

Transformational Coaching: End-of-Year Report

* This document is for the coach to use to reflect on her work, and for the coach to share with her manager—*only* if the manager is not the client’s supervisor. This is not to be shared with an evaluator or with the client.

Coach: Martin **Client:** Jasmine Hernandez **Date:** June 17, 2013

OLD SMARTE Goal 1:

I, Jasmine Hernandez, will increase from a level 1 to a level 2 with parts of level 3 on TEP rubric indicator 1.3 (Using student data to guide planning) by collecting and using different sources of data to inform planning (content organization, instructional and grouping strategies) to meet needs of specific sub-groups of students (English learners at different levels, students with different learning modalities, etc.).

OLD SMARTE Goal 2:

I, Jasmine Hernandez, will increase from a level 2 to a level 4 on TEP rubric indicator 3.4A (Monitoring Student Learning during Instruction) by using frequent and varied techniques to checking for understanding, monitor progress toward the learning objective, and adjust instruction to meet student learning needs.

NEW: SMARTE Goal 1/2 Revised:

I, Jasmine Hernandez, will increase from a level 2 to a level 3 on TEP rubric indicator 1.2A (Lesson Design) by planning using a backwards design and gradual release model including frequent checks for understanding to monitor progress and adjust plans based on student needs in order to move students towards mastery of learning objectives.

1. Description of Change: (*A narrative description*)

At the beginning of the year, Jasmine’s classroom, while relatively behavior management issue-free, was almost completely lacking in terms of planning. Her pacing in her first month included 7 minutes in a single lesson to pass out a single piece of paper to each student; she did not have learning targets or agendas posted and the structure of the class was almost entirely teacher-centered. She would sit at the front behind a desk and call on mainly volunteers to respond to questions or to read out loud while the rest of the class sat there and followed along. In charting an observation I scripted on 9.11.13, over a period of 50 minutes, there were 24 individual responses to questions (7 called out, 14 from volunteers—6 of which were the same student, and 3 non-volunteers) at a rate of about 1 question/response every 2-3 minutes. There were 0 opportunities for students to speak to each other or interact. She got up once to monitor a single students’ work in the entire 50 minute period. She gave 5 positive praise comments during that time that consisted of “Very good” and “good.” She did not have a clear learning target posted or an agenda and the lesson involved 30 minutes of reviewing a worksheet they wrote answers to the day before, and 20 minutes of reading aloud from their class novel with occasional comprehension questions being asked. The lesson ended when the bell rang and the teacher waited for the student reading to stop and then said, “Okay, I will see you guys after lunch.”

¹ “A pseudonym. All identifiers have been changed in this report.

By the end of November, using the same tool, Jasmine's rate of responses had increased to nearly 1 per minute in a 50 minute period with 4 whole class responses, 4 written whole class responses, and 1 extended partner share. She began monitoring throughout the room, called on more non-volunteers, and elicited rich student-to-student talk as a part of the lesson. She also had a clear learning target posted, a lesson that was sequenced to follow a gradual release model (I Do/We Do/You Do), and included an exit ticket as her close. She was able to measure that 19/27 students mastered the learning target, 4/27 had partially mastered the target, and 2/27 did not master the target.

By mid-March, in a 12-minute period, Jasmine was observed eliciting 19 responses (~2 per minute) including a choral, a partner, and a whole class written response within that time frame (for a rate of about 4-5 each if extrapolated over the whole period). She moved the room and when debriefing the observation afterwards was able to notice a pattern in her response elicitation and monitoring that she addressed in future lessons.

Now, at the end of the year, Jasmine has become much more able to plan and design lessons that follow a lesson cycle (though she still has a lot of room for growth in this), include possible scaffolds and supports for her English learners and to meet her students' needs, and include clear and measurable objectives that she plans checks for throughout the lesson. She is more frequently using exit tickets and other checks for understanding and formative assessment, but still does not have a strong system to take this data and analyze it. She is better able to articulate why she wants to use a specific instructional strategy, grouping, or content organization in terms of her learners' needs when we plan together. Whereas at the beginning her plans were primarily a list of activities often without clear learning targets or any opportunities to determine students' mastery or needs, she now plans in more detail not just what she will be doing and saying but what students will be doing and saying following a gradual release model. Whereas at the beginning of the year, nearly if not all of the lesson was a teacher-student questioning with little student-to-student interaction and almost no variation of strategies or techniques for engagement with the content or each other, Jasmine now uses a variety of strategies, including think-pair-share, some groupwork structures, gallery walks, and other active engagement strategies to meet learners needs to interact, to talk about their learning, and to move and transition more frequently during a lesson.

