ITaP Practicable Strategies - Explanations and Modelling (Phase 1)

**Desert Island Reading:** Rosenshine, B. (2012) ‘Principles of Instruction: Research-Based strategies that all teaches should know’, *American Educator*, Spring 2019, pp. 12-39

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **4-step approach for explaining new content** **(CCF 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 2.9)**(The Teaching and Learning Playbook, p124-125) | **Practicable strategies for ITAP 1 to support ‘explaining new content’** |
| **Strategy (CCF)** | **Summary** | **Strategy outlined in:** | **Reading underpinning the strategy** |
| **Hook** – capturing students’ interest in the new content | “Why” First | Practice sharing the purpose of what students are learning and why it is important (beyond specs and exams) | The Teaching and Learning Playbook p 132-133 | * Shimamura (2018) pp. 7-13
 |
| **Schema** – Framing the new content in the context of what they already know | Zoom in, zoom out (2g) | Illustrating how ideas are connected, that they form a bigger picture, and can be arranged into categories | WalkThrus 1 p74-75 | * Rosenshine’s Principle of Instruction No.2: Present new material in small steps (Rosenshine, 2012)
* Shimamura (2018) pp. 21-29
* Elleman et. al. (2009)
* Willingham (2009)
 |
| Embedding New Vocabulary (2g) | Strategy for introducing and embedding new Tier 2 and 3 words into students’ vocabulary | The Teaching and Learning Playbook p 126-127WalkThrus 1 p72-73 |
| Concrete to Concept (2g/4f) | Beginning with a specific example of the knowledge in practice before moving onto the abstract concept that underpins it.  | The Teaching and Learning Playbook p 128-129WalkThrus 1 P76-77 |
| **Structure** – chunking up new knowledge in no more than 4 chunks | Scaffolded Modelling (4b) | Model a skill or process by chunking each component into actionable steps  | The Teaching and Learning Playbook p 136-137WalkThrus 1 p80-81 | * Rosenshine’s Principle of Instruction No.4: Provide models and worked examples (Rosenshine, 2012)
* Van de Pol, Volman, & Beishuizen (2010)
* Van de Pol, et.al. (2015)
 |
| Worked Examples (4b) | Explicitly using examples (and non-examples) to strengthen understanding of a concept | The Teaching and Learning Playbook p130-131 |
| Live Modelling (4b) | Modelling a skill or process in real time, narrating the thinking | The Teaching and Learning Playbook p138WalkThrus 1 p78-79 |
| **Check in** – Ensuring that knowledge is secure before moving on | I do, We do, You do /backward fading (4d) | When students are practicing applying knowledge for the first time, the teacher models, then models with students, then support students’ independent practice | The Teaching and Learning Playbook p 134-135WalkThrus 1 p68-69 | * Sweller et. al. (2019)
* Rosenshine’s Principle of Instruction No.9: Require and monitor independent practice (Rosenshine, 2012)
 |
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