

High Leverage Instructional Practices

This document provides an introduction and overview of the August 6, 2020 webinar focusing on High Leverage Instructional Practices. This topic, as well as the others in the series (Effective Environments, Social Emotional Needs, and Family Engagement), are intended to be aligned, leveraged, and interconnected to support the needs of the whole child.

Introduction

Michigan must ensure that each and every child can read and do math, be a creative thinker and problem-solver, and be an informed, open-minded, and engaged citizen in our society. This process begins in Michigan's classrooms; students need multiple opportunities to be actively engaged in every classroom, every day, whether that classroom is face to face or remote. Recently, Kufeld & Tarasawa (2020) reviewed data on the summer slide between third through eighth-grade students and suggested the potential for an increased loss of student skills during the pandemic. The potential for loss may increase for learners who are traditionally underserved, including students who are economically disadvantaged, learners who struggle, students with IEPs, English learners, and minority students for whom we, as educators, are responsible. By utilizing High Leverage Practices (McLeskey, et al., 2017) throughout the school day, we ensure our students are immediately and continuously provided with effective and efficient instruction.

High Leverage Instructional Practices

Equality (quality for all) + Equity (individual needs are met) + Kindness (Archer, 2018) results in learning and success that is accessible to all. High leverage instructional practices (HLIPs) help educators achieve this level of quality and equity. As the name implies, HLIPs are routines, strategies, and procedures that have a proven track record of maximizing student learning benefits relative to the effort teachers expend in this quest. This webinar series highlights an intentional selection of three interrelated and overlapping HLIPs: **explicit instruction**, **opportunities to respond**, and **judicious practice**. Not only do these HLIPs promote efficient learning for all students in both classroom and remote settings, various aspects of these practices such as active engagement and high levels of student success support both positive behavior and social-emotional well-being that have been the focus of the first two webinars in this summer series. These HLIPs also have the potential of providing understanding of the learning goals and student progress families need to be able to support their children.

Explicit Instruction

In their book, Archer and Hughes (2011) introduce 16 elements of Explicit Instruction. The first three elements address the **content** of lessons, ensuring that instruction focuses on critical content, is logically sequenced, and is broken down into obtainable pieces. The next elements focus on the **design of instruction**: beginning lessons with a clear goal, providing a review of prior skills and knowledge, providing step-by-step demonstrations followed by guided practice, communicating with clear and concise language, and utilizing a range of examples and non-examples. Next, elements of effective **delivery of instruction** are articulated, including: requesting frequent responses, monitoring student performance closely, providing immediate affirmative and informative feedback, maintaining a brisk pace, and helping students organize knowledge. Finally, providing **judicious practice**, including distributed and cumulative practice of the critical content to optimize learning and long-term retention.

Explicit instruction has a positive impact on achievement with students across ages, grade levels, and content areas. While explicit instruction is effective for all students, it is imperative for students with low background knowledge and a history of academic frustration or failure (Archer & Hughes, 2011).

Active Participation / Opportunities to Respond (OTR)

Greenwood, et al. (OTR; 1984) defined opportunities to respond as the interaction between student response to a stimulus and feedback from the teacher. Active participation, or the requiring of frequent opportunities to respond for all students, has been shown to increase student engagement and participation, on-task behavior, and accountability. Effective use of active participation leads to both increase desired student behaviors and decrease undesired behaviors (Haydon, MacSuga-Gage, Simonsen, et al., 2012). Frequent opportunities to respond increases rehearsal of knowledge or skill, allows for retrieval practice, and increases retention as well as provide teacher opportunities for monitoring, adjusting instruction, conducting formative assessment, and giving praise and feedback.

Students can be provided with verbal, written, or action opportunities to respond (Archer & Hughes, 2011).

- Verbal response examples include Choral Responding, Think-Pair-Share, A-B Partners, Whip Around or Pass, or Expert Jigsaw.
- Written responses include Think-Write-Pair, Write-Share, White/Wipe Boards, Response Cards, Writing Frames, and Quick Jots. Written responses may also include guided notes.
- Action responses include acting out, hand signals, facial expressions, or gestures.

Responses during reading include Whisper Reading, Echo Reading, Choral reading, Cloze Reading, or Partner Reading.

Judicious Practice

“It is virtually impossible to become proficient at a mental task without extended practice” (Willingham, 2009). But not all practice is equal in terms of long-term learning. Techniques such as **spaced** or **distributed** practice over time, as well as **retrieval** practice, which forces the mind to remember and restate, are much more effective than the beloved practices of highlighting, re-reading, and cramming (Dunlosky, et al., 2013). In-class activities, homework

assignments, and study habits should be governed by the evidence of cognitive and educational science research, which challenges much current practice.

Conclusion

As educators, we must take time to learn more about high leverage practices, intentionally plan to increase our implementation of explicit instruction and opportunities to respond, and set goals and objectives for our instruction, while providing our students with beneficial practice activities. We can set ourselves and our students up for success and increase student learning and skill immediately upon returning to learning whether we are in school or remote learning environments.

Resources

[Explicit Instruction Website](http://www.explicitinstruction.org)

(www.explicitinstruction.org)

[CEEDAR Center](http://www.ceedar.education.ufl.edu)

(www.ceedar.education.ufl.edu)

References

- Archer, A. L., Hughes, C.A. (2011). *Explicit Instruction: Effective and efficient teaching*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Archer, A. L. (May 14, 2018). Equality and Equity in Instruction. Powerpoint found on Ancora Publishing Webinars <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MvpaS9NCDos&feature=youtu.be>
- Dunlosky, J., Rawson, K. A., Marsh, E. J., Nathan, M. J., & Willingham, D.T. (2013). Improving student learning with effective learning techniques: Promising directions from cognitive and educational psychology. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 14, 4-58.
- Greenwood, C.R., Delquadri, J., and Hall, R.V. (1984). Opportunity to respond and student academic performance. In W. Heward, T. Heron, D. Hill, & J. Trap-Porter (Eds.), *Focus on behavior analysis in education* (pp.58-88). Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill.
- Haydon, T., MacSuga-Gage, A.S., Simonsen, B.S. (2012). Opportunities to Respond: A key component of effective instruction. *Beyond Behavior*, Fall, 23-31.
- Hughes, C. A., Morris, J.A., Therrien, W.J., & Benson, S.K. (2017). Explicit Instruction: Historical and contemporary contexts. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, 32, 140-148.
- Kuhfeld, M., Tarasawa, B. (2020). The COVID-19 slide: What summer learning loss can tell us about the potential impact of school closures on student academic achievement. NWEA.
- McLeskey, J., Barringer, M.D., Billingsley, B., Brownell, M., Jackson, D., Kennedy, M., Lewis, T., Maheady, L., Rodriguez, J., Scheeler, M.C., Winn.J., & Ziegler, D. (2017). *High-leverage practices in special education*. Arlington, VA: Council for Exceptional Children & CEEDAR Center.
- Rosenshine, B. (1987). Explicit teaching and teacher training. *Journal of Teacher Education*, v38 n3 p34-36 May-Jun 1987.
- Willingham, D. T. (2009). Why don't students like school? A cognitive scientist answers questions about how the mind works and what it means for the classroom. Jossey-Bass

Michigan's MTSS Technical Assistance Center is funded by the Michigan Department of Education and the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs.