needs of the general education, special education, students from poverty, and English language learning students as they construct the lessons. The lesson planning project insures that teachers demonstrate a high level of mastery in planning that uses these important standards.*
* research-based academic interventions and assessment practices; *All of the strategies taught in the course are substantiated by significant research and practice. It is based on over 6000 pages of the most current research and practice on effective teaching. A review of the reference list at the end of each chapter of the text shows all of the resources used to develop the content of this course.*
* research-based behavioral interventions and supports; *The managing the differentiated classroom component of the course addresses the management of all students. It moves well beyond the management of general education students into the management of students who significantly challenged academically or behaviorally. At the end of each of each section of the course is a component that instructs the teacher in how the competencies in that section apply to special education students. Of particular note is the section about managing students with significant behavior issues. General education and special education staff are taught a method for creating plans for these students that enable them to receive their learning in the general education classroom. In weeks 12 and 13 general education, special education, and English language learning staff learn how to collaborate in a variety of ways to insure optimum education for all students.*
* universal screening and progress-monitoring;
* collaboration and communication between educators and parents. Session 11 provides educators with concrete strategies for communicating effectively with families. *Sessions 12 and 13 of the course are devoted to teacher collaboration. The new ESE teacher performance rubric has 8 elements (of a total of 33) devoted to teacher collaboration. In session 12 we begin to address the key aspects of collaboration through the use of lesson study and collaborative action research. Through these processes general education, special education, and English language learning staff learn to jointly plan lessons. They also learn how to identify blocks to mastery among all students and develop plans for overcoming these blocks.*

*In session 13 participants address other structures for teacher collaboration. These include examining student work, analyzing student assessment data, professional literature study groups*

*peer observation, and more. We also expand the learning to focus on required collaboration among general education, special education, and English language learning staff.*

The school and district system of supports align with the District Standards and Indicators and provide the structure needed to develop the policies, practices, and procedures to successfully implement MTSS.

The District Standards and Indicators are:

* Leadership and Governance
* Student Support (School Culture, Family and Community Engagement) *One session of the course is devoted entirely to family engagement. Teachers learn how to communicate effectively with parents and guardians. They learn a variety of strategies for engaging uninvolved families and familis They also learn to manage aggressive parents and guardians in ways the channel this energy in positive behavior for the student.*
* Financial and Asset Management
* Human Resources and Professional Development
* Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment (Fidelity of Implementation) *Sessions 5 and 6 focus on student assessment in the general education classroom. Teachers learn to construct valid and reliable classroom assessments. Teachers learn to interpret student assessment data and modify instruction to better meet the needs of their students. Session 13 teaches teachers how to collaboratively analyze assessment data with special education and English language learning staff and plan lesson modifications to better meet the needs of all their students.*

## Matriculation for Graduate Credit

If you plan on matriculating into a graduate program at Fitchburg State University, please be aware that twelve semester hours of Fitchburg State University credit taken within a year prior to the student’s admission may be applied to the degree program with the approval of the program chairperson.

Anything over 12 credits prior to matriculation will NOT be accepted towards the degree.

## TEXTS:

* Deane, J., Ph.D., Ribas, W., Ph.D., Brady, D. Ph.D., Tamerat, J. Ph.D. Candidate, Greer, V. Ph.D. Billings, C. M.A.T.. (2017). *Instructional Practices That Maximize Student Achievement: For Teachers, By Teachers*. Westwood, MA: Ribas Publications.
* Ribas, W., Handout notebook, *Current Research and Practices in Instruction That Maximize Student Achievement.* The notebook includes over 200 pages of documents developed by Ribas Associates for training teachers.
* Fitchburg State University Teacher Preparation Programs. (2012). *Conceptual framework.* Fitchburg, MA: Author. [Online] Available: [http://www.fitchburgstate.edu/academics/academic-departments/education- unit/conceptual-framework/](http://www.fitchburgstate.edu/academics/academic-departments/education-unit/conceptual-framework/)

1.

* Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. *Curriculum frameworks*. Malden, MA: Author. [Online] Available: <http://www.doe.mass.edu/frameworks/current.html>
* Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. *Common Core*. Malden, MA: Author. [Online] Available: <http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/commoncore/>

## LEARNING OUTCOMES/OBJECTIVES:

This course will address the dispositions of the Conceptual Framework in the following way(s):

**Knowledge**: As a result of the learning experiences in the course, you will become more cognizant of: (Week 1) **Introduction**

After this section of the course, participants will be able to:

* describe all the materials needed for the course
* explain all the course expectations and projects as noted in the syllabus
* be completely set up on the courseware site
* have tested all aspects to the technology including audio powerpoints, discussion boards, chats, and online video capabilities.
* reported any issues with set up to their instructors

(Week 2)

## The Philosophical and Research Foundations for Differentiated Instruction

After this section of the course, the participants will be able to:

* explain the research base that supports the positive impacts of differentiating instruction
* explain what it means to differentiate instruction by content, process and product
* explain the impact of differentiated instruction on student mastery and the stages of mastery
* explain the impact of differentiated instruction on the social-emotional development of students
* explain the varied needs of a diverse population of students (e.g. special education, E.L.L., students of color, students from poverty, gifted students, and an array of cultures).

## Creating the Cognitive Context for Learning to Maximize Understanding and Retention for Varied Learning Styles

After this section of the course, the participants will be able to:

* use activators to show students how the content and the skills taught in lessons connect to their previous learning
* use agendas to tell students what they will do during lessons
* use lesson objectives to create contexts that lead to deeper understanding and longer retention of independent facts as they appear in lessons
* create increased motivation and retention by explaining to students why the knowledge and skills taught in lessons are relevant to them
* use summarizers to increase student mastery and retention of the knowledge and skills taught in lessons
* explain how these strategies can be employed in ways that increase the level of success of general education, special education, poverty, gifted and talented, and English language learners.

(Week 3)

## Classroom Management for Effective Differentiated and Standards Based Instruction

After this section of the course, the participants will be able to **implement the nine components of effective classroom management including:**

* develop and implement classroom rules and routines that maximize the level of respectful, on-task behavior
* develop and implement a system of rewards and consequences for reinforcing respectful, on-task behavior
* obtain students’ attention at the start of lessons, after group and partner activities, after interruptions, and after student attention has deteriorated
* create student-teacher and student-student relationships
* use physical proximity and the physical design of the classroom to improve student behavior
* teach students to work with a high level of independence during partner and group work.
* explain how these strategies can be employed in ways that increase the level of success of general education, special education, poverty, gifted and talented, and English language learners.
* develop contingency plans for students who present profound behavior issues.
* align your classroom management plan with the five key areas of social-emotional learning

(Week 4)

## Standards Based Planning and Teaching for Differentiated Instruction

After this section of the course, the participants will be able to:

* develop differentiated instruction lessons based on the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks for the participants particular grade level and content area
* write objectives for classes or units in language that describes what the students will know and be able to do after the teaching is finished
* write objectives for classes or units in language that enables them to readily assess whether or not the objectives have been mastered
* choose develop and/or choose formative and summative assessments that measure student mastery of the objectives
* choose activities that maximize student mastery of the objectives
* explain how these strategies can be employed in ways that increase the level of success of general education, special education, and English language learners.

(Week 5)

## Questioning Skills for Regular and Special Education Students

After this section of the course, the participants will be able to:

* increase the number of general (including students from poverty), English language learners, and special education students who ask and answer questions in their classes
* raise the thinking level of the answers they get from students
* use questions and dipsticking to pre-assess and formatively assess student understanding
* use questions and dipsticking to inform their instruction
* explain how these strategies can be employed in ways that increase the level of success of general education (including students from poverty), special education, and English language learners.

