

The MIRROR Framework

Coaching Metacognitive Integration and Reflective Tech Learning

LaTina Taylor, NBCT, Langston Hughes STEM Elementary School, Chicago, Illinois

Todd Shimoda, PhD, Thinkertools nonprofit educational technology corporation

Overview

The **MIRROR Framework** (Map the mastery, Interrogate the integration, Release to the learner, Reflect on the cognitive load, Observe and co-anchor, Review and recalibrate) is a multi-tiered coaching blueprint for STEM instructional coaches. It helps them shift the classroom conversation from “What app/program are we using today?” to “How is this digital tool helping our students think on a deeper level about content?” This shift should empower students to demonstrate deeper conceptual understanding of content and skills. MIRROR helps STEM coaches to scaffold teacher awareness and the ability to move from Entry level to the Transformation level of the **Technology Integration Matrix (TIM, 2026)**, where technology acts as a collaborative, authentic, and goal-directed vehicle for learning rather than an “easy button” or a compliance checkbox. In this white paper, we introduce the problem that MIRROR will address, present a case study and results of a survey to help ground the framework, describe the MIRROR strategies, present a theory of action based on the framework, and provide a suggested timeline for the actions.

Problem Statement

Recent research on technology integration in K-12 classrooms highlights a complex mix of strengths and weaknesses. Systematic reviews and meta-analyses show that technology's greatest strength lies in its ability to adapt to individual student needs and streamline complex tasks. Technology does not inherently improve or harm learning; it amplifies the underlying pedagogy. Tools designed to scaffold independent reasoning and deep thinking show lasting benefits, while tools that merely give fast answers or fragment attention degrade long-term student retention. The strengths include these:

- **Adaptive and Personalized Learning:** Meta-analyses targeting educational software, including Intelligent Tutoring Systems (ITS) and Intelligent Learning Systems (ILS), consistently demonstrate positive effect sizes on student achievement (Cerón Salazar, 2026; Major, 2022). Systems that explicitly adapt to a learner's individual skill level—rather than just offering generalized feedback—produce significantly higher learning gains, particularly in subjects like mathematics and language learning.
- **Immediate Performance and Scaffolding Boosts:** Causal research on cutting-edge AI and advanced educational applications shows that active access to digital scaffolding significantly

improves immediate student output. Students complete math exercises, programming scripts, and draft writing tasks with much higher initial accuracy and lower early failure rates (Fesler, 2026).

- **Cognitive Burden Alleviation:** By handling mechanical or rote tasks (such as simple calculations or spelling checks), technology frees up working memory, allowing students to focus on high-level problem solving and conceptual exploration when paired with proper pedagogy.

Despite these strengths, studies from 2024 to 2026 have exposed fundamental flaws in how technology impacts long-term learning and student well-being. For example ...

- **The "Illusory Learning" and Transfer Deficit:** A weakness highlighted in recent Stanford research is that technology often creates a false sense of mastery. While student performance spikes while using the digital or AI tool, these gains frequently weaken or vanish entirely when students are evaluated independently without digital assistance (Fesler, 2026). If a tool makes the path to an answer too easy, it acts as a crutch, bypassing the deep mental processing required to form durable, long-term memories.
- **Digital Cognitive Load (DCL):** As schools adopt multiple educational technology platforms, students face severe "platform-switching" fatigue. Data shows a strong negative correlation between the simultaneous use of multiple ed-tech platforms and student well-being (Ibrahim, 2024). Managing varying interfaces and processing fractured streams of data splits student attention and can overwhelm their working memory and trigger academic burnout.
- **The Equity and Implementation Gap:** The effectiveness of technology is affected by teacher training and district funding. Systematic reviews highlight that post-pandemic adoption of advanced educational tech has vastly outpaced training (Osorio Vanegas, 2024). The reviews show that under-resourced schools may lack funds and time for technology training.

Evidence and Current Context: A Case Study and Survey

Case Study Model: *From Substitution to Transformation in Fifth Grade ELA*

This real-world example illustrates how the M.I.R.R.O.R. Framework shifts technology from an instructional "compliance checkbox" to an authentic vehicle for deep, student-driven conceptual mastery.

