

## EMBEDDED COACHING REFLECTION and Summary of Visit

<b>SCHOOL</b> MLK Jr. Elementary School	
<b>DATE</b> January 11 and 12, 2017	
<b>VISIT FOCUS</b> Collaborative Team Time Leadership Coaching	
<p><b>Team Focus 2<sup>nd</sup> grade- pre assessment and instructional planning based on data</b></p> <p>Circle Grade: Pre-k <b>K 1 2 3 4 5</b> 6 7 8</p> <p>Math</p> <p>Reading</p> <p>Intervention</p> <p>Common Formative Assessments</p> <p>Data Analysis</p> <p>Instructional Practices</p> <p>Other:</p> <p><b>January 11- 5<sup>th</sup> grade planning-</b>The 5<sup>th</sup> grade team reviewed the progress assessment data for both ELA and Math and the team shared that they have posted the data in their rooms for the students to be aware of. The team made inferences about student learning for Math and ELA and looked at the Blueprint for the next nine weeks. They understand that math facts, fractions and operations (multiplying and division) are going to continue to need to be addressed. In ELA, there is a need to continue to build comprehension skills, to support student ownership of their learning and to develop critical thinking skills that support students understanding main idea, author's purpose and being able to explain and justify using evidence in their own words.</p> <p><b>January 12- 5<sup>th</sup> grade planning-</b> The team reviewed the document, <i>"Protocol for Data Team Meeting"</i> and agreed to use this document with their progress assessment data. They then moved to look at the ELA blueprint and agreed to focus an instructional discussion around one of the ELA Blue Print standards, ELAGSE5RI8: "Explain how an author uses reasons and evidence to support particular points in a text, identifying which reasons and evidence supports which points(s)". The teachers worked collaboratively to consider how this standard could be supported in all content areas. They agreed to consider a common key for all teachers to use with the students for close reading. They will work to create anchor charts and share these expectations with all students. They also agreed to work collaboratively to build on the "explaining" from evidence that is needed in this standard. All content areas will work to have</p>	<p><b>Leadership/Guiding Coalition Focus</b></p> <p><b><u>Leadership Team Meeting- January 12, 2017</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The 5<sup>th</sup> grade team leader presented how the team is using pre (teacher created from School City) and post assessment (progress assessment) data to analyze student deficits. The teachers used the pre assessment data (they created the pre assessment from questions in School City) to drill down and do item analysis and backwards planned for last two weeks prior to progress assessments. The data was immediately shared with the students (class by class not individual data). The teachers know that the pre assessment questions must be set up so that the actually collect the evidence that they need to impact student learning. Next steps must include carefully vetting assessment questions from School City to ensure that they are closely aligned and ensuring that interventions and next steps are planned based on the data.</li> </ol>

students do more critical thinking and justifying with evidence rather than just creating answers. Ensuring that students understand the difference between explicit/implicit statements is important.

**January 11- 1<sup>st</sup> grade planning** - The team worked to brainstorm priority standards based on Aimsweb Plus Math data as well as some essential learnings for ELA. They discussed the ELA Unit for Week 20 that is based on RI3. The team was reminded to work to align the assessments to the rigor of the standard. They are doing their assessments on Wednesday instead of Fridays so they have the data to work from for the next days. They are regrouping and planning based on this Wednesday data.

The team reviewed the Nevada documents that include instructional strategies. Dibels monitoring will soon be scheduled. Dr. Yarbrough asked the teachers to be sure to be using their data to plan for small group and to work together to do more flexible groupings to meet student needs based on data. Dr. Nancy Thane Forde shared some resources with the team. These included Fry's Phases, [www.hubbardscupboard.org](http://www.hubbardscupboard.org) and Best Things in the World at teacher's net.

**January 12- 1<sup>st</sup> grade planning**- The team reviewed the document, *"Protocol for Data Team Meeting"* and agreed to use this document with some of their common assessment data to begin to become familiar with this document.

The team revisited their current priority standard, RI3- *"Describe the connection between two individuals, events, ideas or pieces of information in a text."* In order to understand the purpose of the PLC process to inform instruction, the team agreed to work together to plan instructional strategies to inform their practice around this standard.

The instructional strategies included a Venn Diagram to show the connections between events. Students would have direction instruction, guided practice and independent practice. The students would also use "class works" to address RI4- ask and answer questions. The team was reminded that "ask" also has to be part of the work of the students- not just answer. The team will be sent the progress assessment data for 3<sup>rd</sup>-5<sup>th</sup> grade and were asked to look at the assessed standards in 3<sup>rd</sup> grade to ensure that their prioritized work is aligned with the essential learnings needed in further grades.