After our TEP short observation and the earlier video observation in the mid-spring, she spent a lot of our sessions reflecting on how to refine or build in more effective routines and procedures to tighten her timing and pacing of lesson segments and to decrease lost instructional time during transitions. In her TEP Long observation in mid-May, while still not continuously using a timer, she shortened her Do Now time from 20 minutes at start of year, to 12 minutes during her last video observation, to 7 minutes during the TEP long observation! She has tightened the pacing and built in opportunities for academic discourse and CFUs into the lesson opener, her introduction of the learning target/new material, and her modeling. She is still struggling with how to pace and move students through guided and independent practice effectively. However, in this most recent observation, she did break up the guided practice to pause and CFU explicitly, which was an improvement. Based on our observations of other teachers and of her own teaching via video, she has

demonstrated increased ability to reflect on her teaching and name specific pedagogical techniques that she wants to improve in and then to take steps to make those improvements. She has begun using a timer during her lessons to improve her transition time through parts of the lesson cycle; she has increased her use of Think-(Write)-Pair-Share from almost never to 2-3 times per lesson or more and uses a variety of structures to increase its effectiveness (delineating partners and who is speaking, decreasing share time and then adding time to build ideas, using sentence frames to support student talk, etc.); she has begun to experiment with groupwork activities and a variety of activities that support kinesthetic and visual learners better (she has now tried a gallery walk, a group puzzle/paragraph creation, and a visual primary sources lesson that moved students into different pair configurations).

2. Specific Indicators of Progress: *(Bullet-pointed list of specifics)*

- Jasmine now always has a learning target posted and generally has the parts of a lesson cycle for nearly every lesson (whereas in the past she often included only a haphazard selection of lesson cycle elements) and her students now transition and use more effective routines to move more quickly through the lesson cycle.
- Jasmine collects more types and frequencies of formative assessment data to inform instructional choices.
- Jasmine is utilizing the unit plans developed in our PLC as the basis for her daily lesson plans, which she often was just eschewing at the start of the year.
- Jasmine is attempting more scaffolds and instructional strategies to build in a clearer gradual release model into her plans based on strategies observed during the observations we conducted together.
- She has increased her use of Think-(Write)-Pair-Share from almost *never* to 3-5 times per lesson or more and uses a variety of structures to increase its effectiveness (delineating partners and who is speaking, decreasing share time and then adding time to build ideas, using sentence frames to support student talk, etc.
- Jasmine has moved from about 100% of the time not circulating the room (and around 40-50% in December) to about 80%+ of every lesson circulating.
- Jasmine has begun included varied checks for understanding (exit tickets, think-write-share, equity sticks, and circulating as individuals are working or pairs are sharing) into most lessons (up from 100% use of oral, individual response to teacher-posed questions checks at the beginning of the year).
- Jasmine occasionally (once or more a week) uses exit tickets at the end of her lessons as a check for understanding, which is up from not knowing what an exit ticket was as of late September.
- Jasmine is using a timer to increase the effectiveness of her transitions. She has moved from 20 minute Do Nows to 7 minutes.

- Her circulation is allowing her to closely observe/monitor about 1-2 students' work per minute compared to monitoring 1 student every 2-3 minutes in January and monitoring almost no students' work during a lesson at the beginning of the year.

3. Sources of Evidence: (*ie—lesson plans, meeting agendas, videos, emails, coaching notes, survey data, etc.*)

Co-created lesson plans, coaching notes, observation scripts and tools (TEP, Observation of Instructional Behaviors Tool), video of her teaching.

4. Contributing Factors: (*What got in the way, or really helped coaching efforts?*)

In completing the mid-year report, I realized that her original goal around 1.3A was way beyond her ZPD. When we named that the goal was a misnomer and that we were actually working more on 1.2A (Designing and Sequencing of Learning Experiences), 2.4A (Routines, Transitions, and Procedures), and 3.2A (Executes the Lesson Cycle), we were more clearly able to see and name the progress she was making. That conversation also helped me to gain clarity on her learning style and to better support her as a visual learner and a very novice teacher to learn by seeing. Around that time, I took her on an observation and planning day where we went to observe teachers at another school and through our observation and debrief, she was able to see and name new practices she wanted to try (three specific ones that she then went on to focus on). She was able to see and then name specific high leverage strategies related to gradual release, checking for understanding, monitoring learning, etc. from our observations together and then plan with me to include those elements into her lessons and begin reflecting on their effectiveness. The amount of co-planning that we did together, particularly in the spring, including a full-day of lesson planning together (and observations) and many of our sessions, really helped to improve the quality of her lesson plans and her ability to reflect on those plans.

