

Final Report

Submitted to the

North Carolina Department of Public Instruction  
John Pruetto, Director, Office of Early Learning

Submitted by

The Frank Porter Graham Child Development Institute  
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill  
Sharon Ritchie, Principal Investigator

Title: Approach to Data: From Evaluation to Inquiry

Period of Performance: September 1, 2012 – December 31, 2015

Date Submitted: May 24, 2016

Signed:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Sharon Ritchie". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Sharon" and the last name "Ritchie" clearly distinguishable.

Sharon Ritchie  
Principal Investigator

## **Final Report: Using Data to Improve Classroom Instruction**

The FirstSchool work in Martin and Bertie Counties centered on setting up school cultures within the districts in which teachers developed a mindset of continuous improvement, used collaborative inquiry structures to examine data and use it to improve their practice, and then providing them professional development to enable changes related to their data-driven reflections. Despite a number of challenges, teachers and administrators overcame their negative reconceptualization about the role of data in the classroom to become active participants in the reflective inquiry process. Engaging in this process led to project-wide changes to a number of instructional practices including increased oral language development; more opportunities for student collaboration around content; and a shift toward a teaching style characterized by open-ended questions, back-and-forth exchanges between students and adults, and engagement through teacher participation and facilitation rather than simply telling students information.

### **RTT-ELC Activity 15.2: Using Data to Improve Classroom Instruction**

*Description: This Activity strengthened the use of assessment to promote high quality instruction in Pre-K through 3rd grade, through implementation of FirstSchool, to produce equitable outcomes for African American, Latino, and low-income students in Bertie and Martin counties.*

**Key Accomplishments: Key goals of the project were as follows. Please provide a narrative report that addresses each of these goals, presenting evidence and data that demonstrate how these goals were successfully completed.**

*Key Goal #1: Administrators and teachers will demonstrate an improved ability to articulate the value, purposes, and use of assessment and how it informs their instructional practices and knowledge of student learning.*

- *Interviews, open-ended questions from teacher surveys, meeting notes*
- *Change mindset from Performance Orientation to Mastery/Growth Orientation*
- *Provide opportunities for reflective practice and data to fuel that process*
- *Provide professional development opportunities related to data-driven areas of interest*

First, FirstSchool works to shift teachers' mindsets from a Performance Goal Orientation to a Mastery Goal Orientation/Growth Mindset. Teachers who adopt a Growth Mindset recognize that their practice is inherently imperfect, avoid taking this fact personally, and work to improve their practice accordingly. Evidence for this shift in mindset is most readily measured through qualitative approaches in which participants talk about their attitudes toward data and the formation of a culture of collaborative inquiry. Therefore, we present here quotes from participants that tell the story of this shift.

Specifically, interviews with leaders in Bertie and Martin Counties suggested three key steps in nurturing a mindset shift and the formation of a culture of collaborative inquiry:

1. Facilitation by leadership is required;
2. It takes time, support from leaders, and positive experiences to create mutual trust;
3. Collaborative inquiry requires joint effort, not isolated effort even when the benefits are shared.

A district leader reflected on the challenge of building an environment where each individual feels safe enough to admit weaknesses and trust colleagues to be sources of help and support in an era of hypercriticism of teachers:

You know, it is about growing, growing our teachers... Nobody's trying to "get you" or ... tell you you're doing it wrong. We want you to be able to reflect, look at the data, and see if it – see what it says, and then I think you can carry it the step further. How are we going to improve? Which is what the one-on-one conversations that you all had with our teachers and our principals when y'all would meet with them (were about).

Another district leader reflected on the process of overcoming resistance on the part of principals as well as teachers to using data to examine what happens in classrooms:

You all never said ... there was never a correction where you said, you know, "You did it this way, so you're a terrible teacher." That was never the goal. I always felt like it was ... safe ... It's, "This is what we saw. ... How does a change in the way you're doing it ... affect what happens in your classroom in terms of student learning, student autonomy, student management, student everything? Your relationship with your kids. Your productivity. Students' productivity. Their self-confidence. Their ability to get along with you and each other."

