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ABSTRACT

A macro-reflection focused on the efficacy of the shared design of the learning spaces, program, and curriculum and the impact that has upon teacher collaboration in a middle school for indigenous Hawaiian students. The methodology included teacher questionnaires, focus groups of teachers, teacher leaders, and high functioning collaborative teams, and instructional rounds. The contextual framework was focused on research on communities of practice, and illustrated the collaboration of teachers in a Hawaiian cultural and 21st century context and how collaboration can be the impetus for educational and social change both now and into the future. The research process and findings informed our work in an innovative wall-less learning environment designed by our teachers, and supported the continuation of the building of a dynamic school culture including a shared vision and the triangulation of Hawaiian culture and language, 21st century learning, and middle school promising practice as professional habit in our middle school. The purpose of this research project was to confirm that the wall-less design we created together has caused collaboration amongst the teachers and has met our learner needs. Additionally, the research led to recommendations for building this kind of learning environment for our campus and other schools beyond Kamehameha.

The major findings of this research were: 1) if teachers are deliberately involved with building design charettes, they are more likely to have their ideas heard and incorporated; 2) in a wall-less teaching and learning environment, flexibility of space, planning, grouping, and instructional delivery are essential and valuable to teams; 3) that collaborative teams had high levels of trust, and had the hard copy guiding documents of their teams in place for all teachers on their team; 4) that integrating high functioning
teams with other teams builds the level of collaboration for all teams; 5) that the instructional rounds revealed that the assimilation of Hawaiian culture and language was not as far-reaching as presumed; and 6) that there was a strong presence of collaboration and teacher leadership in the building, and that the instructional rounds methodology can enhance the sharing of best practices amongst the teams.
“High-performing systems have virtually all their teachers on the move. It’s a school thing, a professional thing, and a system thing. The only solutions that will work on any scale are those that mobilize the teaching force as a whole—including strategies where teachers push and support each other.”

Hargreaves and Fullan, 2012
Professional Capital: Transforming Teaching in Every School
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INTRODUCTION

This research was a macro-reflection focused on the efficacy of the shared design of the learning spaces, program, and curriculum and the impact that has upon teacher collaboration in a middle school. The reflection illustrates the collaboration of teachers in a Hawaiian cultural and 21st century context and how it can be the impetus for educational and social change both now and into the future. The research process and findings will inform our work in an innovative wall-less learning environment designed by our teachers. Further, this work will inform the continuation of building a dynamic school culture including a shared vision and the triangulation of Hawaiian culture and language, 21st century learning, and middle school promising practice as professional habit in our middle school.

Beginning in the fall of 2007, the faculty and staff at Kamehameha Schools Kapālama middle school embarked on a journey to reform their physical environment for teaching and learning. Kamehameha, a private independent co-educational school, was established in 1887 by a Hawaiian monarch, Princess Bernice Pauahi Bishop, the great grand daughter of King Kamehameha I, who left her inheritance “to erect and maintain in the Hawaiian Islands two schools, each for boarding and day scholars, one for boys and one for girls, to be known as, and called the Kamehameha Schools. I desire my trustees to provide first and chiefly a good education in the common English branches, and also instruction in morals and in such useful knowledge as may tend to make good and industrious men and women” (Bishop, 1884). The mission of the institution is to improve the capability and well being of Hawaiians through education (The Kamehameha Schools Strategic Plan, 2000) and admission to Kamehameha requires confirmation of Hawaiian
ancestry. Today the Kamehameha Schools has three campuses on three different islands. The original and largest campus is the Kapālama campus on the island of Oahu. The schools in total serve 6,900 students on the three campuses and 31 pre-schools combined. Approximately 3,200 of those students attend school on the K-12 Kapālama campus. In addition, 40,000 students are served through our community collaborations including programs in the Hawai‘i State Department of Education.

What began in the fall of 2007 as a two-week charette with the goal of updating and replacing a 1950’s era middle school facility on the main campus in urban Oahu became a large-scale complete demolition and revision of the place and the program. The charette process led teachers and staff to connect their ideas of an outdated cells and bells design to a new, open spaced and wall-less learning environment. A collaborative inclusive design process transformed program, curriculum design, and instructional delivery. Additionally, the design process changed the interpersonal and professional relationships, the way teachers worked as individuals and as teams, at the middle school.

The initial assumption in this process was that if teachers and staff designed their teaching and workspace they would feel connected to the project and the outcome, and this would result in a sense of ownership of the place and program. This study was about our journey through that design process and the impact that task had upon how we taught indigenous Hawaiian children in the 21st century in an open learning space design where teachers are engaged, and possessed high levels of collaboration.

Specific to this study, engagement was defined as the connection, commitment, joy and excitement in the work teachers do. Collaboration was defined as the act of employing engagement while working together with others that results in the creation of
something new and meaningful for teachers and the students they serve that did not formerly exist. As described by Hargreaves and Fullan (2012), “They strive to outdo themselves and each other in a spirit of making greater individual and collective contributions” (p. 5). The collaborative process causes the creation of something that didn’t exist before and thus serves to scaffold to the next act of working together to create new and meaningful learning. Collaboration has also been described as the result of communication, coordination, and cooperation, which results in co-creation (Wilson, LeFT Conference, 2013). A detailed pictorial diagram of the LEfT conference notes on collaboration can be found in Appendix C. Etienne Wenger (1998) refers to engagement and collaboration in his work on communities of practice:

There are three distinct modes of belonging: 1) engagement—active involvement in mutual processes of negotiating meaning; 2) imagination—creating images of the world, and seeing connections through time and space by extrapolating from our own experience; and 3) alignment—coordinating our energy and activities in order to fit within broader structures and contribute to broader enterprises (p. 173-174).

At the conclusion of this research my hope was that the findings about efficacy of shared design of physical space, program and curriculum, as well as findings about teacher collaboration, will inform and impact subsequent building projects on and beyond our middle school campus, as well as throughout the Kamehameha system.

It was important to provide background to the charrette process that began in August of 2007. The faculty and staff agreed to frame the charrette task upon a shared vision for learning, as well as three additional explicit understandings. All discussions,
design ideas, program revisions, and curricular changes were calibrated around Hawaiian culture and language, 21st century learner attributes, and middle school promising practice (Appendix D). Because of the mission to serve children of Hawaiian ancestry, it followed that a logical aspect of our design focus would have to be on Hawaiian ways of knowing and doing. Secondly, in August of 2007 we were also the first area of our tri-campus system to roll out a 1:1 lap top program to our students. Thus, it was important for us to consider technology as a primary focus for this design work. Lastly, as a middle school it was essential that we included middle school promising practices in our design tasks.

**Hawaiian Culture and Language**

It followed that a school for children of Hawaiian ancestry would provide an experience through program and curriculum that supports and nurtures the Hawaiian culture. While a focus on being Hawaiian was inherently present, a transformation in the last five to ten years has turned what was a school for students who are Hawaiian to a Hawaiian school, or a *Kula Hawai‘i*. This shift in thinking caused teachers, staff, students, and their families to participate in a program and curriculum that exemplified the language and culture at the core of its instructional delivery in all areas of the campus. The change embraces “…the how, what and who of our knowledge philosophy, strengthens Hawaiians, and thus lays a foundation for our identity and essence as cultural people” (Meyer, 2004, p.193). Recently, we have published a statement describing the enhanced focus on Hawaiian culture and language:

> Each Kamehameha Schools’ campus is a kula Hawai‘i – a Hawaiian school –
where all leaders, staff and students are committed to educational excellence through strong teaching and meaningful learning that supports the renewed vibrancy of Hawai‘i’s indigenous people and their life-long success in the 21st century world. This commitment to high levels of achievement is established on the belief that a vibrant Hawaiian people (Lāhui Hawai‘i), engaged in rigorous learning experiences, steeped in ancestral knowledge and understanding (‘Ike Hawai‘i), and rooted in their mother tongue (‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i), will continue to thrive in a living culture (Nohona Hawai‘i) enabling them to compete globally in ways that contribute to and enrich humankind (as envisioned in the WEO). This renewed vibrancy requires educational opportunities that advance the social, cultural, economic and political status of Native Hawaiians in their own homeland and in the world. These mission-centered outcomes require diverse educational expertise and background, and a significant, sustained commitment of programmatic, human and financial resources. Guided by the vision of Ke Ali‘i Pauahi, Kamehameha Schools dedicates itself to achieving these outcomes to ensure a dynamic future for Native Hawaiians (Ako, Stender, Higa, Kaniaupio, & Fong, 2013).

Our efforts at the middle school to build an architectural piece that incorporated Hawaiian values, culture, language, and motif to support the program and curriculum that was evolving at the same time was deliberate and carefully thought out by the teacher and staff design team. It was imperative to us that we revision our instructional delivery to meet the needs of the Kula Hawai‘i. “And thus begins the recognition that Native Hawaiians have had and currently have a specific culture and language shaped by cultural
mores, beliefs and practices…Hawaiian culture and language is endemic to place, specific to genealogy, unique to the hopes of passed relatives, and alive within the practices of Hawaiians today” (Meyer, 2004, p.194).

21st Century Learning

With the simultaneous roll out of a 1:1 lap top (the first for our three-campus institution) program during the same fall as the design charette, we had the additional responsibility of focusing on technology in an indigenous Hawaiian setting and approach to teaching and learning. Approximately one third of our student admissions quota are reserved for students of Hawaiian ancestry who are orphaned and or indigent. The 1:1 program additionally served the purpose of providing an equitable field for learning for all our students. At our school it was a goal to prepare our students to be globally minded and agents of change. Palfrey and Gasser (2008) posit:

I’m certain that there is a global culture in the making, which joins people from many corners of the globe together with one another based upon common ways of interacting over information networks. The emergence of a common culture is part and parcel of a trend toward globalization. The consequences of an emerging global culture ought to be overwhelmingly positive. It is a dramatic amplification of the diplomatic and cross-cultural benefits gained by the invention of the telegraph, millions of international student exchanges, and the rise of a globally networked economy. As we celebrate the emergence of this global culture, we need to recognize that a sharp divide had formed between those with both the
access and skills to participate in this digital culture and those without either (p. 274-275).

A technology task force was in place for two years prior to the roll out and had done a thorough job of research to prepare everyone for the flagship roll out. That task force existed to handle all research and development issues related to the 1:1 program in our middle school while remaining open-minded to any new issue that presents itself and using student feedback to help the adults grow in their understanding of the issues. As Palfrey and Gasser (2008) explained:

> These are big, gnarly, complicated, subtle issues, every one of them. We have to be flexible in how we approach them, to think creatively, to work together. We have to draw on the wisdom of the Digital Natives themselves in the process. They are our greatest hope, hands down (p. 275).

Collaboration, the focus of this research, was an essential 21st century learner skill. It was through collaboration that group learning approaches lead to increased student learning outcomes; where informal learning became the basis for 70% of professional knowledge amongst adult learners; where teacher collaborative inquiry brought greater job satisfaction and performance; and where collective leadership grows (Wilson, April 2013). We have built a middle school technology approach slowly and organically as teachers and students guided the journey. In the first year of the roll out most teachers used the hardware for word processing. Soon presentation software was folded in and then virtual classroom sites like Ning and Edmodo grew out of the classrooms of the more adept or “ready” teachers. In year two of the 1:1 program, teachers were challenged to think about their classrooms as moving toward being paperless. The paperless-ness
happened very quickly. In year two of the 1:1 program I asked teachers to try to reduce paper usage by twenty-five percent, then in the following year fifty percent. Since year four of the roll out we functioned at about seventy-five percent less paper usage than when we began the 1:1 program. Additionally, I appealed to teachers to revise one unit of study from their curriculum maps and convert it to a 2.0 unit. This request was made so that slowly the curriculum maps, and thus the instructional delivery, would include units of study that were in line with reduced use of paper and inclusive of 2.0 technology. All of this work to convert from a somewhat traditional instructional delivery to a 2.0 environment has taken time and has been supported by purposeful and required training, as well as nearly unlimited professional development both on and off the island depending on the needs and growth curve of each individual teacher with respect to technology integration. Most classrooms employed technology everyday in ways that demonstrated the migration from paper and pencil to lap top driven learning. Our middle school adult population functioned solely on a virtual learning community through a robust Ning site that houses all of who we are and what we do each day in our middle school.

**Middle School Promising Practice**

A decision to become a middle school in the year 2000 led us to adopt the basic tenants of a middle school as outlined in *Turning Points 2000* (NMSA, 2000) and *This We Believe* (NMSA, 2010) both guiding documents for the National Middle School Association, now the Association of Middle Level Education (AMLE). The AMLE document, *Successful Schools for Young Adolescents* (see Appendix E), called on
educators to focus on four essential attributes that included an education that is: developmentally responsive, challenging, empowering, and equitable (NMSA, 2010). Of the sixteen characteristics of a successful school for young adolescents, this research focused specifically on the following: a shared vision, active learning, challenging curriculum, multiple learning approaches, and collaborative leaders (NMSA, 2010).

These five characteristics in particular related to the design of our building and the delivery of instruction that has evolved as a result of the design influence. Most important of these attributes for us was the shared vision. The entire charette process as well as, all operational and instructional design and delivery was centered on our shared vision of Nurturing All Learner Voices. The vision is discussed further in the next section of this research and the documents can be found in Appendix F. In addition, active learning was integral to a wall-less space wherein teachers and students interacted and learned collaboratively throughout the day. The developmental age of middle school students required that a challenging and dynamic curriculum be designed and delivered to hold the engagement through their learning, while at the same time focus students on task completion and accountability. Multiple learning approaches insure that the curriculum was differentiated to meet the needs of all learners. Finally, collaborative leadership was essential for insuring that the shared vision was embedded in all we say and do, was a critical component for an integrated curriculum delivery, and must be a norm for a physical space in which there are no walls to separate teachers and learners. While we are not a customary three-grade-level middle school, we operate in all other ways as a middle school with a strong and deliberate advisory program, exploratory class wheels, block scheduling, and a staff and faculty who are trained to support adolescent developmental
needs. Eighty-two percent of our teachers have at least one master’s degree in a related field, and forty-one percent of the teachers have a master’s degree with a specific focus on middle level education. With the commitment to middle level education by the school and by the faculty we had a strong foundation for the design of the building and program around the middle school student needs.

With the triangulation of the Hawaiian culture and language, 21st century learner attributes, and middle school best practice in place, and a commitment of full participation in the charette process from all teams in the middle school, we began our design of a new building, as well as the re-visioning of our middle school program, and some re-design of our curriculum. About two days into the process the design consultant and I discussed challenging the teachers and staff to think beyond where they were presently and to transfer their thinking into a place fifty years forward in order to try to grasp how we might create a space conducive to the learner of today, and support the kind of learning we would foresee continuing into the future. After our suggestion to envision school beyond the present, the thinking immediately turned in the direction of alternative spaces we might design that were not like the classrooms in which we were educated. Instead of meeting to design the following day, we went on an excursion to visit another independent school in the city that had a building designed as an open learning space. About twenty of us spent the morning observing and asking questions in this facility across town. Upon our return to the design table, faculty and staff began to brainstorm existing movement patterns in the school, where we might design innovative spaces, and what we were willing to commit to should we dramatically redesign teaching and learning in our middle school. By the end of the two weeks the design team, in
collaboration throughout the process with their respective teams of teachers, presented a new concept for our middle school. We would build a wall-less learning space. We were well aware that historically similar designs had been built, especially in the 1970’s two-on-three configuration, and had not been successful. We believed that in our circumstances and with the generous professional development supports we had in place, we could embrace the innovative building design, the changes the design would initiate in our program, and the subsequent necessary curricular revisions required. We were fully supported in intention and with resources by the leadership on the campus and at the corporate level of our institution. Our intent was to create the best learning environment for the indigenous Hawaiian children we served in the context of 21st century learning.

**Shared Vision for Learning**

Our vision for learners was developed towards the end of the charrette process in May 2008 through an appreciative inquiry method. Teachers and staff brainstormed all aspects of our existing program that were positive, meaningful, and successful. The group categorized the data from these initial discussions into pictorial representations of the images of the highlights of our school program. Over the following summer months a couple of teachers took special interest in this task and worked with the visual data from the appreciative inquiry process to reflect upon and draw ideas for our vision. The image of a *pahu* or Hawaiian drum came to them as a fitting metaphor for our middle school, and from this image and the data a draft vision statement was crafted with a small group of teachers and staff. At the end of the summer of 2008 the draft vision for the middle school was published. The vision statement, *Nurturing All Learner Voices*
(see Appendix F) has provided the focal point for every aspect of our school from operations, to curriculum, to program, and to how we work together as a team. The vision development was instrumental to the charette process and building architecture as well as enlightens all we do in the middle school. This work also informed the direction I would take for this dissertation.

The charette process continued into the fall of 2008 when specific architectural design motif echoing the vision were drawn into the plans for the new facility. This included a central gathering place between the two main buildings, which both architecturally and symbolically represents the pahu drum and the voice of the student at the center of our work. It is in this space that we gather every Monday to open school with chant and prayer; it is in this physical space that we close school every Friday with chant and prayer. This space is the center voice for our physical campus and used as the gathering place for both formal and casual meetings of children, teachers, families, and the community. The design process was completed in spring of 2009 when the nationwide economic downturn placed a hold on our next steps. It was not until April of 2010 that we were informed the project would proceed as designed. Needless to say the break in the process caused some doubt about the completion of the project as we had designed it. Teachers and staff moved to a temporary facility in April and May of 2010. This village layout of temporary classrooms, while not ideal, included all the amenities we were accustomed to as well as air conditioning and wireless networking. It is miraculous that between April and August 1, 2010 that an entire temporary middle school for 640 students and seventy-five faculty and staff was erected and opened on time to start the school year. The months of June and July were very disruptive to the staff that remained
on campus. During the summers of 2010 and 2011 there were no summer programs in our area of the campus due to the construction, which limited the summer employment for many of the teachers who would customarily work during these months. Our temporary school setting included making our gym a multi-purpose gym, assembly hall, chapel, and lunchroom every day. These temporary facilities supported us for the next two school years as the new building emerged. No additional human resource support was added to direct the project from a construction-program perspective. For the ensuing five years after my hire I doubled as a school principal and a project manager for the new facility.

In the same fall of 2007 the middle school pioneered the roll out of the first 1:1 lap top program in our system. The technology would provide equal access for all students, but at the same time would cause another disruption to our middle school culture. Teachers would now simultaneously feel pressured to improve their technology integration, while at the same time, work toward a completely re-visioning the learning space for our students. It would follow that collaboration may have been the farthest thing from their minds as they tried to manage all the change.

The third factor impacting the development of our new middle school was the visioning work mentioned above. I do believe that the visioning and team building facet of our work together inherently built and continues to reinforce the growth of collaboration on our middle school campus. As preparatory work for this visioning process, in the fall of 2007 all teachers and staff were given the Myers-Briggs (MBTI) assessment to define types and temperaments of all faculty and staff at the middle school. The foundational assessments would help to develop understandings about each other, as
well as support and help to guide the changes that were occurring in the middle school. Very few teachers and staff were familiar with this assessment information prior to this. However, the MBTI provided foundational understandings about each individual that in turn would inform peers, teams, and the leadership. Each year since that initial assessment seven years ago a specific and non-prescriptive training was folded into our learning to address the monumental changes in our middle school. We assessed the change management needed as they emerged and then proactively use the MBTI assessment as the starting point for all training and development. For example, in the year following the charrette teachers and staff were trained in using their MBTI to build trust and give feedback to each other. Next, teams developed team agreements, norms, and roles and responsibilities to set the stage for mutual understanding and to grow toward high performance teaming. In the third year team leaders were trained to work with their respective teams to gain mutual understanding and respect, as well as build trust between team members. In the fourth year, MBTI guided the discussion between and amongst team leads and the administrative team. In the fifth year we transitioned from the temporary facility to the new building. The fifth year was full of anxiety about the new building, strain about moving yet again, and uncertainties about our design plans and the reality of opening a wall-less building. It was expected that all of our work in embracing change would be threatened and so we needed to retrain in some of the areas of trust and mutual understanding. The fourth and fifth year saw the development of a Transition Team of teachers who would lead the discussions, advise decisions, and assist the faculty and staff in their move to a new learning environment. The Transition Team helped to bridge the discussions about some of the operational decisions that had to be made daily.
and rapidly, with the long held understandings and desires of the faculty and staff. As with all building projects, though you design for an ideal, in the end there is always a revision to that ideal whether because of cost, weather, or unforeseen circumstances with the project. The art of building, contractors, and operations and the art of the educator are not always in sync. The Transition Team collaborated throughout that two-year journey to insure that voices were heard on the ground, ideas were fully discussed and explained, and communication was delivered with clarity to the leadership team at the middle school. Without this teacher-led collaborative team we might have ended up putting up walls both actual and figurative. Instead the Transition Team helped all of us navigate the rough swells of change from a traditional building and program to an innovative building and program. The Transition Team was also instrumental in the development of curriculum and schedule change. A timeline of events leading up to the actual opening of the wall-less facility can be found in Appendix G.

Despite the fact that the building process was an inclusive and collaborative design project, the reality of the building nearing completion caused fear, confusion, and frustration. The fear was caused by the impending innovative design of a wall-less learning environment. While it was a teacher-staff design, there was a lot that we would not know until we actually inhabited and started teaching and learning in the space. Second-guessing our decisions to go in the innovative direction of a wall-less building caused the confusion and frustration we experienced. We were not just replacing a traditional classroom building; we were doing something very progressive which brought with it the expected insecurities. We were deliberate in our training with the MBTI and teaming, but again, we would not know until we actually inhabited the building and
tested all of our ideals. Without the structured multi-year process using MBTI to guide us, I believe we would not be able to move toward a collaborative culture in the new building. “Finding time to develop collaboration, trust, and respect doesn’t just happen accidentally or completely spontaneously—though it is possible to create platforms where spontaneous collaboration will occur” (Hargreaves & Fullan, 2012, p. 114). Our intent all along was to create strong foundations in understanding each other that would help to build knowledge about our relationships to one another. Simultaneously we were creating a vision for learning that was both metaphorical and tangible and would guide our work as we moved into the wall-less building we had designed together. To address some of the uneasiness of this transition to a new learning space we searched for a school that was wall-less so that we could actually see the parts in action.

A fourth significant factor impacting the design of the buildings, program, and curriculum was a week-long action research project in February of 2012 that included fifteen teachers and administrators who traveled to a high school in Buckeye, Arizona. This high school was designed by the same consultant and in the same style as our facility. Through the consultant we were able to make contact with the administration and design a one-week action research project on this Arizona high school campus. The members of the action research team represented each of the six teams (three 7th grade and three 8th grade) at the middle school. The visitation and the research for four research teams with specific focal areas of content, space, leadership, and imagination with respect to both the students and the adults in the building. The high school had been open for about four years and was enjoying success as a wall-less learning environment. Our week there helped us to see the start-to-end of the school day, to observe student interactions,
talk with kids and faculty, staff and administrators, and to document our findings daily to share back home through a Ning site. Those back at our school campus were able to read and respond with clarifying or additional questions. At the end of the week-long action research trip, our faculty was asked to share their findings with the Verrado faculty in their weekly faculty gathering. This experience proved mutually beneficial and we have continued to work with the high school in Arizona, albeit long-distance, since our visit to their campus. One faculty member commented, “If you want to bring in collaboration the wall-less environment is essential; it is just too easy to close a door in a traditional classroom” (Verrado, 2012). In turn our teams have reached out to help others in their journey toward innovation in the years since we opened our facility.

In the spring of 2012, the residential program for middle school students from neighboring islands was transferred from the high school administration to the middle school administration. This move was made so that we could provide a more developmentally appropriate program for our middle school boarding students. The first year was spent conducting the MBTI assessments, creating a companion vision for boarding that cascaded well from our middle school vision, and establishing agreements, roles, and responsibilities. No additional personnel to guide this process were added in this first year. However, as a result of the work done with residential program vision and agreements, roles and responsibilities, it was clear that a boarding administrative position and a support position were needed if we were going to take on this added piece to our program. In the fall of 2013, a new boarding administrator was hired along with a clerical support position. The goal of the middle school within the next three to five years is to
create a comprehensive middle school program that blends the academic and residential programs to serve all students, teachers, and staff.

Finally, it is significant to mention that a number of visitors have come to observe us in our new facility since we opened in the fall of 2012. Most often we get requests from groups of other indigenous educators (e.g., Muckleshoot and Tlingit Native American Indians, South American indigenous Indians, Chinese, Maori, Indonesian, Australian aboriginal) who come to see the wall-less environment with students and teachers in it, and to ask questions about 21st century learning environments for indigenous students.

With this background to a very complex set of circumstances, I return to the focus of this research which is on teacher engagement and collaboration in a wall-less teaching and learning environment for indigenous students in a 21st century setting. The rationale for further investigation of our process will help us to continue to provide appropriate and meaningful learning environments for our children of Hawaiian ancestry, and so that we can share what we have learned with others beyond our middle school. Feedback will be gathered about the presence of our shared vision for learning, and related to the triangulation of Hawaiian culture and language, 21st century learner attributes, and middle school promising practice from evaluators outside of our school. I expect to find the range of collaboration and engagement in our facility, and to be able to share that with others. More importantly, where there is a high level of collaboration I plan to encourage those teachers to influence others. The hope is that the research will also inform the design of buildings on our campus as well as school buildings in other parts of the state and our country. As move continue to grow with the MBTI as a framework, year
six and seven of this foundational work has been focused on refining some of the areas that may not have been addressed in the initial five years of MBTI training. Specifically, the focus for the last two years has been on specific teams with specific issues that are slowing their growth or collaboration as a team. Additionally, with a residential program added the same year the new building opened, we have had to redouble our efforts to assimilate the residential life faculty into the MBTI work. Thus far the residential staff is welcoming the MBTI training with extremely positive feedback. Finally, I have a professional responsibility to find out at a macro level how our design-build process was successful, and in what ways we can continue to grow and improve. To this end, the purpose of this action research project was to confirm that the design we intended has met our learner needs, to inform how teachers and students will continue to grow in this learning environment, and to make recommendations for building this kind of learning environment for our campus and other schools beyond Kamehameha. It is our intent to share what we have learned about the new facility, the 1:1 lap top program, and the new phase of residential learning in our middle school, while at the same time continue to investigate learning environments for indigenous students in a 21st century middle school context.
Contexts

General

In 2001, the middle school was established on our campus. Prior to that date we shared a long “secondary school” history with the high school. The move from a traditional secondary organization of program and faculty to that of a middle school has caused us to consider looking closely at change management processes and training. I believe that the severance of grades seven and eight from this long-standing secondary school was not done with a full understanding of what would then be needed to establish a healthy middle school model. For example, administrative positions were migrated from the high school, and little was done to address the points of overlap between the now middle and high school programs. The middle school was disconnected and left to develop on its own. The boarding and athletics programs remained intact with the high school. Many of the department heads in the high school remained in supervisory capacities over the teachers in the middle school. It has taken the last seven years through the work of the design-build, creating a shared vision, and working in a collaborative style to emerge as our own distinctive program. We used the guiding documents from the Association of Middle Level Educators (formerly NMSA) to steer our program development and to serve as an accountability measure. As a school founded for children of Hawaiian ancestry, it followed that the context of the study would also include a Hawaiian epistemological focus. Further, we enter the seventh year of the 1:1 lap top program this fall and have assimilated to a learning environment that uses technology for instruction, delivery of tasks, and completion of most work by the students. Teachers do the majority of their work through technology. The shared vision development and
implementation process holds us to nurturing all voices of all learners in the middle school.

A significant personal context to mention is that I was an administrator new to Kamehameha and from outside of the institutional culture. The campus’ long history as a traditional educational institution for children of Hawaiian ancestry set in place long standing cultural norms. I knew I would be moving huge change factors simply by being a non-Kamehameha graduate coming into a culture from the outside. While it was not mentioned through the interview process for my position, the intent was for me to lead the design process for a new facility with the faculty and staff. The faculty and staff were not aware that this would be my first and primary charge when I began the job that fall. The campus was predominantly a 1950’s era contained classroom design. The same fall I would come on board I would be tasked with rolling out a 1:1 lap top program to all students and faculty, the first of its kind in our tri-campus enterprise. The move from a traditional secondary instructional delivery to a 1:1 environment was a monumental shift all by itself. I personally represented a lot of change in a place that had been comfortable in a traditional model for over 100 years.

**Cultural**

Kamehameha as an institution is moving toward what is called a kula Hawai‘i, a Hawaiian school. Our institutional policy states:

> Each Kamehameha Schools’ campus is a kula Hawai‘i – a Hawaiian school – where all leaders, staff and students are committed to educational excellence through strong teaching and meaningful learning that supports the renewed

The adopted statement for the Kula Hawai‘i campus vision is:

Our graduates will thrive leading successful and fulfilling adult lives as agents of positive social change. They will create and apply knowledge that productively contributes to the capability and well-being of people of Hawaiian ancestry and enriches humankind in perpetuity.

As a kula Hawai‘i committed to excellence, we envision:

• A school-community, grounded in Hawaiian and Christian values, where all students, staff, families and alumni are welcomed, valued and treated as ‘ohana.

• A dynamic K-12 program that embraces 21st century skills, stewardship, servant leadership, and a solid foundation in Hawaiian culture and language in preparation for college, career and life.

• A school that reflects on practice, promotes transparency by involving stakeholders and initiates sustainable and transformational change.

• Learning environments in which students and adults thrive socially, emotionally, culturally, intellectually, physically and spiritually.

• A shared kuleana for advancing the mission of Kamehameha Schools – Kapālama (Campus Vision, September, 2013).
Our middle school vision for learning is *Nurturing All Learner Voices*. We have transformed that vision into all we do in the middle school. We have included architectural features to exemplify this vision in our central gathering space on the campus. We believe it is our inherent responsibility to nurture each learner’s voice so that when they leave us they are confident and can function alone with confidence. The *pahu* or drum metaphor has been literally transformed by each team through the creation of a *pahu* for each team area. This task required months of dedication by all teams to choose, design, carve, and assemble their *pahu*. Each drum has its own biography and name that is significant to the team. At the opening of our new facility the team leads together chanted with their *pahu* as a student group performed a chant written for that building blessing and opening in fall of 2012. To date all teams have created *pahu* for their team areas. Most recently with the opening of a new middle school dorm facility, our dorm faculty has come together to create their *pahu* and a chant particular to the students in their dorms who come from five of the neighboring islands to live in residence here while they attend school. To hear all twelve team *pahu* together demonstrates the culture we have strived to create in the middle school, a culture that harmonizes all voices.

