



Coaching Implementation of the Framing Routine: Case Study

SECTION 1: As learning standards data is examined and questions are posed, the instructional coach and history teacher (Mr. Smith), determined that his students not learning/understanding important concepts and seem to focus their energies on memorizing test trivia that is quickly forgotten. Mr. Smith expressed concerns about his students' motivation and intellectual ability (e.g., *"They can't learn these standards."*) and academic ability (*"They can't, or won't, read or write"*).

While examining and discussing the nature of the material that students are failing to learn, paired with examining recent quizzes and unit tests, the instructional coach noticed (but did not point out to Mr. Smith) that numerous items on the quizzes and test reflected what might be considered non-essential information. Likewise, the study guides he provided as homework assignments consisted mostly of fill-in-blank sentences addressing factual kinds of knowledge (names of people, places, dates, etc.).

Analysis of recent weekly test scores of students indicated:

Test Score	% Students
90+	3%
80-89	16%
70-79	40%
<70	41%

SECTION 2: A lesson was video taped, and the coach and teacher reviewed the video independently. Although the teacher appeared to be implementing basic lesson structure (Before / During / After) tactics such as providing an advance organizer, activating knowledge, reviewing prior learning, providing explicit instruction followed by an activity, asking questions, reviewing at the end of the lesson), few students were able to respond meaningfully to his questions, and students seemed, on the most part, not engaged in the instruction. The coach found it difficult to discern what the teacher was actually teaching because the manner in which he was presenting ideas seemed chaotic due to the many tangents he pursued. The teacher seemed to relish story telling, but it was difficult for the coach to connect the stories to the content of the lesson. Moreover, it was difficult to differentiate between tangential information that might be interesting and amusing to students, from core information the teacher was also addressing. Likewise, connections between core ideas addressed by the teacher were unclear to the instructional coach.

Students did engage in the activity, but seemed to make little or no connections between the activity and the content addressed by the teacher.

When the teacher and coach met to debrief and discuss the video, the coach initially posed questions about what the teacher valued most about his teaching expertise. The teacher indicated it was his stories. (e.g., *"History is all about the stories."*), organization (e.g., Before / During / After lesson sequence), and that his students liked his activities. Together, the coach and Mr. Smith examined the content standards to determine what the standards seemed to expect, and what the students seemed to not be learning. Mr. Smith expressed frustration about his students' seeming inability to make connections and see the "big picture."

SECTION 3: The coach and Mr. Smith began working on developing a specific student-focused goal. While examining the history content standards, the coach and Mr. Smith noticed that the standards often reflected common information structures (hierarchical, comparison, cause/effect, sequence, and problem solution). They decided to draft a student-focused goal for each type of structure, and then when looking at a specific content standard, decide which of the student-focused goals might make the most sense to use. The options were:

Goal A (hierarchical) : Students will explain a concept by explaining two or more main ideas related to the concept while including pertinent details in the explanation with 85% accuracy and relate the concept to real-world events in a meaningful manner.

Goal B (process/ sequence): Students will identify and explain the features and importance of each step of a process while accurately using pertinent details as well as correctly identify and explain factors that affect the process as well as relate the process to real-world phenomenon with 85% accuracy.

Goal C (comparison) Students will compare two concepts by explaining similarities and differences across multiple dimensions while accurately using pertinent details as well as relate the process to real-world phenomenon with 85% accuracy.

Goal D (problem/solution): Students will explain key ideas associated with a problem and its (possible) solution while accurately using pertinent details to explain connections between the problem elements and solution components in a meaningful manner with 85% accuracy.

Mr. Smith identified a specific history content standard, and then with the coach, determined that the information structure reflected by the standard was primarily hierarchical. Mr. Smith, therefore, selected Goal A.

SECTION 4: After Goal A was selected, the coach and Mr. Smith discussed various forms of observable evidence regarding whether Goal A was being attained (data from quizzes & tests, number of questions students answered correctly during class, etc.). Mr. Smith chose the “number of questions” option.

SECTION 5: The coach then described three possible ways Mr. Smith might approach instruction, given the student-focused goal he selected.

Option 1: Use the *SMARTER Planning Strategy* to plan units and corresponding lessons.

Option 2: As the content associated with the standard is presented to students, co-construct a web in a manner that depict key ideas and details addressed in the lesson.

Option 3: Implement the *Framing Routine*.

SECTION 6: Mr. Smith indicated that Option 1 was intriguing, but was concerned about how much time and effort it would require. He indicated that Option 2 would be a fun activity, but also expressed a concern that students would not be able to discern the main ideas and details. Mr. Smith liked the structure the *Cue*→*Do*→*Review* sequence would blend well with the lesson structure he was already using. Thus, he selected Option 3 (*The Framing Routine*).

SECTION 7: The coach explained the *Quality Frame Rubric* addressing the quality of content that should be noted on the frame. This checklist would serve as a form of checklist for Frame construction.

While discussing the content standard, the coach asked Mr. Smith to identify key information he thought students should learn in relation to the standard. Next, they examined the teacher's guide to identify specific main ideas and essential details it reflected. Based on this information, Mr. Smith and the coach co-constructed the content and noted on the digital (interactive PDF file) *3-Main Idea Frame*. The result of the discussion was a completed Frame. The completed Frame was then checked using the *Quality Frame Rubric*.