This leader went on to describe the initial resistance on the part of some teachers to being observed by an outsider, and the efforts other teachers made to "put on a dog and pony show" when the observer came to collect data in their classrooms. As teachers received supportive feedback in a non-evaluative atmosphere, their response to being observed and to examining their practice changed:

I think towards the end they were used to people. They were used to (you) coming in. They knew that... nobody was derided for teaching a particular way. The data was not ... shared in a way that pointed fingers at any one person. ... So I hope that the teachers in the end found that it was a good experience. I think the folks (did) who opened up their minds and decided that, you know, "I can use this (data) as a positive way to think about how I interact with my class."

One of the principals we interviewed put her finger on the key to developing the right climate for true collaborative inquiry to occur:

The idea of the culture of caring is the part that I probably care about or carried away with me the most. Because that is just right along with my philosophy about students – (they) are children, and (we should consider) not just children, adults. Adults have got to be cared for. ... They've got to feel valued.

... Because it wasn't all about the data is what I realized. I mean, the data was important, but it was also more of a reflection thing, listening to the conversation.

... I do think that just the sharing of information is very good for all of us, teachers, principals, everybody to reflect on. A lot of times we don't do enough of that. We get caught up in the busy day to day things that you have to do, and it has to be a learned process of reflecting and thinking about little things that do make such a big difference in the children's lives.

Taken together, these quotes illustrate a shift from using data in non-meaningful, often coercive ways against teachers to a non-judgmental, supportive framework in which teachers see data as a tool rather than as a punishment or requirement. In developing this mindset of continuous improvement, these teachers have created in their schools cultures of collaborative inquiry, motivating them to continue improving their practice, even after the project has been completed.

*Key Goal #2: Administrators and teachers will learn how to use data that support school and classroom efforts to improve the school experience of under-represented children, including broader use of data such as attendance, retention, and discipline. This includes formative, benchmark, and summative approaches that inform teaching and learning.*

*Key Goal #3: Administrators and teachers will explore the principles and use of collaborative inquiry to inform instructional practice and knowledge of student learning and progress, with a focus on improving learning of African American, Latino and low income students.*

*Key Goal #4: Administrators and teachers will broaden their ability to view instructional practices and student engagement. Using research observation measures, Snapshot and CLASS, teachers and administrators will explore constructs of quality.*

A number of the key goals accomplished as part of the FirstSchool Roanoke Connection project relate to the use of various types of data and assessment by educational practitioners to guide practice. Once teachers had the proper mindset to proceed with work centered on reflection and continuous improvement, FirstSchool facilitated the process by providing data and assisting teachers in using the data already in their possession. At its heart, the continuous improvement process is about action research in schools and classrooms: setting goals, trying new things, measuring efficacy, and repeating the cycle. In addition to providing the data to examine efficacy of new practices, FirstSchool also provided information related to pedagogical techniques that allowed teachers to make informed, research-driven decisions regarding which practices to attempt or amplify. Evaluating this work involves

qualitative statements from participants as well as data from a variety of instruments, including classroom observation measures such as the Snapshot.

Prior to engaging in a more in-depth look at the changes in practice and their drivers, we will provide a brief overview of the notable instructional changes. Changes were tracked for four groupings: Martin County leadership teachers from fall of year one to fall of year three, Bertie County leadership teachers from fall of year one to fall of year three, all Martin County P-3 teachers from fall of year two to fall of year three, and all Bertie County P-3 teachers from fall of year two to fall of year three. Changes will be discussed based on those groupings. We would also like to include an important note with regard to interpretation. The Snapshot instrument measures how children in a classroom, on average, spend their day in school (with the exception of Specials such as Art, P.E., or Music). Therefore, percentages reflect the percentage of the day during which children are exposed to or are experiencing certain things. Although it may be tempting to dismiss small percentage changes, each percent change equates to a change of roughly 11.7 hours of time when expanded over the course of a school year. Adding that much time to a single activity or content area is significant, particularly when multiplied out over all the students in a county or classroom.