As I got clearer on her learning needs, I did a better job in the spring of optimizing this. For example, model teaching a few lessons for her was something she cited as really, really helpful for her to “see” what a particular strategy looked like as well as just the structure and ebb and flow of a lesson. At that time, we began watching video of her teaching and using the observation tool that created a visual of her and her students during an instructional sequence. Through this focused lens, she was able to come to new realizations about her practice and make changes. In our end of year conversation, she talked a lot about this. She remembered how in watching the first video, she could see that her back was to half of the class the entire time (and that there was a correlation between that and minor misbehavior)—after that, I modeled how she could stand differently to shift that and she has never stood that way again! Further, she also has needed much, much more support in just how to plan, period, for whole groups of students—i.e. what are effective instructional strategies, what does a high quality lesson plan look like, etc. . She really benefitted from multiple observations with clear tools and then using really simple data analysis protocols to note her growth in specific indicators like monitoring and circulating and using a variety of techniques to check for understanding. In particular, an observation tool that mapped her room and showed the spread of student responses and her monitoring efforts was much more effective in getting her to analyze her moves and to

reflect on them than earlier scripting protocol attempts. Again, this was a matter of needing to see models and exemplars and the process in action.

5. Lessons Learned and Next Steps: *(A narrative)*

In reflecting on where her growth accelerated and where it lagged, there is a great deal of correlation between when I was best meeting her learning needs (using observation, modeling, and video to help her see, learn, try, and reflect) and her rate of growth/change. When I didn't provide these "vista points" and we would speak about a practice or I would try to talk her through something she asked about, I saw little growth. I think I could have done a better job of anticipating and meeting this need to maximize her growth. In our end of year conversation, she noted that doing more observation (of others and of herself) as well as having me model or role play to practice more with her would really help her as she develops new practices. The correspondence between her learning style (visual) and her ZPD (very novice in terms of many basic teacher practices) has taught me that I need to provide explicit models and opportunities, especially for new teachers to learn by seeing and to narrow their focus to very specific small chunks of learning. This was an area where I needed to be more directive in terms of chunking and narrowing her learning, while still being facilitative in helping her to reflect on her learning and to own it.

I also learned about how important it was to help her to see successes over the year, even when they were nowhere near where she needs to be—but still represented growth. She would often reflect that all the other people coming to observe her would provide a judgment on her lesson that day and lots of suggestions for improvement and lots of feedback on what she needed to work on and do better—much of which was going in one ear and out the other, because she actually didn't know how to do what they were asking her to do. In contrast, she often spoke at the end of our sessions, especially in relation to TEP and other observations, that the focus was on her reflection and learning. In our end of year conversation, she named how an area of growth and learning for her was in her own reflective capacity and her ability to use reflection as a process to improve her teaching. To me, this shows how even in a directive coaching model, one needs to always put the responsibility for the learning and the reflecting back on to the client. I tried to do this with Jasmine and when I did it well, I think her growth was greater—and when I did it poorly (telling her rather than showing her, not providing time for her own reflection, etc.) then she didn't grow as much or at all.

Over the year, she also became more open to name that she didn't know something and to be vulnerable. At the beginning of the year, she often would just not ask a question if something came up (in our session, in a PLC, etc.) that she had no clue about—in our end of year conversation, she talked about this and said that she was now more comfortable being able to say that she didn't know something to me. This reinforces my belief in the importance of trust in a coaching relationship and in naming bright spots and small wins. Using a supportive, catalytic stance was key here in building her agency. This reminds me that a coach needs to operate from an assets-based, optimistic view of the client, rather than a deficit model. It also reminds me that from an adult-learning theory lens, the client needs to be the one owning her own learning, even when very novice, and that she needs to feel in control of that.

SMART Goal 3: *(Complete a separate reflection for each coaching goal.)*

I, Jasmine Sewell, will increase from a level 2 to a level 4 on TEP rubric indicator 2.2B (Response to Behavior) by providing positive reinforcement and showing sensitivity to students' individual needs, as well as teaching students how to respond to each other and redirect each other.

