Looking at student work (LASW)

*2016-2017*

**Overarching Framing and Guidance**

The LASW protocol can serve a number of purposes, and to date we have used it for periodic norming and to uncover scholar misconceptions both at the school site and during Days of Practice. A few of our schools have repurposed and refined the protocol to serve as a coaching tool that helps to methodically drive student achievement in high priority courses. The set of documents and tools that follow demonstrate how to use LASW for those purposes – to hone in on a few high priority courses in order to systematically drive student achievement and develop coach and teacher skill.

**Picking the Right Courses**

Effective engagement in the LASW protocol requires a substantial time commitment, both in the launch of the protocol and on an ongoing basis. Teachers and coaches will need to commit to at least one additional meeting every two weeks as well as pre-work and other actions steps to ensure strong follow-through. While the investment of time is considerable, when done effectively, the protocol can drive vertical and horizontal alignment in a school to rigorous bar and it fit seamlessly into a cycle of data analysis and responsive, effective planning.

In selecting courses for this intensive treatment, consider the following:

* **High stakes and high impact:** Select courses that intensive analysis will yield high impact, both in terms of student achievement but also in terms of school leader and teacher learning.
	+ Generally, your answers to the following questions will help pinpoint the right course(s) to focus on:
		- What are my highest stakes courses?
		- What do my scholars most need to improve on?
		- What’s really at the core of improving my school and driving towards college readiness?
	+ Weight on AFRC**:** The AFRC, especially in high schools, indicates which courses weigh heaviest. For high school, these include advanced placement courses and the SAT
	+ Capstone Courses – They help set the rigor bar, and understanding how to best drive achievement in those courses will most likely yield practices and insights that will transfer to other grades and courses in that specific discipline.
	+ Foundational Courses – A similar argument could be made for “foundational” courses. For instance, algebra I provides scholars with a foundation that undergirds success in all future math courses.
* **Area of need:** The extent to which a school has a clear area of need should be considered in selecting courses for intensive LASW. Schools that have developed clear strengths in some areas may want to use the intensive LASW process to shine light on and learn about areas of growth.
* **Alignment to broader school priorities:** Ideally, but not always, the courses selected for LASW will have some alignment with the school’s broader priorities. For instance, a school focused on reading instruction would choose an ELA course. A school focused on scholar discussion might select a course that already includes regular discussions and seminars.
* **Teacher and dean capacity**:
	+ Intensive LASW is least effective with struggling teachers and/or deans. Lower performing teachers or those who struggle with classroom management are not good candidates for this sort of intensive focus and development. Conversely, it is highest impact in a situation where class culture is stable and the dean and teacher have the bandwidth and personal effectiveness to devote significant time to analyzing data, meeting to look at student work, and adjusting plans week to week as informed by the data.
	+ However, this does not mean that the dean and teachers must possess intimate knowledge of the end of course assessment or the course itself. In fact, one of the primary benefits of this form of intensive LASW is to develop the team’s knowledge of how to attack a particular course and repeatedly-do task.
	+ The general rule of thumb is that intensive LASW requires approximately 60-90 minutes of dean time every other week. This is in addition to the standard slate of coaching actions that we provide to all teachers. (For more information on how LASW intersects with coaching, see below.)

**Picking the Right Tasks**

After prioritizing a course for intensive LASW, the next step is to hone in on a specific task. For instance, the AP Composition and Language Exam, the humanities capstone for AF high schools, includes a slew of multiple choice items and three highly distinct essays. In 2013-2014, the team at Amistad High selected one of these essay tasks – the rhetorical analysis essay – to focus on for LASW over the course of the entire year. The reality is that rigorous tasks like this are multi-faceted, and dramatically moving the needle – both in terms of student achievement and teacher learning –requires prioritization and deep, sustained focus.

In selecting a task for intensive LASW, consider the following:

* **Derived from or aligned to the EOC assessment**
* **Recurring -** not one-off, but a repeatedly do that cuts to the core of the course
* **Rigorous, multi-faceted**
* **Exemplars exist** – ideally from an external source, or the school/TTL has the capacity to develop them
* **Rubrics exist**, or the school/TTL has the capacity to develop one

For sample tasks for each grade level and academic discipline, see Appendix A below.