(Weeks 6 and 7)

## Assessment of Student Work for Effective Differentiating of the Instruction

After this section of the course, the participants will be able to:

* describe the various purposes for assessment
* define the similarities and differences between summative and formative assessments
* define the similarities and differences between product and performance assessments
* create unbiased teacher-made product and performance assessments that gauge levels of student mastery on the stated objectives, both formatively and summatively
* write rubrics and criteria sheets (a.k.a. scoring guides) that assess student products and performances on those concepts that are difficult to quantify for assessment

(Week 8)

## Mid Course Application of Concepts

After this section of the course, the participants will be able to:

* Watch a lesson and identify the following differentiated instruction concepts taught in sessions 1 to 6 (cognitive context for learning, effective classroom groups, concepts from standards based teaching
* Choose a lesson topic and write mastery objectives and formative and summative assessments for the topic

(Weeks 9 and 10)

## Differentiated Instruction Strategies

After this section of the course, the participants will be able to:

* respond to various special education needs and modify their teaching to better meet those needs
* implement strategies designed to address learning styles, the achievement gap (students of color, ELL students, students from poverty), and other diverse needs
* plan lessons that can flexibly provide reteaching, practice and extension as needed
* manage differentiated activities in single lessons
* write objectives for classes or units in language that describes what the students will know and be able to do after the teaching is finished
* implement differentiated instruction activities that allow for students to move from concrete to abstract, simple to complex, few steps to multi-steps, small leaps to large leaps, more structured to more open, less independence to greater independence at their own rate
* explain how these strategies can be employed in ways that increase the level of success of general education, special education, and English language learners.

(Week 11)

## Differentiating Instruction for Special Education Students and English Language Learners

After this section of the course, the participants will be able to:

* assess the language acquisition levels of their ELLs (preproduction, early production, speech emergence, intermediate fluency, and advanced fluency) and implement strategies for each level
* explain the stages of second language acquisition
* explain various special education profiles that are commonly found in regular education classrooms
* plan lessons with strategies that effectively differentiate the learning for those students with these special education profiles
* plans lessons with strategies that effectively differentiate the learning for second language learners

## Communicating Effectively With Parents

After this section of the course, the participants will be able to:

* Develop a plan for effective communication with families that uses multiple communication modes
* Conference effectively with parents and guardians (Week 12)

## Theories and Practices of Intelligence and Student Motivation That Contribute to Student Success

After this section of the course, the participants will be able to:

* explain the key aspects of the following theories of intelligence:
  + innate, single entity intelligence
  + learnable intelligence
  + multiple intelligences
  + attribution of intelligence
* describe the impediments of
* implement classroom strategies that move students toward the belief that success is due more to effort and acquired strategies than to innate ability and luck
* increase students’ motivation by helping them to equate success with effort and to work to acquire effective strategies
* Increase student motivation by tapping into their personal interests and connections to the content
* explain how these strategies can be employed in ways that increase the level of success of general education, special education, English language learners and students from poverty

(Week 13)

## Collaborative Teaching: Lesson Study, Data Analysis, Peer Observation and Action Research Among General Education, Special Education, Gifted and Talented, and English Language Learning Staff:

After this section of the course, the participants will be able to:

* develop a plan for analyzing and solving classroom problems using collaborative action research
* assist colleagues in developing a plan for analyzing and solving classroom problems
* use action research to assess and develop the teacher’s differentiation of instruction
* use lesson study to develop differentiated instruction lessons and assess and improve the implementation of those lessons
* perform effective team data analysis
* Use peer observation for analyzing the effectiveness of the implementation of strategies from this course.

(Week 14)

## The Brain and Learning

After this section of the course, the participants will be able to:

* briefly explain how the brain functions
* explain how the brain functions when learning mathematics
* explain how the brain functions when learning reading
* explain how these strategies can be employed in ways that increase the level of success of general education, special education, English language, gifted and talented learners and students from low socio-economic environments

**Skill**: As a result of the learning experiences in the course, participants will become better able to implement the key components of a standards based classroom with differentiated instruction as described in the knowledge section above.

**Caring**: As a result of the learning experiences in the course, participants will become more competent in their ability to understand the varied learning needs of all students. This includes an understanding of learning styles, English language learners, varied cultures, students with special needs, students from

poverty, and gifted students. With this understanding comes the ability to relate to and empathize with a wide range of students.