**Situational Context**

The Kamehameha Schools Kapālama middle school is part of a larger 600-acre hillside campus, on the island of O‘ahu. The campus has more than 70 buildings, an Olympic-size swimming pool, tennis courts, and a new athletic complex with a football/soccer field, track and seating for 3,000. This campus offers a boarding program, designed to help students attain high academic performance, positive self-esteem, and
personal and community responsibility. The Kapālama campus is currently home to 3,196 students, grades K-12. Kamehameha was founded in 1887 and is a statewide educational system supported by a $9.06 billion trust, endowed by Princess Bernice Pauahi Bishop. The system includes the Oahu K-12 campus as well as campuses on Hawai‘i, and Maui, and 31 preschool sites statewide. The combined 6,715 preschool through grade 12-student enrollment makes Kamehameha the largest independent school system in the United States. Kamehameha Schools gives preference to children of Hawaiian ancestry to the extent permitted by law (KS website, 2014). The seventh and eighth grades of the Kamehameha Secondary School officially became the Kamehameha Schools Kapālama Middle School in July of 2001. Five large construction projects have been completed on the campus since 2010, the last of which was the new middle school facility and the middle school dorms. Master planning for the elementary and high schools are in process. The middle school findings from their inclusive design-build charette, as well as data from a campus-wide educational plan process will help to inform these future projects on the campus that will begin in the fall of 2014. In the fall of 2014 the institution will have fully operationalized six years of pilot and field study of a workplace capacity building initiative that has guided the direction for the use of the Danielson Framework for teaching throughout all classrooms to encourage teacher growth. Similarly, we are about six years into the development of a standards based curriculum that has a foundation in Hawaiian cultural based exit outcomes (see Appendix H).
It is important to provide the situational context of the building projects, the Danielson Framework project, and the Standards-Based Kula Hawai‘i (SBKH) project as all three are integrally tied to this study on the efficacy of shared design around Hawaiian culture and language, 21\textsuperscript{st} century learning, and middle school best practice and the impact on teacher collaboration.
Theoretical Framework

The main theoretical framework for this research was built around Etienne Wenger’s (1998) literature on communities of practice (CoPs). The body of work on instructional rounds (City, Elmore, Fiarman, & Teitel, 2009) and Charlotte Danielson’s (2007) framework for teaching are secondary support frameworks for this research.

Wenger’s work was chosen as a guiding framework as it helped me to define the kind of learning that I see emerging in the wall-less community in our new facility. Wenger and Lave “coined the term ‘communities of practice’ in the late 80’s” (p. 7). Communities of practice have “provided a vehicle for peer-to-peer learning among practitioners” (p. 7). Specifically in the field of education, the CoPs have been a venue for professional development and for offering a fresh perspective on learning and education (p.7).

When I think about this framework in relation to our wall-less building I immediately see where the more collaborative teams are those who have developed strong relationships and have operational systems in place to manage their teams in an organized and efficient way. There was a range of level of team performance throughout the building. Through this research I hope to find ways to continue to raise teams to higher levels of performance, to more effective functioning CoPs.

Community of practice, which we define as a learning partnership among people who find it useful to learn from and with each other about a particular domain. They use each other’s experience of practice as a learning resource. And they join forces in making sense of and addressing challenges they face individually or collectively (Wenger, 2007, p. 9).
Wenger explained another critical factor of CoPs that had relevance to our design of building and program at the middle school—the interplay between relationships and reification, or the documents and hard copy documents of a group that, when synergistic, forms into a well functioning community of practice. Where relationships are strong and the documents that drive that relationship (a team in this case) are in place, then there are strong CoPs. Conversely, when either the relationships are weak and/or the documents that provide frames for the team are not in place, CoPs are not as strong. This concept formed the base of the theoretical framework that guides this research—that a high performing team, or the effective CoPs, was created when the relationships are genuine, strong, and trustworthy, and are coupled with the foundational documents, the hard copy, of that group.

On the one hand, we engage directly in activities, conversations, reflections, and other forms of participation in social life. On the other hand, we produce physical and conceptual artifacts—words, tools, concepts, methods, stories, documents, links to resources, and other forms of reification—that reflect our shared experience and around which we organize our participation. Meaningful learning in social contexts requires both participation and reification to be in interplay (Wenger, 1998, p. 63).

The CoPs framework also illustrated that communities of practice do not necessarily mean that all teams are strong and that the members are in constant agreement. To the contrary there needs to be a little tension present in all team dynamics for growth to occur. I have seen this in the higher functioning teams in our buildings—the ones who
dare to have the critical conversations about learning and teaming inevitably are the
teams that continue to grow.

A community of practice can be viewed as a learning partnership. Its learning
capability is anchored in a mutual recognition as potential learning partners. A
learning partner is not someone who agrees with you or who even shares your
background necessarily. It is someone with whom focusing on practice together
creates high learning potential. There is a kind of trust that arises out of this
mutual recognition. It is not necessarily a personal kind of trust, but it is a
significant trust that all participants will come from a place of experience and
therefore make contributions that are very likely to be relevant to practice. It is

As part of the theoretical framework, I hope to find that collaboration on teams was
occurring and that even though levels of collaboration are at varied stages with an upward
trend toward strong communities of practice.

City and Elmore’s instructional rounds were used as part of the methodology of
this study. The instructional rounds protocol was in alignment with the CoPs framework
because, like the CoPs, the instructional round helps communities of learners reflect upon
their theories of practice to ultimately revise and improve their practice (which can
include both the relationships and the artifacts of that group). Whereas Wenger’s work
was about the development of communities through the interplay between relationships
and the concrete materials of a group, instructional rounds was about reflecting upon
those relationships and those materials in a group to foster continual growth and to keep
groups’ theories of practice dynamic and relevant to the group in which they reside. An
instructional round takes a theory of action of a group and tests it, and checks for its presence and the extent to which it exists. This research used the rounds as a way to get an outside lens of the engagement and collaboration around the shared vision and triangulation.

Danielson’s Framework for Teaching (2007) was considered as a support framework for this study because it was a framework that was in place in our middle school and was well understood by all teachers and staff. The Danielson framework was adopted institution-wide in 2012 in my school setting, and had been thoroughly vetted over a six-year period with the intent that the framework would support the dynamic growth of teachers. The training for all teachers and evaluators was done throughout the pilot period with clarity of purpose, and a shared goal in mind for all which was the continuous improvement of teacher practice. The training was on-going as new teachers and evaluators join the system. The Danielson framework aligned with the CoPs framework in the area of professional communities of learning. I specifically focused on Domain 4, Professional Responsibilities, for this research, addressing the following professional components: participation in a professional community (4d), growing and developing professionally (4e), and showing professionalism (4f). The elements of component 4d specifically address communities of learners in similar ways that CoPs address learners and learning and growing as a community. “Teachers maintain professional collegial relationships that encourage sharing, planning, and working together toward improved instructional skill and student success” (Danielson, 2007, p. 99). In addition, “Teachers contribute to and participate in a learning community that supports and respects its members’ efforts to improve practice” (p. 99). This element
assimilated well with the intent of the instructional round wherein teachers gave feedback to teachers about their theory of practice so that their practice constantly improved. In element 4e Danielson (2007) described a learning environment where “Teachers actively pursue networks that provide collegial support and feedback” (p. 103). The CoPs was that arena in which teachers received support and feedback when relationships and reification are interacting effectively. “Teachers act with integrity and honesty” (Danielson, 2013, p. 107) was an element that was essential for CoPs to possess so that high performance of teams in this wall-less environment was a greater possibility.

Wenger’s research provided a deeper understanding about how teachers work together to build each other’s practices as well and enhance their individual practices. The level of teacher collaboration around improved practice was integral to the discussion of the efficacy of shared design of learning spaces, program and curriculum. The instructional rounds (City et al, 2009) provided an additional and independent lens to the work teachers are doing with each other in the open learning environment. Finally, the Danielson framework provided a background to the levels of practice relating to participation in professional communities, growing and developing professionally, and showing professionalism (Danielson, 2007). Danielson’s work helped to frame the actions of the teachers in their day-to-day activities. The three frameworks provided the foundation for the focus group, instructional rounds conversations, and individual interviews that assisted me in answering the research questions about teacher engagement and collaboration in the wall-less learning spaces.
Research Question

The primary research question that has guided this work:

- What is the efficacy of shared design of learning spaces, program, and curriculum on teacher collaboration in a wall-less environment?

The following related questions were also explored:

- Does participation in the design process cause teachers to be more in tune with the triangulation of concepts upon which the building was built?
- Does the wall-less environment foster collaboration?
- What specifically is happening in those teams where natural team collaboration is occurring?
- How can the highly collaborative teams begin to influence other teams?

Providing the findings from these research questions will give us the next steps to enhancing collaboration and serving our indigenous Hawaiian learners into the future. At an organizational level, we hope that the research about and around our building and program will help us to foresee learner needs in the future and thus impact how we design and build physical structures and the corresponding programs. The research surrounding the development of the innovative physical space and the program will impact campus-wide discussions about the future learning spaces for our students.
At the middle school specific level, this research provided support for those functions that are supporting and growing collaboration between teachers and teams, as well as reveal the areas where we can focus greater attention to improve program delivery and enhance student learning. For the teachers and staff who work in this space each day, the research confirmed what we are doing well and cause us to make adjustments in areas where we can improve our instructional delivery and enhance student learning and success.
LITERATURE REVIEW

If there was shared design of the building, the program, and the curriculum then teachers will collaborate better. That was the premise upon which I based this study. Inherent in our shared design process was deliberate attention to building strong relationships as evidenced in the aforementioned work around MBTI. Accompanying the process of consciously building strong and positive relationships was the creation of the programmatic and curricular documents to guide and notate the progress of this work. I first looked to the literature surrounding communities of practice, CoPs (Wenger), to frame this research.

A community of practice defines itself along three dimensions: its joint enterprise as understood and continually renegotiated by its members; the relationships of mutual engagement that binds members together in a social entity; and the shared repertoire of communal resources (routines, sensibilities, artifacts, vocabulary, styles, etc.) that members have developed over time (2013, p.2).

Charlotte Danielson’s work, particularly domain four, on professional practice (Danielson, 2007), and City’s work focusing on the instructional rounds process (City, et al, 2009) was used to build out this literature review.

The following literature review summary table was done in a journaling style and by careful selection of primary and secondary sources, documents, articles, and texts, providing specific summaries of the interplay of content as related to the overall purpose of the study. Color-coding was employed to show the specific details and how these related, supported, or refuted the contents, purpose and findings.
**Table 1. Literature Review Summary**

**Black text**—notes from reading  
**Maroon text**—specific area relevancy to study  
**Blue text**—comment to enhance findings  
**Green text**—next steps; further questions after this study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literature</th>
<th>Key Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Wenger     | • Social theory of learning  
|            |   o Meaning—experiencing our life and the world as meaningful  
| **Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity**  
| 1998       |   o Practice—shared historical and social frameworks and perspectives to sustain mutual engagement in action  
|            |   o Community—social configurations in which what we do is defined as worthwhile  
|            |   o Identity—how learning creates who we are  
|            | • “Communities of practice are an integral part of our daily lives. They are so informal and so pervasive that they rarely come into explicit focus, but for the same reasons they are also quite familiar” (p. 7)  
|            | • Regarding learning:  
|            |   o “For individuals learning is an issue of engaging in and contributing to the practices of their communities” (p. 7)  
|            |   o “For communities learning is an issue of refining practice and ensuring new generations of learners (p. 7)  
|            |   o “For organizations learning is an issue of sustaining the interconnected communities of practice…to become effective and valuable as an organization” (p. 8)  
|            | • “But perhaps more than learning itself, it is our conception of learning that needs urgent attention” (p. 9)  
|            | • “A key implication of our attempts to organize learning is that we must become reflective with regard to our own discourses of learning and to their effects on the ways we design for learning” (p. 9)  
|            | • (outcome of CoPs/collaboration)—“Knowing involves primarily active participation in social communities…What does look promising are inventive ways of engaging students in meaningful practices, of providing access to resources that enhance their participation, of opening their horizons so they can put themselves on learning trajectories they can identify with, and of involving them in actions,
Table 1. (Continued) Literature Review Summary

- discussions, and reflections that make a difference to the communities that they value” p 10
  - The research assumption is that shared design increases collaboration…which in essence should provide the kinds of learning environments in the quote above….due the design of the open space and the inherent collaboration that has to occur when there are no walls/doors.

- “We must also remember that our institutions are designs and that our designs are hostage to our understanding, perspectives, and theories.” p 10
- “In practice, understanding is always straddling the known and the unknown in a subtle dance of the self. It is a delicate balance.” p. 41
  - In the design and build of the building, and even now two years into the building, we are “straddling” the known and the unknown to create the KMS “self.” It is always a “delicate balance” of each KMS staff/faculty known and unknown, which is why the journey is always so complex and dynamic. I do believe, however, that this “dance” that we are doing together pushes against the status quo of education and is allowing us to create something new that benefits the kids of today. It is in the creation of this “something” that I believe is at the heart of collaboration.

- “Over time, this collective learning results in practices that reflect both the pursuit of our enterprises and the attendant social relations. These practices are thus the property of a kind of community created over time by the sustained pursuit of a shared enterprise. It makes sense, therefore, to call these kinds of communities communities of practice.” p. 45
- “We all have our own theories and ways of understanding the world, and our communities of practice are places where we develop, negotiate, and share them.” p.48
- “…practice must be understood as a learning process and that a community of practice is therefore an emergent structure. Neither inherently stable nor randomly changeable.” p.49
  - couple this idea with my definition of collaboration—that something new must come from people working together—and I begin to understand
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- why it has been challenging to get a structure in place.
- \textbf{If} communities of practice are emergent and unstable, dynamic, by nature \textit{and} collaboration by my definition requires folks to work together to create something new, \textit{then} what we have is an environment that is constantly growing, building, changing, destructing, rebuilding again. Is this not parallel to the 21st century learner environment where little is stable and factual and set in stone?

- (paraphrase) Communities of practice have patterns that give way to meaning, and the constant negotiation of meaning brings dynamic engagement with our environment. p.53

- If we view the journey of KMS from meeting me (2007) to the charrette (2007-2008) to the transition team (2009-2013) to the new building to where we are now, it is a prime example of a pattern—\textit{which is change and innovative practices…doing things unlike how they have been done before—}that is creating meaning for us. We are in an environment where it is possible to negotiate for meaning which I believe then allows for the engagement and collaboration I believe exists and that is unlike other customary learning environments.

- “Living meaningfully implies: 1) an active process of producing meaning that is both dynamic and historical; 2) a world of both resistance and malleability; 3) the mutual ability to affect and be affected; 4) the engagement of a multiplicity of factors and perspectives; 5) the production of a new resolution to the convergence of these factors and perspectives; and 6) the incompleteness of this resolution…” p.53

- (paraphrase p.63) It is the interplay between the participation in a community and the monuments, documents, focal points of that community that constitute the community of practice.

- In the case of our new building, it is the teachers’ participation in the community paralleled by the development of the vision (pahu) that has made the structure of our community of practice.
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- “The duality is a fundamental aspect of the constitution of communities of practice, of their evolution over time, of the relations among practices, of the identities of participants, and of the broader organizations in which communities of practice exist.” p.65
- “The world as we shape it, and our experience as the world shapes it, are like the mountain and the river. They shape each other but they have their own shapes. They are reflections of each other, but they have their own existence, their own realms. They fit around each other, but they remain distinct from each other. They cannot be transformed into each other, yet they transform each other. The river only carves, and the mountain only guides, yet in their interaction, the carving becomes the guiding and the guiding becomes the carving.” p.71
  - significant point relates to the vision, the pahu, and the building and teams, collaboration.
- The interplay between participation and the focal points of that group create the community of practice. The community is created through mutual engagement, a shared repertoire, and joint enterprise. p.83
  - In the case of KMS I see the participation facet as the charrette, Transition Team, HA, etc. at interplay with the vision (pahu), curriculum maps, kalo diagram. Our community of KMS is engaged together in this shared vision for the students we serve. Case in point is the vision itself which became manifest in the teams’ creation of their own pahu, the creation of a chant for the new school, learning the chant. The pahu, the chant, the dance, the vision statement then are our “shared repertoire.”
  - In the methodology for this study I tried to get at the “mutual engagement” facet through the general questionnaire around engagement of the four areas we designed the building from. The aspects of “shared repertoire” and “joint enterprise” were sought through the instructional rounds and focus groups.
- For those teams that are especially successful at becoming communities (identified as high collaborators) I believe have gotten to that point because they establish a “shared repertoire.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. (Continued) Literature Review Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o “The repertoire of a community of practice includes routines, words, tools, ways of doing things, stories, gestures, symbols, actions, or concepts that the community has produced or adopted in the course of its existence, and which have become a part of its practice.” p.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Xxxx and Xxxx teams have routines (include them here) and systems that equal their practice. Therefore they are more highly collaborative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ How might we expose or define the repertoire of successful collaborative teams? What are the elements?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Do the strong teams provide strength to our program but at the same time cause animosity?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “Communities of practice can be thought of as shared histories of learning.” p.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “Our identities become anchored in each other and what we do together.” p.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Xxxx and xxxx teams. Is sustaining a strong identity necessarily creating/sustaining strong communities of practice. Or, does their need to be a heightened awareness of the interplay between participation and the “documents” of each team? Do we change the reification (forms, documents, etc.) dynamically in order to keep the teams growing?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “Communities must tune their practice constantly in their attempt to get the job done.” p.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Re: learning and successful teams like Xxxx and Xxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o “Learning in practice includes the following processes for the communities involved: evolving forms of mutual engagement, or discovering how to engage; understanding and tuning their enterprise, or aligning their engagement; and developing their repertoire and style, or renegotiating meaning.” p.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o How does KMS evolve and continue to grow around mutual engagement, understand and constantly fine tune their work, and continue to develop repertoires that are meaningful and lead to student success around Hawaiian culture and language, 21st century learning, and middle school developmental appropriateness of program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The practice of collaboration on the teams that are more successful at this is a result of their enjoying working together, that they like each other as people, that they like being with one another.

“Practice is ultimately produced by its members through the negotiation of meaning. The negotiation of meaning is an open process with the constant potential for including new elements…with the constant potential for continuing, rediscovering, or reproducing the old in the new. The result is that, as an emergent structure, practice is at once highly perturbable and highly resilient.” p.96

“The combination of perturbability and resilience is a characteristic of adaptability. Learning involves a close interaction of order and chaos.” p.97

“A community of practice does not depend on a fixed membership. People move in and out. An essential aspect of any long-lived practice is the arrival of new generations of members. As long as membership changes progressively enough to allow for sustained generational encounters, newcomers can be integrated into the community, engage in its practice, and then—in their own way—perpetuate it.” p.99

“There is a profound connection between identity and practice. Developing a practice requires the formation of a community whose members can engage with one another and thus acknowledge each other as participants. In this sense, the formation of a community of practice is also a negotiation of identities.” p.149

“In sum, membership in a community of practice translates into an identity as a form of competence. An identity in this sense is relating to the world as a particular mix of the familiar and the foreign, the obvious and the mysterious, the transparent and the opaque. In practice, we know who we are by what is familiar, understandable, usable, negotiable; we know who we are not by what is foreign, opaque, unwieldy, unproductive.” p.153

With respect to Xxxx and Xxxx as high functioning communities, there is a level of expectation for competence. They know who they are as a team because they have a curriculum that binds them, they work for understanding as team members, and they negotiate as part of their normal process as a team.
Table 1. (Continued) Literature Review Summary

- On certain teams I view as not very collaborative, there is a definite lack of transparency (everyone does their own thing), there is a stubborn holding on to certain curricular pieces.
- “Learning events and forms of participation are thus defined by the current engagement they afford, as well as by their location in the trajectory.” p.155
- “Three distinct modes of belonging: 1) engagement—active involvement in mutual processes of negotiating meaning; 2) imagination—creating images of the world and seeing connections through time and space by extrapolating from our own experience;
  - this is where I would place what I am calling collaboration because it requires one to create new “images” and make “connections” starting with one’s own experiences. If I return to my definition of collaboration it is when two or more work together on something that yields something new, new knowledge, a new way of doing something, new program, etc. and 3) alignment—coordinating our energy and activities in order to fit within broader structures and contribute to broader enterprises,” pgs.173-174
- This can be used to support my definition of collaboration: “Through engagement, participants do not necessarily understand the world, each other’s experiences, or their shared enterprise more accurately. Mutual engagement merely creates a shared reality in which to act and construct an identity. Imagination is another process for creating such a reality.” p.177
  - The questionnaire sought to attain the general level of engagement in the triangulation we created together to build the building, program, and curriculum. This was to check the level of the “shared reality.” The construction of our identity in the new building hinges on the level of collaboration that occurred after the initial stage of engagement (which may have even been there before the charette). It is the imagination, which is the process that takes certain teams to greater levels of collaboration as they use their shared engagement and create new versions of reality.
Table 1. (Continued) Literature Review Summary

- “The creative character of imagination is anchored in social interactions and communal experiences.” p.178
  - Those teams then, it would follow, that work well together and are more able to or willing to use their imagination outside of just basic engagement are those teams that are more collaborative.

- “The work of engagement entails such processes as: 1) the definition of a common enterprise in the process of pursuing it in concert with others; 2) mutual engagement in shared activities; 3) the accumulation of a history of shared experiences; 4) the development of interpersonal relationships…” p. 184
  - questionnaire sought to establish the existence of mutual engagement in the four areas of design for the building and then the extent of that engagement.

- “The work of imagination entails such processes as: 1) recognizing our experiences in others, knowing what others are doing, being in someone else’s shoes; 2) seeing ourselves in new ways; 3) sharing stories, explanations, descriptions; 4) opening access to distant practices; 5) assuming the meaningfulness of foreign artifacts and actions; 6) using history to see the present as only one of the many possibilities and the future as a number of possibilities; 7) generating scenarios, exploring other ways of doing what we are doing, other possible worlds, and other identities.” p. 185

- “The work of alignment entails: 1) investing energy in a directed way and creating a focus to coordinate this investment of energy; 2) negotiating perspectives, finding common ground; 3) imposing one’s view; 4) convincing, inspiring, uniting; 5) defining broad visions and aspirations, proposing stories of identity; 6) defining proceduralization; and 7) walking boundaries, creating boundary practices, reconciling divergent perspectives.” p. 187
  - Actually imagination and alignment are what brings about collaboration on teams. Imagination includes the suspension of what we normally hold as true and right (text book knowledge) and refocus that to negotiate new perspectives, to have broader vision of learning and knowing.
Table 1. (Continued) Literature Review Summary

- “A well-functioning community of practice is a good context to explore radically new insights without becoming fools or stuck in some dead end. A history of mutual engagement around a joint enterprise is an ideal context for this kind of leading-edge learning, which requires a strong bond of communal competence along with a deep respect for the particularity of experience. When these conditions are in place, communities of practice are a privileged locus for the creation of knowledge.” p. 214
Table 1. (Continued) Literature Review Summary

- “Communities of practice are formed by people who engage in a process of collective learning in a shared domain of human endeavor.”
- “Communities of practice are groups of people who share a concern or a passion for something they do and learn how to do it better as they interact regularly.”
- “The characteristics of a community of practice are crucial. **Domain:** the identity is defined by a shared interest. They value their collective competence and learn from each other. **Community:** Members engage in joint activities and discussions, help each other, and share information. They build relationships that enable them to learn from each other. **Practice:** Members of a community of practice are practitioners. They develop a shared repertoire of resources: experiences, stories, tools, ways of addressing recurring problems—in short a shared practice. They have developed a set of stories and cases that have become a shared repertoire for their practice.”
- “Communities of practice enable practitioners to take collective responsibility.”
  - Link this idea to the area of the paper that deals with MBTI and our work with Cynthia.
- “Communities among practitioners create a direct link between learning and performance.”
- “Communities are not limited by formal structures.”
- Supports the notion of collaboration per my definition—when people work together to create something new. A formal structure would not allow for the flexibility of collaboration and creation of new knowledge.

- “We each experience knowing in our own ways. Socially defined competence is always in interplay with our experience. It is in this interplay that learning (collaboration—my insert here) takes place.”
  - p 226
  - If collaboration as I have defined it=new knowledge created, then this follows that the interplay of who we are (experience) and what we know (competence) feeds and builds that collaboration.
Table 1. (Continued) Literature Review Summary

- “Knowing always involved these two components: the *competence* that our communities have established over time, and our ongoing experience of the world as a member.” p 227
- “Whenever the two are in close tension and either starts pulling the other, learning takes place.” p 227
- Three modes of belonging: engagement, imagination, and alignment.
  - *Engagement*: doing things together, talking, producing artifacts.”
  - *Imagination*: constructing an image of ourselves, of our communities, and of the world, I order to orient ourselves, to reflect on our situation, and to explore possibilities.” p 227-228
  - *Alignment*: making sure that our local activities are sufficiently aligned with other processes so that they can be effective beyond our own engagement.” p 228
  - “Alignment is the mutual process of coordinating perspectives, interpretations, and actions so they realize higher goals.” p 228

  - The rational for doing the questionnaire and asking about engagement first was to get the first cut at what I was thinking about the process that shared design presented to us that lead to greater collaboration. This assumes that there is greater collaboration. I think there must be if I am comparing the physical space design and its program and curricular requirements to a traditional space from which we came. The *engagement questionnaire* was to test the general level of involvement in the process to move from traditional to innovative space and programming. The collaborative aspects are tested through what Wenger describes here as imagination. The *engagement mode of the charette to design to build required joint discussion and activity*. After the building opened we began the test of the imagination. Wenger describes imagination mode as requiring us to take some distance from the situation. I call that suspension of disbelief just long enough to create, or collaborate. Again my definition is that it involves collaboration is the creation of something new or something that did not exist before that collaborative experience.
Wenger also says that the imagination mode requires reflection, which, I believe, is supported in the feedback from the focus groups and the instructional rounds data where reflection is mentioned in various ways. (Find data to support this here)

- “Each mode requires a different kind of work. The work of engagement, which requires opportunities for joint activities, is different from the work of imagination, which often requires opportunities for taking some distance from our situation. The demands and effects of these three modes of belonging can be conflicting. Spending time reflecting can detract from engagement, for example.” p 228

- “Communities of practice define competence by combining three elements (Wenger, 1998). First, members are bound together by their collectively developed understanding of what their community is about and hold each other accountable to this sense of joint enterprise. To be competent is to understand the enterprise well enough to be able to contribute to it.
  - Beginning in the spring of 2008 we worked together to develop the shared vision for KMS. I can speak to that process in relation to this element.

- Second, members build their community through mutual engagement. They interact with one another, establishing norms and relationships of mutuality that reflect these interactions. To be competent is to be able to engage with the community and be trusted as a partner in these interactions.
  - Throughout the charette and building process we simultaneously developed norms through the TT work on schedule, program of work. June of 2012 a small group developed the general norms for the opening of the new school. Consequently and after the building opened the teams on each floor developed floor norms. Team norms were developed prior to the opening of the building and between the years of 2009 and 2012. Team norms and agreements were in place when the building opened. To date there are adjustments that have to be made on some teams. For example one team in particular still struggles due to the fact that their engagement is not mutually understood.
A second team struggling with this mutuality struggles because I feel they do not believe in the open concept despite the fact that they had input to the design from charrette through design. There may be something to say in the introductory paragraphs about the disbelief that the building would ever be built as it had been promised a few times within the last 25 years. Coupled with that that the economic downturn of 2009 put a stop to all activity may speak to the fact that some never really established the mutuality and trust as teams. Certainly when one team on the floor of three teams is not at the same understanding about this mutuality there will be an impact to the rhythm of the community on the respective floor.

• Third, communities of practice have produced a shared repertoire of communal resources—language, routines, sensibilities, artifacts, tools, stories, styles, etc. To be competent is to have access to this repertoire and be able to use it appropriately.” p 229
  • Team established roles and responsibilities have supported the development of strong communities of practice on the floors. The use of needs and interests versus position has also helped them to work through issues to continue to build shared understandings about their work together.

• “Dimensions of progress in a community of practice: Enterprise—the level of learning energy. A community must show leadership in pushing its development along and maintaining a spirit of inquiry. It must recognize and address gaps, as well as remain open to emergent directions an opportunities.” Mutuality—the depth of social capital. People must know each other well enough to know how to interact productively and who to call for help or advice. They must trust each other, not just personally, but also in their ability to contribute to the enterprise of the community, so they feel comfortable addressing real problems together and speaking truthfully. Repertoire—the degree of self-awareness.
Table 1. (Continued) Literature Review Summary

| Wenger, Etienne, Trayner, Beverly, and deLaat, Maarten | “Community of practice, which we define as a learning partnership among people who find it useful to learn from and with each other about a particular domain. They use each other’s experience of practice as a learning resource. And they join forces in making sense of and addressing challenges they face individually or collectively.” p.9

“The community aspect refers to the development of a shared identity around a topic or set of challenges. It represents a collective intention—however tacit and distributed—to steward a domain of knowledge and to sustain learning about it.” p.9 |

| • Being reflective on its repertoire enables a community to understand its own state of development from multiple perspectives, reconsider assumptions and patterns, uncover hidden possibilities, and use this self-awareness to move forward.” p 230 |
| — “Without the learning energy of those who take initiative, the community becomes stagnant. Without strong relationships of belonging, it is torn apart. And without the ability to reflect, it becomes a hostage to its own history.” p 230 This may be a good quote that starts the paper off? |
| • “If competence and experience are too close, if they always match, not much learning is likely to take place. There are no challenges; the community is losing its dynamism and the practice is in danger of becoming stale. Conversely, if experience and competence are too disconnected, if the distance is too great, not much learning is likely to take place either.” p 233 |
| • “Achieving a generative tension between competence and experience requires: something to interact about, some intersection of interest, some activity; open engagement with real differences as well as common ground; commitment to suspend judgment in order to see the competence of a community in its terms; ways to translate between repertoires so that experience and competence actually interact.” p. 233 |
| • “Communities of practice can steward critical competence, but they can also become hostage to their history, insular, defensive, closed in, and oriented to their own focus.” p 233 |