SECTION 8: Once the Frame had been developed, the discussion next shifted to how to implement the *Cue-Do-Review* procedure with particular emphasis on the *FRAME Linking Steps*. The coach provided Mr. Smith with a copy of the *Framing Routine Checklist*, and explained each of the components. After sharing the information, the coach invited Mr. Smith to make changes in the checklist that he thought would fit better with his teaching style and expertise as well as needs of his students. Mr. Smith decided that what would work best with his students would be to provide them with completed copies of the Frame, and then “*walk them through the information noted on the Frame,*” (as opposed to co-constructing the ideas with students) so the checklist was modified accordingly.

SECTION 9: Next, the coach provided Mr. Smith with options as to how he would prefer to see the technique modeled.

For example...

- In the classroom (*have the coach model use of the Framing Routine in one of the teacher's classes*).
- In the classroom with no students.
- Co-teaching
- Visiting other teachers' classrooms as they use the *Framing Routine*
- Viewing a video of another teacher using the technique

Mr. Smith indicated that he preferred the co-teaching option, so the coach and Mr. Smith scheduled a time to implement the *Framing Routine* in one of Mr. Smith's classes. Their plan was to have the coach provide the initial introduction to the Frame (*Cue*) and then, during the *FRAME Linking Steps*, take turns (e.g., Smith does the “L” step, coach does the “I” step, etc., but implemented in a manner that reflected Mr. Smith's preferred modification (e.g., provide students with a completed copy of the Frame rather than co-constructing the ideas to note on the Frame with students).

SECTION 10: After the modeling (via co-teaching) session, the coach and Mr. Smith met to debrief what happened. The coach posed questions that addressed some of the concerns originally expressed by Mr. Smith. Mr. Smith's *impression* was that students understood the content much better when the Frame was used with the information spelled out on the Frame for students. When queried about student engagement, however, Mr. Smith noted that there was some improvement, but not a lot, but he thought it would improve in time. He did wish to stick with his plan (provide students with completed copies of the Frame).

SECTION 11: The coach asked whether he'd like additional modeling (e.g., co-teach another class); Mr. Smith indicated he wanted to try it on his own, but he preferred to be videoed after he'd had a chance to "work the bugs out." He did indicate, however, that he wanted additional assistance constructing new frames for his upcoming lessons, so they co-constructed three additional frames for use during the week. Mr. Smith also administered a test on Friday addressing the content covered that week. They scheduled a date for video taping the lesson the following week.

SECTION 12: On Monday the following week, Mr. Smith videoed his lesson using the modified *Cue* → *Do* → *Review* steps. The coach and Mr. Smith viewed the video separately and then met to discuss it and review Friday's test results. Before the video was reviewed, the coach asked Mr. Smith to pay particular attention to the number of questions students asked, the number he asked, and to evaluate the quality of their responses to his questions, since he had indicated earlier that this would be a good indicator of whether students were meeting the student-focused goal. While reviewing the video, the coach wrote down every question asked by a student, and every question asked by Mr. Smith.

The questioning data indicated:

- 1 "why" question posed by a student.
- 5 questions posed by Mr. Smith
 - 2 factual questions
 - 1 open-ended question "*What would you guess happened next?*"

Analysis of the weekly test scores of students indicated:

Analysis of recent weekly test scores of students indicated:

Test Score	% Students
90+	4%
80-89	18%
70-79	44%
<70	34%

SECTION 13: The coach posed questions and facilitated a discussion of the video,, analysis of the weekly test results, and data about student- and teacher-questions. Mr. Smith expressed surprise about the 'use-of-questions' data as it was his impression that considerably more questions were posed, both by students and himself during the lesson. As the discussion ensued, Mr. Smith indicated a desire to continue to use the Frames, but to also increase the amount of student-engagement during the lesson. The coach described three options for increasing student engagement within the context of implementing the *Framing Routine*.

Goal 1: Increase student engagement by posing at least 4 open-ended questions (“Why” & “How” questions) that required student-pairs to formulate elaborated responses and less factual questions).

Goal 2: Increase student engagement by providing review activities for at least 10 minutes at the end of the lesson during which student pairs use their Frames to explain ideas noted on them to their partners.

Goal 3: Increase student engagement by placing greater emphasis on co-constructing Frames *with* students by modeling and co-constructing ideas for at least 50% of the main ideas/essential details on a Frame.

Mr. Smith chose Goal 3. The coach then provided a checklist for implementing *Pair-Share Review*. After describing the key elements on the checklist, the coach invited Mr. Smith to make modifications. Mr. Smith elected to implement the technique as designed.

Mr. Smith implemented this adaptation throughout the following week; the coach and teacher met again to discuss implementation and progress. Progress toward attaining the student outcome goal was reviewed, additional options for modifying instruction explored and tried, etc.

Instructional Coaching Checklist:

Knight, J., et al.,(2015). 3 Steps to Great Coaching: A Simple but Powerful Instructional Coaching Cycle Nets Results. *Journal of Staff Development*, 36 (1), 10-18.

COACHING BEHAVIOR	OBSERVATION
IDENTIFY	
Teacher gets a clear picture of current reality by watching a video of their lesson or by reviewing observation data. (Video is best.)	
Coach asks the identify questions with the teacher to identify a goal.	
Teacher identifies a student-focused goal.	
Teacher identifies a teaching strategy to use to hit the goal.	
LEARN	
Teacher chooses an approach to modeling that he or she would like to observe and identifies a time to watch modeling.	
Coach provides modeling in one or more formats.	
Teacher sets a time to implement the practice.	
IMPROVE	
Teacher implements the practice.	
Data is gathered (by teacher or coach, in class or while viewing video) on student progress toward to the goal.	
Coach and teacher meet to discuss implementation and progress toward the goal.	

Teacher makes modifications until the goal is met.	