2000

Teacher videotaping as a method of self -assessing questioning skills in secondary public schools

Stephen Alan Alberts II
West Virginia University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://researchrepository.wvu.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Alberts, Stephen Alan II, "Teacher videotaping as a method of self -assessing questioning skills in secondary public schools" (2000). *Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Problem Reports*. 2374.
<https://researchrepository.wvu.edu/etd/2374>

This Dissertation is protected by copyright and/or related rights. It has been brought to you by the The Research Repository @ WVU with permission from the rights-holder(s). You are free to use this Dissertation in any way that is permitted by the copyright and related rights legislation that applies to your use. For other uses you must obtain permission from the rights-holder(s) directly, unless additional rights are indicated by a Creative Commons license in the record and/ or on the work itself. This Dissertation has been accepted for inclusion in WVU Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Problem Reports collection by an authorized administrator of The Research Repository @ WVU. For more information, please contact researchrepository@mail.wvu.edu.

***Teacher Videotaping as a Method of Self-Assessing Questioning Skills in
Secondary Public Schools***

Stephen Alan Alberts II

A Dissertation

Submitted to the College of Human Resources and Education
at West Virginia University

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Education

Perry D. Phillips, Ed.D., Chair

Robert Bickel, Ph.D.

Scott Bower, Ed.D.

C. Kenneth Murray, Ph.D.

Phyllis Durden, Ed.D.

Department of Curriculum and Instruction

© Copyright 2000 by Stephen Alan Alberts II

Abstract

Teacher Videotaping as a Method of Self-Assessing Questioning Skills in Secondary Public Schools

Stephen Alan Alberts II

Primarily this action research project was designed to hone my ability to Socratically question students by reflecting on my teaching through the lens of a videocamera- while reconciling my own paradigm with as many outside assessment devices as possible. The paramount consideration of my questioning/framing references was to incite students to think critically (see *Pedagogical Skills Honed* in chapter seven). The higher priorities of the outside assessors, on the other hand, were more political than instructional in nature (see *Reconciling Multiple Assessments* in chapter seven).

Scrutinizing and improving my questioning skills (the focus of the research) led to the epiphany that the larger issue at stake was not just the sequencing of questions up and down the progressive levels of the taxonomy, but the sequencing of foundational skills needed for students to operate at higher abstract thinking/skill levels as they mastered each grade level; this was accomplished by reflecting daily on the videotaped lessons within the larger educational constructs (building, district, state and national edicts).

From my gestalt that students were having trouble answering difficult analysis level questions, came the strand that was followed through my running commentary; students were simply having problems mastering progressively challenging levels of the English Language: reading, writing, critical thinking and speaking.

When eleventh grade students could demonstrate abstract knowledge by providing examples (at the synthesis level), beginning the course- it was clear that they could think about complex issues in terms of cause and effect as well as part to whole relationships.

As the course progressed, and new, more unfamiliar vocabulary began to be layered into the literary selections, it became clear that these students didn't have the skills to assimilate the new terms, the within context of the line/story (through knowledge of root words or pre/suffixes, nor could they phonetically sound them out); the whole language programs move away from these skills. The goal of Socratic inquiry, however, is critical thinking that leads to a differentiation of specifics (words representing ideas).

Empirical thought means proving specifics- and these students could only muster generalities (like, "stuff, things, and you know"). The focus of my questioning then became toward textual evidence to support their statements; herein, the second major stumbling block to critical thinking was uncovered. These students couldn't/wouldn't comprehend what they had read, since previous teachers bought into their, "I don't know's" and simply told students which facts to memorize for the test.

The third major roadblock wasn't blatantly obvious from the tapings- until the student essays' were contrasted with the way they spoke; they didn't write in complete sentences, only clips of vague phrases made it onto the paper (instead of concrete evidence). Therefore, grammar needed to be remediated - in a literature oriented course designed to teaching critical thinking skills and advanced written composition skills.

Since, advanced skill levels of the language are all inexorably tied together, and thinking skills can't advance without these sequential reading and writing foundations, my implications sections of chapter seven address this breakdown of foundational skills that are out of the secondary curricular alignment picture.

The conclusions to this study reveal that not only can questioning skills be honed and improved via videotaping, but also that larger educational concerns can be tied to individual classroom practices recursively.

Dedication:

To my maternal grandmother Pauline who instilled a love of knowledge in me

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I wish to thank my students for allowing me to undertake this metacognitive endeavor within the confines of their home environment.

Secondly, I would like to express my gratitude to Cynthia Butcher for assisting me in “norming” the questioning levels (as well as the tedium of continually revising the mechanics of this document); this aided me enormously in defining exact interpretations of questioning difficulty- the essence of the study.

Overall, all of my doctoral committee members, I owe a debt of gratitude to for their incremental nurturing and conceptualization of this project:

The chronological genesis and initial conceptualization of quantifying where teaching actually happens, as well as the actual production and refinement of measuring that teaching growth (within the body of this text), was due in large part to Dr. Robert Bickel, whose ability to find the educational truths through a mountain of minutia- while never losing sight of those small morsels of truth gleaned- is of inestimable value.

Likewise, Dr. Perry Phillips’ continued sensibilities regarding the bigger educational/political picture, both with this project (as my committee chair) and other subsidiary career choices, garnered my respect early on, and maintained it. Throughout my doctoral program, Dr. Phillips, by arbitrating many sensitive internal and external issues of educational value, and grounding the program in real world career choices, has shown consistent professional character in all decisions of educational importance.

Dr. Scott Bower’s pragmatic approach and affable demeanor, from the conceptualization of constructing the research instrument, to be used through the collection of data to be manipulated- down to interpreting the results and meaning of those results- proved itself a boon to avoiding the pitfalls of ill-conceived research and thus results at every stage of development.

Dr. Phyllis Durden, whenever approached, always managed to take the time out of her busy schedule to relate instruction level questions to administrative level considerations; those considerations, in addition to being useful, have proven insightful and have subsequently been inculcated into my administrative conclusions.

Dr. Kenneth Murray, in terms of the format and layout of this document, also provided strategic information in terms of the preliminary layout of information in this study.

Most of all, I would like to thank all of my political, philosophical, psychological, and educational predecessors for leaving me a roadmap to follow in my pursuit of attaining educational (and life) truths and the methodological results that reflect this growth.

Table of Contents

ABSTRACT		ii
LIST OF TABLES		xi
CHAPTER	TITLE	PAGE #
CHAPTER 1	<i>Rationale</i>	
	Introduction	1
	Purpose	2
	Pilot Study	2
	Statement of Problem	3
	Research Questions	4
	Significance	5
	Reconstructing the Project	5
	Limitations	6
	Definitions	6
CHAPTER 2	<i>Review of Literature</i>	
	Introduction	10
	Teacher Values	10
	Standards of Assessment	12
	Videotaping as Assessment	14

	Questioning Strategies	16
	Self-Evaluation	19
CHAPTER 3	<i>Methodology</i>	
	Theoretical Framework	21
	Qualitative Research	22
	Paradigmatic Constructs	22
	Triangulation of Assessment	22
	Data Collection	23
	Data Analysis	24
	Course Demographics	24
	Participants	25
	Course Pedagogy	26
	Lesson Planning	26
	Daily Itinerary	27
CHAPTER 4	<i>Interpreting the Taxonomic Levels</i>	
	Introduction	28
	Inter-rater Reliability	28
	Taping Criterion	28
	Labeling the Taxonomic Level	29

CHAPTER 5

Question Transcription

Introduction	30
One: Paraphrasing “ <i>The Declaration...</i> ”	30
Summary	40
Two: “ <i>Franklin’s Autobiography</i> ”	41
Summary	52
Three: “ <i>Dr. Heidegger’s Exp.</i> ”	52
Summary	60
Four: “ <i>Poe’s Biography</i> ”	60
Summary	67
Five: “ <i>A Cask of Amontillado</i> ”	68
Summary	79
Six: <i>Emerson/Transcendentalism</i>	79
Summary	87
Seven: <i>Emerson (continued)</i>	88
Summary	93
Eight: <i>Poetry Terms/Whitman</i>	94
Summary	102
Nine: <i>Whitman’s Poems</i>	103
Summary	110
Ten: <i>Explicating Dickinson</i>	111
Summary	117
Eleven: <i>Authors’ Compare/Contrast</i>	117

	Summary	123
	Twelve: <i>Course Review/Capstone</i>	124
	Summary	135
CHAPTER 6	<i>Daily Reflections</i>	
	Introduction	136
	Framing the Context	136
	Question Distribution	137
	Level of Taxonomy Addressed	137
	Authors/Texts (for course)	138
	Lesson Design	138
	Lesson Modifications	138
CHAPTER 7	<i>Findings and Implications</i>	
	Introduction	140
	Reconciling Multiple Assessment Rubrics	140
	Multiple Assessment Implications	150
	Education Administrative Aims	150
	Educational Administration Implications	154
	Pedagogical Skills Honed	155
	Pedagogical Implications	159
	Videotaping Considerations	159
	Reconstructing the Project	161

WORKS CITED	162
APPENDIX A: Pilot Study	166
APPENDIX B: Am. Lit. Course Guide	173
APPENDIX C: Sample Lesson Plans	178
APPENDIX D: Participant Consent Forms	182
APPENDIX E: Reflection Guide	187
APPENDIX F: Assessment Review	190
APPENDIX G: Staff Development: Videotaping	215
RESUME	222

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE #
1.	Student Response Elaborations	149
2.	Instructional Emphasis of Lesson	149
3.	Male Pilot Study Responses	170
4.	Female Pilot Study Responses	171

Chapter One: Rationale

Introduction

Given the dearth of research on teachers in public schools using self-assessment tools in their classrooms, offset by the state (report cards) and national edicts (The National Teacher Exam/*Praxis III*) designed to hold schools (teachers) to a higher standard, it only makes sense that teachers assess themselves and modify and improve instruction towards specifically stated standards before the opportunity is taken from them.

What we, as a profession, need to keep in mind about the future of instruction, is how our current milieu relates to past external changes brought into the classroom through internally administrated teacher evaluations. According to Perry Zirkle's *The Law of Teacher Evaluation: A Self-Assessment Handbook* citing Harvard's (1996) Institute on School Law, the following are administratively enforceable areas of a teacher's job performance as have been upheld through case law over the past two decades:

1. Student mastery of concepts as evidenced by tests (mastery is defined as 80% of the class scoring at 80% or better on exams).
2. Clearly defined classroom rules, including concise instructions given on assignment instructions and grading criterion
3. Identification of students for remediation (usually 9 mos. behind or more)
4. Identification of illegal student behaviors, violations such as bringing a weapon, drugs, or physical violence into the school setting (as defined by safe school laws)
5. Compliance with school district (and building) policies
6. A well known teacher evaluation process (i.e. school district appraisal forms)
7. Respecting students rights (as defined by constitutional and case law)
8. Any action that could be construed as insubordination

These standards of evaluation made manifest by laws, federal, state and local, define our job description. The teacher, however, is afforded the latitude of interpreting how best to perform the actual task of teaching. Aside from any specifics mentioned in one's individual contract, and the broad legal areas aforementioned, teachers choose the teaching style and method of delivery in achieving their stated lesson plan objectives.

So, if we, as teachers, know that we're expected to perform specific educational and legal tasks- that through student success, or administrative approval, must be considered- what specific

tasks do we resist being evaluated on, and why? A small study that I conducted in December 1998 will help elucidate attitudes towards these specific tasks - and using videocameras to these ends (a description of the pilot study directly follows the purpose section).

Purpose

The teaching skill focused on, during the tenure of this project is questioning/framing knowledge. The primary purpose of this study however, is to explore videotaping oneself in action as a viable method of metacognitive assessment (in contrast to either reflective note taking or administrative assessment- which do not take a teacher's methodological style or personal value structure into account).

The secondary purpose of this study is to illustrate the responsibility of a motivated teacher, as a professional, to monitor, set goals and achieve those classroom performance improvements with little help from outside assessors.

Thirdly, this study will act as an individually initiated staff development project, which, when completed, can be workshopped, debriefed and ultimately recreated- using other teachers' similar personal classroom performance improvement goals as a model.

Lastly, upon the fruition of this project, the published conclusions and findings can be shared with the educational community at large, as part of a larger academic concerns regarding the current educational reform movements happening nationally on multiple regional, local, and individual fronts.

Pilot Study

The results, from the 46 teacher sampling survey, reflecting local attitudes towards videotaping are here broken down by task being evaluated. The number of positive (defined as a 4 or 5 answer on the Likert Scale) responses to each question regarding a particular application are expressed as a percentage:

1. Raising standardized test scores - 23%
2. Creating consistent classroom standards - 59.5%
3. Improving an administrator's future evaluation - 62.5%
4. Ability to accurately describe illegal behaviors - 85%
5. Quantifying (making concrete) subjective practices – 85%
6. Identifying discriminatory practices - 79.5%

7. Your ability to defend your classroom practices - 85%
8. Targeting students for remediation - 51.5%
9. Further individualizing instruction -50.5%
10. Workshopping “best teaching practices” - 86.5%

**The complete survey is included as APPENDIX A.*

From this survey, quantifying certain basic areas of teacher performance, describing illegal behaviors, identifying discrimination, defending classroom practices, and workshopping “best teaching practices” are areas receiving very positive approval. Raising test scores, identifying subjective practices, and further individualizing instruction may only receive tertiary gains from videotaping classroom instruction. However, creating more consistent classroom standards, improving administrators’ future evaluations, and targeting students for remediation seem to be clear cut areas that having immediate daily feedback on could substantially benefit the receptive teacher.

Since the purpose of this informal pilot study was to confirm and verify teacher intrepidation as reported by Rita Jensen, Doug Smith, and Martin and Mayerson-and was not considered a telling measure in and of itself, explication of the specific areas of resistance to this technological application became the guiding objective to be met out through a real world application.

In addition to political-philosophical value misalignment with tangible assessment of student skills mastered, the “*Boyer Commission Report*”, along with every major longitudinal study done on teacher education programs over the past ten to fifteen years, with my suggestion to lengthen the student teaching apprenticeship to include, at minimum, a one year mentoring term. From a qualified veteran educator mentoring weaknesses in ‘rookie teacher’ skills, these beginning deficiencies could be identified via videotaping then remediated before bestowing the rank and status of a full faculty member/ professional educator upon them. (This identification of skill deficiencies, in fact, is the aim of the *Praxis III* classroom performance assessment now being tooled up by ETS for national implementation for the 2001-2002 school year.)

Statement of the Problem

The problem is, even though teachers are afforded a great deal of latitude in choosing the course materials (text selection) for their respective subject areas, they feel pressured by the outcome oriented learning skills and objectives prescribed by most school districts without feeling enfranchised. This problem is best addressed by understanding the expectations of the individual school district where each educator is employed.

This, for me, means: Reconciling *Praxis III* (ETS) national standards of assessment with state and local district rubric while keeping the objectives of the course guide in mind. (All three performance standards, as well as the course guide for *American Literature I*, are included as APPENDIX B.)

Conversely, every teacher brings a multitude of personal autonomy to the classroom, in terms of philosophical beliefs and their own classroom teaching styles. Before remediating their own skills, each teacher needs to be metacognitive with regard to their own philosophy and practices or mis-alignment of methodology will result in frustration of the administrator and teacher.

Every practicing teacher today must be aware of their own paradigms and methodologies through inventories (which I will briefly synopsise in my review of literature section) or interactive reflection with pedagogical texts. For this study, through self-assessment and introspection through videotaping, my personal pedagogical ends- improving my questioning/framing skills, are best served through my Neo-Thomistic Philosophy and Socratic Methodology.

Research Questions

1. Can *Pathwise* (district), the State of Ohio (proficiency tests/learning outcomes), and *PraxisIII* standards be reconciled into one functional cover-all assessment device that can be reflected upon daily? *Addressed from pp. 146-163 (specifically answered on page 163). The follow up research suggestion is on p. 164.*
2. Is public school teacher videotaping an effective method of self-assessment documentation with regard to administrative educational aims? *Addressed from pp. 164-170 (specifically answered on pages 165-167). Further research considerations appear on page 173.*
3. Can my own questioning and framing skills be honed and improved to target higher order thinking skills, in light of the constraints that the assessment and outcome rubrics (#1&2 from above) place on my lesson plan designs? *Addressed from pp. 173-179 (specifically answered on page 178).*
4. What physical ways will I have to amend my teaching (e.g. classroom movement and voice projection) in order to work effectively within this video medium? *Addressed from pp. 179-181 (specifically answered on page 180).*
5. What technical problems will I face/troubleshoot that might be beneficial to other educators wishing to replicate my research undertaking? *Addressed from pp. 180-181 (specifically answered on page 181).*
6. How will my conclusions affect my administrator's plans to implement this

technology as a staff development project? *Addressed from pp. 170-172 (specifically answered on page 172).*

Significance

The significance of this study is to build on the existing body of educational research in teacher values, by illustrating the role that values play out in everyday educational practices in the public school classroom through the lessons planned. Existing standards of assessment will be inculcated, by connecting the national, state and district criteria to the personal improvement aims of a representative teacher (as a research subject). Videotaping, as assessment, will be the medium of self-assessment, rather than relying solely on reflective notes or outside assessors. My hypothesis then is- can questioning strategies be improved by recursively categorizing and examining their effectiveness in aiding students (and teachers) in the development of critical thinking skills.

Likewise, my further query is- can self-evaluation skills, as well, be improved upon by linking this aspect of self-directed instruction to the growing body of site based faculty development plans (in essence this project is a blueprint for a teacher guided, on site, staff development workshop allowing 'best teaching practices' to be shared). That philosophy (personal beliefs) mediates methodology (teaching style) and is then reconciled with national, state and local edicts provides a rationale for this study. If individually applied, this will benefit the teaching profession by allowing teachers themselves to creatively, based on their own observations, improve their performance in conjunction with meeting tougher and tougher outside standards being imposed upon the profession.

Reconstructing the Project

The following are the progressive levels of this project's development:

1. I became interested in improving classroom instruction via questioning/framing.
2. I collected background information through my graduate level professors.
3. I researched Questioning/framing and related areas (see chapter two).
4. I began to reconcile my own educational beliefs and methods with the research.
5. I conceived a hypothesis that included my beliefs and the existing research.
6. I created a short questionnaire to test my hypothesis on a small sample group.
7. From the pilot study, I conceived a study to measure the intangibles in question.
8. The conceptual paradigm (prospectus) was refined and modified by committee.
9. The appropriate approvals were garnered and consent was given via Institutional Review Board (IRB).

10. The lessons were strategically videotaped to illustrate all facets of the study.
11. I continued to research, reconcile my beliefs and practices throughout,
12. While outside assessors were brought in to triangulate (validate) my paradigm.
13. Upon completion of the information gathering stage, I began to review my journal.
14. Daily journal entries were stitched together to create emergent patterns.
15. From the patterns, categories for my concluding discussion were fashioned.

Limitations

The limitations of this study will be the small sample size of my class (only five students) and myself as a research subject representative of a larger community of secondary teachers and students found in public schools today. Conversely, since this is a qualitative ethnographic study, I was graced with both a small class size (only five students), that all represent a different socio-economic status (SES) cross section of the class structure present in many similar communities across the U.S.

Additionally, an almost endless array of teaching skills could be identified and focused on as perspective areas isolated for research and remediation. For this researcher, however, only outcomes associated with videotaping and improving questioning/framing strategies shall be discussed. Also, subjectively confined, will be to operationally define the progressive levels of questioning that I will employ while videotaping my lesson segments according to the levels of Benjamin Bloom's Taxonomy.

It is important to emphasize that this research is based on a qualitative case study. In contrast to usual surveys, breadth of coverage has been sacrificed for depth of meaningful assertions and future applications/implications of this research.

Once the levels of questioning are defined, the requisite steps will be taken to progressively improve my teaching ability via continuous self-evaluation/metacognition- referencing the appropriate methodological texts (on Socratic Questioning) and modifying instruction accordingly. The only outside validation devices used to identify questioning deficiencies that will be employed are the use of the three outside assessors (named in the methods section).

Definitions

- Action research- teacher initiated research designed to solve/explain real world instructional problems
- Bloom's Taxonomy- Benjamin Bloom's ordering of objectives from simple learning tasks to more complex ones; the elements from lowest to highest cognitive function are:
 1. Knowledge- name, define, memorize, repeat, record, list, recall, know, state, & write

2. Comprehension- discuss, describe, give examples, explain, find, tell, & summarize
 3. Application- translate, interpret, apply, solve, show, practice, use, & demonstrate
 4. Analysis- classify, distinguish, categorize, differentiate, compare, examine, & test
 5. Synthesis- originate, revise, compose, arrange, prepare, construct, develop, & propose
 6. Evaluation- appraise, rate, value, assess, measure, estimate, justify, debate, & score (Slavin, 1997)
- Conceptual framework- is the philosophical, value laden frame of reference (including a teacher's preferred teaching style) that must be constructively reconciled with any new stimulus affecting teaching practices or beliefs.
 - Constructivism- Lev Vygotsky's (1978) conceptual belief that all new information must be connected and made relevant to past information and experiences.
 - Critical thinking- is generally considered to be the analysis, synthesis, evaluation levels of Bloom's taxonomy that denote higher cognitive functioning/intelligence, that stresses the ability to make rational decisions that either challenge or confirm an existing belief structure.
 - Domains (of teaching)- i.e. content knowledge, learning environment, questioning strategies, and lesson efficacy/future modifications as defined by ETS (in *Praxis III*), that are considered to be essential components of instruction
 - Framing skills- the teachers ability to sequentially frame an idea or question in a manner that provides the student with enough concrete context to be answered from the assisted point of reference
 - Reflection- a teacher's ability to metacognitively think about his/her practices
 - Standards of assessment- generally are the result of a professional organization reconciling their own agenda with the available research on classroom practices and create a rubric that reflects those values
 - Socratic questioning- is a method of teaching wherein the instructor seeks to lead students through a complex series of agreed upon empirical truths in order to reach consensus (Webb, 1996).
 - Taxonomy- is the system of classification of interconnected levels of intelligence to the whole.
 - Teaching style- is the manner in which a teacher presents information that can

generally be defined as teacher or student centered in origin; here are some examples of styles according to Grasha and Hicks (1995):

Expert	Possesses knowledge and expertise that students need. Strives to maintain status as an expert among students by displaying students-knowledge and by challenging students to enhance their competence. Concerned with transmitting information and insuring that students are well prepared.
Formal Authority	Possesses status among students because of knowledge and role as a faculty member. Concerned with providing positive and negative feedback, establishing learning goals, expectations, and rules of conduct for students. Concerned with the correct, acceptable, and standard ways to do things and with providing students with the structure they need to learn.
Personal Model	Believes in “teaching by personal example” and establishes a prototype for how to think and behave. Oversees, guides, and directs by showing how to do things and encouraging students to observe and then to emulate the instructor’s approach.
Facilitator	Emphasizes the personal nature of teacher-student interactions. Guides and directs students by encouraging cooperative as well as independent learning activities. Good at questions, exploring options, suggesting alternatives, and encouraging students to make informed choices. Overall goal is to develop in students the capacity for independent action, initiative, and responsibility. Works with students on projects in a consultative fashion and tries to provide

as much direction, support, and encouragement as possible.

Delegator	Concerned with developing students' capacity to function in an autonomous fashion. Interested in having people become self-directed, self-initiating learners. Students work independently on projects or as part of autonomous teams. The teacher is available at the request of students as a consultant and resource person.
-----------	---

*It is important to note here that each style is not mutually exclusive to the others. In fact, I believe the most effective instructors move smoothly between each style when the appropriateness of task aligns with the instructional delivery method.

- Teacher Values- are the beliefs a teacher has that manifest themselves in practice
- Thomism (neo)- St. Thomas Aquinas' belief that empirical reasoning ultimately seeks to define the scientifically quantifiable complexities of Christian existence (Webb, 1996).
- Workshopped- a teacher (or student) 'best' practice that is shared with colleagues or any hands on learning experience that teams a mentor and a protégé working together on a task
- Zone of proximal development- John Dewey's explanation of a student's ability to perform only with teacher guided assistance, in a task that is beyond a pupils intellectual ability while working on their own (Webb, 1996)

Chapter Two: Review of Literature

Introduction

The intent of this chapter is to elucidate the focus of this research by reviewing the pertinent literature. Since teacher self-evaluation ultimately must begin with one's own conceptual framework emanating from a philosophy that judges practices as either positively reinforcing and constructing upon existing beliefs or negatively impacting self-image and challenging current beliefs and practices, I will first discuss *Teacher Values*.

Once teachers comprehend how their beliefs affect their practices, they must make lesson plans that allow administrative assessment: *Standards of Assessment* (national, state, and local), therefore will be the second section of this chapter.

Though there truly is a dearth of information on *Videotaping as Assessment* in the regular education setting of public schools, the third foci of this chapter will cull applications of this technology that peripherally relate to this study; collegiate settings, the medical field, and special education in the public schools all peripherally apply.

The heart of this chapter, and the subsequent study, will revolve around *Questioning Strategies*, specifically strategies that illuminate the desired concept or skill being taught as the object of the daily lesson. The assessment devices discussed in section two (*Standards of Assessment*) have been developed into a rubric for self-reflection that appear in the appendices; ergo, they are an amalgam of all of the previous sections viewed through my Socratic (videocamera) lens.

Lastly, this chapter will focus on the concept of *Self-Evaluation*, particularly as it relates to the videotape medium. The breadth and scope of my methodological considerations will be laid as a foundational praxis here.

Teacher Values

An elusive factor to define, but nonetheless a seminal ingredient in classroom instruction, is teacher values. That is, how do teacher beliefs and interests play out in classroom instruction? In the book *Out of our minds: anti-intellectualism and talent development in American schooling*, Aimee Howley et al. (1995) speculates on the effectiveness of issues that the national reform agenda now lays on the table, "Teachers who consider the acceptance of established authority to be an integral part of the educational process may feel their own values threatened under such a mandate reform". In other words, teachers don't want to be judged on a value structure that is not of their own design. Yet, the greatest debate in public education today revolves around this idea of focusing on tangible results as witnessed by student mastery of concepts, especially higher

order thinking constructs. Dobson and Dobson, in *Teacher Beliefs- Practice Congruency* (1983) likewise argue that, "...values immersed in beliefs and practices are reality", and therefore are discursive of specific educational practices that play out in the classroom every day.

The realization that teachers align their classroom instructional techniques and course material content with their own value structures is the focus of *Teachers Goals, Beliefs, and Perceptions of School Culture as Predictors of Instructional Practice* (Buck et. al. 1992); this paradigmatic conceptualization has created myriad dichotomies in the face of the national instructional reform; the feminist/multicultural -vs- the traditional conservatives, the outcome -vs- process oriented camps, the postmodernist abstract -vs- modern and concrete cadre, to name just a few.

Bussis and Chittenden, in *Open Education: Research and Assessment Strategies* (1976) found that when teacher reform agendas emanated from the national or state hierarchy, that were perceived as being inconsistent with personal philosophical value structures, they were either ignored or pressed into service with a great deal of anxiety; changes were deemed to be outside the realm of a true comprehension of student needs (as witnessed by daily interaction/observation).

Bob Butroyd's 1997 piece, "*Are the Values of Secondary School Teachers Really in Decline?*", gets to the root of explicating values from content when he delves into the multitudinous facets of subjectively evaluating teacher performance; "Strong values are often divided along political/gender lines...Shared values that can be agreed upon are nothing more than summarily dismissed platitudes". Somewhere in the middle of being politically correct and dogmatic -vs- conservative and enigmatic, Butroyd sensibly asserts, "Teacher values are a personal as well as a public matter"(1997).

James S. Leming's 1995 article, "*Reflections on 30 years of Moral Education Research*", strengthens my assertion that values must not only be identified as factors that affect instruction, but also as factors to be included as part of the classroom pedagogy. He states, "The current trend is against teaching neutrally about values. Rather the trend is for teaching values in concert with methods of analysis and judgment that yield answers" (Leming, 1995). Thomas Lickona shares similar sentiments about values: "...stress the integration of cognitive development and character development (sometimes called citizenship) through perspective taking, moral reasoning, thoughtful decision-making, and moral self-knowledge" (*Educating for Character: How our Schools can Teach respect and Responsibility*, 1993). By applying Lickona's rubric, integration of classroom pedagogy with beliefs then becomes the sorting device through which all other categories are created and organized.

Perhaps, Weil Veuglers, in his 1995 AERA presentation, *Teachers, Value Stimulation and Critical Thinking*, describes the progression of integrating values, critical thinking and subject

matter best in his insightful 415 secondary teacher poll: "...when teachers teach a value-loaded topic they often follow a progression of steps: first not expressing their own values, then stressing differences in values without expressing the values they find important, and finally indicating the values they themselves find important".

R.C. Wylie argued, as early as 1974, that external scales, assessments, and measures seldom really identify a teacher's incipient value structure, in his treatise "*The Self-Concept, Revised Edition*". Whether using a Likert type rating scale, an exhaustive checklist, or a Q-Sort separating responses into categories, the free-response (self-derived/described) model is the only one that allows the respondent to create their own patterns of response- and thus norms. As long as teachers are allowed to create the delivery method of stated educational objectives for skills and concepts, outside teacher assessment devices will always need to be personally reconciled with actual classroom practices.

Standards of Assessment

According to the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), every state in our union is in the process (in 1999) of developing or revising their teaching standards. National, subject driven, standards are likewise being published by entities such as the National Council for Teaching of English (NCTE) that reflect the concerns of the field, as well as the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), that not only develop standards, but creates assessment instruments while providing for professional development opportunities. Moreover, domain driven, pedagogical/methodological/political concerns are being toolled up for implementation by the federal government's US Department of Education (such as *Goals 2000*) and by testing corporations such as Educational Testing Service (ETS). The aim of this section is to point out the overlap of many of these assessing bodies, the power (or lack thereof) of these referendums, and contrast the aforementioned with the actual classroom assessments that take place in the public schools regularly as administrative concerns.

National teacher unions, such as the AFT or NEA are primarily support oriented. As such, they are great clearinghouses for statistics that quantify teaching; they make available (market) myriad teacher resource materials. They are not, however, either committed to, or capable of censuring teacher behaviors.

The subject/field driven organizations such as the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM) or the NTE are also vast clearinghouses primarily dedicated to new methods of teaching course content within that particular field, and occasionally to the logical dissemination of new information to the rank and file teachers in the public schools. These organizations are

most influential in the writing, developing, and approving of new texts being marketed by publishers. Only at the collegiate level (teacher preparation programs) are these bodies able to affect instruction via their influence over accrediting agencies such as The National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).

Accrediting agencies, though powerful in academia, have little formal power in modifying teacher assessment standards in the public schools. NCATE is currently calling for higher academic standards as part of their teacher education graduation requirements. Even though their revised standards have been in effect since 1987, real world changes to teacher education programs have come, most recently, from the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC). Principles developed by this governing body now must be evidenced by authentic assessment works in student teacher portfolios at many universities.

With the previously mentioned organizations working towards loftier teacher standards of assessment since the mid-eighties, the federal government made grant monies available with the *Goals 2000: Educate America Act*. This program offered federal tax money directly to local school districts in the form of block grants to create rigorous academic standards, to align the curriculum with instruction and teacher education programs, as well as the purchasing of new textbooks if compliance with the new benchmark standards were met.

If the previously mentioned organizational bodies have shaped assessment standards over the past 15-20 years, the following have defined teaching standards, and as such, are the focus of my own assessment rubric that will be implemented (to varying degrees) in this study. These are: the National Teaching Examination (NTE-*PRAXIS II*) created by ETS, the individual state edicts for teacher/student assessment standards, and traditional local school district performance assessments done by building level administrators.

The NTE (now labeled the *Praxis Series*), in effect since 1993 as a paper and pencil test, directly affects the level of academic preparation needed to pass this national teacher proficiency exam. Both subject matter and pedagogy are tested by this ETS test series. The upcoming *Praxis III* classroom performance assessment (to be implemented in 2002) will have a direct impact on classroom performance since national certification will hinge on passing this authentic assessment device. Similarly, most states in turn now have raised their standards for entry into the teaching profession either by asking for a higher academic attainments (college grades and NTE scores) or are willing to hold off professional licensure until an outside agency certifies proficiency (such as ETS).

Once in the profession, current standards allow working autonomously in a classroom. Under this model, most novice teachers only have to pass a minimal (read competent/incompetent)

performance standard for their actual building level administrator, possibly having to show evidence of remediating/amending individual performance deficiencies. These last three assessment standards, along with questioning strategies, will be the basis of my methodology for this self-assessment study.

Since as many as one-fifth of the major teacher education programs of study currently use videotaped lesson segments (of student teacher classroom performance) as the primary method of both student teacher metacognition of their own performance (mini-lessons), as well as the faculty critique assessment of said performance, why not extend this type of analysis to a veteran teacher's performance?

Videotaping as Assessment

"Videotaping Teachers in Action: A View from the back of the Room" by Martin and Mayerson, looks at the college teaching environment in terms of instructional self-awareness. Feeling that most professors don't accurately judge their own teaching abilities (since research is weighted more heavily in academia), Martin and Mayerson (1992) state, "Formal and informal student evaluations and formal observations by supervisors are rarely used as tools for self-discovery. Instead they must rely on their own intuitive perceptions about what occurs on a regular basis in their classrooms". Getting to the eventual outcome of any student evaluation the authors point out that basically students have a horrible time of extricating the ease/difficulty of a course with an instructors ability. This explains why difficult professional degree programs, such as medical or law, seldom poll students regarding professor efficacy/popularity.

On the other hand, Martin and Mayerson (1992) tacitly state, "Politics and threats to ego also play a part whenever a colleague or supervisor enters your class". The bottom line, these authors say, is, "With current videotape technology, one can effectively and easily see oneself from the student's point of view" (Martin and Mayerson, 1992).

Doug Smith similarly delineates the ego conundrum, when videotaping is introduced, in his article, *"Peer Coaches; Problems with Videotape Recording for Teacher Observation"*. Smith's 1996 query into this medium epitomizes the stand pat dismissals of videotaping teacher performances as being twofold: first, teachers fear administrators' unethical usage of videotaped classroom lessons (primarily), -and- teachers fear their own perceived inadequacies of instructional acumen (secondarily). Unfamiliarity with the video equipment was given superficially as a rouge for these two previous concerns, Smith intimated.

In his summary, Smith offered five areas to be addressed, in an effort to change negative initial misgivings about videotaping as a teacher self-assessment tool: 1. Ethical issues of control must

be addressed. 2. An awareness of possible self-image conflict must occur with properly trained instructors. 3. Training to overcome technical problems must be addressed up front. 4. Coaching through human problems and fears must be provided, and 5. Experienced staff, familiar with all aspects and problems inherent in this assessment medium, need to be cultivated and put in place beforehand.

Though no research model is available to compare in the regular education classrooms of public schools, in “*Self-Evaluation of Instruction: A protocol for Functional Assessment of Teaching Behavior*” by Gunter and Reed, we find teacher videotaping used as a tool for recognizing and modifying teacher behaviors that lead to unwanted student behaviors in special education. Focusing primarily on classrooms for children with behavioral disorders, and the lack of strategies designed to deal with teacher self-improvement, Gunter and Reed state that, “...teachers need to learn to ask questions about their teaching practices” (1993).

Once a lesson has been videotaped, Gunter and Reed suggest watching the video once for each of the seven areas they described to be coded/recorded. After presenting the mathematical analysis for assessing the lesson’s effectiveness, they speculate that an 80% compliance rate of teacher commands given translates into effective instruction wherein the course content (not- off task behavior), is the primary focus of the time spent in the classroom.

For most new topics, they assert, negative and positive reinforcement will need to be adjusted in the form of questioning difficulty; simply stated, when disruptive behaviors are positively enforced, the lesson is derailed and/or incomplete, but when students are experiencing success by positive feedback given from the instructor, the lesson maintains its integrity of focus-and it becomes much more likely than the students will reach concept attainment.

Gunter and Reed conclude that because the teachers themselves are using personally formatted (video) assessment of their own behaviors towards their own needs (and rewards) they are more responsive to positive instructional change. An additional boon to using this tool is that teachers can create tapes to be evaluated by their administrators using lessons of their own choosing. Administrators, in turn, can choose the most exemplary models to workshop during in-service proceedings. Ultimately, Gunter and Reed reflect my sentiments when they recommend, “The protocol presented provides a simple and inclusive format to guide the consistency of self-observation measures with the bonus of providing a functional assessment of child behavior” (1993).

Glenda Clyde likewise made a strong case for incorporating videotaping into daily assessment (for pre-service teachers) when she addressed the 1994 Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association; entitled *Assessment is Epistemic and Heuristic: The Role of Videotape in the*

Public Speaking Course- basically postulates, "...the process of formulating assessment methods is also a process of researching the learning process".

While all of this research provides the requisite positive backdrop to comprehend videotaping in different environments, they are also illustrative of the same external pressures to change in a pre-determined fashion. Conversely, were this technology to be accepted on a widespread basis, as a positively viewed tool for self-improvement, and each individual teacher was allowed to identify his/her own teaching style, outlining the major skill areas to be mastered within their chosen teaching style/technique, then ethical administrative input could be garnered towards improvement.

Questioning Strategies

All of the national, state and local assessment evaluation rubric uses Benjamin Bloom's terminology as the idiomatic currency of this sub-genre of education. For this reason, I do not feel it would be a fruitful educational pursuit to significantly deviate from this literature and practice. The remainder of this section of chapter two ergo, builds on, and supports Bloom's venerable taxonomic device, specifically higher order thinking skills such as the analysis and synthesis levels.