Martin County leadership teachers made the following changes throughout the project:

- increased Whole Language from 15% of the day to 21% of the day,
- increased Oral Language Development from 8% to 13%,
- increased Numbers from 12% to 20%,
- increased total Literacy from 39% to 41%,
- increased total Math from 22% to 25%,
- increased Gross Motor from 5% to 6%,
- increased Scaffolded instruction from 23% to 29%,
- increased Collaboration from 7% to 8%, and
- increased Physical Autonomy from 78% to 97% of the day.

Bertie County leadership teachers made the following changes throughout the project:

- increased Choice time from 11% of the day to 12% of the day,
- increased Small Group from 5% of the day to 6%,
- increased Oral Language from 8% to 10%,
- increased Algebra from 4% to 6%,
- increased Social Studies from 8% to 11%,
- increased Science from 8% to 9%,
- increased Aesthetics from 6% to 8%,
- increased Scaffolded instruction from 20% to 23%,
- increased Collaboration from 6% to 9%, and
- increased Physical Autonomy from 76% of the day to 95% of the day.

Changes made by all Martin County P-3 teachers from year two to year three include the following:

- increased Small Group time from 3% of the day to 4% of the day,
- increased Writing from 3% to 4%,
- increased Algebra from 6% to 7%,
- increased Science from 6% to 9%,
- increased Scaffolded instruction from 22% to 24%, and
- increased Collaboration from 4% of the day to 6% of the day.

Finally, changes made by all Bertie County P-3 teachers from year two to year three include the following:

- increased Small Group time from 4% to 6%,
- increased Read To from 3% to 4%,
- increased Vocabulary from 4% to 6%,
- increased Social Studies from 5% to 8%,
- increased Science from 6% to 8%,
- increased Gross Motor from 4% to 5%,
- increased Scaffolded instruction from 20% to 21%,
- increased Collaboration from 5% to 7%, and
- increased Physical Autonomy from 90% to 93%.

Overall, these results are in keeping with the FirstSchool theory of change. Leadership team teachers, who received the vast majority of the direct professional development, made more changes to practice than their counterparts in schools who did not receive direct professional development. However, a number of positive changes were also made by non-leadership team teachers as district personnel, principals, and leadership team teachers brought new information back to the school, resulting in cultural and instructional shifts within the schools. This is especially evident with regard to Physical Autonomy, which leadership teams made a point of emphasis in year one. Notes from FirstSchool team members reveal that leadership team teachers worked hard in year one to make changes in their own classroom as well as to communicate the importance of this practice to their peers. Consequently, averages on this code moved from around 77% to 96% for leadership teachers and to 91% for non-leadership teachers.

In order to track teacher priorities throughout the project, leadership team teachers were provided with a questionnaire at the end of the 2013-2014 school year ( $N = 39$ ) and the end of the 2014-2015 school year ( $N = 44$ ; see Addendum). One of the items on the survey asked teachers rank the top three practices they were targeting for improvement. It is interesting to note which items shifted in importance for leadership team members based on their participation in the project. In the first survey, Vocabulary Development was the most cited area of focus with 10 (26%) participants citing it as the most important area for improvement and 24 (62%) participants citing it as one of the top three areas. In the final survey, 36 participants (82%) cited it as an area of interest,

with 16 (36%) citing it as the top priority. We placed a lot of emphasis on Vocabulary Development and its importance, and teachers became more focused on it as part of their work in this project. However, data from the Snapshot suggest that this strategy did not lead to meaningful changes in practice within leadership team teachers' classrooms. At time one they were spending 6% of the day on Vocabulary Development and were spending the same amount of time at the end of the project. Examining meeting notes from FirstSchool Roanoke Connection professional development sessions revealed that many schools adopted vocabulary curricula in response to their early focus on this practice. It is possible, therefore, that leaders maintained a focus on this issue in their work with colleagues who were not on the leadership team. In Bertie County, district-wide we did see a significant increase in the amount of time children were engaged in vocabulary development.