Promoting and assessing value creation in communities and networks: a conceptual framework 2007
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wenger, Etienne</th>
<th>Communities of Practice: Learning as a Social System</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Table 1. (Continued) Literature Review Summary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “A community of practice defines itself along three</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dimensions: its joint enterprise as understood and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>continually renegotiated by its members; the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>relationships of mutual engagement that binds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>members together in a social entity; and the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>shared repertoire of communal resources (routines,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sensibilities, artifacts, vocabulary, styles, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>that members have developed over time.” P. 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “Communities of practice develop around things that</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>matter to people. As a result, their practices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reflect the members’ own understanding of what is</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>important” P.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “They self-organize, but they flourish when their</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>learning fits with their organizational environment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The art is to help such communities find</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>resources and connections without</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>overwhelming them with organizational meddling.” P.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Davies, Bethan</th>
<th>Communities of practice: Legitimacy not choice</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “While the definition might be social, the focus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>is firmly fixed on linguistic behavior as the chief</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>concern.” P. 559</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “Three constitutive features: mutual engagement,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>joint enterprise, shared repertoire.” P. 560</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• use this to code the focus groups and the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>instructional rounds. Add to it the relationship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and reification interplay.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Engagement=questionnaire findings=basic “brush</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>stroke” of the whole group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “joint enterprise and shared repertoire”=collaboration as I have defined it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Types of membership in CoPs: full participation,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>peripheral participation, and marginal participation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• For the sake of this research I will focus only on</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the aspects of full participation, which is</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>defined as: “A full participant is on an insider</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>trajectory, maintaining their membership through</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>participation in community practices.” P.565</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Fallah, Nima  | Distributed Form of Leadership in Communities of     |
|---------------|------------------------------------------------------|------|
|               | Practice (CoPs)                                      | 2011 |
|               | • “We propose the distributed leadership theory as    |
|               |   the practical framework for leadership of CoPs.    |
|               |   The key issue is the balance of control—the       |
|               |   authority and power—with enough influence, and to  |
|               |   promote trust, motivation, accountability, and     |
|               |   participation, to sustain CoPs.” P.367             |
|               | • “The interactions of individual members inside a    |
|               |   CoP—the practice of knowledge creation/sharing/  |
|               |   learning—are the key ingredient of practice of     |
|               |   leadership distribution—resulted from the context  |
|               |   and the situations.” P. 367                        |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eckert, Penelope</th>
<th>Table 1. (Continued) Literature Review Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communities of Practice 2006</td>
<td>• “A community of practice is a collection of people who engage on an ongoing basis in some common endeavor. Communities of practice emerge in response to common interest or position, and play an important role in forming their members’ participation in, and orientation to, the world around them.” P. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Two conditions of a community of practice are crucial in the conventionalization of meaning: shared experience over time, and a commitment to shared understanding. A community of practice engages people in mutual sense-making—about the enterprise they’re engaged in, about their respective forms of participation in the enterprise, about their orientation to other communities of practice and to the world around them more generally.” P. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “Another important aspect of the communities of practice approach is its fluidity of social space and the diversity of experience.” P. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “A community of practice that is central to many of its participants’ identity construction is an important locus for the settling down of joint history…” p. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “CoPs emerge in response to common interest or position, and play an important role in forming member’s participation in, and orientation to, the world around them.” P.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schussler, Deborah L.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schools as Learning Communities: Unpacking the Concept 2003</td>
<td>• “The shift in recent literature to the term ‘learning community’ indicates a probable shift in thought concerning the assumptions, values, and structures associated with the purpose of schools.” P. 503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “The concept of vision and shared purposes are tightly coupled as they seek to answer the questions where is the school going? And how will it get there? Whereas vision refers to the desired outcome, shared purposes refer to the processes toward actualizing the outcome.” P. 519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “The vision and shared purpose of a school should be apparent in every aspect of the school. The school exudes its vision by carrying it out everyday through shared purposes.” P.521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “The vision is so ingrained in the culture of the school that it is second nature to actualize the vision through shared purposes. It is part of what the people in that school live and breathe, no memorizing necessary.” P.521</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Sinden, James, Hoy, Wayne K., Sweetland, Scott R. | • “Collegial leadership is responsive to teachers’ needs to do their jobs. Principals are concerned about their teachers as well as setting standards for high student achievement. At the same time, the approach is a team effort with the principal listening to teachers, treating them as colleagues, being supportive to their success, and being open to change.” P. 200  
• “Collegial leadership of the principal builds an enabling structure, but the enabling structure reinforces and enables collegial leadership.” P. 201  
• “We assume that committed teachers value schools that are flexible, cooperative, and collaborative, and reject and try to escape from those that are autocratic, rigid, and coercive.” P. 201 |
| Scott, Susan | • “It takes relationships. Many of us assume we’re good at relationships, but the truth is that almost every person I know needs continued work on it. It takes commitment, practice, and feedback, and there is no shame in feedback. It is energizing to learn together as a team, a staff, or a community.” P. 56  
• “Professional learning gives him the confidence to lead collaboratively and to ensure that the decisions he makes are based on a clear perspective of the issue, and those who would be affected by the decision.” P. 56 |
| Louis, Karen Seashore | • Paraphrase: Three cultural conditions that improve learning—professional community, organizational learning, and trust. P. 478  
• Related to the KMS experience, it is clear that the professional community needed to be built. Prior to the charette work together it is clear teachers did not talk with each other, grade levels never met as grade levels, there was no agreement about what kids should know and be able to do before leaving a grade level, and professional communities mirrored the high school departments. Organizational learning was almost unheard of. Few if any folks traveled, no consultant work had been done, maps were unattended to, and conference attendance was very minimal. |
Table 1. (Continued) Literature Review Summary

- There was certainly a need to build some common organizational learning in the MS. So we began with the MBTI work, braided in the maps, established common “know and be able to do” charts for all subjects, Ka Pi‘ina workplace capacity building pilot was rolling out, 1:1 was rolling out, standards work began full force in 2008. The trust building, while always on going, is something that was assimilated into the building of professional community through MBTI as well as through organizational learning initiatives.
- “A change model based on organization learning assumes that learning takes place in groups and cannot be reduced to random accumulation of individual knowledge.” P. 480
- “Increasingly robust research suggests that trust is an element of organizational culture that is critical and routinely overlooked.” P. 482
- Paraphrase this one if you use it: “Change decreases trust because it disrupts the taken-for-granted aspects of institutional functioning or because it is inconsistent with existing norms.” P. 482

| Knox, Bruce | • CoPs are built around the identities of the participants.  
|• They are organized around what is important to the members.  
|• Identity is important because it helps you figure out what to focus on and what to stay away from.  
|• They are organic. |

| Au, Kathryn H. | • Dr. Au used three modes of belonging to frame her work. The three modes come directly from Wenger’s work. They include engagement, imagination, and alignment. She defines engagement as “active involvement in mutual processes of negotiating meaning” (p. 223). Imagination per Wenger is creating images of the world across time and space (history). (p. 224) Alignment per Wenger is the coordination of energy and activity to contribute to broader enterprises. (p. 225) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2013</th>
<th>Cultivating Communities of Practice: Making Them Grow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Communities of Practice: Engagement, Imagination, and Alignment in Research on Teacher Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Brown, John Seely, and Duguid, Paul

*Organizational Learning and Communities of Practice: Toward a Unified View of Working, Learning, and Innovation.*

1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. (Continued) Literature Review Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Interplay of working, learning, and innovating. Working as the content (the canon), learning as a process, and innovating as creating. That they can be compatible requires us to shift our thinking. Not to see classrooms, learning spaces as only content centered or process-oriented, but together with creativity/innovation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “The complex of contradictory forces that put an organization’s assumptions and core beliefs in direct conflict with members’ working, learning, and innovating arises from a thorough misunderstanding of what working, learning, and innovating are.” P. 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “To foster working, learning and innovating, an organization must close that gap. To do so, it needs to reconceive of itself as a community-of-communities, acknowledging in the process the many noncanonical communities in its midst. It must see beyond its canonical abstractions of practice to the rich, full-blooded activities themselves. And it must legitimize and support the myriad enacting activities perpetrated by its different members.” P. 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “It has been an unstated assumption that a unified understanding of working, learning, and innovating is potentially highly beneficial, allowing a synergistic collaboration rather than a conflicting separation among workers, learners, and innovators.” P. 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “For working, learning, and innovating to thrive collectively depends on linking these three, in theory and in practice, more closely, more realistically, and more reflectively than is generally the case at present.” P. 55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Douglas Fisher and Nancy Frey


*(References student collaborative learning, but applies to some things I am thinking about with adult collaboration)*

<p>| • “The gradual release of the responsibility of the instructional framework” (in this case T has more ownership) p67 |
| • “Network and solve problems collectively” p68 |
| • Collaboration differs from cooperation: looser in structure; metacognitive in nature p70 |
| • Possible that the inclusion of digital technologies has enhanced collaboration as social networking has allowed for more/freer reflection and feedback loops p70 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page Reference</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collay, Michelle</td>
<td><em>Teaching is Leading</em></td>
<td>p. 74</td>
<td>“School cultures and physical structures—from policies that forbid teachers to leave their classrooms unsupervised to long hallways that separate staff members from one another—often limit collaboration among adults. The very act of talking with a colleague during the day can be an accomplishment.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaquith, Ann</td>
<td><em>Instructional Capacity: How to build it right</em></td>
<td>p. 59</td>
<td>“School leaders must create conditions that enable teachers to learn from others and incorporate others’ expertise into their own instructional repertoire.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p. 60</td>
<td>“Paying attention to team composition is important in designing teams that have the capacity to learn together.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hargreaves, Andy and</td>
<td><em>Professional Capital: Transforming Teaching in Every School</em></td>
<td>p. 4</td>
<td>“Individuals get confidence, learning, and feedback from having the right kind of people and the right kinds of interactions and relationships around them.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fullan, Michael</td>
<td></td>
<td>p. 5</td>
<td>“They strive to outdo themselves and each other in a spirit of making greater individual and collective contributions.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Good teaching is a collective accomplishment and responsibility.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>I believe this can be tied into the areas of the paper where I am writing about the phenomenon of Xxxx and Xxxx teams.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“It’s not the metrics that drive most people, but the work itself—whether it inspires you, what it feels like, what it’s for, and how you and your colleagues become energized by striving to solve difficult learning problems.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>I think of Xxxx team in particular in this quote. Specifically I think of xxx and his passion for his work and how he sometimes seems “anti” everything institutional. I believe it’s really because he has discreet passion and shares it so very well with his team. As a team they are especially passionate and move at their own rhythm, from the others.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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- “High-performing systems have virtually all their teachers on the move. It’s a school thing, a professional thing, and a system thing. The only solutions that will work on any scale are those that mobilize the teaching force as a whole—including strategies where teachers push and support each other.” P.22
- “Teaching like a pro means continuously inquiring into and improving one’s own teaching. It means constantly developing and reinvesting in professional capital.” P. 22
- *I think of both Xxxx and Xxxx teams here. They are constantly on the move to improve. They have their relational pieces in good standing, they are able to use the training we have had with Insight to get better and they have in place a system—for Xxxx it is the CBL and for Xxxx it is the Grading for Learning. Wenger refers to having the balance between the relationships and the documents of a group, which brings the strong CoPs. This is a good example of this.*
- “Teaching like a pro means planning teaching, improving teaching, and often doing teaching not as an isolated individual but as part of a **high performing team.**” P. 22
- *This is another convergent thought that ties many of the aspects of our middle school together. The training in teaming has allowed us to learn to work together, the wall-less-ness has necessitated getting along. The work with the Danielson Framework has helped all of us to be students of our practice. When I read about planning and improving I am thinking explicitly about the Framework and how it has added to the depth of conversations we are able to have with teachers about teaching.*
- “Teaching like a pro is not about yet more individual accountability, but about powerful collective responsibility.” P. 23
- *Again I am reminded about the Insight training that has prepared us for this work together in the charrette and in the wall-less building. The collective responsibility is key.*
- “Teaching like a pro is about improving as an **individual,** raising the performance of the **team,** and increasing the quality across the **whole profession.**” P.23
• This quote has direct relevance to my definition of collaboration—which it is the joy and commitment one has as an individual that impacts the team and then they can collaborate to create new knowledge that was not there before the collaboration.
• “What we will see is that it is better to be collaborative than individualistic as a teacher—but that we need to think harder and deeper about better and worse ways to work collaboratively with one’s peers.” P. 106
• “Uncertainty, isolation, and individualism are a toxic cocktail.” P. 107
• At KMS we have a shared vision (as opposed to uncertainty), an open floor plan that is wall-less (as opposed to isolating), and teams, most of them good or even strong (no individualism) so we seem to have the makings of a collaborative environment.
• The architecture of individual buildings, separate egg-crate classrooms, and isolated portables makes it physically hard for teachers to work together. But barriers are easily re-erected in open classrooms, and doors are easily closed after they are opened. Isolation and individualism are more than a question of bricks and mortar. They are deeply ingrained within the habits and cultures of teaching.” P. 108
• Very pertinent to our building and to the environment of collaboration we are trying to achieve.
• “…strong collaboration and distinctive individuality go together in vibrant communities of innovation and growth.” P. 111
• When I think about the strong collaborators, Xxxx and Xxxx, I completely see the diversity that this quote eludes to. They are not a homogeneous group of thinkers. They are, in fact, individuals who are good at the relational piece, which makes for good collaboration.
• Little’s continuum of collaboration as explained in this book: “Little has set out a continuum of collaboration from weaker to stronger forms. These comprise: scanning and storytelling, help and assistance, sharing, and joint work.” P. 112
• I would add the next place on the collaboration continuum, which would be to add new knowledge.
In collaborative cultures, failure and uncertainty are not protected and defended, but instead are shared and discussed with a view of gaining help and support. Collaborative cultures require broad agreement on values, but they also tolerate and to some extent actually encourage disagreement within these limits. Schools characterized by collaborative cultures are also places of hard work and dedication, collective responsibility, and pride in the school. “ p.113

Ironically, disagreement is more frequent in schools with collaborative cultures because purposes, values, and their relationship to practice are always up for discussion. But this disagreement is made possible by the bedrock of fundamental security on which staff relationships rest—in the knowledge that open discussions and temporary disagreements will not threaten continuing relationships.” P. 113

The goal of the training with Insight has been to establish agreements and roles/responsibilities around a shared vision so that we can encourage the hard conversations and disagreements and yet walk away whole and still respecting each other, more importantly, able to continue to collaborate together.

“Finding time to develop collaboration, trust, and respect doesn’t just happen accidentally or completely spontaneously—though it is possible to create platforms where spontaneous collaboration will occur. “ p. 114

“Collaborative cultures do require attention to the structures and formal organization of school life, but their underlying sources of strength are informal in relationships, conversation, expressions of interest, provisions of support, and ultimately the mobilization of collective expertise and commitment to improve the lives and life chances of students. Talk together, plan together, work together—that’s the simple key.” P. 114

Could this quote be used to introduce the section on Findings?

This quote also dovetail with Wenger’s theory of the interplay between relationships and reification (the documents or “hardware” <my word> of the group).
**Table 1. (Continued) Literature Review Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Robinson, Ken. Finding Your Element: How to Discover Your Talents and Passions and Transform Your Life 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• “What defines tribes is their shared passions.” P. 188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “Connecting with people who share your Element can have tremendous benefits for you and for them. They include <em>affirmation, guidance, collaboration, and inspiration.</em>” P. 188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “They are doing it because they want meaning. It’s not just the end result; it’s about the process. You’re creating value in doing something the way you want it.” P. 190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Like ‘Xxxx and Xxxx: Members of tribes, however various and diverse (as plants in a garden), can help each other to flourish. Finding your tribe (your team) reinforces your commitment to what you are doing and can relieve the sense of isolation that people sometimes feel without such a connection.” P. 191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “Wherever common interests align, tribes can emerge. Tribes that work together can achieve more than individuals acting alone because they stimulate each other’s creativity and sense of possibility. In The Element we called this “the alchemy of synergy.” P. 198</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- “First, a lot of the work building collaborative cultures is informal. It’s about developing trust and relationships, and it takes time. But if all this is left to spontaneity and chance, a lot of collaborative effort will dissipate and provide no benefit to anyone. Second, the strong collaboration of joint work can benefit from deliberate arrangements of meetings, teams, structures, and protocols, but if these are hurried, imposed, or forced, or if they are used in the absence of commitments to building better relationships, then they too will be ineffective.” P. 127

- *Ties into both to the time we have taken with our work with Insight. We have deliberately tried to build trust in our middle school through transparency, training with Insight, etc. We have also established a protocol for meeting and sharing understandings with each other. The use of the Ning to document all of that learning and collaboration has been critical to our building collaboration and creating new knowledge. Also dovetails with Wenger’s interplay of relationships and reification.*

“*It’s about whether teachers are committed to, inquisitive about, and increasingly knowledgeable and well informed about becoming better practitioners together, using and deeply understanding all the technologies and strategies that can help them with this.*” P. 127
| Brown, Tim. | | “The best ideas emerge when the whole organizational ecosystem—not just the designers and engineers and certainly not just management—has room to experiment.” P. 73 |
| Brown, Tim. | | “Ideas that create a buzz should be favored.” P. 73 |
| Brown, Tim. | | “An overarching purpose should be articulated so that the organization has a sense of direction and innovators don’t feel the need for constant supervision.” P. 74 |
| | | o This supports our notion of creating a shared vision parallel to the charrette for the building design. We were essentially deciding what we believed about teaching and learners, learners, at the same time we were creating the physical space of the building. |
| | | “We can use our empathy and understanding of people to design experiences that create opportunities for active engagement and participation.” P. 115 |
| Pink, Daniel H. | Drive: The Surprising Truth About What Motivates Us | “The most deeply motivated people—not to mention those who are most productive and satisfied—hitch their desires to a cause larger than themselves.” P. 133 (Xxxx and Xxxx) |
| Pink, Daniel H. | | Motivation emerges when people have autonomy over their task, their time, their technique and their team. P. 94 (Xxxx and Xxxx) |
| Pink, Daniel H. | | “We’re designed to be active and engaged. And we know that the richest experiences in our lives aren’t when we are clamoring for validation from others, but when we are listening to our own voice—doing something that matters, doing it well, and doing it in the service of a cause larger than ourselves.” P. 146 |

Table 1. (Continued) Literature Review Summary
This relates to our work creating the new building. The premise that if we are creating a building, as educators, with no real restraints except to create that which we feel is best for the children we serve, then it should follow that we are listening to our own voices and will design to serve a cause (educating indigenous children in a 21st century context) greater than ourselves.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dever, Robin and Lash, Martha J.</th>
<th>In a middle school where interdisciplinary teams were observed during common planning time.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Using common planning time to foster professional learning.</em></td>
<td>- “The common themes that emerged were: an understanding that their purpose was to benefit their students; a desire that their teaching should impact student learning; sustained engagement in unit planning, resource sharing, content-related discussions; minimization of student-specific discussions; and avoidance of non-academic talk.” P. 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School Journal</td>
<td>- “when collaboration is positive, it yields strong outcomes such as resource sharing, assessment creation, and unit planning.” P. 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2013</td>
<td>- “professional learning communities in middle schools can take the form of small teams of teachers using common planning time to discuss meeting the needs of students.” P. 17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gradwell, Jill M. and DiCamillo, Lorrei</th>
<th>“Currently, very little understanding exists about how teachers establish and sustain collaboration with each other.” P. 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>“The second we stop growing we are dead”</em>: Examining a middle grades social studies professional dyad</td>
<td><em>In this article, they discuss a dyad of teachers and their success collaborating.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School Journal</td>
<td>- Four characteristics defined their professional dyad: the relationship was practitioner-driven and supported by the school administrators; the teachers possessed unified learning goals; it was built on trust; and, they engaged in critical dialogue to reflect on their practice.” P. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2013</td>
<td>- “They do not believe you have to be friends to collaborate; it is not essential. As long as you have people who care about their teaching and want to collaborate.” P. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- “Their relationship contributed to their professional growth, enhanced student learning, and benefitted the school community.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. (Continued) Literature Review Summary
| Lassonde, Cynthia A. and Israel, Susan E. | • “Administrators who want to foster collaboration among faculty should promote interdisciplinary organizational structures within the school and provide regular planning time for same subject teachers to meet.” P. 10  
• “Rather than force collaboration, administrators should promote authentic faculty relationships.” P. 10  
| Teacher Collaboration for Professional Learning |  
2010  
| “Collaborative teacher research involves ‘individuals who enter with other teachers into a collaborative search for definition and satisfaction in their work.’” p. 4 (paraphrase this one if using)  
“Collaborative teacher research involves on-going conversations with colleagues; developing purposes and potential research; researching the topic for theoretical framework; collecting, organizing, and analyzing data; determining the results of the study and applying them to classroom instruction; and evaluating the collaboration.” P. 7  
Paraphrase: Collaborative learning communities offer opportunities for communities of practice to explore, learn, and bond professionally and personally.” P. 12  
“Group development is fueled by collaboration when participants see the group as a collective force that can achieve important work that individuals would not be able to accomplish on their own.” P.40  
“Essentially, groups are held together by common pursuit of shared learning experiences. “ p. 78  
Paraphrase: Leadership of collaborative group requires organization, motivation, and professionalism. P. 95  
| Marzano, Robert J. and Pickering, Debra J. | • Although this refers to students, the concept is similar for adults to be highly engaged. “ To develop a sense of self-efficacy, students can track their progress and then examine the relationship between their behavior and their academic achievement.” P. 117  
• “The fixed theory and the growth theory. We’ve organized directly teaching about efficacy into three phases: (1) distinguishing between growth and fixed theories, (2) having students identify their personal theories, and (3) keeping the conversation alive.” P. 135  
| The Highly Engaged Classroom |  
2011 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Title and Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City, Elizabeth A., et al</td>
<td>Instructional Rounds in Education. 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fowler-Finn, Thomas</td>
<td>Leading Instructional Rounds in Education. 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. (Continued) Literature Review Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional rounds are a way for teachers to look at their practice in groups with their administrators. It is a collaborative process wherein groups give feedback to a teacher about the students and the learning. Familiarity with the group you are viewing makes it more possible to delve deeper into what is going on with students and learning. Findings can be immediately applied to changing practice in the classroom, thus improving the learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- “A theory of action can be thought of as the story line that makes a vision and a strategy concrete. It gives the leader a line of narrative that leads people through the daily complexity and distractions that compete with the main work of the instructional core. It provides a map that carries a vision through the organization. And it provides a way of testing the assumptions and suppositions of the vision against the unfolding realities of the work in an actual organization with actual people.” P. 40
- “Single loop learning describes the situation in which we act on the world”

“a conditional statement that captures the essential connections between practice and what happens in classrooms” P.175
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Palfrey, John and Gasser, Urs</th>
<th>Table 1. (Continued) Literature Review Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Born Digital 2008</td>
<td>“I’m certain that there is a global culture in the making, which joins people from many corners of the globe together with one another based upon common ways of interacting over information networks. The emergence of a common culture is part and parcel of a trend toward globalization. The consequences of an emerging global culture ought to be overwhelmingly positive. It is a dramatic amplification of the diplomatic and cross-cultural benefits gained by the invention of the telegraph, millions of international student exchanges, and the rise of a globally networked economy. As we celebrate the emergence of this global culture, we need to recognize that a sharp divide had formed between those with both the access and skills to participate in this digital culture and those without either” p.274-275</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
METHODOLOGY

The University of Hawaiʻi at Mānoa Office of Research Compliance, Human Studies Program approved this study in the spring of 2013 (see Appendix A). The study included a questionnaire of all teachers, random focus groups, focus groups by invitation, and instructional rounds. The questionnaire was done at a full faculty meeting and included all teachers. The questionnaire participants were asked to identify themselves on the questionnaire. Questionnaire Monkey was used for this part of the data collection. Consent forms (see Appendix B) were read aloud to the participants, distributed, signed and submitted. All consent forms were filed in a locked file for the duration of the research and were shredded once the final research was submitted. A graduate student who was not an employee of Kamehameha Schools facilitated random focus groups. This graduate student had no previous relationship with anyone in the focus groups. All consent forms were completed and turned in to the graduate student who filed them in a locked file. All consent forms from the focus groups were shredded once the final research was submitted. Instructional rounds participant groups were comprised of educators who were subject matter experts but who had no prior background about our facility design or curriculum. Each instructional round also subject matter expert from our middle school.

Design

Triangulation (Maxwell, 2013, p.102) of a questionnaire, focus groups, and instructional rounds are the foundation for the design of this bounded multiple case study (Creswell, 2007). It was important to get the overall feedback through the questionnaire
on engagement in order to have a baseline of the level of engagement and collaboration in the building. The general questionnaire provided a foundation for the research. The focus groups were conducted using a blind process so that teachers could expand upon their ideas about engagement and collaboration in the building without feeling intimidated by the researcher’s presence. I physically left the campus for the duration of the focus group sessions to insure that I did not influence the process in any way. Finally, the instructional rounds were included in the design to provide an outsider’s lens to our building that would later be analyzed alongside the questionnaire and focus group data. Triangulation of these three methodologies was deliberately employed to insure a thorough design that took into account both anonymous and selected feedback, insider and outsider perspectives and feedback, and random and purposeful selection for data collection.

The research included multiple case studies. The main case study was focused on teacher engagement and collaboration around a shared vision for learning and the triangulation of Hawaiian culture and language, 21st century learner attributes, and middle school promising practices. Three subsequent case study components focused on leadership collaboration, teacher collaboration, and instructional rounds related to the work done around a shared vision for learning and the triangulation of Hawaiian culture and language, 21st century learner attributes, and middle school promising practices.
Participants

The participants in the study included 45 of the 51 Kamehameha Kapālama middle school classroom teachers in the questionnaire portion of the research. Of the 51 teachers, three were part time teachers and were not at the questionnaire session. Three teachers were absent on this date and did not complete the questionnaire. Focus groups were designed to get deeper responses about the level of engagement and collaboration in the building around a shared vision for learning and the triangulation of Hawaiian culture and language, 21st century learner attributes, and middle school promising practices. The focus groups were open to all classroom teachers and were conducted by an independent facilitator. This random sampling helped to control for bias and with the intent of increasing the credibility of the results. (Patton, 2002) Although these three focus groups were anonymous, one of the focus groups was set-aside for teacher leaders in the middle school, while the other two were open to any teachers. Follow up focus groups included researcher selected teams. One 7th grade and one 8th grade team were selected for these follow up focus group sessions. The four instructional rounds included subject matter experts from outside of the Kamehameha system as well as specifically chosen Kamehameha middle school participants to balance each instructional rounds team. Follow up interviews were conducted with the building designer and the principal of the school we visited for our preliminary action research project while designing our facility. Throughout all focus groups and instructional rounds, charts were created in front of all group members and were photographed, transcribed and shared with group members to maintain integrity of process and respondent validation. (Maxwell, 2013, p.126)
Data Collection

Questionnaire

The teacher questionnaire conducted in May of 2013 was done during a faculty meeting using the Questionnaire Monkey software. Data from this questionnaire were accessible only to me, and the Questionnaire Monkey administrator at our campus (see Appendix N). Consent forms for the questionnaire portion were read aloud for all who also had copies of the consent in their hands to follow. Those consent forms were collected and locked in a secure location for the duration of the study after which time they will be destroyed.

The initial data collection through the faculty questionnaire focused on teacher engagement in the design of the facility, engagement in a shared vision for learning, and the triangulation of Hawaiian culture and language, 21st century learner attributes, and middle school promising practices (see Appendix E). The questionnaire was developed in a manner that would yield feedback about the design components of the charette process and the shared vision for learning at the middle school. The questionnaire was comprised of twelve questions that were answered on a Likert scale of low to mid to high engagement in each of the aspects described in the questionnaire questions. The questionnaire was done in a regularly scheduled faculty meeting at the end of the first year in the new facility, and took approximately 15 minutes to complete including the reading and signing of consent forms. Questionnaire participants were asked to identify themselves on the questionnaire. The questionnaire was delivered only on this day and at this meeting. There was no intentional plan for follow up if teachers were absent from the meeting.
The questionnaire data collected were analyzed first by looking at the aggregated responses to the questionnaire related to engagement in the building and curriculum/program design. The focus on engagement was a precursor to the latter focus on collaboration in the focus groups. Then I disaggregated the data to focus specifically at the leaders’ questionnaire results as a group because I wanted to eventually determine if there were connections between the leaders’ questionnaire responses and the leaders’ focus group responses. Finally, I disaggregated the questionnaire results to focus in on the two teams I invited into a focus group because I had previously determined these teams as high collaborators through my years of observation of their teaching and through the annual regular review of their curriculum mapping. Through looking at these teams’ questionnaire results, I was attempting to see whether or not there was a connection between their particular questionnaire results and their focus group data.

Focus Groups

Five focus groups were conducted for this research (see Appendices I, J, & K). The focus groups were a combination of random and purposeful sampling (Patton, 2002, p. 241). Of the five focus groups, three were optional and anonymous focus groups in an initial round of scheduled focus groups. One of the three of these groups was deliberately set-aside for teacher leaders. Two additional focus groups selected by invitation were added to collect data from one 7th and one 8th grade team that were perceived as high functioning collaborators. The rationale for the follow up focus groups was to provide more data regarding elements of high collaboration. The purposeful selection of two of
the focus groups was based on professional judgment and perspective coupled with seven years of observation of individual teacher and team development.

A neutral party facilitated the three random focus groups after school hours. I was not on campus for the duration of the focus groups. The consent forms were distributed, read, and signed before the session began. Consent forms were held by the facilitator in a locked location until the end of the research such that I would not know who, rather only how many, attended the focus groups. Data from the focus groups were collected on charts throughout the session and in front of the focus group members so that they could validate everything that was being collected and forwarded to me for analysis. The charts from the focus groups were photographed and transcribed as recorded on the chart paper (see Appendix O). The follow up focus groups were conducted in the same manner although I facilitated the specifically selected follow up focus groups. The questions for the follow up focus groups were similar to the questions presented at the voluntary focus groups (see Appendix O). Consent forms were completed and were held by me in a secure locked file.

The data (transcribed charts) from the focus groups and the instructional rounds was coded (see Appendix R) in the first cycle coding using the In Vivo (Miles, Huberman, & Saldana, 2014) method because I felt that this method would most accurately address the voices of the participants. Participants’ specific words/phrases from the data were used as the first categorization of coding of the data. After the first round of coding was completed, I applied values coding (Miles et al, 2014, p. 75) as my case study focused on the values, attitudes, and beliefs about the design of the wall-less learning environment, companion curriculum, and program. This case study incorporated
inherent cultural values and participant experiences in the design of the building, curriculum, and program, which made a scan of the data based on values and beliefs a logical next step in the coding process.

The second cycle coding of the data included looking for patterns to help understand and interpret the levels of collaboration in the building, curriculum, and programs. I looked for thematic, causal, relational, and theoretical construct patterns (Miles, et al 2014, p. 87).

**Instructional Rounds**

The instructional round is “a conditional statement that captures the essential connections between practice and what happens in classrooms” (Fowler-Finn, 2013, P.175). The middle school theory of action provided the basis for this research: if teachers are the designers of the school building, curriculum, and program, then they will collaborate more effectively. The instructional rounds data were collected on forms designed for the rounds. The forms were identical for each round with the exception of changing the subject of each round (see Appendices L and P). Following each round, the group debriefed their findings, what they observed, and what they concluded. This information was recorded on chart paper with all group members present at the end of the round. The charts from the instructional rounds were photographed and transcribed as recorded on the chart paper (see Appendix Q).

Each round was designed to get feedback on four distinct aspects of the program and curriculum aspects of that general theory. The four program, and curriculum focal points of our middle school theory of action are shared vision, Hawaiian culture and
language, 21st century learning, and middle school promising practice—were used to frame the instructional rounds. The initial round at the middle school was completed in February of 2013 and looked at all four aspects of our program and curriculum design in one, day-long round. The rounds specifically designed for this research and that were implemented by looking at just one of the four aspects at a time were completed in the fall of 2013. The instructional rounds focused on middle school vision and the triangulation of the pillars of our program attempted to provide an inside-outside lens on our practice. The instructional rounds participants were selected based upon their subject matter expertise. The rounds groups included one or more individual from the middle school to insure that trust was maintained throughout the process. The remaining participants in the instructional rounds teams were individuals purposefully selected by me from sister independent schools, consultants we have worked with, and individuals from the corporate side of our enterprise. The instructional round methodology was used to address the validity threat (Maxwell, 2013) of a research design that was too close to the researcher, was carried out by using insiders and outsiders to the middle school (Patton, 2002). The outsiders selected to participate had no prior knowledge of the program or the building design, and/or were selected for their subject matter expertise around the areas of the building and program design. While the outsiders may not have had preconceived notions about the instructional round, this was still somewhat purposeful in that I selected the outsiders for the instructional rounds teams.
The most significant limitation of this study is that I am the principal of the school in which this practice was being researched. The design of the study inherently had to account for this limitation. For example, the methodology included data collection directly in front of all participants to insure that what was being recorded was visible and agreed upon by those in the respective groupings. The data were transcribed and made available to all in the middle school, not just the questionnaire group, focus groups, and instructional rounds participants. Respondent validation was accomplished in several ways (Maxwell, 2013). First, by posting the questionnaire findings through the middle school Ning intranet site which functions as our virtual learning community—everything we do, process, understand, share, and post is on this comprehensive intranet site (www.kmspahu.ning.com). Secondly, focus groups were conducted in open discussions and all responses were charted directly in front of the respondents with deliberate verbal checking for accuracy of anything placed on the chart. All focus groups were asked to validate and give their agreement to the accuracy of the charts before leaving. The transcriptions and photographs of the charts were also posted on the Ning site for all middle school faculty and staff access. I chose to have the charts done in this manner because I felt that if an in-person recorder or tape recording were done of the focus groups that this would exacerbate issues of my positionality related to the research. The instructional rounds data were shared in the same manner as the focus group data.
Lastly my personally held belief that the days of the closed classroom are gone and that we must look to ways to open learning for students so that they can function in a 21st century society is a view that may impact my findings. Additionally, I believe that Hawaiian ways of knowing and doing, and middle school promising practices are in concert with an open learning environment. These ideas color my approach to this research.
FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

“Collaboration is the end result of trying to balance the tension of being on the edge without falling over.” (Focus group participant, 8.27.13)

Included in the following section of this research are the findings and analysis for this research study. Specifically, questionnaire findings will be followed by the focus groups findings, and finally the instructional rounds findings. This section concludes with a discussion of the interplay of findings and its influence on Hawaiian culture and language, 21st century learning, middle school promising practices, and a shared vision for learning in our middle school.