**Ethical**: As a result of the learning experiences in the course, participants will become more competent in their ability to understand the reasons why, unrelated to intellect, certain groups of students historically perform at lower levels on state and national assessment. More importantly, they will understand their role in helping to eliminate these achievement gaps.

## INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES

X Discussion/questioning via online chats (synchronous) X Independent Learning

X Data Collection and Analysis X Viewing Video Taped Lessons X Problem Finding/Solving

X Collaborative Learning Groups X Reflective Responses

X Creating Visual Illustrations of Concepts

Graduate level work is expected, that is, work rooted in adequate theory and requires a high level of critical thinking analysis and synthesis of material.

## COURSE\_REQUIREMENTS:

As noted below, students are required to complete all reading assignments and written assignments by the dates these are due. The learning that results from these assignments is an imperative for students’ appropriate participation in the subsequent classes. Assigned reading and assigned writing assignments are each assessed as noted below in the grading policy.

## FIELD-BASED REQUIREMENTS:

All written assignments are based on the practical application of what is learned in this course with the students you teach. For example, the lesson plans you complete are used to teach their students. The standards based teaching and differentiated instruction strategies learned are used with your students and you actively reflect on the impact of those strategies with your students.

## EVALUATION OR GRADING POLICY:

Once one of the major assignments (see below) is submitted the instructor will correct the assignment. Any major assignment (except for the reading for understanding) below a grade of A will contain author comments indicating why the assignment did not fully meet the criteria. It is the policy of Ribas Associates to allow students to revise an assignment based on the instructor’s comments and email the revised assignment to the instructor. If the resubmitted assignment contains all the components in the criteria the student’s grade will be raised to an A.

Interim assignments include the discussion forums and interim uploaded assignments. The forums will be assessed based on the Criteria for Scoring Discussion Forums. **The uploaded interim assignments and session** assignments will be graded based on a high score of 100%

## Introductory Assignment 5%

**The Discussion Forums are worth 10% of your grade**.

The students will be asked to read pages sections in the text and then complete detailed assignments directly on the discussion forum. These need to be posted in a timely fashion as they require responses from your classmates.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criteria for Scoring Discussion Forums** | **Scoring Guide for each assignment** |
| Timeliness and Quality | 3 = Timely posting of the assignments.  2 = Posting incomplete or lacked substance. 1 = Posting incomplete and lacked substance. |
| Followed Guidelines | 3= Posting used complete sentences. Tone was collegial. All responses were appropriate and added to the discussion.  2= Posting used incomplete sentences. Tone was collegial. Responses were appropriate and added to the discussion.  1 = Posting used incomplete sentences. Tone was not always collegial and/or responses added little to the conversation. |
| Incorporation of knowledge from assigned readings | 3 = Incorporated clear understanding of the reading material and practice into posting  2 = Material from the readings incorporated into some of the posting  1 = Little evidence of understanding of material. Readings not incorporated into posting. |