**January 11 -K planning**- Betsy Glissen worked with the team to train them in Dibels Next assessments. She was able to bring in two students to demonstrate with the team how to do the Dibels monitoring effectively. The K team reviewed the current Dibels data and were reminded that they must be aware of their end goals. What do they want to accomplish with the students by year-

2. Dr. Yarbrough led The Leadership Team in an examination of the progress assessment data from grades 3,4,5 ELA and Math data. Each table was provided with either the Math or ELA data to discuss for the three grades. The teachers were asked to look for trends in the data- both successful trends and challenges. The teachers brainstormed some next steps. These next steps included:

- Blue Print standards built in to pacing guides
- Sharing successful strategies with each other
- Release questions- error analysis- backwards planning for the last three months
- Student data to be analyzed
- Understand standards and how this aligns to instruction and assessments
- How do we use this data for small group instruction and intervention plans?

The team leaders were reminded to share this with their teams for further discussion.

3. The team leaders discussed their School Action Monitoring Plan and the updates needed for this document. Ms. Henry supported this discussion reminding the team leaders of their shared responsibility for this work including focus walks.

**Ms. Thomas**- Ms. Thomas was in the school to do formative

end? How do they backwards plan to accomplish this? The Dibels expectations included:

23 sound, 18 phoneme parts, 15 nonsense sounds in a minute and 45 letters in 60 seconds.

**January 12- K planning-** The team reviewed the document, *"Protocol for Data Team Meeting"* and agreed to use this document with some of their data to begin to become familiar with this document.

The team identified the standard, RL3- "With prompting and support identify characters, settings, and major events in a story" as a current priority standard. They worked together to discuss a common high yield strategy that they can collaboratively use with the students and were reminded that they need to dig deeper to create critical thinking and to be well planned to formatively assess this standard. Some of the strategies that they discussed included using a graphic organizer (web) focused on character and setting. They also discussed using a flipbook and a journal for written response. The proficient students could also work to change the end of the story. The team worked with Coach Power and Ms. Thomas to discuss further how these tools would be built in to instruction and how you would be formatively assess this work on a daily basis.

**January 11- 2<sup>nd</sup> grade planning-** The team worked on their collaborative planning document focused on the standard RL6. The team spent some time writing learning targets and explored the Nevada documents and were shown how to find the learning targets and student activities that are aligned with the standard on that document (doe.nv.gov)

**January 12 -2<sup>nd</sup> grade planning-** The team reviewed the document, *"Protocol for Data Team Meeting"* and agreed to use this document with some of their data to begin to become familiar with this document. The team revisited their priority standard: *RL6 "Acknowledge differences in the points of view of characters, including by speaking in a different voice for each character when reading dialogue aloud"*.

The instructional strategy selected is a "T chart". The students will be using the T chart to demonstrate character traits. They will also practice compare and contrast. Another strategy will be with a read out loud to demonstrate "characterization". A next step would be doing a strategy using dialogue. Coach Walker reminded the team to consider how they would assess it? What would be the scoring guide for the T Chart? Dr. Yarbrough asked about shared reading texts. Is there a way to do some small group instruction with shared reading texts?

**January 11 - 3<sup>rd</sup> grade planning-** The 3<sup>rd</sup> grade team reviewed the data from the progress assessments. This was done standard by standard so that a discussion could be held around the intent of

instructional practice walkthroughs. She was able to share some of her observations with Coach Power, Walker and Principal Yarbrough. She expressed some concern about the set up of the room needing to be addressed in some classrooms to support guided reading and small group instruction. She also wants teachers to dig deeper in to the standard to ensure that instruction and daily assessment is well planned

#### **Nancy Thane Forde**

Dr. Thane Forde was able to attend some of the PLC meetings on January 11. She was able to share several resources and strategies with the teachers as literacy needs were identified.

#### **Mr. Lewis**

A discussion was held on the types of questions that students are seeing on Math progress monitoring assessments. Mr. Lewis will share the questions with the teachers to ensure that they start to expose students to the vocabulary and high order thinking skills needed for these questions. Mr. Lewis has sent the notebook file to the teachers and Coach Walker and Mr. Lewis would like to review this with the teachers.

#### **Leadership Coaching –**

- Dr. Yarbrough attended all of the PLC meetings both days with Coach Power. Between PLC meetings, there was time to discuss the commonalities, strengths and weaknesses as well as the next steps needed for each team

the standard, how they had been addressing the standard and what next steps might be. This conversation needs to continue for both Math and ELA. Ms. Clark shared an instructional strategy with the team as based on the data her students had been more successful on some of the standards addressed in the progress assessment. This led to a discussion for the team focused on creating some collaborate anchor charts to support understanding “character traits”.

**January 12- 3<sup>rd</sup> grade planning-** The team reviewed the document, “*Protocol for Data Team Meeting*” and agreed to use this document with some of their data to begin to become familiar with this document.