Socratic Questioning, the method of instruction predominantly used in law schools in the united states is designed in "...exact opposition to the sophistic reduction of values to arbitrary artifacts established by convention" (Brumbaugh, p,105, 1982). In reviewing Alfred North Whitehead's venerable educational constructs, Brumbaugh goes on to delineate Socratic precepts, "...wisdom comes in part from removing conceit and false opinion...(p,106). Essentially, a shared inquiry mode of operation, the Socratic method seeks to dismiss the facile and superficial attempts at explanation in lieu of consensus concerning agreed upon truths. Brumbaugh extols, Platonists (followers of Plato and Socrates' teachings) "... see no virtue in pretending that philosophical arguments can exist in a vacuum" (p, 102). Dennis gray's 1988 discourse, *Socratic Seminars: Basic Education and Reformation* perhaps best defines the tenets of the modern public school application as, it, "(1) emphasizes rigorous thinking, not mastery of facts; (2) stresses that a leader's questions should promote serious conversation, not evoke correct answers; and (3) engages students in a collaborative quest for information"

Cathleen Galas' inquiry based (1999) method of engaging critical thinking skills in students is proposed as, "*The Never Ending Story? Questioning Strategies for the Information Age*". In this model, Galas describes the classroom situation as one where, "The students categorize and explore the questions; explain and hypothesize about the experience; develop a rubric for evaluation; compare to other class discussions; define the intended users; give evidence supporting their research design; articulate their commitment to the question, research plan, and finally visualize and evaluate their own and others' projects" (Galas, 1999). With the focus of this classroom model on open- ended questions and locating resource materials (such as the internet), these strategies may only be appropriate for

layering depth into the stated course objectives, at, or near, the end of a unit or course that emphasizes process over content knowledge (breadth). Nonetheless Galas' model will be applied to this study when/where time constraints (of material mandated for coverage) permits.

"*The Effects of Questions on Visualized Instruction*" (1971) by Dwyer involving the most time efficient way of presenting material that must be quickly/accurately memorized and correctly charted on a performance based (visual labeling) assessment. This research uses the 'time is valuable' axiom to define the quandary most public school educators face (yet many of our collegiate counterparts ignore); does internalized student questioning strategy schema greatly aid in the recall of essential (as defined by state/local objectives) information that students will be tested on? Dwyer says no- at least for straight memory recall.

Though a plethora of related studies were drawn in to define the pupil performance -vs- time spent instructing issue, Wager and Mory (1992), in their article, *Feedback, Questions and Information Processing-Putting it all Together*, came to this conclusion: "Fixing the time frame to restrict the amount of interaction with the questions, or allowing students the freedom of setting their own time frame to interact with questions, showed no differences in achievement". On the other hand, Denner and Rickerts in *A Developmental Comparison of the Effects of Provided and Generated Questions on Text Recall* (1987) found that, "Questions helped focus students' attention on the important aspects of the message and helped them to use study time more effectively". Again, research can't get away from the issue of trying to help students internalize a study strategy that is personally meaningful, without spending valuable (sometimes highly restricted) class time helping less receptive/motivated students find the connections and categories, prior to disseminating the information (to be later recalled on standardized performance tests).

The next few empirical studies build on the latest research on the brain's ability to store new information (and the ability to recall said information). These authors all based their conceptualizations on the idea that schema (a pre-existing category) is available in all human brains, in which every individual can construct (Vygotsky's constructivism) relevant connections to/with new facts. In literature there are multiple levels of comprehension available- based on the ability a student possesses to get away from the factual recall and into the realm of reconciling new knowledge with past paradigms. Unfortunately, with regard to lower -vs- higher ability students, Rosenshine's 1976 article *Recent Research on Teaching Behaviors and Student Achievement* found that lower ability students do better with textually explicit questions that don't stray far from the literal concrete, whereas higher ability students function best in an atmosphere of (Socratic) probing and re-directed questions; real world teaching affirms this truth. Martin's 1979 research, *The Effect of Teacher Higher Order Questions on Student Processes and Product Variables in a single Classroom Study*, on student attitudes towards high/low level questioning also bears this dichotomy out, "...a negative correlation (exists) between the use of high

order questions and the (lower functioning) student attitude toward the teacher”.

Similarly, Garner and Alexander identified a wide gulf between the ability of students and the benefit of pre -vs- post reading questions to be answered in *Strategic Processing of Text: An invitation of the Effects on Adults' Question- Answering Performance* (1982). Basically, Garner and Alexander found that higher functioning students who could activate schema (create their own question categories) did better with pre-reading (organizing) strategies. Concomitantly, lower functioning students were overly stressed with trying to activate and create a schematic that was not of their own origin, and they subsequently spent all of their time referring back to the advanced organizer (i.e. post- selection questions were answered from short-term memory rather than an internalized schema connection).

The issue of actively engaging students in the learning process is functionally expressed by Bonwell and Eison in their (1991) article, “*Active Learning: Creating Excitement in the Classroom*”; “To be involved, students must engage in such higher-order thinking tasks as analysis, synthesis, and evaluation”. The authors, citing Penner (1984) suggest such activities as class time spent on note consolidation (three times per lecture) and simple listening activities (without taking notes) wherein the main ideas and details of the lecture are to be recalled later in a group discussion. These activities, they stress are inestimable in value. Though nothing profound was gleaned from this text, the end note- asking faculty members to self-reflect and explore alternative approaches to instruction, offers sage, time tested advice for improving instruction by targeting higher levels of Bloom’s Taxonomy.

According to Cardellichio and Field’s 1997 article, “*Seven Strategies that Encourage Neural Branching*”, which specifically delineates questioning strategies designed to overcome the brain’s natural tendency to limit information, “...neural branching, or extending the neural networks...” is accomplished by asking students to think hypothetically. The seven specific strategies that the authors advocate are:

1. The use of reversal (putting yourself in the negative situation to resolve the problem)
2. The creation of the student’s own symbol system to classify information
3. The use of personal analogies created by students to constructively connect information
4. The completion of unsolved/unresolved problems
5. The web analysis to physically chart the relationship of parts to the whole
6. The creation of point of view charts that explicate factors leading up to beliefs
7. The individual creation of personal hypotheses to explain disparate anomalies

The authors go on to lambaste questioning strategies that never reach these higher levels of the taxonomy, even though essential comprehension of a given concept may have been met. The caveat to not using critical thinking is that, according to Cardellichio and Feild, neural pruning occurs in the brain since not enough data was assimilated to challenge lower order thinking misconceptions (i.e. students continue believing incomplete and inaccurate ideas- or- they simply memorize the new answers without fully

comprehending their extended implications).

Self-Evaluation

This self-evaluation discourse (conceptualized for this study), in addition to meeting the criteria specified in the “Standards of Assessment” section of this chapter, also draws its strength from the growing body of teacher self-empowerment literature that is emergent in defining deficit to competency based teacher self-improvement. This approach stresses professional growth through metacognition of ability and the commensurate self-reliance needed to improve one’s teaching delivery.

In the document, “*Changing Conceptions of Teaching Influence: The Future of Staff Development*”, Smylie and Conyers (1991) suggest this advice to perspective administrators: “Providers of inservice programs need to consider, however, that teachers have little time during the school day to pause, reflect on practice, or conduct research. Ways need to be found to provide practicing teachers with such time”. Smylie and Conyers go on to say, “...experiences are perceived as professional resources...This paradigm shift addresses one of the most pervasive conditions of the classroom- teacher isolation, or the inability to learn and communicate with colleagues in the place where it counts the most- the school” (1991). The decentralization movement in public education, these authors report, has given impetus to, “...professional development, inservice in particular, increasingly being conducted in, and by, school systems rather than in colleges and universities” (Smylie and Conyers, 1991), where greater personal meaning can be discussed in an open forum.

In “*Self-Evaluation of Instruction: A Protocol for Functional Assessment of Teaching Behavior*”(1996), by Gunter and Reed (previously discussed in the “Videotaping as Assessment” section of this chapter) we find a useful guide for self-assessment, particularly of the video medium: First, our authors suggest that the initial recordings be used simply as a baseline for technical adjustments having to do with camera angles and sound quality. The bonus here is that this time also acts as a buffer to desensitize students to the presence of the equipment in their environment.

Next, Gunter and Reed recommend isolating periods of academic instruction, based on the function of that time allotment. Logically, instructional time breaks down into administrative concerns such as the taking of role and anything else that has nothing to do with didactic concerns. Once these concerns are addressed, new concepts introduced, skills to be mastered, individualized instruction (seat work), and discussion of the text, in addition to concept attainment (of the unit) can all be broken down into meaningful instructional segments according to their particular function.

Finally, these authors (Gunter and Reed) advocate coding specific areas of concern (for this study, I have created a list of questions to be reflected upon). They note that while observing these areas of particular concern, careful attention should be paid to the time immediately pre/proceeding these endeavors. After the coding has been defined, Gunter and Reed believe that grouping like items together

for schematic/topical purposes will yield the best (read, least time wasted). These categories, in turn, can be viewed as separate areas of concern to focus on in each sitting (tape review). A further breakdown, in this study, might be to first mark/note the specific question (and answer) that fits the criteria, and then follow up with a second viewing with the road markers in place. For more specifically coded research, a final quantification of on/off task ratio of student or teacher behaviors may be developed as an interfacing device with quantitative research; for the purposes of this study, the patterns that emerge from the qualitative research will be discussed as part of my conclusions section, once the study is brought to fruition.

With the exception of not being a pre-service teacher, trying to internalize a rubric for self-assessment, but rather a professional wishing to improve/fine tune his own performance, this study roughly follows the research model utilized by Rita Jensen et. al. as described in their 1994 presentation to the ATE. In, *Fear of the Known: Using Audio-Video Technology as a Tool for Reflection in Teacher Education*, Jensen set up a study and control group of student teachers and successfully showed that the study group, "...demonstrated they were better at assessing their interpersonal skills and instructional management competencies than at assessing their use of questioning strategies".

Chapter Three: Methodology

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical foundation of this study rests upon the values of the teacher instructing; these incipient values either allow modification to instruction (or block improvement) that take into consideration the philosophical outlook and teaching style of the instructor. The teacher, given educational objectives to perform in the classroom, based on national, state and local assessments- in turn, either performs up to expectations or modifies objectives to meet their own value laden paradigm of operation according to Blumberg and Jonas' (1987) article *Permitting Access: The Teacher's Control Over Supervision*.

Teachers themselves are the best judge of their own instructional effectiveness (if they are made aware of their own beliefs and have a specific outcome to improve upon in mind)- not outside administrators, that may have divergent ideas about how to meet the same objectives. The University of Michigan's Institute for Social Research identifies three distinct models for reconciling "*Individual Goals and Organizational Objectives*" in Barrett's (1970) synopsis of the study of the same name. They are: The "Exchange Model" that operates on a reward system for teachers doing their jobs according to a supervisor's view. The "Socialization Model" wherein a teacher is expected to accept and internalize the organizations objectives in order to fit into the existing social strata. The most effective model identified by the study however was labeled the "Accommodation Model" because it takes the teacher's philosophy and teaching style into account first and then amalgamates those preferences with the organization's standards and objectives.

Videotaping pressed into service in lieu of an administrators outside (of a teacher's philosophical realm of) assessment then makes the most empirical sense. In the privacy of one's own home, after the instructional day has ended, a teacher can, according to their own rubric, assess their own performance. Arther Blumberg (1980) defines the following as integral to teacher/administrator collaboration: a) both teacher and administrator should reach agreement on objectives that are consistent with both teacher and district goals for instruction, then, b) decide what data is necessary for a teacher performance evaluation.

Once a specific area of instruction has been targeted, such as questioning strategies, a conscientious teacher, motivated to personally improve their own performance can begin to collect information regarding the changes they wish to bring about. From literature on teacher performance, categories can be created for specific analysis (as described in the self-analysis section). After improvements have been targeted and specifics for improvement have been discussed with a building administrator, these tapes can be evaluated based on a shared criteria checklist that meets both the district standards as well as the particular areas that the teacher values. Ultimately, if the teacher and administrator agree upon the

performance criteria to be evaluated then, tapes can be workshopped as part of a faculty development process. The findings section of this completed study, denoting exact quotational references and specific phrases may aid greatly in the workshopping phase.

Qualitative Research

Since qualitative research, to a great extent, rests upon the extant sensibilities of the researcher, to not only have reasonable constructs comparable to other similar work in the given field, throughout the tenure of this project, I will continue to discuss, review and consult outside sources for methodological input. However, the actual reflection upon my classroom teaching practices will be limited to my own arrangement of information and perspectives discussed in the proceeding section. Though I do not have statistical weighting to convince novice educators of the validity of this action-research project, the seminal points made and means of explanation made are likely to ring true to the professional educator currently dealing with the issue of personal assessment as it relates to personally defined teaching effectiveness.

In this connection, it is useful to acknowledge that all research is interpretative, and that all interpretations are subjective in the sense that they are produced by people who are culturally distinctive, rooted in a particular time and place, and inevitably imbued with a socially acquired frame of reference. The frame of reference, moreover, is both illuminating and distorting. Without it, however, interpretation is impossible, because there's nothing to use in the interpretative process – there's nothing to think with.

Paradigmatic Constructs

Student teacher preparation programs routinely use videotaping as a method of improving pre-service instructional techniques, either in a university classroom, or in actual student teaching placements; I will likewise use this technology to evaluate my teaching techniques weekly (for at least 12 consecutive weeks).

Furthermore, administrators sporadically observe both novice and veteran teacher alike (even less frequently in the case of the latter), in order to insure instructional proficiency. I will focus on the rubric of not only my building administrator, but also the assessment criteria my *Pathwise* mentor in my school, as well as the criteria set forth in the *Praxis III* (ETS) NTE standards (to be evaluated by an outside, of the building/district assessor).

Triangulation of Assessment

Teachers seldom receive any metacognitive feedback regarding specified areas they want to improve, other than briefly reflecting on their own lesson plans. Therefore I will ask the three aforementioned outside assessors to specifically evaluate, and discuss 'questioning' improvement strategies with me.

Data Collection

Additionally, it is incumbent upon teachers to continually improve instruction. With this weekly videotaping self-assessment tool (a tangible, accurate, all inclusive recording- not based on memory or notes) it will be easier to focus on and track ongoing performance improvements; which I will keep as a running commentary (as a summary at the end of each lesson) based on the “Master List of Criteria to be Reflected Upon”.

Given the aforementioned considerations, it follows that:

1. Videotaping as a method of self-improvement can be implemented in public school classrooms as a means of supplying daily/weekly qualitative feedback.
2. Likewise, much of the standard teacher assessment rubric used by administrators is seldom addressed on a daily basis, yet is expected to be part of the teaching repertoire. For instance, unless an administrator was coming to observe at the beginning of a unit, he/she probably would not get a clear, student oriented, overview, nor would a casual observer know the effectiveness and totality of any alternative teaching methods, such as cooperative learning (followed through to fruition). In short, much of the daily observable teaching behaviors are only a part of a larger weekly, bi-monthly, or monthly unit plan and truly can not be holistically scored/evaluated without that context.
3. With specifically identified instructional goals set forth by the teacher, multiple domains (the focus of *Praxis III*) of learning can be focused/improved upon over longer periods of time using daily/weekly/monthly video feedback.
4. Ultimately, teacher research indicates that real teacher improvement only comes from internally valued criteria that has been chosen for reflection upon & remediation thereof.

Therefore, my methodology follows my own paradigmatic model of construction. Since I am self-aware of my philosophical and methodological perspectives, and wish to improve my instruction through this lens, I have created a self-assessment checklist to reflect upon during the tenure of my videotaping project.

This model is an amalgamation representing different foci and interconnected strands of the educational model. The national *Praxis III* and district *Pathwise* rubric are similar models that are derived from sound teacher preparation practices (written and supported by educators wishing to quash both the political and pedagogical pundits of our current licensing and certification system); these two, nearly synonymous models are broken down into four domains that the district (and therefore, building) level criteria are layered upon. For this study, I have culled specific criteria from the existing assessment

devices that my teaching performance will be evaluated on which particularly focus on questioning strategies- since this is the area of instruction I most wish to improve.

The building level teacher appraisal assessment likewise wishes to thwart criticism, but these criteria are geared more towards minimal levels of competency that can either be defended in court or dealt with through district policy guides. Either way, the intent here is to prevent educational lawsuits from bankrupting the district, while trying not to create an adversarial polarity between administrators and their representative teacher unions. Nonetheless, some of these criteria have likewise been inculcated into my reflection criteria.

The last set of criteria to be inserted into the multi-faceted nature of this coverall self-assessment reflection guide, is coming from the parents/prospective employers/ tangible- skills-mastered camp. The state of Ohio requires that reading and writing proficiencies be mastered by high school seniors. As part of my course guide (which will be reflected on separately in my daily lesson plan book) for American Literature I, these skills must be integrally included as part of my regular repertoire of fundamental skills taught that students must show proof of mastery.

Data Analysis

In order to triangulate my self-assessment skills, I will be: a) Reconciling my scripted lesson plan questions with b) my journal based on my own perceptions of what actually happens in the classroom, after viewing the weekly tapes and c) asking the three outside assessors to specifically focus on my questioning strategies using their own evaluation rubric- in order to gain outside perspectives that validate my own metacognition (five cumulative scheduled outside visits). **The actual "Self-Assessment Reflection Guide appears as APPENDIX E.*

With the fundamental empirical backdrop to this project's constructs in place, I will focus on the specific implementation of this project:

From Jan. 17th, 2000 in my American Literature I (a junior/senior level) course that met daily from 8:25-9:15 AM I videotaped myself twice a week -in an effort to improve my own instructional abilities. The entire project will take place within the confines of a High School in Ohio and ended concomitantly with the course and school year on May 28, 2000.

After this raw data had been gathered and reflected upon, I immediately began categorizing and grouping the annotated data into segments of meaningful information in order to address my tacitly stated research questions.

Course Demographics

This American Literature I (American authors up to circa 1860) course is offered by the High School to mostly junior (some seniors) level students. It is a one semester English elective course designed to be

taken in conjunction with American Literature II to round out the American/English Literature requirements. Though the course enrollment has theoretically been set since the inception of the school year (early August, 1999), experience with other required electives tells me that over ten students will be initially enrolled and fewer than five will comprise the class roster after the liberal two week class change period has ended.

The students themselves are coming from a more and more diverse family environment since Pataskala, Ohio (located 12 miles due East of Columbus) is slowly being engulfed by the suburban sprawl of the ever burgeoning growth of the greater Columbus area. However, a small majority of these 15-18 year olds will still be operating from a rural farming community upbringing (paradigm) that has a decidedly conservative value structure; whereas the remainder of the student population will either be comprised of professional commuter families, who are decidedly more liberal, (wishing to avoid the crime and congestion of Columbus) or the urban poor (also liberal in thought, but for other reasons altogether) that have migrated for many of the same reasons (including taking discipline problem children out of the greater Columbus schools); these are the same sort and type of real world students that most any suburban public school system in the United States, regardless of regional idiosyncrasies, would service.

Participants

Though the primary participant in this study is myself (a 35 year old doctoral student in Curriculum and Instruction), the life experiences and current academic ability of the five, 16-18 year old, students does have a bearing on the line and level of questioning pursued daily- in terms of comprehension of abstract concepts. Plus, on a the macro level they are effected in terms of the student learning curve that occurs when higher order thinking constructs become internalized and anticipated as both part of the written and spoken language. In this section, I am speculating on student background in order to anticipate each student's paradigmatic point of view (for appropriate analogies during this project).

Student "A" is a 16 year old junior student used to making A's and B's. She spends much of her time with friends, outside of school, that also have poor home lives. She does not participate in any extra-curricular activities, but she is an avid reader of poetry (which explains her willingness to tackle difficult texts) and does plan on attending a four-year university.

Student "B", a 17 year old junior is likewise taking the course to fulfill her English requirement in the prescribed sequence. At 6'4", she is an outstanding athlete in volleyball; her work ethic is the product of her home life (father a former NBA player) and her own sense of accomplishment. Though not always able to handle abstract questioning during the initial explication of difficult literary works, her affable demeanor and tenacity to succeed academically show in her grades (which she knows are all-

important in her scholarship quest for collegiate athletics).

Student “C” is an 18 year old senior who is active in her church youth group and is the assistant manager of a local video rental store. An interesting anomaly is the fact that she misses a third of her classes, yet still managed to graduate on time with honors. Moral issues embraced by the authors in the classical canon often draw this student into the issues and concepts thematically discussed. Though able to operate at a slightly higher level of abstract reasoning, than the other two girls, her excellent study skills and ability to memorize seminal ideas explain her academic success.

Student “D”, an 18 year old senior, takes on the persona of the “grunge” group wearing the clothes, piercings and ever-changing hair colors, but is a member of the school’s “Quiz-Bowl” team and is genuinely interested in knowledge. He takes pride in his ability to relate trivial information about historical figures to other students. While both of his parents hold degrees, his father’s suicide and mother’s alcoholism force this youth into peer relationships that do not foster traditional values. Nonetheless, this student is able to work with abstract concepts with very little framing or grounding in a contemporary issue.

Student “E”, on the other hand, a product of two professional parents, thrives on the contemporary analogy to (classical canon) traditional literary themes. An 18 year old senior who plans on majoring in English Literature and going on to law school, this student is very willing to judge and analyze literature on an abstract level, but lacks the articulatory ability of student “D”.

Course Pedagogy

The course itself will be taught Socratically, focusing on the issues that many of the founding (read, American Revolutionary Leaders) fathers faced, along with the historical background and origins of the genres later developed and solidified by great American fictional authors. The focus of this course, while attempting to meet all of the objectives listed in the course guide, will be to traditionally illuminate the intent of the great authors in the canon, since a) I feel these authors are seminal in comprehending American thought in literature/government and b) the ethnically diverse population, that might oppose traditional authors, in this school system (Southwest Licking Local Schools) is less than 3%. For additional information about the breadth and scope of the course.

Lesson Planning

Lesson plans, questioning strategies and consensus on issues reached, were limited by available space (a sample page is included as APPENDIX F), and specific, pre-planned, minute by minute, scripted out questions were not prepared prior to daily lesson segments (class periods) being taught. However, as a general daily maxim, review questions usually began with analysis (level four) or evaluation (level six)

and were sustained, or the level of abstraction was raised, until a student was either unable to comprehend the concept, didn't understand the question as it was originally posed, or was simply unable to articulate a salient response.

Daily Itinerary

The following represents a typical progression of daily events:

1. Daily journal prompts are written on the board, while-
2. Roll is taken, then...
3. The journal prompt is discussed.
4. A brief review of yesterday's concepts and skills are covered.
5. Homework is checked.
6. Homework is related to prior lesson content and today's activities.
7. A student is asked to read from the text.
8. Students then paraphrase passages pertaining to thematic unit.
9. Students are asked to generate possible essay thesis statements.
10. Students are asked to review key supporting ideas from the text.
11. Another student reads.
12. Additional essay topics are discussed.
13. Upon completion, the post-text analytical questions are discussed.
14. Key concepts and unfamiliar vocabulary are reiterated.
15. The progression of the current writing process is defined.
16. Previously graded papers are handed back.
17. Individual essays are workshopped at my desk.
18. I Recap tomorrow's assignment(s).
19. Students are dismissed at bell.

Though there were a few quizzes to confirm basic comprehension of concepts as well as homework (usually text questions hitting the analysis level), the primary mode of formative assessment was the in-class Socratic discussion and the essay draft -whereas the summative assessment was usually in the form of a letter grade assigned on the essay final drafts (which had been individually workshopped in class) plus test grades.

Chapter Four: Interpreting the Taxonomic Levels

Introduction

In the following section, each lesson segment's (approximately 40-45 minute class periods) questions are labeled according to Bloom's Taxonomy. As is often the case in the classroom, specific contextual references are needed. Likewise, the contextual frame of reference is also here included to lend situational clarity. Furthermore, since this was an exceptionally small class (only five students), I have also included designations (letters A through E) indicating to whom each question was addressed.

By labeling each question at its corresponding level of comprehension and cross-referencing the number of correct student responses falling under levels 4,5, and 6 (analysis, synthesis, and evaluation), the researcher wishing to target higher order thinking skills should be able to learn how affective his/her questioning/framing strategies were during any given class period, unit, or even semester long analysis.

Inter-rater Reliability

Though I, the researcher and subject of the study, was the primary stenographer, interpreter, and rater of the taxonomic levels of questions that appear in the proceeding section, care was taken to norm the interpretation of the data; Cynthia Butcher, a 25 year old English/Math/Education undergraduate familiar with Bloom's Taxonomy also labeled each question posed from the first three lesson segments. The reliable outcome of 232 questions classified was 85%. This was accomplished by simply reconciling the 197 questions that both she and I labeled as falling in the same taxonomic level. Primarily semantics and syntactical interpretations were ferreted out as nebulous differences in interpretation that that would occur during a norming session wherein there is a question of strict semantical definitions and syntactical meanings.

Taping Criterion

Three primary considerations were taken into account in deciding when and what lesson would be taped, since the beginning of the project was delayed due to IRB considerations. The priori consideration was, were all of the students present on the planned day of taping. Given that the class size was exceptionally small, the researcher felt that the audience dynamic could change by losing members. The next factor considered was the methodological nature of the lessons; for instance, were 'essay development' to be the focus of the lesson, individually workshopping student papers is geared more toward teacher directed (student) skill remediation through suggestion than Socratic

questioning- and would therefore yield data much harder to quantify. Lastly, the read throughs (of literary selections from the text), though some were taped, obviously do not yield the volume or variety of questions that unit over/re-views do. Therefore, when possible, unit and semester long themes were taken into consideration as part of the subject matter to be explicated vis a vis video-taping.

Labeling the Taxonomic Level

Comprehension, though only one step above memory recall, also can be seen as the end result of Socratic questioning – which seeks consensus (i.e. commonly agreed upon interpretations). Therefore, before going on to greater levels of syntactical student awareness, some modicum of authorial intent must be agreed upon by the group by using referential (within text) and historical (common historical knowledge of the era) context.

Likewise, if students are merely repeating what the teacher or another pupil has just said – or – are simply reading from their notes – this will be labeled at the *knowledge* level.

When differentiating between *application* and *comprehension* levels of questioning, *application* has been used preferentially over *comprehension* in cases where the students are still struggling with translating and interpreting the query or having difficulty solving and demonstrating internalization of the concept being embraced.

Comprehension, on the other hand, is being labeled in cases where one or two students have thoroughly defined the concept yet *comprehension* (internalization) has not been checked with the remaining students (i.e. if students are only layering examples onto an already defined list – this is only *comprehension* not *application*). The more critical analysis moniker will be placed at any point where some type of classification or comparison is implicitly/explicitly evident.

Synthesis, or the creating anew by internalizing abstract criterion, likewise can present a problem when coveted as an end result in a literature survey course – since the stated overarching objectives seek student comprehension of concepts, themes and ideas as the end result of literary analysis while concomitantly seeking the application of epistolary skills in composing an articulately phrased lucid essay.

Chapter Five: Question Transcription

Introduction

This chapter transcribes all of the twelve videotaped lesson segments labeling the taxonomic level of each question to the left, the question verbatim, the frame of reference, as well as indicating which student was being addressed- by letter designation (all in 14 pt. bold type), followed by a running reflective commentary below each question in italics (12 pt. type). In the case of two questions appearing together, without a space in-between, I have simply re-directed (rephrased) the question to the same student. Each lesson is also immediately proceeded by a lesson summary indicating the most noteworthy events that transpired, what was gleaned from the lesson, and the direction I am headed in for the subsequent session.

Taxonomic Level Intended	Questions Transcribed	Student Addressed
-----------------------------	-----------------------	-------------------

Lesson One: *Paraphrasing the Declaration*

Analysis	<p>1. What are the key ideas there (if you had to come up with a very short list of three key things said)? (Student B)</p> <p><i>Since the prior three weeks of introductory material, and the first reading of the Declaration, had previewed several categories for an analytical breakdown of the categories Jefferson was delineating, I was hoping the student could transpose and overlay those themes onto the actual text (i.e. inductively place particular phrases in pre-existing categories). She had, in preliminary discussions given modern examples that fit each of Jefferson's particular referents.</i></p>	
----------	---	--

Frame: “Which is not the kind of government that represents the people as much as a government that controls the people.”

Student “B” has accurately described some of George’s transgressions against the colonials, after identifying two of Jefferson’s implicit categories, without actually describing a tyrannical oligarchy as the type of government.

Comprehension 2. ...and what would another category (do you think) be? (S.B)

Frame: “He (King George) was suppose to be protecting us...”

Application 3. ...but in reality he was doing what? (S.B)
The student, after waiting two full minutes for a reply, does not follow the abstraction from example to appropriate categorical placement (i.e. she cannot label George’s behavior).

Frame: “He was bending us to his will.”

Knowledge 4. O.K. who has the next section?

Frame: “I didn’t notice a whole lot of changes there (paraphrased)...”

Knowing that this student comprehends the majority of the vocabulary used in the original text, the challenge here is to get this student to break down the complex issues into root issues that have been layered upon (through paraphrasing).

Analysis 5. ...but if you had to break that down into the things that Jefferson was writing about as a specific complaint against George, what would you say they are? (Student D)

Again the student tries to comment upon the category rather than vivisecting it into meaningful smaller terse specifics.

Application

6. Now, why is hiring these mercenaries a problem?
(S.D)

The student is starting to see the cause and effect nature of mercenaries as agents taking away basic freedoms.

Application

7. (Absolutely) Is there any other reason to have foreign soldiers on our soil? (S.D)

Frame: “None, whatsoever unless they were going to be fighting a war against us; that’s one.”

Frame: “O.K., O.K., O.K., after student breaks down causes.”

Knowledge

8. Who has the next section?

Analysis

9. If we had to narrow that down into a couple of key ideas, what would we say out of that paragraph?
(Student A)

This student, being somewhat introverted, has trouble creating categories for analytical breakdown without receiving incremental “Zone of Proximal Development” feedback (her first essay illustrated this need for continuing reinforcement).

Comprehension

Knowledge

10. What does he (Jefferson) start out with? (S.A)
11. What is the key verb that he starts out with, there in the second sentence? (S.A)

Frame: “ ‘Warned’ right? (S.A nods). Jefferson is saying that Britain has been warned over, over, and over again – and they (the British) have done nothing,

nothing to try to get around, to circumvent, this problem of going to war with the colonists; they have been warned over and over again.”

Application

12. What would be another key idea? (S.A)

After demonstrating the skill of looking for the key verbs, I expected the student to apply my model to the next segment of the selection she was assigned.

Application

13. What were “the circumstances” (when the Europeans came over? (S.A)

Frame: “For the most part these people (early settlers) had to get their rights of passage from the King himself. The King told them that they could come over here and run this country anyway they saw fit. ...that is why Jefferson’s family paid, whatever they paid, for their property and plantation; because King George was saying: This is a frontier, a chance for you to be your own boss. That was the situation that George set up, they were going to have. Especially the Aristocrats thought that they had a deal...”

After repeated attempts to nudge the student into paraphrasing, the problem, replete with situational context, it was simply laid out.

Comprehension

14. ...but did it work out that way? (S.A)

Frame: “There wasn’t much we could do about it (George’s taxes) because we were held hostage by the British soldiers.”

Analysis

15. So, what are the key ideas here? (Student E)

This student, from previous in-class discussions, showed an ability to recognize, label, and break down seminal concepts- and predict outcomes based on facts and the tone of charged language.

Application 16. What is he (Jefferson) saying, as he's wrapping up this document? (S.E)

Comprehension 17. What part of the document is it, according to our introduction? (S.E)

Knowledge 18. Where is this (section) in the layout of it? (S.E)
Although the student is able to give an extended dissertation on the topic of the section he has been asked to explicate, I am shifting his focus to the role it plays within the entirety of the text.

Frame: "This is formal, we the people have agreed to it."

Application 19. This is a what? (S.E)
Analysis 20. What are the key ideas here? (S.E)

Frame: "Good point, yes exactly we're only going to answer to God, we're not going to answer to the King."

Frame: "Yes, because we know we are good people and we don't need your permission."

Application 21. What's this about "contract alliances" and "establishing commerce"? (S.E)

At this point, the student has internalized the schemata (categories) and is able to draw macro inferences from the implications of the language used by Jefferson.

- Application 22. "...and contract alliances", how does that go along with it? (S.E)
- Frame: "You got it, he (Jefferson) says, from here on out, we're going to build our own alliances. If we want to deal directly with France, we're going to deal directly... we're going to have our own (independent) business and..."
- Comprehension 23. We're not going to give you any _____? (S.E)
At this juncture, the student is clearly following the author's intent; thereby allowing the Socratic discussion format to take on a new dynamic that questions underlying assumptions which clarify theories and perspectives that undergird the text.
- Analysis 24. Any other key ideas there? (S.E)
- Frame: "Yeah, exactly we're pledging to ourselves, because we believe in divine providence..."
- Application 25. ...by whom? (S.E)
- Frame: "because we believe in divine providence..."
- Knowledge 26. Remember, we talked about this yesterday? (S.E)
- Comprehension 27. ...by who's authority? (S.E)
- Frame: "He (Jefferson) says that as long as we are all together on this, and we all believe in God..."
- Knowledge 28. How much time do we have left? (All students)
- Frame: "Let's start a brief discussion here. On page 158, let's try to work through these questions."

Evaluation	<p>29. What's your reaction to this document? (S.B)</p> <p><i>At this point, realizing the student's articulatory reticence, I am satisfied just to get her to speak at length though prodding her into increasingly more sophisticated logical disseminations of detailed descriptions.</i></p>
Knowledge	30. What was Jefferson's occupation? (S.A)
Knowledge	31. What was he trained to do? (Student D)
Knowledge	32. What did he make his living at? (S.E)
Evaluation	<p>33. Do you think that he (Jefferson) did a good job of preparing this case? (S.E)</p> <p><i>This student's desire to attend law school is being focused on as a method of motivation in order to get the student to explicate the text in terms of the laws that are being questioned.</i></p>
Comprehension	<p>34. Does he have concrete evidence here? (S.E)</p> <p>Frame: "Everything that the King has ever done; he's saying, here is a list of all of his transgressions."</p>
Application	<p>35. Why do you think that he would have gone through the trouble (of preparing the case)? (S.B)</p> <p><i>Though able to transcribe cause and effect relationships after the relationship has been defined, he doesn't initially see the connection.</i></p>
Analysis	36. Why would, if they know that they (the colonies) are going to go to war, send this document off to Great Britain? (S.A)
Application	37. What would have happened if we had lost the war? (S.A)

Frame: "...lots of reasons for writing this document out, not the least of which was to keep the colonists pumped up."

Application 38. How would you define a "self-evident truth"? (S.D)

Frame: "Remember they were living in the age of enlightenment 'scientific reasoning' was prevalent. ...Locke, Rousseau and Bacon."

Comprehension 39. When he (Jefferson) says, "self-evident truth" what is he talking about? (S.D)

Comprehension 40. ...more than that if something is a self-evident truth, how do we know it's a self-evident truth? (S.A)

Application 41. (It's instinct) but is it provable? (S.E)
Asking the student to separate sociocentricity from universally grounded empiricism here does not lead to insight into each side's (British-vs- Colonials) egocentric behavior and belief structure.

Frame: "Exactly, so we're talking about the idea of consensus ...it's so basic and fundamental, that you can't even argue with it."

Synthesis 42. Under what circumstances today would Americans elect to change their system of government? (S.D)

Synthesis 43. What would have to happen? (S.B)
Contributing factors and spurious relationships are being sought.

Frame: "So we would have to go through the same procedure that he (Jefferson) went through."

- Comprehension 44. First we would have to _____? (All students)
- Comprehension 45. Then we would have to do what? (S.A)
- Comprehension 46. Well, what did they do? (S.E)
- Here, I have chosen to review the factual recollection of events presented in the text, in an effort to reach consensus regarding the sensible and logical progression of events that unfolded (i.e. facts are connected to the principle impetus here).*
- Frame: “Well they waited for a while to see if anything was going to get better.”
- Comprehension 47. Did it get better for them (the colonists)? (S.B)
- Frame: “...things (the situation) got worse because...”
- Comprehension 48. What happened after they waited for a while? (S.A)
- Frame: “Soldiers taxes, and unjust laws...and finally when they knew things weren’t going to get better, but worse...”
- Comprehension 49. ...they finally ____? (S.D)
- Evaluation 50. Which reason for breaking away from British rule strikes you as most important? (S.D)
- Comprehension 51. Over our daily lives you mean? (S.D)
- Comprehension 52. Soldiers in citizens’ houses would have been the final straw wouldn’t it? (S.D)
- Comprehension 53. People are going to stand up and say that’s it; is that what you’re telling me? (S.D)

Frame: “Jefferson’s complaints are against George – not the British people.”

- Analysis 54. In what ways does the declaration emphasize this difference? (S.A)
- Application 55. Why do you think that this distinction was made? (S.A)
- Comprehension 56. So you think the British people, had they known about some of these things (George’s transgressions), may have been just as upset as the colonists? (S.A)
- Analysis 57. How does he (Jefferson) make it clear that it was just George and not the British people that they had a problem with? (S.E)
Now that the motivation for action (causes) have been reviewed and the effects have been explicated, I am asking the student to separate individual actions from sociocentric behavior (i.e. carte blanche hatred of unlike groups).
- Comprehension 58. Cite examples from the Declaration that shows it’s a fair minded reasoned approach: (S.E)
- Application 59. So what was very “fair-minded” about this document? (S.E)
- Comprehension 60. Why was that “fair-minded”? (S.E)
- Comprehension 61. Who was it fair to? (S.E)
This line of questioning was designed to elucidate the principles, moral and ethical, of the democratic civilization conceptualized by Jefferson (based on equality and merit).
- Comprehension 62. They (the British troops) were not interested in our

well-being; is that what you are saying? (S.E)

Again the student gives an at length list of transgressions without grounding his thoughts (and case) in the principle (law) not followed. I was trying to cajole a closing argument (synopsis) from him.