Class Chats: 10% of your grade. Each student is required to attend 6 out of 9 chats.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Chat Room Criteria Sheet** | | | | | |
| ***Criteria*** | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** | **Point Value** |
| **CurriculumC ontent** | * Chat aligns with the subject matter content knowledge or specialty area * Chat discussion evidences subject knowledge and the pedagogy required in engaging all students * Chat discussion includes content level rigor while meeting the needs of all students * Chat discussion makes explicit connections between subject matter, curriculum framework standards and the Common Core * Chat discussion evidences how curriculum is adapted to child and adolescent development | * Chat draws connections to most, but not all, of the following: content knowledge, pedagogy, frameworks’ standards, content rigor and adapting curriculum to child and adolescent development | * Chat makes   only partial connections to: content knowledge, pedagogy, frameworks’ standards, content rigor and adapting curriculum to child and adolescent development | * Chat does not connect to content knowledge, pedagogy, frameworks’ standards, content rigor, and adapting curriculum to child and adolescent development |  |
| **CurriculumPl anning** | * Chat discussion focuses on rigorously designed standards-based unit design * Chat discussion evidences planning for well- structured, highly engaging lessons for all students | * Chat draws connections to most, but not all of the following: designing standards-based units; and well-structured, highly engaging lessons for all students | * Chat makes only partial connections to: designing standards- based units; and well-structured, highly engaging lessons for all students | * Chat does not make connections to: designing standards- based unit design; and well-structured, highly engaging lessons for all students |  |
| **CurriculumA ssessment** | * Chat discussion focuses on the use of a variety of assessments that measure student learning, growth and progress toward achieving state/local standards * Chat discussion includes organization and results analysis from assessments * Chat discussion includes drawing conclusions through analysis of a wide range of assessments * Chat discussions with colleagues and students about students’ performance, progress and improvement * Chat discussion includes adjustment to practice | * Chat draws connections to: variety of assessments; organization and results analysis; drawing conclusions through analysis; and discussion with colleagues and students about student performance, etc.; adjustment to practice | * Chat makes only partial connections to: variety of assessments; organization and results analysis; drawing conclusions through analysis; and discussion with colleagues and students about student performance, etc.; adjustment to practice | * Chat does make connections to: variety of assessments; organization and results analysis; drawing conclusions through analysis; and discussion with colleagues and students about student performance, etc.; adjustment to practice |  |
| **Teach All Students** | * Chat discussion includes defining high expectations for quality of work and effort * Chat includes use of instructional practices that motivate and engage all learners, including independent works and home work * Chat discussions include a varied repertoire of practices to create structured opportunities for each student o meet or exceed state/local curriculum or behavioral expectations * Chat discussions focus on a safe learning environment for all students, including routines and risk-taking * Chat includes discussions on a collaborative learning environment for all students | * Chat draws connections to: defining high expectations; motivating and engaging all learners; varied repertoire of practices; safe learning environment and collaborative learning environment | * Chat makes only partial connections to: defining high expectations; motivating and engaging all learners; varied repertoire of practices; safe learning environment and collaborative learning environment | * Chat does make connections to: defining high expectations; motivating and engaging all learners; varied repertoire of practices; safe learning environment and collaborative learning environment |  |
| Total Points |  |  |  |  | **/16** |
| *Please note*: A total of 12 criteria points or more must be accumulated for a passing grade on this chat.  Criteria is noted as “N/A” in the final column, if not applicable. | | | | |  |

## Concrete evidence of Reading for Understanding (aka strategic reading):

The assessment of all assigned readings is determined by completing the reading related assignments for the discussion forums and completing the reading components of assignments that are placed in the participant’s assignment folder

**Reading for Understanding, aka Strategic Reading, by William B. Ribas, Ph.D.** Reading for understanding (aka strategic reading or content reading instruction) is the act of reading more than just the words. When candidates are asked to read for understanding, they are asked to absorb the information in the text. Teachers often ask students to demonstrate they have read for understanding by:

1. Students are also required to state in the notes why they believe those points are important.
2. Students are also asked to note on the discussion forum questions they have about the text itself or higher order questions prompted by the concepts and ideas conveyed in the text. Students may sometimes be asked to graphically organize concepts in a passage.

Instructors assess strategic reading using one or a combination of two or more of the following:

1. The instructors give students comprehension and/or higher order thinking questions (see chapter 5 in your text *Instructional Practices That Maximize Student Achievement* for a description of higher order thinking questions) or specific tasks to complete related to the reading prior to the reading. Students must look for, note, and use in the chats, discussion forums, and uploaded assignments the information that helps answer those questions or complete the tasks.
2. The instructors ask students to answer comprehension questions on the discussion board after they have read to test student understanding.
3. Students are told that the teacher reserves the right to ask individual students questions about their notes to “test” their comprehension of the content that is noted. The teacher also has the expectation that the student understands any information for which there is not a question noted on the discussion board. Students who correctly answer the teachers question receive a check plus. Students unable to answer the question with supporting information from the reading receive a minus. Students with partial answers receive a check.

