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**Game Plan**

- **Introductions**
- **Framing the Issue:** *The Implementation Challenge*
- **Brief R&E Synopsis:** *Findings From Our Research and Partnerships To Date*
- **Panel Discussion:** *What We Have Learned*
Problem: The Implementation Challenge

**INPUTS**
- Standards & Assessments
- Policies & Guidelines
- Federal Funds
- Materials & Curricula

**OUTCOMES**
- Improved Student Achievement

Accountability Pressures

(Ermeling, 2005, Used by Permission)
Expectations are high for CCSS, but results will depend on quality of implementation at the school level.

**Common Core Shifts:**

- **Scaffold the balance of informational and literary text**
- **Heighten literacy experiences across all grade levels and all content areas**
- **Increase academic vocabulary**
- **Focus on performance tasks and assessment**
  - Text complexity, close reading, scaffolding
- **Strands of Writing:** Argument, Informational, Narrative

“The CCSS focus on learning expectations for students, not how students get there.”

—CCSS Initiative: Overview Presentation, March 2010

“The CCSS are not a curriculum. They are a clear set of shared goals and expectations for what knowledge and skills will help our students succeed. Local teachers, principals, superintendents, and others will decide how the standards are to be met. Teachers will continue to devise lesson plans and tailor instruction to the individual needs of the students in their classrooms.”

—CCSS Initiative: Myths v. Facts About CCSS

“The CCSS will not prescribe how they are taught and learned but will allow teachers to teach and students to learn in various instructionally relevant contexts.”

—CCSS Initiative: Standards-Setting Criteria

“The CCSS are essential, but inadequate. Along with standards, educators must be given resources, tools, and time to adjust classroom practice...”

—CCSS Initiative: Overview Presentation, March 2010
The Implementation Challenge

Inputs → Classroom Practice → Outcomes

Improved Student Achievement

Accountability Pressures

Alternative: Translating “Inputs” into Improved Student Achievement

Inputs → Classroom Practice

Teach, Plan, Analyze

Outcomes

Improved Student Achievement

Supporting the Ongoing Study of Teaching & Learning

(Ermeling, 2005, Used by Permission)
Game Plan

- Introductions
- Framing the Issue: The Implementation Challenge
- Brief R&E Synopsis: Findings From Our Research and Partnerships To Date
- Panel Discussion: What We Have Learned

**Brief R&E Synopsis: Evolution of the Research**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phases</th>
<th>Books, Journal Articles, Publications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**LT Central Premise:** For schools to be productive places of learning for students, they must also be productive places of learning for teachers and administrators.
### Brief R&E Synopsis: Evolution of the Research


| Single School Case Study: Freeman Elementary School Project |

- **1989-1996**
- **American Educational Research Journal**
  - http://aera.aera.net
  - Increasing Achievement by Focusing Grade-Level Teams on Improving Classroom Learning: A Prospective, Quasi-Experimental Study of Title I Schools
    - William M. Saunders, Claude N. Goldenberg, and Ronald Gallimore
    - Am Educ Res J 2000; 36 (4) published online March 29, 2000; DOI: 10.3102/0018801202003000 |
  - The online version of this article can be found at: http://aerj.aera.net/content/36/4/5026

### Brief R&E Synopsis: Evolution of the Research

- **1997-2003**
- **Scale Up Project**
  - Los Angeles Unified School District (LD1 & 2 schools)


- Saunders, W.M., Goldenberg, C.N., & Gallimore, R. (2009) Increasing achievement by focusing grade level teams on improving classroom learning: A Prospective, Quasi-Experimental Study of Title I Schools.

### Increasing Achievement by Focusing Grade-Level Teams on Improving Classroom Learning: A Prospective, Quasi-Experimental Study of Title I Schools

- William M. Saunders
  - Pomona Unified
- Claude N. Goldenberg
  - Stanford University
- Ronald Gallimore
  - University of California, Los Angeles

**Abstract**:

The authors conducted a quasi-experimental investigation of effects on achievement by grade-level teams focusing on improving learning. For 2 years (Phase 1), principal-only training was provided. During the third year (Phase 2), school-based training was provided for principals and teacher leaders on matching team settings and using explicit procedures for grade-level meetings. Phase 2 produced no differences in achievement between experimental and comparison schools. During Phase 3, experimental groups across schools received school-based professional development by team leaders and school-based professional development for teachers in order to set up team meeting processes and procedures. Authors conclude that team-based professional development is key to effective teacher teams. The long-term sustainability of teacher teams depends on coherent and aligned district policies and procedures.

**Keywords**: professional development, school-based effectiveness, educational reform, longitudinal studies, elementary schools, organization, theory, change
Six-Year Evaluation of Learning Teams Model (K-5)

Compared 9 Learning Teams Schools with 6 comparison schools

Schools were matched on:
- Percent Free/reduced lunch [86%, 89%]
- Percent Latino [69%, 83%]
- English learners [71%, 75%]

Scale-Up Study Results
Scale-Up Study Results

Over this five year period, LT schools demonstrated statistically significant gains on state assessments:

- 41% above and beyond the rate of gains in comparison schools for the overall student population
- 54% above and beyond the comparison schools for the Latino population

[Graph showing mean NCE over years for LT schools, comparison schools, and district]
Brief R&E Synopsis: Evolution of the Research

1997-2003
Scale Up Project
Los Angeles Unified School District (LD1 & 2 schools)


Inside the Black Box of School Change:
A Qualitative External Evaluation

Compared to Non-LT schools, Learning Teams schools had:

- Wider Distribution of Leadership
- More Effective Team Meetings
- Sharper Focus on Academic Goals & Outcomes
- Stronger Collective Commitment
- Higher Expectations
- Attributing Outcomes to Teaching
Brief R&E Synopsis: Evolution of the Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2004-Current LT (learning teams) Scaling: Secondary Research and Development and Elementary Replication Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Recent LT Partners:

Over 200 schools across 20+ districts in 19 States
Brief R&E Synopsis: Evolution of the Research

How can we create and support settings for teachers and administrators that consistently focus on teaching and learning?