Application

63. How do you consider that to be fair? (S.B)

Comparison and contrast of the literal dead ends with the points we've already discussed in class. Creating anew the abstract examples does not come easily for this student.

Frame: Reading of the preamble... "causes of separation..."

Comprehension

64. Is that fair-minded? (S.B)

Summary of Lesson One:

The purpose of this lesson, in the larger scheme of this project, was to create a set of dialectical notes that could be referred to as student roadmarkers of progress. As such, it contains many more annotations documenting students' current cognitive abilities than do the subsequent sections that seek to mark specific student critical thinking abilities that are burgeoning into a new abstract skill mastered. My technique here, as stated in my daily reflections summary, was to begin each individual line of student questioning with a sufficiently difficult open ended query and provide a contextual frame only as the student showed clear signs of difficulty breaking the task into meaningful answers that demonstrated part to whole relationships (which at times also meant heading off a generality heading away from empirical thought). What I learned here was twofold: 1) Students have been groomed by society (including educational settings) to generate gross generalities- these new critical thinking skills will not come easy since students also recoil at, 2) new vocabulary; this reticence to tackle new vocabulary, I feel is an outcropping of, a) feeling disenfranchised in the public school system and- b) a fundamental lack of skills necessary to effectively assimilate new words within their respective contexts.

A long held suspicion of teaching quality, methods, and accountability at the middle school level is starting to congeal; has whole language and "quiet" reading time subverted secondary education? Is the elementary school setting the last time most of these students were asked to

sound out words and come up with, at least, tentative conclusions on their own? I'm already wondering, early on, how much of the gap I can bridge when students lack essential reading and vocabulary skills.

Since reading comprehension facilitates vocabulary assimilation and vocabulary assimilation leads to new schematic categories in which to place new knowledge (according to Vygotsky, Dewey, Benjamin, et al...), I'm wondering how critical thinking can be fostered in this environment. What I want to know is how far can these students be weaned from their comfort zone (easy language and simplistic over- generalizations) into Dewey's "Zone of Proximal Development"?

Taxonomic Level Intended	Questions Transcribed	Student Addressed
-----------------------------	-----------------------	-------------------

Lesson Two:
Franklin's Autobiography (in class reading)

Knowledge	1. Where did we leave off, somewhere around page 133? (All students)	
-----------	---	--

Frame: Discussing "temperance as a virtue".

Comprehension	2. What does he (Franklin) say about temperance? (S.E)	
---------------	--	--

Frame: "No excess of anything in life."

Application	3. The very first thing you need to do to be effective, is have a clear what? (S.E)	
-------------	--	--

Frame: "The virtues must be done in progression as they appear."

Knowledge	4. What's his plan for the year? (on page 113)	
-----------	--	--

- Comprehension 5. What's his plan and how is it going to go?
- Knowledge 6. What does he say? (S.B)
- Frame: Referring to Franklin's own usage of his virtues chart.
- Application 7. We see he had no dots under "T" in the chart on page 113, what will that tell him? (S.C)
- Knowledge 8. He (Franklin) goes on to the next thing, which we can see he had a little more of a problem with; which was _____? (S.C)
- Frame: "Now he's mastered temperance and he's moving on to silence."
- Knowledge 9. What is the vocabulary word we have there? (S.D)
- Frame: "Every 13 weeks Franklin creates a new chart to eliminate faulty virtues by identifying them."
- Comprehension 10. Does that sound like a reasonable plan of attack? (S.D)
- Frame: Discussing with (S.E): Franklin as a printer.
- Comprehension 11. ...or better yet, what might he have done since he had access to it? (S.E)
- Frame: "The precept of order"
- Knowledge 12. O.K. who had order? (S.E)
- Application 13. What do some people carry around with them, especially business men? (S.D)

After providing a modern day analogous situation, students were able to recognize the evolution of the planner.

Application	14. Do you think there were many daily planners around during this time period? (All students)
Application	15. How does he break this down? (S.E)
Comprehension	16. What does he cover? (S.D)
	Frame: "He gets up at 5am."
Knowledge	17. The first thing he does when he wakes up, is asks himself what? (S.A)
	Frame: "Yes, what good shall I do today."
Knowledge	18. What's our (daily) quote today?
	Frame: "Yesterday we discussed science, religion, and morality."
Application	19. How would we define "great" in this instance? (S.D)
Comprehension	20. O.K. in general terminology how would we define great? (S.A)
Comprehension	21. Who is somebody that you think is great? (S.A)
Comprehension	22. What else could we add to this description? (S.D)
	Frame: Virtues of greatness (public figures) discussed.
Analysis	23. Do you think Franklin had that as a politician and businessman? (S.E)

After reaching consensus on a universal value structure based on merit, I am asking the student to reconcile actions (and results) with stated objectives (from Franklin's Autobiography) as they relate to "greatness".

- Comprehension 24. Anything else we could add to the definition of greatness? (S.B)
The student is here beginning to synthesize the abstract examples of concepts internalized.

Frame: A synopsis of the complete of traits is now given.

- Knowledge 25. ...and what was the one you just said? (S.B)
Positively reinforcing previous abstractions (answers given), upon later review of the videotaping, yields a greater level of enfranchisement in the student (i.e. posture & attentiveness improved).

- Comprehension 26. Are all of these things (just discussed) covered by Franklin's list of virtues? (All students)

Frame: "If someone could make it to greatness, Franklin probably did, but he says you have to be good first."

- Comprehension 27. So what does "good" mean? (S.E)

- Comprehension 28. Decent, wholesome, what else describes a "good" person? (S.C)

- Comprehension 29. Honest right? What else? (S.B)
Though still sticking close to the text, the student is beginning to deductively infer new extended implications.

- Comprehension 30. (S.A) ?

Frame: “The first thing he (Franklin) does, when he gets up each day, is say ‘What good will I do on this day?’”

Knowledge 31. Well what good does he plan to do on this particular day? (S.C)

Frame: “He doesn’t really define work, but he says he’s going to work from 7:30 to 11am.”

Knowledge 32. Now what was his business? (All students)

Knowledge 33. Then sometime around noon, what would he do? (S.A)

Comprehension 34. Do you think that people who get up at five o’clock in the morning and work until at least five o’clock in the evening have a great chance of being successful? (S.D)

Comprehension 35. What’s one of the sayings (from “Poor Richard’s Almanac) that Franklin had; “early to bed, early to rise ..._____? (S.C)

Comprehension 36. So then around six o’clock in the evening, what does he ask himself? (S.E)

Comprehension 37. So what does he do before he goes to sleep? (S.B)

Frame: “Yesterday, we defined Franklin as a renaissance man.”

Comprehension 38. What did we define as traits of a renaissance man? (S.D)

- Comprehension 39. A renaissance man is somebody who ____? (S.E)
- Frame: At this point, a recap of Franklin's accomplishments is postulated and then the discussion is refocused on "order."
- Application 40. O.K. so what's he talking about? (S.E)
- Frame: "Referring to his daily chart"
- Comprehension 41. When he is saying, "scraping out the marks" what does he mean there? (S.D)
- Frame: Again, referring to the durability of Franklin's reusable chart.
- Application 42. When do you think the dry erase board was invented? (S.D)
- Frame: "Yeah, it's hard to say..."
- Comprehension 43. ...but do you think it was around in Franklin's time? (S.D)
- Application 44. Paraphrase that for me; what is he saying (here)? (S.D)
- Comprehension 45. O.K. well what are the things that he wants to change about himself? (S.E)
- Frame: "When he's talking about self-examination and becoming a journeyman printer..."
- Comprehension 46. What kind of a system is he talking about? (S.A)

- Application 47. Does anybody know about the apprentice system at all, or how it works? (S.D)
- Frame: The apprentice system (of the trades) is explained.
- Comprehension 48. In this day and age, if you're a journeyman, you carry what kind of a card? (S.E)
- Application 49. What kind of a group do they (trades men) belong to? (S.C)
- Frame: "He (Franklin) says that most people learn by Somebody watching and critiquing them."
- Comprehension 50. That makes sense, right? (S.C)
- Application 51. In order for him (Franklin) to improve any more than he already has, he has to critique what? (S.D)
- Frame: "He gives us a word (footnoted) here, vex."
- Knowledge 52. To vex something is to ____? (All students)
- Frame: Franklin on metacognition
- Comprehension 53. Do you get this analogy here? (S.E)
- Frame: Discussing tradeoffs/mediocrity
- Comprehension 54. What are we doing, according to your example? (S.B)
- Comprehension 55. What are we really saying? (S.B)
- Comprehension 56. ...and we're also settling for ____? (S.C)

Frame: “It’s human nature, but...”

Application 57. Why do we do that? (S.E)

Application 58. How much effort does it really take to reach perfection at some level? (S.E)

Frame: In comparison to Franklin’s “speckled ax” being imperfect.

Application 59. Do we do that? (S.C)

Frame: Discussing the vocabulary word “fop”.

Knowledge 60. Have you ever seen a Shakespeare play where he has some kind of a fool? (S.D)

Frame: Franklin is discussing public relations.

Knowledge 61. Does anybody know the name of the book written by Machievelli, in the 1500’s? (S.E)

Comprehension 62. Ever hear of, know anything about,... what was Machievelli like? (S.A)

Frame: “The thing that Machievelli said that always kept Franklin’s interest was;”

Application 63. If you appeared to be too perfect, what would people say about you? (S.B)

Comprehension 64. Anybody who appears to be too perfect, is not ____? (S.B)

Feelings and thoughts are not about the text are still not leading to personal interpretations of the text (but is coming

out in the general class discussions).

Comprehension	65. Franklin realizes, if he gets to the point of moral perfection, how will people perceive him? (All students)
Comprehension	66. Are other people morally perfect? (S.C)
Application	67. What do we think about people who don't appear to have any faults? (S.D)
Analysis	68. So what kind of a conclusion is he (Franklin) coming to here? (S.A)
Application	69. Even if he could (achieve perfection), would he act like he's perfect around other people? (S.A)
	Frame: "Franklin sees perfection as a never-ending process."
Comprehension	70. Do you think that's true? (S.D)
	Frame: "We all know that we can't reach it, but..."
Application	71. Do you think you would feel better about your life, if you would at least try to (reach perfection)? (S.B)
Comprehension	72. Do you ever wake up in the morning and say, today I'm going to improve on this thing? (S.C)
Comprehension	73. Do we do that? (S.D& S.B)
Comprehension	74. We don't talk about it, but we think about it don't we, from time to time? (S.A)

Frame: Quotes from Poor Richard's Almanac

Comprehension 75. Who did we say was his primary audience? (S.A)

Application 76. The only other book that was more widely read,
in America in the 1780's, was the ____? (S.C)

Frame: "He that cannot obey cannot command"
(Franklin).

Application 77. What does that mean? (S.A)

Comprehension 78. Are we going to follow the rules that somebody else
makes up if they themselves don't follow the rules?
(S.B)

Frame: "He that lies down with dogs, shall rise up with
Fleas" (Franklin)

Application 79. What does that mean? (S.D)

Application 80. So what's he talking about when he says "a dog"?
(S.B)

Frame: "Love your neighbors, but don't pull down their
Hedge" (Franklin).

*(S.C) answers without prompting

Frame: "A mob's a monster, heads enough but no
brains" (Franklin).

Comprehension 81. Would he (Franklin) have seen "mob" type mentality
in his day? (All students)

- Knowledge 82. During what time period have we just been talking about? (S.D)
- Comprehension 83. What happened in Boston that was so famous? (S.A)
- Frame: "There were hundreds of men that boarded those ships."
- Comprehension 84. Do you think all of them understood exactly why they were doing that? (S.C)
- Frame: "Lost time is never found again" (Franklin).
- Application 85. How would you interpret that? (S.A)
- Comprehension 86. Anything that you wished that you would have done, in the past, that you didn't get a chance to do? (S.D)
- Application 87. It tells us that we need to take advantage of ____? (S.D)
- Frame: "Early to bed, early to rise..."(Franklin).
- Analysis 88. Do you think anybody can get rich by only working a few hours a day? (All students)
- Comprehension 89. ...but in order to get to the point that you were making \$800 an hour, what kind of training would you have to have?
- Frame: "Be slow in choosing a friend, slower in changing" (Franklin).
- Application 90. What does that mean? (S.B)

Summary of Lesson Two:

Having a firmly entrenched baseline of student ability, based on in-class and videotaped observations, I am now starting to work the fringes of student ability while nurturing student confidence by strategically pinpointing a student's ability to articulate a salient answer while concomitantly gauging a student's emotional reticence to delve into heretofore uncharted abstract cognitive realms of thought.

What I'm learning, en media res, is that Skinnerian axioms regarding positive and negative reinforcement are needed at critical junctures to either ferret out negative student willingness (which I chide) or bolster students' willingness to attempt the new and unfamiliar (which I praise).

The real test of my questioning and framing skills becomes the accuracy of my instantaneous prognosis of student ability as orchestrated and directed towards a student's own metacognitive epiphany of innate ability (I want to push them, but the climax of their ability, I want to come during the last week being videotaped).

Taxonomic Level Intended	Questions Transcribed	Student Addressed
-----------------------------	-----------------------	-------------------

Lesson Three: Dr. Heidegger's Experiment (Character Analysis)

Frame: Discussion of Heidegger's (Fountain of Youth)
water

Comprehension	1. So how long did this potion last? (S.A)
---------------	--

Frame: "Earlier on, the narrator describes what happened
to the rose."

Comprehension	2. What happened to the rose? (S.A)
---------------	-------------------------------------

Frame: Student reading Heidegger's epilogue.

Application	3. So what does Heidegger learn there, in the end? (S.C)
-------------	--

Working inversely, I'm here hoping to link the moral platitude to the axiological rubric for virtuous behavior- which in turn- can be contrasted with actual character behaviors and actions.

Application	4. You had (were assigned Heidegger's character) Heidegger, what did he learn? (S.E)
Comprehension	5. Did they (the other characters) learn anything from this (experiment)? (S.B)
	Frame: "Using the chart (in the book) on page 193, let's see if we can describe accurately the characters' traits."
Knowledge	6. Who had Mr. Medbourne? (S.D)
Comprehension	7. We said that he had lost what? (S.D)
Comprehension	8. When he was given a second chance, what does he do with it? (S.D)
Knowledge	9. What does he do 'specifically'? (S.D)
Comprehension	10. What do we learn about his greed? (S.D)
Comprehension	11. What are the decisions that he makes in the story? (S.D)
Comprehension	12. O.K., he lusts for 'things' doesn't he? (S.D)
Comprehension	13. What are the things that he tries to do, just in the short time that he's at Heidegger's? (S.D)
Comprehension	14. What was his (Heidegger's) idea to do to help these

characters? (S.E)

Frame: "...ice to the East Indies..."

Comprehension 15. How was he going to make money at it? (S.D)

Application 16. So what are we going to discuss about him (Mr. Medbourne) when we're writing an essay? (S.D)

Synthesis 17. What are we going to use as a thesis statement? (S.D)

Application 18. What's our synopsis? (S.D)

Application 19. What's our overview of this character? (S.D)
Certain obvious benefits arise from following an idea from inception to fruition; the student was forced to carefully craft his character analysis via interpretation of particular actions that illustrated identifiable traits.

Comprehension 20. When Mr. Medbourne was given an opportunity to change his old life ____? (S.D)

Frame: Referring to Medbourne lusting after widow Wycherly.

Application 21. How did he know that it was a mistake to chase after her? (S.A)

Comprehension 22. Was she true (monogamous) to one person? (S.A)

Frame: "Let's see if we can learn more about Colonel Killegrew."

Knowledge 23. Who had Killegrew? (S.C)

- Application 24. What is Killegrew's story? (S.C)
- Comprehension 25. What's his background? (S.C)
- Frame: 'gout' as a euphemism for venereal disease
- Comprehension 26. So, does he change? (S.C)
- Comprehension 27. Right, isn't that his character? (S.C)
- Frame: "He wants to dance with her (widow Wycherly)"
- Comprehension 28. What else does he do as the story progresses? (S.C)
- Analysis 29. How are we going to break this (information listed on the chalkboard) down into three body paragraphs? (S.C)
- Application 30. How can we break this down to show that he doesn't change? (S.C)
- Analysis 31. What are three things that Killegrew does, during the story, that he tells us that he hasn't changed? (S.C)
- Frame: "Let's talk about Mr. Gasciogne."
- Knowledge 32. Was that one yours? (S.B)
- Application 33. What characterized Gasciogne? (S.B)
- Comprehension 34. What is the primary characteristic of Gasciogne? (S.B)
- Comprehension 35. What do politicians do? (S.B)

- Comprehension 36. They manipulate right? (All students)
- Frame: "They do things to gain power."
- Comprehension 37. Does he lie and cheat? (S.B)
- Comprehension 38. When he's in Heidegger's study with the others, what does he do? (S.B)
- Knowledge 39. What does he do there? (S.B)
- Comprehension 40. What do we know about Gasciogne specifically? (S.B)
- Frame: "The phrases that he uses are manipulative."
- Application 41. Why does he phrase things the way he does? (S.B)
- Frame: A synopsis of Gasciogne's characteristics is given.
- Knowledge 42. What other characters do we have? (All students)
- Knowledge 43. Who? (S.A)
- Knowledge 44. Was that you? (S.A)
- Application 45. What are we going to say about the widow Wycherly? (S.A)
- Frame: "The men lusting after her..."
- Evaluation 46. What was she trying to get them to do? (S.A)
- Comprehension 47. She wanted them to fight didn't she? (S.A)

Frame: “Elaboration on her powers of seduction over men.”

Synthesis 48. So what kind of a thesis statement are we going to create describing the widow Wycherly? (S.A)

Analysis 49. What is it about her character that says that one man is not enough for her? (S.A)

Frame: “Now, the one and only character in the story that has an epiphany.”

Knowledge 50. What is an epiphany? (S.E)

Application 51. What did Heidegger want to come out of this experiment? (S.E)

Evaluation 52. Did Heidegger have the right idea in mind when he got these people together? (S.E)

Comprehension 53. What did he think was going to come out of it (the experiment)? (S.E)

Comprehension 54. He thought that they would change right? (S.E)

Frame: The rose (dying in the experiment) as a symbol of Heidegger’s lost love.

Application 55. How did she (Heidegger’s wife) die? (S.E)

Frame: Wrap up of Heidegger’s key traits is listed on the board

Comprehension 56. Tell me one more time what your thesis will be: (S.E)

Synthesis 57. So what are your three body paragraphs going to be?
(S.E)

Frame: After student gives key traits, two ideas are added

Comprehension 58. Does that make sense? (S.E)

Comprehension 59. Does that sound like a good essay? (S.E)

Frame: Discussion of text questions on page 207

Analysis 60. What was your mood as the story ended and why?
(S.D)

Evaluation 61. Do you feel sorry for these people (characters) at the
end? (S.D)

Comprehension 62. ...but, you do feel sorry for the doctor right? (S.C)

Comprehension 63. So, you feel sorry for them because, in the end, they
learned absolutely nothing? (S.A)

Analysis 64. Why do you think Dr. Heidegger chooses these four
subjects for his experiment? (S.E)

*Though still unsure of the correct terminology to use in
creating his categories for analysis, the student is becoming
more adept in sensibly labeling, based on authorial intent, the
motivations behind character behaviors; intellectual courage
is becoming internalized.*

Frame: Description of character motives, when they were
in their prime is given

Comprehension 65. How were they going after what they wanted? (S.C)

Application	66. What qualities do these characters represent? (S.D)
Application	67. All these characters are ____? (S.B)
Analysis	68. Which thoughts and actions reveal that the guests have not learned from the mistakes of their youth? (S.E)
Application	69. Do we get any clues, before the last paragraph, about looking for the “fountain of youth”? (S.A)
Analysis	70. How do the attitudes from the pre-reading (textbook) discussion compare with the attitudes in the story? (S.D)
	Frame: “In our society (today)...”
Application	71. How do we feel about old age? (S.A)
	Frame: “The moral majority tends to respect old age.”
Comprehension	72. They paid their dues, didn’t they? (S.A)
	Frame: “People in society (the elderly) are concerned about losing physical beauty.”
Application	73. What do they end up losing? (S.C)
Comprehension	74. What are the things we have today designed to hide aging? (All students)
	Frame: The health and beauty industry
Comprehension	75. It’s all attached to what idea? (S.B)

Comprehension 76. People want to ____? (S.B)

Synthesis 77. What do you imagine is going to happen to these people (characters)? (S.A)

Frame: “They may die trying to find the fountain of youth.”

Comprehension 78. What do you think, is that the case? (S.B)

Summary of Lesson Three:

In this lesson, my Socratic methodology was the vehicle through which I questioned student beliefs while challenging superficial interpretations- as well as reinforcing moral sensibilities.

I learned that strongly held beliefs connected to strongly held convictions- that can't easily be articulated or connected to textual facts, can be a recipe rife with dissent, but worth the risk of student anger if it generates a paradigm shift on the students' part. I'm now taking students down an academic road they don't want to traverse simply because they're emotionally, albeit negatively, connected to the issues. Images of Socrates questioning Glaucon in “The Republic” are also beginning to conjure up images of the pitfalls of this mode of operation.

Taxonomic
Level Intended

Questions Transcribed

Student Addressed

Lesson Four: Poe's Biography

Frame: Journal topic: “Great minds have purposes, others just have wishes” (Washington Irving).

Analysis 1. What do you think, is that true? (S.E)

A little reticent still, in creating his own organizational schemata as an advanced organizer for all to use, nonetheless, the strength of having a concrete, ever-evolving, dynamic,

audio-visual record (videotape) is becoming apparent. Judging material based on his own paradigmatic interpretation that takes empirical logic into account as a goal for this student.

Comprehension 2. Elaborate: (S.B)

Frame: "You have a pretty good idea of what you want to do with your life."

Comprehension 3. What do you want to do? (S.B)

Frame: "So you have a purpose and on a daily basis know what to do."

Comprehension 4. You have some plans right? (S.D)

Comprehension 5. Do you have a purpose? (S.E)

Comprehension 6. Which is ____? (S.E)

Frame: During the checking of student daily journal entries

Comprehension 7. Where is your elaboration on these (journal entries)? (S.E)

Frame: Beginning the biographical introduction to Poe

Comprehension 8. What was his background? (S.D)

Application 9. What was he like? (S.D)

Frame: Discussing Poe's parents

Knowledge 10. The mother's name was? (S.D)

- Comprehension 11. What were his parents, we talked about this yesterday? (S.D)
- Knowledge 12. What else do we know? (S.D)
- Application 13. What kind of (life) influences did he have? (S.E)
*Student has already read several of Poe's works.
 So, rather than looking at character motives as evinced through behaviors described in the text, I am asking the student to begin to attribute the actual themes developed by the author to his own life situations (Constructivist ideology and Socratic methodology allow me to move at a different cognitive level of attainment with this student- though still achieving concept consensus with all pupils).*
- Knowledge 14. How old was he when he went to live with his aunt and uncle? (S.D)
- Frame: "So he grew up around the stage."
- Application 15. What do you think that explains? (S.B)
- Frame: Referring to yesterday's quote (Washington Irving)
- Knowledge 16. What was the quote that we had yesterday? (All students)
- Frame: "Poe traveled a lot as a child, with his parents."
- Comprehension 17. Your formative years are when? (S.D)
- Comprehension 18. When are you most susceptible to new ideas? (S.E)
- Knowledge 19. What else can you tell us? (S.D)

Application	20. What do you think he read a lot of? (S.D)
Application	21. Who would be some of the people (authors) that Poe would have read? (S.D)
Knowledge	22. In fact, what's the date of Poe's death? (S.D)
Knowledge	23. What's the date of Hawthorne's death? (S.B)
Comprehension	24. So who do you think that he tried to emulate as a writer? (S.E)
Application	25. Do you want to pick up there? (S.D)
Application	26. What kind of people do you think his aunt and uncle were?
Application	27. What were they like? (S.B)
	Frame: "Poe's uncle expected a lot from him (rules to be followed), but his aunt doted incessantly on him."
Comprehension	28. So what happened when Poe went to the University of Virginia? (S.B)
	Frame: "Thrown out because of his gambling debts that his uncle wouldn't pay..."
Knowledge	29. What did he do then? (S.D)
Knowledge	30. He did what next? (S.D)
Application	31. What kind of qualifications do you have to have in order to get into West Point? (S.A)

- Comprehension 32. Such as ____? (S.C)
- Application 33. Again, what kind of qualifications do you need to get into West Point? (S.E)
Heretofore left as an abstract (imagining oneself in another time period), I am now tacitly asking students to compare their own modern world knowledge to situational equivalencies from the past – in an effort glean emotional insight into lifestyle choices that affected Poe. Both student readiness and a more contemporary social situation permit this change in methodological tactic.
- Comprehension 34. Who do you think he got the recommendation from? (S.D)
- Application 35. Who do you think gave him the other recommendations? (S.E)
Here, the student is working from his own schemata of personal experience wherein he himself needed recommendations for a scholarship nomination.
- Frame: “After West Point, Poe settled down a little.”
- Knowledge 36. Who did he marry? (S.A)
- Frame: “His 14 year old cousin – first cousin.”
- Comprehension 37. Do you think it was common even in the 1800’s? (S.A)
- Frame: “For the first time, Poe accepted some responsibility.”
- Knowledge 38. What kind of work did he find? (S.A)
- Application 39. As a magazine editor, what were the benefits? (S.A)

Frame: “So Poe now had an income, and was starting to get published.”

Application 40. Why do you think Poe didn’t stay at his editing jobs for long? (S.C)

Insight into her own perspective of Poe’s character reveals a host of opinionated judgments that cast Poe into the same negative light as some of her subordinates at the video store. Separating limited knowledge/experience from fact, while still keeping the emotional connection is my challenge here.

Analysis 41. What factors contributed to Poe’s inability to stay at a job? (S.B)

Frame: “So Virginia’s sickness and Poe’s drinking and drug addiction...”

Application 42. What were some successes, however, that came out of Poe’s work as a magazine editor? (S.D)

Frame: “At least other authors came to know Poe’s work/name.”

Application 43. How, in what context, did most of his contemporaries know of Poe? (S.E)

Comprehension 44. So, during Poe’s life, what was he best known for? (S.D)

Application 45. After his death, what contributions to Romantic Literature was he revered for? (S.C)
After holding such strong negative conceptualizations of Poe’s character, I am asking the student to now step back into a more sensible/logical viewpoint in order to appropriately label clear categories of achievement (along with the failures).

- Comprehension 46. According to Poe, how long should it take to read a short story? (S.E)
- Comprehension 47. Poe is often called the father of the modern ____ ____ story? (S.B)
- Application 48. What genres did Poe work in? (S.D)
- Frame: “So poetry, short stories were fiction and literary criticism was non-fiction.”
- Comprehension 49. What was the only genre Poe didn’t tackle? (S.D)
- Application 50. Where did Poe get his story ideas from? (S.B)
After discussing Poe’s life as a source of thematic motivation(affects manifested in literature)- she is able, through empathy, to vaguely show their manifestations in his work.
- Application 51. How did Virginia’s death effect Poe? (S.A)
- Frame: “So Poe’s poetry was written with Virginia as the intended audience.”
- Application 52. What common theme do Poe’s poems all have? (S.C)
A less value laden category is now inductively created to get the student to think stoically rather than emotionally, in order to bring about a meaningful discrimination between the author’s life and his contribution to literature.
- Analysis 53. How does this theme relate to the Romantic body of literature? (S.D)
Though a few generalized descriptions come, relating to “man vs. nature”, the student vaguely encircles the theme.

Analysis	54. How does Poe’s work relate and fit in with previous Romantic authors covered, such as Irving and Hawthorne? (S.C) <i>Now judgments based on externally agreed upon criterion are meaningful and rational in nexus (though the emotional connection- albeit negative- remains neutral).</i>
Analysis	55. What difference do you expect to see between Hawthorne and Poe, given their family and educational backgrounds? (S.B) <i>Now confident in her thought processes, she connects the socio-economic educational paradigm to level of attainment reached by the respective authors.</i>
Knowledge	56. Other than “A Cask of Amontillado” and “The Raven,” which are in our text, what other works of Poe have you read or heard of? (All students)
Application	57. Why do you think Poe is still well known and appreciated, especially by high school students today? (S.E)
Knowledge	58. Has anyone already read “A Cask of Amontillado”? (All students)

Summary of Lesson Four:

The analytical skill tantamount to empirical operational efficiency is here shown to be of cause and effect origin. Likewise, if the student ethos is connected to the cause- then the pupil pathos must be connected to the effect. Moving from the emotional connections of cause to the cognitive connections of effect always requires a great deal of student trust in the facilitator (framer) while never losing the tangible connection to this endeavor (as mental gymnastics that prepare students to explicate the complex issues they will be faced with later in life). What I’m hoping is

that, even though students are yet to recognize the rubric associated with questioning critically (i.e. the taxonomic progression), they will nonetheless employ it.

Taxonomic Level Intended	Questions Transcribed	Student Addressed
-----------------------------	-----------------------	-------------------

Lesson Five: *Essay development based on “A Cask of Amontillado”*

Frame: “It is more dangerous that even a guilty person should be punished without the forms of law than that he should escape” (Thomas Jefferson).

Application	1. How does this quote relate to, “A Cask of Amontillado”? (S.C)
Comprehension	2. You didn’t understand “A Cask of Amontillado” or, you didn’t understand the quote? (S.C)
Application	3. So what is the quote saying (stating)? (S.D)
Comprehension	4. Who takes the law into his own hands in “A Cask of Amontillado”? (S.B)
Application	5. So once again, what is Jefferson saying here? (S.B)
Comprehension	6. This is called what kind of justice? (S.D)
	Frame: “In this essay, we are going to focus on all the elements of the story as they work together.”
Application	7. What is one of the literary elements that we can identify in this story? (S.E)

Frame: Student says “time frame”

Analysis	8. O.K. so that is part of what? (S.E)
Comprehension	9. Plot, characterization, or setting? (S.E)
	Frame: Setting as first body paragraph of the essay.
Comprehension	10. What evidence, from the text, can we give that supports setting as helping to create the (end result) mood? (S.B)
Application	11. What are we going to say about setting? (S.E)
Knowledge	12. Where do we find that (passage) in the text? (S.E)
Comprehension	13. What do we know about the catacombs? (S.E)
Application	14. Dead bodies are housed in the catacombs and what else? (S.D)
Knowledge	15. Where do we find that information? (S.D)
Comprehension	16. What did these catacombs look like? (S.D)
Comprehension	17. ‘Really’ describe what these catacombs look like: (S.C) <i>Since she obviously didn’t read the text carefully, I am layering facts into the in-class explication in order to reach the revenge theme (which in turn can be related to vigilante justice- Jefferson’s fear).</i>
Knowledge	18. ...damp ground, what else does it say? (S.A)
Comprehension	19. Anything else about smell? (S.A)
Knowledge	20. What page do we find that information on? (S.E)

Frame: “We know there are dead bodies (in the catacombs).”

- Application 21. What stage of decomposition are they in? (S.B)
- Application 22. Where would the most recent dead bodies be found? (S.E)
- Comprehension 23. Where does Montessor take Fortunato? (S.D)
- Application 24. I’m walking through these catacombs, ‘at first’, what kind of things do I see? (S.B)

Frame: “First I’m going to see some skeletons...”

- Comprehension 25. Do you think they’re going to be recently deceased? (S.B)
- Comprehension 26. Would that bother you to some extent? (S.B)
- Comprehension 27. Would that make you uneasy? (S.B)

Frame: “We’re traveling onward (into the catacombs), the further we go...”

- Application 28. The more it’s going to be ____ what? (S.B)
- Comprehension 29. Didn’t he (Poe’s narrator) mention the mold in the air? (S.B)
- Application 30. What kind of effect did the nitre (on the walls) give; look at the illustration? (S.D)

Frame: “So then we’re talking about the look of it (the Catacomb).

Comprehension 31. Did you ever go through a haunted house ride and see lights come up out of nowhere? (S.B)

Frame: Referring to the notes listed on the board.

Comprehension 32. Based on what we have here, could you write a decent paragraph describing the setting? (S.C)
Now that concrete textual comprehension is in place, the initial comparison/contrasting of the anagram (Jefferson) can be disseminated and overlaid upon the Poe conceptualization.

Frame: “Furthermore we need to include specifics...”

Comprehension 33. Where does Montessor live? (S.B)

Application 34. What kind of home is it? (S.B)

Comprehension 35. How are we going to describe that? (S.B)

Comprehension 36. Remember the family motto; what was it? (S.E)
Capable of deductively explicating behaviors in patterns that predict events, after watching this student firmly grasp abstract critical thinking skills, I now am asking the student to sense the intimate connection between reason and emotion (both propel Montessor’s actions). I decide to wait, however, for other students to develop more concrete evidence in coming to this Gestalt before actively dichotomizing this incongruency.

Frame: “I know you don’t remember Latin, but...”

Comprehension 37. What was the translation? (S.A)

Frame: “So we now have setting.”

Evaluation 38. Is this complete? (S.C)

- Comprehension 39. Do we want to add anything else to this? (S.C)
The concept attainment of theme comes here.
- Comprehension 40. Any questions about setting? (All students)
- Application 41. Why was I talking about this walk, this voyage,
down the catacombs? (S.D)
- Frame: “I mentioned three different elements that
contribute to mood....”
- Knowledge 42. Besides setting, what else did we discuss? (S.E)
- Frame: (When talking about characters) “Let’s start with
the antagonist.”
- Comprehension 43. Who is the antagonist in this story? (S.A)
- Comprehension 44. Do you think so? (S.E)
- Frame: “Usually, the protagonist is the good guy, but...”
- Comprehension 45. Are we saying that “Fortunato” is the bad guy?
(S.B)
- Application 46. I’m confused, can you help me out with this one?
(S.B)
- Application 47. Is Montessor the good guy? (S.B)
- Frame: “I don’t know”
- Application 48. Is this written from the antagonist or protagonist’s
point of view? (S.B)

Frame: “We have our antagonist.”

Comprehension	49. Which is _____? (S.A)
Comprehension	50. What do we know about Montessoro? (S.C)
Comprehension	51. What do we learn about him (Montessoro), in the beginning? (S.E)
Comprehension	52. What other items does Montessoro talk about in the beginning? (S.C)

Frame: Renaissance Italy’s import/export tradesmen (merchants) discussed.

Comprehension	53. What, besides wine, does Montessoro mention, that he sells? (S.C)
Comprehension	54. When he (Montessoro) is describing “Fortunato”, what does he say Fortunato is an expert at? (S.D)
Comprehension	55. What does Montessoro say Fortunato is a “quack” at? (S.E)
Comprehension	56. A “quack” at _____? (S.E)

Frame: Discussing gemstones

Comprehension	57. Generally we would translate that as _____? (S.D)
Application	58. Montessoro would own the equivalent of what kind of store today? (S.B)
Application	59. What kind of store would sell these types of items? (S.C)

Frame: The list of items Montessoro sells is written on the board.

Application 60. If we take the cheese out (of the list), what kind of store can we envision? (S.E)

Frame: An exhaustive list of details known about Montessoro is created

Evaluation 61. What kind of a character is Montessoro? (S.A)

Application 62. How do we know that? (S.A)

Comprehension 63. Why was he “unhappy”? (S.B)

Frame: “He (Montessoro) is set on revenge.”

Comprehension 64. How do we know that? (S.C)
Now that the revenge motive has been disclosed, the concept of equitable justice can be Socratically discussed.

Application 65. What specifically, is he holding against Fortunato? (S.A)

Frame: “He says, this is the one thing that Fortunato did that went too far...”

Application 66. What’s the revenge for, that’s the question I want answered? (S.A)

Comprehension 67. What did Fortunato do to him (Montessoro)? (S.C)
Implicitly, at least I’m asking for commentary on justification.

Frame: “We don’t know what kind of insult, but...”

- Application 68. What does he pride himself on being an expert at?
(S.A)
- Comprehension 69. What else can we say about Montressor? (S.D)
- Comprehension 70. When he (Montressor) sees him (Fortunato), does he
(immediately) try to kill him? (S.D)
- Comprehension 71. What else could we say? (S.A)
- Application 72. What other trait could we ascribe to Montressor?
(S.A)
- Frame: Discussing Montressor's intelligence and
patience.
- Application 73. Why do we say that? (S.A)
- Comprehension 74. So could we say, he's in control? (S.A)
- Frame: "This would be a good place for a quote in your
essays."
- Application 75. What's the quote we could insert here? (S.C)
- Comprehension 76. What did he say about the best kind of revenge?
(S.C)
- Knowledge 77. What page is that on? (S.E)
- Application 78. How are we going to put that (explain) in our own
words? (S.D)
- Comprehension 79. What kind of revenge did he say was the sweetest?
(S.C)

Frame: “Unexpected, well-planned, revenge”

Application	80. What else can we say about Montressor? (S.B)
Application	81. How do we know that he has a sense of humor?
(S.B)
Comprehension	82. What does he say to show us that he has a sense of
humor? (S.B)
Knowledge	83. O.K. where do we see that? (S.C)
Knowledge	84. What page is that on? (S.C)
Comprehension	85. It’s toward the end right? (S.C)
Comprehension	86. What does he (Montressor) do while he’s walling
him in? (S.A)
Comprehension	87. What does he do to get him (Fortunato) down there
for? (S.A)
Comprehension	88. What was the premise...? (S.A)
Application	89. Somebody who likes somebody else to suffer is
called a what? (S.E)

Frame: All of Montressor’s traits are reviewed here.

