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ABSTRACT
This study investigates the influence of learning team participation on four teachers' implementation of Hawai`i Content and Performance Writing Standards in classroom instruction. The study takes place in two schools in the Leeward District on O`ahu and involves participants in the Targeted Standards Teacher program, a professional development initiative designed to use the techniques of cognitive coaching and workshop participation to enable teachers to incorporate literacy standards into their classroom instruction. Learning team activities include developing standards-based lesson plans, discussion of the standards with other participants, reflecting on instructional practices, and learning research based methods of implementation. Research methods include participant observations and teacher interviews and surveys. In addition, teachers' journal entries and lesson plans will be analyzed.
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CHAPTER I
PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The State of Hawai‘i Department of Education (DOE) recognized that teachers needed support in implementing the Hawai‘i Content and Performance Standards and accompanying Benchmarks (Strategic Plan, 1999). This was consistent with Federal legislation invoked by the passage of the Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA, 2002) reauthorization and amendment. According to the DOE’s Strategic Plan for Standards-based Reform Report of Progress, “Beyond the refinement of the standards themselves, there is a need to provide support to teachers...[such as] professional development support to implement standards via expanded knowledge and skills of varied instructional strategies” (Strategic Plan, 1999, p. 5).

In order to implement this reform, the DOE required that all schools, complexes, and districts create a Standards Implementation Design (SID). Each SID stated an action plan for implementation of the standards and specified a timeline for the completion of this plan. The 2001-2002 Leeward District SID Direction #1 stated, “Standards will be incorporated into classrooms in every school in the district” (Leeward District, 2001, p. 1). One of the strategies initiated to promote this goal was the development of the Targeted Standards Teacher (TST) program, which organized 80 teachers in the District into 40 learning teams with the goal of assisting teachers with the implementation of the Hawai‘i State Content and Performance Standards (see Appendix A). Although the goal was to expand the program each year to include more teachers, the format of the initiative changed because of a change in administrative personnel. The original intent was to have the
TST work collegially with her grade partner and help the new TST understand and implement the Hawai‘i Content and Performance Standards. The resource teachers would form a new learning team from the same school, which would include teachers from two different grade levels not previously participating. The school would then have four grade levels learning about and implementing standards. The third year this same process would be repeated. At that point an entire faculty for an elementary school would have been trained in standards implementation.

Unfortunately, this did not come to fruition. The new initiative still involves learning teams but with a different emphasis and treatment. This research seeks to address whether participation in a learning team, particularly those in the TST program, promotes teachers’ knowledge about writing standards and encourages their ability to implement those standards into their classroom instruction.

Each learning team included two classroom teachers from a school in one of the six Leeward complexes and a resource teacher from the Leeward District Office. Principals from each school in the six Leeward complexes asked for volunteers to participate in this initiative. The team from the school, along with the principal and curriculum co-coordinator, attended five all day sessions presented by the Leeward District Office throughout the school year. In addition, the district resource teacher met with each school team to plan standards-based lessons, observe their delivery and give feedback to the teachers.

Using qualitative research methods of interviewing, participant observations and analysis of teachers’ reflection logs, this study investigates how participation in a learning team has influenced four elementary teachers in the Leeward District.
This study is directed at whether or not the teachers were able to implement standards-based instruction in their classroom. The Leeward District Key Elements define a standards-based classroom as classrooms where:

(a) Standards are stated as clear targets understood by students, teachers, and parents; (b) instruction overlaps assessment seamlessly and provides feedback to students through interaction with their teachers; (c) students self-assess against targets (criteria/standards) on an on-going basis, thereby demonstrating their understanding of whether or not their work has met the standards, and to what degree; (d) the environment is safe, and it invites and involves students actively in the learning process (Leeward District, 2001, p. 1).

(See Appendix B for details of these Key Elements.)
CHAPTER 2
THEORETICAL FOUNDATION

Theories

Triadic reciprocal determinism. The TST program was consistent with Bandura’s (1989) model of triadic reciprocal determinism. Bandura explained human behavior in terms of three sources of influence: behavior, cognition and other personal factors, and the external environment (Bandura, 1989). Relationships between and among each of these influences are bi-directional, and the influence of each of these factors is dependent on the task (Bandura, 1997). For example, beliefs can influence behavior in any given situation and conversely, actions determine thought patterns. A person’s behavior can affect the environmental conditions, which in turn act upon the person’s behavior. “People are both products and producers of their environment. They affect the nature of their experienced environment through selection and creation of situations” (Bandura, 1989, p. 3).