Questionnaire

The findings of the faculty questionnaire on engagement were analyzed as a whole set of data, then in sub-sets of data to later draw connections between the questionnaire data and the focus group and/or instructional round data. There were three sub-sets of data analyzed including teacher leaders, and the 7th and 8th grade team I selected for the focus group follow up. The following graph shows the composite results of the questionnaire.
Figure 1—Teacher Engagement Questionnaire

The questionnaire sought to attain the general level of engagement in the triangulation we created together to build the building, program, and curriculum. This questionnaire intended check the level of the shared reality. The construction of our identity in the new building was determined by level of collaboration that occurred after the initial stage of engagement, which may have even been there before the charrette. It is the imagination, which was the process that took certain teams to greater levels of collaboration as they implemented shared engagement and created new versions of reality. The questionnaire data illustrated that there is generally a medium and high engagement in the new learning environment. Of the twelve questions asked, the three questions that had high ratings for high engagement were focused on (1) engagement as a teacher in this new learning
environment/facility (66.7%); (2) presence of 21\textsuperscript{st} century ways of learning and doing in the new learning environment/facility (55.6%); and, (3) teacher implementation of middle school promising practice (53.3%). The two questions that had a high percentage of low engagement were focused on (1) degree of involvement in the charette process (35.6%); and (2) degree of involvement in the visioning process (31.1%). About thirty-three percent of those questionnaired were actually part of the building charette and design process.

The next area for analysis was on those questionnaire questions that focused on the vision development, which occurred during the same time as the design charette. If one combines the medium and high engagement data for presence of the middle school vision in the new facility, over ninety-seven percent of the teachers answered that the vision was indeed present in the buildings, program, and curriculum. Additionally, eighty-nine percent of the teachers reported that they implemented the vision in their daily work in the new environment.

Eighty-seven percent of those questionnaired reported that Hawaiian ways of knowing and doing was present in the building, and 76% percent reported implementing Hawaiian ways of knowing and doing in their daily work. I found it interesting that this was the lowest engaged on the questionnaire. In a school that was exclusively for students of Hawaiian ancestry, and that has made great strides toward assimilating Hawaiian ways of knowing and doing into all aspects of the campus in recent years, I would have expected a bit higher result.

The questionnaire results showed a resounding presence of 21\textsuperscript{st} century learning and doing in the new environment/learning space—a one-hundred percent combined
medium to high engagement was reported. Almost as high, at 96% combined medium to high, was the implementation of 21st century learning and doing in the new environment/learning space. It seems that the roll out of the 1:1 laptop program at the same time we were designing the building informed the design charrette process from an operational perspective as well as from a curriculum and program design perspective.

Teacher respondents reported that middle school promising practice was clearly present in the building and in their daily implementation. The questionnaire results revealed a 98% and an 87% (combined medium and high) presence and implementation of middle school promising practice in the building, respectively.

Further analysis of the questionnaire results of the sub-group of eleven teacher leaders’ was disaggregated from the total count in order to see whether or not their questionnaire responses about engagement in the new environment/learning space were in any way different from the general group of teachers. This group of teacher leaders was directly engaged in the charrette process and/or were directly involved in the development and design of program and curriculum throughout the building process so it was important to analyze whether or not that direct involvement paralleled their responses regarding engagement in the building. The high engagement responses overall ranged from seventeen percent on the low to seventy-five percent on the high. This may be attributed to the fact that some present team leaders may have only been involved in part of the charrette process and not the entire process from the beginning. Further, the charrette task was required of the leaders in order to insure that all teams were represented. However, some leaders may not have been as interested in the process and thus rated a score low on engagement. Finally, the data may reflect that leaders who were
unsure or leery of the innovation may have rated themselves on the low end of the engagement continuum. When combining the mid and high responses, the range was then sixty-seven to one hundred percent engagement. When combining the mid-engagement responses with the high engagement there seems to be a more realistic measure of engagement. I believe that whether or not leaders were interested in the charrette they were productive participants. They may not have fully grasped or supported the innovative design, and may also have been evolving in their leadership of the building innovations. In the end, all team leads (except one whose room isn’t within the new building) responded that they were highly engaged as a teacher in the new environment/facility.

Next I analyzed the lead teachers’ data regarding the degree of presence of the vision, Hawaiian ways of knowing and doing, 21st century learning, and middle school promising practice in the building, program, and curriculum at the middle school. Three of the four categories—shared vision, 21st century learning, and middle school promising practice—had a somewhat even split between mid and high engagement. Fifty-five percent of the teacher leaders reported medium engagement of the presence of the vision in the building, program, and curriculum, and forty-five percent reporting high engagement in the same category. The data were reversed for 21st century learning and middle school promising practice with forty-five percent of the teacher leaders reporting medium engagement of the presence of 21st century learning and middle school promising practice in the building, program, and curriculum, and fifty-five percent reporting high engagement in the same categories. Most significant, and consistent with the findings in the total questionnaire group, was the data related to the presence of
Hawaiian ways of knowing and being in the buildings, program, and curriculum in the middle school. Ninety-one percent of the teacher leaders reported a medium engagement of the presence of Hawaiian ways of knowing and being in the buildings, program, and curriculum, with just one teacher leader reporting that there was a high degree of engagement in this same category.

With the overall and teacher leader data reviewed, I moved on to analyze the data of the sub-groups of one team at 8th and 7th grade who were seen as highly engaged and highly collaborative. The same questionnaire foci were used as with the teacher leader group—overall engagement, and the presence of shared vision, 21st century learning, and middle school promising practice in the building, program, and curriculum. Following the process used with the sub-group of teacher leaders, I analyzed the 7th and 8th grade team data regarding the degree of presence of the vision, Hawaiian ways of knowing and doing, 21st century learning, and middle school promising practice in the building, program, and curriculum. The eighth grade team data for the degree of engagement in 21st century learning, and in middle school promising practice was identical—seventy-five percent of the team reported high engagement in both areas while twenty-five percent of the team reported medium engagement in both areas. The degree of engagement in Hawaiian ways of knowing and doing for the eighth grade team was aligned with that which was demonstrated in the overall and teacher leader questionnaire data—seventy-five percent of the 8th grade team reported medium engagement while twenty-five percent reported low engagement. The seventh grade team data for the degree of engagement in all four areas was identical—thirty-three percent of the team reported high engagement in all areas while sixty-six percent of the team reported medium
engagement in all areas. This stands out for a couple of reasons. First, this identical aspect of the data supported the assumption I had that this team collaborated well. At the very least it demonstrated that this team shared similar thoughts and ideas about the areas around which we have built our building, program, and curriculum. Secondly, the resonance around medium engagement for all four areas demonstrated to me that there are still areas for this team to continue to grow. The instructional rounds data revealed that the two areas of the questionnaire with a significant low reporting--involvement in the design charette and involvement in the visioning process--do not appear to have impacted the overall engagement in the building. While these are the two lowest elements of the questionnaire, the overall engagement in all areas of the learning environment is high, with a range from 76% (implementation of Hawaiian ways of knowing and doing) to 100% (21st century learning and doing). For both the 8th and the 7th grade teams, the energy they possess about learning and growing was evident and is also supported in their focus group data.

**Focus Groups**

“There’s something encouraging about how people who share the same passion will help each other. This is one of the most valuable traits of a tribe: the love for the pursuit tends to outweigh the instinct to protect one’s turf.” (Robinson, 2013, p.201-202)

The teachers appeared to own the learning space that they designed. In this respect it supported the notion that if they have had a hand in the design of the building, the program, and the space that they will collaborate well. One teacher mentioned that
there was shared leadership to get them to the building but that there is still work they must do to continue to grow together. Another teacher suggested that they were given room to grow in their own way to find out how they fit in the open learning space.

There was no specific connection to the theoretical construct of the balance between relationships and reification (Wenger, 1998). However I can discern that the relationships seem strong as evidenced by the fact that the teachers shared that colleagues were supportive, there are agreements in place, and collaboration is a shared responsibility. The mention of the agreements and the focus on the vision alludes to documents in place that we have created together and that frame our work in the middle school. Implicit in the mention of the agreements and the vision was the validation that documents are in place to guide and assist teams in building strong communities of practice. As a result of the focus group feedback it was evident that not everyone was completely confident in the collaborative open learning environment. An area for future growth was providing time for expanding collaborative work further than just within the classroom building. Lastly, participants mentioned that decision-making and agreements needed to be more consistent and unified.

Leaders’ Focus Group

The leaders’ responses were more focused on the freedom to determine how the spaces would be used. Leaders mentioned how the floor space allowed for flexibility to change as the need arises, and that they were given the chance to grow and make decisions about how their teams fit in the scheme of the floor with the others. “We were
given the room to grow in our own way to find how we fit in” (Focus Group, August, 2013).

They agreed that the shared leadership model has helped them to get where they are in terms of collaboration and working together as a learning community on the floor. “The interactions of individual members inside a CoP—the practice of knowledge creation/sharing/learning—are the key ingredient of practice of leadership distribution” (Fallah, 2011, p.367). Leaders see the space being used as a learning tool, and that groups (teams) need to be flexible so that collaboration can occur. One lead felt that in many cases the flexibility and collaboration are done so well that line between teaching and learning was blurred. “The line between teaching and learning space is blurred because what and how we teach are very impacted by the learning space,” (Focus Group, August, 2013).

**Purposeful Focus Groups: (7th, 8th grade)**

These two groups’ responses were different from the general focus group responses—they were more explicit about their teams’ collaboration and how and why they experience success collaborating. These teams specifically called out the fact that they do not ever do things alone, that no one on the team was alone or isolated, and that there was a high level of interdisciplinary design of instruction. “We don’t go away and do a job alone and call it the team’s; we do not write individual chapters and together call them a book; it is never *my* lesson” (Focus Group, October, 2013). Wenger explained: “Our identities become anchored in each other and what we do together” (Wenger, 1998, p.89). Through creating strong identities, teams can sustain strong communities of
practice. Ideally this was what the middle school was attempting to do with the shared vision of *Nurturing All Learner Voices*. This identity, developed collectively by the faculty and staff, was manifested in the architectural design, the curriculum, and in the middle school culture. The other team invited into a focus group shared a similar sentiment of being together in all they do, which heightened the relationships they have with each other. “We show up together; we check on each other; we gravitate towards each other; we communicate; we talk; we enjoy talking; we end up wandering and come up with things” (Focus Group, October, 2013). Wenger stated:

> Practice is ultimately produced by its members through the negotiation of meaning. The negotiation of meaning is an open process with the constant potential for including new elements; with the constant potential for continuing, rediscovering, or reproducing the old in the new. The result is that, as an emergent structure, practice is at once highly perturbable and highly resilient (Wenger, 1998, p. 96).

These two sentiments, that jobs are not done alone and that teams always show up together to work together, combine nicely to define the balance between relationships and the hard copy of what needs to get done as a team. In both teams there was a high level of trust and respect as colleagues and as friends. They referred to their meetings as collaborations instead of meetings. Both teams attributed their collaboration to organic thinking and a growth mindset. There was a freedom that came with this kind of high performing team, one that allowed any member to make decisions and lead his/her team. “(We) are being given the arena to try new things allows for conjecture, shared leadership (which) helps us to continue to want to change” (Focus Group, October, 2013).
Ultimately these two teams committed themselves to this high level of collaboration for the sake of the students they serve. “Collaboration is at a level that if the students had to pull apart what subjects they are learning they might not be able to do that” (Focus Group, October, 2013).

**Instructional Rounds**

“What you have in effect is a true learning community; learning ceases to be Monday to Friday, but instead who they are” (Instructional Round, 9/23/13).

The instructional round methodology provided the third lens in this research on teacher collaboration, following the first lens through the questionnaire data on teacher engagement in aspects of the design of building, program, and curriculum around the middle school theory of practice, and the second lens through the focus groups that revealed the teachers’ voices about the design of the building, program, and curriculum around the middle school theory of practice. Each round had its own unique focus relative to our theory of practice and thus deserves its own section. Following the individual findings sections will be overall findings from the rounds as a whole.
**Instructional Round: Shared Vision**

*VISION: “Teachers talk about collaboration without having to sit down and collaborate”*

*(Instructional Round, 8/20/13)*.

The data show that we are employing our vision of nurturing all student voices in the following emergent pattern of responses. The rounds group said in the debriefing session that it was clear teachers can flex, change, design, move in the internal space; they are open, creative, and responsive to student needs and will risk change to meet student needs (Instructional Round, August, 2013). In the case of the 1:1 environment of our middle school, the technology should be everywhere and fluid in all learning spaces. The rounds group described the learning space as one that “mimicked the world workplace for the students” (Instructional Round, August, 2013). The environment this group observed was a place where getting an answer right was not as important as thinking through a process and understanding. “What is powerful is students are anxiously raising their hands and not worrying about the right answer. There is safety in sharing” (Instructional Round, August, 2013). The students’ voices are heard, are considered precious; students are encouraged to speak out and share knowledge and to build on it. Teachers and students learn through inquiry, learn to think, and learn to build on knowledge as opposed to telling or imparting knowledge (Instructional Round, August, 2013). The rounds group felt the environment was non-threatening, there was pairing and coordination of learning, there was no negative language spoken, and most importantly that collaboration seemed to be embedded in the learning. Continuing to build on collaboration and teaming was a suggested area of continued focus and growth.
Instructional Round: Middle School Promising Practice

MIDDLE SCHOOL PROMISING PRACTICE: “What you have in effect is a true learning community. (We) saw life-long learning, teams working together, breakthrough in teaching, (a) true middle school” (Instructional Round, 9/23/13).

The specific areas of focus for the work with respect to middle school promising practice were: active learning, challenging curriculum, multiple learning approaches, a shared vision, and collaborative leaders. The instructional rounds group for the middle school promising practice focus shared some significant findings in each of these areas. The group shared that “kids were on top of each other learning, and that there was a sense of shared space” (Instructional Round, September, 2013). The group also mentioned that students interacted and were actively learning from each other, though kids were never intimidated or uncomfortable. When the instructional rounds group debriefed and shared their observations was that students were “tackling change in a world of work pacing” (Instructional Round, September, 2013), this indicated aspects of a challenging curriculum. Students were problem-solving and had initiative to change answers and question results. Multiple learning approaches were evident in the inclusion of all kids in learning. “Inclusion, the identity of self; we saw lots of this” (Instructional Round, September, 2013). Student voices were present, heard, acknowledged, and understood which helped to demonstrate that a shared vision, that of nurturing student voice, was present in the learning space. Continuing to build on collaborative leadership in the learning space was an area of on-going growth and development.
Instructional Round: Hawaiian Culture and Language

HAWAIIAN CULTURE AND LANGUAGE: “If you ho‘okani the pahu in the right way it will resonate” (Instructional Round, 9/25/13).

This instructional rounds group was able to give us as much supportive feedback about language and culture in the learning space as areas for further growth. They found that there was a genuine sense of aloha present in one floor of the building but not as prevalent in another floor. For example, on one floor the rounds participants said, “if you ho‘okani (play as in musically) the pahu the right way it resonates; there were consistent approaches to learning; the architecture works in this favor; and there’s a whole livelihood of learning happening on that floor” (Instructional Round, September, 2013). To the contrary, one of the participants described the other floor that was not alive with the language and culture in the following way: “I was asked to wear my cultural lens. I was like fisherman in murky water,” (Instructional Round, September, 2013).

This group spent a lot of time talking with the students and was able to get the genuine feeling from the student perspective. For example, one student shared that the Hawaiian language was our ancestry and it protected who we are. Further, the students felt connected to their culture and language, and that there was a genuine respect between teachers and students (Instructional Round, September, 2013). Additionally, students interviewed felt that it was a friendly environment where everyone looks out for each other. The rounds group described the environment as excited, with no disrespect to
others; there was order, presence, a connectedness, calm, and focused air to the learning spaces they visited.

The rounds group also noted areas of emergent need for growth including the enhancement of the curriculum by including the history of the building names. Significant at our school was the naming of the buildings. This process was lengthy and done with thorough research and specific meaning and reverence. Hence, it followed that if the buildings are significant to the institutional history that students should have a deep and ready understanding of the building names. Secondly, the group pointed out that the use of Hawaiian culture and language being varied from one floor to another. One floor was described as students having “a lot of opportunity to learn their culture,” whereas the other floor was “absolutely different from the other floor; what I expected to see was not there,” (Instructional Round, September, 2013). Certainly this is an area for further work.

**Instructional Round: 21st Century Learning**

*21st CENTURY LEARNING: “There was lots going on interrelated with technology; a good mix of technology and traditional” (Instructional Round, 10/22/13)*

“Most striking was the task-mindedness on the part of the students” (Instructional Rounds Group, October, 2013). Throughout the visit this instructional rounds group saw a heightened integration of technology due in large part to the fact the we are in our seventh year of a 1:1 learning environment, and in a new building fitted with an interactive white board and fifty-two inch televisions in every classroom. There is on-site technology support, as well as an instructional technology resource teacher for each grade
level whose job it was to team with and support teachers in all technology needs. With this support and hardware resource in place, the rounds group saw a space that was evolving and leading teachers to design and push their thinking toward student created learning targets and learning connected to the community (Instructional Rounds Group, October, 2013). This group found a lot of curriculum integration of technology, with shifts of instruction to collaboration, writing, thinking, critical analysis, and partnering in learning (Instructional Rounds Group, October, 2013). The students interviewed by this group also shared that they see a shift in their learning environment toward greater use of technology for their learning. Students shared that they appreciated the laptops and that the device helped them to organize, extend learning, and was key to their learning success (Instructional Rounds Group, October, 2013).

Overall Findings from the Instructional Rounds

“Most (of the) work by the teachers is autonomous; time, space, ownership of where they are going” (Instructional Round, 10/22/13).

The data show evidence of collaboration focused on the design points of our middle school—shared vision and the triangulation of Hawaiian culture and language, 21st century learning, and middle school promising practice. I surmised that both the teachers and the students felt the freedom of the space, the flexibility that allows all them to create, learn, and share knowledge. The data also showed that there was an understanding by teachers and students that we are committed to the vision of nurturing student voice, that the Hawaiian cultural norms permeated the space, and that conscious
effort was placed on coordination and integration of learning so that teachers and students can collaborate. The instructional rounds confirmed our middle school vision of nurturing student voice. If one nurtures the child’s voice well, appropriately, and with care it will resonate. In this learning space and in the program and curriculum, attention is paid to multiple modalities when designing learning tasks. A sense of community and engagement are present in the learning space as well.

**Discussion**

The intent of the triangulation of a questionnaire, focus groups, and instructional rounds was to insure that the voices and the lenses of the teachers were brought to the surface with the commitment to use this information to continue to grow professional collaboration in the building. The addition of outsider feedback during the rounds gave dimension to the process of collecting data about the building. The questionnaire’s generality was deliberate, with the rationale of attaining a broad brushstroke of the level of engagement in a teacher designed building, program, and curriculum. The focus group refined responses further and provided more detail about the levels of collaboration in the building around the middle school theory of practice. Finally, the instructional rounds helped to confirm what we have believed about teacher design of building, program, and curriculum and the impact that has upon collaboration. The following are overall findings of this research.

If we start with the three major high positive responses of the questionnaire--engagement in facility, presence of 21st century learning, teacher implementation of middle school promising practice--and connect these with feedback from the random and purposeful focus groups, as well as the instructional rounds, we can begin to see the
impact of communities of practice and collaboration on the learning environment. “The community aspect refers to the development of a shared identity around a topic or set of challenges. It represents a collective intention to steward a domain of knowledge and to sustain learning about it” (Wenger, Trayner, & deLaat, 2007, p. 9). The questionnaire responses parallel with random focus group responses supporting flexibility and collaboration in the building and its program. In every focus group flexibility was mentioned as a foundational concept to the learning space. Focus group members mentioned flexibility of groupings, spaces, and lessons to enhance learning opportunities. Collaboration and communication also rose to the top as essences of the culture of the open learning space.

Further, the questionnaire responses are aligned with the random teacher leader focus group responses that the building provided freedom and shared leadership. “They self-organize, but they flourish when their learning fits with their organizational environment. The art is to help such communities find resources and connections without overwhelming them with organizational meddling” (Wenger, 2013, p. 9). Further, there was a robust connection of the three highest questionnaire items with the purposeful focus group responses regarding the high degree of strong and positive relationships on their teams. “It takes relationships. Many of us assume we are good at relationships, but the truth is that almost every person I know needs continued work on it. It takes commitment, practice, and feedback. It is energizing to learn together as a team, a staff, or a community” (Scott, 2013, p. 56). These particular teams are committed to inclusiveness of all team members, everyone shows up and does their share of the work and more, there was a high level of trust amongst them, and they are committed to
collaboration. When we look at the major questionnaire findings of engagement in facility, presence of 21st century learning, teacher implementation of middle school promising practice and align them next to the instructional rounds findings we need to look at each rounds’ discoveries to gather the most meaningful information. With respect to the instructional round on the middle school vision for learning it was clear from the rounds data in all four rounds that student voice was present in positive and productive ways. “Collaborative cultures’ underlying sources of strength are informal relationships, conversation, expressions of interest, provisions of support, and ultimately the mobilization of collective expertise and commitment to improve the lives and life chances of students” (Hargreaves & Fullan, 2012, p.114). Naturally the rounds on our middle school vision, focused on nurturing student voice, revealed the clearest message about student voice. However, the other three rounds mentioned the importance of student voice as integral to their round. Each rounds group also mentioned engagement as a strong presence in the learning spaces. For example, the vision and 21st century technology rounds groups specifically documented student engagement in the learning environment. Clearly 21st century learning was evident in the instructional rounds on technology and 21st century learning. The findings from the middle school promising practice rounds group are best summarized in this feedback from the rounds: “There is life-long learning, team work together, break through teaching; a true middle school. What you have in effect is a true learning community” (Instructional Rounds, September, 2013). There were also specific areas for growth that were suggested by the rounds group. For example, they suggested that we determine how we can insure that the best practices of teams permeate and become the best practices of all. Additionally, the group
mentioned that the more that students have voice and choice in their learning, the more the technology might be employed in meaningful and real world ways.

The findings thus show that there was a desire for engagement and collaboration in the building and its program as shown by questionnaire, focus groups’ feedback, and instructional rounds conclusions. Additionally the questionnaire, focus groups, and instructional rounds have revealed for us some significant areas for emergent growth and change. One participant mentioned that there are times when it is not “safe” to express their ideas. Clearly this was an area for future work that can be built on the foundation of the work we have already done with MBTI. Most important was how we will be using these findings to make recommendations for our future work.
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

One significant conclusion was there are two teams in particular who are high functioning collaborators. These teams have strong relationships, high levels of trust, and the hard copy of their teams in place, which allowed them to constantly grow and refine their work. There are *individuals* on the floors that have similar traits to the high functioning teams and also have strong relationships and individual dynamic guiding documents that fueled their professional practice. The difference between some of the successful individuals and the teams that are high functioning collaborators was that as a team so much more can be accomplished, and a level of synergy from the combined talent and passion on a team caused the creation of new and better elements to the curriculum and the program. Thus, a refinement to the middle school theory of practice included continuing to build time and strategy into the teachers’ days to allow for collaboration to occur, and to encourage the cross pollination of high functioning teams’ relationships, strategies, and systems for getting work done. This was specifically mentioned in the instructional round on 21st century learner attributes. The introduction of instructional rounds as a way to give feedback to teams was another way that we can begin to cross-pollinate high performance attributes from one team to another. The use of instructional rounds required that teams begin to develop their team theories of practice. This will be a growth area for our middle school teams. Once those theories of practice are realized, then the coaching and feedback culture, in my opinion, will gravitate toward more meaningful and use-able data for teams and for teachers. Additionally the Danielson framework will take on new and expanded meaning for teams. More focused attention will be placed upon Domain 4, professional responsibility, and specifically on
component 4d, participating in a professional community, and 4e, growing and
developing professionally (Danielson, 2007).

**Questionnaire**

The questionnaire findings helped me to conclude that if there was deliberate and
meaningful representation in a charette that people generally felt their ideas were taken,
heard, and represented in the design process. Going forward this informs future building
charette processes we may be involved in throughout the campus master plan
development. Key personnel representing the breadth of the middle school shall be
recommended for involvement in campus planning that impact the middle school.

The simultaneous development of the middle school vision for learning while we
were designing the building and its program was a significant process that impacted the
program and curriculum once we moved into the new learning spaces. The data showed
that the majority of the teachers report the presence of the vision in the building, and that
they implement the vision in their daily work. This was significant because we designed
specific and prescribed activities throughout the design process to insure that the vision
for our work was clear to all. Further, we have operationalized that vision into culturally
significant aspects of the architecture. More importantly, that vision work has been
manifested in the cultural protocol of teams through the creation of pahu for their team,
the authoring of chants in reverence to that vision, and the students’ learning of the chant
and dance that is presented at appropriate events throughout our school year. Going
forward we will continue to build on the vision we established, and will encourage others
when they are designing physical spaces to consider first thoroughly vetting what they believe about the teaching and learning that will occur in that space.

A focus on Hawaiian ways of knowing and doing was recommended in order to continue the good work done thus far to move our school from a school for Hawaiian children to a Kula Hawai‘i, or Hawaiian school. It was significant that both the total questionnaire data count and the disaggregated teacher leader group revealed that this area of our building, program, and curriculum was the lowest area of engagement of the four questionnaire areas. Additionally, the 8th grade team data from the questionnaire revealed that twenty-five percent of the team found the area of Hawaiian ways of knowing and doing to be of low engagement. The instructional rounds group recommended this as an area for further growth for our middle school. These findings supported the recommendation that we do further research to find where in our building, program, and curriculum we can shore up the delivery of Hawaiian culture and language unique to our school ethos and demographic. This was non-negotiable for our school in light of the fact that enterprise, campus, and middle school vision and goals are built on Hawaiian values.

Equally as important was continuing to focus our attention on the 21st century learner needs in the Hawaiian cultural context at our middle school. It was significant that the 1:1 laptop roll out at the same time we designed our new buildings appeared to have impacted the engagement in technology once the buildings were opened. This causes us to recommend that technology continue to be considered as a major factor in how we design our buildings for our learners.
Focus Groups

The most significant conclusion gathered from the focus groups was that the flexibility of space, planning, grouping, and instructional delivery was overwhelmingly recognized as present and valuable. Thus I recommend and encourage the exploration of ways that the floor can be continually used effectively to meet the needs of the students we serve. Specifically, how do we design the floor so that it is reflective of a true 21st century learning community where students facilitate their learning, teachers guide the learning, and knowledge is created and shared outside of the building, school, and community?

Focus groups reported that highly collaborative teams’ instructional delivery and leadership was seamless, and that all team members lead on these high functioning teams. Thus it was recommended that we find ways to continue to support leadership growth and development, and to seek ways for all teachers to lead some aspect of their teams’ work together. I recommend that we further define leadership opportunities on the floor and in the middle school, and that we continue leadership delegation and shared leadership.

Training for leadership building and high performance teaming shall continue to build on MBTI trainings thus far. As new individuals join the middle school, or as new groups are formed, it was recommended that the foundational training in MBTI continue. Time and strategies (i.e., instructional rounds) shall be designed into the day so that high functioning teams can support and share their strategies for success with others on the floor. The use of instructional rounds shall be employed as a way to share theories of practice of teams and to build team collaboration at the team, grade, and middle school levels.
Instructional Rounds

The significant conclusions from the instructional rounds were directed toward building collaboration, collaborative leadership, and the incorporation of more Hawaiian culture and language in our learning spaces. Similar to the focus groups’ significant findings, the rounds revealed high levels of collaboration and leadership. It was recommended that we continue to build upon the existing collaboration and leadership strengths, and that the teachers expand beyond their own spaces and teams to influence others in meaningful ways. High functioning teams will be asked to take the risk of being the first teams to participate in the development of the theory of practice for their team, and then to allow another team to carry out an instructional round day focused on the theories of action. It was my belief that if the high functioning teams were the first to allow the instructional round around their processes, then others would be more willing to be part of an instructional round. Further, this process allowed for the first steps of sharing the aspects of a highly functioning team. Ideally all teams will eventually move toward the instructional round as a way to collaborate and grow in their instructional practice. The second significant finding from the instructional rounds was in the area of Hawaiian culture and language. Like the questionnaire, the Hawaiian culture and language was not as strong as one would expect in a school uniquely for children of Hawaiian ancestry, and a school working toward the assimilation of Hawaiian culture and language across all areas. The priority recommendation was to specifically provide cultural support where there was a need for greater delivery of Hawaiian cultural and language. This may require us to revisit the program structure to include additional learning experiences for teachers and students that are grounded in the Hawaiian
worldview. We must make explicit the need to have the Hawaiian cultural presence in all areas of the building, program, and curriculum through the WEO as a starting point. We will incorporate the specific recommendation from the instructional round to build into the curriculum a unit on the study of the building names in our middle school. We will strive to be consistent in the use of Hawaiian culture and language in all areas of the middle school. Last, the instructional rounds data showed that there was a very high presence and implementation of technology in the learning spaces. Our challenge will be to continue to integrate technology into a Hawaiian cultural setting so that students are able to function both as indigenous learners in a 21st century environment.

The overall recommendations based on this research included a move from an engaged to a collaborative mode of practice as our norm in the middle school. Secondly, that we move from designers of a building to facilitators of an innovative learning space. And last, that teams developed theories of practice around the areas of design of our school building, program, and curriculum. Teams do not have to develop their theories of practice around all four areas, but should be mindful to include any of the aspects of our design construct when creating their team theory of practice.
MODIFICATION TO THE THEORY OF PRACTICE

“This is one of the most valuable traits of a tribe: the love for the pursuit tends to outweigh the instinct to protect one’s turf” (Robinson, 2013).

The initial theory of practice was that if teachers and staff were the designers of the building, program, and curriculum, and that they were instrumental in designing the vision for learning in their school, that they would be engaged and collaborate. For the sake of this research this engagement has been defined as connected, committed, joyful and excited about the work they do. Collaboration has been defined as employing engagement while working together with others that results in the creation of something new and meaningful for teachers and the students they serve that did not exist prior to the collaboration.

This theory of practice has been modified after the completion of this study and helped to define our next steps in education in a wall-less middle school for indigenous students in a 21st century context. At the close of this research task, the theory of practice was now focused more discreetly. The present theory was that if teachers are engaged and collaborate, they will grow in their instructional practice, improving student learning, and will thus contribute to the overall growth middle school program and curriculum and to the campus at large. It was imperative that the middle school continue to reflect on their practice of collaboration, but at the same time share more between and beyond teams to other areas of our campus and beyond. The next steps to achieve this lie in continued training in and experience of high performing teams, sharing not for reciprocation, but for the actualization of all teachers and students; all learners.
Specifically we will need to engage in instructional rounds and feedback on individual teams’ theories of practice. Additionally, we built into our middle school culture the practice of professional reflection on practice both between teacher and supervisor, and teacher to teacher. These reflections, both oral and written, became part of the teacher’s body of work that demonstrates his/her on-going professional growth. We are striving for an environment whose practice is authentic learning for all adults and students, for real reasons, and unabashedly self-less.
NEXT STEPS

High levels of collaboration are occurring in the open environment designed by the teachers as evidenced in the focus group data from the high functioning teams. On the teams that are highly collaborative, there is a norm of interdisciplinary planning and instructional delivery to the extent that students may not even know what content is specifically being taught at any given time. There is a high level of accountability to each other on these teams, and the teachers like working and being with each other. These teams influence and challenge each other. Wenger (1998) describes this using nature as his example.

