



Description of

Essential Practice Frames™

Description of Essential Practice Frames™

The Essential Practice Frames (EPFs)™ and associated rubrics described in this document are the result of more than six years of research and development. The purpose of the frames is to offer teachers, coaches and administrators, who are currently implementing new College and Career Readiness Standards including the Common Core State Standards (CCSS), a suite of tools that can be used for a variety of purposes: 1) informal or guided self-assessment of teaching practices; 2) site- and district-based professional growth initiatives; 3) formative assessment of teaching practices; and 4) Teacher Evaluation.

Defining *professional teaching* by way of the CSTP Model Teaching Standards, and defining *student learning* according to the grade-by-grade expectations of the Common Core State Standards, the project team developed a set of *SOAR Teaching Frames*™ for the ELA and Anchor Literacy Standards and for the Mathematics Standards. The *SOAR™ Teaching Frames for Literacy* and associated rubrics index the stage of development of classroom teachers at four levels: no evidence, limited evidence, acceptable evidence, and strong evidence. These specific rubrics apply to ELA and Anchor Literacy Standards as per CCSS (grades Tk-2 and grades 3-12). Other rubrics that have been developed as part of this ongoing work include: SOAR Teaching Frames™ for Math TK-12; and Academic Language and Literacy in Every Subject (ALLIES Teaching Frames™) TK-12.

The development of the rubrics described in this document has been guided by the question: Which practices are most essential and highest leverage for supporting the CCSS and demonstrating progress toward the CSTP Model Standards? In developing the SOAR Teaching Frames™ and rubrics, we sought to avoid the following: (a) developing so many practices that the essential practices that drive student learning get lost; (b) developing a discrete set of practices with no articulation of how the practices are interconnected in instruction; and (c) articulating the practices at a “grain size” that is either too small or too large to foster professional growth.

The practices articulated in the *SOAR Teaching Frames™ for Literacy* and the ALLIES Teaching Frames™ emerged from analyses of data from a number of studies of expert recommendations (Brisk & Proctor, 2012; Echevarria, Richards-Tutor, Chinn, & Ratleff, 2011; Grossman, Loeb, Cohen, & Wyckoff, 2013), observations of classroom instruction (O’Hara, Pritchard, & Zwiers, 2014; O’Hara, Pritchard, & Zwiers, in press), existing instructional practice rubrics with established reliability and predictive validity (Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, 2014; Danielson, 2013; Grossman, Cohen, & Brown, 2014; O’Hara, Pritchard, & Zwiers, in press), and an extensive review of the research literature on effective literacy instruction (Baker et al, 2014; Fisher, Frey, & Lapp, 2012; Nagy & Townsend, 2012; Uccelli, Galloway, Barr, Meneses, & Dobbs, 2015). We also drew heavily on a Delphi Panel study of expert consensus on academic language and literacy development (Pritchard, O’Hara, & Zwiers, in press).

The data from this Delphi Panel study, in combination with our observations of classroom practice videos, revealed not just a list of practices, but ways in which the essential instructional practices support one another. To show the interconnectedness of these

practices, we have organized them into what we call “Essential Practice Frames” (Pritchard, O’Hara, & Zwiers, In Press; O’Hara, Zwiers, & Pritchard, 2012). The EPFs show how the essential practices support one another, and they also highlight six practices with the highest impact on student outcomes in support of the CCSS (Kibler, Walqui, & Bunch, 2015; Van Lier & Walqui, 2012; Zwiers, O’Hara, & Pritchard, 2014a; Zwiers, O’Hara, & Pritchard, 2014b). Supporting each high-impact practice are three cross-cutting practices that are common across each of the six essential practice frames: Promoting a Culture of Disciplinary Learning, Fostering Metacognition for Disciplinary Learning, and Monitoring and Guiding Disciplinary Learning. Supporting all is the foundational practice of Designing Instruction for Disciplinary Thinking and Understanding. We next aligned the instructional practices to a number of standards for the teaching profession including the CSTP Model Standards. As we designed the frames and corresponding rubrics, and aligned them with the CSTP Standards, we intentionally focused on identifying the practices that are *most relevant* for each of the ten standards. We also developed a supplemental crosswalk between our practices elements and the elements of the CSTP standards.