Profile Overview

- **Teacher:** Terri McCrary (Fifth Grade ELA)
- **STEM/Verizon Innovative Learning Schools (VILS) Coach:** LaTina Taylor
- **Core Anchor Text:** *Love, Amala* (Realistic Fiction)

→ **The Tech Stack Evolution:** BBC micro:bit (Physical Computing) → Hello World CS / AI 360 (Block Coding, AI, & Virtual Reality)

This case study highlights the remarkable classroom transformation in Ms. McCrary's fifth-grade ELA class during their unit on the realistic fiction core text, *Love, Amala*. By seamlessly blending literary analysis with immersive technology, Ms. McCrary shifted her students from passive readers into active creators of their own virtual realities.

The Instructional Journey: From Analysis to Creation

The project centered around the text *Love, Amala* and progressed through a deliberate, multi-phased digital architecture designed to maximize comprehension and critical thinking:

1. **Phase 1: Character Analysis via AI 360**

The unit launched with students diving into deep character analysis. Utilizing AI 360 tools, students examined the motivations, traits, and arcs of the characters within *Love, Amala*, grounding their upcoming technological creations in strong textual evidence.

2. **Phase 2: Crafting Alternate Endings**

Building upon their character foundations, the curriculum transitioned into rigorous narrative writing. Students were tasked with drafting, designing, and coding alternate endings to the text, taking the story off the flat page and moving it into an interactive virtual space.

The Scaffolded STEM Coaching Journey

STEM Instructional Coach LaTina Taylor guided Ms. McCrary through a deliberate progression, managing the cognitive load of both the teacher and the students to apply higher-order critical thinking.

Phase 1: Entry	Phase 2: Adoption/Adaptation	Phase 3: Transformation
<i>The Foundation:</i> Asynchronous Learning Platforms Micro:bit Basics	<i>The Exploration:</i> AI 360 & VR (Character analysis in VR)	<i>The Transformation:</i> Student-authored VR and complex writing
Intro to basic block coding mechanics	Low stakes tinker	Immersive alternate ending

1. The Foundation: Lowering the Barrier

- **What we (STEM coach and teacher) did:** We met in our coaching cycle and discussed teacher comfort level with tech and student tech readiness. The STEM coach introduced students to physical computing and basic block coding mechanics using the *BBC micro:bit* during our co-teaching time together.
- **The Purpose:** Established a non-threatening baseline of tech confidence for both the ELA teacher and her students before introducing complex narrative standards.

2. The Exploration: Low-Stakes Tinkering

- **What we (STEM coach and teacher) did:** We transitioned to the *AI 360 / Hello World* CS tool, combining block coding, artificial intelligence, and virtual reality for character analysis.
- **The Purpose:** Allowed students to "tinker" and explore the tool's rich capabilities through a traditional ELA objective (character analysis) without the pressure of a massive project score.

3. The Transformation: Releasing Agency to the Learner

- **What the teacher did:** Upon completing the core text, *Love, Amala*, students expressed strong dissatisfaction with the book's ending. Seizing this authentic student engagement, Ms. McCrary challenged students to use AI 360 to author, code, and build interactive, immersive alternate endings in VR.
- **The Purpose:** Shifted students entirely into creators, driving them to demonstrate profound comprehension of character motivation, narrative arc, and theme through code.

How This Demonstrates the MIRROR Framework

- **Map the Mastery and Reflect on Cognitive Load:** Rather than throwing fifth graders into complex VR creation on day one, the STEM coach and the ELA teacher scaffolded the skills (micro:bit → AI 360 tinkering → VR creation) so that technology never overwhelmed the ELA learning goals.
- **Review and Recalibrate:** Ms. McCrary observed student dissatisfaction with the text's ending and used it as a data point to pivot her instructional design.
- **Release to the Learner:** The project moved completely away from a teacher-led app tutorial and reached the Transformation Level on the TIM matrix, where students actively used AI and VR as their personal vehicle to write, create, and problem solve.