**Other “Must Haves” to Ensure High Impact LASW**

* **A consistent, steady focus:** As detailed above, this process requires coach and teacher to sustain focus on one substantive task over time, *ranging from at the very least a quarter to in some cases an entire school year.* .
* **Frequent and regular meetings – every 2 weeks**: Ideally, LASW meetings would occur *every two weeks*. This allows enough time between meetings for the teacher to adjust plans, re-teach, practice multiple at bats, and intervene with scholars. At the same time, a two week window is short enough that if forces the LASW team to identify bite-sized “traction points” that can be improved quickly. In this way, the teacher can make steady, incremental progress and build momentum.
* **A LASW team**: Intensive LASW can occur between coach and teacher. However, in the ideal it involves the principal and in some cases the regional superintendent. This stems from the fact that at least in part intensive LASW is a teacher and dean development tool and that “many minds” on the student work tends to provide a more objective and insightful analysis.
* **A focused schedule of assessments**: Regular, intensive LASW requires that the coach and teacher plan ahead to ensure that they are regularly assessing the task. This is one of the chief benefits of the process, as it imposes a disciplined focus on the teacher’s planning and guarantees regular assessment and data analysis. Going back to the example from Amistad High, the AP Lang teacher had scholars practice the rhetorical analysis essay frequently and formally assessed every two weeks.
* **Narrowing the focus:** The protocol works best when deep diving on a limited set of papers. As indicated in the protocol itself (see below), the team will need to prioritize a set of scholar work to regularly examine. For instance, this may mean honing in on the performance of 1 class section or 1 cross section of scholars that are on the cusp of break-through. *Generally, participants have time to read 10-15 pieces of work – depending on length and complexity –in a meeting*.
* **Data Tracking** – A strong data tracking tool greatly enhances the focus and efficiency of LASW meetings. It is not required to get these meetings off the ground, but a strongly recommended best practice. Appendices B below is an example of a “Traction Point Tracker” displayed in an academic dean’s office. This serves to keep a visual record of next steps as well as to catalogue all recent action stems in order to guard against “slippage.” Appendices C and D are examples of score-cards used to score AP responses. These provide crystal clarity on what graders should be looking for and are instrumental in LASW meetings to pin-pointing a clear traction step. Other data trackers should drill down to the whole-group and sub-group trends, to hone in on the specific traction point while also monitoring for “slippage” on previously mastered traction points.
* **Integrating LASW with teacher coaching**: Intensive LASW is a supplement to weekly coaching that includes lesson plan feedback and obs-feedback. LASW meetings provide coach and teacher a specific “traction point” to focus their planning and data gathering around, which should work in concert with the actionable next steps the coach is articulating for teacher skill in execution.

**Intensive LASW as a Supplement to Weekly Coaching:**

Intensive LASW requires additional dean time – approximately 60 -90 minutes every other week. It augments and complements - it does not replace - the standard slate of coaching supports (lesson plan review, obs-feedback, co-planning). The charts below illustrate this relationship. Assume that typically the LASW meeting is occurring every 2 weeks. All times are approximate.

Two important notes:

1. The chart below assumes that every teacher receives approximately two hours of coaching per week. One hour consists of core coaching that all teachers receive: 5 min personal check-in, 5-10 mins of lesson plan review, 40 mins devoted to observation-feedback and practice and/or co-planning. The additional hour could be drawn from a menu of items based on teacher skill and need. Some of these options include: IPP, LASW, co-observations, video analysis, additional observations and feedback, etc.
2. These time allocations will differ in the first 8 weeks as schools tailor coaching expectations to achieve week 8 goals. For further guidance, see “AF Coaching Parameters 2014-2015.”