We implemented a protocol for organizing selected teacher leaders, administrators, literacy experts, education researchers, education faculty, and other stakeholders into design and development groups to provide input into, as well as feedback on, the language of the rubrics and to identify any essential practice gaps. The team then worked in partnership with Teachscape to develop a calibration tool aligned with the rubrics, which included mastercoding videos, developing critical attributes of the practices, and developing supplemental documents to support the calibration process. We utilized two documents to guide this process: Foundations of Observations produced by ETS for the Measure of Effective Teaching project (MET, 2014) and A Practical Guide to Evaluating Teacher Effectiveness (National Comprehensive Center of Teacher Quality, 2009).

The original ALLIES™ Teaching Frames have established reliability and validity, and have been used in multiple professional development programs. Our research has shown positive impact of professional development using the frames on teacher and mentor practices as well as on student learning outcomes (O’Hara, Pritchard, & Zwiers, in press).

In partnership with *Teachscape* and *EPF for teaching* we have developed a calibration platform designed around the *SOAR™ Teaching Frames*. This new calibration platform:

- Provides a much needed nexus between the CCSS and CSTP standards.
- Helps teachers and administrators drive student learning by focusing on a set of effective, integrated instructional practices for CCSS ELA and Anchor Literacy Standards and Mathematics Standards.
- Scaffolds professional learning opportunities for teachers in different grade spans (TK-2, 3-8 and 9-12) and across content areas (ELA, Math, Social Studies, Science).

For more information please contact:

Susan O’Hara, Executive Director REEd, UC Davis spohara@ucdavis.edu

Robert Pritchard, Co Founder EPF for Teaching, rpritchard@epfteach.com

SOAR Teaching Frames™ for Literacy

High-Impact Practices	Acquisition of Disciplinary Language		
	Disciplinary Thinking Processes		
	Disciplinary Perseverance		
	Disciplinary Communication		
	Disciplinary Discussions		
	Disciplinary Uses of Evidence		
Cross-Cutting Practices	Promoting a Culture of Disciplinary Learning	Fostering Metacognition for Disciplinary Learning	Monitoring and Guiding Disciplinary Learning
Foundational Practice	Designing Instruction for Disciplinary Thinking and Understanding		

SOAR Teaching Frames™ for Literacy

Disciplinary Discussions (Each frame includes one High-Impact Practice, the three Cross-Cutting Practices, and the Foundational Practice)

High-Impact Practices	<p>DISCIPLINARY DISCUSSIONS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Build disciplinary conversation skills • Provide multiple, extended, and supported opportunities for students to engage in disciplinary discussions 		
Cross-Cutting Practices	<p style="text-align: center;">PROMOTING A CULTURE OF DISCIPLINARY LEARNING</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enact and refer to norms of interaction that enable all students to participate and take risks • Establish high expectations and maintain the intellectual rigor of classroom activities 	<p style="text-align: center;">FOSTERING METACOGNITION FOR DISCIPLINARY LEARNING</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visibly enact metacognitive processes students are expected to use in support of disciplinary learning • Deconstruct metacognitive processes that support disciplinary learning 	<p style="text-align: center;">MONITORING AND GUIDING DISCIPLINARY LEARNING</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitor learning and adjust instruction, supports, and disciplinary tasks to meet student needs • Provide written and/or oral feedback during lessons to promote disciplinary learning
Foundational Practice	<p>DESIGNING INSTRUCTION FOR DISCIPLINARY THINKING AND UNDERSTANDING</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Set disciplinary learning targets that are aligned with ELA/Literacy CCSS and the target high-impact practice • Structure and connect tasks that support the learning targets • Design supports to help students meet the disciplinary language demands of texts and task 		