Like the water and the mountain, they shape each other but they have their own shapes. They are reflections of each other, but they have their own existence, their own realms. They fit around each other, but they remain distinct from each other. They cannot be transformed into each other, yet they transform each other (p. 71).

Within the middle school there is a range from high functioning to developing in terms of team collaboration. Each team is slowly influencing each other as they form their communities of practice. “A next step is, how can the best practices of teams become the best practices of a floor/grade level/school” (Instructional Round, October, 2013). The focus group data also revealed that there is a need for greater consistency amongst all teams in the areas of agreements and decision-making processes. In one case a teacher reported not feeling safe to express them self. It is clear that deliberate time for critical dialogue about collaboration and teaming must be designed into the workday for the teachers. Time should also be set aside for dialogue and written reflection on practice. The need for dialogue and reflection should include discussions around the consensus
maps of teacher teams including both the content and interdisciplinary maps. Teams are encouraged to request support for teaming development as they see the need, and are encouraged to travel for professional development to build relationships and content knowledge to support student learning. Teacher and team times should be set aside for content, team and grade level collaboration, with the open environment also providing a venue for constant conversation and observation of instructional practice between and amongst teachers. Teams should influence, coach, and support the other teams on the floor. Those with strong individual or team skills should seek permeate other teams so that those skills and abilities become the best practices of all teams and grade levels. It is understood that a teacher’s day is full and that time for this deep reflection is always challenging. It is important to note that the decisions to do this work and to move toward collaboration are driven by the teachers. Resources and time are available for this work and are absolutely supported by the administrative team. Routine time is built into teacher schedules for common preparatory time each day. Two retreat days are set for all teachers, all teams, and all content areas so that this and other work can be accomplished. Travel to other schools on island as well as on neighboring islands and on the continent are commonplace and are strongly encouraged. We have the ability to design into operational needs the professional development for this work. The teachers with encouragement and support of the administration decide the design and implementation of the work.

The next steps for us must include attention to Wenger’s descriptions of the CoPs, and to helping all in the middle school to continue to grow through specific training and steps. We must “define ourselves more explicitly along the three dimensions set out by
Wenger: *joint enterprise, mutual engagement that binds members together in a social entity, and shared repertoire of communal resources*” (Wenger, 2013, p. 2). We need to bring to the surface as a matter of process and habit those things that matter and that are important to individuals, teams, grade level floors, and the middle school as a whole. We do this well, but it behooves us to keep this at the front of our minds and actions as we aim to keep the middle school a dynamic place for learning for students and adults. A specific task going forward then shall include constantly revising and refining what the non-negotiables (things that matter and that are important) are for respective teams, use them to build relationships, and document those standing needs of each of the teams in agreements and roles and responsibilities at the team, floor, and middle school levels. We will couple those non-negotiables with the cascade of goals created by our institution, which flows from the enterprise level to the campus then to the middle school, teams, and individuals. “They (CoPs) self-organize, but they flourish when their learning fits with their organizational environment. The art is to help such communities find resources and connections without overwhelming them with organizational meddling” (Wenger, 2013, p.9). Another task at hand as we move forward is the strengthening of the triangulation and the shared vision upon which we built the middle school. While the vision is in place visually through the pahu created by each team, the chants performed, and the words of the language of the vision comprehended, I believe we can work harder at living the vision so that it is seamless in all we say and do. We are doing a good job, but need to strive to do a great job.
The vision is so ingrained in the culture of the school that it is second nature to actualize the vision through shared purposes. It is part of what the people in that school live and breathe, no memorizing necessary” (Schussler, 2003, p. 521).

The operationalization of the instructional rounds is supported by feedback from instructional round on technology. “It is a good idea to have teachers do instructional rounds” (Instructional Round, October. 2013). Beginning in the 2014-2015 school year, learning spaces will be re-visioned and refined to encourage greater collaboration between and amongst teams. Curricular changes will be adjusted as needed to meet the needs of the collaborative approach to learning. In addition, the two high-functioning teams will pilot instructional rounds. All the teams will develop their theory of action for their respective individual classroom/content area. The administrative team will work with these teams on their instructional rounds development and implementation. The teams will spend the first half of the school year carrying out instructional rounds on a small scale within their teams. Toward the end of the first half of the year, a willing team will agree to carry out a round for the high performing team during the second half of the year. An instructional round day will be set aside for each of the high performing teams during the second half of the year. Throughout this process a reflection journal will be kept so that we can establish the best ways to use the rounds to grow collaboration and sharing in the learning spaces. At the close of school year 2014-2015 the teams who participated in the rounds will make recommendations for next steps.
Included in this recommendation will be ways in which we can assimilate the instructional rounds process into the Danielson Framework requirements that the school has already adopted. Ideally the rounds would become an inherent process in the middle school and a true reflection of communities of practice.
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Section IV. Description of Project

Briefly describe the purpose and objectives of your project in non-technical language.

The purpose of this project is to describe the impact a teacher designed progressive building and program has upon teacher engagement with their work and students. The research assumption is that with ownership of the design of the building, program, and curriculum teachers will thus be more engaged. The primary research question is: If teachers are the designers of a wall-less facility, and do this work around a shared framework of understanding and vision, will teacher engagement change once they are in the facility? Engagement in this research is defined as the presence of teacher enthusiasm, interest, joy, satisfaction, pride and the resulting personal and professional growth related to the work they do each day. Further, engagement is defined in this research as specifically linked to the following four areas: Hawaiian epistemology, 21st century skills and attributes, middle school promising practices, and shared vision for learning.

In the Fall of 2007 a group of middle school teachers and staff embarked on the design-build project to create a middle school serving indigenous students’ needs in a 21st century world. The building opened in August of 2012. Throughout the design and building process, as well as into this first year in the facility, faculty and staff focused on the triangulation of Hawaiian epistemology, 21st skills and abilities, middle school promising practice, as well as a shared vision for teaching and learning.

The objectives are: (1) to gather information that will support the design of wall-less learning environments for middle school students and to suggest areas for growth and improvement; (2) to determine whether the wall-less environment enhances teacher engagement; (3) to determine whether the triangulation of Hawaiian epistemology, 21st century skills and attributes, middle school promising practices enhances teacher engagement; (4) to determine whether a shared vision for teaching and learning enhances teacher engagement; and finally, (5) to determine the degree of implementation of the guiding design principles of Hawaiian epistemology, 21st century skills and abilities, middle school promising practice, and a shared vision in curriculum and program in the building.

The findings will inform the administration, instructional leaders, and users of the building of the level of assimilation of the areas described above, assist us in calibrating our vision for the future, as well as inform the next steps in design and implementation of this learning environment. Additionally, the findings will inform current campus-wide K-12 educational plan development and master planning that address the facility and educational programmatic needs of indigenous students in the 21st century setting. Ultimately the desire is to impact learning environment design beyond our school for the students of tomorrow.

Briefly describe your research design methods.
A case study methodology will be employed (Creswell, 2013) for this research. The case study approach involves a detailed and rich description of a particular group or sub-set of a group on an issue of importance or relevance. Specific data gathering tools include interviews, questionnaires, focus groups and observations via field notes. A faculty-wide questionnaire will provide a baseline understanding of the presence of Hawaiian epistemology, 21st century skills and abilities, middle school promising practice, and a shared vision. Questionnaire findings will provide a general view to guide more in-depth focus group discussions. The instructional round (City, Elmore, Fiarman, and Teitel, 2009) will provide observational data systematically collected that will then be discussed and analyzed by the specific rounds groups that will be formed by the researcher. The instructional round is similar to a medical rounds process. The data from the rounds will inform instructional methods and thus inform teaching strategy and enhance student learning in our wall-less facility. The instructional round is already a process in place in our teaching and learning environment. A round was completed in spring of 2013 after the building was functional for the first semester of school. This initial round was completed to get a baseline of the instructional practice occurring in this progressive physical environment, and to inform the next steps in supporting teachers in their instructional delivery. The instructional rounds groups in this research will be formed around five focused and specific areas: Hawaiian culture, 21st century learning, middle school practice, and shared vision. The rounds groups will include individuals outside of the school faculty and who have specialized knowledge in each of the areas. The rounds will provide an outside assessment of the level of existence of Hawaiian epistemology, 21st century learning, middle school promising practice, and a collaborative vision in our facility, our program, and our curriculum. The focus group discussions will provide details that will support the next steps in the design revisions of our building, program, and curriculum. Focus groups discussions will add depth and breadth on the range of evidence and presence of Hawaiian epistemology, 21st skills and abilities, middle school promising practice and a collaborative vision for teaching and learning. These discussions will further assist us in defining and describing the level of teacher engagement around these entities. Periodic systematic observations as an additional data set will add dimension to the findings of the instructional rounds, questionnaire, and focus groups. The questionnaire of the middle school faculty will be done at the end of the first year in the facility and will be delivered through an on line questionnaire instrument. The results will make visible the general level of teacher engagement in the wall-less environment, and where teachers stand on the continuum of low to high implementation of Hawaiian epistemology, 21st century skills and abilities, middle school promising practice, and a shared vision. The analysis of the questionnaire findings will guide specific foci for the ensuing instructional rounds teams. The instructional round data will be analyzed next to the questionnaire results to check for congruity. Instructional rounds data will be transcribed and analyzed for common themes that support or refute the level of engagement in a wall-less facility as determined through the questionnaire, as well as the level of presence of Hawaiian epistemology, 21st century skills and abilities, middle school promising practice, and a shared vision as revealed through the baseline questionnaire.

For research being conducted as “educational practice,” describe how the activity being studied is part of “normal” educational practice.
An inclusive design-build approach provided the foundation for an innate awareness and facilitation of daily work through the triangulation of Hawaiian epistemology, 21st skills and abilities, middle school promising practice and a collaborative vision for teaching and learning. This ownership of the process has become the norm for the work in this facility. The wall-less learning environment by nature includes daily and wide-ranging observation of program, curriculum, and instructional practice. A normal day for teachers and administrators includes formal and informal observations, verbal and written feedback, conversations, collaborations, and visitations by numerous groups in this state, country, and internationally who are looking to design similar learning environments. Much of this research is akin to the culture of this particular school, and to the nature of the work we do each day.

**If the research will be observational, describe how the observations will be recorded.**

Instructional rounds will be recorded through pencil paper template observations. Debriefing of the rounds will be recorded on chart paper. All instructional rounds data will be transcribed and submitted as an appendix to the body of work. Observations will be recorded on a template on a lap top computer.

**Describe your participant population. How will you identify, contact, and recruit participants? How many participants do you intend to involve in your research? How will you explain your research to your participants?**

There are an estimated 66 individuals in the participant population. Participants are members of the faculty employed in this school and experts in and outside of the school environment who are specialists in the fields of Hawaiian epistemology, 21st century skills and abilities, and middle school promising practice. There are 54 teachers in this school who will complete the baseline questionnaire. Consent forms will be provided to all participants in the questionnaire. Completing this questionnaire is offered to all teachers but is completely voluntary. Instructional rounds teams will be comprised of outside experts in the areas of Hawaiian epistemology, 21st century skills and abilities, middle school promising practice. The primary researcher will contact the individuals participating on the instructional rounds teams. The participation on an instructional rounds team is completely voluntary. There will be approximately four individuals on each of the three teams. Focus group members will be identified through a purposeful sampling determined from the questionnaire data. Participation is voluntary in all focus groups. An estimated ten of the total 54 teachers in this school may be considered for the focus group discussions. Research will be explained through print material including consent forms to be distributed before the questionnaire, instructional rounds, and focus groups. Additionally, information about this research will be disseminated at faculty meetings, through one-to-one conversations, administrative written communications, and team meetings.
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Section V. Consent Form
University of Hawai‘i
Consent to Participate in Research Project:

Does teacher engagement increase when they participate in building, curriculum, and program design?

My name is Elsa M. P. M. Kaʻai. I am a doctoral student at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa (UH), in the College of Education. As one of my requirements for this program, I am conducting research. The purpose of my current research project is to examine the impact of an inclusive process of school building, curriculum, and program design upon teacher engagement. I am asking you to participate in this project because you either were part of the design-build process, and/or are participants in on-going curriculum and program design related to the facility.

Project Description - Activities and Time Commitment: If you participate, I will questionnaire you once through an on line questionnaire at the end of the first year in the new facility. The questionnaire will require about 10 minutes of your time and will be done through an on line questionnaire instrument. I will gather the questionnaire findings through the on line reporting process. From those questionnaire results I intend to form voluntary one-sitting focus groups to gather further details about teacher engagement in the building and its programs. The focus groups will require about 30 minutes of your time. I will record the focus group responses by entering them on a lap top or with paper and pencil. One example of the type of question I will ask is, “How were your ideas specifically implemented in the design-build charette (program design; curriculum design) process?” If you would like to preview a copy of all of the questions that I will ask in the focus group, please let me know now.

Benefits and Risks: I believe there are no direct benefits to you in participating in my research project. However, the results of this project might help us to learn more about the impact of the inclusive design process of building schools, curriculum, and program on teacher engagement. I believe there is little or no risk to you in participating in this project. If, however, you are uncomfortable or stressed by answering any of the questionnaire questions, you may skip the question, or take a break, discontinue the questionnaire, or withdraw from the questionnaire altogether. Similarly, if you are part of the follow up focus group sessions and are uncomfortable or stressed by answering any of the questions, you may skip the question, or take a break, stop the focus group, or withdraw from the focus group altogether.

Confidentiality and Privacy: During this research project, I will keep all data from the questionnaire and the focus groups in a secure location. Only I will have access to the data, although legally authorized agencies, including the University of Hawai‘i Human Studies Program, have the right to review research records. When I report the results of my research project, and in my typed transcripts, I will not use your name or any other personally identifying information. Instead, I will use a pseudonym (fake name) for your name. If you would like a summary of the findings from my final report, please contact me at the number listed near the end of this consent form.
Voluntary Participation: Participation in this research project is voluntary. You can choose freely to participate or not to participate. In addition, at any point during this project, you can withdraw your permission without any penalty.

Questions: If you have any questions about this project, please contact me via phone at (808) 227-2104 or e-mail (ekaai@hawaii.edu). If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, in this project, you can contact the University of Hawai‘i, Human Studies Program, by phone at (808) 956-5007 or by e-mail at uhirb@hawaii.edu.

Please keep the prior portion of this consent form for your records.

If you agree to participate in this project, please sign the following signature portion of this consent form and return it to Elsa M. P. M. Ka‘ai.

Tear or cut here

Signature(s) for Consent:
I agree to participate in the research project entitled, “Does teacher engagement increase when they participate in building, curriculum, and program design?” I understand that I can change my mind about participating in this project, at any time, by notifying the researcher.

Your Name (Print): _____________________________________________
Your Signature: ________________________________________________
Date: __________________________________________________________________________

Elsa M. P. M. Ka‘ai

Does teacher engagement increase when they participate in building, curriculum, and program design?
IRB (attachment)

Section V. Attachment; Questionnaire Questions*

1. To what degree were you part of the design charette?

2. If you were not specifically on the design charette team, to what degree do you believe your ideas were heard and influenced decisions about the building design?

3. To what degree were you part of the visioning process (e.g., *Nurturing All Student Voices; pahu*)?

4. To what degree do you believe the vision is present in our buildings, program, and curriculum at KMS?

5. To what degree do you implement the vision in your daily work as a teacher?

6. To what degree do you believe Hawaiian ways of knowing and doing is present in our buildings, program, and curriculum at KMS?

7. To what degree do you feel you implement Hawaiian ways of knowing and doing in your daily work as a teacher?

8. To what degree do you believe 21st century ways of learning and doing is present in our buildings, program, and curriculum at KMS?

9. To what degree do you feel you implement 21st century ways of learning and doing in your daily work as a teacher?

10. To what degree do you believe middle school promising practice (e.g., *This We Believe; Turning Points*) is present in our buildings, program, and curriculum at KMS?

11. To what degree do you feel you implement middle school promising practice (e.g., *This We Believe; Turning Points*) in your daily work as a teacher?

*Using Questionnaire Monkey on line questionnaire tool: will have a “N/A-low-mid-high” Likert scale beneath each question.*
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Section V. Attachment; Focus Group Questions

1. How were your ideas implemented in the design-build charrette process?

2. What does that specifically look like in your teaching space now that the building is opened?

3. How are your ideas implemented in the KMS program design?

4. How are your ideas implemented in the KMS curriculum design?

5. Describe how you implement Hawaiian ways of knowing and doing in your teaching and in your learning space?

6. Describe how you implement 21st century knowing and doing in your teaching and in your learning space?

7. Describe how you implement the KMS vision (e.g., Nurturing All Student Voices; pahu) in your teaching and in your learning space?

8. Describe how you implement middle school promising practices (e.g., This We Believe; Turning Points) in your teaching and in your learning space?
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Shared Vision for Learning: *Nurturing All Learner Voices*

- Hawaiian Culture and Language
- 21st Century Learner Attributes
- Middle School Promising Practices
Appendix E: 16 Characteristics of Successful Schools for Young Adolescents

This We Believe
Keys to Educating Young Adolescents

16 Characteristics

- Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment
  - Educate young adolescents and prepare to teach them.
  - Value students as they are engaged in active, purposeful learning.
  - Assessing learning
  - Challenging: Curriculum is challenging, exploratory, integrative, and relevant.
  - Multiple learning and teaching approaches.
  - Varied and ongoing assessments advocate learning as well as measure it.

- Essential Attributes
  - Developmentally Responsive: Using the nature of young adolescents as the foundation on which all decisions are made.
  - Challenging: Knowing that every student can learn and can achieve at high expectations.
  - Empowering: Providing students with the knowledge and skills they need to take control of their lives.
  - Equitable: Advocating for every student's right to learn and providing challenging and relevant learning opportunities.
  - Leadership and Organization
    - A shared vision developed by all stakeholders guides every decision.
    - Leadership
      - Leaders commit to and become advocates about this age group.
      - Leaders demonstrate courage and collaborate with colleagues.
      - Ongoing professional development reflects best educational practices.
      - Organizational structures foster purposeful learning and meaningful relationships.
  - Culture and Community
    - The school environment is inviting, safe, inclusive, and supportive of all.
    - Every student's academic and personal development is guided by an adult advocate.
    - Comprehensive guidance and support services meet the needs of young adolescents.
    - Health and wellness are supported in curricula, school-wide programs, and related policies.
    - The school actively involves families in the education of their children, links, and support.

This chart is based on "This We Believe: Keys to Educating Young Adolescents (AMLE/NASA, 2003). For more information visit us, www.amle.org."
Appendix F: Middle School Vision

Kamehameha Schools Kapālama Middle School
Vision

A pahu represents, and is a reflection of, excellence.
As is with each child,
The hidden part of the pahu is a resonating chamber, defining the quality of the voice.
As is true with each child,
What you start with has imperfections, wounds…things brought from the environment.
So true of each child,
Lashing the pahu helps define the voice. Once lashed, there is continuous adjustment to transform the voice with subsequent new resonance.
…and so must we with each child.
KMS MISSION
We shape character, performance, and values to help our students find their unique and individual voices to succeed at Kamehameha and contribute to their communities.

KMS GOAL
Our goal is to bring out personal excellence in each of our students.

KMS VISION
When students journey from Kamehameha Kapālama Middle School, their inner voices have been nurtured and are now more resilient, recognized and appreciated for their own strength and quality.

All children we work with are in different spaces in their lives. Some will sing and sound as they leave, some will only manage the first whisper of their greatness.

None will leave voiceless or untouched. Until they can sing and sound on their own, someone will be there to support them.

METAPHOR
A pahu represents, and is a reflection of, excellence.
*As this is with each child,*

The hidden part of the pahu is a resonating chamber, defining the quality of the voice.
*As is true with each child,*

What you start with has imperfections, wounds...things brought from the environment.
*So true of each child,*

Lashing the pahu helps define the voice. Once lashed, there is continuous adjustment to transform the voice with subsequent new resonance.
*...and so must we with each child.*

*Draft 8/12/08;KMS*
### Appendix G: Timeline for Design of Building and New Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>Events</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>New Leadership</td>
<td>Change and new direction for middle school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building Charette</td>
<td>Teacher and Staff ownership of the design of the facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:1 Roll Out</td>
<td>Middle school is selected to begin the transition of the tri-campus system to a 1:1 delivery for instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Myers-Briggs (MBTI) assessment</td>
<td>Foundational baseline of types and temperaments of faculty and staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Creating middle school vision and agreements, roles and responsibilities in May of 2008.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>Charette Revisions</td>
<td>Final decisions on design of building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MBTI</td>
<td>Whole staff/faculty activities to understand of the types and temperaments in the middle school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Any new faculty and staff do foundational assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Whole group focus training on conflict resolution and feedback loops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>MBTI</td>
<td>Team leaders’ types in relation to their team make up; strategies for working as teams in light of this information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Whole group training in change curve implications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Any new faculty and staff do foundational assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>Economic downturn causes hold on project</td>
<td>All creative work to design building, and the excitement in gearing up for the move now on hold for almost one full school year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>1st year in Temporary Facility</td>
<td>April 2010 teachers and staff move into temporary facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summer of 2011 to include FF&amp;E (fixture, furniture, and equipment) charette.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBTI</td>
<td>Transition Team established</td>
<td>Specific work with administrative leadership team; leadership types in relation to other middle school leaders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Any new faculty and staff do foundational assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>Transition Team Lead met with the principal regularly on an as needed basis for decision making and information flow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>Action Research</td>
<td>Team of fifteen teachers and administrators spend one week in a school in Arizona carrying out an action research project designed to gain understanding of wall-less learning environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>2nd year in Temporary Facility</td>
<td>Settled in and then moved out in May of 2012. Temporary facilities donated to various community charter schools in June of 2012.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBTI</td>
<td>Summer additional days of work for moving in teachers needed to be bargained for with union and management. Complex construction site with move of temporary and install/opening of new facility. Focus on vision to include tangible work by all teams of creating pahu, drums, which metaphorically stand for our vision of <em>Nurturing All Learner Voices.</em> Specific work with team leaders; leadership types in relation to their respective teams. Any new faculty and staff do foundational assessment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition Team</td>
<td>Teacher team continues to work at the ground level with teachers to insure the needs and concerns are addressed by the administration.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013 Move into new facility</td>
<td>Additional days for teachers to move in and adjust to wall-less set up. Specific work with administrative and team leaders to understand the leadership culture of the middle school. Team pahu are completed. Chant written for the opening of the new building. Students learn chant. All these activities served the purpose of embedding the vision into the physical, cultural, as well as affective aspects of our program. Any new faculty and staff do foundational assessment. Work commences on creating residential vision, agreement, roles and responsibilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential program transferred to middle school</td>
<td>Decisions are made by the residential and middle school staff through this work that an administrative lead and clerical support will be necessary for the transition to occur smoothly.</td>
<td>No construction project manager as with school buildings. School administrator fills that void as needed. Residential administrator hired in spring of 2013.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitors to facility</td>
<td>Indigenous educators from around the world visit to see how we have created a space for indigenous learning in a 21st century context. Visitors come from Dutch Guyana, Ecuador, New Zealand, China.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>MBTI Middle School Residential program</td>
<td>Revisions of the leadership philosophy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transition Team ends and the Hui Kāko’o is created</td>
<td>Residential administration and support staff are hired and in place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visitors to facility</td>
<td>Indigenous educators from around the world visit to see how we have created a space for indigenous learning in a 21st century context. Visitors come from New Zealand, China, American Indian tribes including the Muckleshoot and the Navajo, and Indonesia.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H: Working Exit Outcomes (WEO)

Working Exit Outcomes Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ke Ao Lani, Ke Ao Honua</th>
<th>Ke Ao Ho'oiulu</th>
<th>Ke Ao Pilina</th>
<th>Ke Ao <code>Imi Na</code>auao</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Global</strong></td>
<td><strong>Growth</strong></td>
<td><strong>Relationships</strong></td>
<td><strong>Knowledge and Wisdom</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Kū i ke ao – Be of the world.</strong> To be like the world in which one lives. Live in interdependence with all that surrounds me physically, spiritually, emotionally, and intellectually.</td>
<td><strong>A. He Hawai'i au mau a mau – I am a Hawaiian now and forever. Embrace my identity as a Hawaiian.</strong></td>
<td><strong>A. Hīlina'i i Ke Akua – Trust in God. Live a life reflective of Christian values.</strong></td>
<td><strong>A. Nānā i ke Kumu – Look to the Source. Utilize various sources, i.e., kūpuna, kumu, loea, mo'olelo, wahi pana, mo`omeheu to foster inquiry and seek knowledge.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. E ho<code>ōki i ka ho</code>ina wale o ho<code>ono </code>ia mai ke kumu – One should never go home without some knowledge lest his teacher be criticized. Embrace the collective experience in Hawaii and the Pacific as a foundation for relating to the diversity of the world.</strong></td>
<td><strong>B. E lawe i ke a<code>o a mālama, a e </code>oi mau ka na`auao - He who takes his teachings and applies them increases his knowledge. Grow by identifying strengths and needs and pursuing appropriate actions.</strong></td>
<td><strong>B. ‘Ike nō i ka lā o ka `ike; mana nō i ka lā o ka mana - Know in the day of knowing; mana in the day of mana. Adapt successfully to various kulana.</strong></td>
<td><strong>B. Ua lehulehu a manomano ka <code>ikena a ka Hawai</code>i – Great and numerous is the knowledge of the Hawaiians. We create, share and apply knowledge in purposeful and relevant ways. Engage in critical thinking to apply traditional knowledge to my contemporary context.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Ka `ike a ka makua he nei na ke keiki – The knowledge of the parent is [unconsciously] absorbed by the child. Nurture and value my identity as a source of understanding, purpose, meaning, and connection to others.</strong></td>
<td><strong>C. La<code>we i ka ma</code>alea a kū<code>ono</code>ono – Take wisdom and make it deep. Transform my knowledge through the blending of imagination, intuition and intellect.</strong></td>
<td><strong>C. La<code>we i ka ma</code>alea a kū<code>ono</code>ono – Take wisdom and make it deep. Transform my knowledge through the blending of imagination, intuition and intellect.</strong></td>
<td><strong>C. He aupuni palapala ko<code>u; </code>o ke kanaka pono <code>o ia ko</code>u kanaka – Mine is the kingdom of education the righteous man is my man. Seek and apply knowledge ethically.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. Mōhala i ka wai ka maka o ka pua – Untold by the water are the faces of the flower. Promote and utilize Hawaiian perspectives and practices to enhance my well-being and the well-being of my `ohana, kaiaulu, lāhui, and world.</strong></td>
<td><strong>D. Naʻenaʻena – Look to the Source. Utilize various sources, i.e., kūpuna, kumu, loea, mo<code>olelo, wahi pana, mo</code>omeheu to foster inquiry and seek knowledge.</strong></td>
<td><strong>D. Naʻenaʻena – Look to the Source. Utilize various sources, i.e., kūpuna, kumu, loea, mo<code>olelo, wahi pana, mo</code>omeheu to foster inquiry and seek knowledge.</strong></td>
<td><strong>D. Naʻenaʻena – Look to the Source. Utilize various sources, i.e., kūpuna, kumu, loea, mo<code>olelo, wahi pana, mo</code>omeheu to foster inquiry and seek knowledge.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hawaiian Glossary:
- `i`i / `ai`i – community
- kūlana – role and status
- kumu - teacher
- kūpuna – ancestors and elders
- wahi pana – storied and historical places
- lāhui – nation
- loea – experts
- mo`olelo - story and history
- mo`omeheu – traditions
- `ohana – both nuclear and extended family

Updated April 14, 2010
Appendix I: Focus Group Invitation

An INVITATION to Share Your Manaʻo

Aloha Kākou,

As you know there are many of us who are in the process (or who have completed the process) of researching issues of practice at Kamehameha. Part of this research is to explore key questions related to our school and our programs. To gather this information in this process we need to ask the people in the programs we are studying. The feedback that people provide through questionnaires, focus groups, and other means of gathering information help to inform our practice, our programs, and the work of others on our campus and beyond our campus.

I am writing to ask you to share your reflection upon the work we have done thinking about, designing, building, and re-visioning our new facility, its programs, and the curriculum. As a doctoral student at the University of Hawaii at Mānoa I am researching our work employing a shared vision of designing our buildings, program, and curriculum design in a wall-less learning environment.

I am specifically interested in how involvement in the design process has influenced your engagement in your work and the work you do with others, as well as if your engagement in this process has enhanced collaboration within and amongst teams.

KMS alakaʻi participated in a campus-wide educational planning process this past spring where collaboration was determined by them to be an area of focus for our new facility and program design in the next steps we take together as a middle school. You may recall the voluntary questionnaire I asked you to complete at the end of last school year. That questionnaire helped me to get a general idea of the engagement in a client-designed building, program and curriculum.

The second phase of this reflection on our process includes voluntary focus groups. We have a very unique facility and very innovative and creative teachers—my goal is to share our experience with others on our campus and in schools beyond our campus.

The focus groups will be completely voluntary. I have received approval from the University of Hawaii at Mānoa Institutional Review Board (IRB) as well as the Kamehameha Schools Research and Evaluation Group to conduct these voluntary focus groups. One of the things I have learned to avoid bias is to have someone outside of the process to facilitate the groups. Thus, I have chosen to have someone outside of Kamehameha who is a graduate student facilitate these groups for me. I will not be present at the Focus Group sessions. A KMS faculty member will host the session, which means they will introduce the facilitator to the group and make sure the room is secured. All manaʻo will be collected anonymously. There are no sign in sheets or recording of who attends. I am asking only for the number of folks who attend each session. Your names will not be used in this research. No audio or video recording will be used.
Charting of the focus group responses by the facilitator will be the method of data collection for these group reflections. The kinds of questions I will be asking you to respond to are listed at the end of this invitation.

I have set aside the following dates/times for these focus groups and deeply appreciate that you will consider giving me an hour of your valuable time to share your mana’o to inform this research.

- **8/27**— Hui Alaka’i (teacher leaders) Focus Group reflection discussion; 330-430 p.m.; voluntary  
  **Hosted by xxxxxxx**
- **8/28**— Focus Group reflection discussion; 330-430 p.m.; voluntary; open to all teachers  
  **Hosted by xxxxxxx**
- **8/29**— Focus Group reflection discussion; 330-430 p.m.; voluntary; open to all teachers  
  **Hosted by xxxxxxx**

I will be setting aside the first session for Hui Alaka’i. That session will be formatted the same, but will focus on the leadership group and the work they have done together. All other Teachers may choose from either of the two subsequent sessions listed above. Mahalo to the three teachers who have agreed to help me by accepting the “Hostess” role to be present to introduce the facilitator to the group and insure the building is secured for leaving when the focus group is done.

As I complete my drafts of this research going forward I will post them on the Ning for all. I welcome any and all feedback to any draft you read. Additionally, I will share findings at wikiPD at the end of the year. I am open to your thoughts and ideas about this process and always welcome your feedback. Mahalo in advance for your willingness to help us reflect upon the good work we have done together that has brought us to the forefront of innovative teaching and learning.

Respectfully and with thanks,
Pua

**Focus Group Questions:**
- In what ways do you collaborate in the **program design** process of the new facility? (schedule, procedures, agreements, etc.)
- In what ways do you collaborate in the **curriculum design** process in the new facility now (individual, team, floor, content, organically and planned)?
- Describe some of the ways you collaborate with your peers to implement **Hawaiian language and culture** in your teaching and in your learning space?
- Describe some of the ways you collaborate with your peers to implement **21st century learning practices** in your teaching and in your learning space?
- Describe some of the ways you collaborate with your peers to implement the **KMS vision (Nurturing All Student Voices)** in your teaching and in your learning space?
- Describe some of the ways you collaborate with your peers to implement **middle school promising practices** in your teaching and in your learning space?
Is there *anything else you would like to share* about your collaboration with others in the new middle school facility?