The related skill of Oral Language Development also became more important over the course of the project. In the initial survey, only seven (18%) participants listed Oral Language as the most important focus area, and only 11 (28%) individuals listed it as one of the top three. In the final survey, five (11%) participants listed Oral Language Development as the most important practice they were working on as part of the project while 17 (39%) participants listed it in the top three. The shift from 28% of participants focusing on this skill to over a third of participants focusing on it appears to have paid off. In Martin County, the proportion of the day leadership teachers spent on Oral Language Development went from 8% of the day to 13% of the day while in Bertie County, the proportion of the day moved from 8% to 10%. Across the two counties, over an entire school year, this increase equates to each PreK-3 student in these counties potentially receiving almost five additional days (29.5 hours) of additional Oral Language Development.

It is interesting to note that similar gains were not made by non-leadership teachers. Although any analysis at this point is necessarily post-hoc, we believe that this is due to the fact that, for some things, teachers already have the skills to implement instructional change, but fail to prioritize it. That does not appear to be the case here, as the direct professional development provided by the FirstSchool team appears to have provided to the leadership team teachers skills that were not acquired by their non-leadership counterparts in the schools. Contrary to this, all teachers in both counties increased their Collaboration scores, which track the amount of time teachers allow students to work together to complete academic tasks. This skill appears to be one that teachers possessed all along but were not using for one reason or another.

In other cases, there appeared to be complex skills that FirstSchool strongly emphasized in direct professional development that were able to be passed along to other teachers through leadership emphasis and secondary professional development conducted by leadership teachers. The most important of these is Scaffolded instruction, which was targeted as an important skill upon which to focus by over half the leadership team teachers in 2015 and was increased by both leadership team teachers and all teachers in both counties. The largest gains were made by leadership team teachers, who averaged an increase of 4%. Smaller gains were made by all

teachers in both counties, who averaged an increase of 1.5%. Increasing the amount of time teachers spend on Scaffolded instruction is critical as it allows students to engage more in higher order thinking skills and more nuanced learning support from teachers. The disparity between leadership teachers and others is not surprising, though, as employing Scaffolded instruction involves a shift in how teachers interact with students. These interactions are governed not by a single skill but by the use of multiple skills, which must be deployed differently in various situations. Therefore, it seems likely that some of these skills would be easily communicated to non-leadership team teachers while others would be more difficult to pass along.

Finally, we would like to draw attention to shifts made by Bertie County teachers that largely occurred during the final year of the project. During this year, the counties, per their request based on data and interest, worked on different goals. Two goals addressed by Bertie County were curriculum balance and math. With regard to curriculum, it appears that efforts to provide more balanced content by all Bertie teachers were largely successful. Science increased by 2% across the county, Social Studies by 3%, and Gross Motor activities by 1%. The latter, based on meeting notes and observations at schools, appears to have been accomplished by administrators at certain schools encouraging teachers to reinstate recess, a topic that was the subject of FirstSchool professional development. The second goal, related to improving math instruction, is difficult to track. While the total amount of time spent on math instruction does not appear to have increased, the type of math instruction FirstSchool in partnership with the Bertie Central Office focused on promoting, Algebraic Thinking, increased by 2%. Therefore, it appears that teachers did not enlarge their math blocks but instead shifted their instruction, focusing more on higher order thinking skills related to recognizing patterns, sorting and categorizing, and matching based on attributes.

*Key Goal #5: Administrators and teachers will learn to use the NC teacher evaluation to promote the use of data, evidence based practice, and collaborative inquiry in order to improve the school experiences of African American, Latino and low income children.*

One domain of the NC teacher evaluation tool requires teachers to document their pathway for improved instruction. During PD and individual conferences, teachers were encouraged to use their EduSnap data to help identify an area for improvement and to document this target, attempts at improvement, and subsequent data. This same information was shared with principals along with encouragement to support teachers in doing this. Since these were suggestions and not mandated, some teachers, but not all, did work with their principals to use EduSnap data and to document their progress in improving a specific instructional practice. Those who used it expressed the EduSnap data was a good fit with the NC teacher evaluation tool. Another domain of the evaluation tool focuses on teacher leadership. Teachers and principals were also urged to grant credit for leadership roles that teachers took on as part of the FirstSchool project. Many leadership team teachers did document their role in the project as an example of their work in this area.