Application	90. What is the ironic thing, that we see along the way,
that foreshadows Fortunato’s demise? (S.E)
Comprehension	91. What was the guild that Fortunato belonged to?
(S.A)
Application	92. How does that relate to the Mason’s trowel? (S.A)
Comprehension	93. What does he say to Fortunato when he pulls out the

trowel? (S.A)

Comprehension 94. “To your _____ _____? (S.A)

Frame: The irony with the trowel

Knowledge 95. What page is that on? (S.E)

Frame: “If we dedicate this long paragraph to
Montressor, we certainly would want to dedicate,
at least a short paragraph to Fortunato, but before
we do that...”

Knowledge 96. Does everybody have all of these notes (on the
board) down? (All students)

Application 97. So what are we going to say about him (Fortunato)?
(S.A)

Comprehension 98. Who to, and why is Montressor telling this story
now? (S.B)

Comprehension 99. ...and how much time after the fact is it? (All
students)

Application 100. He’s telling it to ____? (S.E)

Comprehension 101. Why do we say, maybe his priest? (S.C)

Application 102. What (religious) denomination was he probably?
(S.D)

Application 103. What do Catholics tend to do, especially when they
are dying? (S.A)

Frame: “We’re saying that Fortunato is the protagonist,

but he may have been just as bad a character as Montressor, because...”

- Comprehension 104. What does Montressor say about him, in the beginning? (S.C)
- Comprehension 105. What does he say? (S.C)
- Comprehension 106. How does Montressor describe Fortunato early on? (S.E)
- Knowledge 107. What page is that on? (S.D)
- Frame: “Montressor says that, Fortunato was a man to be respected and even feared.”
- Application 108. He admired him for what quality? (S.D)
- Application 109. He disrespected him for what trait? (S.D)
- Application 110. What does the word “Fortunato” mean? (All students)
- Comprehension 111. Was he fortunate? (S.E)
- Comprehension 112. How about before Montressor got to him? (S.D)
- Analysis 113. What was the big difference between Montressor and Fortunato’s businesses? (S.A)
- Comprehension 114. What else could we say about Fortunato? (S.C)
- Analysis 115. Who is the more trusting, Fortunato or Montressor? (S.C)

Here I leave the student, after a brief monologue, focused on the might vs. right issue.

Comprehension	116. Fortunato is somewhat gullible isn't he? (S.B)
Application	117. How was Montressor able to deceive Fortunato?
(S.D)
Comprehension	118. What does he say to him to keep him going down
the catacombs? (S.A)

Lesson Five Summary:

In this lesson, I set out to prove that the students did, in fact, know a great deal about the characters' actions and motivations in this story- since all of the students found both Poe and his tales interesting and were therefore engaged. What I learned, by using this rapid-fire questioning technique, was that if students could be orchestrated into a crescendo- they themselves would inductively draw their own conclusions. Perhaps even more importantly, many of the descriptive terms that I used such as deceive, gullible, disrespect, etc... were picked up on by students and inculcated into their own descriptive repertoire. I will use this rapid paced questioning technique again to build student confidence during a later lesson.

Taxonomic Level Intended	Questions Transcribed	Student Addressed
-----------------------------	-----------------------	-------------------

Lesson Six: Transcendentalism/Emerson (reading)

Frame: "It's the way we live our lives."

Application	1. What kind of a philosophy is this that Emerson is
talking about? (S.A)
Knowledge	2. Starts with a T? (S.E)

Frame: "Emerson is talking about a personal relationship
with God based on deeds and actions, not words."

Application	3. What's he saying here? (S.D)
Comprehension	4. What did Shakespeare say, "Be true to ____"? (S.D)
Comprehension	5. We said the Romantics were primarily concerned with what? (S.E)
Application	6. What theme was Hawthorne working with in his "mad scientists"? (S.E)
	Frame: "Yes, man trying to improve on man, and ..."
Application	7. The answer to that folly is always what? (S.E)
	Frame: Emerson's definition of right
Application	8. Constitution, in this case, means? (S.B)
Application	9. According to Emerson, who is it that should be able to tell you what's right and what's wrong? (S.C)
	<i>Here, I am drawing on her internalized sense of morality, ethics and virtuosity; her self-esteem comes from the same didactically oriented pedagogy as Emerson.</i>
	Frame: "Independence of solitude..."(Emerson).
Application	10. Do we know anything about Emerson or Thoreau that relates to this idea of solitude? (S.D)
Application	11. What did Thoreau do with Emerson's idea of solitude? (S.B)
	Frame: "Solitary man not contaminated by society, but simply applied God's ideas..." (Emerson).

- Comprehension 12. What do you think about that idea, solitude? (S.A)
- Comprehension 13. Do you think you're more or less pure a person? (S.A)
Highly sensitive to issues of moral platitudes, student "A" begins to disclose her biases and prejudices that limit her own humility. Wishing to expose the limitations of her thought processes, I move on to other students more cogniscent of their own metacognitive limitations- in hopes of her achieving the epiphany without directly cross-examining her logic.
- Comprehension 14. Do you think that's true? (S.C)
 Frame: "Not being forced, but deciding to go out and live on your own for awhile."
- Application 15. Do you think you would be a better person for doing that? (S.C)
With a highly developed internalized value structure in place, this student begins to enumerate the benefits of being a "free-thinker" unencumbered by pop-culture (MTV & egocentric values).
- Comprehension 16. Do you think that's true; would it help? (S.D)
- Application 17. What kind of things would you tend to eliminate if you were in solitude? (S.E)
- Comprehension 18. So who are you held accountable to? (S.E)
Now my Thomistic philosophy manifests itself in the Socratic method in that the Christian code of ethics roots scientific (including self-reflexive) truths as being firmly entrenched in the belief that your conscience (soul) must transcend the temporal world and answer directly to God; this concept (self-accountability) is readily understood

by all students (thanks to middle school pedagogy)- though untempered by humility, civility or logic. The challenge here is to build upon an incomplete conceptual frame of knowledge.

Analysis 19. Why do monks and sometimes nuns live a life of solitude? (S.B)

Analysis 20. Why do they do that? (S.B)

Analysis 21. Why would somebody go to the heart of the Himalayas in Tibet and climb 10,000 feet up a mountain, with nothing but the clothes on their back, and then maybe not even talk to anybody for ten years? (S.C)

Frame: S.C discusses the hardships of going it alone.

She hits close to home, discussing her moral upbringing (family life/belief structure) as contrasted daily with her liberal, mostly amoral, peers dealt with daily.

Comprehension 22. Do you think that's true? (S.D)

Frame: S.A is reading.

Knowledge 23. Our footnote on "countenance" says? (S.A)

Frame: "That's pretty heavy commentary on the masses."

Application 24. What's he saying there? (S.E)

Frame: "That's part of it – what else..."

Comprehension 25. What's he saying? (S.E)

- Application 26. So he is speaking positively about the mass of people around him? (S.E)
- Frame: Just follow the rules on MTV and no one gets hurt.
- Comprehension 27. Is that right, just follow the rules on MTV? (S.E)
- Frame: In Emerson's day it was the newspaper.
- Analysis 28. What media pressures do we have that influence us today? (S.B)
- Frame: He's saying something about people that conform.
- Application 29. What's he saying there? (S.A)
- Frame: ...that people just do it.
- Application 30. Because they don't ____? (S.A)
- Comprehension 31. So then, they are not thinking for ____? (S.B)
- Frame: Emerson's views on habits.
- Application 32. What did (Ben) Franklin say about habits? (S.A)
- I now come back to this student's lack of questioning habitual modes of operation. She sees how theory applies to Franklin, but still fails to see her own mis-alignment.*
- Application 33. What is Emerson saying about habits here? (S.B)
- Frame: People have a hard time breaking bad habits.

Comprehension 34. Why? (S.C)

Frame: Emerson says others expect you to perpetuate bad habits to make them feel good.

Comprehension 35. Is that true? (S.A)

Now forced to apply her own value structure, the student begins the process of evaluating the tenets of the concept of conformity- yet is still unwilling to elaborate. Though the facial expression of this student was considered minutia during the lesson (I didn't respond to it), the videotape here greatly enhances my ability to follow a particular student, at her developmental level, and modify my instructional strategy to accommodate the diverse levels of abstract cognition present within this group.

Comprehension 36. Did you ever get involved with a group of people, where you know that they're making some bad decisions and you've grown out of it and decided, hey, I don't need this anymore? (S.D)

Comprehension 37. Have you ever been in that situation? (S.D)

Frame: They only want your friendship, if it meets their needs...

Comprehension 38. And then you're left with ____? (S.D)

Frame: "...words as hard as cannonballs"

Application 39. What's he saying? (S.D)

Frame: "To be great is to be misunderstood."

Comprehension

40. Is that true? (S.A)

Now feeling confident that she has internalized the immediate schemata, the pupil gives examples illustrating the point. Had I paid more careful attention (i.e. caught her facial expression from the previous round of questioning), I may have opted to invest greater time and energies into nurturing this student into a more intricate analysis. Clearly, in this instance, videotaping captured a subtle nuance that later could be identified as part of a larger developmental picture (though it was not uncovered while making instructional adjustments “on the fly”).

Frame: Referring back to Galileo, Copernicus, etc...

Knowledge

41. Now, you’ve heard of most of these names once I said them , right? (S.C)

Knowledge

42. Franklin said, “Imitate Jesus and ____? (S.D)

Frame: Discussion of Emerson and Franklin emulating Socrates.

Knowledge

43. How about Pythagoras? (S.B)

Knowledge

44. Has anybody had any advanced math classes? (S.B)

Knowledge

45. What is it called? (S.B)

Frame: “Yes, his theorem.”

Comprehension

46. What does that have to do with? (S.B)

Knowledge

47. Who was Luther, as in Martin Luther? (S.E)

Knowledge

48. Copernicus was the first one to say that ____? (S.D)

Comprehension 49. What did Sir Isaac Newton discover and label? (S.E)

Frame: All of these people were great thinkers that in
Their day were misunderstood. So, Emerson is
saying, if you want to be great you've got to
break away from the crowd.

Comprehension 50. Does that make sense? (S.A)

Frame: Handed student a dictionary.

Knowledge 51. Somebody tell us what the word "aphorism" is?
(S.E)

Frame: S.A is reading Emerson's aphorisms.

Analysis 52. What do these remind us of? (S.D)

Knowledge 53. Franklin's sayings that came from what publication?
(S.B)

Comprehension 54. So what's an "aphorism"? (S.E)

Frame: "Aphorisms", maxims, words to live by

Application 55. Is there anything we take issue with here (Emerson's
quotes)? (S.E)

*While aware of his own belief structure, the student only
has a vague sense of why some of Emerson's aphorisms
didn't reconcile with his own beliefs; articulatory fluency
(the actual labeling of abstract concepts) later turned out
to be the primary source of this inconsistency. Subsequent
discussions would yield a reference back to a couple of
Emerson's ideas later disputed when discussing
Thoreau. Review of the videotaped lesson segment*

posthumously led me to the conclusion regarding articulation of the student's ideas as the quandary- not, in fact, comprehension of Emerson's maxims, as I had initially supposed.

Comprehension 56. Which one did you like the best? (S.B)

Comprehension 57. What about you? (S.D)

Comprehension 58. S.C?

Because she had reached concept attainment early on (sometimes a negative in terms of teacher focus), I now touch base with her to show the value of her input.

Comprehension 59. Which one did you say you liked? (S.E)

Aware of the student's previous inability to accurately describe problematic ideas, I wanted to make sure that the pupil didn't associate irreconcilable beliefs with the author's ability to generate acceptable platitudes that were appealing (i.e. I didn't want the student to tune out to the author's larger message[forest] based on minor disagreements[trees]). Moreover, since the student was intellectually engaged, and Thoreau would continue to bring Emerson's ideas through to fruition, my intent was to instill patience in working through obstacles and difficulties toward a rational unification of a personal philosophy of his own.

Knowledge 60. How much time do we have left? (S.D)

Lesson Six Summary:

In this lesson, I was beginning to separate students' underlying beliefs from, empirically proven, observable facts accepted while not losing the emotional connection to the underlying social issues being discussed. What became very clear during this lesson was- the dynamic effect that my extended questioning of one student, to the exclusion of others- they were tuning out, since

they were not receiving personal attention; though schools have allowed this self-centered pupil egocentrism to occur, the fundamental devaluation of ‘the golden rule’ being reinforced in the homes and churches also goes a long way towards explaining why we, as a society, have a national problem with ignorance being bliss; they (children) don’t value anything not of their own origin.

What, amongst myriad other goals, I hope to cultivate over the next few lessons is the conditioning of students to value the origination of any ideas that may expose the roots of sophistic (hearsay) rather than philosophic (empirical) reasoning.

Taxonomic Level Intended	Questions Transcribed	Student Addressed
-----------------------------	-----------------------	-------------------

Lesson Seven: *Emerson’s ideas (oral quiz)*

Analysis	1. How does this (quote on board) relate to Emerson? (S.B)
----------	---

Application	2. How does Emerson say that you should live your life? (S.C) <i>Her extensive diatribe reinforces her confidence in mastering the subject matter.</i>
-------------	--

Frame: While checking journal entries

Knowledge	3. Have you been here every day? (S.B)
-----------	--

Evaluation	4. Which ideas in this essay did you find the most meaningful? (S.C)
------------	---

Evaluation	5. (S.B)?
------------	-----------

Evaluation	6. (S.E)?
------------	-----------

Application	7. So put that in your own words: (S.E)
-------------	---

Comprehension	8. What does that mean? (S.E)
Evaluation	9. (S.A)?
Evaluation	10. (S.D)?
Comprehension	11. Ultimately, you only answer to ____? (S.D)
Analysis	12. What are the advantages of being a “non-conformist”? (S.D)
Analysis	13. Any other advantages, to being a “non-conformist”? (S.A)
Application	14. Can you think of anything other than not being influenced by other people? (S.E) <i>Economics, authority and social status are prematurely brought out as disadvantages, indicating a clear preference for prestige resulting from conformity. A balanced treatment of this issue is abandoned for fear of being too heavy-handed in guiding the student to a point of view that lucidly weighs the consequences and rewards. I decide to let the other students dispel the preconceived notions regarding disadvantages of dogmatic thought.</i>
Application	15. Any other advantages that we can think of? (S.B) Frame: The other side of the coin are the disadvantages.
Analysis	16. What does that say about great people needing support? (S.B)
Application	17. Can most people make it in life without some kind of serious support group? (S.B)

- Application 18. What other disadvantages do we have in being a non-conformist? (S.A)
- Application 19. You are not getting any quality feedback right? (S.E)
Reviewed approximately a week after the taping, I now ironically see the student's actions as being non-conformist, for here he is also playing the devils advocate in discussing the merits of being free of outside influences.
- Frame: Discussing Emerson defining man as alone.
- Comprehension 20. Do we agree with that? (S.C)
- Application 21. Why? (S.C)
- Comprehension 22. Is that what you were going to say? (S.B)
- Frame: "Envy is ignorance, imitation is suicide" (Emerson).
- Application 23. How about that one (S.E)?
- Frame: "What I must do is all that concerns me, not what people think" (Emerson).
- Application 24. (S.A)?
- Frame: "To be great is to be misunderstood" (Emerson).
- Comprehension 25. What did we just say about this (S.C)?
- Frame: reference to Galileo, Copernicus, etc...
- Comprehension 26. What was Emerson saying about these people (S.D)?

Analysis 27. What kind of ridicule do “different” kids have to endure (S.D)?

Comprehension 28. What can we add to this (S.A)?

Comprehension 29. (S.B) Do you get mis-judged a lot?

Application 30. Based on what? (S.B)?

Comprehension 31. Do people mis-judge you at times? (S.C)

Comprehension 32. Has nothing to do with your brain though does it? (S.C)

Frame: Discussion turns to cliques

Analysis 33. What happens when you get out of high school when everybody goes a different direction? (S.C)

Application 34. So then what? (S.C)

Frame: Analogy: Henrik Ibsen’s “Enemy of the People” is synopsized.

Comprehension 35. What do you do in this situation? (S.B)

Application 36. What do you think happened to this character? (S.D)

Frame: The towns people tried to deny the problem and...

Comprehension 37. Labeled him a ____? (S.D)

Frame: Then people started dying

- Application 38. Then what happened? (S.A)
- Application 39. In the end (of “Enemy of the People”) what do you think that he (the protagonist) learned? (S.A)
- Frame: When people that you counted on turn their backs.
- Comprehension 40. Were they your real friends to begin with? (S.A)
- Frame: Favorite aphorisms are recapped here.
- Comprehension 41. What can we say about enthusiasm? (S.C)
- The student rightfully defines, as does Aristotle, motivation as the most essential ingredient in the learning process.*
- Analysis 42. Although Emerson’s ideas might work for a few people, would they work for an entire nation? (S.D)
- Knowledge 43. Did you ever read Plato’s Republic? (S.D)
- Frame: “The Republic” –and its citizens are explained.
- Application 44. Would these ideas work for everybody in this Country? (S.E)
- Application 45. Do you think everybody is capable of thinking for themselves? (S.C)
- Frame: (S.C) is explicating
- Disparate levels of cognitive ability are finally defined as the deciding factor second only to motivation.*
- Comprehension 46. What were you saying? (S.A)

Application	47. Is everybody intellectually able to do what Emerson is suggesting? (S.A)
Comprehension	48. Aren't there people that have trouble just functioning independently? (S.D)
Comprehension	49. They wouldn't understand these concepts right? (S.E)
Analysis	50. The question is, who are these people going to follow? (S.A)
<i>Consensus is here reached after following the "anybody can be anything" pop-culture platitude to fruition; a dead end.</i>
Application	51. If everybody in the United States became a non-conformist ____? (S.D)
Application	52. Without rules and laws who would be left? (S.B)

*The lesser volume of questions here is due in great part to greater elaboration on each question by the students.

Lesson Seven Summary:

In this lesson, I was more concerned with students taking their own thought processes to fruition than using specific terminology- at first. However, once the students showed a willingness to explicate their own value structure (steeped in the hypothetical realm), I then pointed them in the direction of the connection to the text. Once this textual connection was established, the specific word choices and phrases of Emerson were propondered.

What I learned here is that, generally speaking, teenagers are able to contemplate and even quantify to some extent, the intricacies of issues that they themselves deal with every day are themselves difficult to articulate, but again have trouble seeing from another's abstract perspective. Could it be that Kohlberg's studies showing adolescent egocentrism up until age 30 (and beyond) is also the product of a public school curriculum that doesn't lay the foundations of said critical thinking?

After all, learning is incontrovertibly sequential. Therefore, if that sequence breaks down, as Piaget and Erikson suggest, and several essential sequences are skipped (read middle school, and in many high school courses) then how can this mature adult thinking be taught in a vacuum?

The next lesson, along with previous less encompassing attempts, seeks to define particular literary terminology as the currency of thought to be bartered as ideas expressed. Unlike past attempts, the next lesson will focus on the language first-followed by the incipient idea, rather than the inverse posthumous labeling (i.e. I return to deductive logic now).

Taxonomic Level Intended	Questions Transcribed	Student Addressed
-----------------------------	-----------------------	-------------------

Lesson Eight: *Preparation for Whitman/poetry terminology*

Frame: “Peace is always beautiful” (Walt Whitman).

Application	1. Is that true? (S.A)
-------------	------------------------

Application	2. Is it always beautiful? (S.D)
-------------	----------------------------------

Frame: Other than if you are an anarchist.

Application	3. Is it true or not? (S.A)
-------------	-----------------------------

Application	4. O.K. so what is your idea of peace? (S.E)
-------------	--

Comprehension	5. So you’re talking about a state of relationships with no drama going on? (S.E)
---------------	---

With only minor prompting, the student is able to follow his own, off the cuff knee-jerk, reaction to its’ proper underlying assumptions that illustrate his egocentric desires untempered.

Frame: If you open this up to a national or international level...

Comprehension 6. In that case, would we agree with this? (S.E)

Frame: At this point, Whitman is being discussed within the context of the other writers read thus far in the semester.

Knowledge 7. In the beginning, what were the early writers writing about? (All students)

Comprehension 8. What kind (genre) of writing was it? (S.B)

Analysis 9. Based on what kind of ideas? (S.E)

Frame: From Jefferson to Franklin (the revolutionaries)

Analysis 10. What kind of topics did they move from to? (S.D)

Comprehension 11. By the end of that colonial period, what was Franklin writing about? (S.E)

Comprehension 12. The next group of writers that we get into is ____? (S.D)

Frame: Writers of mostly fiction.

Analysis 13. Why is it possible that they're able to write about something other than real life at this point? (S.D)

Frame: Social turmoil has subsided- farming is productive...

Application 14. What kind of fictional topics did these authors write

of? (S.D)

Frame: Generalizing about Romantic themes.

Application 15. Basically the theme is man in what kind of setting?
(S.A)

Comprehension 16. Man who wants to change what? (S.B)

Frame: First we go through short stories.

Application 17. According to Poe, what is the definition of a short story?
(S.C)

Frame: At this point, poetry terminology is defined on the board.

Knowledge 18. Does everybody have the journal copied from the board? (All students)

Frame: A list of romantic poets (previously discussed) is given.

Application 19. What kind of subject matter do they generally write about? (S.D)

Not one to miss an emergent pattern, the student here is being asked to hone his articulatory abilities using content specific literary terminology as his medium.

Frame: “In order to understand poetry, you need to under- stand some central terms that are used to describe poetry.”

Comprehension 20. What is theme? (S.E)

Application	21. All poetry works on what kind of a basis? (S.D)
Application	22. What's the function of all poetry? (S.D)
Comprehension	23. In almost all poetry, we see what device? (S.E)
Knowledge	24. A metaphor is ____? (S.E)
Knowledge	25. The definition of a metaphor is what? (S.E)
	Frame: Theme and metaphor (concepts) are reviewed.
Comprehension	26. Give me an example of a theme and a metaphor: (S.D)
	Frame: "Instead of saying love, love, (theme), the poet is talking about the parts and components of the rose."
Comprehension	27. Does that make sense to you? (S.A)
Knowledge	28. What other terms do we have from our poetry notes? (S.A)
Comprehension	29. When we're talking about rhythm, what are we talking about? (S.C)
Knowledge	30. The meter is what? (S.C)
Comprehension	31. When we have a "Shakespearean sonnet" it is written in iambic pentameter – which means what? (S.E)
Knowledge	32. "Penta" means what? (S.A)

Frame: S.D and S.E are cajoled to remember these terms from creative writing class.

- Comprehension 33. Rhyme scheme has to do with what? (S.E)
- Frame: We're looking at the last syllable and...
- Application 34. How it what? (S.D)
- Frame: A short poem is written on the board.
- Application 35. How are we going to label this (rhyme scheme),
we're going to start with what? (S.E)
- Frame: Rhyme scheme is labeled on the board example.
- Application 36. Could you label a rhyme scheme like this on the test?
(S.B)
- Comprehension 37. Could you do that for me on Monday if we have a
quiz? (S.A& S.C)
- Frame: Still discussing rhyme scheme
- Comprehension 38. We don't necessarily get a lot of that though, if we
have what kind of poetry? (All students)
- Comprehension 39. What does "free verse" mean? (S.D)
- Analysis 40. What's the down side to rhyming poetry? (S.E)
- Comprehension 41. What else? (S.A)
- Once able to experience a modicum of success, she now
feels confident (partially due to her outside of class readings)
to make some broad based generalizations regarding the
subject at hand (the effect of the language pattern on the
reader).*

- Analysis 42. For instance, if our theme was death, do you think it would be all that appropriate to have a rhyming poem? (S.A)
- Frame: Theme example on board is changed to death and the metaphor for love is erased.
- Synthesis 43. What would be a good metaphor for death? (S.B)
- Application 44. Who wrote about these concepts? (S.C)
- Comprehension 45. What author's poetry is very similar to Poe's, that we're going to get to after Whitman? (S.B)
Outside interests are here gleaned as a method of drawing another heretofore passive learner into an active analysis of stylistic comparison of somewhat similar author.
- Frame: All terminology on board is briefly reviewed.
- Knowledge 46. What other terminology did we mention last week? (S.C)
- Frame: "When we read 'The Raven' though we didn't apply it much..."
- Application 47. "Sensory details" describe what (term)? (S.D)
- Comprehension 48. When we talk about sensory details, what are we talking about? (S.B)
- Application 49. Based on the ____? (S.B)
- Comprehension 50. How many senses do we have? (S.B)
- Frame: So we're using our senses to create a mental picture.

- Comprehension 51. Give me an example: (S.E)
Knowing the student has internalized this concept (and its commensurate application), I now draw him into the fray.
- Frame: “I’m going to give you a word; you’re going to give me a sensory detail to describe it.”
- Synthesis 52. “Rock”? (S.E)
- Comprehension 53. Can you see, feel, touch, smell, or hear that word? (S.E)
- Synthesis 54. “Tree”? (S.D)
- Application 55. Can we see, feel, touch, smell, taste “shade”? (S.D)
- Frame: There is a mental picture that is associated with these words.
- Synthesis 56. Try for me “water”: (S.A)
- Frame: Yes to “cool”.
- Application 57. Refreshing is a little more abstract, can you think of anything else? (S.A)
Though this is the first time I have tacitly differentiated between concrete and abstract phraseology, she inductively comprehends that the abstract must be defined concretely.
- Synthesis 58. “Grass”? (S.B)
- Application 59. “Soft,” O.K. but what else could we say about “grass”? (S.B)
- Comprehension 60. What other terms do we really need to define and

work with poetry? (All students)

Frame: Alliteration is a “literary device.”

Application 61. What does alliteration mean? (S.E)

Application 62. What would be an example of that? (S.C)

Comprehension 63. What’s the sound being repeated? (S.B)

Comprehension 64. Questions about alliteration? (S.A)

Comprehension 65. Can you think of one? (S.A)

Tempted to give an example and non-example from which to choose, I wait; it works!

Comprehension 66. (S.B)?

Comprehension 67. (S.C)?

Frame: In prose we have paragraphs...

Application 68. What’s the equivalent in poetry? (S.A)

Frame: Personification is another literary device.

Comprehension 69. Personification is where we take ____? (S.D)

Frame: “This is especially addressed to you girls, since the guys have had these terms before.”

Application 70. Will we be able to take these literary terms, that we’ve had so far, which have to do with describing poetry – and apply them? (All girls)

- Comprehension 71. Can we do it? (All girls)
- Comprehension 72. If I ask you to identify, say stanza three, in a poem we're looking at tomorrow – can you do it? (All girls)
- Comprehension 73. Does that sound easy? (S.A)
- Comprehension 74. Would you be able to find the alliteration? (S.A)
- Comprehension 75. Could you do that? (S.B& S.C)
- Comprehension 76. If I ask you to cite examples of “Imagery” from a poem that we read tomorrow, could you do that? (S.E)
- Comprehension 77. Could you find “Imagery” in the poem? (S.E)
- Comprehension 78. If I asked you to simply define for me “free verse” could you do that? (S.A)
- Comprehension 79. What doesn't it necessarily have? (S.A)
- Comprehension 80. If I asked you to label rhyme scheme, could you do that? (S.B)
- Comprehension 81. Could you pick out what the “metaphor” (in the poem) is, Given that you have had lots of guided practice? (S.D)
- Comprehension 82. S.A?

Lesson Eight Summary:

More than anything else, here I was trying to draw in each students interest in a particular facet of an issue (connected to past classroom situations) to create the emotional connection to the revisited topic- hoping new student insights would be articulated in a refined oratory using

the appropriate vocabulary. I learned that students really do need to have a high level of comfort with the terminology to break out of old speech patterns (that fall back on vagaries that lead to eventual student frustration). Next, I will try to synthesize the vocabulary and personal connection to the issues in the upcoming taping.

Taxonomic Level Intended	Questions Transcribed	Student Addressed
-----------------------------	-----------------------	-------------------

Lesson Nine: Whitman's Poetry

Frame: Students are taking turns reading "When I Heard the Learned Astronomers".

Analysis	<p>1. First define the theme here, then try to relate this back to Emerson and Thoreau: (S.D)</p> <p><i>He guesses, "self-reliance" without making the connection.</i></p>
----------	--

Frame: "That's part of it."

Application	2. What do you think the theme is? (S.D)
-------------	--

Frame: "Your on the right track, it's about being alone."

Comprehension	<p>3. What did Emerson say? (S.D)</p> <p><i>Previous criteria is now used to define the current analogy.</i></p>
---------------	--

Frame: "Self-reliance"

Application	<p>4. So what is Whitman saying about the way that this astronomer is interpreting the stars? (S.D)</p> <p><i>Working through the "zone of proximal development", the student is finally able to lucidly quantify the correlation.</i></p>
-------------	--

Frame: S.A says the speaker is relying on the astronomer.
...but there is more to it than that...

- Application 18. Do we have an even meter to this poem? (All students)
- Application 19. What do the stanzas look like? (S.A)
- Application 20. Does there seem to be any kind of set grouping? (S.A)
- Comprehension 21. How many stanzas are there? (S.A)
- Comprehension 22. Where does the first stanza start? (S.E)
- Comprehension 23. How about the last stanza? (S.C)
- Frame: “This is definitely a free verse poem. How about literary devices...”
- Application 24. Do we have any literary devices that, as we go through, we could pick out? (S.D)
- Application 25. Do we have any kind of internal rhyme scheme (alliteration)? (S.E)
- Frame: Other literary devices...
- Application 26. Do we see any kind of personification here? (S.A)
- Analysis 27. What is your impression of the speaker of this poem? (S.B)
- The recall and synthesis of complex variables orchestrated into a singular theme- still does not come without prodding.*
- Analysis 28. How would we describe this person? (S.C)
- Application 29. Anything else we could say about this speaker/narrator? (S.A)

- Comprehension 30. Anything else we could add? (S.B)
- Application 31. Why do you think the speaker in this poem leaves the lecture room? (S.D)
- Application 32. Where are the roots of Whitman's ideas? (S.D)
- Comprehension 33. What other literature did we just read? (S.D)
The student is now able to recount the strands of self-reliant ideology as they historically relate to Whitman.
- Frame: Scientific or naturalistic approach to seeing things
- Analysis 34. Which approach do you favor – and why? (S.E)
- Frame: Student says “natural.”
- Comprehension 35. ...but on the other hand, aren't you planning on going to law school? (S.E)
- Comprehension 36. ...but aren't there some things that you will need to break down and understand the component parts of? (S.E)
Again, the grasp of the generalization does not lead to the analogy of building a legal case based on empirical fact.
- Analysis 37. Which one (viewpoint) do you appreciate most? (S.D)
- Frame: The speaker in the poem
- Comprehension 38. Anybody disagree with that? (S.C)
- Comprehension 39. Could we improve our volleyball game if we didn't look at the specific statistics...and videotapes once

in a while? (S.B)

Frame: Just going out and having fun.

Application 40. Would that give you the kind of results
(improvement) that you wanted? (S.B)

Frame: In reference to (S.E's) previous commentary on
Whitman:

Comprehension 41. Do you now agree more with his point of view?
(S.E)

Comprehension 42. You still think you're going to have a difference in
philosophy with him? (S.E)

Frame: Students read "One's Self I Sing".

Application 43. How does this particular poem relate to the (daily
journal) quote? (All students)

Comprehensive 44. Would it surprise you to learn that we have an
abbreviated version of this poem in our text and that
the quote is another line of the original complete
poem? (All students)

Comprehension 45. Now we have some language here; what does "en
masse" mean? (S.B)

Comprehension 46. When we're talking about "physiology" we're
talking about ____? (S.A)

Application 47. Who were the muses? (S.C)

Comprehension 48. What is immense? (S.D)

- Comprehension 49. If it is immense it is ____? (S.B)
- Knowledge 50. Do we have a (foot) note on that? (S.A)
- Frame: “The modern man I sing” (Walt Whitman).
- Comprehension 51. Is he talking just about the man? (S.A)
- Comprehension 52. What’s he talking about? (S.D)
- Application 53. So what’s the theme of the poem? (S.D)
- Comprehension 54. Equality right? (S.A)
- Comprehension 55. So he’s talking about what kind of appearances?
(S.A)
- Evaluation 56. What’s the most memorable line in this poem? (S.E)
- Evaluation 57. S.C?
- Frame: “The female equal to the male...” (Walt Whitman)
- Application 58. That line is most illustrative of what, theme or metaphor? (S.C)
- Application 59. Is there any real metaphor that he’s using here? (S.B)
- Application 60. What are some of the topics that Whitman will
“sing” about? (S.C)
- Comprehension 61. What else? (S.A)
- Application 62. What was the idea (theme) from the last poem, and

where do we see that again in this one? (S.E)

Comprehension 63. What was the theme of the last poem? (S.D)

Frame: "Individualism"

Comprehension 64. Where do we see that (here)? (S.D)

Application 65. "Simple and separate" is also an example of what literary device? (S.B)

Comprehension 66. How many stanzas do we have here? (S.C)

Analysis 67. Any particular reason you think he grouped these the way he did? (S.A)

Application 68. He's talking about what topic in the first stanza? (S.C)

Frame: "Yes, individualism and..."

Comprehension 69. At the same time, you are part of what? (S.E)

Application 70. Second stanza, what's the idea he's trying to convey here? (S.C)

Application 71. Third stanza? (All students)

Application 72. What do you think Whitman means by the phrase "modern man"? (S.B)

Comprehension 73. "Modern man" in his estimation, also takes into account, what (other group)? (S.C)

Analysis 74. So what were some of the ideas that Whitman was talking about, and is this a follow-up of Emerson and

Thoreau? (S.E)

Correctly assessed, the student rightly differentiates between Whitman's social issues and the transcendentalist's focus on free thinking through a personal locus of moral operation.

Application 75. How does he, Emerson and Thoreau want to interpret things? (S.B)

Frame: Emerson – in terms of non-conformity...

Application 76. Felt that it was important that you figure out what? (S.A)

Comprehension 77. I gave you a term called free ____? (S.D)

*For the rest of the period, the students are asked to apply the poetry terminology (a written self-directed activity) used to a new, previously unread, poem by Whitman.

Lesson Nine Summary:

Though I do feel that I am finally working in these students' respective "Zones of Proximal Development", the apathy towards thoughts not of their own origin (immediate interest) combined with the intricacies of language precision also not present (in their heretofore untapped cognitive abilities) and a genuine lack comprehending the value of these higher-order thinking skills, are all exceptionally difficult disparate factors to overcome without an incredible amount of trust and showmanship. It is no wonder so few teachers attempt to take students to this level of thought (even if they themselves could conceive of teaching it).

I can't help wondering if it would be an infinitely more accessible endeavor for the high school teacher if more middle school teachers would genuinely force (force in middle school?) students to attempt difficult reading material on their own before generating a list of answers for students to memorize before each test.

Of course that would also mean moving away from whole language (which incidentally is NEVER EVER used to remediate reading skills) to facilitate students assimilating new vocabulary based on their working knowledge of phonetics, spelling rules, root words and pre/suffixes. Even if given these edicts were in place, would any of these (mid-level) teachers attempt to meet

these standards without more stringent standardized testing at each and every grade level?

Taxonomic Level Intended	Questions Transcribed	Student Addressed
-----------------------------	-----------------------	-------------------

Lesson Ten: *Explicating Dickinson*

*Abbreviated class period (only 30 minutes) due to an assembly

Frame: “That such have died enable us the tranquiller to live” (Emily Dickinson)

Application	1. What’s the interpretation on that? (S.A)	
Application	2. (S.D)?	
Comprehension	3. Anything you could add to that? (S.E)	
Comprehension	4. Anything to add? (S.B)	
Comprehension	5. (S.C)?	
Comprehension	6. What did we say Dickinson was preoccupied with and wrote about all the time? (S.A)	
Application	7. This all falls under the heading of what genre of writing? (S.D)	
Comprehension	8. What other authors’ (ideas) is she building upon? (S.B)	
	Frame: Brief Dickinson biographical introduction (lecture) here	
Comprehension	9. Are you taking notes on this, it may be on the test? (S.E)	

This comment is particularly appropriate to the student since he tends to rely upon concept generalizations that capture the gist of the information internally- yet when asked to write an essay or justify an in class opinion, the student falls back on poorly articulated vagaries.

Application 10. Who else is living at this time? (S.E)

Comprehension 11. What about the authors that we've already read that were living during this time? (S.B)

Frame: Poe was already dead by the end of this time period.

Comprehension 12. Hawthorne, does this work for him? (S.D)

Comprehension 13. Who were the two transcendentalist authors we just read? (S.D)

Frame: "Dickinson would have known the work of all the authors we have read."

Application 14. Why would those authors have not known her work? (S.C)

Again, I here rely upon outside interest in the author to draw this introverted student into the discussion.

Application 15. Why did she withdraw from society? (S.D)
The abstraction from yesterday's short introduction describing her affair with a married man doesn't register as a fact that can be extrapolated and applied.

Comprehension 16. What problem did she deal with in her daily life? (S.D)

- Application 17. Do you think she was a happy person? (S.D)
- Frame: She had an affair with a married man who moved away.
- Comprehension 18. Apparently, what happened here? (S.B)
Cause (jilted) and effect (seclusion) is correctly hypothesized here.
- Comprehension 19. What's that? (S.C)
- Frame: "Yes, self-exile"
- Application 20. Why would she dress exclusively in white? (S.A)
- Application 21. What do you think she was trying to prove? (S.A)
Thinking that having read Dickinson's Biography would prove a boon to speculative prowess, I try to get the very concrete thinking student to speculate.
- Application 22. Any thoughts on why she would have dressed exclusively in white? (S.D)
- Frame: "Think about this for a second."
- Comprehension 23. What if the guy came back from California and ask around about what Emily had been up to? (S.A)
I really don't want to let this student off the intellectual hook (confidence in her thought process needs to be bolstered) so, I add a narrower frame.
- Application 24. ...but what else, if we said that white is a symbol of ____? (S.B)
- Frame: "With most authors no, but with Dickinson her

life influenced her work.”