The Magic of Tech-Driven Writing and Collaboration

The integration of technology triggered an explosive level of student engagement and naturally elevated the academic rigor of the classroom.

- **Vocabulary With a Purpose:** Because students knew their narratives would be brought to life in a coded, virtual environment, they actively pushed themselves to use richer, more descriptive vocabulary to accurately paint their digital scenes.
- **Creation Over Consumption:** The project proved that when students are given the tools to create rather than just consume, tech integration naturally drives deep, rigorous writing.
- **Collaborative Development:** Students did not code in silos. Working in collaborative development teams, they engaged in intense dialogue, negotiated plot directions, peer-edited, and shared creative ownership as they decided how the new narrative would unfold both visually and textually.

Critical Thinking and the Iterative Process

Coding an interactive story in a 360-degree virtual space requires intense planning, continuous debugging, and self-evaluation.

The technology served as a shared canvas that forced students into a continuous, high-level cognitive loop of trial, error, and refinement. To successfully build their alternate endings, students had to achieve the following:

- **Set milestones:** Script and map out clear development phases for their stories.
- **Execute and Debug:** Run and test their code to see if it executed their narrative choices correctly.
- **Evaluate:** Continually assess whether their descriptive writing effectively conveyed the new story arc within the 360-degree digital space.

Teacher Spotlight: Overcoming the Tech Barrier

“From the onset, the integration of the VILS program into the classroom was a bit intimidating. However, the collaborative partnership with Ms. Booker-Taylor and my students' eagerness to get involved was the catalyst to propel me to implement these new ideas.” —Terri McCrary, Fifth-Grade ELA Teacher

- **The Evolution:** “As we got further into the school year, the devices became a powerful resource tool for research in real time—like with our school garden, ideas we encountered through text (new vocabulary or scientific phenomena), and our fifth-grade 'Cell phones versus no Cell phones' podcast debate.”
- **The Mindset Shift:** “I learned to keep encouraging my students to use the technology. Now, I feel more comfortable trying new technology-integrated projects, software, and accessory pieces like

the VR headsets. I know I'm not in this alone. My students benefit so greatly, and they blow me away with the ideas they come up with."

Survey Results of Participants in the Technology Integration Matrix (TIM) Professional Development Workshop

In February 2026, eight teachers at Langston Hughes STEM Elementary School participated in a professional development workshop on integrating technology in the classroom to increase and improve collaborative learning and student "talk-time." Participants were introduced to TIM with an aim for these teachers to demonstrate advancement along the matrix by the end of the semester. At the conclusion of this introductory workshop, teachers completed a short survey consisting of ten questions (both qualitative and quantitative in nature).

Survey findings revealed:

- Participants varied in comfort with and frequency of integrating technology.
- Most participants placed themselves at the Adaptation level of the matrix.
- There did not appear to be an association between self-assessed matrix level and self-reported frequency of integrating technology; however, participants at the adaptation level reported greater comfort.
- Barriers included integrating technology within their established curriculum as well as relying on students and the technology itself.
- Teachers felt that new technology could facilitate collaborative, student-led learning.

Proposed Strategic Support

To address the problems of technology integration and help teachers and students move to the Transformation level, we propose the following MIRROR strategies.

Map the mastery (goal-directed focus)

Before a teacher selects a digital tool or opens a device, the STEM coach anchors the conversation in a student-friendly learning objective that will be a fundamental element of reaching the goal of the lesson, project, or assignment. Instead of evaluating the *technology* itself, the dialogue focuses entirely on *what the students are doing*. Here are some questions to consider: If the technology was removed, would the core standards or goal still be clear? Does the tech amplify the goal and not become the goal? Can the teacher clearly identify the pedagogical difference between using technology as a digital chalkboard versus using it as a student-centered medium for inquiry?