ALLIES Teaching Frames™

<i>High-Impact Practices</i>	Foster Academic Interactions		
	Fortify Academic Output		
	Interact with Complex Texts		
<i>Cross-Cutting Practices</i>	Facilitate Acquisition of Academic Language	Foster Metacognition	Monitor and Guide Language Learning
<i>Foundational Practices</i>	Design Instruction of Academic Language and Literacy Development		

References

- August, D., Branum-Martin, L., Cardenas-Hagan, E, Francis, D., Powell, J, Moore, S., & Haynes, E. (2014). Helping ELLs meet the Common Core State Standards for literacy in science: The impact of an instructional intervention focused on academic language. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness*, 7, 54-82.
- Baker, S., Lesaux, N., Jayanthi, M., Dimino, J., Proctor, C. P., Morris, J., Gersten, R., Haymond, K., Kieffer, M. J., Linan-Thompson, S., & Newman-Gonchar, R. (2014). *Teaching academic content and literacy to English learners in elementary and middle school* (NCEE 2014-4012). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance (NCEE), Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from: http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publications_reviews.aspx.
- Beers, K., & Probst, R. (2013). *Notice & Note: Strategies for Close Reading*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Bernabei, G., & Reimer, J. (2013). *Academic Writing for Serious Learning*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Literacy.
- Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. (2014). Building trust in observations: A blueprint for improving systems to support great teaching. Seattle, WA: Author.
- Brisk, M.E. & Proctor, C.P. (2012). Challenges and supports for English language learners. In K. Hakuta, & M. Santos (Eds.), *Understanding language: Language, literacy, and learning in the content areas* (pp. 115– 122). Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University.
- Brophy, J. (2010). *Motivating students to learn* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Cook, H. G., Boals, T., & Lundberg, T. (2011). Academic achievement for English learners: What can we reasonably expect? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 93(3), 66-69. Retrieved from <http://intl.kappanmagazine.org>
- Cummins, S. (2013). *Close Reading of Informational Texts: Assessment-Driven Instruction in Grades 3-8*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Danielson, C. (2013). The framework for teaching evaluation instrument. Princeton, NJ: The Danielson Group.
- Echevarria, J., Richards-Tutor, C., Chinn, V., & Rattleff, P. (2011). Did they get it? The role of fidelity in teaching English learners. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 54(6), 425-434. Doi: 10.1598/JAAL.54.6.4.
- Finley, T. (2015). The science behind classroom norming. *Edutopia*, Retrieved from: <http://www.edutopia.org/blog/establishing-classroom-norms-todd-finley>
- Fisher, D., & Frey, N. (2014). *Close Reading and Writing from Sources*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Fisher, D., Frey, N., & Lapp, D. (2012). Text Complexity: Raising Rigor in Reading. International Reading Association: Newark, DE.
- Fogo, B. (2011). Making and measuring the California history standards. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 92(8), 62-67.
- Grossman, P., Cohen, J., & Brown, L. (2014). Understanding instructional quality in English Language Arts: Variations in the relationship between PLATO and value-added by content and context. In T. Kane, K. Kerr, & R. Pianta (Eds.). *Designing teacher evaluation systems: New guidance from the Measures of Effective Teaching project*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Grossman, P., Loeb, S., Cohen, J., & Wyckoff, J. (2013). Measure for measure: The relationship between measures of instructional practice in middle school English Language Arts and teachers' value-added scores. *American Journal of Education*, 119(3), 445-470.
- Jennings, P., & Greenberg, M. (2009). The prosocial classroom: Teacher social and emotional competence in relation to student and classroom outcomes. *Review of Educational Research*, 79(1), 491-525.
- Kazwmi, E., & Hintz, A. (2014). *Intentional Talk*. Portland, ME: Stenhouse.