Application 25. What did Poe’s poetry look like, in terms of the way he laid it out on the page? (S.C)

Frame: Poe’s poetry layout is contrasted with Dickinson’s stanzas and lines.

Comprehension 26. What did we say a stanza does? (S.D)

Comprehension 27. What did we say a metaphor was? (S.A)

Comprehension 28. So what is that? (S.D)

Comprehension 29. Personification, we said, is what? (S.E)

Comprehension 30. A simile is a comparison using ____or____? (S.B)

Frame: Student reading of Dickinson excerpt “My letter to the world”.

Analysis 31. What are we seeing in this poem, that we didn’t see in Whitman? (S.A)

Here she is willing to make the physical comparison.

Comprehension 32. So, if we’re going to label the rhyme scheme here, how are we going to do that? (S.C)

Frame: “So we do have a definite rhyme scheme.”

Application 33. How about meter or rhythm? (S.B)

Frame: The first and third lines, etc...we see a repetitive pattern.

- Application 34. What kind of an effect does that create? (S.E)
- Application 35. Does it make it more or less memorable, the poetry? (S.B)
- Application 36. Why do you think so? (S.B)
- Comprehension 37. If that's the case, do you think you'll remember more of the text and the words? (S.B)
- Frame: "Well, let me ask you this."
- Comprehension 38. How long does it take you to remember words to a new song that you like? (S.D)
- Application 39. Now, how long does it take you to remember a paragraph that doesn't rhyme and your not that interested in? (S.D)
- Frame: "This is my letter to the world that never wrote to me" (Dickinson).
- Application 40. How does she feel about the world? (S.A)
- Comprehension 41. Do you have something to add? (S.E)
- Frame: "Simple mood of nature told with tender majesty" (Dickinson).
- Application 42. What do you think she is speaking of there? (S.C)
- Comprehension 43. What does the word "romance" mean? (S.B)
- Comprehension 44. Do you think it was a love that was returned? (S.C)

Frame: “her message is committed to hands I cannot see”
(Dickinson)

Application 45. Who’s the “her”? (S.B)

Application 46. Who’s hands do you think she might have been referring to? (S.A)

Application 47. So, what’s the overall theme that she’s working with? (S.D)

Analysis 48. What is your impression of the speaker in this poem? (S.C)

All of the speaker’s character traits are correctly synopsized, based on her intuition.

Application 49. What are her feelings at this point? (S.B)
Paraphrases synonyms for sadness.

Application 50. What can you infer, from her statement “no-one wrote back”? (S.A)

Frame: “Simple news that nature told” (Dickinson).

Application 51. What does this suggest about Dickinson’s feelings for nature? (S.D)

Application 52. Does she appreciate the beauty of nature? (S.A)

Analysis 53. What does she want her readers to think about nature? (S.B)

*Language (vocabulary) used by the poet still cannot be correctly asserted as a specific necessary to the full unencumbered message of the writer. *Fear of new words begins in the middle school (whole language).*

Application 54. What does she expect her readers to get out of this? (S.A)

Frame: Since only a handful of Dickinson's poetry was published in her lifetime.

Analysis 55. Do you think she expected to become famous after her death? (S.D)

Already asked in a previous lesson, this query is designed to layer new factors into the students broader comprehension of the affects on the author while testing his ability to accurately convey those ideas.

Lesson Ten Summary:

As much as possible, I tried to keep this lesson at the analysis level of cognitive operation. Students were, in fact, able to break down complex issues and ideas into subsets; my hard work is paying off, in terms of thinking skills- but is extremely limited in terms of getting students to internalize new terminology that conveys the specifics of our in-class explications. Plus, cognitive ability change is almost non-existent in terms of applying these new higher order skills to their essay assignments. Next, I will delve deeper into the criteria used to judge previously read authors' worth (contribution to the literary canon).

Taxonomic	Questions Transcribed	Student Addressed
Level Intended		

Lesson Eleven: *Comparison & Contrast of Authors (layout of final essay)*

Frame: Ultimately, we're going to compare and contrast.

Application 1. ...but what's another type of layout that we can use? (S.A)

Comprehension 2. How are you going to lay yours out? (S.A)

- Analysis 3. What are the commonalties between these authors?
(S.A)
Students have been conditioned by teachers to quip “I don’t knows” almost as a reaction to anything that’s not blatantly obvious. I realize that the language, not the question (as is most often the case) is the problem.
- Analysis 4. What kind of things are the same, that we can group?
(S.A)
I give her a look that says, “this test of wills will not get you off of the hook”. Based on previous class discussions and a knowledge of her introverted tendencies, I know today is one of those days when she is on the verge of getting angry, which sometimes will draw her out.
- Frame: Students’ three authors (chosen) listed on board.
- Analysis 5. What kind of similarities are we going to look at here?
(S.A)
Finally she creates categories.
- Frame: Daily quote on “Duty” (Robert E. Lee)
- Analysis 6. How did these three authors feel about duty? (S.E)
- Frame: Doing the things you don’t want to do.
- Comprehension 7. Is that true? (S.B)
- Comprehension 8. Do you ever get that (sublime) feeling when you’ve done your duty? (S.E)
- Analysis 9. What are some other similarities that we can discuss between Hawthorne and Poe? (S.D)

Student goes into the similar story settings and character motives.

Frame: The notes on the board about similarities (schooling).

Application 10. This is also going to spur what? (S.A)

Frame: Geographic region as an influence on these authors

Knowledge 11. Didn't we talk about this one (factor) too the other day? (S.A)

Knowledge 12. Hawthorne was from? (S.D)

Knowledge 13. Poe was from? (S.B)

Frame: Poe – v – Hawthorne

Application 14. Who do you think probably did more traveling though? (S.E)

Based on his remembrance of Poe's tumultuous life he recounts many of Poe's travels.

Comprehension 15. As a child his (Poe's) parents were what? (S.C)

Comprehension 16. What else are we going to talk about, similarities and differences? (S.A)

Frame: "For those of you covering other authors (in your essays)...

Application 17. Who else spent a lot of time in isolation? (S.C)

- Application 18. What do you think this created for theme these authors, spending time in isolation? (S.B)
- Comprehension 19. Anything else we could get in and maybe discuss about these two (Hawthorne and Poe)? (S.E)
- Frame: Student asks why Hawthorne wrote the number 64 over and over before he died.
- Comprehension 20. By the way, how old was Hawthorne when he died? (S.A)
- Knowledge 21. So who's our third author here (to be compared in your essay)? (S.A)
- Comprehension 22. Where did Twain get a lot of his traveling in; two different time periods in his life? (S.E)
- Frame: "Steamship travel in 1830's – 1850's and then..."
- Application 23. He traveled a lot again when? (S.B)
- Comprehension 24. Did Twain spend much time in isolation? (S.A)
- Application 25. If he did, what did it cause? (S.A)
- Comprehension 26. What else (other comparison or contrasts) can we get in with Twain? (S.A)
- Application 27. How can we take this comparison/contrast of Hawthorne, Twain, and Poe, who all were contemporaries, and apply it to other authors we've read Who weren't alive at the same time? (S.C)
- Knowledge 28. Who are we discussing in your essay? (S.C)

- Application 29. How much of this information (listed on the board) can we apply to Emerson and Dickinson? (S.D)
- Frame: Dickinson's Education
- Comprehension 30. Famous girl's preparatory school was called? (S.D)
- Frame: Isolation (on board) as a comparison
- Application 31. Does this apply (pointing to board)? (S.D)
- Application 32. How about education, what are we going to talk about here? (S.D)
- Comprehension 33. Were they all three educated? (S.D)
- Application 34. To what extent and how (course of study)? (S.D)
- Application 35. How about parents (as a factor in comparison)? (S.D)
- Comprehension 36. Wasn't Dickinson a teenager when her parents died? (S.A)
- Frame: Discussing Dickinson, Emerson, and Poe
- Application 37. When did they become famous? (S.C)
- Application 38. What about their life experiences? (S.D)
- Comprehension 39. Are those different? (S.D)
- Comprehension 40. What geographic regions are they coming from? (S.D)
- Frame: The three authors motivation to write...

- Comprehension 41. ...and Emerson didn't have to write for a living because predominately he was making enough money as a ____? (S.D)
- Application 42. What else can we take (extrapolate) from our brainstorming activities here on the board? (S.D)
- Comprehension 43. What other similarities and differences can we work with? (S.D)
- Comprehension 44. Do you think you have enough (notes) for three pages there? (S.D)
- Knowledge 45. Who are the authors you're working with? (S.E)
- Comprehension 46. Jefferson and Franklin, they both lived and were instrumental in what period? (S.E)
- Comprehension 47. First of all, where are they from geographically? (S.E)
- Frame: "Franklin, on the other hand was from the Boston area, but..."
- Comprehension 48. Predominately made his impact when he lived in ____? (S.E)
- Application 49. What about education? (S.D)
- Frame: Franklin as a Renaissance man
- Application 50. What were some of the areas where Franklin contributed? (S.E)
- Comprehension 51. What were some of the things Franklin did? (S.D)

Frame: Both Jefferson and Franklin received a lot of respect during their lives...

Comprehension 52. How about Poe? (S.D)

Comprehension 53. Did Poe ever gain a lot of respect in his lifetime? (S.E)

Comprehension 54. What kind of (genre) writing did Jefferson and Franklin do? (S.D)

Frame: All were instrumental in shaping.

Application 55. Instrumental in shaping what? (S.B)

Knowledge 56. What do you have so far, read it back to me: (S.E)

Frame: Student reads off his notes.

Comprehension 57. How long should a short story be according to Poe? (S.E)

Frame: Franklin's plans and organization

Comprehension 58. How would we say that? (S.E)

Lesson Eleven Summary:

The comparison/contrasting went well, with students themselves generating many of the categories for discussion. Some (two) of the students are actively trying to manipulate me into believing they do not understand the subject matter in order to avoid writing the final essay. Unfortunately, students believe they have a choice 'not to' here when parents, administrators and sometimes even (pitiful) English teachers facilitate this behavior with statements like, "Well, they just don't do very well with writing, but that's no reason to fail the course". WRONG!

Writing lucidly phrased ideas that are comprehensible to others facilitates critical thinking. Let me rephrase that in another way: If students are never made to be precise with the rules of

writing (which is a proven schematic boon to organization) or even attempt it, then those students will never be able to operate on the synthesis level when dealing with complex life issues. I know from personal experience that I could not even begin to express complex relationships (part to whole) until I began crafting empirically organized essays as the roadmap for my own learning.

Again, middle school short-sighted mentality here prevails! Even Beethoven who composed entire symphonies in his head had to write his notes down on paper as an organizational device that he, himself, could manipulate and refine, not to mention the loss to all of society had he never written his music for all to see, study and re-create for eons to come. No, writing well is not optional, it is essential to learning!

Taxonomic Level Intended	Questions Transcribed	Student Addressed
-----------------------------	-----------------------	-------------------

Lesson Twelve: *Course recap/final essays discussed*

Frame: “The brightest are the tenderest, the loving
are the daring” (Longfellow).

Application	1. What do you think about this? (S.A)
-------------	--

Application	2. Was Henry Wadsworth Longfellow correct in making this assertion? (S.A)
-------------	---

Application	3. Why? (S.A)
-------------	---------------

Application	4. Reaction? (S.B)
-------------	--------------------

Frame: “We’re talking about trying to get underneath
the surface...”

Application	5. To what? (S.A)
-------------	-------------------

Application	6. What’s underneath the surface? (S.A)
-------------	---

- Application 7. What compels somebody to do something? (S.E)
- Comprehension 8. What else? (S.D)
- Comprehension 9. What's underneath the surface? (S.D)
- Frame: In terms of the law
- Application 10. What do they look at in crimes? (S.E)
- Application 11. And? (S.E)
- Comprehension 12. So what's Longfellow saying about motives and intentions here? (S.C)
- Comprehension 13. Elaborate? (S.C)
- Frame: Student questions the syntax of the quote.
- Comprehension 14. You think it would be better the other way (inverted)? (S.D)
- Application 15. So why does he say it (write) this way? (S.D)
- Frame: Referring to Jefferson's passion for the revolution
- Application 16. What did he do for it? (S.B)
- Frame: From the Revolutionary to the Civil War
- Comprehension 17. What's the time span? (S.B)
- Comprehension 18. How much time are we talking about? (S.B)
- Knowledge 19. When, then, is the beginning of the Civil War? (S.E)

Knowledge	20. Who did the revolutionary authors? (S.C)
Application	21. What were they concerned with in the 1770's-80's? (S.C)
Comprehension	22. What was the central focus of the writings? (S.C)
Comprehension	23. ...free from the oppression of ____? (S.C)
	Frame: "After we win the Revolutionary War, Jefferson helps pen..."
Comprehension	24. What famous document? (All students)
Application	25. By around 1800, how has the mood changed in this country? (S.D)
Application	26. What has changed in that thirty year period? (S.A)
Comprehension	27. They were more relaxed because ____? (S.E)
	Frame: Student discusses leisure time and agricultural productivity.
Comprehension	28. Is that what you were going to say? (S.B)
	Frame: "The next major change in American literature comes in the 1830's."
Comprehension	29. Who was the predecessor of Hawthorne and Poe? (S.C)
	Frame: Dealing with another type of oppression
Application	30. What is Hawthorne concerned with in "The Minister's Black Veil" or "Young Goodman

Brown”, you guys read those? (S.B)
Loss of faith is correctly recounted.

Knowledge 31. Has anyone read “Young Goodman Brown”? (All students)

Comprehension 32. Hawthorne set a lot of his stories during what time period, because of his grandfather? (S.B)

Frame: Hawthorne was concerned with religious/
personal freedom as a romantic.

Comprehension 33. What were the romantic authors concerned with generally? (S.D)

Comprehension 34. And ____? (S.D)

Frame: Personal freedom

Application 35. What’s the tie-in to Jefferson? (S.A)
Improving mans’ life quality; she gets it.

Comprehension 36. ...and Franklin, Henry, etc...? (S.C)

Comprehension 37. What’s the tie-in between Hawthorne and the Revolutionaries? (S.C)

Application 38. How did the revolutionaries deal with freedom? (S.E)
They created it (he sees the big picture).

Application 39. So Hawthorne’s writing about what? (S.D)
Freedom of choice (viola!).

Frame: Hawthorne’s didactic conclusion discussed

Application	40. What happened at the end of “Dr. Heidegger”?
(S.B)
Application	41. Hawthorne is concerned with showing man’s what?
(S.A)
<i>Selfishness (she comprehends)</i>
Comprehension	42. What kind of writing, genre did Hawthorne work
in? (S.E)
Comprehension	43. Approximately how long were most of Hawthorne’s
stories? (S.B)
Application	44. Did they fit Poe’s definition of short story? (S.D)
<i>He correctly recounts Poe’s criterion.</i>
Application	45. Hawthorne was writing from what point of view?
(S.E)
Comprehension	46. “Omniscient” means what? (S.E)
Comprehension	47. “Omni” means _____? (S.B)
	Frame: Poe influenced by Hawthorne. “Poe comes
along and...”
Application	48. What was the situation with Poe? (S.B)
	Frame: Hawthorne concerned with man changing man
for the worse.
Analysis	49. What was Poe’s overarching theme? (S.C)
<i>She guesses death and gloom- again too general.</i>
Application	50. Do you think Poe ever really fit in anywhere? (S.C)

Frame: Student discusses Poe's fears.

- Comprehension 51. ...about what? (S.C)
- Application 52. Did he ever really have anything to hang onto?
(S.C)
- Application 53. What was the one thing that Poe had? (S.A)
- Comprehension 54. Before Virginia (his wife) and after her, how did
he feel? (S.B)
- Application 55. Where was he coming from? (S.B)
- Application 56. So what kind of writing did he tend to do? (S.D)
- Application 57. Elaborate, when you say "dark" you mean ____?
(S.D)
- Comprehension 58. In the beginning of his life he wanted ____? (S.D)
- Application 59. Why do you think Poe married someone a whole
lot younger than he? (S.E)
- Application 60. What is he concerned with showing (themes) in his
short stories? (S.B)
- Comprehension 61. What's "The Mask of the Red Death" about? (S.A)
- Application 62. Do you think there were people in Poe's life that
he wanted revenge on? (S.C)
- Here the Socratic method comes full circle to zero in
on the nature of the question (which, when dealing with
people, always centers around motivation).*

- Comprehension 63. He probably entertained a lot of thoughts of revenge against his uncle, don't you think? (S.E)
Providing a key example spurs his recollection of Poe's nemesis- and his handling of Poe's roadblocks.
- Comprehension 64. What was the real life inspiration for "A Cask of Amontillado"? (S.D)
- Comprehension 65. Remember, Poe is the father of not just horror, but the modern _____ story? (S.E)
Again checking to see if any specific information made it into this student's (normally non-existent) notes.
- Application 66. If Poe's horror stories are concerned with revenge; what are the detective stories about? (S.B)
Doesn't see the connection and guesses "Who dunnit".
- Application 67. If the short stories are about revenge, what are the poems about? (S.A)
Is cognizant of the effect of Virginia's death, but is unable to open it up into an all encompassing theme.
- Application 68. The poetry was primarily concerned with what? (S.C)
- Frame: "Lost love"
- Comprehension 69. What's Annabel Lee about? (S.C)
Since deductively drawing conclusions doesn't work, I'm hoping that inductively she can break down the specific themes into broader categories.
- Application 70. What literary device does Poe use in all of his poems? (S.B)

Frame: A refrain in all of his poetry

Application 71. Why do you think Poe does that? (S.A)

Frame: The repetition

Comprehension 72. Had anybody ever really done this before Poe? (S.B)

Frame: Although Annabel Lee is romantic it's not Gothic.

Application 73. ...on the other hand, what's "The Raven" like? (S.A)

Frame: Poe's short stories revenge theme; poetry – lost love

Application 74. Where does Dickinson fit in to all of this? (All students)

Comprehension 75. She was around then right? (S.A)

Application 76. What did she do with the ideas of Hawthorne and Poe? (S.C)

Comprehension 77. Unrequited means what? (S.C)

Application 78. Why did she write about unrequited love? (S.C)
Here, I am trying to reinforce the previously discussed role that her personal life had in shaping her writings.

Application 79. Why was she concerned with death? (S.C)

Frame: Dickinson's affair with the married preacher discussed.

- Comprehension 80. Do you think a preacher in the late 1800's would get a divorce and change their whole life situation? (S.A)
- Application 81. Is it likely that the situation would ever change during her lifetime? (S.A)
- Comprehension 82. So what was Dickinson waiting for? (S.B)
- Frame: Postulation of reasons she wrote
- Knowledge 83. Do you know what catharsis means? (S.C)
- Comprehension 84. She was also considered a romantic because she talked about what in her poetry? (S.D)
Knowing the student internalized the idea of man in nature, here I am asking him to make the connection.
- Comprehension 85. How man or woman, in this case, fits into _____? (S.D)
- Comprehension 86. Remember the poetry where she talks about things being ripe? (S.E)
- Comprehension 87. Wasn't it a bird she uses as a metaphor? (S.E)
- Application 88. At first, when he (her lover) leaves, she thinks _____? (S.B)
- Comprehension 89. At the end of her life, what idea were her poems totally concerned with? (S.C)
- Comprehension 90. Do you think she was looking forward to it, at that point? (S.D)
Early thought of death lead to later thoughts of her

place in nature, the student attempts to quantify.

Comprehension 91. What was her primary purpose for living, as an adult? (S.A)

Frame: Students speak of her lack of job or career and living at home.

Application 92. She was able to do this because she came from what kind of a family background? (S.D)

Frame: All authors thematic ideas are reviewed here.

Application 93. About the same time period as Dickinson and Hawthorne we start to see the emergence of a couple of philosophers: (S.D)

Frame: Emerson and Thoreau

Comprehension 94. Their idea was what? (S.E)

Comprehension 95. Are they romantic writers? (S.B)
Correctly points out that Thoreau spent time in nature.

Application 96. If so, why? (S.C)

Comprehension 97. What broader genre of writing are they working in? (S.A)

Application 98. Non-fictional because the subject matter was ____? (S.D)

Comprehension 99. If Emerson laid out the plan, what did Thoreau do? (S.E)

- Comprehension 100. Who goes out and does it? (S.B)
- Comprehension 101. Where does Thoreau go to live? (S.A)
- Application 102. What kind of conclusions does he come up with, based on his experiences there? (S.C)
- Comprehension 103. Who do you need to consult, in order to make correct decisions in life – according to Thoreau? (S.E)
- Frame: The geographical regions of all the writers is recapped.
- Application 104. What does Twain talk about? (S.A)
- Frame: “If Poe, Hawthorne, and Dickinson are concerned with the dark side of life...”
- Comprehension 105. Where’s Twain thematically? (S.A)
Points out Twain’s comedic nature.
- Comprehension 106. Twain wrote about what (subject matter)? (S.C)
- Frame: “If Poe and Dickinson are pessimists and Twain an optimist...”
- Comprehension 107. Where do Emerson and Thoreau fit in? (S.D)
- Application 108. Along with John Fennimore Cooper, Twain was one of our first ____ in this country? (S.E)
- Comprehension 109. Because he wrote what two famous novels? (S.B)
- Comprehension 110. Was that all Twain wrote? (All students)

Comprehension 111. What other genres of writing did he work in? (S.A)

Lesson Twelve Summary:

Though the nature of this study was to improve my questioning skills- while moving up and down Bloom's Taxonomy- always edging closer to the analysis, synthesis levels with all students, I had the epiphany that- I did take these students to the higher-order thinking abilities that I wished to endow them with.

On the other hand, I was only able to instill (read remediate) a modicum of change in their respective abilities to: read critically, overcome and incorporate new vocabulary, and improve their written organizational and articulatory skills. They became much more adept at critical, sensible, thinking (since they now had a rubric to apply)- but the paradigm shift (read apathy) towards learning reading, writing, and vocabulary skills had not changed significantly.

Chapter Six: Daily Reflections

Introduction

The intent of this chapter is to explicitly acknowledge all of the various criterion that were considered, from the federal (*Praxis III*), district (*Pathwise*), and building (Watkins Memorial High School administrators use a state generated form) level assessors up front- prior to discussing my conclusions in the proceeding chapter. For a complete reconciliation of all criteria please see the *complete assessment guides located in Appendix B*.

Framing the Context

Time was taken each day, with the daily journal quotes to:

1. Relate the quotation to previous material covered
2. Frame knowledge constructively, by asking students to paraphrase sections of text covered.
3. Engage students by analogizing to a situation they can relate to.
4. Lay out concepts, such as “oppression” (textbook questions) at the end of each literary excerpt.
5. Create a logical coherent lesson by constructively layering a cause and effect relationship in the unit – and by layering national trends and thoughts (based on technological, political and economic advancements) in as well.
6. Hone skills in these *taxonomic* areas:
 - A. Paraphrase (*comprehension*– level 2)
 - B. Interpret meanings (*application*- level 3)
 - C. *Analyze* and test concepts– level 4 on each excerpt relating authors and their works, one to another, - and –
 - D. *Evaluate* the quality of ideas, complexity of ideas (authorial intent) as well as, how successful, or comprehensible/accessible the author was.

Question Distribution

1. Questions are always rotated to all students, but modifications (the level of comprehension) are tempered to hit the specific level of comprehension that each student is at (or near) and thereby work progressively up the taxonomy from there.
2. Students are always encouraged to take risks and speculate – as long as the text is being used as support.
3. Students are praised for finding support for their answers within the text; incorrect answers are remediated by asking students where they are (what specific passage) basing their ideas on.
4. Off task behaviors (unengaged students) are re-directed based on the above (#3) and by reminding/reiterating the skills and objectives that the course guide requires them to know (i.e. the class exams/proficiency tests will ask for evidence of these skills that are stated and taught).
5. All students are being monitored for skill and concept attainment either through in-class discussions or written (essay) assignments to assess the exact working level of knowledge (level of taxonomy mastered).

Level of Taxonomy Addressed

1. Analogies are custom tailored to each student based on known interests of students: *Student E* – interested in sports cars and wants to go to law school;

Student A- is an abstract thinker needing less concrete grounding who can place herself within the context of the protagonist (higher functioning);

Student B – needs a little situational (real world analogies) prompting to discover connections/correlations with literature (usually based on her volleyball interests);

Student D – thinks abstractly, but must always be shown the relevance (the stakes involved) of an issue to engage in analysis and evaluation, and wants to know authors' life situations as their (the author's) motivation;

Student C – needs an issue of injustice in order to go back and look at the concrete tangibles leading up to an outcome. Many analogies, for her, were of work, school, or family situations.

2. Every question attempts to challenge students to be concise/precise with their answers – at the highest level of cognition (usually beginning in this Jr./Sr. level course, with application/interpretation).
3. Each lesson begins with a concept(s) in literature attainment. Skills, however, such as paraphrasing, interpreting, analyzing, and evaluating literary genres (and their authors') are ongoing integral parts of the lesson plan design.

Authors/Texts chosen

The rubric for evaluating and judging these American authors is based upon the articulatory ability of those authors confined within their ability to craft the characters, plot, dramatic suspense, and illustrate other literary devices- as well as to what degree these seminal authors helped define/refine the respective genres they were working within.

Lesson Design

Each lesson is designed with two overarching considerations in mind:

1. Each lesson/activity is designed to show the prevailing (concerns) social consciousness of America during the time period and genre that the author was writing in. Therefore, cognitive mastery is an ongoing objective, though mastery of central key ideas and concepts is achieved on a daily moment to moment basis.
2. Students, at the end of a lesson or unit- if designed well- can predict the outcome of individual fiction/non-fiction writings as well as the types of themes that are developed by individual authors (e.g. Dickinson's preoccupation with death).

Lesson Modifications

1. Since the goal of nearly all of the lessons was to reach consensus on comprehension of the concept (i.e. attainment), and questioning was the means to that stated end, modifications came only in the form of moving up and down the taxonomic level that the original query was designed to elucidate.
2. Lesson plans were continually modified and changed, primarily in terms of the questions anticipated by me and then re-directed towards the students.
3. Lessons were only modified if consensus, the end concept was not attained, (i.e. the next lesson

would then begin exactly with that previous concept attained or not attained yet).

4. Time scheduled concepts were monitored and built upon, but concept attainment (consensus of) was a realistic goal considering the class size (only five students).
5. Strong points of each lesson usually came in the form of the instances wherein a question was phrased/framed in a manner in which the student was able to make the Gestalt connection to concept and instant comprehension was attained. Weak points, therefore, were defined as incomprehensible questions leading to greater confusion rather than situational clarity.

Chapter Seven: Findings and Implications

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to reconcile the findings of my classroom performance assessment as witnessed by the two *Praxis III* assessors, the district *Pathwise* assessor, and the two building administrators with my criteria based paradigmatic frame of departure; each assessor's frame of reference will likewise be speculated upon, along with possible reconciliations of my own criteria with broader educational (and political) standards (read I will answer research question number one). Ultimately, this chapter drives at the essence of curricular alignment of all teacher performance standards by suggesting specific solutions on the national, state and local levels that would facilitate higher order thinking, reading, and writing skills.

Reconciling Multiple Assessment Rubrics

Research question # 1: Can *Pathwise* (district), the State of Ohio (proficiency tests/learning outcomes), and *Praxis III* standards be reconciled into one functional cover-all assessment device that can be reflected upon daily?

Since the scope of this action research project was an amalgamation of personal desires to improve my methodological delivery while attempting to meet administrative edicts in the four (*Praxis III*) domains, in this section, I will discuss to what extent those ends were met.

The *Educational Testing Service* created the *Praxis III* authentic classroom assessment device to augment the already existing *Praxis I* pre-service portfolio assessment (in place in most teacher education programs) and the *Praxis II* National Teacher Exam (the comprehensive paper/pencil test). The purpose of the *Praxis III* is to determine if the first year rookie teacher can evince satisfactory skill levels in each of the four following domains: (A) ORGANIZING CONTENT KNOWLEDGE FOR STUDENT LEARNING; (B) CREATING AN ENVIRONMENT FOR STUDENT LEARNING; (C) TEACHING FOR STUDENT LEARNING and (D) TEACHER PROFESSIONALISM.

Throughout the remainder of this section, I will be using emboldened letter abbreviations to the left of the paragraph(s) discussing each particular section. I will designate the *Praxis III* P., followed by the Domain **A.-D.**, then the subsections will be given numbers **1**; hence *Praxis III*, Domain A, subsection one, would be designated **P.A.1**.

P.A.1 In domain (A), under "Organizing Content Knowledge..." comes subsection number one; *becoming familiar with relevant aspects of students' background knowledge and experiences*. There is a direct correlation between this assessment criterion and classroom videotaping, since it becomes readily

apparent (on tape) when a teacher has done his/her homework in gaining personal insight into student interests, motivation, and familial SES. When student “D” is asked to relate a literary analogy to a similar skill used as an attorney, or student “C” is asked to relate a philosophical concept to a team mentality applied in sports, the evidence of this advanced preparation becomes a tangible factor.

P.A.2 Under subsection two, *Articulating clear learning goals for the lesson that are appropriate for the students*, the intended area being assessed becomes slightly nebulous- since, what is clear to an evaluator or even a rookie teacher may not be clear to a student (on the particular day of evaluation) being observed- as satisfactory evidence of the teacher meeting this criteria.

Here videotaping multiple lessons in a unit becomes a decided advantage when working with thematic concepts such as “Romanticism” which may not become crystallized until mid-way through or nearing the end of a unit. Since the weight of national certification is resting on only two days (one class period per visitation) worth of classroom snapshots (*Praxis III* assessments), the teacher must either choose, lower order, simplified concepts for the instructional period or interrupt the larger educational portrait (being strategically created and orchestrated in segments designed to come to fruition as an epiphany by students).

Furthermore, students may have a very vague conception of how the rules of a genre apply to a heretofore unseen work; therefore- not until they actually have interacted with said illustrative texts, does that semantic differentiation validate reader pathos and become a worthy abstract concept retained. Likewise, the word appropriate conjures up images of Piaget, Erikson, Dewey and a host of other educational theorists that ask teachers to constantly evaluate the readiness of a student to grasp an abstract concept. However, as Vygotsky and Benjamin aptly pointed out, sometimes it is necessary to immerse a pupil in a new concept in order to create the “gestalt” from the new construction- where no prior visible evidence existed that the pupil was ready. Without question, videotaping multiple lessons can produce far greater evidence of an accurate student prognosis than can a simple preliminary interview question lightly probing the topic.

P.A.3 In subsection three, *Demonstrating an understanding of the connections between the content that was learned previously, the current content, and the content that remains to be learned in the future*, we also see a clear advantage in creating a running commentary- even if for only one class period. When the triangulation of the first *Praxis III: Record of Evidence* (APPENDIX F) suggested a decent 2.5 (or “C”) rating of my American Literature Revolutionary Period Unit and a second observation (different assessor) score of 3.0 on my Poe Unit, I began to realize just how accurate my misgivings about single observation assessments were. After two subsequent viewings of each lesson assessed, wherein multiple references of the part (the author) to whole (the course) picture connection was stressed, my hypothesis- based on my own student teacher assessments of pre-service

teachers is that both assessors were keyed into only the initial introduction of the lesson segment, not the examples and clarifying questions that were interspersed throughout each observation period.

P.A.4 Regarding subsection four, *Creating or selecting teaching methods, learning activities and instructional materials or other resources that are appropriate for the students and that are aligned with the goals of the lesson*- biases, training and teacher philosophy strongly affect. During both post-observation interviews with the respective *Praxis III* assessors, it was made manifest that not only teaching style preferences and philosophy were divergent, but also my overall political ideology was being scrutinized. The first assessor (came in Fall '99'), an older male high school teacher of English from a parochial school, shared many of my Thomistic and Neo-Platonic views of education, though not necessarily my Socratic method. He, responding favorably to my conservatism, rated the delivery of my Revolutionary Unit into a solid 3.0, which I genuinely think needed to be improved (see A1 in Appendix B).

Conversely, the second assessment (Spring 2000) was performed by an older, decidedly liberal, female middle school teacher that clearly preferred student centered learning activities- not as strictly related to the text and issues. Total misalignment of ideology, methodology, and the culpability/accountability (needed on the student's part) ensued. An educational divorce court would have proclaimed our irreconcilable differences; yet, I believe that I accurately judged, by my own rubric, the Spring 2000 observation lesson's delivery as a stellar performance when compared to the first observation in the Fall.

As an aside, and to bring the building *Pathwise* mentor teacher into the fray (also included in APPENDIX F), she too, using the identical *Praxis III* rubric, wanted to see differing (from Socratic) methods and activities relating to lesson delivery. Concomitantly, I later learned from a district curriculum coordinator, she too was given an administrative edict to stress alternative teaching styles to match diverse learning styles. Without bemoaning the ramifications, suffice it to say, I see 11th grade literature courses as needing to be firmly grounded in the textual transcript written on the page- not vague generalities unsubstantiated- and Socratic Methodology delivers the empirical subtleties specifically.

Additionally, reading and writing skills can not be taught without sticking close to the printed word published. A home economics teacher, with no formal assessment training, given a dictum to follow does not warrant teaching efficacy introspection on my part. For the record, this was her only formal teaching suggestion, though she was a helpful affable resource for other general school related procedural task explanations (read, helpful colleague).

P.A.5 Dovetailing with subsection four, subsection five *Creating or selecting evaluation strategies that are appropriate for the students and that are aligned with the goals of the lesson*, delineates many of the underlying issues present when using the single observation; if there is no formative evaluation being pressed into service during this very brief snapshot (less than 40 minutes), it presupposes then you are deemed uninformed as to the rate of student progress. By focusing on the level of Bloom's

Taxonomy addressed, the professional educator is constantly analyzing such disparate factors as student schemata internalized (broad categorical conceptualizations) with the rate of retention being constructively layered upon. Socratic discussion formatively measures summative skills and cognitive internalization incrementally (i.e. again, I take issue with the accuracy of rating overall teacher competency using this ill-conceived category).

P.B.1 Upon closer inspection of Domain B, “Creating an Environment for Student Learning” again we find politically correct labels given to highly subjective, poorly measured, subsections. For example, subsection one, *Creating a climate that promotes fairness*, seems straightforward and innocuous enough; I interpreted this, based on the *Praxis III* guidebook, as giving (in fact I require) all students an opportunity to participate in every facet of the classroom instruction taking place. To a great extent, in fact, this was part of my aim for improving instruction in each student’s zone of proximal development (see Pedagogical Skills Honed section of this chapter).

Given that the first assessor understood, and appreciated, my methodology (i.e. working from the student’s highest level of current comprehension [the question’s aim] to the next level of cognitive abstraction in the zone of proximal development), it was not surprising that I received a just 3.0 score on my questioning. Since the first lesson was only three days into the semester and course, I felt I was not only genuinely focussed on my personal questioning objectives, but that, upon viewing the taped segment, I also was fairly rating my own ability to be metacognitive; which was a boon to the initial project undertaking.

After almost a hundred (93) viewings of the lessons leading up to my second assessment and countless minute changes to my questioning techniques, somehow, paradoxically, I was given only a mediocre 2.5 rating by the Spring 2000 assessor. Possible explanations? The first reaction to most disappointments normally are not empirically sound observations, so I discounted pop-culture/correct politics in favor of attempting to understand the assessors point of departure for this subsection.

Given that she had zero prior information of any of the students previous classwork or working knowledge regarding each student’s cognitive ability to articulate their own thoughts, let alone a thorough understanding of all of the research on questioning - nor the dynamic already in place amongst this cast (my class), my intuition interpreted this anomaly as an attempt on her part to protest the three girls operating at a lower level of cognitive abstraction. Her protest was seemingly (to the casual observer) a clearly laid out educational axiom; you must have a minimum 90 second wait time, and possibly as much as three minutes, before rephrasing the question or moving on to the next student. I do not doubt the validity of this research applied to the context it was designed for- checking student comprehension of clearly conceptualized concrete concepts that could easily be culled from listening in class or reading passages wherein no new vocabulary or terminology was introduced.

I, do however, take issue with applying this research carte blanche to all questioning situations in light

of the following overarching concerns: 1. Incorrect overgeneralizations (misunderstanding the part to whole relationship) create slightly more than ignorance embellished with a better vocabulary and confuse the other students and themselves. 2. The students unable to, at least, apply the knowledge (fact memorized) to their own schemata (read, relevance and constructivist relationship to other concepts) will gain nothing from guessing without these guidelines.

Therefore, students need this higher order thinking modeled first or they will only be overly stressed by experiencing the failure. Yes, on earlier questioning attempts I did wait.

Just as no coach would ask a beginning basketball player to dribble between the legs while running-without first mastering the essentials of dribbling in place, I will not set students up for clear failures by asking them to perform operations three steps beyond their ability -without first asking them to master the next sequential level of critical thinking difficulty. *For a reasonably complete overview of the seminal research on questioning strategies see the “Questioning Strategies” research reviewed in chapter two.

P.B.2 *Establishing and maintaining rapport with students*, subsection two amounts to a footnote and off the cuff comment by the assessor that I hesitate to even review, due to its nature. Tersely stated, I don’t believe this category should be observable as part of a pre-planned observation. If a teacher is focussed on instruction (and a question distribution category already exists) then in-class discussions of students’ outside-of -class interests shouldn’t be taken up as instructional time. How would a one shot observation possibly capture all of the hours spent speaking to students about personal quandaries in the hallways before, during, and after school bells ring? Furthermore, the fact that 153 identifiable videotaped analogies directly related to an existing rapport with all students that already (and were easily singled out) is documented exists- only strengthens my position that a videotaped portfolio should be the cornerstone of certification/licensure level teacher assessments.

