



### **DEEP DIVE INTO CLINICAL TEACHING**

Delving into the depths of clinical teaching in an encounter with the educational reality of teaching high school mathematics and science at the five-unit level.

*NOVEMBER 2, 2016, 9:00-11:30, DJANOGLY HALL, MISHKENOT SHA'ANANIM*

The Trump Foundation's strategic outline assumes that excellent teaching is the deepest and longest-lasting factor in expanding the circle of excellence in mathematics and the sciences. The foundation defined excellent teaching as a clinical specialization focused on providing a response to the learning of each individual student. Clinical teaching affects the student, the class, and the professional community of teachers, and includes a diagnosis of every student's capabilities and difficulties as well as a joint articulation of ambitious goals, an adaptation of teaching methods, and follow-up of progress, while providing constructive and supportive feedback.

In a 2014 meeting of the advisory committee, members noted that the definition was insufficiently clear to the foundation's staff and to project leaders and teachers participating in the program. In response, the foundation's team appealed to the collective wisdom of excellent teachers participating in foundation programs and research done in Israel and abroad. Based on these data, they back-engineered a concrete, visual definition under the heading of "A Compass for Excellent Teaching." To examine and validate the definition, 15 experienced teachers were asked to observe several foundation programs and interview teachers using the compass as an analytical tool.

The teachers' observations were collated and edited by Guy Ashkenazi, a chemistry teacher and the winner of the 2015 Trump Master Teacher Award. The raw data and analysis reports served Leah Pass and Haim Lapid for their in-depth study analyzing the encounter between the clinical approach to teaching and the actual field of teaching.

#### **QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION:**

1. Is the more detailed definition that the compass provides sufficiently clear? Is its internal logic clear and convincing? Does it contain unnecessary components, or lack necessary ones?
2. What do the generic features of the compass indicate? Is the compass suitable for the teaching of other disciplines, and, by contrast, does it lack specific adaptations for mathematics and science?
3. What desirable and/or possible ways are there to promote and refine the use of the compass in educational programs and classrooms? Does it make sense to create more concrete examples or define standards and/or levels of performance?
4. What is important to learn from the feedback from the field? Should the focus on the learning of each student and the creation of individualized learning programs stand front and center in the foundation's objectives? If so, how?

As **background** to the discussion, we recommend reading the following:

A. [Compass for Quality Teaching](#)

B. ["Clinical Teaching in Practice – Interim Report,"](#) Haim Lapid and Leah Pass