**Challenges (any significant impediments): *Please provide a narrative section that describes any challenges, how they were overcome or prevented the expected successes.***

Teacher and principal turnover always presents a challenge in school transformation work. To overcome this challenge, we worked to developing a cadre of leaders at each school who have the knowledge and skills to advocate for the cultural shifts and key instructional practices when new colleagues and leaders join the school. However, prior to year two of the project, Bertie Schools experienced a 41% teacher turnover rate. In this case, we held three half-day professional development sessions with all new PreK-grade 3 teachers and their mentors to orient them to the FirstSchool project and understand EduSnap data.

Another significant issue concerned competing priorities and scripted curricula in the districts. Because these were both transformation districts, they felt tremendous pressure from the state, central office, and community to make rapid improvements in the instructional quality of the schools. While we attempted to work closely with transformation staff and district leadership, at times the priorities were not aligned with FirstSchool's goals. For example, while FirstSchool sought to increase the amount of higher order thinking skills on which teachers were focusing in the classroom, educators in the target schools often cited pressures coming from the district to spend more time on basic skill-building and curricula that focused on less challenging work. Therefore, even teachers who individually prioritized FirstSchool instructional practices often felt unsupported while less confident teachers did not even take first steps.

Finally, these districts were eligible for this project because the Department was aware of the low level of teaching occurring, in particular an absence of rigor in these schools. In our project, when teachers see their data and identify areas for improvement, they generally have three main responses:

1. "I used to do that, but I stopped paying attention to that. I can start doing that again."
2. "I want to do that, but these things (testing, etc.) get in the way of doing it."
3. "I don't know how to do that."

For a large number of teachers in this project, even those on the leadership teams, many of the key instructional practices we focus on fell into the third category. For some teachers, this was a result of a lack of professional development on current pedagogical techniques while for others, strategies that had been learned in the past had atrophied due to lack of use. Many of the teachers we encountered had shifted from being able to plan and implement units of instruction independently to relying on pre-made curricula much of which came from the internet and was not delivered as part of a cohesive unit plan. The ability to understand basic graphs and data printouts was also an issue for some of the team members in schools. In all of these cases, time had to be spent bringing educators up to a consistent, basic level of knowledge before the originally planned work could begin. This, in turn, impacted the ability of the FirstSchool team to move instructional practice as far as originally targeted.

Finally, one of our goals was to help schools incorporate data from a wide variety of sources (e.g., attendance, suspensions) into their decision-making processes. To this end, in the first year of the project, we partnered with the two school districts to create a single database housing this information. However, after conference calls with both the districts together and individual district data teams, we found out that these data are, for the most part, unstandardized, uncollected, or unable to be accessed due to FERPA constraints. Therefore, our discussion of data sets such as these remained necessarily abstract as we were not able to create a cohesive data set for districts to use in the decision-making process. This likely limited the ability of districts to use data like these as we found repeatedly that practice using data was an important key for many of our successes.

**Sustainability/Upcoming Tasks: *Please provide a narrative section that describes expectations for sustainability beyond the RTT-ELC grant):***

Leadership team members gained proficiency in sharing with colleagues the research underlying the FirstSchool Cultures of Caring, Competence, and Excellence. Based on this information and corresponding EduSnap data, they worked to change their practices, to elevate the level of their teaching, and to see children as capable of greater autonomy and collaboration. Teachers at one elementary school are learning to use the EduSnap app to continue collecting time-sampling data in classrooms and using the results to impact practice.

**Lessons Learned: *Please provide a narrative section that describes lessons to inform future work of First School, or future work at the state level.***

Deep and lasting cultural shifts in school are essential to meaningful changes in classroom practice. Helping schools make those shifts requires trust and long-term investment. Teachers need to have the chance to try new things, fail, reflect, try again, and experience success before new ways of approaching data and classroom practice can take hold. When teachers and leaders are being held to standards of instant improvement, an environment that promotes and nurtures risk-taking is a luxury. Initially we were very open to allowing teachers to select their own goals and, in doing so, found teachers selecting “low hanging fruit” rather than tackling those practices that the research has shown most impact the children they serve. So, we tightened our focus by directing teachers to select instructional practices from the list of the top indicators for student success by 3<sup>rd</sup> grade. This helped ensure that what they were focused on for FirstSchool was better aligned with what improve student achievement.

Another important lesson we learned concerns pacing and depth. Our original plans involved quick reviews of the data and a far larger amount of time spent on professional development on targeted instructional practices and curricular planning based on the data. However, this project taught us that truly understanding the data takes greater time and intentionality than we were allowing, so we adjusted our plans to incorporate much more time understanding the data itself and its connection to instruction. By doing so, we found that educators were better positioned to use data on their own to

improve instruction and avoid misconceptions about the data when explaining it to their colleagues.

**2015 RTT-ELC Annual Performance Report (APR): *Because the final report for this project had not been received, the information reported in the APR was limited and no specific data (such as numbers of teachers, administrators, students, families impacted by the work) was included. We will have an opportunity to provide additional information. Please add to/edit the information below as needed. The APR addresses only Jan. 1 – Dec. 31, 2015.***

*First School is included in the section addressing Comprehensive Assessment Systems (Section C(2) of Application):*

*Describe the progress made during the reporting year (2015). Please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in these areas by the end of the grant period.*

The NC Department of Public Instruction worked with the FirstSchool initiative of the Frank Porter Graham Child Development Institute at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill on the ELC activity "Using Data to Improve Classroom Instruction". This activity has strengthened the use of assessment data to guide instruction in schools pre-kindergarten through third grade. The FirstSchool model was implemented in Bertie and Martin Counties, two adjacent small districts in Northeastern NC.

FirstSchool develops school leaders' and teachers' knowledge and skills in order to improve the school experiences and outcomes for children across the PreK-3 continuum. The approach emphasizes collaboration and the use of data and inquiry to guide and monitor change efforts. Observational data from the FirstSchool Snapshot and CLASS are used to address evidence based characteristics of practices that support children. During 2015, FirstSchool staff continued to provide on-going support throughout the year to all PK-3 teachers in Bertie and Martin Counties. This included coaching and professional development throughout the year for teachers, Leadership Teams, principals and central office staff. Professional development focused on developing a Culture of Excellence with an emphasis on the development of higher order thinking through the delivery of high quality questioning and high quality feedback. Regular PreK-3 team meetings were held within schools to review data and plan school and classroom improvement.

Facilitated visits to the Pre-K and Kindergarten demonstration classroom with a debriefing continued with elementary school principals and Elementary Program Directors to help them gain a deeper understanding of play-based learning. Work with principals continued and focused on the benefit of the daily 3-minute classroom walk-through process and how they might use this approach to improve instructional practices within individual classrooms and the school as a whole. Guided one-hour (or more) walk-throughs of Pre-K-Grade 3 classrooms continued with principals, targeted data was gathered, and afterwards data and observational notes were compared and reflected upon. Final professional development events were held in September. In keeping with efforts to build capacity within the districts, planning was designed in a way

that gave district staff a greater role in supporting Pre-K - 3<sup>rd</sup> grade teachers and leaders. Final data feedback sessions were provided for teachers who requested them. During the summer of 2015, a semi-structured interview was conducted with school and district leaders in Bertie and Martin Counties to uncover their challenges and successes with the project. We explored how change happened in their schools and sought indicators that the changes will be sustained. The project was completed December 2015.

## Addendum 1

### TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE:

We gave the leadership team teachers a list of 10 practices and asked them to rank the 3 on which each had been focusing her improvement efforts. The following tables show the number of times each practice was ranked by a respondent.

In the spring of 2014, increasing scaffolded instruction and vocabulary development were the most often mentioned practices, with a focus on increasing reflection while engaging with students coming in as the next most popular practice on which teachers were focusing improvement efforts (see Figure 1)..