P.B.3 *Communicating challenging learning expectations to each student* , subsection three, is not only readily apparent when viewing any given videotaped lesson segment, but is substantiated during each round of questioning with minute by minute “challenges”. Ironically, the second assessor here rated my “probing question” at a higher 3.0 mark than did my more methodologically aligned first assessor (2.5). Here, he tertiarily observes my questioning of an unprepared student who has not read the selection being explicated whereas the second observer notes “actively asks”. Somewhere along the line, teacher intent, motives and classroom activities must converge into a tangibly observable product... Like a cross-examination from an overzealous prosecuting attorney hell bent on getting to the facts, my Socratic intent screams “challenging”; I therefore discount these superficial facile attempts at measurement as inappropriate for my, or any, purposes.

P.B.4 *Establishing and maintaining consistent standards of classroom behavior*, referred to in subsection four, similarly must be interpreted within the context. In a Socratic Dialogue, the observable

essential truths are sought as a foundation for creating a detailed, well-documented, blueprint of knowledge- centered around an issue. Erroneous beliefs can not be ferreted out and dealt with unless students feel “intellectually safe” to pursue these ends. Considering the scope of this heading, and the fact that both assessors keyed into the students behavior as telling evidence, this category needs to be either rephrased as percentage of students “off-task” or the assessors need to focus on teacher actions that truly affect students.

I can promote and maintain consistency via my own actions, but, as the dearth of research on public school videotaping tends to indicate, this (teacher assessment) is truly an area to fear administrative abuse in. Where do we begin discussing, at what age (given the rights of adults) children are to be held culpable for their own actions- and how much of this appropriate behavior should parents be held liable for? I had no behavior problems- all students were engaged- though I expressly accept only limited credit and liability for either appropriate or inappropriate student behavior.

P.B.5 Subsection five, *Making the physical environment as safe and conducive to learning as possible*, though it should not have been evaluated (I was a floating teacher at the time), since I couldn’t affect any physical change of the surroundings- nonetheless is an area where videotaping could possibly lead to uncovering a potential safety hazard. Though one would tend to think that a careful periodic check of safety considerations would yield an accurate analysis of potential student hazards, it might be fruitful to see human subjects moving about within the confines of the area to isolate unforeseen ergonomic considerations.

P.C.1 Section C, “Teaching for Student Learning”, subsection one, *Making learning goals and instructional procedures clear to students* is generally less subjective than previous categories, easier to quantify, in terms of specific actions performed by the teacher and behaviors illustrated by students- all of which lends itself to stop-action video analysis. If interpreted literally, this component of instruction has two natural outcroppings: 1. Directions stated by the instructor, and 2. Modeling the appropriate response being requested of the pupil.

Verbal directions given to students can be endlessly honed by the instructor- if one were to videotape, and then watch the same set of instructions being stated to, several groups at the same developmental level during different time (or class) periods. Applied to this situation, a goal oriented reflective teacher could continually refine his/her vocabulary (synonyms easily understood) as well as developmentally appropriate analogies that relate to the paradigm (SES, geographical, etc...) that the particular group of students is working from. Unfortunately, due to the nature and limits of this experiment (since instructions for heretofore unheard directions only happened once during the course before moving up to a more complex task) the project did not lend itself to this goal.

On the other hand, modeling the appropriate responses being sought can be observed for clarity of both example and non-example of the task by introspectively breaking the task down into its component

parts. For instance, in lessons (videotapes) five through eleven there is an explicitly stated underlying reference to the “five paragraph essay structure” which continually is refined via the sieve of abstract conceptualization, practiced both in student essays (summatively graded) and examples of paragraphs (to be included in future essays) generated by students; which I repeatedly modeled on the chalkboard. After considering the level of student ability to recreate the layout (purpose driven) of each individual paragraph, as it pertains to the intent of their own thesis statement or topic sentence, the videotaping yielded a decided advantage here (in specifically reviewing each example generated and its commensurate level of effectiveness) which in turn could be re-created during the subsequent lesson.

P.C.3 *Making content comprehensible to students*, the aim of subsection two, was an integral component to my own instruction aims, hence the labeling of each cognitive level of “Bloom’s Taxonomy”. Interestingly, though the *Praxis III* guidebook also aims to assess this higher order thinking phenomena, in neither the Fall nor Spring assessment were either assessor concerned with anything more than mere very concrete questions of fundamental comprehension. As such, both assessors rated my skill at disseminating knowledge a 3.0 - but neither was concerned with the student’s ability to accurately articulate something other than an oversimplified generalized gist of the differentiations being sought.

Ergo, if the criteria here was, could a student generate an answer generally related to the question (in their own imprecise vocabulary), once I framed an analogy in their paradigm- then I was accurately assessed. If the criteria was inversely applied to read, could students repeat specialized words relating to literary terms/devices, skills, or concepts on cue (without comprehending the meaning of their answers) then I was similarly treated fairly.

However, in the first scenario, if students are simply responding to egocentric questions about their own life’s issues, without empathizing and relating to the parallel drawn out (in the literature under discussion) or using the appropriate terminology, then what have they learned or I accomplished? The second scenario, I liken to learning the words to a song without comprehending its meaning; Don McLean’s “American Pie” lives on (like great literature) though few remember its original intent as homage to Buddy Holly; “bye, bye, Miss American Pie...” most college students could complete the lyric. However, the real question in critical thinking is, could the apt pupil describe what “...but the levy was dry...” represents metaphorically?

Though many of the earlier assessment questions I have currently placed under indictment for overstepping the boundaries of what can accurately be empirically assessed- in this category, I see the intent of this measuring instrument (content comprehension) being misaligned with the end result desired (critical thinking); in summary, none of the four domains in the *Praxis III* rubric are designed to differentiate between rote recitation/vague generalization and abstract levels of analysis- which videotaping facilitates. * A more in-depth discussion of this misnomer will occur in the Pedagogical Skills Honed

section of this chapter.

P.C.4 Though the next subsection makes an attempt to capture the essence of critical thinking, *Encouraging students to extend their thinking*, it doesn't define what end result is supposed to be achieved. Specifically stated, "extend" and refine are not synonymous. Extend has no result in mind- only the idea of continuation is expressed. This is not a semantical difference when assessors key on words like "add" and "think" (see C3 summary in APPENDIX F) rather than phrases like "break it down further", "categorize", "evaluate" which I use in these lesson segments to refine generalizations. If we want specifics to be measured, we need to create categories designed to measure specifics that- at minimum- differentiate between the appropriate time/place to use analysis (break it down on your own), synthesis (generate new/unheard examples) and evaluation (create new categories, of your own to use in measuring effectiveness) -and not the more simplistic knowledge (memory), comprehension (uncontextualized definitions) and application (repeat an example already stated) levels of knowledge.

The only danger here, which I will address in terms of responsibility/accountability is, were this category to be more specifically phrased (with the commensurate assessor training), it might be tempting to the assessor to do as they've done in previous categories and measure student responses, rather than the level of questioning attempted by the teacher. This current administrative thinking (holding only teachers accountable for results) is totally incongruent with all current research showing the myriad factors that influence educational outcomes. Essentially, a student's prior training and current ability are mediated by such disparate factors as SES, mother's level of education, and, as Aristotle pointed out two millennia ago- internal motivation! Current US Department of Education literature revolves around getting the third party (parents) involved in the educational process.

P.C.4 Again subsection four, *Monitoring students' understanding of content through a variety of means, providing feedback to students to assist learning, and adjusting learning activities as the situation demands*, leaves me wondering what "the situation" is referring to. Are we simply asking if the stated lesson plan's objectives are being met (today's small piece of the pie) -or- do we make our transitory lesson goals subservient to (the end of course results in) this moment by moment revisionary process? I opt for the latter. Understandably, any evaluator must look at stated lesson objectives as a barometer against which to gauge effectiveness, but here's where overarching knowledge of course goals and methodology must be considered by the evaluator (i.e. another subject specialist must fully comprehend my Socratic methodology, Thomistic Philosophy and the end result of the course- to improve students' abilities to think critically, first orally- then epistolarily).

If all of the aforesaid considerations are not firmly entrenched in the evaluator's mind then what ensues is a measure of how well your methodology, philosophy, and overarching course goals meet their conception. Which- in the case of a home economics or middle school teacher trying to evaluate complex thinking process and a student's ability to clearly articulate those concepts on paper- becomes

a totally subversive farce to the entire process of teacher improvement; for it asks you (the instructor with advanced methodological training) to revert to oversimplifications and redundancies to accommodate the uninformed, somewhat pedantic, assessor's deficiencies in your methodological area of expertise. This is ridiculous!

Even in the case of my previously described, reasonably aligned (first *Praxis*) assessor, personal beliefs and stigmatism did influence his analysis: Was I covering the authors whose thinking and craft he valued? No. Was I trying to present the information in a way that would easily facilitate student memorization of key facts? No. Did I give positive feedback to clearly off-track student responses to my queries? No. Did I present the same information in the same manner that he would have presented it? No. Was I trying to accomplish any of these objectives? No. Was I being judged by my own lofty standards? No. Again, I argue for trying to accomplish the stated course objective; students should be able to break down complex issues via critical thinking and evince that knowledge by creating clearly lucid (specific to author/theme/genre) essays which convey the intricacies of those conceptual ideas.

If the classroom 'read throughs' (students read aloud/we discuss seminal ideas) were not observed by the assessor (step one), but the classroom discussion- designed to aid in essay organization (step two) is- without considering the final product, the essay (step three), then how can any mention of assisting or adjusting of learning activities be justified? Would a coach make any drastic changes to the player lineup on the football field if they were temporarily losing this game, but the same lineup proved unbeatable in every prior game during the season? Videotaping provides a tremendous boon to sequential task analysis in terms of having the entire course context in mind (by frequently reviewing all tapes in a series).

P.C.5 *Using instructional time effectively*, is the focus of subsection five. This category is easily assessed by the casual and infrequent observer, as well as through self-analytical videotaping. For my purposes, isolating the appropriate times and points of instruction in which to foster critical thinking at the higher levels of the taxonomy, I chose to create an interaction analysis chart borrowing from the self-analysis conceptualization of Gunter and Reed (see page 23 of chapter two).

Although rough numerical statistics stating this number of level four (analysis), five (synthesis), and six (evaluation) questions (all higher order questions) is slightly less than 10 percent (9.75%) of the total volume of questions- the more telling statistic is the fact that all of these higher order questions required far more time, skill, and articulatory ability in an effort to fashion an answer (i.e. these were student, not teacher framed responses). Considering about five minutes is lost per class period doing administrative/organizational tasks, and I spoke approximately 53% of the time on average, the length of response time is clearly increasing as the level of the taxonomy increases (i.e. there exists a positive correlation). *See tables on page 149.

P.D.1 Section D "Teacher Professionalism" is more of a post-session information-gathering category

for the Praxis assessor than a tangible measurement of effective classroom practices- and therefore only has limited use to the practicing teacher/self-assessor. However, even though segments of this domain were covered by myriad other subsections falling under other domains, subsection one, *Reflecting on the extent to which the learning goals were met*, does ask the assessed teacher to label specific segments of their lesson design with concretely conceptualized educational terminology to their respective evaluator.

Table 1: Student Response Elaborations

Taxonomic Level of Questions Per Level	Number of Questions Total Response Time (min.)		Duration of Re- sponse Per Question (sec.)
Knowledge	91	5.63	3.2
Comprehension	413	48.11	6.99
Application	311	114.13	22.02
Analysis	60	38.21	38.21
Synthesis	11	5.13	28.0
Evaluation	15	13.79	55.16

Table 2: Instructional Emphasis of Lesson

<i>Lesson</i>	<i>Purpose</i>	<i>Lesson</i>	<i>Purpose</i>
1	Review	7	Read/Review
2	Review	8	Introduction
3	Essay Dev.	9	Read/Review
4	Introduction	10	Read/Review
5	Essay Dev.	11	Essay Dev.
6	Introduction	12	Review

* When the nature of the lesson is considered as being conducive to higher order critical thinking, such as essay development, then the statistical breakdown of time spent on task is an even more meaningful statistical expression (compare to Table 1).

P.D.2 There is a clear responsibility here, on the teacher's part, to master the vocabulary of the professional assessor- if one wants to be viewed as a professional instructor familiar with the language of their craft. Some of the terms that I used during the post-assessment evaluation were: formative/

summative, verbal feedback, theoretical constructs, observations, reflections, metacognition, student groupings, student activities, skill competency, consensus, methodology, pedagogical philosophy, etc... all of which favorably affected the assessors summative evaluation of my, *Demonstrating a sense of efficacy* (subsection two).

P.D.3-4 The last two subsections of the domain are as follows: Three, *Building professional relationships with colleagues* -and- *Communicating with parents or guardians about student learning*, are areas which have no clear correlation to videotaping classroom instruction due to the focus on affective intangibles outside the classroom; these are assessments (again unjustly included) based solely on the post-observation interview.

Therefore, **research question #1.** Can *Pathwise* (district), the State of Ohio (proficiency tests/ learning outcomes), and *PraxisIII* standards be reconciled into one functional cover-all assessment device that can be reflected upon daily? – is not a realistic possibility, considering the diverse points of instructional reference and measurement devices.

Multiple Assessment Implications

The obvious implication in reconciling multiple assessment rubrics is that there can be no agreed upon criteria between the teacher being assessed and the assessor if there is no dialogue clarifying conceptualizations of categories to be assessed prior to these observations. The second offshoot to this same issue of misalignment comes in the form of norming the assessment device to clearly defined methodology that is alignment with teaching styles and philosophical beliefs regarding the nature and delivery of classroom instruction.

Simply stated, these outside assessors must have advanced pedagogical training in the area methodological teaching styles and the underlying philosophical tenets thereof- before evaluating an orange on the qualities of a Kumquat! Once this issue is addressed, and the major teaching methodological camps are represented with separate evaluation criterion- then other issues such as the ethics of measuring teachers- based on student actions and behaviors- can be disentangled before the teachers (unions) and administrators square off in court, and finally decide whether ETS really is the “God” of education (or just a thinly masked administrative teacher compliance governing body designed to push only “liberal” educational aims).

Educational Administration Aims

Research question #2: Is public school teacher videotaping an effective method of self-assessment documentation with regard to administrative educational aims? In this section, the focus of videotaping

classroom instruction will be dwelt upon as either being in concert with administrative concerns, of no benefit (or neutral), and, in a few cases, possibly a hindrance to the process of keeping teachers aligned with chain of command hierarchy. Unfortunately, the principal of the high school was unable- even after repeated invitations- to come into my American Literature course (being videotaped) and instead chose to evaluate a creative writing course that I was also teaching during the same semester; therefore no triangulation with his perspective of my own metacognitive assessment (of the videotaped American Literature course) exists. However, the following are all valid reasons that educational administrators in secondary public education should strongly consider, at least piloting (for further study), teacher video taping:

1. Set of dialectical notes (running commentary on student progress) which allows speculation about solutions; for instance, vocabulary reticence as a result of whole language instruction is now documented on videotape – lesson one.
2. Allows specific student skill deficiencies to be identified such as reading comprehension (discussed as a running commentary from lesson one).
3. Connections of inter-related skills such as reading comprehension, vocabulary assimilation, critical thinking and writing skills – lesson one.
4. Observation of student posture, attitude and attentiveness (can be clearly observed – lesson one and three) in relationship to analogies (question frames).
5. Specific teacher frustrations can be isolated and discussed with administrators (student discipline issues to apathy) – lesson one.
6. Balanced positive and negative reinforcement can be shown within context to head off parental criticism – lesson two.
7. Instructors can check and re-check earlier prognosis with later epiphanies (once new conceptualizations become crystallized) – lesson two.
8. Likewise, larger orchestration (longer time periods) can be viewed as a whole; like an orchestra leader saving the crescendo for the finale – lesson two.
9. Instruction can be individualized much easier than memory alone – based on video – lesson two, three, and six.
10. Specific methodology (Socratic questioning in this case can be proven either effective or ineffective) – lesson two.
11. Evolving dynamic group changes (learning conceptualizations can be easily identified) – lesson three.
12. Links to specific educational research dynamics can be easily pinpointed – lesson three.
13. Student connection to personal issues (emotions) can be identified as motivational factors to build on – lesson four.
14. Student trust in the teacher can be easily documented at critical junctures where new skills are being

honed and old inaccurate ideas are dispelled – lesson four.

15. Components of difficult, sequentially progressive conceptualizations can be schematically mapped (and diagnosed if faulty) – lesson five.
16. Unclear instructional phrasing can be easily ferreted out and changed prior to teaching similar lessons – lesson five.
17. Pacing of correctly phrased questions, answered correctly shows student confidence in taking risks (critical thinking) – lesson five.
18. Specific teacher training (classroom practices) can be traced by identifiable oral or written teacher commentary – lesson six.
19. Basic student academic behaviors, such as patience, can be fostered by keeping previous lessons fresh in the students' minds – lesson six.
20. A greater sense of trust in the students to develop their own conceptualizations (mastery on their own) – lesson seven.
21. Inductive and deductive lessons can be contrasted for situational effectiveness – lesson eight.
22. Teachable moments (reinforcement of previous learning, such as literary terminology) can be more easily identified – lesson eight.
23. Repetition, re-teaching, needs can be gauged – lesson eight.
24. Modeling of specific skills can be continually honed and revised – lesson ten.
25. Multi-grade level concerns can be tracked more easily – lesson eleven.
26. All of the information gleaned from videotaping can be used to custom tailor continuing teacher training – lesson eleven.
27. State learning goals and student performance outcomes can be specifically documented by teachers and verified by administrators – lesson twelve.

I mention the creative writing course to illustrate several, what I believe to be, telling considerations in administrative assessment: First, are there any student (leading to), parent (calling), board of education member (calling), superintendent (calling), principal concerns? After speaking to a plethora of administrators in public education over the past five years (many in my own education administration classes at the graduate level), one thing is crystal clear; lawsuits scare the hell out of all administrators!

The second, well known, factor along the same economic continuum is test scores. Test scores dictate state and federal dollars that benefit and also, when high scores have been attained, allow a modicum of autonomy from the state to be maintained. I don't mean to oversimplify or trivialize the tediously difficult job of being a public school administrator. I respect sensible, effective administrators orchestrating divergent factors tremendously, but I also realize that a teacher's classroom practices are seldom scrutinized without an underlying economic reason. Principals envision their job as seeing to it that the school runs smoothly, from heating system and maintenance to teaching and students, while keeping their

eye on the larger financial picture.

With the administrative paradigm squarely defined, I can confidently say that even though the principal came in as part of a regularly scheduled visit, his intent was to see if I was meeting the minimum acceptable standard of my job performance- including whether I was able to effectively teach highly abstract skills and concepts through sophisticated questioning techniques; *clear evaluation procedures, providing frequent feedback to students, encouraging learning environment, and independent student thinking* were all singled out as commendable areas of my administrative evaluation. However, all other categories were checked off as being effective (see appraisal form in APPENDIX F).

Conversely, the principal is also concerned with monitoring, evaluating, and keeping the teacher in compliance with other areas not associated directly with instruction, such as: *Staff Relations, Parent-Community Relationships, Professionalism, and Personal Qualities*, since teachers must work as team within the building; many of these categories were checked as unobservable.

Under: *Personal Qualities*, “is reliable in performing non-instructional duties”; under *Professionalism*, “Performs assigned duties and complete reports accurately and on time”, “Serves on district and building committees”; under *Parent-Community Relationships*, “Supports school and/or community activities” “Communicates positively with the community about the school, the district, and the educational program”; and under *Staff Relationships*, “Accepts and profits from supervision”, “Assumes fair share of responsibilities for schoolwide activities”, “Works cooperatively with colleagues and administrators” - are all illustrious examples of the types and kinds of activities that administrators are concerned with- not directly related to instruction.

When the Southwest Licking Local Schools’ standard teacher appraisal form creates only one page of categories relating to instruction -and two defining other non-teaching duties assigned the teacher, it is fairly easy to assume, 1) that administrators are concerned with teachers doing administrative work more than teaching and 2) that due to the sheer volume of administrative tasks and concerns, they wouldn’t be all that receptive to spending any more time evaluating teachers than the law mandates.

Considering the request to glean administrative input was asked for prior to the school year, in fact during the interview process before being hired, I felt that I made it very clear that this project was an important consideration in my accepting the position. Nonetheless, after the school year was over, I found myself in the unenviable position of having no administrative evaluation of any of my videotaped lessons. The assistant principal finally acquiesced in early June 2000 to view one of the American Literature videotapes and write up the standard evaluation form (previously described).

Though she tacitly states that she feels the videotaping lacks enough clear contextualization of the educational situation (in the classroom)- she doesn’t check off unobservable in the following categories: Sound knowledge of subject, prepares instructional activities to meet individual differences, provides clear explanations and instructions, uses varied and adaptable teaching techniques, provides frequent

feedback to students, provides an environment that encourages learning, respects, understands and likes children, maintains professional rapport with students, and promotes respect among students towards learning. She even checks commendable for, maintains a consistent and fair approach in dealing with students, plus she encourages independent thinking and problem solving category.

Objectively speaking, classroom videotaping- though it meets or exceeds many of the aims of classroom instruction frequently dwelt upon by teachers and outside assessing agencies (focussed on instruction)- does not offer any significant time/money advantage to the administrator (in fact it does the opposite) and therefore shouldn't be counted on as a possible source of support for this type of assessment- though many educators concerned with improving instruction (and thus test scores) may not oppose this extra effort on the teachers part.

Educational Administration Implications

Research question #6: How will my conclusions affect my administrator's plans to implement this technology as a staff development project? The most obvious implication to be addressed with regard to future teacher/ administrator alignment on issues of instruction is for administrators to be clear about their economic concerns and teachers to be equally clear about their instructional concerns. If administrators are viewing their school buildings simply as another business, with employees to be manipulated toward economic ends, while teachers are concerned with issues of student comprehension of concepts and skills mastered- there is an obvious curriculum misalignment here.

The beginnings of addressing this problem would be for school districts to stop their promotional mentality from being extended to future administrators who lack any in-depth pedagogical knowledge of diverse methods of delivering instruction (i.e. stop promoting physical education teachers who are good with discipline, but lack in-depth multi-discipline teaching knowledge).

Secondly, school districts need to be clear about their overall outcome (the quality of the students produced) by administrators asking themselves whether they want to run scared from liberal parents and teachers threatening lawsuits (which have a stranglehold on middle school methodology) or resign themselves to delivering test results (which the majority of elementary and high school curriculums revolve around). If administrators simply wish to avoid lawsuits, then holding teachers accountable for results becomes a ludicrous undertaking considering keeping parents and students happy and entertained is the reality and learning the joke.

On the other hand, if district level administrators are willing to make proactive curriculum choices that meet with success- then two essential ingredients must be in place:

1. Every grade level must be assigned an equitable portion of the educational pie; this means most of the current middle school "student centered" practices must be re-evaluated to reflect parity within the

larger student final product (no whole language, reading comprehension and writing must be taught, and student responsibility gets stressed equally at every level, etc...)

2. Teachers who are working towards that final educational goal must be rewarded with, at minimum, a positive evaluation. Teaching, not administrative duties, here need to be focussed on; this can only be accomplished by knowledgeable (in terms of classroom instruction) administrators genuinely understanding a teacher's personal classroom aims and then assisting that instructor in that method of delivery. Support, then, of these individual teachers working towards a common goal- becomes a natural out-cropping when parents or students rebel against the higher standards (and they will until solidarity is achieved).

Furthermore, and directly to the point of this study, videotaping provides more- not less- information (a movie) central to improving classroom instruction than does the occasional administrative evaluation (a snapshot). Deanna L. Nekovei's (1997) 24 teacher study entitled, *Assessment of Beginning Teacher Performance Utilizing Video Technology*, clearly specifies, "In sum, it appears that videotape performance assessment that uses a holistic scoring scale is a viable and cost effective method of teacher evaluation". The only caveat here is, as I stated, the administrators must be familiar with differing methods of instructional delivery involved in effective clinical supervision in order to be capable of reaching the same teacher ends (i.e. student outcome). *See examples of teaching styles in the definitions section. Therefore, **research question #6**, How will my conclusions affect my administrator's plans to implement this technology as a staff development project? – remains an inconclusive finding considering the various interpretations of the time and effort versus money continuum.

Pedagogical Skills Honed

Research question #3: Can my own questioning and framing skills be honed and improved to target higher order thinking skills, in light of the constraints that the assessment and outcome rubrics (#1&2 from above) place on my lesson plan designs?

With questioning and framing (of questions) skills firmly anchored as the focus of this study, the most appropriate method of explicating my pedagogical ends is by viewing the larger critical thinking spectrum (Bloom's Taxonomy only labels the components) in terms of its dimensions and end result aspirations. As is the case with all learning, critical thinking too asks the learner to build sequentially on component skills mastered before moving on to a more complex procedure (skill) or concept and eventually to mastery that holistically showcases this learning.

Considering the larger overview, just stated, one of the most elementary of the critical thinking skills I began working with, early on in the course, was distinguishing the tacitly stated fact from opinion and

vice versa; in the case of the former, students were asked to recall pertinent clearly germane information from the texts read versus remembering summative generalizations regarding a character's behavior (within a story) for instance. Because character analysis requires both an ability to cite facts plus make a reasonable generalization about that character- here is where a large portion of the course time was spent.

With only minimal prompting, students were able to make generalizations about what they had read by ruminating the essence of the details just passed over. Conversely, the opposite was not true. Without digressing into multitudinous factors of this fact, suffice it to say that, the students had not, along their educational journey, been asked to provide any proof to support unfounded generalities; this was the beginning.

One of the effective strategies that I employed was to ferret out the root of student thinking Socratically. Since the advent of the "MTV generation" students, more often than not, tend to view the world through a sociocentric pop-culture lens that stresses instant gratification. Independent "free-thinking" is therefore a seldom asked for (by parents running to and from work, etc...) until educational requirements, such as creating a clearly thought out, articulately phrased essay, demand this skill. Unfortunately, many steps must be taken en route to developing confidence in reason over social propaganda. Initially, this Socratic process involved exploring underlying feelings associated with the issues being embraced by this course.

If refining generalizations and avoiding oversimplifications was the macro ability, what were the skills leading up to this ability? Essentially these skills boiled down to clarifying and analyzing the meanings of words or phrases (yes, they needed to understand the new vocabulary), developing criteria for evaluation (e.g. how do these characters rate in terms of moral consensus?), evaluating the credibility of one character's feelings towards another (perspective), questioning the significant issues raised in didactic texts, and comparing and contrasting ideals with actual practice; all of this, taken collectively required "questioning everything" as a starting point.

If "MTV" is not the authority in terms of rational reasonable thought based on meritocracy, then conceptualizing this type of thinking is best accomplished, in this course, by looking at the American authors that epitomized this "enlightened, Age of Reason" empirical process. Once the shaping contributions of these seminal authors' thoughts were contrasted with the nouveau rich mentality, then a thorough breakdown of egocentric perceptions could be contrasted with reality; whereas Jefferson and Franklin modeled clear headed open hearted thought for all-mankind, Emerson and Thoreau illustrated the schism between group-think and free-thinking (self-reliant) models.

By the mid-point of the course, the post-modernist chaos mantra, "I should get anything I want, simply based on my wants" was en media res being replaced by a tolerance of rational meritocratic axioms. Not only were the students' own ideas and vague platitudes repeated, but the incipient thought

processes were vague conceptions of my ideas as well. By now, the skill of being able to accurately diagnose student educational needs was quickly being replaced with a prognosis for connecting thought to feeling.

For any aspiring educator reeling from the divergent factors that influence the classroom practices the professional educator must be adept with, let me now draw psychological skills into the admixture. Without understanding the pervasive egocentric “I WIN-YOU LOSE” mentality present at Kohlberg’s (Webb, 1996) fourth level of morality, Piaget’s concrete (read literal interpretations) stage, or Erikson’s (Webb, 1996) conceptualization of progressive stages of intellectual development, then I wouldn’t begin to apply reality therapy to a high school English course. Concomitantly, were I not willing to describe these roadblocks as resistance to educational change, on the students’ part, then I would be in need of therapy.

When, throughout school the public school system, teachers ask students to memorize only the absolutely essential information covered (which teachers provide with little student effort), parents take little time with their children to augment the educational process (due to current economic and social conditions), and children likewise are allowed to run free (seeking only their own immediate gratification) without having to work for/at anything given to them, then it’s no great surprise that they don’t want to think for themselves. Nonetheless, without student thought, any student essay is nothing more than a pre-fabricated teacher conceptualization of an issue.

How then do we get students to suspend judgement and re-think conclusions constructively- based on new evidence that controverts the old? One effective method to expose these irrational ideas is via teacher restatement of student sentiment. Often this technique alone has netted impressive results wherein students frequently chortle aloud at their own ridiculous incongruencies. However, for more deeply held irrational beliefs, a tightly focussed discussion of group benefit vs. consequence needed to be concretely labeled; in these pursuits, I frequently (and sometimes a student) would play devils advocate.

During the height of defending their erroneous beliefs and feelings toward other groups, I would apply their self-same standard to the other party. For example, when students would fail to provide specific examples from the text that illustrated their essay thesis, when queried, they would reply, “I don’t know”. Coming out of their own mouths, this statement sounds right at home. Applied to the adult world, parents, teachers, employers- all the students agreed, was unacceptable. My analogy (and thus mirror of) to them was, “So, when you ask me what your grade is, It’s okay if, I don’t know”? Consistent principles modeled by my classroom demeanor coupled with continually requiring a sustained systematic student effort ultimately, after better than half a semester, allowed these initially concrete thinkers to move into the realm of abstract thought- and thus begin crafting self-directed essays designed to unmask authorial intent in a given work.

Even with shaky intellectual confidence in place, students were now able to generate their own essay ideas based on myriad themes that had been explicated during the process of 'read throughs'. Once the genesis of the concept was of their own schemata (related to personal knowledge constructs), I began the process of supporting the thesis generalization by breaking the statement into at least three key points illustrative of the generalization (and subsidiary student point of view). Next, the three pieces of evidential support were fashioned into topic sentences relating back/supporting the thesis. From here, students were asked to provide examples to support their constructivist conceptualization (i.e. quotes were needed).

With quotes, paragraph topics, and an idea to glue it all together came the arduous task of asking students to draw from our in-class Socratic discussions to deductively arrange facts under their subsidiary generalization and articulate these ideas in a comprehensible manner-using the English Language properly. Yes, it's true, up to this point in the semester, I hadn't asked students to write but a few times (three)- but, up to this point, students weren't internally motivated to share their own personal perspective. Therefore, students didn't really care whether the ignorance of the proper use of the language detracted from their own voice as a writer because, it wasn't their ideas being voiced.

Up to this point, videotaped lesson segment were tremendously beneficial to me in terms of gauging my prowess at discourse against the student's existing frame of reference, but once the concept of essay layout congealed in the students mind, their own epiphanies provided the impetus for expression through the written word. All proceeding student leaps in ability were subsequently measured in written articulatory responses (the essay format became the focus of the last third of the course).

Now that students believed they had something important to say, and an empirical method of doing so (via the Socratic dialogues) other tertiary issues at the sentence level could be dissected and broken down into easily digestible parts. Subject specific vocabulary here becomes simply a question of whether the terms (and corresponding ideas) have been used continually throughout the course- even though the vocabulary, literature, and for that matter, the course text has been approached in a heretofore largely apathetic manner.

Reinforcing the Socratic mode of questioning now becomes the basis for individual sentences designed to convey specific hierarchical relationships illustrating the part to whole nature of the entire document. The payoff for asking for proof of ideas along the way, comes now if the student has been astute in noticing the repeated words (or similar synonyms) used as past illustrations (key quotes) supporting themes. Usually, at the initial stages of essay development, I will have asked students to write down at least three key quotes that are obvious examples of the authors theme (and intended messages). Now the students have a basis of judging a quality example that draws its strength from the facts it makes clear- rather than second hand information, opinion or a mis-leading statement from another character in the text.

Nearing the end of the course, the process of developing ideas, formatting them, and sticking to the objectives could then be simply referred to periodically as the student was in the various stages of developing the piece. Viola! More time spent early in the course on fundamental thinking skills and clarifying concepts equals less teacher effort in generating answers (that students can simply memorize) and greater student achievement at the end, in terms of self-styled conceptualizations- since they now possess the tools necessary to learn on their own.

Therefore, **research question #3**, Can my own questioning and framing skills be honed and improved to target higher order thinking skills, in light of the constraints that the assessment and outcome rubrics (#1 & 2 from above) place on my lesson plan designs? – yes, my questioning and framing skills were improved though, many of the external constraints placed on my lessons were made subordinate to my own pedagogical concerns.

Pedagogical Implications

The clearest implication to this section comes in the form of the personal responsibility needed on the part of every teacher to understand that learning is a sequential process of building up skills connected to more and more abstract concepts. Therefore, not only should teachers understand each underlying skill needed to perform at the next progressive level of instruction, but teacher education programs should put greater focus on the diagnostic abilities that their graduates should possess. Meaning, we should be training student teachers to diagnose the larger semantical breakdowns in terms of the highest cognitive abilities that students clearly possess (i.e. don't expect students to write paragraphs if they are not competent at the sentence, or, worse yet, the word level).

Videotaping Considerations

Research question #4: What physical ways will I have to amend my teaching (e.g. classroom movement and voice projection) in order to work effectively within this video medium? The most fundamental of all considerations in any endeavor to improve one's self is a clear conceptualization of what you hope to achieve. Once this objective is known, then an exploration of personal beliefs must be forthcoming; if you don't understand your current ideological ends, then improving skills towards those ends becomes an exercise in futility. An objective (appropriate for a rookie teacher) might be as simple as improving the clarity of verbal instructions given, provided that the teacher his/herself had a clear conceptualization of how a clearly phrased explanation was measured. If it was measured according to an ideological perspective defined, say, through a speech course, then vocal inflection, body posture, rate and clarity (word speed and choice) might be isolated as factors to look for; if the measurement followed current educational trends, perhaps pupil ability to demonstrate mastery of the specified skill would be targeted.

Here, I wish to illustrate a paramount consideration; pupil performance in a group situation, where oral or kinesthetic factors are being observed can be an affective information gathering tool and possibly it could be used as a summative assessment- but educational change needs to be measured academically as the professional endeavor that it is; document your philosophy, methodology, and specific pedagogical ends you are working towards ahead of time or you will be held to somebody else's standard.

With the caveat given, once a teacher understands exactly what end result they are aspiring to, and the measurement thereof, an advanced organizer of specific actions or behaviors needs to be created as a focal point. Now come the tangibles such as camera angle, point of focus, volume, etc... Initially at least, regardless of the intended unit of measurement chosen, a teacher must see themselves in action (even if student behavior/actions are deemed more important)- there may be a surprising effect to seeing yourself in action.

Research question #5: What technical problems will I face/troubleshoot that might be beneficial to other educators wishing to replicate my research undertaking? To videotape yourself, I recommend "blocking" the scene as if on a theatrical stage: First, mark the edges of the area of the classroom that you normally travel. If generally you know you are going to be presenting a great deal of information on the chalkboard, then place X's on the floor at the edges of the area and then have someone close to your approximate height walk between the marks while you adjust the focal point of the videorecorder from the back of the room. Usually, you'll want the tripod height set between three and four feet for an eye level camera angle. With this type of setup, the automatic focus feature (present on most modern cameras) will keep the picture clear as long as you make no rapid movements (walking and writing stay in focus). The only conceivable problem here could come from the less emphatic, soft-spoken oration on the teachers part, since the built in microphone is going to be affected by proximity.

The second useful camera angle to include in your repertoire would be the side angle shot that captures all of the action in the classroom- both student and teacher. The obvious drawback to this focal point is the reasonably distant horizon line; you will probably need a minimum of 10 feet (probably 15) of unobstructed space from the subjects to the camera in order to affective use this shot. If you can move all of your students into the last three rows of a thirty-foot wide classroom- this shot will give a clear depiction of both teacher actions and student reactions. Again, I recommend blocking off the scene and adjusting the camera (ready to go, set on pause) prior to filming the lesson.

The last camera angle can also be useful if simply observing student behavior during a lesson; the "Podium" front view gives the teacher an opportunity to specifically tailor the camera view to the specific subject(s) being observed. Normally, less than a third of the students attempt to answer all of the questions staying actively engaged, but if you wished to observe the unnoticed behavior of other students, this pre-determined camera angle could be beneficial.

* For all other videotaping assessment considerations refer back to the section of the same name found in chapter two.

Reconstructing the Project

The following are the progressive levels of this project's development:

1. I became interested in improving classroom instruction via questioning/framing
2. I collected background information through my graduate level professors
3. I researched Questioning/framing and related areas (see chapter two)
4. I began to reconcile my own educational beliefs and methods with the research
5. I conceived a hypothesis that included my beliefs and the existing research
6. I created a short questionnaire to test my hypothesis on a small sample group
7. From the pilot study, I conceived a study to measure the intangibles in question
8. The conceptual paradigm (prospectus) was refined and modified by committee
9. The appropriate approvals were garnered and consent was given via IRB
10. The lessons were strategically videotaped to illustrate all facets of the study
11. I continued to research, reconcile my beliefs and practices throughout,
12. While outside assessors were brought in to triangulate (validate) my paradigm
13. Upon completion of the information gathering stage, I began to review journal
14. Daily journal entries were stitched together to create emergent patterns
15. From the patterns, categories for my concluding discussion were fashioned
16. Feedback from committee mentors was sought on the layout of write-up
17. The final product (dissertation) was laid out in sections according to purpose
18. Drafts were drawn, revisions made, conclusions presented before
19. Pre-printing (final edit) approval from a key mentor was given
20. The final draft was printed, research defended successfully and...
21. Technological changes were met before the degree was conferred

Work Cited

American Educational Research Association. (1992). *Ethical standards of the American Educational Research Association*. Washington, DC: Author.