## Strategies implementation and reflection journal assignment: 20%

Each participant is expected to implement the differentiated instruction strategies learned in the course. Participants are required to keep a log to document the level of success when implementing the strategies. From time to time they are asked to try specific strategies and post the level of success implementing those strategies either on the discussion forum, upload the information on the assignment link. At the conclusion of the course the student will be required to provide at least four journal entries like the one shown below.

* Read the exemplar journal entry found below.
* Try at least four new strategies you learned from this course, the text, or another student in the course. The strategies you choose must be strategies you have never used prior to the start of this course.
* For each strategy write a self-reflection journal entry that includes the following:
* Name and briefly describe the strategy you chose. (1 to 3 sentences)
  1. Explain why you chose the strategy for your class. The reason you chose the strategy could be to reach a specific student, a specific group of students or for specific reasons related to the entire class. (2 to 4 sentences)
  2. Explain what worked and why it worked? **Or** Explain what did not work and why? (3 to 8 sentences)
  3. Is there anything you would do differently the next time you use this strategy? If yes, please explain. (2 to 4 sentences)
  4. Upload the four journal entries together to the “upload assignment folder.”

## Exemplar of an entry from a seventh grade social studies teacher’s self-reflection journal

1. I used processing partners with the union generals as the partner terms.
2. I chose this strategy so I could get students to effectively partner and process higher order thinking questions. I needed a strategy that would quickly and effectively get the students into partners to discuss a question and then quickly back into their own seats. I used causes of the Civil War because students tend to only remember slavery as a cause. I want them to remember more of the causes by the end of our Civil War unit.
3. The first time I tried it was a mess. I had forgotten to tell the students to be certain that they put each other’s name next to the same terms. I noticed about half way through the time they were collecting names that several of the students had quickly written in seven names without checking to be certain their name was next to the same term on their partner’s sheet. I stopped the name gathering and had them return to their seats. I told them I had forgotten to give them a direction and collected the sheets. Fortunately, I had a set of new processing partner sheets for the afternoon class. I passed those out and repeated the directions with all the directions and had the students again get partners. It worked much better this time.
4. Next time I will go over the directions orally and then have a student tell me back the directions in his/her own words. I will check to be certain I gave all the directions and that all the directions were understood.

## Differentiated Instruction Mastery Lesson Plan Assignment Criteria: 20%

Each participant is expected to develop and teach a differentiated instruction lesson plan based on the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks.

1. The lesson plan is headed with your name, the grade level for which the lesson is planned, and the date.
2. The lesson plan addressed all questions and their subsections found in differentiated instruction lesson plan template on pages 252-255 of the book *Instructional Practices That Maximize Student Achievement: For Teachers, By Teachers* (2010).
3. The mastery objectives are written in the form described and shown on pages 11-13 and 39-40 in the book *Instructional Practices That Maximize Student Achievement: For Teachers, By Teachers* (2010). When necessary they include any additional mastery objectives needed for E.L.L. students.
4. The lesson plan includes a description of the standard addressed and the page number, standard number and/or standard letter designation from the appropriate standard. Please see the kindergarten, second grade, fifth grade, middle school and high school lesson plan exemplars in the Green Book pages 26-33
5. The assessment section contains both formative and summative assessments. The assessments cited are as described in chapter 4 of the book *Instructional Practices That Maximize Student Achievement: For Teachers, By Teachers* (2010) and will enable the teacher to determine each student’s level of mastery.
6. The activities are described with sufficient specificity for a reader to understand each of the steps of the lesson. The lesson describes the tasks for students who are at the introductory, guided practice, immediate mastery, and immediate application mastery levels of mastery. Please see pages 2-3 in the book *Instructional Practices That Maximize Student Achievement: For Teachers, By Teachers* (2010) for the definitions of the levels of mastery.
7. Question five on page 11 of the text identifies a teacher, administrator, or other person who can assist the teacher in planning the lesson.
8. Also include the materials the teacher needs to teach the lesson including any classroom management and/or formative assessment materials.