How can we leverage these settings to translate standards, assessments, initiatives and curriculum into improved student outcomes?

How can we sustain this work over time throughout the school and across multiple schools within a complex area?
Learning Communities?

What might serve as evidence that a community of teachers is learning?

One important thing to look for in discourse and work products: *cause-effect knowledge about practice*

(Gallimore, Ermeling, Saunders, Goldenberg, 2009; Ermeling, 2010)

---

e.g., How do we help students analyze and critique grade appropriate text to make and support an argument?

e.g., How do we help students draw inferences from text and apply text that supports inferences?

e.g., How do we help students utilize multiple entry points to make sense of and solve mathematical problems?
Each learning team must have a trained facilitator.

The group of facilitators also becomes a team.

Contextual inputs (e.g. standards, curriculum, materials, etc.)

Teacher Workgroups
2-4 a Month
for 50-90 minutes

Monthly Principal Planning Meeting
90-120 minutes

Monthly Facilitator Leadership Meetings
60-90 minutes

Stable Settings
Training & Assistance

Results: Student Outcomes

Classrooms

Distributed Leadership

Classroom Instruction

Student Outcomes

Plan
Teach
Analyze

Facilitator Team

Teacher Workgroup

(Goldenberg, 2004; Ermeling, 2012)
Addressing Common Student Needs
(The 7 Steps)

Step 1
Identify and clarify a student need to work on together

Step 2
Formulate a clear objective for each common student need

Step 3
Identify and adopt an instructional approach to address each need

Step 4
Plan and prepare to deliver lessons in the classroom

Step 5
Deliver the lessons in the classroom: make consistent and genuine efforts

Step 6
Analyze student work to evaluate whether instruction met the need

Step 7
Reassess: repeat cycle or move on to another area of need

---

Step 6
Analyzing Student Work to Evaluate Whether Instruction Met the Need

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRENGTHS</th>
<th>CONTINUING NEEDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Describing Strengths and Needs (Evaluation of Student Work)</td>
<td>Analyzing What Worked and Next Steps (Evaluation of Instruction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 List the strengths evident in the student work.</td>
<td>6.3 Describe how instruction might have contributed to the strengths.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4 List the continuing needs evident in the student work.</td>
<td>6.5 Describe what needs to happen in subsequent instruction to address the continuing needs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Step 1
Identify and clarify a student need to work on together

Step 2
Formulate a clear objective for each common student need

Step 3
Identify and adopt an instructional approach to address each need

Step 4
Plan and prepare to deliver lessons in the classroom

Step 5
Deliver the lessons in the classroom: make consistent and genuine efforts

Step 6
Analyze student work to evaluate whether instruction met the need

Step 7
Reassess: repeat cycle or move on to another area of need

Perseverance until there is progress on key indicators

It is not how long a team works on a problem that determines if they see a cause-effect connection, but whether they persist until it is solved.

Once they see tangible student gains, teachers are less likely to assume, “I planned and taught the lesson, but they didn’t get it,” and more likely to adopt the more-productive assumption that “you haven’t taught until they’ve learned.”

(Gallimore, Ermeling, Saunders, Goldenberg, 2009)
Results: Student Outcomes

Monthly Principal Planning Meeting
60-90 minutes

Monthly Facilitator/Leadership Meetings
90-120 minutes

Classrooms

Teach

Teacher Workgroups
2-4 a Month for 50-90 minutes

Plan

Analyze

Learning Teams Advisor Support

Contextual inputs (e.g. standards, curriculum, materials, etc.)

COMMON CORE

Goldenberg, 2004; Ermeling, 2012

Stable Settings
Training & Assistance

Learning Teams Approach

Fully Elaborated Model

Teams (Workgroups)

Stable Settings

Study of Teaching & Learning

Tested Protocols

Training & Assistance

Distributed Leadership

Ongoing Dedicated Support

LT Advisor

Advisor Network

2 Decades of Research & Results Published in Scientific Journals
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“We ‘cannot appreciate how difficult it is to make the ordinary happen’ if we are always looking for ‘unusual circumstances and dramatic events.’” (p.4)

“We underestimate how difficult it is to make the ordinary happen. The devil, truly, is in the details: Connecting rhetoric to action often make change elusive—and illusive. Rhetoric can be inspiring, moving, and uplifting. Reality is cantankerous, unforgiving, and often quite banal.” (p.4)

A lesson from a great teacher

When you improve a little each day, eventually big things occur. . . . Not tomorrow, not the next day, but eventually a big gain is made. Don’t look for the big, quick improvement. Seek the small improvement one day at a time. That’s the only way it happens—and when it happens, it lasts.

--John Wooden