The learning team was designed to modify the teachers thinking (cognition) about their instructional practices, including implementation of the standards, in the delivery of their lesson (behavior). As the teachers began to internalize the standards as a keystone of their instruction, they became more conscious of standards-based instruction.

Self-efficacy. According to Bandura (2000) self-efficacy, defined as the individual’s perceived belief to be in control of situations that affect their lives (Bandura, 1994), influences cognitive, motivational, affective and selection processes. Cognitive (thinking) processes involve the ability to ascertain, organize and use information (Bandura, 1994). Motivation is the impetus to move into action
The affective processes regulate individuals’ emotional states (stress, elation, depression, etc.) and reactions to those states (Bandura, 1994). Selection involves the activities and environment individuals choose (Bandura, 1994). The Leeward District needed teachers with self-efficacy to agree to participate in the initiative. The district knew the goals of implementing standards would be challenging so a commitment by these teachers to attaining those goals would be critical. A less efficacious teacher would quit the initiative.

Although the teachers were chosen by their principal, they had the opportunity to decline participation in the TST initiative. The four teachers who were studied chose to participate and continued in the initiative, subsequently including their submission of portfolios for credit.

The teachers needed to think analytically to deliver the content in the classroom as they adjusted their instructional practices. There was no room for self-doubt. As their successes increased, their motivation also grew; every mastery experience affected the teachers’ willingness to continue on the journey.

The cognitive coaching techniques (Costa, 2001) used during the TST learning team planning and debriefing meetings reflected Bandura’s (1989) five capacities and sought to increase self-efficacy. Each coach (resource teacher) received training in these techniques in preparation for facilitating the learning teams. According to Costa (2001), cognitive coaching "uses a coach’s strategies to begin internal thinking processes, which lead to observable behaviors that contribute to enhanced performance" (Costa, 2001, p. 18). These cognitive

The cognitive coach helped the targeted teachers develop the capacity to make a difference in the classroom through improved instruction. The teacher developed options in designing the delivery of the lesson according to the varied needs of the students, both regular students and those at risk. This coaching process worked to hone the craftsmanship of the classroom teachers and allowed them to be conscious of their instruction as it took place; through coaching, they sharpened their metacognitive ability to adjust instruction as it occurred. The TSTs developed a relationship with not only their cognitive coach, but also with other Leeward District teachers who participated in this initiative.

The TST initiative was designed to give participants choices in their instructional strategies, adjustments in their delivery, and perseverance in their resolve with the help of their learning team, even if confronted with obstacles. Each "mastery experience" (Bandura, 1994) in their standards-based instruction should have increased and convinced the TST to keep on track. By sharing successful lessons with the team, the other teachers would realize that they, too, could succeed in improving their standards-based instruction.

Through the TST initiative, the Leeward District sought to improve the quality of teaching in its schools by offering professional development (i.e., learning teams) for teachers. This professional development was designed to raise the teachers' confidence in delivering standards-based instruction, simultaneously addressing accountability for standards implementation. According to the American
Federation of Teachers, "Nationwide, states have placed testing and standards at the center of education reforms that focus on strengthening school improvement and accountability" (American Federation of Teachers, 2002).

Bandura's basic human capacities. Bandura (1989) suggests that environmental influences shape humans and contribute to their behavior and development. These fundamental human capabilities (Bandura, 1986) include observational learning, modeling and imitation. He characterized people as having five basic capacities: symbolizing capability, forethought capability, self-regulatory capabilities, self-reflective capabilities, and vicarious capability.

Symbolizing capability is the ability to process and manipulate symbols such as imagination, thought process, and language (Bandura, 1989). "Knowledge and thinking skills provide the substance and tools for cognitive problem solving" (Bandura, 1989, p. 7). Dialogue during the planning sessions of the learning teams provided strategies to help the teachers understand the standards and translated these strategies into instructional practices. The teachers used the observation sheet provided by the program to guide their reflections about their behavior and to make necessary adjustments. In their classrooms, the teachers also needed to communicate with students about the standards. All of these are examples in which the teachers are using language or other symbols to guide their behavior. These conversations gave the teachers proximal goals to meet (Bandura, 1989) and increased self-motivation to continue implementing standards.