## Lesson Study Reflections: 10%

Each participant is required to teach the differentiated instruction lesson plan (see assignment above) he or she developed. After teaching the lesson the participants is expected to answer the following questions:

* 1. What went well?
  2. Why did it go well?
  3. How can you transfer what you learned with this success to another area of your teaching?
  4. What did not go as well as you hoped?
  5. Why didn’t it go well?
  6. What will you do differently the next time you teach this lesson?
  7. If you need help figuring out what to do differently next time whom can you go to in your district for this help?

## Construction of Action Research Assignment Criteria: 10%

Students will be asked to construct a piece of action research in their classrooms related to their efforts to differentiate instruction (see chapters 10 and 11 in the text *Instructional Practices That Maximize Student Achievement* for more information on action research*).*

1. A research question that is worded so as to specifically note the classroom differentiation issue the project is designed to address.
2. A listing of the specific data that will be needed to study the classroom issue.
3. The explanation of the method(s) that will be used to gather the data noted in 2 above.
4. A step-by-step description of how the data will be analyzed. This should include any tables or charts needed to accurately represent the data.
5. Students will not be required to implement the action research as part of this course.

**AUTHOR CHATS: *(optional author chats are posted online)***There will be an “***optional***” monthly chat time set up for course participants to have an online chat session with one of the author’s of the text. The dates and times will be posted online.

## GRADUATE GRADING SYSTEM:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **4.0** | 95 – 100 | A |
| **3.7** | 92 – 94 | A- |
| **3.5** | 89 – 91 | A-/B+ |
| **3.3** | 86 - 88 | B+ |
| **3.0** | 83 - 85 | B |
| **2.7** | 80 – 82 | B- |
| **2.5** | 77 – 79 | B-/C+ |
| **2.3** | 74 – 76 | C+ |
| **2.0** | 71 – 73 | C |
| **0.0** | 0 – 70 | F |
| **W** | Withdrawn |  |
| **IN** | Incomplete |  |
| **IP** | In-Progress |  |

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:**

**Fitchburg State University** encourages all Extended Campus students to take advantage of our online student services. We have created a “virtual student center” just for you. Here you will find access to Counseling Services, Career Services, The Student Activity Center, the college bookstore and many other helpful links. You can access our student center by going to the college homepage at [http://www.fitchburgstate.edu](http://www.fitchburgstate.edu/) and clicking on Offices and Services. Scroll down and click on Extended Campus Center. You will find links to Library Services, our Virtual Student Center and other important information.

## FITCHBURG STATE UNIVERSITY ON-LINE LIBRARY SERVICES

The Gallucci-Cirio Library at Fitchburg State University provides a full range of library services including borrowing privileges; document delivery (books and articles mailed to your home); Interlibrary Loan; reference assistance via: phone, email, IM, Blackboard’s Collaborate tools, Skype and in-person; library instruction; research help and more. Any questions relating to library services should be directed to the Access Services Librarian, at 978-665-3062 or [dllibrary@fitchburgstate.edu.](mailto:dllibrary@fitchburgstate.edu) There is also a special section for Distance Learning and Extended Campus Services at <http://fitchburgstate.libguides.com/dlservices>outlining the wide range of services available to you and how to access them. Activate your library account online through our ILLiad system at <http://fitchburgstate.illiad.oclc.org/illiad/>; from here you can access article, book, etc. request forms to

get items from our library and from other libraries. If you haven't used ILLiad before, you will need to click on the "First Time User? Create Your Account" link and set up your account.

