

EMBEDDED COACHING REFLECTION

SCHOOL McKibben Lane Elementary	
DATE 11.29-11.30.17	
VISIT FOCUS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Collaborative Team Time <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Collaborative Coaching Reflection (Principal Collaboration) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Leadership/Guiding Coalition Meeting	
Team Focus Circle Grade: PreK K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 <input type="checkbox"/> Math <input type="checkbox"/> Reading (writing) <input type="checkbox"/> Intervention <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Common Formative Assessments <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Data Analysis <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Instructional Practices <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____	Leadership/Guiding Coalition Focus <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Data Analysis <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PD Planning <input type="checkbox"/> Team Reflections <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____
Team Discussions Lane teams have seemingly become more invested in the process of collaboration to support student learning, and yet, some teams are not making the most of the plan-do-study-act process and how it can target improvements in a specific skill or concept being taught. To ensure that teachers had shared knowledge about the “why” and the “how”, all teachers participated in an overview of common assessments held during a staff meeting. During this overview, the teams observed a team in action (video) and analyzed the culture, focus and process used by the team. We also discussed the big ideas around common formative assessments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bigger isn’t better More often is better The items don’t need to be original creations, but teams do need to ensure that they are aligned to the standards, rigor, etc. The important thing is that they are used to help students learn more (i.e., this isn’t about compliance) We score, but don’t penalize students by grading them on formative measures. They are there as feedback for our students and us. 	Leadership/Guiding Coalition Discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The leadership team participated in half-day meetings to discuss implementation of effective common assessment practices, with an emphasis on designing/selecting assessment items that are aligned to the essential standards and reflect an appropriate level of rigor. We examined items using the filter of DOK and emphasized how teams need to build clarity about their end in mind by looking at the end-of-unit expectations, the end-of-year expectations, and the impact that the task, the stimulus, and the supports make on the level of rigor. A few areas of concern arose from the conversations that led to some recommendations for future: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Examine strategies/scheduling options that will allow the PEC teachers to engage with at least one grade level team next year (at least one day/per week). Since many students require work on pre-requisite skills, the school can engage in vertical conversations to ensure that everyone is clear

<p>I also walked through several classrooms looking at the level of engagement and expectations. I did see some patterns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In many classes, there is little academic conversation taking place among the students. I think this might be an area to emphasize. For example, the dialogue is typically taking place between the teacher and one student (after waiting for the hand to raise). • Additionally, the opportunities for writing are inconsistent across grade levels and the expectations for quality of writing aren't clear to students. Consequently, the artifacts seen on the walls, etc. were of relatively low level at some grade levels. Having a vertical conversation about these expectations, common academic language, and even rubrics would help to align their efforts and increase the quality of work as students progress through the grades. 	<p>about the end in mind (e.g., in math or literacy), and what it looks like to be proficient for each grade level. These vertical foundations are a vehicle to examine quality practices and expectations within Tier 1/core instruction. Also, it would be beneficial to look systematically at the interventions that are taking place—are they closing the gap? Are there additional opportunities to build in support for students who are missing pre-requisite skills (e.g., math fluencies, etc.)?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We also discussed how bringing students into the mix—i.e., by sharing clear targets, making sure they know what quality work looks like, being clear on where they are relative to the target (e.g., keeping track of their data, etc.) and having specific strategies for improving.
<p>Next Steps Follow-through on the information for teams around common formative assessments. Also, engage staff in the examination of quality/rigor of products being produced and the alignment with end of year expectations.</p>	<p>Next Steps Work with the leadership team to co-design initial vertical conversations in order to address an area of need (e.g., math prerequisites).</p>

Complete each section that represents the session you attended.

<p>REFLECTION: What did I learn? Based on what I learned, what will have the greatest impact on student learning?</p>
<p>We discussed how having clarity about learning targets at the team level will enhance the quality of assessments and instruction. Additionally, when teachers are clear, then they can make sure their students are clear. We also discussed how vertical conversations can be used to impact school wide practices.</p>
<p>NEXT STEPS: What are the actions needed before next coaching meeting?</p>
<p>Continue to build on the ideas established during the CFA conversations.</p>
<p>AGENDA ITEMS: Topics for next coaching visit.</p>
<p>Looking at rigor of instruction (i.e., questioning/assessment, expectations, etc.) and possibly structure a vertical conversation.</p>