Interrogate the integration (TIM alignment)

STEM coaches use the TIM matrix to help teachers audit their current tech usage level (Entry, Adoption, Adaptation, Infusion, Transformation). The STEM coaches guide the teacher to analyze the task to discover if the students are passively consuming content (Entry) or are using technology to construct fresh meaning (Infusion/Transformation). This phase acts as a pedagogical diagnostic where the STEM coach scaffolds the teacher's analysis using the TIM's five characteristics (Active, Collaborative, Constructive, Authentic, and Goal-Directed learning). This also a good opportunity to see if the teachers see the differences in the TIM tiers and the value in moving from their technology integration from Entry toward Transformation.

Release to the learner (goal-directed focus)

To move up the TIM matrix, technology control must shift from teacher-directed to student-driven. The STEM coach scaffolding helps teachers design structured choices. Instead of assigning a specific app or program, give students a menu of tools and ask them to select the one best suited to solve the problem. The STEM coach can guide the teacher to redesign an upcoming lesson if needed to remove any procedural bottlenecks to make room for student choice. To evaluate the effectiveness, check student engagement with the content and the technology supporting learning and problem solving.

Reflect on the cognitive load (metacognition)

This is the heart of the framework. Both teachers and students must pause to reflect on how the technology altered their thinking process. Provide teachers with "Metacognitive Exit Tickets" or digital reflection prompts for students. *Student Example:* "Why did you choose this tool over another? How did it help you overcome a roadblock in your learning today?" *Teacher Example:* "Did the technology accelerate student understanding, or did it outsource their critical thinking?" These answers will help the coach and teacher find out if the current observation instruments specifically track the student mastery level, teacher use of the technology, and other defined parameters or school goals.

Observe and co-anchor (coaching support)

STEM coaches don't just hand over a framework; they step into the arena. The STEM coach observes from the sidelines, taking targeted content logs and micro-coding interaction patterns. The goal of this phase is optimization through real-time feedback loops. Coaches may help co-teach or model a lesson using a high-level TIM strategy. Often the focus is on how to manage transitions, maintain student stamina, facilitate peer-to-peer collaboration, and yet encourage problem solving using devices. For example, when a student encounters a technological or logic gap, does the teacher respond with an investigative question rather than a direct, step-by-step solution? Are the teachers and students actively learning together and have agency over their technology use?

Review and recalibrate (data-driven iteration)

At this stage, the coach and teacher evaluate the artifacts of learning created during the lesson (projects, code, digital boards) alongside any data or reflections collected from the students. Use these questions to guide your review: How did the technology help the students master the concepts? Did the students achieve the intended level of understanding the subject matter, problem solve, and attain other measurable outcomes? Did the students move toward or achieve the Transformation level? Based on the answers, adjust the instructional approach for the next cycle.

Theory of Action

IF STEM instructional coaches systematically utilize the multi-tiered **MIRROR Framework** to scaffold teacher awareness and pedagogical design,

THEN teachers will shift their practice from passive, entry-level tech adoption to transformative, student-centered technology integration (TIM Transformation Level),

SO THAT technology ceases to be an "easy button" compliance checkbox and becomes an authentic/real world, collaborative, and goal-directed vehicle that empowers students to demonstrate deep conceptual understanding.

Level 1: The STEM Coach-to-Teacher Shift

- IF a STEM coach uses the *MIRROR* framework to ground coaching cycles in standards and cognitive depth rather than software features,
- THEN teachers will stop asking "*What app/program are we using today?*" and start asking "*How is this digital tool helping my students think on a deeper level?*"

Level 2: The Teacher-to-Classroom Shift

- IF teachers shift their tech integration from the Entry level to the Transformation level of the Technology Integration Matrix (TIM),
- THEN the daily classroom experience will evolve from teacher-led digital consumption to student-led digital creation, collaboration, and authentic real world problem-solving.

Level 3: The Classroom-to-Student Outcome

- IF students are given regular access to collaborative, authentic/real world, and goal-directed digital learning experiences,

→ THEN they will move past rote compliance and successfully demonstrate high-level conceptual understanding of complex STEM contents and skills.