American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, National Council of Measurement in Education. (1985). *Standards for educational and psychological testing*. Washington, DC: APA.

American Federation of Teachers, National Council on Measurement in Education, National Education Association. (1990). *Standards for teacher competence in educational assessment of students*. Washington, DC: Author.

Barrett, J. (1970). *Individual Goals and Organizational Objectives*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, Institute for Social Research.

Bloom, Benjamin S., & Krathwohl, David R. (1956). *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: The Classification of Educational Goals, by a committee of college and university examiners*. New York, Longmont, Green, 1956.

Blumberg, Arther. (1980). *Supervisors & teachers: A private cold war*, (2nd ed.). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.

Blumberg, A., & Jonas, R.S. (1987). *Permitting access: The teacher's control over supervision*. Educational Leadership, 44(8), pp. 58-62.

Bonwell, Charles C., & Eison, James A. (1991, September). *Active Learning: Creating Excitement in the Classroom* (Report No. RI88062014). Washington, DC: George Washington University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 340 272).

Brumbaugh, Robert S. (1982). *Whitehead, Process Philosophy, and Education*. Albany, SUNY Press, 1982.

Buck, Rachel. et al. (1992). *Teachers' Goals, Beliefs, and Perceptions of School*

Culture as Predictors of Instructional Practice (Report No. SP034243). San Francisco, CA: American Educational Research Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED352359).

Bussis, Anne., & Chittenden, Edward. (1971). *Open Education: Research and Assessment Strategies* (Report No. PS005408). Minneapolis, Minn: National Association for the Education of Young Children. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED060932).

Butroyd, B. (1997). *Are the Values of Secondary School Teachers Really in Decline?* Educational Review, pp. 49, 251-8.

Cardellichio, T. L., & Field, W. (1997). *Seven strategies that encourage neural branching.* Educational Leadership, 54, 33-6.

Carnegie Forum. (1986). *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the Twenty-First Century.* Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy's Task Force on Teaching as a Profession.

Clearing House. (1993, August). *Teacher Questions and Schema Activation.* The Clearing House, 66 (6), pp.349. Retrieved December 14, 1999 from EBSCO database (Masterfile) on the World Wide Web: <http://www.ebsco.com>

Clyde, Glenda. et al. (1994). *Assessment is Epistemic and Heuristic: The Role of Video Tape in the Public Speaking Course* (Report No. CS508843). New Orleans, LA: Speech Communication Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED380826).

Denner, Peter R., & Rickards, John P. (1987). *A Developmental Comparison of the Effects of Provided and Generated Questions on Text Recall.* Contemporary Educational Psychology, 12 (2), pp. 135-146.

Dobson, Russell, & Dobosn, Judith. (1983). *Teacher Beliefs-Practice Congruency.* View-points in Teaching and Learning, 59 (1), pp. 20-27.

Dwyer, Francis. (1971, July) *Effect of Questions on Visualized Instruction.* Journal of Psychology, 78, pp. 181-183.

Galas, C. (1999). *The never-ending story? Questioning strategies for information age.*

Learning and Leading with Technology, 26 (7). pp. 10-13.

Garner, Ruth., & Alexander, Patricia. (1982). *Strategic Processing of Text: An Investigation of the Effects on Adults' Question-Answering Performance*. Journal of Educational Research, 75 (3), pp. 144-148.

Grasha, Anthony F., & Yangerber-Hicks, Natalia. (2000, Winter). *Integrating Teaching Styles and Learning Styles with Instructional Technology*. College Teaching, 48 (1). pp. 2-11.

Gray, Dennis. (1988). *Socratic seminars: Basic education and reformation*. Basic Education Issues, Answers, and Facts, 4 (3). p.23.

Gunter, P. L. & Reed, T. M. (1996, March). *Self-evaluation of instruction: A protocol for functional assessment of teaching behavior*. Intervention in School and Clinic, 31, p. 225.

Instructional Innovation. (1987, September). *The Use of varied interactive questioning strategies with feedback in improving posttest Time efficiency during visualized instruction*. Journal of Instructional Psychology, 24 (3), pp.207. Retrieved December 14, 1999 from EBSCO database (Masterfile) on the World Wide Web: <http://www.ebsco.com>

Jensen, Rita. et al. (1994). *Fear of the Known: Using Audio-Video Technology as a Tool for Reflection in Teacher Education*. St. Louis, MO: American Teachers of English.

Leming, James S. (1995). *Reflections on Thirty Years of Moral Education Research*. Moral Education Forum, 20 (3), pp. 1-9, 15.

Lickona, Thomas. (1991). *Educating for Character. How Our Schools Can Teach Respect and Responsibility* (Report No. ISBN-0-553-07570-5). New York, NY. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED337451).

Martin, E. & Mayerson, E. (1985, November). *Video interviewing: An effective technique for aspiring job seekers*. Journal of Education for Business, pp. 57-59.

Martin, Jack. (1979). *Effects of Teacher Higher-Order Questions on Student Process and Product Variables in a Single-Classroom Study*. Journal Educational Research, 72 (4), pp. 183-187.

Nekovei, Deannal L. (1997, November). *Assessment of Beginner Teacher Performance Utilizing Video Technology*. Research in Education.

Rosenshine, Barak. (1976). *Recent Research on Teaching Behaviors and Student Achievement*. Journal of Teacher Education, 27 (1), pp. 61-64.

Slavin, Robert E. (Ed.). Educational Psychology: Theory and Practice. (5th ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Smith, D. (1996). *Peer coaches' problems with videotape recording for teacher observation*. Action in Teacher Education, pp. 18-27.

Smylie, M. A., and Conyers, J. G. (1991, winter). *Changing Conceptions of Teaching Influence: The Future of Staff Development*. Journal of Staff Development, 12 (1), pp. 12-16.

Veuglers, Weil, (1995). *Teachers, Value Stimulation and Critical Thinking*. Chicago, IL: American Educational Research Association.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society. M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, & E. Souberman (Eds.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wager, Walter, & Mory, Edna. (1992). *Feedback, Questions and Information Processing—Putting It All Together* (Report No. IR015775). Iowa: Convention of the Association for Educational Communications and Technology. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED348038).

Webb, L. Dean, et al. (Eds.). (1996). Foundations of American Education. (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Wylie, R. C. (1974). *The self-concept, revised edition*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Zirkle, P. A. (1996). *The Law of teacher evaluation: A self-assessment handbook*. Topeka, KS: National Organization on Legal Problems of Education.

APPENDIX A: PILOT STUDY

APPENDIX A

Teacher Attitudes Towards in-class Videotaping: An Action Research Project

By Al Alberts

RETURN TO AL ALBERTS' MAILBOX - 604 ALLEN HALL

BACKGROUND: Over the past ten years videotaping students, student teachers, and even veteran teachers has become a more accepted method of collecting classroom performance data; From self-analysis using set criteria, to peer review, to supervisory assessment and longitudinal studies, videotaping, for all of its inherent strengths, still has not met with widespread acceptance in the classroom as a teacher assessment device. It is legal to videotape in a public arena. It is increasingly being used to identify and prosecute students endangering other students- on this basis alone, it will certainly become a more prevalent practice. The questionnaire that follows is designed to capture teacher attitudes concerning the use of classroom videotaping. Moreover, I personally plan to follow through on any emergent pattern coming out of the results of this questionnaire in developing my doctoral thesis.

TEACHER VIDEOTAPING: effective classroom assessment tool?

Using the Likert scale: 1. Very negative 2. Somewhat negatively 3. Neutral 4. Somewhat positively 5. Very positive, please complete the following inventory from this frame of reference; How would unobtrusive videotaping affect (or relate to) your performance in the following areas:

1. Your ability to raise standardized test scores?
2. Your ability to create consistent classroom standards?
3. Your ability to improve your administrators future evaluation?
4. Your ability to accurately describe immoral/illegal student behaviors to administrators and parents?
5. Your ability to quantify subjective areas of teaching?
6. Your ability to identify discriminatory practices?
7. Your ability to defend your classroom practices to parents, the public or media?
8. Your ability to target students for academic intervention (i.e. remediation/tutoring)?
9. Your ability to further individualize instructional strategies?
10. Your ability to share (workshop) "best teaching" practices with peers?
11. Please characterize your political outlook (1 being very liberal - 5 being very conservative).
12. How many years have you taught?
13. What is your age?
14. Please circle: male/female
15. Please describe the level you teach at.

* In the space provided below, or on the back of this paper, please add any further questions or comments that might improve or validate this research instrument.

Rationale

As a doctoral student in curriculum and instruction interested in maximizing teacher effectiveness, it seems blatantly logical to create opportunities for teachers to improve their own instructional techniques; In the past, this has been accomplished solely from editorial commentary generated by administrators and/or students. The problem with this system is twofold: 1. Memory becomes selective after a period of time (and therefore more subject to immediate emotional contextualization). 2. This critique does not take into consideration, nor delegate the responsibility to, the respondent teacher in terms of stylistic conceptual approaches. Self-analytical teacher videotaped assessment addresses both the need for immediate feedback as well as empowers that teacher to refine his/her own teaching persona- before presenting the results of this effort to their respective administrator. The added boon to adopting this method of self-evaluation lies in the concrete images created, that may later be workshopped as "Best Teaching Practices". Towards these ends, my exploratory inventory on teacher attitudes' concerning the effectiveness of this metacognitive technique seeks to isolate and identify specific areas of resistance to and desire for such a system.

Questions

The questions for this interest survey were generated by carefully reviewing the available current literature (articles published within the past 15 years) and gleaning the essential areas of accepted usage as well as the resistance (legally and ethically) to said usage - hopefully framing these legal/moral issues (in question form) in the process. All ten of these issue-oriented questions (1-10) additionally have been identified by The Harvard Law School's educational law division as being definitional in defending the legality of this practice. Questions 11-15, on the other hand, were designed to be exploratory descriptors that might, at some point in the future of this research endeavor, be given the causal status role of dependant variable. * The entire questionnaire appears as an addendum to this document (see back page).

Methods

Rather than relying on others' innate interest in this topic of research or the tenuous relationship request for the compliance of professional acquaintances, in 95% of all of the 46 questionnaires returned, I prefaced my request with "could you take just a couple of minutes to fill out this questionnaire on teacher attitudes toward videotaping for me now?" While respondents filled out the survey, I busied myself with other activities in an attempt not to be obtrusive or influential. Since the questionnaire neither asked for names nor reasoning behind the answers given, I feel my physical proximity did not create any undue anxiety affecting my respondents. The research alluded to in this text was

performed during the last two weeks of November and the first two weeks of December 1998. Once I felt I had adequate representation from both genders, public and higher education, rookie and veteran teachers, I examined the frequencies for each question and began looking for the mediating effects of questions 11-15 on questions 1-10. The final comparison grouping of the data will be fundamentally explicated in the "Interpretation" and "Conclusion" sections of this essay.

Results

Beginning with the demographics to greater conceptualize the responses:

N=27 female respondents (#14) with 11.6 years average teaching experience (#12). The median age of these respondents was 39.2 years of age (#13) with the following teaching background (#15): four taught elementary, three taught at the secondary level, and 20 taught in higher education.

N=19 male respondents (#14) with 12.4 years average teaching experience (#12). The median age of these respondents was 47.4 years of age (#13) with the following teaching background (#15): eight taught at the secondary level and 11 taught in higher education (none taught at the elementary level).

In response to question #11, I have averaged the male central tendency = 3.3 and the female central tendency = 3.0 to illustrate the older, more conservative nature of the males' answers; The complete frequencies of response (including #11) appear below:

N = 19

Males Likert:	1 very negative	2 negative	3 neutral	4 somewhat pos.	5 very positive
QUESTION	RESPONSE	RESPONSE	RESPONSE	RESPONSE	RESPONSE
#1	0	2	11	5	1
#2	0	0	6	8	5
#3	1	2	5	5	6
#4	0	0	3	8	8
#5	1	2	4	10	2
#6	0	1	4	11	3
#7	0	0	1	12	6
#8	1	1	8	7	2
#9	1	4	6	5	3
#10	0	1	2	8	8
#11	2	1	8	6	2

- For layout purposes, so that a side by side comparison may be made, the female response table appears on the proceeding page.

N = 27

Females	1	2	3	4	5
Likert:	very negative	negative	neutral	somewhat pos.	very positive
QUESTION	RESPONSE	RESPONSE	RESPONSE	RESPONSE	RESPONSE
#1	1	2	20	4	0
#2	0	1	12	11	3
#3	0	4	5	13	5
#4	0	2	5	9	11
#5	0	1	11	12	3
#6	0	0	5	14	8
#7	0	1	3	17	6
#8	1	0	11	12	3
#9	2	0	9	14	2
#10	0	0	3	15	9
#11	1	10	7	6	3

Interpretation

Out of this admittedly limited data set come several trends that warrant further study with greater numbers to determine the validity of this pilot study. However, for the purpose of identifying patterns of responses, I will base my interpretations on the top two most positive categorical responses (i.e. 4 and 5 on the Likert scale) that relate favorable approval for the practice stated within the question.

Based on the fact that the females in general were younger and more liberal than the male participants, they tended to be slightly higher in approving of using this technology (82% responded either 4 or 5) to identify discriminatory practices in the classroom (question # 6) –Vs- the males combined total of only 74% , using the same top two categories. Likewise, the female respondents were also a shade more willing to share “best teaching practices” (question #10) at 89% than the males 84% approval - though both responded very positively to this practice.

Conversely, the older, more conservative males were more willing to use the videotape technology to identify immoral student behavior (question # 4) at 84% -Vs- the lower female approval of 76%; Ironically, I see questions # 6 and # 4 as two sides of the same inappropriate behavior continuum separated only by the nature of the transgression.

Age, political outlook, and gender issues aside, both the males and females felt, at an identical 85% rate, that this technology could be well used to defend classroom practices (question # 7). Other than # 4, # 6, and # 10, none of the other questions (and practices questioned therein), received an approval rating over 67%. Still, the least favorable approval of practices identified in these questions bears exploration as well.

Both males and females failed to generate positive answers regarding raising test scores (question # 1); The males rated 31% and the females only 15%. Whether this means that they don't see an application of technology towards this objective, simply a negative outlook on this practice, or both, this was the most apathetic answer (with both males and females scoring very high numbers in the neutral category).

The next poorly received project for the females dealt with consistency (question # 2) gleaning a lowly 51% approval. Contrastly, the males scored this usage at a much higher 68% rate of approval. The next most coolly received practice for the males was question # 9 dealing with individualizing instruction at 42%. Inversely, the females had fewer problems with this application at 59% (though they too rated this usage far from the top of their respective agendas).

Conclusion

Whether the trends I have identified are justifiable conceptualizations or not, are and will be, subjects of conjecture until greater statistical significance is created through validation of a larger data base isolating dependant variables. Concomitantly, I also feel very strongly that gender oriented paradigms have increasingly (over the past 20 years) colored our collective objectivity in ways that can't be ignored by education or society at large. Hopefully, by isolating and identifying these gender variances towards the same educational end, we can all use this, now commonplace, technology to hone our collective teaching skills - and in the process come to realize that the classroom can no longer be thought of as an isolated area to conduct educational experiments. As teachers we must have professional growth that reflects the metacognitive process involving feedback; From this growth, the art of teaching as a performance will gain professional respectability and maybe in the long run the commensurate pay that it deserves.

APPENDIX B: AMERICAN LITERATURE COURSE GUIDE

AMERICAN LITERATURE I

Credit: 1/2
Length: Semester
Grade Levels: 11 and 12
Prerequisites: English 10

I. Course Description

This course includes American literature from the Early Native Americans to the Civil War period. Students will be provided with integrated language arts opportunities to improve skills in reading, writing, listening, visual literacy and oral communications. Short story, essay, poetry, drama, and the novel will be explored, interpreted, and analyzed. In addition, students will complete a variety of writings, such as narrative, expository, and persuasive, based on the literature. Instruction and practice in language structure and usage are included.

II. Course Objectives and Content Outline

A. Reading

The student will:

1. read, interpret, analyze, and discuss various literary forms (short story, poetry, essay, novel) which include but are not limited to the following authors and their time periods:

a . Puritans

- 1 .Smith
- 2 .Bradstreet
- 3 .Edwards
- 4 .Taylor

b . Revolutionaries

- 1 .Franklin
- 2 .Jefferson
- 3 .Henry

c . Romantics

- 1 .Whitman
- 2 .Dickinson
- 3 .Poe
- 4 .Hawthorne

d . Transcendentalists

- 1 .Emerson
- 2 .Thoreau

e . Pre-Civil War

- 1 .Twain**
- 2 .Crane**

- 2 . assess the validity of ideas and the quality of writing of a literary selection.**
- 3 . read to facilitate content learning.**
- 4 . read to develop an awareness of contemporary issues and relate them to issues of historical significance through their presentation in literature.**

B. Writing

The student will:

- 1 . write as a response to the literature using the following writing types:
a .persuasive
b . expository
c . narrative**
- 2 . display a knowledge of gathering research and evidence from the novel or other outside sources to support interpretations and analyses of literature.**
- 3 . use correct mechanics, usage, grammar, and spelling in written assignments.**
- 4 . display increased knowledge of a building vocabulary, much of which is obtained from the literature in the course.**
- 5 . determine patterns of organization appropriate to a writing topic.**
- 6 . develop organized pieces of writing which contain strong voice, clear theses, and well-developed ideas.**
- 7 . assess personal/peer revisions to a piece of writing.**
- 8 . apply an appropriate recursive writing process as suggested by the writing task.**
- 9 . write in various domains.**

C. Listening /Visual Literacy

The student will:

- 1 . listen to and view a wide variety of genres.**
- 2 . expand vocabulary through listening to and/or viewing varied media.**
- 3 . listen and view critically to facilitate learning across the curriculum.**
- 4 . participate and be involved in individual, small-group, and whole-group listening and viewing activities.**

D. Oral Communication

The student will:

- 1 . participate in the following activities that are related to the readings in the class:
a . discussion
b . drama**

- c . debate
- d .speech/ public speaking
- 2 . use oral communication for a variety of purposes and audiences.
- 3 . be involved in individual, small-group, and whole language activities.

III. Evaluation

Evaluation of the student may include, but not be limited to, the following:

participation in oral reading, listening, and class discussions.
work done by the student, including homework, tests, quizzes, exams,
projects, and reports.

PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES

AMERICAN LITERATURE I

** = strongly emphasized areas of course*

1. After reading a complete work of literature, the student will respond in writing, demonstrating an acceptable level of understanding of the material, as evidenced in part by the capacity to:
 - a. relate a personal experience or the experience of another, gleaned through literature, to the literary work;
 - b. compare and contrast the literary work to another which has been studied;
 - c. determine structural elements of the literature, including such areas as theme, characters, plot, setting, mood, and point of view;
 - d. recognize and interpret organizational patterns of writing to teacher satisfaction.
2. Presented with appropriate nonfictional selections, the student will demonstrate comprehension, as evidenced in part by the capacity to:
 - a. find major concepts by identifying stated or implied thesis, then differentiating between details that support the thesis and those that do not;
 - b. differentiate statements based on fact from statements based on opinion;
 - c. make predictions about whether certain information is likely to be included in material;
 - d. compare and contrast facts and events from one selection with facts and events from other selections, to teacher satisfaction.
3. Presented with everyday/functional reading materials, the student will identify, locate, and use information from libraries and other sources, to the teacher's satisfaction, as evidenced in part by the capacity to:
 - a. follow multiple-step directions;
 - b. develop directions for completing a basic task;
 - c. select and use appropriate reference sources and illustrative materials.
4. The student will respond to a variety of texts, including complete works, by generating interpretations using background knowledge and literary elements to determine responses, to the teacher's satisfaction.
5. When presented with a prompt designed to elicit narrative writing, the student will generate writing appropriate for the purpose of narration that demonstrates competence in the development of content and use of language, as evidenced in part by the capacity to:
 - a. develop a response that is related to the prompt;
 - b. prepare a fully developed beginning, middle, and end;

APPENDIX C: SAMPLE LESSON PLANS

APPENDIX C

April 10, 2000 American Literature I 2nd Period

Monday:

A Objectives, RLO# 2 & 4, PPO# 1

Procedures: Begin reading Poe's "Cask of Amontillado," identify elements of plot, setting, characterization, foreshadowing, and irony

JN: "Man is unjust, but God is just; and finally justice triumphs" H.W.L.

Text/Materials: pp. 208-212

Evaluation: Formatively discussed

Tuesday:

A Objectives, PPO #1, RLO #2 & 4

Procedures: Finish "Cask of Amontillado" noting the dialogue between Montressor & Fortunato

JN: "The ability to discriminate between that which is true and that which is false is one of the last attainments of the human mind." J.F.C.

Text/Material: pp. 212-221

Evaluation: Formatively discussed

Wednesday:

C Objectives, PPO #10, 11, 17, LLO #3 & 4

Procedures: Explicate, on board, setting, plot and characterization as they affect mood and tone of "Cask of..."

JN: "It is more dangerous that even a guilty person should be punished without the forms of law than that he should escape." T.J.

Text/Material: based on pp. 208-221

Evaluation: Note taking observed

Thursday:

C Objectives, PPO #10, 11, 17, LLO #3 & 4

Procedures: Finish explication of plot, using the five-act plot diagram, drawn on the board: then – review essay format

JN: “Nothing brings more pain than too much pleasure...” B.F.

Text/Materials: based on previous story

Evaluation: Note taking observed

Friday:

B Objectives, PPO #1, 5, 8, WLO #7, 8

Procedures: Individually workshop essay drafts of “A Cask of Amontillado” carefully noting the points developed in each body paragraph on plot, characterization and setting.

JN: “Courage is resistance to fear, mastery of fear – not absence of fear.” Mark Twain

April 24, 2000

American Literature I 2nd Period

Monday:

D Objectives, PPO #4, 11, 17, LLO #2,3,4, OLO #4

Procedures: Discuss text questions on “The Raven.” Collect textual evidence (cite text) of the speaker losing his lucidity.

Text/Materials: pp. 226

Evaluation: Written answers summatively graded

Tuesday:

D Objectives, PPO #4,11,17, OLO #4

Procedures: Discuss genres of writing covered thus far: essays (Jefferson & Paine), autobiography

(Franklin)- non-fiction, short (horror) stories (Hawthorne & Poe)- fiction, and
subject matter of the Romantic – vs – Transcendentalists

Text/Material: p. 254 and notes on the board

Evaluation: Observed notes taken

Wednesday:

A Objectives, PPO #2, RLO #2,4

Procedures: Begin Emerson's "Self-Reliance" essay reconciling his personal spiritual "transcendental"
philosophy with common public perceptions then and now

JN: The true test of civilization is, not the census, nor the size of the cities, nor the crop – no, but the kind of man
the country turns out." R.W.Emerson

Text/Material: pp. 250-257

Evaluation: Class discussion

Thursday:

A, D Objectives, PPO # 6,8,10,11,17, OLO #4

Procedures: Discuss Emerson's ideas and how they might be applied (questions on p. 258).

JN: "Whatever course you decide upon, there is always someone to tell you that you are wrong." R.W.Emerson

Text/Material: p. 258

Evaluation: Formative discussion

Friday:

D Objectives, PPO #4,11,17, OLO #4

Procedures: Classroom discussion: free thinking "Self-Reliance"- vs – ostracism and
isolationism

Text/Material: Based on text questions

APPENDIX D: PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORMS

West Virginia University

The Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects

DATE: February 28, 2000

NOTICE OF APPROVAL FOR PROTOCOL H.S. #14704

This research will be monitored for re-approval annually.
This protocol was first approved on February 28, 2000.

TO: Alan Alberts

Project Title: Teacher Videotaping as a Method of Self-Assessment
in Public Schools

SPONSORING AGENCY: DSRP

The Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Research Subjects (IRB) has approved the project described above. Approval was based on the descriptive material and procedures you submitted for review. Should any changes in your protocol/consent form be necessary, prior approval must be obtained from the IRB.

According to the Code of Federal Regulations, Section 312.32, investigators are required to notify the FDA and the study sponsor of any adverse experience associated with the use of an investigational drug that is serious and unexpected. A serious adverse experience is considered any event that is fatal or life-threatening, is permanently disabling, requires inpatient hospitalization, or is a congenital anomaly, cancer, or overdose. An unexpected adverse experience is an event that is not identified in nature, severity, or frequency in the current investigator brochure. Any experience reportable to FDA and the sponsor must also be reported immediately to the IRB.

A consent form X is is not required of each subject.

An assent form X is is not required of each subject.

A recruitment ad has has not X been approved.

Phone: 304 255-7575
Fax: 304 255-7425

IRB Office, 1 Ring Road, Room 402
PO Box 6845
Morgantown, WV 26506-6845

Equal Opportunity/Non-discrimination statement

Page 2-

Alberts
HS #14704

February 28, 2000

* Only copies of the consent and/or assent form with the IRB's approval stamp may be used with human subject research. It is the responsibility of the investigator to submit a revised consent form for the IRB's approval should funding be obtained. This stamped consent form must then be used for subjects enrolled. A copy of each subject's signed Consent/Assent Form must be retained by the investigator and accessible to federal regulatory authorities for at least three years after the study is completed.

Marian J. Turner
IRB/ACUC Administrator

MJT/baw

Assent Form

"TEACHER VIDEOTAPING as a METHOD of SELF-ASSESSMENT in PUBLIC SCHOOLS"

Introduction. I, _____, have been asked to be in this research study, which has been explained to me by S. Alan Alberts II.

Purpose of the study. I have been told that the purpose of this study is for my teacher (Mr. Alberts) to improve his teaching ability by recording our class on videotape.

Description of procedures. This study will be performed at _____ School. I will be asked to behave appropriately focusing on the lesson (not the camera). I have been given an opportunity to ask questions regarding this research. I understand that the focus of this study is the instructor's teaching behavior and actions; we, the students, are not the primary focus of this research.

Discomforts. Some of the questions (during this American Literature I course) will be difficult and I may not enjoy trying to answer them.

Benefits. I understand that this study is not expected to help me., but what they learn from the study may help other people.

Confidentiality. I have been promised that anything they learn about me in this study will be kept as secret as possible.

Voluntary Participation. I have been told I do not have to do this. No one will be mad at me if I refuse to do this or if I decide to quit. I have been allowed to ask questions about the research, and all of my questions were answered. I will receive a copy of this form after I sign it.

I willingly agree to be in this study.

Signature of subject

Date

Signature of Investigator or Investigator's Representative

Date

WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY
Institution Review Board for the
Protection of Human Research Subjects

FEB 28 2000

APPROVED

X
EXPIRES 2-28-01
H.S. # 14704

*version #3 3/1/00

PARENTAL or GUARDIAN CONSENT FORM

"TEACHER VIDEOTAPING as a METHOD of SELF-ASSESSMENT in PUBLIC SCHOOLS"

Introduction. I, _____, have been asked to allow my child _____ to participate in this study by S. Alan Alberts II, who is conducting this research study to fulfill the requirements for his doctoral dissertation in Curriculum & Instruction at West Virginia University, he has explained the study to me.

Purpose of the study. The purpose of this study is to learn more about public school teachers improving their own classroom teaching performance by assessing themselves in action using a videocamera to record the lesson.

Description of Procedures. This study will be performed _____ School. My child will be asked to behave appropriately focusing on the lesson (not the camera). I have been given an opportunity to ask questions regarding this research. I understand that the focus of this study is the instructor's behavior and actions; the students are not the primary focus of this research.

Risk and Discomforts. There are no known or expected risks from participating in this study, except for mild frustration, sometimes associated with performance when initially exposed to the videocamera. Alternatives. I understand that my child does not have to participate in this study.

Risks and Benefits. I understand that this study is not expected to be of direct benefit to my child, but the knowledge gained may be of benefits to others.

Contract Persons. For more information about this research, I can contact Mr. Alberts at (614) or his supervisor, Dr. Perry Phillips, at (304) 293-3637 ext. 6.

For information regarding my child's rights as a research subject, I may contact the Executive Secretary of the Institution Review Board at (304) 293-7073.

Confidentiality. I understand that any information obtained as a result of my child's participation in this research will be kept as confidential as legally possible. I understand that these research records, just like hospital records, may be subpoenaed by court order or may be inspected by federal regulatory authorities. In any publications that result from this research, neither my name nor that of my child nor any information from which might be identified, will be published without my consent.

Voluntary Participation. Participation in this study is voluntary. I understand that I may withdraw my child from this study at any time. Refusal to participate or withdraw will involve no penalty or loss of benefits for me or my child. I have been given the opportunity to ask questions about the research, and I have received answers concerning areas I did not understand. Upon signing this form, I will receive a copy.

I willingly consent to my child's participation in this study.

WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY
Institution Review Board for the
Protection of Human Research Subjects

Signature of Parent or Guardian

Date

FEB 28 2000

APPROVED

Signature of Investigator or Investigator's Representative

Date

X
EXPIRES 2-28-01
N.S. # 14784

*version #3 3/1/00

APPENDIX E: REFLECTION GUIDE

APPENDIX E

Master List of Daily Criteria to be reflected upon:

Framing the Context

1. Connecting to past class lessons with relevance stated?
2. Framing questions that relate to student knowledge?
3. Are students engaged in the issues of concept?
4. Are concept and skill attainment goals clearly laid out?
5. Is there a logical coherent lesson structure?
6. Is the whole (unit) to part (lesson) sequenced in a way that leads to analysis/synthesis of the concept using the identified skills?

Question Distribution

1. Are questions being equitably distributed around the room?
2. Are students encouraged to take risks and speculate?
3. Are students given positive reinforcement for genuinely attempting the questions?
3. Are negative (off task) answers being modified without derailing the lesson?
6. Are students at the top and bottom of the cognitive range being formatively monitored for concept and skill attainment?

Level of Taxonomy Addressed

1. Are analogies specifically addressing each responding student's cognitive ability?
2. Does each follow up question attempt to address the next cognitive level?
3. Does the lesson activity begin at a concept and skill mastery level?
4. Does the lesson activity/unit culminate in a higher level of cognitive mastery?
5. At the end of a lesson/unit, can students predict the outcome?

Lesson Modifications

1. Were the lesson goals met?
2. If the desired skill or concept was not evidenced by a skill or concept attained, were lesson plans changed?
3. What modifications were made to the lessons planned?
4. Were clear, time scheduled, concepts attained as planned?
5. What were the strong and weak points of this lesson?

* This rubric was only used as a guide.

APPENDIX F: ASSESSMENT REVIEWS: *PRAXIS III, PATHWISE AND
LOCAL SCHOOLS*

APPENDIX F

The Praxis III Assessment Process for Entry-Year Teachers

Central Ohio Regional Coordinator for Praxis III

(O) 614
(H) 614

1. candidate profile (pages 65 - 66 of OG) completed and forwarded to Ohio Department of Education
2. assignment letter sent to Praxis III Assessor with copy of candidate profile
3. letter sent to EYT (Entry-Year Teacher) with name of assessor and copies of:
 - class profile (pages 67 - 69 of OG)
 - instructional profile (pages 71 - 73 of OG)
4. assessor calls to arrange a mutually convenient time for visit
5. EYT, with copies to the principal and regional coordinator, receives confirmation letter regarding date and times for visit
6. for visit, EYT must have following prepared:
 - class profile (pages 67 - 69 of OG) on form sent by regional coordinator
 - instructional profile (pages 71 - 73 of OG) on form sent by regional coordinator
7. day of assessment visit (purpose of which is to gather data) requires:
 - 30 - 45 minutes for assessor to independently review:
 - ✓ class profile
 - ✓ instructional profile
 - 30 - 45 minutes for pre-observation interview (pages 75 - 77 of OG): EYT and assessor
 - 35 - 60 minutes (one complete class period) for observing a class selected by EYT (pages 79 - 80 of OG): EYT, assessor and students
 - 30 - 45 minutes for post-observation interview (pages 81 - 84 of OG): EYT and assessor
 - assessor leaves with NO feedback to EYT, mentor teacher or principal
8. following the assessment visit:
 - assessor independently completes a record of evidence based on all of the data gathered, using the scoring rules described at the end of each criterion (pages 85 - 96 of OG)
 - completed record of evidence is forwarded to the Ohio Department of Education with copy to the regional coordinator
 - Ohio Department of Education prepares final report of summary statements and ratings and sends report directly to EYT

State of Ohio
Department of Education

Susan Tave Zelman
Superintendent of Public Instruction

Professional Development and Licensure

Marilyn Troyer, Interim Director, 65 South Front Street, Room 1009, Columbus 43215-4183, (614) 466-2761

MEMORANDUM

To: Ohio Beginning Teachers
Participants in Entry Year Program

From: Rae Harriott-White, PRAXIS Program Administrator
Division of Professional Development and Licensure
Robert Hite, PRAXIS III Regional Coordinator, Central Region

Re: PRAXIS III Assessment Schedule/Materials

Date: Fall/Winter 1999

We hope your new teaching position is one that has been rewarding and that you are gaining confidence with each day. We appreciate your willingness to be a part of this Entry Year pilot program.

You should be working with your district mentor each week, and using him or her to support and assist you. As a part of this Praxis III pilot study, we will be having two assessments of your classroom teaching this year. This will NOT impact your state certificate, nor your district contract. Please view it as an opportunity for professional growth.

Enclosed are the Class Profile (gray), and the Instructional Profile (beige) that you will need to complete for your assessor prior to the pre-observation interview. After your assessor contacts you, please make arrangements to complete these two forms for the observation day.

Your assessor will be contacting you to set a mutually convenient appointment. Your assessor has been given a copy of your Candidate Profile and will be contacting you for an appointment and observation. Should you have any questions or concerns, please call Robert Hite, your Praxis III Regional Coordinator, at (614) 236-6135 or e-mail rhite@capital.edu

Thank you for your involvement in the Entry Year Program with the Praxis III assessment and commitment to the education of Ohio's students.

cc: Mentor

State of Ohio
Department of Education

Susan Tave Zelman
Superintendent of Public Instruction

Professional Development and Licensure

Marilyn Troyer, Interim Director, 65 South Front Street, Room 1009, Columbus 43215-4183, (614) 466-2761

MEMORANDUM

To: Stephen Alberts, Entry Year Teacher
From: _____, Praxis III Assessor
Re: Entry Year Beginning Teacher Assessment Confirmation
Date: January 3, 2000

We appreciate your commitment to the Ohio Department of Education Entry Year Pilot Project and look forward to observing you on this round using the ETS PRAXIS III Teacher Assessment Strategies. You should have received two forms that relate to this observation: the Class Profile and the Instruction Profile. Please prepare these for the teaching activity for the day of observation and arrange to either mail them directly to me, or have them available in the office prior to our meeting.

We need to have a Preobservation and Postobservation interview (25-45 minutes) in a location that is free from interruption and interference from the routine activity of the school day. During the interviews you will need to have release time from your normal classroom duties. Together we can arrange this with your building principal. Our schedule for the day of observation is as follows:

Date: Wednesday, January 19, 2000

- 6 : 45 Arrival at School Site/Report to Office
- 6 : 50 Preobservation Teacher Interview (25-45 minutes)
- 8 : 10 Classroom Teacher Observation (30-60 minutes)
- 9 : 30 Postobservation Teacher Interview (25-45 minutes)
- 10 : 15 Report to Office/Depart School Site

Should you have any questions or situations that relate to our observation, please contact me at:

_____.

Thank you for your assistance.

cc: _____, Principal
_____, Regional Coordinator

Praxis III Observation Confirmation Form

This form needs to be returned with your hard copy of the ROE to your Regional Coordinator. (NOTE: You will need the college/university information when you submit the Record of Evidence via Internet - in future this will be on the Candidate Profile.)

Candidate Name S. Alan Alberts II SS# _____
College of Education BA in Liberal Arts "English" } Marshall University, Huntington, WV
MA in Teaching "MAT" } WVU, Morgantown, WV
ED.D. CIBD in Curriculum & Instruction - WVU, Morgantown, WV State West Virginia

Assessor Name _____ RPDC #01

Date of Observation January 19, 2000

Check one: ☒ First Observation ☐ Second Observation

Please check that these events have occurred:

☒ Pre-Observation Interview

☒ Class Observation

☒ Post-Observation Interview

Signature: _____ January 19, 2000
Entry Year Teacher Date

Signature: _____ January 19, 2000
Praxis III Assessor Date

PRAXIS III: RECORD OF EVIDENCE

Candidate Name: S. Alan Alberts Candidate ID#: SS:
Assessor Name: Assessor ID#: RPDC #01 District: .
School: District:
Grades: 11th Subject(s): American Literature
Date of Obs. 01-19-00 Start Time of Obs. 8:17 AM End Time of Obs. 8:57 AM

[A] ORGANIZING CONTENT KNOWLEDGE FOR STUDENT LEARNING

A1. Becoming familiar with relevant aspects of students' background knowledge and experiences
Evaluation [2.5]

SUMMARY STATEMENT: The teacher demonstrates understanding of the importance of becoming familiar with students' background experience (The teacher has identified 80% of the students in the class to be in the average range; 10% above average and 10% below; 1 student has a learning disability), describes procedures for obtaining this information (The teacher claims to have learned about the students in this class through earlier reading comprehension practices in class), and has some familiarity with the background knowledge and experience of many students in the class. (T-"I know some students from previous classes I have taught." And "I know students outside of class in many different settings.")