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Coaching Mechanism** | **Standard Support** **(for all teachers)** | **How Intensive LASW Supplements** **(for 1-2 teachers per dean)** |
| **Lesson plan feedback** | * 5 – 20 mins, depending upon the skill of the teacher and level of review
 | * Additional 5-15 mins of lesson plan feedback to ensure that key points from the LASW meeting are embedded into plans. These plans require heightened scrutiny.
 |
| **Classroom observations** | * 15 - 25minute observation
 | * Additional 10-20 minutes of observing to ensure quality instruction and implementation to the plans developed in the LASW meeting. This may occur in one burst or in shorter segments over the course of a week to ensure consistent implementation and fealty to the plan articulated in the LASW meeting.
 |
| **Observation feedback and practice** | * 20 mins observation-feedback and practice
 | * 20 mins observation-feedback and practice remains and often is devoted to LASW follow-up
* Additional real time coaching may be necessary
* Additional e-mail follow-up may be necessary
 |
| **Co-planning** | * Contingent on skill and need of the teacher min co-planning
 | * Additional 15-30 mins of co-planning time to focus on the traction point and next steps derived from the LASW meeting
 |
| **Data Analysis** | * Cursory review of weekly data
* Some spot checking of exit tickets
 | * At minimum, checking to ensure that the LASW data tracker is updated weekly
* More regular analysis of student work in real time (during class) and looking at exit tickets
 |
| **Interventions** | NA | * 15 mins of observing teacher interventions
* Sometimes involves 20-30 mins of the dean teaching an intervention group
 |
| **LASW Meeting** | NA | * 50 minute LASW meeting
* Optional: Additional 25 mins to debrief with regional sup and then to debrief with dean
 |
| **Total approximate time** | 120 minsThis includes 60 mins for the standard coach meeting plus 1 hour of additional support tailored to teacher need. | 180 minutes  |

**Phases of Protocol Implementation**

The intensive LASW process is multi-faceted. The LASW team will need time to build their analytic muscles and to learn as a team to become more efficient with the process. Therefore, it is recommended that schools phase-in all facets of the protocol –

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Phase** | **Phase 0 – Norming on Excellence** | **Phase I – Focusing on Whole Class Trends and Traction Points** | **Phase II – Focusing on Instructional Next Steps** | **Phase III – Sub-group Analysis** |
| **Objective** | * Determine a clear picture of excellence for exemplary student work and the nuances of the task
 | * The LASW team becomes adept at articulating clear and actionable whole-class traction points
 | * The LASW team becomes more efficient at identifying traction points and spends more time developing key points and developing instructional practices.
 | * The pre-work and protocol shift to enable more time for tracking and analyzing the work of specific sub-groups of students.
 |
| **Agenda and time allocation*****Note: Bolded items = the focus for this phase*** | *0 -* This takes the form of a scoring workshop to ***familiarize participants with task itself, to understand the bar for excellence, and to clarify the discrete components of the task***. For more, see the sample agenda below. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Step | Time |
| 1 – Set the Context | 5 mins |
| 2 – Examine whole class trends | 15-20 mins |
| 3 – Discuss whole class trends and ***identify whole class traction point*** | 20 mins |

 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Step | Time |
| 1 – Set the Context | 5 mins |
| 2 – Examine whole class trends | 10-15 mins |
| 3 – *Discuss whole class trends, identify whole class traction point* ***with greater time and emphasis on instructional next steps*** | 20-30 mins |

 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Step | Time |
| 1 – Set the Context  | 2 mins |
| 2 – Examine whole class trends | 8-10 mins |
| 3 – Discuss whole class trends, *identify whole class traction point* ***with greater time and emphasis on instructional next steps*** | 15 mins |
| 4 – ***Examine sub-group trends*** | 10 mins |
| 5 – ***Discuss sub-group trends*** | 10 mins |

 |
| **Pre-Work** | * Illustrative example: Read 3-4 specific prompts, anchor papers and scoring guidelines from the College Board
 | * Reading the text or problem set that scholars responded to
* Teacher brings papers from the focus class divided into H-M-L piles
 | * Read the text or problem set that scholars responded to
* Teacher brings papers from the focus class divided into H-M-L piles
 | * Read the text or problem set that scholars responded to
* Read scholar work (10-15 pieces of work total) and form hypothesis about whole class traction point
 |
| **Adjusting the Protocol/****Activities** | * Developing rubrics and exemplars if they do not exist or require revision
* Internalizing rubrics and exemplars
* Norming around blind grading
* General learning about the task (what do students need to know and be able to do, and at what level, for success on this assessment?)
* Setting of expectations – This is a time when the facilitator should set and reinforce expectations, especially around the importance of completing high quality pre-work.
 | * Initially, learning to efficiently read scholar work takes time.
* In parallel, it may take the LASW team time and at bats - especially as they are continuing to learn about the task itself - with this phase of the protocol where they share out trends, debate and discuss to winnow down to one focus area.
* Facilitators should be sure to allow ample time for reading the work samples, for “writing to think” and to ensuring broad participation.
 | * In this phase, the team should aim to identify a clear traction point more efficiently such that they have at least one third of the meeting to discuss the instructional next steps for attacking the traction point.
 | * Pre-work involves sorting scholar work ahead of time and coding/marking specific sub groups.
* The protocol preserves time for analyzing the progress of sub-groups, articulating traction-points for them and clarifying the intervention plan.
* This will feel slow and clunky at first, but over time the LASW team will learn to become more efficient.
 |
| **Duration** | * 2-3 meetings
* Should begin in August PD
 | * 3-4 meetings
* August-September
 | * 3-6 meetings
* October-November
 | * November - EOY
 |