Forethought capability refers to the ability to anticipate outcomes by recognizing events in the environment and planning accordingly (Bandura, 1989).
The TST initiative emphasized this capability as teachers planned their actions through goal-setting procedures in their lesson plans and as they reflected on the completion of those goals. Planning their lessons with the team assisted the teachers in being able to anticipate possible outcomes and alternative approaches to the lesson (Bandura, 1989). The planning process also required teachers to identify assessments that would show evidence of learning. This preliminary step had the potential to promote students’ forethought capabilities because the teachers could inform students about how they would be assessed.

Self-regulatory capabilities are the internal controls that allow individuals to be self-motivated through intrinsic rewards and to exercise control over external detrimental factors (Bandura, 1989). The targeted teachers volunteered to be part of the initiative and were motivated to become more competent in standards implementation through feedback given by the cognitive coach. The added incentive of nine professional development credits offered by the Leeward District at the end of the school year (if all requirements were completed) strengthened that commitment. All four of the TST’s in this study earned the nine professional development credits.

Self-reflective capabilities allow individuals to reflect on their thinking, make adjustments, and “gain understanding” (Bandura, 1989, p. 41). The TST program was consistent with this constructivist view of acting with intent and striving to improve the quality of instruction through reflection and personal experience. (Bandura, 2000) Reflection was a means for the teachers to judge the capacity of their thinking and to exercise control over events that affect their lives.
The teachers provided written reflections after each Leeward District session, lesson observed and debriefing session with the resource teacher. These reflections were designed to assist the teachers in considering changes in their practices and incorporating standards into their instruction.

Serafini uses the term reflective stance (Serafini, 2002) to explain how teachers teach a lesson, reflect on their teaching and question their instructional practices with the help of input from colleagues. He sees reflection as a priority for teachers. Other components include distance from personal experiences in order to be objective, conversations with other teaching professionals, and a common vision that drove change (Serafini, 2002). Stronge writes about qualities of effective teachers and ranks reflection high on his list. He believes reflection helps the teachers become lifelong learners while improving their effectiveness in the classroom (Strong, 2002). Furthermore, the metacognitive process of reflecting after an event was designed to help the teachers think about the process and note changes that were necessary. This reflection could only take place after the practices were learned by the participants (Snow, 2001).

Vicarious capabilities refer to the human ability to learn through observation of models, in addition to direct experience (Bandura, 1989). The TST program provided for vicarious learning during the large group sessions with other teams. Bandura (1989) suggests that social supports involved in vicarious learning give "incentive, meaning and worth to what they do," (p. 6). This aptly describes the supportive interaction between and among the district resource teacher and the
targeted teachers. This observational learning could take place because the participants shared a common motivation to implement standards (Bandura, 1989).

Prior knowledge. Social Cognitive Theory states that learning occurs when new ideas connect to prior knowledge (Bandura, 1989). The resource teachers within each team acted as cognitive coaches. The coaches began with the teachers’ reflection on their previous practices. If, during this reflection, the TST discovered that a previous practice was not standards-based, the teacher adjusted or sometimes eliminated the practice. Bandura (2000) referred to changes in one’s understandings as metacognition. The learning team resource teacher coached the teachers to realize the misalignment of their practices with the standards and assisted in generating suggestions for making adjustments.

Learning Teams as Professional Development

Professional development is a vital part of a teacher’s preparation for instruction and should be integrated into teachers’ lives (Willis, 2002). Glickman (2002) suggests that professional development and other school initiatives should always lead back to improvements in student learning. He made an analogy of a bull’s eye with concentric circles surrounding this target (student achievement) at the center and the outer circles consisting of evaluation, renewal priorities and professional development (Glickman, 2002). Professional development can be accomplished through clinical supervision, peer coaching, critical friends, action research teams within the classroom, or study groups (Glickman, 2002). Professional development with a major component using learning teams is a necessary part of ongoing teacher preparation; not just service for new teachers (Johnson, 2002).
The learning teams established in the Leeward District were a form of professional development that asked teachers to analyze their practices, determine alternatives to instruction and make use of appropriate techniques. The learning teams consisted of three teachers working together to learn about content standards and implementing those standards in their classroom instruction. The learning teams were developed because teachers needed more in-depth training in standards implementation than just attending in-service sessions (Davies, 2001). These kinds of learning teams, sometimes known as school-based study groups (Arter, 2000), strengthened relationships among teachers and increased the knowledge of the learning that was taking place in each other’s classroom. The foundation of strong learning teams included voluntary commitment, community building, challenging the thinking as educators, and integration of theory and practice (Birchak, 2002). The TST program was designed to incorporate all of the aforementioned characteristics.