A2. Articulating clear learning goals for the lesson that are appropriate for the students
Evaluation [2.5]

SUMMARY STATEMENT: The teacher articulates clear learning goals, appropriate for the students (T-"Students will gain an awareness of the social context that prevailed in Colonial America that led the Founding Fathers to revolutionary sentiment.") and offers an explanation of why they are important for the students ("This is the introductory lesson, seminal to the document under study, and the beginning of a chronological study.")

A3. Demonstrating an understanding of the connections between the content that was learned previously, the current content, and the content that remains to be learned in the future
Evaluation [2.5]

SUMMARY STATEMENT: The teacher accurately explains how the content of this lesson relates to the content of previous lessons (T-"A brief overview of Crèvecoeur's economic, academic, and social status was given as a contextual preface."), and fits within the structure of future lessons (T- "This introduction/overview establishes a baseline paradigm for the 'Founders' Writing") (T- "What the students know from previous discussions connects socially and politically to the times.")

A4. Creating or selecting teaching methods, learning activities and instructional materials or other resources that are appropriate for the students and that are aligned with the goals of the lesson
Evaluation [3.0]

SUMMARY STATEMENT: The teacher chooses methods, activities and materials (T- "Since the class is exceptionally small, a Socratically oriented discussion will be generated regarding the social and economic climate of the time period.") (T-"We will work through previously

written text questions, identify four social strata divisions, and locate specific passages from the essay.") (T-"I will use text, chalkboard and notes.") are related, aligned with the goals of the lesson and appropriate to the students in general. (T-"Text questions [1] seem to delineate the pattern of social classification, breakdown [2] stratification further to relate present social conditions; and relate specific information to both [1] and [2].") These methods, activities and materials seem to allow a differentiated learning experience for individuals. (T-"Small group size makes Socratic style most productive in seeing student understanding and consensus is possible.")

A5. Creating or selecting evaluation strategies that are appropriate for the students and that are aligned with the goals of the lesson

Evaluation [2.0]

SUMMARY STATEMENT: The teacher has a plan for evaluating student learning (Discussion is based on size and lesson plan grouping) that is aligned with the goals of the lesson and appropriate to the students. (Small group size offers the ability to use Socratic, consensus method.) (T-"Verbal evaluation today; a summative assessment is incorporated into the essay assignments.")

[B] CREATING AN ENVIRONMENT FOR STUDENT LEARNING

B1. Creating a climate that promotes fairness

Evaluation [3.0]

SUMMARY STATEMENT: The teacher appears to be fair in the treatment of students (The teacher uses both direct and indirect questioning to include all students.), encouraging positive as well as fair treatment (e.g. S-"Native Americans." T-"You've created a new category I didn't think of, good!") and actively promotes general fairness among students throughout the lesson. (While taking information for a chart on the chalkboard, T-"...including?..." [all students respond] "Okay, one at a time.")

B2. Establishing and maintaining rapport with students

Evaluation [2.0]

SUMMARY STATEMENT: The teacher establishes a basic level of rapport with students (T-"... write the quote on the board.") (The teacher speaks to one student, "What do you think? Do you agree? Can you add anything?") and shows evidence of interest in students involvement in class. (The teacher asks a question...waits...student responds, T-"You're right, you are absolutely right!") (T-"You wouldn't want the president to be an 8th grade dropout?!" Students laugh.)

B3. Communicating challenging learning expectations to each student

Evaluation [2.5]

SUMMARY STATEMENT: The teacher does nothing to communicate to any student that he or she is incapable of meeting learning expectations; and in fact makes attempts to encourage participation. (The teacher addresses , who has entered the class on his first day of this new course: T-"I know you didn't read it, but what do you think?")

B4. Establishing and maintaining consistent standards of classroom behavior
Evaluation [2.5]

SUMMARY STATEMENT: The teacher makes generally appropriate attempts to maintain appropriate behavior in ways that demonstrate respect for the students. (T-"... do you have your book? S-"I have a book." T-"I gave it to you yesterday." S-"Uh-huh.") (The students have good posture in class, enjoy a comfortable atmosphere and participate throughout the class.)

B5. Making the physical environment as safe and conducive to learning as possible
Evaluation [2.0]

SUMMARY STATEMENT: The teacher creates a physical environment that is safe and does not intentionally interfere with learning (The teacher travels to several classrooms. The classroom for this lesson is used for a large Health class. The teacher's American Literature class has six students. While they stayed in one section of the room, the teacher did not attempt to move them closer together nor closer to the chalkboard.)

[C] TEACHING FOR STUDENT LEARNING

C1. Making learning goals and instructional procedures clear to students
Evaluation [2.0]

SUMMARY STATEMENT: The teacher provides students information about the instructional procedures of the lesson (The teacher explains the format of quotations and discussion) (T-"I hope you see, by the way, I am drawing this [chart] up on the board as a way to have information to start you thinking about things for writing later.")

C2. Making content comprehensible to students
Evaluation [3.0]

SUMMARY STATEMENT: The content is accurate and appears to be comprehensible to the students. (T-"Read the quote, are there any ideas from yesterday?") (T-"Summarize ideas; what is the main idea?") (The teacher also repeats, restates and clarifies student answers.) (T-"Is that what we are saying?") The lesson as a whole was logical and had a coherent structure. (The teacher created a data chart while students answered; and the teacher asked every student to respond.)

C3. Encouraging students to extend their thinking
Evaluation [3.0]

SUMMARY STATEMENT: The teacher uses activities or strategies that are designed to actively encourage students to think independently, creatively, or critically about the content being taught. (T-"... read question #1; What do you think, ...?" "Anything to add ...?") (T-"So you believe what Jefferson says? ..., you did not read, I know, but what do you think?") (The teacher goes to the board, writes classifications. The teacher invites and adds student input.) (T-"Who do we not have?" "What does the author think, ...?")

C4. Monitoring students' understanding of content through a variety of means, providing feedback to students to assist learning, and adjusting learning activities as the situation demands

Evaluation [2.0]

SUMMARY STATEMENT: The teacher monitors students' understanding of the content. (T-"Anything to add?" "Do you think this is the case today?") The students receive feedback as necessary. (T-"Good point, good point; explain.") (The teacher writes all student data on the board. T-"That's right" nods in agreement as student talks.)

C5. Using instructional time effectively

Evaluation [2.5]

SUMMARY STATEMENT: The teacher provides students with activities of instructional value during the majority of the instructional time (The teacher provides quotations, procedures for answering questions and discussion opportunities.), and paces them appropriately. (Opening quote creates discussion, use of board chart illustrates for students the categories for discussion.) Non-instructional procedural matters do not occupy an excessive amount of time. (The small class size enables the teacher to keep students focused and to keep them engaged from bell to bell.)

[D] TEACHER PROFESSIONALISM

D1. Reflecting on the extent to which the learning goals were met

Evaluation [3.5]

SUMMARY STATEMENT: The teacher accurately identifies strengths (T-"Overall students stayed on task; the discussion had its own dynamic." "The verbal feedback was good. The evidence provided support, substantiation of theoretical constructs."), and weaknesses (T-"At times the students had ideas I hadn't figured on.") of the lesson in relation to the learning goals and describes in general terms how he could use the experience from the lesson in future instruction (T-"Perhaps I could use a stronger advanced organizer, though the Crevecoeur essay provides a good synopsis."). In addition, the teacher supports his judgments with specific evidence from the observation reflection. (T-"Students were able to come to consensus before moving to another issue." "I anticipated that once there were categories on the board students would fall in, indicating they stayed with the text.") (T-"The text framed issues fairly well and created a baseline.") (T-"Group size is an asset, a larger group would not likely have reached consensus; skill competency would be lower.")

D2. Demonstrating a sense of efficacy

Evaluation [3.0]

SUMMARY STATEMENT: The teacher suggests specific, practical actions that he intends to take to help specific students who are not meeting the learning goals. (T-"From her non-verbal cues, I think she might have a better chance to express herself in the essay. It will help if I help pick out differences of opinion she might have with other students.") (T-"I think is simply bored with these issues on which he has already conceptualized.") (T-"I will follow up with each student as much as possible to customize the essays to reflect the facets of their interests.")

C4. Monitoring students' understanding of content through a variety of means, providing feedback to students to assist learning, and adjusting learning activities as the situation demands

Evaluation [2.0]

SUMMARY STATEMENT: The teacher monitors students' understanding of the content. (T- "Anything to add?" "Do you think this is the case today?") The students receive feedback as necessary. (T- "Good point, good point; explain.") (The teacher writes all student data on the board. T- "That's right" nods in agreement as student talks.)

C5. Using instructional time effectively

Evaluation [2.5]

SUMMARY STATEMENT: The teacher provides students with activities of instructional value during the majority of the instructional time (The teacher provides quotations, procedures for answering questions and discussion opportunities.), and paces them appropriately. (Opening quote creates discussion, use of board chart illustrates for students the categories for discussion.) Non-instructional procedural matters do not occupy an excessive amount of time. (The small class size enables the teacher to keep students focused and to keep them engaged from bell to bell.)

[D] TEACHER PROFESSIONALISM

D1. Reflecting on the extent to which the learning goals were met

Evaluation [3.5]

SUMMARY STATEMENT: The teacher accurately identifies strengths (T- "Overall students stayed on task; the discussion had its own dynamic." "The verbal feedback was good. The evidence provided support, substantiation of theoretical constructs."), and weaknesses (T- "At times the students had ideas I hadn't figured on.") of the lesson in relation to the learning goals and describes in general terms how he could use the experience from the lesson in future instruction (T- "Perhaps I could use a stronger advanced organizer, though the Crevecoeur essay provides a good synopsis."). In addition, the teacher supports his judgments with specific evidence from the observation reflection. (T- "Students were able to come to consensus before moving to another issue." "I anticipated that once there were categories on the board students would fall in, indicating they stayed with the text.") (T- "The text framed issues fairly well and created a baseline.") (T- "Group size is an asset, a larger group would not likely have reached consensus; skill competency would be lower.")

D2. Demonstrating a sense of efficacy

Evaluation [3.0]

SUMMARY STATEMENT: The teacher suggests specific, practical actions that he intends to take to help specific students who are not meeting the learning goals. (T- "From her non-verbal cues, I think she might have a better chance to express herself in the essay. It will help if I help pick out differences of opinion she might have with other students.") (T- "I think is simply bored with these issues on which he has already conceptualized.") (T- "I will follow up with each student as much as possible to customize the essays to reflect the facets of their interests.")

MEMORANDUM

To: Stephen Alberta, Entry Year Teacher
From: _____, Praxis III Assessor
Re: Entry Year Beginning Teacher Assessment Confirmation
Date: 4/7/00

We appreciate your commitment to the Ohio Department of Education Entry Year Pilot Project and look forward to observing you on this round using the ETS PRAXIS III Teacher Assessment Strategies. You should have received two forms that relate to this observation: the Class Profile and the Instruction Profile. Please prepare these for the teaching activity for the day of observation and arrange to either mail them directly to me, or have them available in the office prior to our meeting.

We need to have a Preobservation and Postobservation interview (25-45 minutes) in a location that is free from interruption and interference from the routine activity of the school day. During the interviews you will need to have release time from your normal classroom duties. Together we can arrange this with your building principal. Our schedule for the day of observation is as follows:

Date: April 12, 2000 (Wed.)
before 7:00 AM Arrival at School Site/Report to Office
7:00 AM Preobservation Teacher Interview (25-45 minutes)
8:15 AM Classroom Teacher Observation (30-60 minutes)
9:15 AM Postobservation Teacher Interview (25-45 minutes)
 Report to Office/Depart School Site

Should you have any questions or situations that relate to our observation, please contact me at:

(614) _____

Thank you for your assistance.

cc: _____, Principal
_____, Regional Coordinator

State of Ohio
Department of Education

Susan Tave Zelman
Superintendent of Public Instruction

John E. Nicholson
Administrator
Educator Preparation
Ohio Departments Building, Room 1009, 65 South Front Street, Columbus 43215-4183, (614) 752-9447

M E M O

To: Beginning Ohio Teachers
Participants in PRAXIS III Pilot Study

From: Rae Harriott-White, PRAXIS Administrator
Center for the Teaching Profession

Re: Evaluation Results

Date: Spring/Summer 2000

Enclosed please find the Record of Evidence based upon your second evaluation. Please excuse the delay in your report due to computer problems. The four domains are outlined as are the nineteen specific criteria areas. Take this opportunity to review those domains in which you still may wish to concentrate improvement for next year, again sharing it with individuals with whom you are comfortable. It is your decision as to how you wish to share your results. Should you have any specific questions related to the results, you may call me or speak with your mentors or area coordinator.

Since the school year has drawn to a close, there will be no additional observations by an assessor, but we hope that your work with mentors and colleagues will continue next school year. Enclosed is a final evaluation form for you to complete.

Thank you for your involvement in the PRAXIS III pilot program. We hope you have found it has assisted you professionally.

Stephen Alberts

1/19/2000

Domain A Scores and Summary Comments

A1 Score: 2.0

Summary:

The teacher describes some understanding of why it is important to become familiar with students' background so that he can encourage them to bring their own life experiences as analogies. He describes one procedure (informal class discussions) that he uses to obtain information and has some familiarity with the background knowledge (writing skills) and experiences of his students.

A2 Score: 2.0

Summary:

The teacher articulates clear learning goals that are appropriate for the students.

A3 Score: 3.0

Summary:

The teacher accurately explains how the content of this lesson (outline) relates to the content of previous lessons (authors already read) and future lessons (use the generalizations and interpretations of the text to write a rough draft of an essay). The lesson addresses Poe's writing within the historical overview of American Literature.

A4 Score: 2.5

Summary:

The teacher chooses methods (Socratic lecture), activities (students contribute and copy notes from the board), and materials (graphic organizer of notes) that are aligned with the goals of the lesson and are appropriate to the students in general.

A5 Score: 2.5

Summary:

Teacher has a plan for systemically evaluating student learning (looking at draft and final copy) that is aligned with the goals of the lesson and appropriate to the students. However he does not indicate how he will use the results of this evaluation for future planning.

Domain B Scores and Summary Comments

B1 Score: 2.5

Summary:

Teacher calls on every student during the discussion, although he frequently does not allow enough time for a student to respond before calling on another student for the answer. Since other students often answered a question before the called upon student had a chance to respond, there is no evidence that the teacher actively encourages fairness among students.

B2 Score: 2.5

Summary:

Teacher establishes a basic level of rapport with the students and permits a relaxed, casual atmosphere.

B3 Score: 3.0

Summary:

Teacher expects students to extend their thinking by asking probing questions during discussion and actively encourages students to meet challenging learning experiences.

B4 Score: 3.0

Summary:

The students' behavior during the lesson is consistently appropriate.

B5 Score: 2.5

Summary:

The teacher creates a physical environment in which learning takes place and some provisions are made to accommodate students' need for an informal setting.

Stephen Alberts

1/19/2000

Domain C Scores and Summary Comments

C1 Score: 3.0

Summary:

Students receive and seem to understand the learning goals. They receive clear and accurate information about the instructional procedures and how they relate to the next assignment.

C2 Score: 3.0

Summary:

The teacher conveyed content of the lesson through a logical and coherent structure. It was accurate and comprehensible to most of the students.

C3 Score: 2.5

Summary:

Teacher encourages students to think independently and creatively on the content being studied by using open-ended questions, but seems to be pressured by time constraints to quickly give the answer in the form of notes for students to copy.

C4 Score: 3.0

Summary:

Teacher monitors students' understanding with continuous questions related to the content. Students receive substantive feedback through additional comments relating to the content.

C5 Score: 2.5

Summary:

Although the pacing seems to allow little time for reflection, the teacher provides students with an activity of instructional value the entire class time and noninstructional duties were performed efficiently.

Domain D Scores and Summary Comments

D1 Score: 3.0

Summary:

Teacher describes the strengths and weaknesses of the lesson in relation to the learning goal and says that he would use the same Socratic Questioning method because it works with a small group of students. He said he would focus his questioning on more concrete questions because some students had difficulty making the 'jump ...to abstract answers.'

D2 Score: 1.5

Summary:

Teacher makes no attempt to find ways to help specific students who were not meeting the learning goals that day because he believed the reason was that those two students 'had been absent and had not read the assigned short story.' 'I might not try anything different in the future because if they are prepared they perform the same.'

D3 Score: 2.0

Summary:

Teacher demonstrates knowledge of resources and attempts to consult with colleagues when necessary on matters related to learning and instruction.

D4 Score: 3.0

Summary:

Teacher demonstrates knowledge of forms of communication (telephone, personal contact ex. open house, and considered using letters), that he uses to communicate with parents or guardians and describes situations ('If a student is not performing in class, is in danger of not passing, or receiving a D average ') in which he would use these strategies.

ENTRY YEAR *as of 2007*

(A) Entry Year Program

- (1) The Entry Year Program shall be successfully completed prior to issuance of a professional license to a teacher or principal. Completion of the entry year as an assistant principal meets the Entry Year Program requirements for the principal license.
- (2) The Entry Year Program shall include both a formal program of support, including mentoring to foster professional growth of the individual, and assessment of the performance of the beginning teacher or principal.
- (3) A candidate for the Entry Year Program shall hold a provisional license issued pursuant to paragraph (A) of Rule 3301-24-05 of this chapter for a teacher; or paragraph (B) of Rule 3301-24-05 of this chapter for a principal. *(24)*
- (4) The Entry Year Program shall be one academic year in length which shall include a minimum of one hundred twenty school days. In those instances when the teacher or principal is employed after the beginning of the school year, the Entry Year Program shall be a minimum of one hundred twenty school days. Teachers or principals may attempt to complete the Entry Year Program requirements no more than two times under the provisional license. Failure to complete the entry year requirements successfully after the second attempt will result in loss of the provisional license until such time as the candidate completes additional coursework, supervised field experiences, and/or clinical experiences as designated by a college or university approved for educator preparation, and is recommended by such college or university.
- (5) The Entry Year Program shall be developed by school personnel, a majority of whom shall be practicing classroom teachers, following guidelines established by the Ohio Department of Education. School districts, chartered nonpublic schools, or consortiums of schools desiring to participate in the Entry Year Program shall engage in collaboration with colleges or universities preparing teachers. The entry year does not replace employment evaluation. Entry year assessment is exclusively used for licensure determination.
- (6) Districts and chartered nonpublic schools shall provide entry year teachers or principals full salary as determined by appropriate placement on the school district or school salary schedule.

(B) Entry Year Assessment

- (1) An assessment of skills and abilities appropriate to the field of licensure shall be used to assess the entry year teacher or principal.
- (2) Assessment of the skills and abilities of the entry year teacher or principal shall be prescribed with the involvement of the profession, shall be administered under the authority of the State Board of Education, and shall:
 - (a) Encompass the performance-based licensure requirements specified in Rule 3301-24-02 of this chapter for beginning teachers, with appropriate modifications for principals; and
 - (b) Be conducted throughout the entry year period.
- (C) Upon successful completion of the Entry Year Program and assessment, the individual shall be deemed to have met the requirements for professional licensure.

NTE II + Praxis III = certification

SCHOOLS
CHECKLIST FOR TEACHER EVALUATION

Teacher ALAN ALKARTS Date 10/8/99
Subject/Grade Observed ENGLISH 9-12 School Year 99-2000

*

RATING SCALE DEFINITIONS

*

COMMENDABLE - Above what is routinely expected of all staff

EFFECTIVE - At the level of performance that is routinely expected of all staff

NEEDS IMPROVEMENT - Generally of acceptable quality, but in some aspects improvement is needed

NOT SATISFACTORY - Generally below what is routinely expected of all staff

NO OPPORTUNITY TO OBSERVE - Evaluator has not been able to observe this particular area enough to make a judgment

*

*

INSTRUCTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

1. Possesses and demonstrates a sound knowledge of subjects taught.
2. Prepares lesson plans which follow district guidelines and curriculum guides.
3. Plans and prepares instructional activities to meet individual differences.
4. Maintains organized lesson plans and adequate records of students' progress.
5. Establishes instructional objectives and goals for daily lessons and long range units.
6. Provides clear explanations and instructions.
7. Uses varied and adaptable teaching techniques.
8. Has clear evaluation procedures.
9. Provides frequent feedback to students.
10. Provides an environment that encourages learning.

COMMENDABLE	EFFECTIVE	NEEDS TO IMPROVE	NOT SATISFACTORY	NO OPPORTUNITY TO OBSERVE
	✓			
	✓			
	✓			
	✓			
	✓			
	✓			
✓				
✓				
✓				

COMMENTS

APPRAISAL RECORD, FORM 2

COMMENTS

RELATIONSHIP WITH PUPILS

1. Respects, understands, and likes children.
2. Maintains professional rapport with students.
3. Maintains established classroom and school discipline policies.
4. Promotes respect among students and towards learning.
5. Maintains a consistent and fair approach in dealing with students.
6. Encourages independent thinking and problem solving.

STAFF RELATIONSHIPS

1. Works cooperatively with colleagues and administrators.
2. Assumes fair share of responsibility for schoolwide activities.
3. Accepts and profits from supervision.

PARENT-COMMUNITY RELATIONSHIPS

1. Demonstrates willingness to communicate with parents about students' educational experiences.
2. Communicates positively with the community about the school, the district, and the educational program.
3. Supports school and/or community activities.

COMMENDABLE	EFFECTIVE	NEEDS TO IMPROVE	NOT SATISFACTORY	NO OPPORTUNITY TO OBSERVE
	✓			
	✓			
	✓			
	✓			
	✓			
✓				
	✓			
	✓			
				✓
	✓			
	✓			
	✓			

PROFESSIONALISM

1. Observes district and building policies, regulations, state and federal laws, statutes, and minimum standards.
2. Follows ethical standards of the teaching profession.
3. Models consistently professional behavior.
4. Seeks professional growth and development opportunities.
5. Maintains membership in professional associations.
6. Serves on district and building committees.
7. Performs assigned duties and complete reports accurately and on time.
8. Uses correct English and appropriate language as part of professional responsibility.

PERSONAL QUALITIES

1. Exhibits positive attitude toward teaching.
2. Exercises self-control.
3. Is prompt for work.
4. Is regular in attendance.
5. Is reliable in performing non-instructional duties.
6. Maintains sound, mature emotional judgment.
7. Dresses appropriately - is neat and well groomed.

COMMENDABLE	EFFECTIVE	NEEDS TO IMPROVE	NOT SATISFACTORY	NO OPPORTUNITY TO OBSERVE
	✓			
	✓			
	✓			
				✓
				✓
				✓
	✓			
	✓			
	✓			
	✓			
	✓			
	✓			
	✓			
	✓			

C O M M E N T S

WHAT EXTENUATING CIRCUMSTANCES EXIST?

AREAS OF STRENGTH:

ALAN IS VERY KNOWLEDGEABLE, HE ASKS GOOD QUESTIONS WHICH LEAD HIS STUDENTS TO CONTINUE DISCUSS. HE WALKS AROUND THE ROOM ANSWERING STUDENTS WHICH MAKE THE STUDENTS FEEL GOOD ABOUT ASKING QUESTIONS. ALAN IS A GOOD ADDITION TO OUR RALLIGH DEPT. BECAUSE OF HIS TECHNIQUES HE USES TO GET STUDENTS INVOLVED.

AREAS NEEDING IMPROVEMENT, SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT, AND PLANS FOR SUPERVISORY FOLLOW UP:

ALAN NEEDS TO WORK WITH A COUPLE OF HIS STUDENTS TO GET THEM TO PARTICIPATE MORE IN CLASS.

COMMENTS BY TEACHER:

Accurate assessment

* I have received a copy of all of this appraisal record that has been completed *
to date and I DO NOT wish to have any additional statements of my own
included with this record at this time.

*

EVALUATOR'S SIGNATURE

DATE

EMPLOYEE'S SIGNATURE

DATE

10-8-99

*

APPRAISAL RECORD, FORM 3

SUMMARY OBSERVATION REPORT

Protégé: Alan Alberto Observation Date/Time: 11/9/99
 Mentor: Carol Skinner Conference Date/Time: _____
 Activity: Review of poetry terms.

Teaching Behaviors to Continue	Teaching Behaviors to Improve
<p><u>A. Organizing Content (Planning)</u></p> <p>Plan is detailed and shows the observer clearly what will be covered in the observation and details the why and how as well.</p> <p><u>B. Environment</u></p> <p>Students are called on randomly (fairness). Class rules are reviewed as necessary (bringing books to class, sharpening pencil). Expectations are stated to class clearly with student repeating these expectations. Students follow procedures & routine for journal writing (beginning of class period).</p> <p><u>C. Instruction</u></p> <p>Explains to students what will be done during the period and why. Tell students what specifically will be written down to study. Monitored student for understanding by asking different ones the same question. Kept moving and present the entire time.</p> <p><u>D. Professionalism</u></p> <p>Use the other English teachers to confer with (if necessary) and administration for discipline. Reflected on change that would be made in teaching the Goals:</p>	<p>None noted --</p> <p>--</p> <p>none noted -- keep up the good work</p> <p>Suggestion -- give some student a longer "wait time" when asking them a question, before moving on to next student for the answer.</p> <p>none noted --</p> <p>you noted many changes/adjustments that you would make the next time you teach a lesson like this --</p> <p>Keep calling parent as you have done!!</p>

Mentor's Signature _____

Protégé's Signature _____

SCHOOLS
CHECKLIST FOR TEACHER EVALUATION

Teacher A/ Alberta Date 6/14/00 for 3/17/00
Subject/Grade Observed Primary 2/3 School Year 1999-2000

*

RATING SCALE DEFINITIONS

*

- COMMENDABLE** - Above what is routinely expected of all staff
EFFECTIVE - At the level of performance that is routinely expected of all staff
NEEDS IMPROVEMENT - Generally of acceptable quality, but in some aspects improvement is needed
NOT SATISFACTORY - Generally below what is routinely expected of all staff
NO OPPORTUNITY TO OBSERVE - Evaluator has not been able to observe this particular area enough to make a judgment

*

*

INSTRUCTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

1. Possesses and demonstrates a sound knowledge of subjects taught.
2. Prepares lesson plans which follow district guidelines and curriculum guides.
3. Plans and prepares instructional activities to meet individual differences.
4. Maintains organized lesson plans and adequate records of students' progress.
5. Establishes instructional objectives and goals for daily lessons and long range units.
6. Provides clear explanations and instructions.
7. Uses varied and adaptable teaching techniques.
8. Has clear evaluation procedures.
9. Provides frequent feedback to students.
10. Provides an environment that encourages learning.

COMMENDABLE	EFFECTIVE	NEEDS TO IMPROVE	NOT SATISFACTORY	NO OPPORTUNITY TO OBSERVE
	✓			
				✓
	✓			
				✓
				✓
	✓			
	✓			
				✓
	✓			
	✓			

COMMENTS

APPRAISAL RECORD, FORM 2

RELATIONSHIP WITH PUPILS

1. Respects, understands, and likes children.
2. Maintains professional rapport with students.
3. Maintains established classroom and school discipline policies.
4. Promotes respect among students and towards learning.
5. Maintains a consistent and fair approach in dealing with students.
6. Encourages independent thinking and problem solving.

STAFF RELATIONSHIPS

1. Works cooperatively with colleagues and administrators.
2. Assumes fair share of responsibility for schoolwide activities.
3. Accepts and profits from supervision.

PARENT-COMMUNITY RELATIONSHIPS

1. Demonstrates willingness to communicate with parents about students' educational experiences.
2. Communicates positively with the community about the school, the district, and the educational program.
3. Supports school and/or community activities.

COMMENDABLE	EFFECTIVE	NEEDS TO IMPROVE	NOT SATISFACTORY	NO OPPORTUNITY TO OBSERVE
	✓			
	✓			
				✓
	✓			
✓				
✓				
	✓			
	✓			
	✓			
	✓			
				✓
	✓			

COMMENTS

PROFESSIONALISM

1. Observes district and building policies, regulations, state and federal laws, statutes, and minimum standards.
2. Follows ethical standards of the teaching profession.
3. Models consistently professional behavior.
4. Seeks professional growth and development opportunities.
5. Maintains membership in professional associations.
6. Serves on district and building committees.
7. Performs assigned duties and complete reports accurately and on time.
8. Uses correct English and appropriate language as part of professional responsibility.

PERSONAL QUALITIES

1. Exhibits positive attitude toward teaching.
2. Exercises self-control.
3. Is prompt for work.
4. Is regular in attendance.
5. Is reliable in performing non-instructional duties.
6. Maintains sound, mature emotional judgment.
7. Dresses appropriately - is neat and well groomed.

COMMENDABLE	EFFECTIVE	NEEDS TO IMPROVE	NOT SATISFACTORY	NO OPPORTUNITY TO OBSERVE
				✓
				✓
	✓			
	✓			
				✓
				✓
	✓			
✓				
✓				
✓				
✓				
✓				
✓				

COMMENTS

WHAT EXTENUATING CIRCUMSTANCES EXIST?

Evaluation too sides of classroom.

AREAS OF STRENGTH:

Explanations were thorough. The students were involved in the lesson. Lesson had variety to it. I "sounded" as though the students were behaving.

AREAS NEEDING IMPROVEMENT, SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT, AND PLANS FOR SUPERVISORY FOLLOW UP:

COMMENTS BY TEACHER:

With side observation, unable to see & feel the look of the class. Unable to get a sense of how truly receptive the students were.

* I have received a copy of all of this appraisal record that has been completed *
to date and I DO / DO NOT wish to have any additional statements of my own
included with this record at this time.

EVALUATOR'S SIGNATURE

6/12/00
DATE

EMPLOYEE'S SIGNATURE

6-12-00
DATE

APPRAISAL RECORD, FORM 3

June 12, 2000

Observations for Al Alberts

Direct Observations vs. Video Observations

My name is _____ and I am the Assistant Principal of _____ School. We _____ are not only thrilled to have Mr. Al Alberts as part of our staff, but are likewise thrilled with his desire to involve new and innovative ways of doing what we have always done the same way! Al spoke with me early in the school year about his plans for video taping his classes. His idea at that time was to not only use it as a way that he would be able to observe himself and make adjustments with his presentation and mannerisms, but to also allow the Principal and myself yet another tool to use in the observations of teachers. Throughout the school year, Al was able to tape his classes and make his own personal adjustments. _____ the Principal, observed Al on a number of occasions. I was not able to do such an observation. If I had been, perhaps I would have been able to make more use of the video classroom.

With making this tape the initial observation and having no baseline data observed in a direct way available, the video taping was not inclusive enough for an administrative observation. Again, had I observed Al teaching personally, I would have found the taping to be much more advantageous. As it was, I was not able to observe the classroom atmosphere, the student reaction, and the learning environment. These three areas are crucial in the overall observation of a teacher.

However, such taping can be tremendously advantageous to the classroom teacher. How wonderful such a tool could be if the teacher is willing to put in the time and energy to not only make such tapes, but review the tapes and make necessary adjustments. Al has indeed demonstrated such an eagerness to take such a challenge. Al has also ignited such a spark in several other teachers! We are planning on allowing Al the opportunity to enlist other "recruits" in this arena during In-Service opportunities in the coming school year.

APPENDIX G: STAFF DEVELOPMENT: VIDEOTAPING (MODEL)

APPENDIX G

THE MIRRORED EYE ON ME

EDLS 331
Summer Session 1999

Principles of Supervision
Staff Development Committee:

Al Alberts
Bernie Boice
Glenna Clutter
Joseph Oliverio

Mirrored Eye on ME

- I. Introduction: Our school was selected by the county to field test the practice of videotaping instruction in order to improve teaching. We have decided to conduct the initial in-service during a full day faculty senate meeting in October. The in-service day(s) set aside in August will be changed to a general meeting, building administrator meetings and teacher prep day(s).
- A. Title: Mirrored Eye on ME
- B. Description: A timely seminar on the metacognitive reflection of classroom techniques as they relate to your own personal teaching style.
- C. Rationale: Every instructor can benefit through a physical, psychological, and situational analysis in their delivery of instruction.
- D. Target Group: All classroom professionals. No prerequisite skills needed. A positive attitude towards self-improvement is desired.
- E. Objectives:
1. All teachers will discover their philosophical outlook.
 2. All teachers will analyze their teaching style.
 3. Receive literature associated with philosophy and style for contrast and comparison.
 4. Improve teaching skills, techniques, and methods through synthesized video taped self-analysis.
 5. Learn to value the collaborative model by sharing results and information learned from the video taping experience.
- F. Assumptions: Cost- \$600- \$800
Participation- Required for in-service, voluntary for implementation.
Knowledge- Some will have a working knowledge of topic.
Presenter's Expertise: A trained administrator will present.
- G. Location and Time: First full day faculty senate meeting in October. The in-service will begin at 10:00 a.m. and conclude at 2:30 p.m. The commons area will serve as the location. The training will be conducted at this time, due to the distractions involved with conducting seminars/training during the days before students return to school. Distractions include: getting room prepared, bulletin boards, copying various forms and papers, text book and locker issues, etc.
- H. Preliminary Information: Since attendance is required, information sent prior to the meeting, will take the form of a graphic flyer describing the major

tenets one week prior to the initial meeting. A general description of the in-service will be given during the building meetings in August.

- I. Administrator support and involvement: A trained administrator will conduct the in-service. The same administrator will be involved in all follow-up activities.

II. The Plan

A. Overview:

- 10:00-10:40 Administer Philosophy Inventory (HUG model)
Discuss each of the five major categories
Provide literature to teachers in regard to their own results
- 10:40-10:55 Break
- 10:55-11:35 Repeat the process for administration of T.S.Q.
Discuss results
Provide literature
- 11:35-11:55 Discussion: How do the two inventories relate to each other?
- 11:55-12:55 Lunch
- 12:55- 1:25 Presentation on advantages of video taping for expressed purpose and self-evaluation.
Answer any questions.
- 1:25- 1:40 Give video handout. (See attached)
Show example of video taped teaching with teachers taking notes.
- 1:40-2:10 Discuss the tape and information recorded on the handout.
- 2:10-2:20 Demonstration of how to use video equipment.
- 2:20-2:25 Ask for two volunteers who are willing to video tape themselves and then share the information they learned at the next meeting.
- 2:25-2:30 Explain and distribute questionnaire. (See attached)
In-service complete.

- B. Activities: The inventories are being done in order for the teachers to learn about themselves in regard to their teaching style and philosophy. (Obj. 1,2)

Literature is being provided in order for teachers to develop a deeper understanding of their philosophies and styles. (Obj. 3)

The video sample is being shown in order for teachers to learn about the process of video taping. Along with learning the process, teachers will learn how to use the information gained in improving instruction. (Obj. 4)

Teachers will share what they learned from the video taping process during each follow-up. This sharing of ideas creates an atmosphere of collaboration. (Obj. 5)

- C. Resources: Trained administrator, two video cameras (with tri-pods), video tapes, sample videotaped mini-lessons, extension cords, philosophy (Hug) and teaching style inventories (T.S.Q.), academic background literature on philosophy and styles, TV/VCR, handouts (feedback rubric).
- D. Handouts: See Attached
- E. Evaluation Instrument: See Attached
- F. Follow-up: There will be a follow-up session during each of these faculty senate meetings (Nov., Jan., Feb., Mar., Apr., May). The follow-up will take one hour. The following will provide the set-up for each follow-up meeting.
 - 1. Discuss questionnaire from the previous meeting. 10 min.
 - 2. People who have used the video taping will share their experience (verbally). 20 min.
 - 3. Show a videotaped segment of instruction. Teachers who video taped themselves are not required to share, but may if they wish. Pass out observation sheet. 15 min.
 - 4. Discuss the tape and the observation sheet. Request volunteers for the next meeting. 15 min.

Video Observation Handout

Please give feedback with regard to the following:

1. Teacher's belief or philosophy:

2. Teacher's teaching style:

3. Teacher's classroom climate:

Evaluation Of In-service

Please answer the following three questions:

1. What insights did you gain from the information provided?
2. List three concerns you had concerning this in-service and/or the information presented?
3. How do you plan on implementing this practice?

413 B Harrison Ave.
Berkeley Springs, WV 25411

Phone: (304) 258-2268
or: (304) 599-7061

S. Alan Alberts II

Objective: To effectively communicate current educational objectives/pedagogy/methodology and curricular theory to pre-service teachers

Professional:

- Professionally NTE (*Praxis*) certified in English/LA 5-12
- *Praxis III*, domain driven classroom assessment trained
- Team member for district curriculum mapping committee
- Ed.D. action research: "Self-Improvement Videotaping"
- Researched an "On-Line" lap-top secondary school in WV
- Supervised graduate level (WVU) student teacher training
- Participant- Ed.D. workshop on grant preparation process
- Developed software evaluation scoring/usage rubric
- Familiar with state data programs WVEIS & MOLE
- Prepared students for proficiencies; CTBS & ACT to NTE

Education: **Bachelor of Arts in English** 1994 @ Marshall University (WV)
- 66 core hours completed in creative writing specialization
Master of Arts in Teaching 1997 @ Marshall University (WV)
-36 core hours in educational pedagogy 3.8 GPA
Ed. D. in Curriculum & Instruction 2000 *Ed.Ad. Minor* @ WVU
- 80 core hours beyond Master's completed 3.9 GPA

Experience: Three years as English 9-12 teacher (West Virginia & Ohio):
Vinson H.S. 1997-1998 Huntington, WV
Watkins Memorial H.S. 1999-2000 Pataskala, OH
Berkeley Springs H.S. 2000-2001 Berkeley Springs, WV
Plus, one year supervising student teachers at WV University
West Virginia University 1998-1999 Morgantown, WV

* References and transcripts may be requested directly from:
WVU Career Services Center. P.O. 6008, Morgantown, WV
26506-6008 Ph: (304) 293-2221