**Sample Agenda for Beginning of Year Scoring Workshop**

Note: To serve as an illustrative example, assume this is for AP Language and Composition.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Pre-Work | Read 3-4 prompts, anchor papers, rubric and scoring guidelines from the College Board for free response question #2 (rhetorical analysis) |
| Objectives | * TWBAT describe and define the language of the AP rubric
* TWBAT list and describe the discrete facets of free response question #2 (this includes length, format, thesis, assertions, frequency/quality/interpretation of evidence, use of rhetorical devices, etc.)
* TWBAT to answer the following questions with precision and clarity:
	+ What distinguishes an essay that will score a 3 on the AP exam from a 2?
	+ What distinguishes a 4-5 from a 3?
 |
| Agenda | * Sort anchor papers- high, medium, low
* Discuss – What distinguishes high-medium-low?
* Norm – blind grade papers and compare to CB scores and rationale
* Match the rubric to the anchors – Where do we see the high scoring essays fulfilling the specific requirements of the rubric – highlight all the places we see this in the essays and discuss
* What are the discrete facets of this task? Let’s list them.
* What does it look like to do each of them poor-fair-well?
* What will be hard about this? Are there specific instructional techniques/RDs we want to put in place/discuss in detail right now for the school year?
* Anything about data tracking tool and expectations?
 |

**Criteria for an Effective LASW Meeting**

**OUTCOMES**

* **CLEAR, WHOLE-CLASS “TRACTION” POINT**: Meeting participants identify and capture in writing a clear “traction point” that defines how student work will improve by the next LASW meeting.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Criterion:** | **Non-Example:** | **Example:** |
| Focused and Specific | *“Improve body paragraphs.”* This is much too broad. Body paragraphs contain a number of sub-elements. This is traction point is so broad that (a) it’s not clear exactly how student work will improve and (b) it’s unlikely that students will improve in a short period of time. | *“In the interpretation of evidence, use specific language to explain the effect of rhetorical devices on the reader.”*This exemplar focuses on one specific sub-skill in writing a strong body paragraph. In fact, it focuses on one facet of analyzing evidence. This traction step is narrow enough that scholars can improve in a short period of time.  |
| High Impact and Central to the Task | Weaker traction points would focus on peripheral facets of the task.*For instance, it would not be high impact to focus AP Lang scholars on employing obscure and highly technical terms for rhetorical analysis.* | Strong “traction points” will focus on the core facets of the task that earn the bulk of points on the AP exam or rubric. *For instance, scholars can earn 2 core points on the DBQ for the AP World History exam for logically grouping documents.* |
| Logically Sequenced, or “First Things First” | Weaker traction points overlook foundational flaws in service of pursuing more secondary or peripheral components.*For instance, in AP World History we would not begin working on the “additional document” if scholars were struggling to craft clear assertions or to logically group the documents on the DBQ.* | Strong traction points focus on the foundational elements of the task that comprise the very core and serve as a platform for the essay to earn additional points. *For instance, this often includes focusing on the clarity of thesis statements and assertions.* |

* **CLEAR AND SPECIFIC INSTRUCTIONAL NEXT STEPS**: Effective LASW meetings do not stop at identifying a clear growth area or “traction point.” Instead, effective LASW meetings are efficient enough to allow for considerable time to discuss and capture in clear and precise language the instructional next steps that the teacher should pursue. The highest impact LASW meetings produce exemplars and other practically applicable lesson artifacts.
* **STRATEGIC DATA ANALYSIS**: The highest impact LASW meetings will confirm – in an efficient and systematic way – the progress of specific sub-groups of students. In parallel, high impact LASW meetings will also articulate new goals for these subgroups. In all, a high impact LASW meeting will determine progress (for instance, coding at red-yellow-green) on the following:
	+ The whole class traction point from the previous meeting: Did the overwhelming majority of the class make substantive progress on the whole class traction point?
	+ The improvement of scholars receiving targeted interventions: Did scholars receiving interventions improve on the whole class traction point and any additional traction points tailored to their needs?