- Kibler, A., Walqui, A., & Bunch, G. (2015.) Transformational opportunities: Language and literacy instruction for English language learners in the Common Core era in the United States. *TESOL Journal*, 6(1), 9-35. DOI: 10.1002/tesj.133
- Marzano R., & Heflebower, T. (2011). *Teaching & Assessing 21st Century Skills*. Centennial, CO: Marzano Research.
- Marzano, R., Yanoski, D., Hoegh, J., & Simms, J. (2013). *Using Common Core Standards to Enhance Classroom Instruction and Assessment*. Centennial, CO: Marzano Research.
- Murphy, P.K., Rowe, M., Ramani, G., & Silverman, R. (2014). Retrieved from: <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10648-014-9281-3#page-2>
- Nagy, W. & Townsend, D. (2012). Words as tools: Learning academic vocabulary as language acquisition. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 47(1), 91-108. DOI: 10.1002/RRQ.011
- O'Hara, S., Pritchard, R., & Zwiers, J. (in press). Academic language and literacy in every subject (ALLIES): A capacity building approach to supporting teachers in grades 4-8. In P. Proctor, A. Boardman, & E. Hiebert (Eds.), *English Learners and Emergent Bilingualism in the Common Core Era*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- O'Hara, S., Pritchard, R., Pitta, D., and Webb, J. (in press). Implementing new technologies to support social justice pedagogy. In Papa, R., Eadens, D. M., & Eadens, D. M. (Eds). *Social Justice Instruction: Empowerment on the Chalkboard*. Springer Publishing.
- O'Hara, S. & Pritchard, R. (2015). Using new technologies to engage and support English learners in mathematics classrooms. In D. Polly (Ed.) *Cases on Technology and Common Core Mathematics Standards*. IGI Global. Hersey, PA.
- O'Hara, S., Zwiers, J. & Pritchard, R. (2012). Framing the teaching of academic language: A research brief. [Webinar] National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality. Retrieved from: <http://www.tgsources.org/webcasts/2012ELL/>
- Pritchard, R., O'Hara, S., & Zwiers, J. (in press). Framing the teaching of academic language to English learners: A Delphi study of expert consensus. *TESOL Quarterly*.
- Schoenbach, R., Greenleaf, C., & Murphy, L. (2012). *Reading for Understanding: How Reading Apprenticeship Improves Disciplinary Learning*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Schoenfeld, A. (2011). Education: Learning to think in a discipline. Retrieved from: <http://gsi.berkeley.edu/gsi-guide-contents/learning-theory-research/think-discipline/>
- Uccelli, P., Galloway, E., Barr, C., Meneses, A., & Dobbs, C. (2015). Beyond vocabulary: Exploring cross-disciplinary academic-language proficiency and its association with reading comprehension. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 50(3), 337-356. DOI: 10.1002/rrq.104.
- Van Lier, L., & Walqui, A. (2012). Language and the common core state standards. *Commissioned Papers on Language and Literacy Issues in the Common Core State Standards and Next Generation Science Standards*, 94, 44.
- Wiggins, G. (2012). Seven keys for effective feedback. *Feedback for Learning*, 70(1), 10-16.
- Wilson, H.W., Sztajn, P., Edington, C., and Myers, M. (2015). Teachers' Uses of a Learning Trajectory in Student-Centered Instructional Practices. *Journal of Teacher Education* May/June 2015 vol. 66 no. 3 227-244.
- Zwiers, J., & Crawford, M. (2011). *Academic Conversations*. Portland, ME: Stenhouse.
- Zwiers, J., O'Hara, S., & Pritchard, R. (2014a). *Common Core Standards in diverse classrooms: Essential practices for developing academic language and disciplinary literacy*. Portland, ME: Stenhouse.
- Zwiers, J., O'Hara, S., & Pritchard, R. (2014b). Cutting to the Common Core: Changing the playing field, part 1. *Language Magazine: The Journal of Communication & Education*, 13(5), 24-27.
- Zwiers, J., O'Hara, S., & Pritchard, R. (2014c). Cutting to the Common Core: Changing the playing field, part 2. *Language Magazine: The Journal of Communication & Education*, 13(6), 26-27.
- Zwiers, J., O'Hara, S., & Pritchard, R. (2014d). Conversing to fortify literacy, language, and learning. *Voices from the Middle*, 22(1), 10-14.