Figure 1.				
Q.20. Based on the data feedback you received through FirstSchool, where have you focused your improvement efforts? Please place a 1 next to the one you've focused on most, a 2 next to the 2 <sup>nd</sup> highest focus, and a 3 next to the 3 <sup>rd</sup> highest focus.				
2014 n=39. [2 respondents chose fewer than 3 priorities.]				
	First Priority	Second Priority	Third Priority	Any Priority
Increased Scaffolding	6	11	3	20
Improve Family communication		1		1
Increase Gross Motor Time		1	5	6
Increase Reflection	5	5	7	17
Decrease Whole Group Time	5	2	3	10
Shorten Transitions	2	5	7	14
Balanced Groups	1	1	3	5
Vocabulary	10	9	5	24

Development				
Oral Language	7	2	2	11
Other	3: increase small groups (2); increase choice	1: increase composing	2: increase composing; increase stations	6

In the spring of 2015, vocabulary development remained a high priority. Decreasing whole group time and increasing reflection while engaging with students were the next most popular practice on which teachers were focusing improvement efforts (Figure 2).

<p>Figure 2.</p> <p>Q.20. Based on the data feedback you received through FirstSchool, where have you focused your improvement efforts? Please place a 1 next to the one you've focused on most, a 2 next to the 2<sup>nd</sup> highest focus, and a 3 next to the 3<sup>rd</sup> highest focus.</p> <p>2015 n=44.</p>				
	First Priority	Second Priority	Third Priority	Any Priority
Increased Scaffolding	3	6	7	16
Improve Family communication			3	3
Increase Gross Motor Time			1	1
Increase Reflection	4	6	11	21
Decrease Whole Group Time	13	6	5	24
Shorten Transitions	2	4	4	10

Balanced Groups	1		1	1
Vocabulary Development	16	14	6	36
Oral Language	5	7	5	17
Other		1: Increase small group instruction	1: Concept development	2

The teacher questionnaire also included the following open-ended question:

**Please let us know what you found helpful about your participation.**

The last time we administered the questionnaire (summer 2015) we received 44 questionnaires and one or more responses to this question on 31 of the questionnaires (see Figure 3).

Figure 3		
Number of Mentions	Theme	Example Quotes
14	Data, graphs, and the review of these	<p><i>“Relevant data. Helped me pinpoint areas to work on improvement. Made me more conscious of things such as reflecting, developing vocabulary, and increasing time on critical thinking skills.”</i></p> <p><i>“What I found helpful was the break down of the data. I found it important to get the feed back.”</i></p> <p><i>“Data review and discussion as to what the data examined.”</i></p> <p><i>“Loved working on the graphs and being able to compare from 1 year to another year.”</i></p> <p><i>“It has helped me to reflect on actual</i></p>

		<i>time spent on specific areas during the school day.”</i>
9	Professional growth/reflection on practice	<i>“growing professionally”</i>
6	Specific content shared	<i>“What I found that was most helpful was allowing students to have more choice and collaboration”</i>  <i>“Since math is an area I struggle with, I really liked the math professional development we had. This helped me improve my centers.”</i>  <i>“How to better manage time and transitions all throughout the school day.”</i>
4	Collaboration with peers	<i>“I also enjoyed collaboration with other teachers in the county.”</i>  <i>“Working with grade level groups was very helpful”</i>
4	Everything	<i>“Everything! This process has been amazingly helpful and has FUNDAMENTALLY changed my teaching style!”</i>
2	Entire district involved including administration	<i>“Including administrators as integral part of process.”</i>  <i>“Whole district involvement.”</i>
2	Video examples of practice	<i>“Videos and seeing examples of different areas helped me.”</i>  <i>“Continue use of video clips for participants to view and or practice with to gain understanding. Perhaps using them sooner.”</i>

1	Focus on small improvements	<i>“Focusing on SMALL improvements.”</i>
1	One-on-one classroom help	<i>“I benefitted greatly from having a member of the team come into the classroom and work with my kids and demo for me.”</i>