**FACILITATION**

* **Ensures broad participation:** Employs a range of strategies including *everybody writes*, *cold call*, *whip arounds*, *turn and talk*, *finger votes or fist to fives* as well as *wait time* to ensure broad and even participation. Has an eye for noticing and engaging quieter participants to ensure a breadth of voices have been heard and that true consensus has been achieved.
* **Balances urgency with deliberation:**
	+ Uses a timer and holds to time stamps.
	+ Notes for the group when they are off on a tangent or spinning their wheels (redundant, going in circles).
	+ At the same time, adjusts when necessary to allow for vigorous debate, rich discussion and careful deliberation.
	+ Models economy of language and clarity of ideas.
* **Maintaining focus:** Steers the group around “rabbit holes” – questions that are hard to solve in a LASW meeting or overly cerebral, philosophical issues. Allows for humor, fun and personal interactions but keeps the group’s eyes on the prize.
* **Ensures fidelity to the protocol:** Makes specific reference to the protocol and ensures that all participants have copies to refer to and are versed in the document.
* **Pushes for clarity**
	+ Draws out tensions and challenges the group to reconcile them.
	+ Periodically summarizes and synthesizes.
	+ Assigns a note-taker and makes sure next steps are captured and distributed to the team.
	+ Uses CFU and stretch-it questions to probe for clarity and insight.
* **Fosters a sense of “Team and Family” via a positive, upbeat and joyous tone and is a model of “bright face”**

**Sample EXIT TICKET for a LASW Meeting**

*\*Note: This is for a LASW meeting focusing on FRQ #2 for the AP Composition and Language exam.*

**WHOLE CLASS TRACTION POINT**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Whole Class Traction Point:** | **Instructional Next Steps:** | **Follow-Up:** |
| 1. While annotating the prompt and before reading the text, scholars need to box in their “headline” about the author’s big purpose.  (We may equip them with a list to prime the pump.)
2. Scholars should name this big purpose in their introductions.
 | * Create exemplar and non-exemplar “headline” purpose statements
* I-we-you – How to annotate the prompt and box in your “headline.”
* Look at recent texts  and practice – what’s the headline?
 | * [TEACHER] will submit exemplar and non-exemplar to coach and principal by [insert date].
* [COACH/DEAN] will observe this lesson on [insert date].
 |
| 1. Scholars need to write 2-3 crisp and insightful analysis sentences interpreting evidence.
 | * Create standard of excellence for what this looks like, along with simple criteria.  This would include creating 2-3 mentor sentences.
* Lesson – have scholars tease out the difference between really strong analysis sentences and mediocre ones.  Rewrite the mediocre to make stronger.  Then practice more – go back into the Kelley essays and re-write 3 of your anaylsis sentences using the mentor sentence sand matching criteria.
 | * [TEACHER] will submit lesson plan and artifacts by [insert date].
 |

**INTERVENTION GROUPS**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scholar Names** | **Traction Point** | **Instructional Next Steps:** | **Owner** | **When/where interventions will occur:** |
| Natasia, Tubyez, Essence | Assertions: Frame assertions around author’s purpose as opposed to one specific rhetorical device. | Show them exemplar assertions from Spencer’s essay.Require them to rewrite all three assertions in the Kelley essay. | Lisa | Lunch, Tuesdays and Thursdays |
| Amber, Spencer, David, Olivia | Pacing: Need to finish reading and annotation (judiciously) in less than 7 mins. | Model targeted, more judicious annotations.Practice 1x without time.Practice 2x with time to get under 7 mins. | Luke | Advisory on Monday and Wednesdays |

**LASW Protocol**

**Before Meeting**

* Leader selects a high stakes, high impact course. These are likely to be capstone or foundational courses.
* Teacher or leader selects one worthy task (exit ticket, written response, independent practice, etc.). Tasks should be aligned to the EOC assessment, recurring and rigorous. Ideally, exemplars or rubrics already exist.
* Teacher shares the lesson plan aligned to the worthy task. Participants read the lesson plan in advance.
* Team completes the task for the meta purpose of identifying what insights/strategies/skills would indicate student mastery. *Note:* fully completing task may not always be feasible for some extensive tasks.
* Teacher gathers and copies at least 6 samples of student work (2 mastered, 2 approaching, 2 not yet) for each participant.