*Mahalo for considering participation in this focus group opportunity!*  
8.16.13
Appendix J: Focus Group Consent Form

University of Hawaii Consent to Participate in Research Project: Efficacy of Shared Design on Teacher Collaboration

My name is Pua Ka‘ai and I am a graduate student at the University of Hawaii at Mānoa (UH), in the College of Education’s Department of Educational Foundations. I am being assisted today with facilitation support by Lynn Mochizuki who is also a graduate student at the University of Hawaii at Mānoa (UH), in the College of Education’s Department of Educational Foundations. As part of the requirements for the graduate degree, I am doing research for a doctoral degree. The purpose of this project is to conduct a multiple case study to explore how the involvement in the design process of the building, program and curriculum has influenced your engagement in your work and the work you do with others, as well as if your engagement in these processes has enhanced collaboration within and amongst teams. The methodology includes general questionnaireing of the entire faculty to establish what the level of engagement in this process might be. The focus groups will serve the purpose of allowing teachers to voluntarily speak more deeply about their engagement, but more importantly focus on the specific area of collaboration with others. The goal of this research is to reflect upon the work that has been done in the wall-less learning environment, to inform your current practice and revisions to program and curriculum, and to help others doing similar work here at Kamehameha and beyond our campus. I am asking you to participate in this focus group because you are teacher leaders at the school and someone who can provide valuable feedback for this study.

Project Description—Activities and Time Commitment: If you participate, the facilitator will conduct a focus group at your school site. The focus group will last about one hour and consist of seven open-ended questions. An example question is, “In what ways do you collaborate in the curriculum design process in the new facility now (individual, team, floor, content, organically and planned)?” A preview of all seven questions will be sent to you through the US mail service prior to the focus group.

Benefits and Risks: I do not anticipate any risk or harm to you in participating in this research project. The results of the project will help to determine how to continue to optimize the use of the learning environment by teachers and teams. If, however, you are uncomfortable or stressed by any of the focus group questions, we will skip the question, take a break, or stop the focus group. At anytime you are welcome to withdraw from the process altogether with no penalty.

Confidentiality and Privacy: During this research project, all identities will remain anonymous by not including names at all. I will store all data from the interviews in a locked and secure location. The facilitator will store all signed consent forms in a locked and secure location for the duration of the research and will destroy the signed forms when the research is completed.

Only I will have access to the focus group data (charts), although legally authorized agencies, including the University of Hawaii Committee on Human Studies, have the
right to review the research records. The research records will not contain any names of personal identifiable information.

When I report the results of this research, all identities will remain anonymous. Instead I will use the term(s) “teacher(s)” and “team(s).” If you would like a summary of the findings from the final report, please contact me at the number listed at the end of this form.

**Voluntary Participation:** Participation in this focus group research is voluntary. You can choose freely to participate or not participate. In addition, at any point during this project, you can withdraw your permission without any penalty.

**Questions:** If you have any questions about this project, you can contact my advisor at the University of Hawaii at Mānoa Dr. Nathan Murata, at nmurata@hawaii.edu. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, in this project, you can contact the University of Hawaii, Committee on Human Studies (CHS), by phone at (808) 956-5007 or by email at uhirb@hawaii.edu.

*Please keep the prior portion of this consent form for your records.*

If you agree to participate in this focus group, please sign the following signature portion of this form and give to the focus group facilitator.

**The facilitator will secure the consent forms in a locked location for the duration of the research. Upon completion of the research study in July of 2014, the facilitator will destroy all consent forms.**

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Tear or cut on the line above.*

**Signature for Consent:**

I agree to participate in the research project entitled, *Efficacy of Shared Design on Teacher Collaboration.* I understand that I can change my mind about participating in this project, at any time, by notifying the researcher.

**Your Name (Print):**

**Your Signature:**

**Date:**

*Efficacy of Shared Design on Teacher Collaboration, Fall/Spring 2013-2014*
Appendix K: Focus Group Protocol

EFFICACY OF SHARED DESIGN ON TEACHER COLLABORATION

INTRODUCTION
Good afternoon! I am a facilitator for the focus group of teacher leaders/teachers. My name is Lynn Mochizuki and I am a graduate student at the University of Hawaii at Mānoa. I am here to facilitate a discussion about how shared design of a building, programs, and curriculum impacts teacher collaboration.

Thank you for consenting to participate in this research study; if you have not yet completed a consent form, I can give you a few minutes to do that now. The consent forms will be kept by me (facilitator) in a locked and secure location for the duration of the research and will be destroyed upon completion of the research in July of 2014.

In the next hour we will be asking you seven questions. This is a voluntary activity and your answers are confidential. Your responses will be recorded in front of the group on chart paper as we progress through the discussion.

If, at any time, you need to take a break, please feel free to do so. Also, at any time you do not want to answer a question or wish to withdraw from participation, please feel free to leave or refrain from answering the question.

Please be as honest and truthful as possible, remembering again that this is confidential and your answers are completely anonymous.

Thank you for your participation in this study. Are there any questions before we begin?

QUESTION LIST
1. In what ways do you collaborate in the program design process of the new facility? (schedule, procedures, agreements, etc.)

2. In what ways do you collaborate in the curriculum design process in the new facility now (individual, team, floor, content, organically and planned)?

3. Describe some of the ways you collaborate with your peers to implement Hawaiian language and culture in your teaching and in your learning space?

4. Describe some of the ways you collaborate with your peers to implement 21st century learning practices in your teaching and in your learning space?

5. Describe some of the ways you collaborate with your peers to implement the KMS vision (Nurturing All Student Voices) in your teaching and in your learning space?
6. Describe some of the ways you collaborate with your peers to implement middle school promising practices in your teaching and in your learning space?
7. Is there anything else you would like to share about your collaboration with others in the new middle school facility?

Efficacy of Shared Design on Teacher Collaboration, Fall/Spring 2013-2014
Appendix L: Instructional Rounds Protocol

Instructional Round Visit—Pahu as vision; Nurturing All Student Voices

8/20/13
KMS Kapālama

Overall Theory of Action:

Growth Driver: Cultivate Committed Communities of Practice (Learning Teams)
Internal Drivers: Continuous Curriculum Renewal
Value Proposition: Create a learning Community that Sustains Collaboration between and amongst teachers to enhance student success.

KMS Problem of Practice:
How is the shared vision (Nurturing All Student Voices) evidenced in the middle school buildings, programs, and curriculum?

KMS Theory of Action:
If the shared vision (Nurturing All Student Voices) is present in our building, programs, and curriculum, there will be a high level of teacher engagement and collaboration.

- Pahu will be visible and integrated into the team areas and curriculum
- Multiple perspectives related to the vision of Nurturing All Student Voices are integral to the lessons being taught
- Data points (MAP, teacher assessments, common assessments) will inform the curriculum renewal process around Nurturing All Student Voices
- Danielson framework will inform the level of engagement and collaboration toward the vision of Nurturing All Student Voices.

Alignment with KMS TOA:
- When teachers are engaged and collaborate around the vision of Nurturing All Student Voices, curriculum continuity, instruction, and assessment have clarity.
- When physical space design, program and curriculum are dynamic and are centered on our vision of Nurturing All Student Voices, the discussions curriculum revision and renewal follows.

Rationale:
The process of creating a new middle school facility was carried out by the KMS faculty and staff, and was guided by the shared vision of Nurturing All Student Voices. This vision statement was created through the appreciative inquiry process with our whole faculty and staff throughout the 2008-2009 school year, culminating in the adoption of the vision in fall of 2009. The building charette began in fall of 2007 and continued through the 2008-2009 school years. The design of the buildings was informed by the collaborative work on the vision that was occurring simultaneously. Teachers and staff collaborated on a design that would best meet the needs of our demography and our school mission while aligning with the KMS vision of Nurturing All Student Voices. Throughout the charette process, teachers and staff researched and worked with consultants to better understand the open learning environment. Throughout both the
charette and building process, teachers and staff visited other wall-less learning environments in Hawaii and on the continent to see how such an environment would engage students. The design choice was consistent with cultural practice of interdependent living and learning. The design of choice, a wall-less and door-less learning space, brings with it the need to pay attention to the engagement and collaboration by teachers (for students) in this interactive, active learning environment.

KS is engaged in a institution-wide workforce capacity building project to recruit, retain, and reward educational professionals. We are at present in year four of the pilot/field test. A component of that initiative is the implementation of the Charlotte Danielson teacher evaluation process. Our KMS teachers have been observed using Danielson’s framework for observation for the past four years. At present all teachers are in the field test. This year we are focusing both our goal setting and our observations on the eight high leverage components in the framework.

*How is the shared vision (pahu; Nurturing All Student Voices) evidenced in the middle school buildings, programs, and curriculum?*

**SCHEDULE**

A=Talking to students  
B=Evidence of student work and curricular materials. (Domains 1 and 2)  
C=Classroom environment and instructional practice. (Domains 3 and 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>830-900</th>
<th>Briefing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9-945</td>
<td>Xxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A=Cynthia B=Tiara C=Brad Pua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>945-1030</td>
<td>Xxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A=Tiara B=Brad C=Cynthia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1030-1130</td>
<td>Debrief in Pua’s Office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall Theory of Action:

Growth Driver: Cultivate Committed Communities of Practice (Learning Teams)

Internal Drivers: Continuous Curriculum Renewal

Value Proposition: Create a learning Community that Sustains Collaboration between and amongst teachers to enhance student success.

KMS Problem of Practice:

How are Middle School Promising Practices evidenced in the middle school buildings, programs, and curriculum?

KMS Theory of Action:

If Middle School Promising Practices are present in our building, programs, and curriculum, there will be a high level of teacher engagement and collaboration.

- Middle School Promising Practices will be visible and integrated into the team areas and curriculum
- Multiple perspectives related to the Middle School Promising Practices are integral to the lessons being taught
- Data points (MAP, teacher assessments, common assessments) will inform the curriculum renewal process around Middle School Promising Practices.
- Danielson framework will inform the level of engagement and collaboration toward Middle School Promising Practices

Alignment with KMS TOA:

- When teachers are engaged and collaborate around Middle School Promising Practices, curriculum continuity, instruction, and assessment have clarity.
- When physical space design, program and curriculum are dynamic and are centered on our Middle School Promising Practices, the discussions curriculum revision and renewal follows.

Rationale:

The process of creating a new middle school facility was carried out by the KMS faculty and staff, and was guided by Middle School Promising Practices. A vision statement was created through the appreciative inquiry process with our whole faculty and staff throughout the 2008-2009 school year, culminating in the adoption of the vision in fall of 2009. The building charrette began in fall of 2007 and continued through the 2008-2009 school years. The design of the buildings was informed by the collaborative work on the vision that was occurring simultaneously. Teachers and staff collaborated on a design that would best meet the needs of our demography and our school mission while aligning with the KMS vision of Nurturing All Student Voices. A triangulation of Hawaiian epistemology, 21st century learning, middle school promising practices served to guide and inform all discussions throughout the design-build process, throughout program design, and throughout curriculum design. To date, this triangulation still serves as the
base for all design, program, and curriculum. During the charrette process, teachers and staff researched and worked with consultants to better understand the open learning environment. Throughout both the charrette and building process, teachers and staff visited other wall-less learning environments in Hawaii and on the continent to see how such an environment would engage students. The design choice was consistent with cultural practice of interdependent living and learning. The design of choice, a wall-less and door-less learning space, brings with it the need to pay attention to the engagement and collaboration by teachers (for students) in this interactive, active learning environment.

KS is engaged in an institution-wide workforce capacity building project to recruit, retain, and reward educational professionals. We are at present in year four of the pilot/field test. A component of that initiative is the implementation of the Charlotte Danielson teacher evaluation process. Our KMS teachers have been observed using Danielson’s framework for observation for the past four years. At present all teachers are in the field test. This year we are focusing both our goal setting and our observations on the eight high leverage components in the framework.

*How are Middle School Promising Practices evidenced in the middle school buildings, programs, and curriculum?*

**SCHEDULE**

A=Talking to students
B= Evidence of student work and curricular materials. (Domains 1 and 2)
C= Classroom environment and instructional practice. (Domains 3 and 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>830-900</th>
<th>Briefing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9-945</td>
<td>Xxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A=Dee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B=Lynn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C=Pua</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pua</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>945-1030</td>
<td>Xxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A=Lynn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B=Pua</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C=Dee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1030-1130</td>
<td>Debrief in Pua’s Office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instructional Round Visit—Hawaiian ways of knowing, doing, and being
9/25/13
KMS Kapālama

Overall Theory of Action:

_Growth Driver:_ Cultivate Committed Communities of Practice (Learning Teams)

_Internal Drivers:_ Continuous Curriculum Renewal

_Value Proposition:_ Create a learning Community that Sustains Collaboration between and amongst teachers to enhance student success.

KMS Problem of Practice:
How is the _Hawaiian ways of knowing, doing, and being_ evidenced in the middle school buildings, programs, and curriculum?

KMS Theory of Action:
If the _Hawaiian ways of knowing, doing, and being_ is present in our building, programs, and curriculum, there will be a high level of teacher engagement and collaboration.

- _Hawaiian ways of knowing, doing, and being_ will be visible and integrated into the team areas and curriculum
- Multiple perspectives related to the _Hawaiian ways of knowing, doing, and being_ are integral to the lessons being taught
- Data points (MAP, teacher assessments, common assessments) will inform the curriculum renewal process around _Hawaiian ways of knowing, doing, and being_
- Danielson framework will inform the level of engagement and collaboration toward _Hawaiian ways of knowing, doing, and being_.

**Alignment with KMS TOA:**

- When teachers are engaged and collaborate around the _Hawaiian ways of knowing, doing, and being_, curriculum continuity, instruction, and assessment have clarity.
- When physical space design, program and curriculum are dynamic and are centered on our _Hawaiian ways of knowing, doing, and being_, the discussions curriculum revision and renewal follows.

**Rationale:**
The process of creating a new middle school facility was carried out by the KMS faculty and staff, and was guided by _Hawaiian ways of knowing, doing, and being_. A vision statement was created through the appreciative inquiry process with our whole faculty and staff throughout the 2008-2009 school year, culminating in the adoption of the vision in fall of 2009. The building charette began in fall of 2007 and continued through the 2008-2009 school years. The design of the buildings was informed by the collaborative work on the vision that was occurring simultaneously. Teachers and staff collaborated on a design that would best meet the needs of our demography and our school mission while aligning with the KMS vision of _Nurturing All Student Voices_. A triangulation of Hawaiian epistemology, 21st century learning, middle school promising practices served
to guide and inform all discussions throughout the design-build process, throughout program design, and throughout curriculum design. To date, this triangulation still serves as the base for all design, program, and curriculum. During the charrette process, teachers and staff researched and worked with consultants to better understand the open learning environment. Throughout both the charrette and building process, teachers and staff visited other wall-less learning environments in Hawaii and on the continent to see how such an environment would engage students. The design choice was consistent with cultural practice of interdependent living and learning. The design choice, a wall-less and door-less learning space, brings with it the need to pay attention to the engagement and collaboration by teachers (for students) in this interactive, active learning environment.

KS is engaged in an institution-wide workforce capacity building project to recruit, retain, and reward educational professionals. We are at present in year four of the pilot/field test. A component of that initiative is the implementation of the Charlotte Danielson teacher evaluation process. Our KMS teachers have been observed using Danielson’s framework for observation for the past four years. At present all teachers are in the field test. This year we are focusing both our goal setting and our observations on the eight high leverage components in the framework.

_How is the Hawaiian ways of knowing, doing, and being evidenced in the middle school buildings, programs, and curriculum?_

**SCHEDULE**

A=Talking to students  
B=Evidence of student work and curricular materials. (Domains 1 and 2)  
C=Classroom environment and instructional practice. (Domains 3 and 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>830-900</td>
<td>Briefing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-945</td>
<td>Xxxx</td>
<td>Xxxx</td>
<td>Xxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A=Kaipo, Pua</td>
<td>B=Lanakila</td>
<td>C=Noe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pua</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>945-1030</td>
<td>Xxxx</td>
<td>Xxxx</td>
<td>Xxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A=Lanakila</td>
<td>B=Noe</td>
<td>C=Kaipo, Pua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1030-1130</td>
<td>Debrief in Pua’s Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instructional Round Visit—21st Century Learning
10/22/13
KMS Kapālama

Overall Theory of Action:
Growth Driver: Cultivate Committed Communities of Practice (Learning Teams)
Internal Drivers: Continuous Curriculum Renewal
Value Proposition: Create a learning Community that Sustains Collaboration between and amongst teachers to enhance student success.

KMS Problem of Practice:
How are 21st Century Learning Practices evidenced in the middle school buildings, programs, and curriculum?

KMS Theory of Action:
If 21st Century Learning Practices are present in our building, programs, and curriculum, there will be a high level of teacher engagement and collaboration.
- 21st Century Learning Practices will be visible and integrated into the team areas and curriculum
- Multiple perspectives related to the 21st Century Learning Practices are integral to the lessons being taught
- Data points (MAP, teacher assessments, common assessments) will inform the curriculum renewal process around 21st Century Learning Practices.
- Danielson framework will inform the level of engagement and collaboration toward 21st Century Learning Practices

Alignment with KMS TOA:
- When teachers are engaged and collaborate around 21st Century Learning Practices, curriculum continuity, instruction, and assessment have clarity.
- When physical space design, program and curriculum are dynamic and are centered on our 21st Century Learning Practices, the discussions curriculum revision and renewal follows.

Rationale:
The process of creating a new middle school facility was carried out by the KMS faculty and staff, and was guided by 21st Century Learning Practices. A vision statement was created through the appreciative inquiry process with our whole faculty and staff throughout the 2008-2009 school year, culminating in the adoption of the vision in fall of 2009. The building charrette began in fall of 2007 and continued through the 2008-2009 school years. The design of the buildings was informed by the collaborative work on the vision that was occurring simultaneously. Teachers and staff collaborated on a design that would best meet the needs of our demography and our school mission while aligning with the KMS vision of Nurturing All Student Voices. A triangulation of Hawaiian epistemology, 21st century learning, middle school promising practices served to guide and inform all discussions throughout the design-build process, throughout program
design, and throughout curriculum design. To date, this triangulation still serves as the base for all design, program, and curriculum. During the charrette process, teachers and staff researched and worked with consultants to better understand the open learning environment. Throughout both the charrette and building process, teachers and staff visited other wall-less learning environments in Hawaii and on the continent to see how such an environment would engage students. The design choice was consistent with cultural practice of interdependent living and learning. The design of choice, a wall-less and door-less learning space, brings with it the need to pay attention to the engagement and collaboration by teachers (for students) in this interactive, active learning environment.

KS is engaged in an institution-wide workforce capacity building project to recruit, retain, and reward educational professionals. We are at present in year four of the pilot/field test. A component of that initiative is the implementation of the Charlotte Danielson teacher evaluation process. Our KMS teachers have been observed using Danielson’s framework for observation for the past four years. At present all teachers are in the field test. This year we are focusing both our goal setting and our observations on the eight high leverage components in the framework.

**How are 21st Century Learning Practices evidenced in the middle school buildings, programs, and curriculum?**

**SCHEDULE**

A=Talking to students  
B=Evidence of student work and curricular materials. (Domains 1 and 2)  
C=Classroom environment and instructional practice. (Domains 3 and 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9-930</td>
<td>Briefing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 930-1000 | XXXXX  
A=Renee  
B=Brian  
C=Mark  
Pua |
|        | XXXXX  
Xxxx                                        |
| 10-1030 | XXXXX  
A=Brian  
B=Mark  
C=Renee  
Pua |
|        | XXXXX  
Xxxx                                        |
| 1030-1100 | Debrief in Pua’s Office                      |
## Appendix M: Leadership Engagement

### Hui Alaka'i Leadership Engagement Exercise

8/15/12

### 5 Affirmative Whys:

*Why is the new middle school a great new facility?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Why the new middle school is a great new facility</th>
<th>Why is the new middle school a great new facility</th>
<th>Why is the new middle school a great new facility</th>
<th>Why is the new middle school a great new facility</th>
<th>Why is the new middle school a great new facility</th>
<th>Why is the new middle school a great new facility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Because the individuals within it have dared to change how they do what they do, and stand for it.</td>
<td>Because there is a willingness to work very hard, spend numerous hours, and stick with it.</td>
<td>Because our teachers are proud and committed to their craft and want to do their best.</td>
<td>Because they want their students to do well and they want happy kids.</td>
<td>Because happy students who do well are a reflection of a teacher’s excellent work.</td>
<td>Sweet Spot!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much easier to communicate and collaborate with my team and other teams</td>
<td>No walls and closer proximity.</td>
<td>Building was designed this way.</td>
<td>A new way to meet the needs of a 21st century middle schooler.</td>
<td>It’s all about the kids!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teams/teachers have the ability to flex space/schedule/student groupings based on their needs daily.</td>
<td>Because of our open learning spaces and schedule.</td>
<td>Teachers who have expanded their thinking beyond what they know and are used to.</td>
<td>Teachers know there is so much more to offer our students and WE CAN make a difference.</td>
<td>We have leaders who dared and trusted us to expand our thinking.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open space lends to collaboration and community.</td>
<td>We see each other much more often.</td>
<td>We have a schedule that allows us to do all the things we wanted to offer our students.</td>
<td>We wanted to provide a rich middle school program that spoke to the whole child.</td>
<td>We are professional middle school educators who want to do the best for our students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We (faculty/staff) are within 5 minutes (or less) walking distance from each other :)</td>
<td>Good infrastructure/closer buildings/all in the same building.</td>
<td>Charette/building planning.</td>
<td>“Admin” included faculty/staff in charette process.</td>
<td>All members of KMS are valued as leaders and therefore their voices are/were included.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because the people in the building are working together to find a common goal.</td>
<td>Because everyone wants to succeed and work as a “team” to succeed.</td>
<td>We have a common vision of what we view as success.</td>
<td>Because we believe in the vision and will do what we need to (to change) to make the vision come true.</td>
<td>Because like our students, we are learning as educators and will become what we need to in order for our students to be successful.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For students visited to discuss academic probation there is a hope for improved performance in a new facility and a new school year.</td>
<td>Students are optimistic and they have learned from their experience and can/will improve.</td>
<td>Students know they can improve and have good ability.</td>
<td>Students are learning from choices and are positive about what they do and be.</td>
<td>Hope springs eternal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for greatness…improvement, new ways of doing things.</td>
<td>Open space</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Teamwork</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ability to collaborate.</td>
<td>No walls Flexible schedule</td>
<td>We designed the building and the curriculum.</td>
<td>It’s what’s best for middle school kids.</td>
<td>21st century learning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beautiful look and feeling of togetherness.</td>
<td>Purposeful design to cater to middle school philosophy.</td>
<td>Research shows the middle level education is important for young adolescents.</td>
<td>This is a different time in the lives of middle schoolers so we need to nurture their whole lives.</td>
<td>If a student is nurtured they will have a better chance to be good and industrious.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible spaces</td>
<td>It was designed that way</td>
<td>Teachers/teams wanted more autonomy</td>
<td>To do more project/challenge-based learning, to collaborate more, to be more consistent.</td>
<td>To do what’s best to serve our students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Its’ beautifully new and allows us to think in ways we could not have imagined.</td>
<td>We have flexible spaces which are leading to flexible mindsets.</td>
<td>No excuses for why we can’t do things.</td>
<td>Limitations have been removed.</td>
<td>We have freedom to imagine.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility for students to work in large groups and small groups.</td>
<td>Tables and chairs are easy to arrange in different formations with teacher collaboration.</td>
<td>Teachers are thinking “out of the box” collaboratively for the students.</td>
<td>“Out of the box” focused curriculum.</td>
<td>Students are focused on guiding towards creativity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix N: Teacher Questionnaire Table and Graph of Findings

### Learning Space Engagement Survey

Please select one answer in each row below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>n/a</th>
<th>low engagement</th>
<th>medium engagement</th>
<th>high engagement</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I am engaged as a teacher in this new learning</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To what degree were you part of the design charrette for the</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. If you were not specifically on the design charrette team, to</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To what degree were you part of the deliberation process</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To what degree do you believe the vision is present in our</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. To what degree do you implement the vision in your daily</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. To what degree do you believe Hawaiian ways of knowing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. To what degree do you feel you implement Hawaiian ways</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. To what degree do you believe 21st century ways of</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. To what degree do you feel you implement 21st century</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. To what degree do you believe middle school promising</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. To what degree do you feel you implement middle school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Graph of Findings

The graph shows the distribution of responses for each question in the survey. The colors represent the level of engagement: red for high, purple for medium, blue for low, and orange for n/a.

- **High Engagement**: Represents the highest level of agreement or participation.
- **Medium Engagement**: Represents a moderate level of agreement or participation.
- **Low Engagement**: Represents a lower level of agreement or participation.
- **n/a**: Represents answers that were not applicable or not selected.

The data is visualized using a bar graph, which includes categories such as "Believe the vision is present in our," "Implement the vision in your daily," and "Believe Hawaiian ways of knowing," among others, all of which can be seen in the detailed graph representation.
Appendix O: Focus Group Transcriptions

Focus Group #1
# of participants=2
8.27.13

Q1
In what ways do you collaborate in the program design process in the new facility?
- skeleton schedule
  - Freedom to determine how to perform
- aware of schedule along the way
  - Allowed some feedback
  - Flexibility for possible changes if needed
- floor level agreements
- school-wide procedures document

Q2
In what ways do you collaborate in the curriculum design process in the new facility?
- more flexibility
- 100%-200% us—we designed it
- choosing 5-7
- Ka Ike Loa
  - EfS
- grading for learning
- PBLs
- CBLs

∞

Q3
Describe some of the ways you collaborate with your peers to implement Hawaiian language and culture in your teaching and in your learning space.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your Teaching</th>
<th>Learning Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- common greetings and requests</td>
<td>- way floor operates is very in line with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Hawaiian language teacher shadow</td>
<td>- the Hawaiian culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>each of us (make lessons more culturally relevant)</td>
<td>- display of team pahus and banners and WEOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- TRIBES agreements</td>
<td>- TRIBES agreements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q4
Describe some of the ways you collaborate with your peers to implement 21st century learning practices in your teaching and in your learning space.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your Teaching</th>
<th>Learning Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- teachers use tech tools to collaborate (Edmodo,</td>
<td>- use it with students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ning, Google docs, Questionnaire Monkey)</td>
<td>- space allows for critical thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- inventing and creating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- use of space is a learning tool</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q5
Describe some of the ways you collaborate with your peers to implement **KMS pahu vision of nurturing all student voices** in your teaching and in your learning space.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your Teaching</th>
<th>Learning Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| -every team does it differently, but they all do it well  
  - Grading for learning  
  - iMP program flexibility of getting to every child  
  -use MAP data  
  -KLT (formative assessment)  
  -team meetings-bringing up kids that need attention  
  -meeting with counselor  
  -allowing flexibility of how they demonstrate what they know  
  -flexible groupings | -spaces designed for flexible grouping |

Q6
Describe some of the ways you collaborate with your peers to implement **middle school promising practices** in your teaching and in your learning space.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your Teaching</th>
<th>Learning Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| -collaborate with advisory  
  -giving students choices (Explorer, elective, teams) (within core)  
  -teaming  
    see previous charts  
  -providing safe place for kids to understand about self so they can determine who they are | -group flexibility such that collaboration with kids can occur  
  see previous charts  
  -we need everyone to get on board so we can move us forward |
Q7

Anything else to share about collaboration with others in our facility

- line between teaching and learning space is blurred
  - because what and how we teach are very impacted by the learning space
- not 100% want to collaborate, but vast majority understand the value of it
- we were given the room to grow in our own way to find how we fit in
- It’s very hard sometimes
- It’s always hard and sometimes really hard
- But we keep coming back
- We need to get on the same page
- Shared leadership has helped us get to where we are, but we have so much farther to go
- see Q6
Focus Group #2  
# of participants=5  
8.28.13

Q1  
In what ways do you collaborate in the program design process in the new facility?  
- within teams  
- floor mtgs (rules)  
- combined mtg of 7th and 8th grade floor  
- not able to collaborate as a whole KMS faculty  
- communication disseminated to individuals through team leads  
- do not see how agreements and decisions reach  
- floor rules differ (8th graders come down to 7th grade floor but have different rules)  
  • Need for unified rules

Q2  
In what ways do you collaborate in the curriculum design process in the new facility?  
- within teams and content areas  
- collaborative exercises—continuity across content areas  
- collaborative assessment  
- teams have common themes  
- languages have common themes

Q3  
Describe some of the ways you collaborate with your peers to implement Hawaiian language and culture in your teaching and in your learning space.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your Teaching</th>
<th>Learning Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- WEOs</td>
<td>- olelo noeau posters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- sit down with peers</td>
<td>- Hawaiian value posters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- do it anyway in social studies</td>
<td>- many visual aids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Hawaiian values in all content areas</td>
<td>- we are a family so learning space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- advisory activities</td>
<td>- becomes an opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- colleagues very supportive</td>
<td>- all woven into the fabric of school</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q4  
Describe some of the ways you collaborate with your peers to implement 21st century learning practices in your teaching and in your learning space.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your Teaching</th>
<th>Learning Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- core teachers decide who will teach</td>
<td>- allows team to collaborate even more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>what (how to upload into Turnitin.com, etc.)</td>
<td>(can see and talk to each other face to face—same day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- unified voice</td>
<td>- Promethean boards (lap tops, tools)— interactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- able to rearrange space to cover for each other (no need for subs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- no one owns space—flexibility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q5
Describe some of the ways you collaborate with your peers to implement **KMS pahu vision of nurturing all student voices** in your teaching and in your learning space.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your Teaching</th>
<th>Learning Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-hands on stuff that is displayed</td>
<td>-all of students in one space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-students do presentations</td>
<td>-opportunities for movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-student selection (iNote, boards, Keynote)</td>
<td>-flexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-allows student to decide how they want to be assessed</td>
<td>-taken students out in mass (team bonding, formations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-extend learning space beyond building</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q6**

Describe some of the ways you collaborate with your peers to implement **middle school promising practices** in your teaching and in your learning space.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your Teaching</th>
<th>Learning Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-embrace and utilize TRIBES</td>
<td>-no anonymity so everyone can see everything</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-advisory</td>
<td>-able to get to know all kids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-collaborate with peers and within areas (so not as distracting for students)</td>
<td>-able to see all colleagues (not in separate buildings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-students with needs</td>
<td>-we are the village and take responsibility for all kids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-each teacher is an advocate so becomes a family floor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q7**

Anything else to share about collaboration with others in our facility

- whatever you are doing in your own lesson, you need to communicate and collaborate

- sometimes it works and sometimes it doesn’t

- need to work on collaboration between teams (doing well within teams)
- welcoming feeling and able to share

- need to be better between core and encore (communication, understanding, compassion about teaching load and responsibilities)

- have to have a positive attitude and be a team player

- need to be able to be flexible

- space allows for meetings when they need it (easy to meet quickly)

- depends on team leads on mtgs, flexing, collaboration
languages and electives and performing arts are physically separated so harder to collaborate

some team leads do not create a safe environment to express themselves
Focus Group #3
# of participants=3
8.29.13