1. Description of Change: *(A narrative description)*

Jasmine has made a lot of progress on this goal. Whereas at the beginning of the year, she spent about 40-50% of every session wanting to talk about how to deal with individual behavior or student challenges, she has become much more adept at determining how to positively support students in challenging situations. Jasmine made significant progress towards this goal over the fall and by mid spring, we agreed that she had essentially met this goal so we stopped working on it actively. We added this goal after our initial goal-setting, because nearly every session, Jasmine wanted to spend some of the time discussing struggling students and her interactions with them inside and outside of class. Based on that, we added this goal and the amount of time she has wanted to spend discussing student interactions has decreased as has her ability to conference successfully one-on-one with students and parents when students are experiencing academic and behavior problems. In the spring, when we observed her videotaped lesson clips together, we were able to see her very effectively use the techniques of positive reinforcement (over 12 positive reinforcements in less than 12 minutes), proximity, redirection, use of a clear, non-demeaning consequences ladder to monitor and respond to student behavior appropriately. We celebrated this as a success.

In her final TEP observation, she was able to notice how she occasionally provided preferential treatment to a small group of students, allowing them to call out without a redirection and to disrupt other students. While this was relatively minor misbehavior and was not intentionally being disrespectful to her or other students, she was able to see the correlation between the lack (or slack) of certain routines and procedures that would help to decrease lost instructional time and the opportunity for off-task behavior that these boys were exhibiting. This helped move her thinking about this goal area forward and how she could improve in other areas of Domain 2 in the coming year.

2. Specific Indicators of Progress: *(Bullet-pointed list of specifics)*

- Jasmine conducted independent research on a student who was struggling. Ultimately, she was able to secure an appropriate solution to the students' needs and behavior related issues through working with a variety of administrators and other site staff.
- Decreased frequency of needing to problem solve and role play together related to student-teacher conferences; demonstrates the ability to surface an issue, formulate possible responses, and then select one or two and give reasoning for why it will be effective based on her knowledge of the individual student's needs.

3. Sources of Evidence: *(ie—lesson plans, meeting agendas, videos, emails, coaching notes, survey data, etc.)*

Coaching notes

4. Contributing Factors: *(What got in the way, or really helped coaching efforts?)*

In the mid year report, I wrote, “What helped coaching efforts was an early use of role plays and probing questioning techniques to try to focus on her agency in each dilemma and force her to come up with solutions to her own problems rather than let her use the time to pick my brain about how I would act (which was her initial approach to bringing up these issues). I was conscious that I wanted her to do the reflection and idea generation so the use of role play helped me to model some questioning techniques but then the focus of our discussions surrounding the role plays centered on what she might ask or try and how that would contribute to her knowledge of the student’s needs or why she thought a particular approach might be successful based on knowing her students’ needs. Finding a way to stay in a more facilitative stance while still offering some directive possibilities was key to building her agency and reflective capacity. Naming this as a goal, when initially we didn’t have one for this, was also helpful because it gave a space for her to work on this with me that fit within our work rather than being an aside. “ I still agree with this assessment, though I have also reflected on whether naming a new goal in Domain 2 after “meeting” this one could have pushed her practice more...

5. Lessons Learned and Next Steps: *(A narrative)*

I think helping her to name that she has in many ways met this goal and has moved beyond it was helpful to our work on her other two goals, because it represented a win. We named together the steps that she now knows she can take and the strategies she can try when responding to behavior, but naming those tools as the reason for why she met the goal or is now capable of meeting it independently was important for solidifying her understanding of her practice in this area and enabling her to replicate successes in the future. Further, I think this contributed to her increased ability to be vulnerable in a weird way... By affirming her competence in one area, she was able to begin seeing and naming other things (response to behavior, routines, procedures, and transitions, etc.) that she could see areas for growth and improvement in. This strikes me as an interesting area for further contemplation—understanding how to build agency and confidence seems to have a direct correlation to a person’s ability to grow—if not tended to, then growth might not be possible. It also reminds me the importance of recognizing the humanity in each of my clients and having compassion and love and respect for them where they are at and not trying to push an agenda on them but allowing them to drive their learning is really important. So while in some ways I wish this had been a goal around 2.4 (Routines, Procedures, Transitions), I also realize that that is my agenda and it wasn’t even on Jasmine’s radar at the start of the year. So helping it to get on her radar and become a priority came through a kind of mis-direction—heading in a different direction in order to progress and then tacking back (some kind of sailing metaphor?). When she reflected on her learning and growth this year, she spoke about feeling like she was a seed at the start of the year that was just now growing into a small plant. When she named her learning, she said it was “a plant” and then when asked to describe it with more detail, she said it was “a tree with deep roots and a fruit tree where the fruit was her students and their learning.”

As a metaphor, this captured for me a real picture of her as a very new learner and reminded me of all the very careful attention a seed needs in order to sprout.