**Step 1: Affirm and Review Action Steps** (2 min)

* Leader starts by narrating academic goals achieved or previous action steps met.
* Teacher provides context about the task (unit, purpose, other relevant information).

**Step 2: Start with the Exemplar** (5 min)

* Leader guides the group to unpack the standard:
	+ Based on the standard, what do students need to understand and be able to do?
	+ What is the evidence we would need to see in student work to demonstrate mastery of the standard?
* Leader guides the group to identify the Criteria for Success from the teacher, student and / or external exemplar

**Step 3: Analyze Student Work** (8-10 mins)

* Independently score a representative sampling of student work against the CFS. The data is tracked systematically and easily viewable by the entire team.
* Collaboratively sort the student work into mastered, approaching, and not yet (or other categories based on your rubric). Collaborate with your teammates to ensure that folks are operating from a common lens.
* As you sort, think about the following questions:
	+ What differentiates those who mastered the task from those who didn’t? What were the biggest gaps between the “approaching” student work and our exemplar?

**Step 4: Identify the Gaps & Determine Action Steps** (5-7 mins)

* What are the biggest gaps between the approaching student work and our exemplar?
* Work toward agreement on the 1-2 highest impact analysis statements using the analysis sentence starter:
* Based on the analysis above, what whole-class or sub-group instructional adjustments will you make? Is there a teaching point that needs to be mastered by the whole class or a sub-group?

Scholar understanding would improve the most ***if scholars*** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

* Complete action step sentence starter:

Scholar understanding would improve the most ***if the teacher*** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Step 5: Plan Reteach** (8-10 mins)

* Leader and teacher collaborate to design / revise an upcoming lesson plan to implement the action step(s). The reteach should address the biggest gap the group identified.

**Step 6: Practice and Follow-up** (8-10 mins, if available)

* Leader and teacher role play how the teacher will re-teach the upcoming lesson.
* Leader and teacher plan intervention groups – which students need more support, what they need help with, when and how this will happen.
* Teacher re-states 1-2 concrete action steps s/he is committing to in the next week.
* Leader and teacher identify how to reassess the re-teach, including what data to review and when.

**LASW as a Dean Management and Development Tool**

**Overview:** LASW meetings offer insight into a dean’s management of a priority area and their coaching of a teacher. Regular LASW meetings with a dean and teacher allow the principal (and regional superintendent) to observe for and monitor the following:

* Is the dean aggressively championing achievement in this area?
* How is the dean prioritizing time and follow-through?
* Do they push for clarity – in instructional next steps, intervention groups, the teacher’s allocation of time – or do they settle for ambiguity?
* Has the teacher arrived to the meeting fully prepared – with an updated tracker, student work copied and sorted/tagged by different student groups?
* What’s the relationship between dean and teacher? Where on the spectrum of tight and directive management versus autonomy and deference does the relationship fall? Is the dean deferring too much?
* Put another way, does the LASW meeting provide evidence that the dean is actively managing the course – tracking data, hawking lesson plans, regularly observing for the fidelity of next steps, etc. – or is the management more hands-off?

The LASW meeting can be leveraged as a dean development tool with three steps that occur after the LASW meeting –

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Step: | Purpose: | Time: |
| Regional Sup – Principal Huddle | Align on feedback for the dean | 10 mins |
| Feedback to the dean (RS observes) | Observe principal delivering feedback | 15 mins |
| Regional Sup – Principal Feedback Meeting | RS gives feedback on feedback | 10-15 mins |

**Regional Sup – Principal Huddle after LASW:** To fully leverage LASW as a dean development tool, the following must be in place –