Q1
In what ways do you collaborate in the program design process in the new facility?
- faculty input to design schedule and develop program elements
- important components felt needed for middle school students
- faculty input to team leader on agreements and procedures
- ability to contribute to 1:1 lap top program via Tech Task Force (agreements, software, etc.)
- floor collaboration (operation, use of space)
- team collaboration (operation as a team)
- Advisory committee-character ed program
- faculty asked consistently to give feedback
- faculty should be ready to receive feedback

Q2
In what ways do you collaborate in the curriculum design process in the new facility?
- Ka Ike Loa
- resource teachers help with curriculum (resources, technology, etc.)
- EfS Cloud Institute
- intentionally do things interdisciplinary (team level collaboration)
- SBKH
- content area 5-7 ECP
- team

Q3
Describe some of the ways you collaborate with your peers to implement Hawaiian language and culture in your teaching and in your learning space.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your Teaching</th>
<th>Learning Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - some Hawaiian language reps on Ka Ike Loa came in to obs lesson specific to WEO and Hawaiian culture | - signage (in Hawaiian)
| - call Hawaiian language teacher at school for assistance                     |   • TRIBES agreements
| - pule and himeni                                                             |   • Ke Ala Pono
| - hula and choir incorporates Hawaiian repertoire                             | - common phrases
| - Hawaiian language and culture resource rep consults with SBKH lesson design  | teams named spaces I Hawaiian so everyone knows where places are
| - protocol and cultural practices                                              | - teams have pahu that they collaborated on the design and making

Q4
Describe some of the ways you collaborate with your peers to implement **21st century learning practices** in your teaching and in your learning space.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your Teaching</th>
<th>Learning Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Tech resource people that can help with lap tops</td>
<td>- space used flexibly to meet lesson needs daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- people who go to tech conference and post learning on Ning and share something learned and utilized on wikiPD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- use of Edmodo to help students be one class despite being physically separated (done as a team)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- team level collaboration to design a reflection portfolio (EfS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- unit design, lesson design, student grouping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q5**

Describe some of the ways you collaborate with your peers to implement **KMS pahu vision of nurturing all student voices** in your teaching and in your learning space.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your Teaching</th>
<th>Learning Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- quarter classes to help students find their passion (explore and find passion, mastery prioritized later)</td>
<td>- make student work visible (show range of student voices)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Exploratory classes</td>
<td>- space is where people collaborate to implement vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- implementing formative assessment techniques</td>
<td>- rooms are fluid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- kids have access to teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- teacher can reach kids at back of room</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q6**

Describe some of the ways you collaborate with your peers to implement **middle school promising practices** in your teaching and in your learning space.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your Teaching</th>
<th>Learning Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- EfS get kids to recognize growth and improvement (hold kids accountable and responsible for that)</td>
<td>- useful to differentiation (being able to deliver differently)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Exploration philosophy</td>
<td>- sit, lie down, stand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- flexibility in how they get to end goal (how, when, procedures, agreements, curriculum)</td>
<td>- not married to room-able to go outside, other room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- recognizing they need that flexibility</td>
<td>- shared learning spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- block scheduling allows for flexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- flexibility in grouping students for instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- option to team teach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q7

**Anything else to share** about collaboration with others in our facility

- collaboration priority in design
  - more time to meet than in previous facility
  - not a matter of how, but when (time embedded into schedule so up to individuals to use time)

- would be great to have more time to collaborate (separate from prep time)

- facility necessitates us to collaborate and forced us to learn to, and play by the rules that didn’t apply before

- collaboration takes a lot of time, coordination, and logistics

- product at end is richer than if it were only done individually

- facility changed definition of teaming and how we work
  - different layers

- communication heightened

- organization is more vital

- collaboration is what always wanted to do and facility creates opportunities

- level of conversation is deeper

- people hold people accountable

- not great at it yet, but growing in balancing accountability and empathy for each other (know what others are going through)

- still high level of judgment at times (need to observe and understand what is going on in classrooms)

- good and bad: no privacy (can’t be in own zone, no place to hide)

- wish for cross-content cross-floor cross-grade cross-team (not procedures, but best practices)
Focus Group #4
# of participants=4
10.9.13
Xxxx Team
Grade 8

Q1
How does Xxxx team collaborate?
- Daily; little things; frequent; as arises
- Nothing/no one on team is done alone; we help each other out; it’s always “me and the 3 others”; everything
  - FTs
  - Groupings
  - We split; we do the job
  - “collective communication/project”
  - “we don’t go away and do our job (a job) and call it ‘Xxxx’”
  - “you wouldn’t write our own chapters and call it a book”
  - “not only team stuff; it’s lessons and units…we bounce stuff to get other perspectives on something”
  - “never a wall”
  - “never my lesson is lesson…I’m keeping to cool stuff to myself”
  - “we collaborate so well together we can make decisions for the team; high level of trust; what ever was done was done with good intention”
- strong collaborative foundation

Q2
Do you collaborate around 21st century attributes, Hawaiian epistemology and middle school best practice?
- (the triangulation) sets up for the collaboration
  - the physical space
  - the middle school environment; being flexible
  - 21st century (learning); 1:1 use to make new products
  - “whole child”
- high collaboration allows checks and balance to blend the 3 aspects (21st.HE.MS) in design of what team does
  - ICC (International Coastal Clean up)
    - Ahupua’a—mo’olelo—historical
    - 21st century homelessness
  - “the way we are encouraged to use the building fosters (the use of) Hawaiian epistemology”
  - “being given the arena to try new things allows for conjecture, shared leadership…helps to continue to want to change”
  - “creativity used to go from desk to kids to walls to stop”
  - “the open space is a bigger canvas”
  - “allows flex”
  - the teacher nook is a fantastic change (to the space)
Q3  
**Do you want to share anything else?**

- The team is good at understanding our strengths
- “unspoken roles”—we know what each other is good at and are OK at letting them be that strength.”
- “it’s organic”
- feedback: comfortable sharing and comfortable receiving
- we play to the strengths
- “we know there is so much more we can do”
- **Barrier to collaboration:** “for 8th…HS content demands on what the end product is” “it has to be done their way (HS)”
- Re: HS content demands….how to do MS best practice and know how to play the game
- “(we are) all in on fewer things, rather than ½ assed on many things”
- time, time—needed for co-planning and high levels of collaboration
- “prep” in a cells and bells vs. “prep” in our new building…
  - prep has evolved to collaboration time
  - “back then” meetings =logistics/operational”
  - **NOW meetings =collaboration**
  - “prep”=”old school”
  - “collaboration=strength and a weakness”
  - body language STOP signs
  - organic
  - big ideas are not done immediately; they are bounced around…at lunch…figure out cool ideas…non-structured idea exchange
Focus Group #5 (Invitation)
# of participants=4
10.29.13
Xxxx Team
Grade 7

Q1
How does Xxxx team collaborate?
• We communicate: verbal; in person
• We enjoy talking
• We end up wandering…we come up with things
• Always together
• Show up together
• We check on each other
• We gravitate
• Started way back (with our work) with sustainability
  o IDU …to CBL….to EfS
• EfS is our framework
  o We did good stuff
  o (EfS) allows us to connect really good stuff
  o (EfS) found a way to tie everything together
  o We haven’t done the same thing twice
  o It’s the pillar and joined
• We are trying to do things new to reach the kids
  o (do) what is truly best for the kids
  o Kids this year are fertile ground
  o This team of teachers has gifts and talents in so many ways
    ▪ Systems thinking
    ▪ Ke kumu
    ▪ The mother (team lead reference)
      • Coach—when she is gone; we don’t really feel it until she leaves; she’s the glue; really pretty glue

Q2
Do you collaborate around 21st century attributes, Hawaiian epistemology and middle school best practice?
• We try to kill the most birds with the same stone (re triangulation)
  •
  •
    Our sense of place; what resonates with all three areas is keeping that sense of place
• Three of the teachers specifically trained in elementary education
  o Predisposition is to integrate
  o Math science integration
• One teacher has always been in middle school
• Team always has a middle school approach
• We value this collaboration, the interdisciplinary approach
• ½ the time they (STs) don’t know what subject(s)
  o If they (STs) had to pull apart what subjects they might not be able to do that;
  o Multiple facets/answers/content
  o More than one way to get at multiple answers

Q3
Do you want to share anything else?
• We think out of the box a lot; it gets us in “trouble” when it doesn’t fall within the constraints of the schedule
• With the exploratory (classes) linked to teams we could do more
  o Our team always found a way to integrate with exploratory
  o When that (schedule) component changed it took that option away but made the schedule nice
• Hokulea—an example of a need for discussion about clock vs event time
• Tlingit—example that we can pull it together (as a MS)
• Need to add more teachable moments “like a policy”
  o Punaluu—example; cannot go up stream because it is not in the educational zone

Anything else to share about collaboration with others in our facility
• We have fun
• We like each other a lot
• We respect each other as colleagues; as people
• We enjoy what we do
• We have a lot of freedoms
### Appendix P: Instructional Rounds Record Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KMS Record Sheet</th>
<th>Before: what would you need to see</th>
<th>Evidence of Student Work and Curricular Materials (Domains 1 and 4)</th>
<th>Class Environment and Instructional Practice (Domains 2 and 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Talking with Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
After Round…Debrief Discussion in Whole Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What did we OBSERVE</th>
<th>What did we FIND</th>
<th>What can we CONCLUDE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix Q: Instructional Rounds Transcriptions

Instructional Rounds

Problem of Practice: Teachers are engaged in and collaborate around the shared vision: pahu; nurturing all student voices.

8.20.13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What did we OBSERVE?</th>
<th>What did we FIND?</th>
<th>What do we CONCLUDE?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Focus on community and culture based norms</td>
<td>• Did not hear negative language</td>
<td>• Do we need to communicate? How do we communicate that pahu are living things?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ ST-“because we can work better together”</td>
<td>• Non-threatening</td>
<td>• Teachers can maximize on skills examples: (network down, ERB, T absence)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Value of norms for culture/community</td>
<td>• Lots of volunteering by STs</td>
<td>• Gain flexibility; expand beyond walls; on-the-spot adjustments to enrich and also trouble shoot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• True colors strategy—we are all in this together</td>
<td>• Pahu are physically visible</td>
<td>• Teams know exactly what each other are doing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Kids trying things not familiar with</td>
<td>• Ts make “pahu” alive—STs are precious; they are heard; encouraged to speak out; add; share your knowledge; build on it</td>
<td>• “talk about collaboration without sitting down to collaborate”—BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “this is hard” (ST) but didn’t give up</td>
<td>• Kids so focused and engaged</td>
<td>• Ts and STs learning through inquiry: to make them think; build knowledge as opposed to telling and imparting knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ST working at their pace and in collaboration with peers</td>
<td>• (Guidance-Nonona&lt;hula&gt;)—active</td>
<td>• If STs are sharing, learning is going on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ST w/no partner—“come join us” (inclusion)</td>
<td>• Pairing and coordination (ERB) all in one area</td>
<td>• “what is powerful is STs are anxiously raising their hands and not worrying about the right answer”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 5 words: tight integration w/language and technology ...asking ...guiding; T did not tell</td>
<td>• &quot;in this open space we can do much more&quot;</td>
<td>• &quot;safety&quot; bring safe to share</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ST didn’t worry about not getting it right</td>
<td>• &quot;we can supervise, help, release others to do other positive PD building things&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Nice &quot;ask not tell&quot; openness to sharing</td>
<td>• w/out walls easier; 2 classes in wet lab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Network down—whole team can be tighter in a closed class setting that would not be possible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Continued)

**Instructional Rounds**

**Problem of Practice:**  
Teachers are engaged in and collaborate around the *shared vision:*  
*pahu;* nurturing all student voices.

8.20.13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Pahu on display, w/name, explanation</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o  ? DO NOT TOUCH sign (on pahu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o  pahu in a place of honor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o  7th grade—meant to be played</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o  STs walk around pahu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Google presentation back channel</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;So who you&quot; and quote activity in guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promethean—Lord’s prayer in Spanish (non-threatening)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;open mic at other times=tasteful; =open&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>blossoming</strong> of STs new to space (7th grade fall Q)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>interesting</em> to see 8th grade in 4th Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>is</em> there a retention of this &quot;aliveness&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th and 8th grade floors—procedures different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>would</em> be good to see more on 8th grade floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>some</em> spaces are more conducive to nurturing all ST voices; none do not nurture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>because To</em> can flex, change, design, move internal space they are more open, creative, responsive to ST needs, risk change to meet ST needs (EK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>this</em> is the 21st century design &quot;work is where your technology is&quot; &quot;mimicking that world for them&quot; &quot;that’s why people work at home&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration is embedded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance:</strong> shift back to nature as a residual of technology &quot;work is where you are&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>tech</em> has provided a balance that wasn’t there before</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instructional Rounds

Problem of Practice: *Teachers are engaged in and collaborate around middle school promising practices.*

9.23.13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What did we OBSERVE?</th>
<th>What did we FIND?</th>
<th>What do we CONCLUDE?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Level of ST interaction</td>
<td>• validation of open learning space</td>
<td>• On the right track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o problem solving w/fellow STs</td>
<td>• kids are adaptable</td>
<td>o 21st Century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o esp math</td>
<td>• less about adults, more about the kids validation</td>
<td>• Re-design environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o flipped class</td>
<td>• enough space for teachers but space for flow</td>
<td>• Absence of desks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o ST initiative to change variable in equation</td>
<td>• intrigued how Ts decided space is for the kids</td>
<td>• Flipped class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Collaboration in science class—jello</td>
<td>• no specified T desk (if limits) area</td>
<td>• Integration of tech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o T struggle with tech, ST stepped up to solve</td>
<td>• nice when kids invade space</td>
<td>• Kids are free to ask questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o All teachers really using tech</td>
<td>• safety</td>
<td>o What's good for kids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o 21st century learning</td>
<td>• recess break</td>
<td>o Tackling change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o in asking “tell me what you are doing” STs could answer/expand</td>
<td>o safety indicator</td>
<td>o Admin guides to a point and then disconnects so Ts/teams can make decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o varied learning modalities</td>
<td>o imaginary food “line”</td>
<td>o Positive change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o visual</td>
<td>&lt;no eating beyond&gt;</td>
<td>o Ts responsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o verbal</td>
<td>o STs operate without being told</td>
<td>o ST driven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o kinesthetic</td>
<td></td>
<td>Early adopters vs. strugglers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o “truly the learning modalities were there”</td>
<td></td>
<td>at what point “you really have to keep with pace”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o STs not afraid to ask; Ts available</td>
<td></td>
<td>“world” of work pacing; education is now having to meet with that pacing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Content lines becoming blurred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborative environment in a humanities based approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New environment (building) supports change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Budding/blooming T leaders
- Tables—conscious decision; traditional desks “clunky;” may hinder STs ability to work together
  - “kids on top of each other learning”
  - “sense of a shared space”
- TRIBES
  - Inclusion
  - Identify self
  - “saw a lot of this”
- STs on projects
  - Librarian brought a cart with books
  - Books were selected by choice
  - Excitement from STs about the cart
- Learner targets on wall
  - T questioning
  - “no, use the words we learned”
  - site honor code
  - exemplify meaning
- 8th grade ICC PSA
  - coming back from service learning to create PSA
  - variety of designs

- niko
  - Monday we are a family
  - we are one
  - Friday environ what needs to be done
  - Solidifies “community”
  - “what you have in effect is a true learning community”
  - “values” cemented
  - “learning” will cease to be Monday through Friday, but instead be who they are
  - “saw” life-long learning, team work together, breakthrough in teaching, true M$’”
  - “doing the true middle school”
  - “scientific research” data shows we are doing
Instructional Rounds
Problem of Practice: Teachers are engaged in and collaborate around middle school promising practices.
9.23.13

- including traditional flow
  - allowed movement in/out; doesn’t hinder collaboration
- variety of design important in field of teaching; it can say a lot about teaching
- team teach attention direct instruction then break out in groups and work
Instructional Rounds

Problem of Practice: Teachers are engaged in and collaborate around Hawaiian language and culture. 9.25.13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What did we OBSERVE?</th>
<th>What did we FIND?</th>
<th>What do we CONCLUDE?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Kumu addressed and spoke only in Hawaiian; no blank stares; seemed to comprehend; nodded; incentives to oli; “how would you grade yourself? 0-10?”</td>
<td>• Multiple modality approaches of cultural pieces throughout the floor; all STs have to say; consistent use of language</td>
<td>Floor 1 (7th grade) “If you hookain the pahu the right way it resonates”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No grumbling</td>
<td>• Genealogy—ceiling; kupuna watching you</td>
<td>• consistent approaches to learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No namunamu</td>
<td>• “how does it feel to be Hawaiian” bulletin board</td>
<td>• architecture works in this favor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dignity</td>
<td>• focus on ST identity “Big Time”</td>
<td>• “there’s a whole livelihood of learning going on on that floor”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hoʻaheʻa</td>
<td>• Science: “I teach science….Kumulipo (paper mača) hanging from the ceiling”</td>
<td>• ano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Genuine sense of aloha in them</td>
<td>• –plant/animals—the life force of the Hawaiians</td>
<td>• o excited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Talking with STs:</td>
<td>• poster statements: (Snow)</td>
<td>• o not disrespectful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o RMS—“the vibe here is friendly”</td>
<td>o change statements in Hawaiian</td>
<td>• o sense of order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o “everyone looks out for each other”</td>
<td>o Kumu: “everyone needs to take Hawaiian”</td>
<td>• o be present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o “challenge to learn language”</td>
<td>o “it’s our ancestry and protects who we are”</td>
<td>• o be connected; calm; focused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o “encouraged by the kumu who want them to learn”</td>
<td>o Kumu: “everyone needs to take Hawaiian”</td>
<td>• need to identify champions in 8th grade to continue richness that is present in 7th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o “It’s our ancestry and protects who we are”</td>
<td></td>
<td>• what does that look like?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Brad’s class:</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Can the curriculum be enhanced by including history of the building names?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• (new 7th) “so different; a lot of opportunity to learn their culture”</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Content may influence Hawaiian cultural influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• First Floor of Bldg:</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Re 8th grade floor: “was asked to wear my cultural lens; was like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o “feel connected”</td>
<td>o “how kupuna came here and how brilliant they were”</td>
<td>fisherman in murky water”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o “transitioning from KES-KMS….what they found is an open learning environment where KES is a closed environment; we have to be respectful of each other”</td>
<td></td>
<td>o Approach was very Western</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Genealogy: “it was a challenge; it made me….I come from a colorful past.”</td>
<td></td>
<td>o 7th grade teachers included themselves with the STs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Kids were never intimidated or uncomfortable</td>
<td></td>
<td>o genuine respect between kumu and haumana on 7th floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• He alo a he alo—“face to face” in Momi’s class</td>
<td></td>
<td>o Nohona Hawaii class may be the only place where culture is taught/present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• T—“wall-less environment allows them to collaborate much more effectively.”</td>
<td>o 2nd floor “hit me” as absolutely different (from the 7th grade floor)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Instructional Rounds

Problem of Practice: *Teachers are engaged in and collaborate around 21st century learning attributes.*

10.22.13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What did we OBSERVE?</th>
<th>What did we FIND?</th>
<th>What do we CONCLUDE?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Most striking, significant was the task-mindedness on the part of the students | • Shift instruction  
  o Collaboration  
  o Writing  
  o Thinking  
  o Critical analysis  
  o Partnering/mentoring  
  • In talking with kids, they see the shift (in the learning environment)  
  • Flipped; spanning disciplines  
  • Clarity on learning goals; instructional moments...there was clarity; coherent instruction | • Lots going on; interrelated tech and other stuff  
 • Good mix of technology and traditional  
 • Balance of independent and group work  
 • Kids appreciate lap tops [student interview]  
  o To organize  
  o To extend learning  
  o Key to learning success  
  • “first you change your structures then you change you.” Churchill  
  • “The more students have voice and choice, the more technology will be employed.”  
  • “most work by teachers is autonomous; time, space, ownership of where they are going”  
  o “can be nuanced as you move forward”  
 • space evolving—leading teachers to design and push thinking, toward student |
| • Students were strikingly “on task”  
 • Variation in spaces from institutional; range; work was on move-able boards by class  
 • Since spaces are integrated content-wise, the work displayed should follow  
 • Lots of work but not so much description of what work is (work descriptions give context)  
 • Happy to see a lot of integration  
 • Most 50” TVs “off”—Zapped student work | | created targets, connected to the community.  
 • Next Step: how can the best practices of teams become the best practices of a floor/grade level/school?  
 • Good Idea. Have teachers do instructional rounds |
Appendix R: Focus Groups and Instructional Rounds Coding Matrice

**FGs**

*Categories from In Vivo coding—first cycle; array of individual codes associated with the data (Saldana, 2014, p. 89)*

1 “freedom” 2 “flexibility” 3 “agreements” 4 “design” 5 “collaborate” 6 “hard” 7 “opportunity” 8 “supportive” 9 “communicate” 10 “feedback” 11 “accountable” 12 “trust”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values</th>
<th>First Cycle</th>
<th>Thematic</th>
<th>Causes/Explanations</th>
<th>Relationships</th>
<th>Theoretical Constructs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Importance we attribute to someone or something</td>
<td>1-Freedom to determine how to perform 2-Space is used flexibly to meet lesson needs 2.5-Shared learning spaces and flex grouping</td>
<td>5-To use tech tools to collaborate 2-Spaces are designed for flexible grouping 2-Program flexibility so we can get to every child 5-Collaborative continuity across content areas, in assessments; there are common curricular themes 5-Faculty input to the design of the schedule and the development of the program elements 5-Faculty input to agreements and</td>
<td>3-Floor level agreements 2-We are able to rearrange spaces to cover for each other 9,5-You need to communicate and collaborate 5-We need to work on collaboration between teams 5-The learning space is where people collaborate to implement the vision 5-8-Nothing is done alone/no one on a team is alone 5.11—We don’t go away</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- | | | | | |

| Attitudes | The way we think about someone or something | | | | |

- 2-Flexibility for possible change if needed 2-Allow students the flexibility of how they demonstrate what they know 2-Give students choices 1-We are given room to grow in our own way to find how we fit in 2-No one owns the space 2-Allows student to decide | | | | | |

- 9-Collaboration is very supportive 7-We are a family so the learning space becomes an opportunity 7-No anonymity so everyone can see everything 7-Able to get to know all | | | | | |

- 10-Faculty asked consistently to give feedback; faculty should be ready to receive feedback 5-We intentionally do things in an interdisciplinary manner 5-Teams collaborated on the design and making of their sala 6-Hawaiian language and culture teachers observe, give feedback, assist, and consult in support of Tia 5-Now the meetings we have are collaborations 5-We value collaboration and an interdisciplinary approach | | | | | |

- procedures and do a job alone and call it the team’s; we do not write individual chapters and together call them a book; it is never my lesson 3.8—We are always together; we show up together; we check on each other; we gravitate towards each other 3.8-We communicate; we talk; we enjoy talking; we end up wandering and come up with things 1.5.9, 10, 11-we have fun, we like each other a lot, we expected each other as colleagues and as people, we have a lot of freedoms | | | | | |
(Continued)

**Coding matrix**

**FGs**

*Categories from In Vivo coding—first cycle: array of individual codes associated with the data (Saldana, 2014, p. 89)*

1 “freedom”  2 “flexibility”  3 “agreements”  4 “design”  5 “collaborate”  6 “hard”  7 “opportunity”  8 “supportive”  9 “communicate”  10 “feedback”  11 “accountable”  12 “trust”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F1</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>F3</th>
<th>F4</th>
<th>F5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| how they want to be assessed  
7-Opportunities for movement about the space; extend learning spaces  
5-The rooms are fluid  
4-It's organic; 4-sys-tems thinking design  
3-This allows us to connect things; tie things together;  
2-There is more than one way to get an answer | kids and all colleagues  
7-We all take responsibility for all of the kids  
5-The facility necessitates us to collaborate and forced us to play by the rules that didn’t apply before  
7-Collaboration is what we always wanted to do and the facility creates those opportunities  
1-(we are) growing in balancing accountability and empathy for each other  
6-Still a high level of judgment at times  
5-we collaborate so well together we can make decisions for the team |

**Beliefs**

*Includes values and attitudes as well as personal knowledge, opinions, norms and other interpretive perceptions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beliefs</th>
<th>Beliefs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 6-It’s very hard sometimes  
5-Shared leadership has helped us get where we are, but we have much further to go | 4-TRIBES agreements  
2-Inventing and creating; using the space as a learning tool  
2-There is group flexibility such that collaboration can occur  
4-Line between teaching and learning is blurred  
5-We are not able to |
| 5-You have to have a positive attitude and be a team player  
6-9-Some team leads do not create a safe environment to express themselves  
5,6,4-Collaboration takes a lot of time, coordination and logistics  
4-product at the end is |

**Memo for FG**

**Relation to research question**

The teachers appear to own their space. In this respect it supports the notion that if they have had a hand in the design of the building, the program, and the space that they will collaborate well. One teacher mentioned that there was shared leadership to get them to the building but that there is still work they must do to continue to grow together. Another mentioned that they are given room to grow in their own way to find out how they fit in the open learning space.

**Emergent patterns**

In every focus group flexibility was mentioned as a foundational concept to the learning space. Focus group members mentioned flexibility of groupings, spaces, and lessons to enhance learning opportunities. Collaboration and communication also rose to the top as essences of the culture of the open learning space.

**Emergent problems; dilemma**

There was no specific connection to the theoretical construct of the balance between relationships and reification (Wenger, 1998). However I can discern that the relationships seem strong as evidenced by the fact that the teachers shared that colleagues were supportive, there are agreements in place, and collaboration is a shared responsibility. The mention of the agreements and the focus on
the vision alludes to documents in place that we have created together and that frame our work in the middle school. Implicit in the mention of the agreements and the vision is the validation that documents are in place to guide and assist teams in building strong communities of practice.

**Future directions**

As a result of the focus group feedback it is evident that not everyone is completely confident in the collaborative open learning environment. One participant even mentioned that there are times when it is not “safe” to express themselves. Clearly this is an area for future work that can be built on the foundation of the work we have already done with MBTI. Another area for future growth is providing time for expanding collaborative work further than just within the classroom building. Lastly, participants mentioned that decision making and agreements in the space, and more consistent, “unified” rules of the space need to be put in place.
(Continued)

Coding matrix
IRs

Categories from In Vivo coding—first cycle; array of individual codes associated with the data (Saldana, 2014, p. 89)

1 “cultural norms” 2 “collaboration” 3 “integration” 4 “coordination” 5 “nurturing ST voice” 6 “engaged” 7 “multiple learning modalities/21st century learning” 8 “community”

IR1 IR2 IR3 IR4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Cycle</th>
<th>Thematic</th>
<th>Causes/Explanations</th>
<th>Relationships</th>
<th>Theoretical Constructs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Importance to someone or something</td>
<td>7-the right trade for 21st century re-design of environment 5-ST voice is present, heard, acknowledged, understood 5-what’s good for kids 1-tackling change 2-world of work pacing—education is now having to meet that pacing 5-kids are on top of each other learning; a sense of shared space 5-winter learning is who they are 2-life long learning, team work together, break through in teaching, true</td>
<td>1-focus on community and culture based norms. 1-Value of the norms for culture/community 5-Some spaces are more conducive to nurturing ST voice 5-Because TX can flex, change, design, move in the internal space, they are open, creative, and responsive to ST needs; risk change to meet ST needs 7-Work is where the technology is μ in the world work place for STs</td>
<td>5-STs didn’t worry about not getting it right 5-Nice “ask not tell” openness to sharing 5-What is powerful is STs are anxiety raising their hands and not worrying about the right answer 5-Safety; being safe to share 2-problem solving with fellow STs 5-ST initiative to change answer to a math problem 2-collaboration in science class 5-interaction and learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MS
1-being the true middle school
1-genuine sense of aloha
1-focus on the student identity as a Hawaiian
1.5-if you hold on to the puu the right way it resonates
7-“there is a whole livelihood of learning going on on that floor”
6-most striking was the task-mindedness on the part of the STs
5-clarity and coherent instruction
5-“the more STs have voice and choice, the more technology is employed.”
1.2,6-“most work by teachers is autonomous—time, space, and ownership
7-space is evolving with doubles, to design and push thinking toward ST created targets, connected to community
5-how do the best practices of teams permeate and
8-what have you in effect is a true learning community
8-values are cemented
5-kids were never intimidated or uncomfortable
5.6-grade floor absolutely different from 7th grade floor; “what I expected to see was not there,” no cultural exemplars, no artifacts; structured
| From each other
1 nice when kids invade the space
5-kids are free to ask questions
5-inclusion; identity of self
“saw lots of this”
| 1-πico on Monday/Friday—we are one
| B-solves/communities
| 6-STs feel connected
| 8-we have to be respectful of each other
| 8-he alo a ho alo face to face
| 1.2-genuine respect between kumu and hanaum, on the floor

184
(Continued)

**Coding matrix**

**IRs**

*Categories from In Vivo coding--first cycle; array of individual codes associated with the data (Saldana, 2014, p. 89)*

1 “cultural norms” 2 “collaboration” 3 “integration” 4 “coordination” 5 “nurturing ST voice” 6 “engaged” 7 “multiple learning modalities/21st century learning” 8 “community”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IR1</th>
<th>IR2</th>
<th>IR3</th>
<th>IR4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitudes</strong> The way we think about someone or something</td>
<td>1-Pahu are physically visible 1-Pahu are on display in a place of honor</td>
<td>6-To make pahu alive; STs are precious; they are heard; encouraged to speak out; share knowledge and build on it 2-When the network is down a whole team can be taught; in a closed classroom setting that would not be possible 4-Gain in flexibility; expand beyond walls; on-the-spot adjustments to check and troubleshoot 4-Teams know exactly what each other are doing 7-To and ST’s learn through inquiry; to make them think to build knowledge as opposed to telling and imparting knowledge 7-To are really using technology to teach 21st century learning 5-STs can answer and expand</td>
<td>2-1: “In this open space we can do much more” 2-2: “We can supervise, help, release others to do other PD building” 5-5: “So who you” activity in guidance class 5-ST says the vibe is friendly and everyone looks out for each other; encouraged by Ts 1-one=excited, no disrespect, order, presence, connected, calm, focused 2-need to identify champions in 8th grade to build on 7th grade richness of culture in program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Pahu are physically visible 1-Pahu are on display in a place of honor</td>
<td>6-To make pahu alive; STs are precious; they are heard; encouraged to speak out; share knowledge and build on it 2-When the network is down a whole team can be taught; in a closed classroom setting that would not be possible 4-Gain in flexibility; expand beyond walls; on-the-spot adjustments to check and troubleshoot 4-Teams know exactly what each other are doing 7-To and ST’s learn through inquiry; to make them think to build knowledge as opposed to telling and imparting knowledge 7-To are really using technology to teach 21st century learning 5-STs can answer and expand</td>
<td>2-1: “In this open space we can do much more” 2-2: “We can supervise, help, release others to do other PD building” 5-5: “So who you” activity in guidance class 5-ST says the vibe is friendly and everyone looks out for each other; encouraged by Ts 1-one=excited, no disrespect, order, presence, connected, calm, focused 2-need to identify champions in 8th grade to build on 7th grade richness of culture in program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-kids are adaptable 5-STs operate without being told 6-early adopters 3-strugglers; at some point you really have to keep up with the pace 3-content lines become blurred 8-librarian brought books to the floor; kids were excited about the book cart 1-one communication 1-1 one s a 1-dignity 2-1: wall-less environment allows them to collaborate much more effectively 3-happy to see a lot of integration 2-shift in instruction to collaboration, writing, thinking, critical analysis, partnering and mentoring 2-7-to talking with STs they see shift in learning environment 7-good mix of technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Continued)

Coding matrix

IRs

Categories from In Vivo coding--first cycle; array of individual codes associated with the data (Saldana, 2014, p. 89)

1 “cultural norms” 2 “collaboration” 3 “integration” 4 “coordination” 5 “nurturing ST voice” 6 “engaged” 7 “multiple learning modalities/21st century learning” 8 “community”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IR1</th>
<th>IR2</th>
<th>IR3</th>
<th>IR4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beliefs</strong>&lt;br&gt;Includes values and attitudes as well as personal knowledge, opinions, morals and other interpretive perceptions</td>
<td>2. We can talk about collaboration without having to sit down to collaborate&lt;br&gt;1. New environment supports change&lt;br&gt;1-ST: “Hawaiian language is our ancestry and it protects who we are.”</td>
<td>2-STS work at their own pace and in collaboration&lt;br&gt;3-Tight integration with language and technology&lt;br&gt;6-Kids are so focused and engaged&lt;br&gt;2-If STs are sharing, learning is going on&lt;br&gt;7-Google presentations; back channeling&lt;br&gt;9-varied learning modalities: “truly the learning modalities were there”&lt;br&gt;2-collaborative environment in a humanities based approach&lt;br&gt;6-Learner targets on the wall&lt;br&gt;7-variety of design is important in the field of teaching, learning, direct instruction, group work</td>
<td>5-Did not hear negative language&lt;br&gt;5-Non threatening&lt;br&gt;4-Pairing and coordination in one area.&lt;br&gt;3-Collaboration is embedded&lt;br&gt;5-STS were not afraid to ask; T’s are available&lt;br&gt;5-lest about the adults and more about the kids&lt;br&gt;1-no specified T desk; no off limits areas&lt;br&gt;2-in and out flow doesn’t hinder collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memo for IR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Relation to research question**

I get a sense from this data that there is evidence of strong collaboration reported in all rounds. I gather from the findings that both the teachers and the students feel the freedom of the space, the flexibility that allows all them to create, learn, and share knowledge. The data shows that there is an understanding by teachers and students that we are committed to the vision of nurturing student voice, that the Hawaiian cultural norms permeate the space, and that conscious effort is placed on coordination and integration of learning so that teachers and students can collaborate. The rounds
confirm our middle school vision of nurturing student voice by acknowledging where the vision is evident, and also supporting us in ways that we can improve the implementation of the vision. If one nurtures the child’s voice well, appropriately, and with care it will resonate. Attention is paid to multiple modalities when designing learning tasks, and a sense of community and engagement are present.