In forming learning teams, voluntary participation is more desirable than mandatory selection because teachers are more invested and less likely to sabotage an initiative (Arter & Busick, 2001). For instance, a Colorado group of third grade teachers was formed into learning teams to implement math standards (Shepard, 1995). Unlike the TST teams, the Colorado learning team participants were selected through a non-random, deliberate process. They were not willing volunteers and thwarted the research and implementation of standards because of differences in basic philosophies. In contrast, the teachers in the TST study wanted to be part of the initiative and agreed that standards were important. In addition to this
willingness, they still needed encouragement, guidance, and time to reflect about
the implementation of standards.

In the Edmonds (Washington) School District, learning teams developed
from teacher leaders, a cadre of teachers trained by outside math consultants during
the summer of 1991 (Link, 2002). After their extensive summer training, the
teachers returned to their own schools in the fall to in-service other faculty members
through learning teams, which were designed to implement writing standards (Link,
2002).

Another group of teachers, administrators and board of education members
in Bloomington School (Illinois) District #87 (Assessment Training Institute, 2000)
formed voluntary learning teams to expand their knowledge of standards and
subsequent implementation into classroom instruction. These participants applied
their standards to instruction by meeting with teachers from across grade levels and
comparing the benchmarks represented at each level. This articulation helped them
formulate a plan to prepare their students for mastery at each level. The school
board president felt that teachers and students became more “engaged in learning”
(ATI, 2000, video clip) because the teachers were getting feedback from their peers
and support from administration. This support and encouragement was also a
component of the TST program, which believed in shared responsibility to bring
about noticeable changes in classroom instruction through standards
implementation.

Other studies in New York City (Barnes, 2000) and Portland, Oregon (Boss,
2000) also used teacher groups as a basis for professional development. “Conscious,
reflective talk about teaching and learning on a regular basis strengthens a whole staff" (Barnes, 2000, p. 5). The Portland group went beyond meeting in study groups; they had residencies where authors spent a week working with the teachers and their students to improve writing. The teachers later supported this effort by continuing to meet in their groups “to connect as professionals” (Boss, 2000, p. 1).

The New York group also went beyond study groups; they used their meetings to initiate school-based-inquiry projects (Barnes, 2000). They designed and conducted their research as they met collaboratively to discuss issues involving their own students.

Learning Team Connected to Initiative

The purpose of this study is to investigate whether or not four teachers’ participation in a learning team enabled them to become more knowledgeable about writing standards in the Hawai`i Content and Performance Standards II (HCPS II) and better able to incorporate those standards into their classroom instruction. The author worked as a combination mentor/facilitator/cognitive coach with two learning teams consisting of two teachers from Pearl City Elementary School and two teachers from Palisades Elementary School.

The teams met 16 times during the school year to plan for the implementation of writing standards into classroom instruction. Each month the team met twice. The first meeting of the month was to plan and discuss strategies, discuss related literature, and look at implementation of the performance indicators of the Key Elements. The second meeting each month consisted of classroom observations of their instructional delivery. The author went into each TST class
and used the observation sheet (see Appendix D) to record the events that took place during the standards-based instruction. At the end of the observation, the author and TST met for a debriefing session. The teachers kept a reflection log of thoughts on the process and what changes they made in their instruction because of discussions held during the learning team meetings. The guiding questions for these reflections came from Busick and Mann (2001):

(a) What steps might I take to become more familiar with my state standards? (b) What are my beliefs about the statements “standards for all students” and “all children can learn”? (c) In what areas are my classroom practices traditional? (d) Which practices are standards-based? (e) Am I confident that students are learning given my current classroom practices? (Busick and Mann, 2001, p. 15.)

The teachers also reflected on questions about the professional development activities:

(a) How does the entry relate to specific professional development experiences—content areas, purposes, and activities? (b) Summarize learning that took place” (NCREL, 1999, p 4).