* The dean should facilitate the meeting. This will allow the principal (and RS) to take notes on the meeting and will yield insight into the dean’s coaching (push for clarity, etc.).
* The principal and RS should take notes during the meeting. Ideally, one of them should take literal notes, though this could be challenging given the intellectual demands of participating in the LASW protocol. Given a choice, it’s probably best for the RS to engage in the protocol in order to push for clear and high impact instructional next steps.
* After the LASW meeting, the principal and RS should huddle for 10 minutes prior to debrief. The express purpose is to prepare the principal to debrief the LASW meeting with the dean. The following steps and questions should drive this debrief:
	+ Using the rubric, what were the facilitation strengths?
	+ What’s the big rock for growth in terms of facilitation?
	+ What is the whole class traction step we want to see next time?
		- Is it clear, observable and high impact?
		- Do we have a clear vision and/or exemplar of what this will look like? Do the principal and dean need to create one? How and when will this happen?
	+ How confident are we that the teacher is clear on HOW to teach the traction step? What evidence would we need to see from the teacher in order to feel confident that they know how to teach the traction step?
	+ How confident are we that the dean and teacher have clarity on intervention groups – which scholars, which aims? What evidence would we need to see in order to feel confident in this? By when?
	+ What did we notice about the coaching and management dynamic between dean and teacher? Did we see evidence that the dean is managing aggressively enough . . . or deferring too much?
	+ Overall, did we see evidence that the dean is aggressively managing to priorities?
	+ Sum-up:
		- What is the big-rock feedback for the dean in terms of meeting facilitation?
		- What is the big-rock feedback for the dean in terms of championing this priority?
		- Based on these big-rocks, what are the key leverage points for the principal to ensure that we gain maximum traction on the traction point?

**Principal-Dean LASW Debrief**

The principal-dean debrief should follow this protocol:

* Ask dean to reflect
* Consulting the CFS and exit ticket from the meeting, evaluate –
	+ What are the facilitation grows?
	+ What is the facilitation big rock?
	+ Do we have a clear, observable and high impact traction step?
		- If no, how can we improve it?
	+ Do we have clear intervention groups – who, what, when?
		- If no, when/how will we clarify?
	+ How confident are we that the teacher knows clearly how to teach the traction point? What do we need to put in place to feel 100% confident about this?
* Feedback on the dean’s championing of the priority –
	+ Glows
	+ Grows
* Summarize feedback and next steps

**Regional Sup – Principal Feedback Meeting**

This meeting should involve the following steps:

* Ask principal to reflect
* Unlimited positives
* Guided discovery (3 questions max)
* State big rock/actionable next step
* Role-play and practice
* Summarize next steps

**APPENDIX A: EXAMPLE TASKS FOR LASW**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade/Course** | **Rigorous Task** | **Task Criteria it Meets**  | **Course Criteria it Meets** (This is specific to each school) |
| 9th World History | The AP exam includes multiple choice questions and three open ended tasks, any of which is ideal for LASW:1. Document Based Question (DBQ)
2. Continuity and Change Over Time (CCOT)
3. Compare and Contrast
 | * Derived from or aligned to the EOC assessment
* Recurring
* Rigorous, multi-faceted
* Exemplars exist Rubrics exist

Link to exemplars, rubrics and scoring guidelines: | * High stakes and high impact
* Area of need
* Alignment to school priorities
* Teacher and dean capacity
 |
| 12th AP Comp and Language | The AP exam consists of multiple choice questions and three essays, any of which is ideal for LASW:1. Synthesis Essay
2. Rhetorical Analysis
3. Thematic Commentary
 | * Derived from or aligned to the EOC assessment
* Recurring
* Rigorous, multi-faceted
* Exemplars exist Rubrics exist

Link to exemplars, rubrics and scoring guidelines: | * High stakes and high impact
* Area of need
* Alignment to school priorities
* Teacher and dean capacity
 |
| 12th AP Calculus | The AP exam consists of multiple choice questions as well as several open response problems that require significant amounts of written justification. These are ideal for sustained LASW. | * Derived from or aligned to the EOC assessment
* Recurring
* Rigorous, multi-faceted
* Exemplars and rubric exist

Link to exemplars, rubrics and scoring guidelines: | * High stakes and high impact
* Area of need
* Alignment to school priorities
* Teacher and dean capacity
 |

**APPENDIX B: *PLAN RE-TEACH* FEEDBACK CHEAT SHEET**[[1]](#footnote-1)

* Model precisely the thinking when moving through a specific task:
	+ Narrow the focus to precisely the thinking students are struggling with that frees their mind to focus only on that component
* Model replicable steps that students can follow
* Model how to activate one’s content knowledge and skills that have been learned in previous lessons
* Vary in tone and cadence to sound different from a “teacher” voice
* Debrief the model:
	+ What did I do in my model? What are the key things to remember when you are doing the same in your own work?