**Emergent patterns**
Student voice presence
Collaboration
21st century learning environment and tasks

**Emergent problems; dilemma**
Cultural norms and instructional delivery very evident on one floor; almost absent from another.

**Future directions**
The priority is to specifically provide cultural support where there is a need for greater delivery of Hawaiian cultural ways of knowing and being. This may require us to revisit the program structure to include additional learning experiences for teachers and students that are grounded in the Hawaiian worldview. We must make explicit the need to have the Hawaiian cultural presence in all areas of the building, program, and curriculum through the WEO as a starting point.
Appendix S: Notes from Action Research Project at Verrado High School

Reflections and Insights from our visit to Verrado HS on February 13-15, 2012

Wednesday End of the Day:  Meeting Notes/De-brief/Projections
Great day. The meeting with VP Julie was very helpful to me towards our transition into the new building. The best thing I learned when dealing with safety in our school is: “Keep it simple”. Have a clear plan in place that all teachers can understand and practice. Where there is limited supervision, there is a higher chance that things can happen in that area.

Athletics: all coaches have a rubric for sports tryouts that are kept on file with the A.D. Each sport also has a contract that parents and students need to sign. Athletic probation expectations are simple and clear for all sports.

End of the Trip Reflections and Projections:
Some teachers are more comfortable with the open environment than others. The biggest impact about the open environment is the opportunities for students/faculty to interact with each other. It is the people in the building that make the building. These are words or phrases that I hear when thinking of Verrado High: helpful, embrace, trust, communicate, respect, better teacher, enjoyable, more aware, in a community, relationship with kids/teachers/admin, classroom management, open, work together, help vs judgement, force teachers to get out of the comfort zone, transparent.
We will have bumps in the road towards our new school. We will work together to help our school become the best.

Wednesday End of the Day:  Meeting Notes/De-brief/Projections
TEAM AREA:
After observing Verrado, I imagine our Team Area similar to, but smaller than, a wing of their building. We will need team agreements, but like Wing A, some teacher autonomy. The teachers in Wing A seemed to get along well, but they each ruled their own 3-walled domain. We will not be able to have that train of thought. We will need to make more team agreements than them since we won’t have 3 walls. I imagine setting team agreements and having open communication. I also see us as being able to ask another teacher to quiet down and not taking things personal when someone asks us to quiet down. We will also need to communicate what we are doing on a daily basis to see if we need to adjust and/or move what we are doing. I foresee thinking outside the box when it comes to teaching our classes. I’m sure we will come up with ideas that I cannot even think of at this time and I look forward to those ideas. I also imagine teachers working more closely together in integrating curriculum and classes in order to make things work in the space we have.

GRADE-LEVEL:
I imagine 4 teams of 80-85 students on each floor working together to come up with floor agreements. As with the team area, we will need to communicate and cooperate with each other to create a safe and productive environment. I can possibly see having 7th and 8th grade teams across from each other, therefore taking away the label of “grade-level” floors. Teachers would have the option of integrating across grade levels. At this time I
do not support blending teams with 7th and 8th graders but I do see the potential in blending the floors.

**End of the Trip Reflections and Projections:**

SIMILAR, BUT DIFFERENT:
There were similarities and differences between Verrado HS (VHS) and KMS. They have a nontraditional open-environment setup but each class has 3 walls. At KMS, the science lab and the outside teaching space will have 3 walls, but the 3 middle spaces will share a total of 3 walls, averaging 1 wall per space. Another obvious difference was that they have 1 huge building with lots of indoor space for students to gather. They could socialize by the auditorium, dining area, stairs or right outside the wing doors and wait for the bell to ring. They also had lots of optional areas to move to within the building with just a phone call or email to admin – and they could do it on the same day with no 14-day notice required.
Also, they do not have a 1:1 Program so they are far behind us in technology.

TRADITIONAL TEACHING:
Every teacher that I observed at VHS taught in the traditional style. I’m not sure what changed when they took away the 4th wall. They realize that other teachers and admin is watching them all the time, but I think more could be done as far as upgrading with curriculum, instruction and assessment in relation with the 3-walled classrooms.

AGREEMENTS:
Because of the close proximity and absence of walls, teams will have to come up with agreements in order to maintain a healthy, safe, and productive learning environment for students and Core teachers. Teachers will need to trust each other, communicate openly and honestly, and not take things personal. However, there still needs to be some sort of autonomy for teachers to employ their own strategies as well. We cannot create cookie-cutter teachers that act like robots.

FLEXIBILTY:
Flexibility will be a key component for Core teachers to adjust to the open environment, especially during the first couple of years. The open-environment will not have that much of an effect on teachers that will still have 4 walls and those teachers need to be sensitive to the challenges that the Core teachers will be facing.

EMBRACE:
Core teachers should embrace the change and the potential that the open-walled environment brings. Other teachers and admin may be watching you at anytime, which will force you to bring your A-Game on a daily basis. Don’t see this as a bad thing. This will be good for you and your students. This will also allow you to observe other teachers on a daily basis and witness teaching strategies that you may choose to adopt.

**Wednesday End of the Day:**  Meeting Notes/De-brief/Projections
It is important to call out and distinguish positives that are attributed to tight traditional teaching strategies versus attributes of an open environment. The learning areas in the open environment provides opportunities to enhance student learning of the traditional instruction in the 3WC (3 Wall Classroom). There is potential to enhance student achievement when the open environment is integrated with the traditional instruction in the 3WC. Social norms and expectations of the teachers drive program and instruction in the 3WC. Anywhere and anytime access to technology tools and online resources
supports learning in the open environment outside the 3WC. A mentor teacher housed and hired by the district is a resource that has helped new teachers transition into the 3WC.

**End of the Trip Reflections and Projections:**
What makes Verrado a special place? The difference makers are the people that live in the complex. The social culture developed between the stakeholders are what give the school a sense of place. The 3WC and open learning environments of the building enhance the development of the social culture that I experienced. IMO, the development of our sense of place includes social norms, our Hawaiian culture, and the 21st Century norms.

Mahalo for giving me the opportunity to participate in this activity.

**Wednesday End of the Day: Meeting Notes/De-brief/Projections**
- “One World, One Verrado” establishes a strong sense of community at VHS. This community feel permeates everything from behavior in the halls to security of others’ belongings.
- Communication and respect are key within the wing and will be in our grade level spaces
- We need to conduct orientations for students to acclimate them to the new facility and help them through logistics of an open classroom.
- “The learning environment will create a totally different social structure amongst faculty and staff in the new facility.”

**End of the Trip Reflections and Projections:**
We have a lot to be grateful for at Kamehameha. We have varied opportunities for professional development, support staff, and technology. I really appreciate the hard work of the faculty and staff and see that we are doing many things very well. We’ve successfully integrated teaming, 21st century skills, 1:1 laptop computing, and project based and challenged based learning. We consciously departed from traditional teaching to innovative strategies and have thus have improved the educational experience for our students.

**Community**
I envision a school where our sense of community runs strong. We would truly live and model the Hawaiian values for our students, parents, and visitors. We’d want to be quick to offer support and not deliver harsh criticism or judgment. Our community will demonstrate effective communication and respect for one another.

**Evolution**
I project that the evolution will not happen overnight. Many of the VHS teachers stated that it took anywhere from 6 months to a year to get acclimated to the new building. I imagine that it would take longer than this to thrive and meet the highest potential. It will be imperative for us to be flexible, open minded, and positive.

**Flexibility**
We need to be willing to change and explore options to improve the education for students and have an open mind when considering all of the wonderful opportunities this new building affords for teaching and learning. To maximize our experience in the new facility, we’ll need to be open to reviewing current policies and practices so that we can empower teachers to control the learning environment. This flexibility was highly
apparent and probably contributes to the overall climate and success of the open learning environment at VHS.

**Wednesday End of the Day: Meeting Notes/De-brief/Projections**

1. Stan, Age, and I met with Mrs. Julie Jones. Our meeting agenda included safety, fire drill, lockdown, athletics, and campus buildings.
2. Professional Development. This morning we were blessed to witness students from an engineering class lead a group of teachers in a discussion on a “widget” that teachers would use in their indoor and outdoor classroom.

**End of the Trip Reflections and Projections:**

1. By visiting Verrado High School, I was able to acquire knowledge on a Project Based Learning School with 3-wall classrooms. I observed teachers in their classroom-teaching students without a fourth wall. I participated in a “house” meeting where project based learning in a Verrado classroom was dissected and reconstructed. I expected to see teaching in a 3-walled classroom and that expectation was met.
2. Kamehameha Middle School will move into a new building soon. I plan to use this visit to proactively prepare, promote, and engage KMS into the new building. What I have experienced at Verrado will assist me in the move and in my interactions with my fellow teachers.
3. I recommend every teacher visit a classroom without a wall. Doing so will allow teachers to observe teachers in an open classroom, but I also feel that there are resources on the Kapālama Middle School Campus that can be used to prepare teachers to teach in an open classroom.

**Wednesday End of the Day: Meeting Notes/De-brief/Projections**

A key component leading to success is ENGAGEMENT; motivation to be on-task at best would be self-imposed. One teacher stated she is mean so students fear her (not really); grades are a motivation for some. The advisory time showed a wide range of effectiveness from total engagement on the sharing of values to no engagement at all (roaming, doing hair, hanging out). Clear EXPECTATIONS are a must. For classes with teachers who seem to have consistent and clear expectations, students are focused. Expectations include assignment requirements as well as classroom procedures (leaving for bathroom, nurse, etc.) There is a definite range of student behavior; some students try to get away with what they can as in any learning environment. FLEXIBILITY is another necessity. I witnessed this in action via students, teachers, and administration. One teacher shared that the administration had moved her planning period to the end of the day so she could tend to her daughter’s special needs. Therefore, in order for us to function successfully in the building, we must know what we want ourselves first of all. We must know what we are willing to tolerate and what our non-negotiables are. In most cases I observed, teachers had quite a bit of freedom to make choices of how to run their classrooms. In our short visit, I witnessed no teacher conflict although I’m sure it must occur.

**End of the Trip Reflections and Projections:**

Verrado gave us the opportunity to see a learning environment similar to our new building. However, the extra walls at Verrado do make the spaces there much more like typical classrooms than ours will be.
The teaching I observed was very traditional. The wall-less environment may have created more teacher interaction; however, I did not see much instruction which was truly enhanced by the building. This observation leads me to conclude that the type of instruction we want to happen must be purposefully designed. If not, the teaching/learning could stay static, although inconvenienced by outside distractions. Our teachers will need to be very comfortable being observed all the time. Colleagues at Verrado see each other teaching every single class period. There is no way to hide (although I did see a pair of teachers across the hall from each other who had blocked themselves in with dividers). We will truly have to be consistently on our “A-game”. The new building could lead to stronger bonds between teachers….or not.

In planning for our new spaces, I think we need to focus on how to keep things simple when we can. If we do, chances are we will be less confused and much more capable of focusing on the things that really are hard.

**Wednesday End of the Day: Meeting Notes/De-brief/Projections**

Things to think about incorporating at KMS (or not):

- Counselors post pictures of the at-risk students and faculty members put a sticker on the picture if they know that student; if a student has only a couple of or no stickers, they’re falling through the cracks & the staff needs to do a better job of reaching those kids
- No lockers; if students have access to PE & athletics lockers, why the need for the regular school locker?
- Doing the “sweep”
- Open lunch

**End of the Trip Reflections and Projections:**

**Ahas:**

- advisory is a major component at this school; students stay with same advisor for all 4 years, at graduation, students sit by advisory
- “One world, One Verrado” philosophy is carried throughout the school – mixed grades, mixed wings, open environments help to erase the delineations of cliques
- students are pretty well-behaved and respectful; not too much horse-play during passing time, no yelling/running/shoving observed, not much litter, no graffiti
- open auditorium is used a lot throughout the day
- teachers are encouraged to use the alternative spaces (ex. dining area, auditorium, outdoor courtyard, etc.) even if it’s last minute – all they need to do is phone/email the office to let them know where their class will be
- most classrooms I observed were taught in a very traditional manner; teaming is pretty much non-existent
- lunch is efficient and with a purpose – it is for eating and socializing
- Verrado being a high school without teaming compared to KMS is a little like apples and oranges – not everything is transferable to our situation
- talk to the wall, not the opening
- audio enhancement system is important to have even if it’s not used regularly – helps students focus better, saves teacher’s voice
- need to keep an open mind
- biggest difference seen culturally, not necessarily academically
• engagement strategies within the classroom and team building amongst staff are key
• open spaces allow for more collaboration, fosters better relationships with colleagues, allows for teachers to be more aware of what their peers are doing (able to learn from each other) as well as students being aware of what is happening in other classes
• teachers feel safer if emergencies arise, more witnesses if any incident happens or if accusations are made
• classroom management is important – need to build strong relationships with students
• helpful if teachers within same area have similar teaching styles
• if expectations are made clear & students are highly engaged, everything else is easy

Gems of wisdom offered by Verrado staff:
• embrace the fact that you have help & are not alone
• you have to be willing to change your ways & embrace the change
• teachers need to be willing to give up some control/power
• try as many different things as you can
• learn from seeing what others are doing
• see it (colleagues’ inquiries) as help & not judgment; people are interested and want to learn about what you’re doing
• open environment forces teachers out of their comfort zone in a good way
• puts you on your “A”-game

My take-aways:
• The building is just a tool - success in an open environment is mainly about good teaching (classroom management, meaningful & relevant learning experiences, high engagement, support structure for all, etc.)
• Keys that drive the success are communication, collaboration, compromise, community, cxxxxsion

Wednesday End of the Day: Meeting Notes/De-brief/Projections
Today as I walked into the large building of Verrado High School I had a certain pep in my step as I felt energized to learn more from our new Arizona friends. I was excited to share with them about the special place we come from but also felt it was important to share with them the impact they have on me (us). I think observing the students and faculty in action, here and probably anywhere, validates my career choice and today was one of those days where I was filled with inspiration. I also wondered, “Could I see myself working here at this school?” I think the answer would be yes. I am thankful for this opportunity to continue my learning and hope that I can serve my peers as I continue work on the transition team and as I work with my colleagues at KMS. I mua!
As we move away from the old KMS and into a new KMS, it is a great time for us to consider what are things that work and don’t work? I would challenge each adult to re-invent themselves. What is good about what they do at KMS and how they operate and what can/should they change? Let’s take time to introspect and reflect on what we do and take time to be deliberate about who we will be in this new KMS.

End of the Trip Reflections and Projections:
WOWs:
The principal, Mr. Huffman, was complimented for knowing the effect of the open environment and learning (by Paul Winslow). It seems he’s done his homework and is very much invested in the open environment and the effect it has on learning, teaching, relationships and culture of the school. The **openness** of the whole building (design) flows throughout. Even though the elective wing has four “walls”, the wall nearest the hall is glass and so outsiders can observe. The auditorium, cafeteria, weight room are adjacent to each other. The library is visible from the outside and above. The open area near the college planning center is used by many for large group sessions.

CBL in action. Engineering students leading groups of teachers in creation of a portable teacher workstation development project during PD time (faculty meeting on Wednesdays).

Students and adults alike were very welcoming with us. Great experience.

Things that might be different from what we experience at KMS:
The teaming concept is absent at this school. It is a high school and the teachers in a common wing work together but do not share the same students.
The entire school is in the same building the entire day.
Advisory teachers are advisors for four years to the same students.
Teachers at VHS work in an open environment that has three walls versus KMS core teachers who may work with 1 or two walls.
Students have a choice in where to sit at lunchtime. (Note: I do not think that student choice at lunch will be what is best for all students at KMS.)

Things that might be common with the KMS experience:
Advisory meets twice a week and has a curriculum.
Teachers are at various levels of using innovative teaching strategies (Socratic circle, group lessons, PBL, use of technology, CBL).
Teachers have a genuine care for the students.

**THE MOST SIGNIFICANT THINGS I LEARNED:**
**Important things:**
Being willing to give and receive help.
Ideas are shared and received readily.
Openness and trust in our relationships is important as we head into this journey into the new KMS!

**Challenges for me (us):**
What must I change (in my teaching, in my temperament, in my expectations of others, in my expectations of myself)? Do I give and receive help readily?
How do I take the step towards building relationships with my peers/colleagues that is built on openness and trust?
Be ready to accept that change is always happening, and embrace it!

**Wednesday End of the Day:** Meeting Notes/De-brief/Projections
Today was a day well spent as I was able to speak to teachers, students, as well as the assistant principal that is responsible for curriculum development with the school. They shared their thoughts and feelings about the open learning spaces. For teachers, I heard much on tips and tricks on how to set up the classroom, which included the placement of
teacher desk as well as more distracted students. I heard from them how their wings work and how they meet and collaborate. The PBL process for them is newer and some are doing it more than others. They see our space, with the three classroom space with no walls as an opportunity to collaborate and see the shifts in teaching that need to be made. I heard several suggestions on how they would structure the learning environment if they were in this space.

Students shared with me about how proud they are of their school and how students interact with each other. They are proud that we are unable to see who the freshman, sophomore, junior, or senior is in the classroom. They are proud of their learning in this space and the accomplishments they make. They are proud on how they are connecting real world problems for them and coming up with information to share with others or even solutions that can be applied.

The curriculum assistant principal shared how they structure their staff development, as they have no housekeeping faculty meetings. The admin team, with the assistance of other teachers around the school, has sessions. The session we were in today included us presenting, but prior had students assisting with a design project for a mobile classroom. The school is realizing they will be growing out of their space soon and teachers may need to share space. In order to accommodate this, the design students are coming up with a product, based on student feedback, to create a mobile station.

In many senses I see us beyond what Verrado has done as we have the PBL and CBL training and are already integrating cross-curricular unit design, which will now flow into teaching. What I see as a strong need is for teachers to work together to create shared understanding and shared objectives in working with students this way they are in the know of what is being expected and can rise to the challenge. This was also feedback given to us by a group of teachers.

End of the Trip Reflections and Projections:
I am very comfortable knowing that we have the PBL and CBL training and experience in place. We have support of Ka `Ike Loa in both content area and cross-curricular area work. We have cohort 1 and 2 who are working with Jaimie Cloud in Education for Sustainability and unit design process. The focus of this work is on feedback (student work) of students to enhance and clearly define expectations and needs to the classroom. We have worked with Cynthia for five years to assist us in how we communicate with each other, collaborate with each other, and create a productive learning environment for all of us. We are ripe for the picking...we have so many good things in place...we have all the right ingredients and are about ready to cook. I am excited to see the rivers come together, I am excited to provide this reciprocal opportunity for Verrado and look forward to the relationship that is to come.

One action item for me is to get with the social studies teacher to see if any of them are interested in having the students work with an 11th grade US History course to teach those students about annexation. Their textbook does not say much and the teacher knows there is so much more to tell. She wants the students to really understand what happened during this time in history. How cool would it be if 7th and 8th graders were teaching 11th graders. This would build our student engagement and could also be a wonderful relationship in the future.

Wednesday End of the Day: Meeting Notes/De-brief/Projections
As I project forward, I know there are some immediate tasks that have to be addressed. I know now that the work in building team is something that was validated over and again and is something that we cannot stop training in. I know the immediate session in conflict strategies will be experienced quite differently by this travel team than by the others. We will be able to make connections in the session that now have a visual reference from this trip and all the experiences at Verrado. I know that the standards work is ever more important as we relax our PBLs and realize that there can be more flexibility of pairings/groupings for the PBLs. As we gain confidence to design our program to actualize learning, greater (not lesser) attention needs to be placed upon standards such that all kids are attaining what we have agreed they will attain at exit from KMS. This is based in work already done and in place—5-7 content elements, WEO, SBKH. I see that the leads will need to formulate their floor expectations and that will take discussions and perhaps release time. Time will be our challenge in the next 6 months. The Ka ‘Ike Loa hui will have the capacity building opportunity to lead others on their floor more openly and frequently. Ka Piina field test will be more accessible as seeing into classrooms will be so much more natural.

Above all, the projection is that we WILL feel pressured for time and we WILL have conflict within the next 6 months. I am confident we are prepared to manage this conflict though it will, at times, become a bit uncomfortable.

End of the Trip Reflections and Projections:
The greatest thrill of this experience has been that it was focused, it employed action research, it built collegiality between the participants and beyond to the faculty and staff of Verrado. We have made links and made life long partners in the education od children. At conferences the menu of sessions is based on what is available. Here, we found what was meaningful to us and were able to internalize and apply it to ourselves, to KMS, and to all the work we are doing to prepare for the building.

Projections include working with Verrado over the next 6 months as critical friends who we can consult if we have questions and or need feedback. Additionally, we would like to include Tom in our blessing as it is very important to us to include those who have helped us achieve this vision and realize a new facility. It would be purposeful for Tom and Paul Winslow and Caroline to walk our halls after the opening of the building to give us feedback and ways we can continue to maximize the space and thus maximize the learning and growth that occurs.

I project that the completion of the pahu for our teams may have some design influence from this action research.

Wednesday Afternoon: Imagine/Evaluate and Synthesize
Advisory observation:
On my way to visit the counselors in the wing, I had a request by a counselor's advisory to come and speak with them. Initially started with me asking them about their experience in the open learning space. Generally positive responses - they did say that it's a little bit of an adjustment in the beginning but then they began to see benefits. Some stated that it sometimes can be noisy and distracting. Many shared that it's sometimes difficult to take a quiz or test when something is going on across from them. These were seniors and some shared that when they went to other schools to take SATs, it was strange being in a traditional classroom. Many shared that they're not sure how it's going to be in
college as many have done visits and see that they'll probably end up in an a self-contained classroom.

I then had the opportunity to share our building plans and told them unlike their space, we will have just one wall. They were pretty intrigued by the concept and pondered the probability of success. Noise was an obvious concern for them and they asked if the student groupings would remain constant. They were familiar with middle school set-up and understood the reshuffle for 8th grade. They then asked about the electives and whether those would be in an open space. There was general relief when I explained that they would be in traditional classrooms (it's the same for them with their electives).

I asked if any of them had ever visited Hawai‘i and three of them said that they had. I shared some basics about home. I then asked them what college they were going to (these were seniors) and they all had an answer, many going out of state, many staying in, some going to community college to "figure it out." We then talked about schedule and they came up with their ideals of a perfect schedule (this started with me asking them how they felt about the late start of school). There was the idea of starting at 9a and ending at 4p everyday. One student suggested 8-5, M-Th and Friday off. This led us to a conversation about work schedules and college schedules.

The rest of the afternoon was spent speaking one-to-one with the counselor who was the second one on board. She provided answers to many of the topics on my inquiry list.

**Wednesday End of the Day: Meeting Notes/De-brief/Projections**

Group end-of-the-day debrief:
Opportunities, requires flexibility
Lots of traditional teaching observed, our new facility also offers the opportunity to move above the traditional, if we so choose
Use of space, any space is an opportunity for learning space
   Our building is a flexible space within the boundaries of a traditional space
   "Other" space use - hallways, outside the building, piko
Irony for me: imagining the use of space in a space that I won't be in
   Need to look at getting counselors "in" the building
   Discuss with counselors, provide options for use
Rigor, relevance, RELATIONSHIPS

**End of the Trip Reflections and Projections:**

The culture promoted at VHS is one that values relationships between and among students, faculty, staff and community. We've been focusing on teaching and learning and how that happens. However, as the teachers have found on this visit, more than anything else, basic good teaching methods and strategies serve the open space well. Sometimes singular, sometimes collaborative, it is the cultural expectations that have been set which help to keep the space an effectively functional one. With this, however, comes the understanding that all of this is a constant work in progress - one that is shared by all participants. Some of the initial participants have departed from the school, yet many more have come to replace them and continue the kuleana that was put forth by the
original group.

PRESENCE:
On our first day of the visit, the principal shared how, in an open learning environment, there is nowhere for teachers to hide. On the second day he made a statement that within the entirety of the building, there is nowhere for the kids to hide. I found that counselors, instead of being housed collectively and separate from students, instead were placed directly in the heart of the learning wing. Our teachers found that administrators were highly visible throughout the day and when not, we're easily accessible and present when absolutely necessary. Physical presence is one thing but I think what is equally important is the presence of commitment, trust and camaraderie.

Brainstorms for further thought and exploration:
Both admin presence and counseling presence already within PA/student activities area
Gathering feedback/data- year one and beyond
Must questionnaire regarding experience in open space
Utilization of talking/discussion circle - holds all accountable
Adds to “presence,” used with students and faculty/staff
Lockers?? Are they really necessary?
Staff development within the school day
Interview process: utilized to screen for fit to building - foundation is the learning philosophy
What is the culture that our school is trying to promote?
What can we do in the next 5 months to begin to address this?
Bringing parents into the space for better understanding
For existing faculty:
   Involve in planning process
   Work on engagement strategies
   Team building among staff
Key role of advisory to communicate and build relationships, common understandings
Utilize stimulating music during in-service
Check out/gather data on current advisory or team activities (Xxxxlympics, Birthday)

The main take aways are that,
1. Verrado has a unique culture of inclusiveness. Cliques were not readily visible. There were few students who were not part of a group. There is a very noticeable lack of rubbish and yet, few trash cans. The restrooms have no paper towels...that do not contribute to trash, and are sustainable. Believe this is due to the one verrado vision and the unique advisory - four year looping - program. This is unique for a high school program.

How do we cultivate such a culture at kms? We can move forward with the imua acronym. Teachers and staff (and parents) need to role model the desired behaviors.
How to do this? Propose that in the 13 to 14 school year we again hold tribes training for all staff and teachers to promote common language and expectations as we travel down the tribes trail. The tribes activities will familiarize teachers with activities that can build community and give lessons that will help with activities for teaching in the open classroom. Many tribes activities are similar to those taught by nancy doda.

2. Advisory program -there is a consistent curriculum that is tied to four identified goals and teacher buy-in thru admin observation/support. Advisory lessons are modeled at staff meeting. Advisory also is introduced to parents at open house and each advisor is required to call advisory parents to make a positive connection. Advisory groups loop for four years and meet twice weekly. The advisory program has evolved from uniformed lessons to more flexible teacher choice format.....and now circling back to uniform, consistency. Patrick believes that this structured consistent approach is more desirable. He believes that an successful advisory program is hinged on administrative support. The principal gives faculty time to preview and demonstrate advisory lessons. The principal monitors teacher participation by doing walk bys. They are looking for an assessment tool but have gathered data in other ways.

They involve parents by demonstrating an advisory lesson at open house. Each teacher is required to call each advisory students parent at the beginning of the school year. Students lead conferences.

How to improve the character education program? This confirmed that we are on the right track for identifying the main goals/ vision of character education, as part of tt work. This confirmed that prescribed character programs like character counts, are not the best fit.

We can improve our advisory program by gaining more teacher buy in thru staff training-tribes, or by faculty meeting demonstrations. We can improve by holding peers accountable....the open space will help with this. We can educate our parents by demonstrating our advisory program at bts days and by engaging parents more. We can adopt the parent phone call home at the beginning of the school year to touch bases and affirm pua’s positive touch. The assessment piece seems to be more elusive for all schools. Will endeavor to create and hone a tool to gather rich longitudinal data. Student involvement is another piece we can incorporate. Additionally, we can look more closely at looping and creating more opportunities for grade level sharing/ constructive learning....to try and mimic the verrado hetero groupings.

3. Look at how what we learned fits into the cloud institute standards as well as our own content standards. Have begun to tweak my leadership curriculum to include the cloud standards. Sustainable relationships are a cloud standard. I think the one verrado concept lends itself to the clod standard.

4. Provide more opportunities for students to serve and lead. Students are selected to serve lunch. Want our student leaders to serve snack and learn 21st century skills.

5. Social areas and free time- while there is no recess and a short lunch period, it does not appear that the students are lacking social time. Feel that the open environment lends itself to this feeling of socialization during class time. Speculate that this sense of freedom may result in a reduction of horseplay that i observed in the heavily traveled and
densely populated walkways. Believe the 30 minute lunch and recess proposed at kms will yield positive results and be done b/c of the trials we have timed in the present dining hall. When students are given a fixed amount of time, they will meet the goals.

6. Rules and what battles to fight-cell phone se is more focused on appropriate use. We recently have had concerns with cell phones at kms....can we apply the example from verrado?

**Quote-ables:**

“Achievement is equal in the wall-less setting; engagement has increased.”

“Wanting to bring in collaboration it is too easy to close the door in a traditional classroom.”

“Embrace the fact that you have help and you are not alone.”

“Embrace that you are not on display.”

“You have to be willing to change your ways. Not everything is going to work. You can’t keep it quiet in the same way. Embrace it and go with it.”

“Look at me! Is no longer there. It’s about me giving up that narcissistic power.”

“I wish it didn’t take me so long to embrace. Then you change your teaching style. Just embrace it. Let yourself go. No matter how long you have been teaching.”

“Try as many different things you can.”

“I really like seeing what other people do in their classrooms. Some of the stuff is really cool. In a 4 walled classroom you’d never see this.”

“It’s not judgment. See it as help, not judgment.”

“It allows, it forces teachers, in a good way to get out of their comfort zone. It forces you to look at your teaching, their teaching. It puts you, not on edge, but it puts you on you’re a game.”

“To lead a floor:
  
  Clear expectations
  Admin open door policy
  Clarity”

“There is safety for teachers—re accusations, etc. are nullified when you are in an open environment.”