Students who are currently registered with the university may access any of the library’s subscription databases, including an increasing number with full-text, by visiting the Gallucci-Cirio Library’s homepage at <http://www.fitchburgstate.edu/academics/library>and clicking on the Research Databases button in the center of the page. Select the resource you want to access from the alphabetical or subject listing. Once you click on the database title you will be prompted for your Falcon Key logon information; this is the same logon you will use for your Fitchburg State email account and if you have any online Blackboard courses. If you do not know your Falcon Key username and password or if you have any problems logging in, contact the university’s Technology Help Desk at 978-665-4500 or [helpdesk@fitchburgstate.edu.](mailto:helpdesk@fitchburgstate.edu) The Library can issue you a temporary guest login to access the library's databases while the Technology Department is setting up your account: contact us at 978-665-3062 or [dllibrary@fitchburgstate.edu](mailto:dllibrary@fitchburgstate.edu)

All registered Fitchburg State University students are eligible for a Fitchburg State University OneCard ID which also serves as his/her library card. If you have not received your OneCard yet, you can still access all of our online services as long as you have activated your library account through ILLiad. After activation by the Gallucci-Cirio Library and receipt of your OneCard, students may also use any Massachusetts State College/University Library and you may request an ARC Card to access participating libraries in the Academic and Research Collaborative (ARC) during the current semester.

OneCards are available on campus all year round. Students wanting a OneCard must either complete the online Extended Campus OneCard request form at <http://web.fitchburgstate.edu/technology/onecard/photoless/index.cfm>or present a course registration confirmation at the One Card Office in the Anthony Building of the main campus. Please call 978-665- 3039 for available times or if you have any questions about your One Card.

## UNIVERSITY AND EDUCATION UNIT POLICIES

**Policy on Disability**

Disability Services is the primary support system for students with disabilities taking classes in the day and evening divisions. The office is located on the third floor of the Hammond Building and can be reached at 978/665-4020 (voice/relay). If you need course adaptations or accommodations because of a disability, if you have emergency medication information, or if you need special arrangements in case the building must be evacuated, please make an appointment at the beginning of the course to talk with me. It is important that the issues relating to disabilities be discussed with me as soon as possible.

## Attendance and Participation

1. As an emerging professional, you are expected to attend every class session, to be on time, and to communicate with the instructor regarding any absences. Absences and tardiness may result in a permanent grade change. Attendance at all pre-practicum sessions is mandatory.
2. Participation in class discussions and cooperative groups is expected. All candidates are responsible for meeting required deadlines on projects and assignments; your ability to complete tasks in a timely fashion demonstrates professional maturity and an ability to organize and manage time. Completion of assigned reading is imperative to your individual development as a professional.
3. All of these behaviors regarding attendance, preparation, and meeting deadlines are critical for successful teaching and thus are factored into the final grade.

## Education Unit Computer Literacy Requirement

All assignments must be typed, doubled-spaced; follow the Department Writing Guide; and use APA format when appropriate.

You are expected to use word processing for all assignments (unless otherwise instructed). [If your course has other requirements list those also, e.g., ‘You are expected to use e-mail for dialogues with other class members, to examine the use of software in the field, and to use the Internet to obtain information, ideas and resources.’]

## Cellular Telephones

Kindly turn-off cellular telephones during class time and field experiences and place them in book bags or purses. Please no texting in class. It reflects negatively upon you as a developing professional. Once class begins and if use of the laptop is not required, all laptops should be closed during class time so that your full attention is focused on your colleagues and the discussion or lecture in progress. If you prefer to take class notes on your laptop, please inform the instructor. You are on your honor to be focused on note taking and not on email, Facebook or other technological enterprise not germane to the class in progress. Thank you in advance for your consideration of colleagues and students.

## Grade Appeal

If you disagree with the evaluation of your work or believe an improper grade has been assigned, an appeal may be followed. Please discuss the matter with the instructor and refer to the Fitchburg State University Grade Appeal Policy in your Student Handbook.

## Academic Integrity Policy

The faculty in the Education Unit at Fitchburg State University that work submitted in fulfillment of course requirements will be solely that of the individual candidate and all other sources will be cited appropriately. University Academic Dishonesty Policy, as outlined in the University Catalogue, will be strictly adhered to.

## Copyright Policy

You are reminded that, in preparing handouts for peers or the instructor, reproduction of copyrighted material without permission of the copyright owner is illegal. Such unauthorized copying may violate the rights of the author or publisher. Fitchburg State University adheres to federal laws regarding use of copyrighted materials. See the Student Handbook for more details.
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