**Show the students how**

Option 2:

Model / Thinkaloud

**Guide the Student Conversation**

* Begin with the end game
	+ What strategy/skill/thinking / conceptual understanding do you want students to understand via the discourse?
* Start from student work – Show Call
	+ Post/display/chart an exemplar student response OR
	+ Post/display/chart an incorrect student response OR
	+ Post both ☺
* Call on students – ID the student thinking:
	+ Exemplar: what did this student do?
		- Push for clearer answers when they haven’t precisely IDed the successful strategy
	+ Incorrect response: Do you agree/disagree with this answer? What is the error?
* Stamp the understanding:
	+ What are the key things to remember when solving problems like these?
	+ Name the strategy/conceptual understanding
	+ Have students put it in their own words
	+ Have students revoice the strategy / conceptual understanding.

Option 1:

Guided

Discourse

**Give student more at-bats to build good habits**

* Aggressively monitor: collect in-the-moment data on whether students are mastering the standard/concept/skill prioritized in the gap analysis
* Set deadlines for lesson plan objectives coupled with exit tickets and future weekly data meeting review

More at-bats

**APPENDIX D – PICTURES OF TRACTION POINT TRACKERS**

****

****

**APPENDIX E – SCORECARD FOR AP U.S. HISTORY**

1. Thesis (0-1):

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| State a thesis that addresses all parts of the question. The thesis must do more than restate the question. **1 point** |  |
| Total: |  |

1. Analysis (0-4 points):

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Documents | Offers plausible analysis of the content of a majority of the documents, explicitly using this analysis to support the stated thesis or a relevant argument. **1 point**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A | B | C | D | E | F | G |

 |  |
| Offers plausible analysis of BOTH the content of a majority of the documents, explicitly using this analysis to support the stated thesis or a relevant argument; ANDat least one of the following for the majority of the documents: intended audience; purpose; historical context, and/or author’s point of view. **2 points**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A | B | C | D | E | F | G |

 |
| Offers plausible analysis of BOTH the content of all or all but one of the documents, explicitly using this analysis to support the stated thesis or a relevant argument; ANDat least one of the following for all or all but one of the documents: intended audience; purpose; historical context, and/or author’s point of view. **3 points**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A | B | C | D | E | F | G |

 |
| Outside Examples | Offers plausible analysis of historical examples beyond/outside the documents to support the stated thesis or a relevant argument. **1 point** |  |
| Total: |  |

1. Contextualization (0-1 point):

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Accurately and explicitly connects historical phenomena relevant to the argument to broader historical events and/or processes. **1 point** |  |
| Total: |  |

1. Synthesis (0-1 point):

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Appropriately extends or modifies the stated thesis or argument **1 point** |  |
| Recognizes and effectively accounts for disparate, sometimes contradictory evidence from primary sources and or secondary works in crafting a coherent argument. **1 point** |  |
| Appropriately connects the topic of the question to other historical periods geographical areas, contexts, or circumstances. **1 point** |  |
| Total: |  |

**APPENDIX F – SCORECARD FOR AP COMPOSITION AND LANGUAGE**

**(1 points) Introduction**

         **Audience:** Explicitly names all audiences

         **Purpose:** Explicitly names what the author is attempting to accomplish with each audience

         **Rhetoric:** Explicitly names at least two core rhetorical devices that the author uses to achieve their purpose

**(3 points)Body Paragraph 1**

         **Assertion 1:** Clear assertion that names **rhetoric, purpose**, and intended **impact** on audience.

         **Context:** Sets the stage in terms of the issue or historical context surrounding this particular appeal

         **Analysis:** Analyzes the effect of the specific appeal/device on the audience, argument, and/or purpose by seamlessly weaving in key words and phrases from the text.

**(3 points) Body Paragraph 2**

         **Assertion 1:** Clear assertion that names **rhetoric, purpose**, and intended **impact** on audience.

         **Context:** Sets the stage in terms of the issue or historical context surrounding this particular appeal

         **Analysis:** Analyzes the effect of the specific appeal/device on the audience, argument, and/or purpose by seamlessly weaving in key words and phrases from the text.

**(2 points) Writer’s Craft**

* Prose demonstrates an impressive control of the elements of writing, matching the style of the text under examination.
* There are little to no errors or lapses in diction.
1. Acknowledgements to our friends at Uncommon and Relay for much of the thinking behind this tool. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)