The team reviewed the third nine-weeks ELA Blue Print standards. They agreed to focus today’s discussion on the standard ELAGSE3RL2: “*Recount stories, including fables, folktales and myths from diverse cultures; determine the central message, lesson, or moral and explain how it is conveyed through key details in the text.*” The team worked on planning an instructional strategy to support grade level proficiency of this standard. A graphic organizer and other strategies/tools were discussed. This team would benefit from role clarification/task assignments and a protocol for all voices to be in the room to ensure equal participation by all teachers.

**January 11 -4<sup>th</sup> grade planning –** The 4<sup>th</sup> grade team reviewed the progress assessment data for Math and they will do the same for ELA. They were able to review data for two classes only and as an extension of the discussion of the standards that were missed by the students, Coach Power demonstrated unpacking a standard so that the teachers could clearly see what was required in the standard. More time will be dedicated to analysis of the progress assessment data both with the questions and the student data from all classes.

**January 12 - 4<sup>th</sup> grade planning-** The team reviewed the document, “*Protocol for Data Team Meeting*” and agreed to use this document with some of their data to begin to become familiar with this document. The team looked at their third nine-week ELA Blue Print document. They agreed that standard RL1: “*Refer to details and examples in a text when explaining what the texts says explicitly and when drawing inferences from the text*” is currently an important priority standard and they used this standard to plan a high yield instructional strategy. The team decided that they would all utilize a whole group instructional strategy about details and have the students use a graphic organizer to find the details in the story. They would also create a common anchor chart to demonstrate “explicit”.

- There is an identified need to continue to build connections with the teachers of how all of the planning, assessment, instruction, intervention and data are connected as the PLC process. These are not single tasks but truly must be aligned
- Some teams will need support in role clarification
- The PLC work on Day 2 was developed from the need to understand the Data Team Protocol and how to plan instructional strategies collaboratively
- Dr. Yarbrough and Coach Power worked together to plan the Leadership Team meeting on Jan 12
- Consider the question posed by Ms. Henry:

Questions to ponder:

“How do we help them see the urgency for creating quality instruction and assessment and the link to their evaluation?”

“How do we build shared ownership for all students to ensure “whatever it takes” is the motto to urgently meet the needs of students?”

\*A special note of thanks to Coach Walker for organizing, facilitating and ensuring that both days of PLC meetings were highly productive.

#### **Next Steps**

##### **PLCs-**

- The teams must begin to use the Georgia Guidance Documents and Framework documents each week to support their planning. They should also have their curriculum documents and pacing guides. The State documents can provide the “tights”. What instructional strategies, activities are recommended in the state documents should be the first choices for the teachers as they plan instruction. It is important that more consistent attention is paid to instructional discussion
- Begin to use the data protocol as part of the PLC cycle to further understand the evidence of learning and to identify next steps to meet the needs of students
- More PLC time should be dedicated to teacher discussions around student needs and adult actions in response to these needs. This includes instructional strategies that are collaboratively planned and thoughtfully created to deepen understanding of the rigor of the standard and align to an assessment plan
- Common Assessments need to be established as part of the continuous PLC process at MLK Jr.
- Post Progress Assessment Data in coaching room and continue to display data in the coaching/PLC room
- Consider role clarification for each person at the team to ensure all teachers are participating

#### **Next Steps for Dr. Yarbrough:**

- Ensure that the PLC teams are supported by leadership/coaching with questions being asked of them to address what they are doing, how they know their students are learning and that they are planning effective instruction, assessment and interventions (our goal continues to move teachers from compliance around PLC work to authentic collaboration)
- Coach Walker and Dr. Yarbrough to talk with state and district support personnel on any suggested adjustments that can be made to allow Coach Walker more time to work in classrooms with teachers
- A plan should be made to increase the knowledge of teachers around rigor and relevant strategies that are aligned to the standard. This should include understanding what is

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The PLC cycle should be a continuous cycle that includes planning from standards, determining grade level proficiency, what an assessment plan will be including classroom assessments, how instruction will be implemented, what the assessment data is providing evidence of and how will teachers meet student needs with interventions, remediation, instruction and how do they cycle back to begin planning again</li> </ul>	<p>expected of them instructionally</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Classroom observations should be focused on increasing the use of effective strategies- providing feedback, modeling and coaching</li> <li>• Teachers must be held accountable for the “tights”- truly understanding what is expected and what work is urgent and aligned to their evaluations</li> <li>• Data talks should be aligned to the expectations for improvement</li> <li>• Common Formative Assessments should be part of the building of common knowledge for teachers to understand the links between formative assessment, instruction and interventions</li> </ul>
---	--

*Complete each section that represents the session you attended.*

<p><b>REFLECTION:</b> What did I learn? Based on what I learned, what will have the greatest impact on student learning? (Dr. Yarbrough to complete as reflection)</p>
<div></div>