Framework Phase	The Operational "If-Then" Statement
Map the Mastery and Interrogate the Integration	<i>IF</i> STEM coaches guide teachers to first identify the rigor of the content standard and critically evaluate where their tech usage sits on the TIM matrix, <i>THEN</i> teachers will design lessons where technology is intentionally aligned to the depth of the learning goal rather than used as a digital worksheet.
Release to the Learner and Reflect on the Cognitive Load	<i>IF</i> STEM coaches scaffold a teacher's comfort with handing digital agency over to students while actively managing task complexity, <i>THEN</i> technology will transform into a student-driven vehicle for higher-order thinking rather than a passive "easy button" for teacher delivery.
Observe and Co-Anchor and Review and Recalibrate	<i>IF</i> STEM coaches and teachers collaboratively analyze live student artifacts and iteratively adjust instruction based on real-time evidence of learning, <i>THEN</i> transformative, goal-directed technology integration will become a permanent, sustainable baseline of the school's STEM culture.

Expected Outcomes and Timeline

To know if the **MIRROR Framework** is working, we have to look for shifting behaviors across three distinct groups: STEM coaches, teachers, and students.

Partner	Short-Term Outcomes (1-4 Months)	Long-Term Outcomes (5-9+ Months)
STEM Coaches	STEM coaching logs show conversations centered on standards and complexity of the task rather than app/program tutorials. Baseline TIM (Technology Integration Matrix) data is collected for all coached teachers(through observations and surveys).	STEM coaches can reliably use the MIRROR framework to move teachers up at least one full tier on the TIM matrix. Data drives professional development decisions.

Teachers	Lesson plans start with the learning goal ("Students will analyze...") before picking a digital tool. Teachers can identify where their current tech use sits on the TIM.(i.e. Tech Pulse survey)	Shift from teacher-led tech use (Entry) to student-driven tech use (Infusion/Transformation). Increased comfort with "releasing control" to students using digital tools.
Students	Students can explain why they are using a specific tool, beyond "because the teacher told me to." Increased engagement with collaborative digital platforms	Students create authentic digital artifacts (e.g., models, podcasts, code) that demonstrate deep conceptual STEM mastery. Student agency and goal-directed learning increase. (student survey data)

References

- Cerón Salazar, E. M. & Burbano Gonzalez, D. C. (2026). Intelligent learning systems in primary and secondary education: A systematic review (2014–2024). *Frontiers in Education*, 11, Article 1720377 <https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/education/articles/10.3389/feduc.2026.1720377/full>
- Fesler, L., Martinez Claeys, J. P., Agnew, C., & Loeb, S. (2026). *The evidence base on AI in K-12: A 2026 review*. AI Hub for Education of the SCALE Initiative, Stanford University. <https://scale.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/The%20Evidence%20Base%20on%20AI%20in%20K-12%20Report.pdf>
- Florida Center for Instructional Technology. (n.d.). *Technology Integration Matrix*. University of South Florida. TIM (2026), <https://fcit.usf.edu/matrix/>
- Ibrahim, R. K., Al Marar, Y. A., Salman, M., Jehad, S., Hamza, M. G., Abouelnasr, A. S., Abdelaliem, S. M. F., Alahmedi, S. H., & Hendy, A. (2025). Impact of multiple educational technologies on well-being: The mediating role of digital cognitive load. *BMC Nursing*, 24, Article 1028. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1186/s12912-025-03655-z>
- Major, L., Francis, G. A., & Tspali, M. (2022). The effectiveness of technology-supported personalised learning in low- and middle-income countries: A meta-analysis. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 52(5), 1935–1964. <https://bera-journals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/bjet.13116>
- Osorio Vanegas, H. D., de María Segovia Cifuentes, Y., & Sobrino Morrás, A. (2024). Educational technology in teacher training: A systematic review of competencies, skills, models, and methods. *Education Sciences*, 15(8), 1036. <https://www.mdpi.com/2227-7102/15/8/1036>



[CC BY-NC-ND 4.0 Deed | Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 4.0 International](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/)