TST learning team activities also included the teachers’ participation in five district-wide sessions, designed to enhance their foundational knowledge of standards-based learning and instruction. The session topics included (a) developing performance indicators and enabling activities to meet standards, (b) learning to set criteria, (c) formulating a plan to involve students through self-assessment and goal
setting, (d) implementing ways to conference and report with students and parents, and (e) reflecting and sharing their standards-based journey. Typically, there were approximately 105 session participants, which included the TST teachers. These sessions often included presentations by guest speakers, discussion of reading materials and a sharing time for the participants. (See Appendix A for more details on these sessions.)
CHAPTER 3
METHOD

Participants

Participants included four female elementary school teachers that comprised the two learning teams from Pearl City Elementary and Palisades Elementary Schools, located in the Leeward District on the island of O‘ahu. Their ages ranged from 32 to 40 years old. Two of the teachers had master’s degrees in education and two had bachelor’s degrees in education. All four teachers were certified in elementary education.

Participation in the study was voluntary. The principals of the two elementary schools recruited the teachers to participate in the TST program. One month after the teams met, the teachers were invited to participate in the study. The teachers agreed and signed a consent form (see Appendix C).

Data Sources

Field notes. The author used a portable computer at the TST meetings to record the teachers’ reactions to the large sessions and their questions and impressions regarding the study group activities. At these meetings, the teachers planned for the eight lessons they would be conducting. The author provided assistance as necessary. For example, one of the teachers asked for “kid friendly” examples of the six traits of writing. The author was able to provide a set of these traits and direct the teacher to a website that featured examples of scored student work and teacher commentary on them. During these planning meetings, the author asked the teachers the following seven questions developed by Busick and Mann (2000):
(a) How will your lesson introduce the standards-based target? (b) What else might help students get a clear picture of the criteria that will be applied in this assignment? (c) What sequence is best for learning experiences? (d) How will students be grouped as they work toward the target? (e) How will you help students familiarize themselves with any graphic organizer? (f) What resources—human, electronic, and text—do you want to have available? (g) What is the time frame for the lesson? Will it be carried out over several days? A week or more? (Busick and Mann, 2001, p. 30)

Classroom observations. The author observed the participants teaching eight different lessons on eight separate occasions. Each observation lasted between 30-45 minutes. The observations took place in the teacher’s classroom, except on two occasions when the lessons took place in the school computer lab. All observations were recorded on the observation sheet (See Appendix D), with the author completing the sections labeled “Enabling Activity Demonstrated,” “What Happened,” “Evidence of Achievement,” and “Effectiveness of Strategies and Decisions”. In the section labeled “Enabling Activity Demonstrated,” the author recorded the particular learning opportunity presented to the children. In the “What Happened” section, the author noted the events that took place during the observation. In the sections “Evidence of Achievement” and “Effectiveness of Strategies and Decisions,” the author listed the observable events and products that indicated the teacher had reached her goals delineated in her standards-based lesson plan.
After each class observation, the author facilitated a debrief session with the teacher and asked the following questions:

(a) How did you feel about the lesson just completed? (b) What did you observe of your students as you were giving the lesson? (c) How does that correlate with your feelings about the lesson? (d) What do you recall of your own teaching and presentation? (e) How would you compare your students' behavior with your desired plans? (f) How would you compare your own teaching behavior with your intended outcomes? (g) What can you infer about the achievement of your lesson objectives? (h) As you reflect on the lesson, can you analyze why the students performed or did not perform as they did? (i) If you were to do this lesson again, what other teaching strategies or conditions might be workable? (Costa, 2001)

During this debrief session, the author completed the remainder of the observation sheet, noting the teachers' impressions. In the section labeled "Summarize Impressions and Assessment of Event," the author noted how the teacher felt about the completed lesson, what she felt worked and did not work. The author recorded the teacher's observation of her students' participation and understanding in the section "Recall Supporting Information." In the section labeled "Analyze, Infer & Determine Cause & Effect Relationships" the author noted the teacher's reflections on her expectations for the lesson, her analysis of what actually happened and the reasons for those outcomes.

Lesson plans. The teachers each compiled a portfolio consisting of six of the eight lesson plans developed for the lessons observed. (In order to receive their
professional development credits, the teachers were only required to complete six lesson plans.) The teachers used the Leeward District Standards-Based Lesson Plan template to develop their plans (see Appendix E). The plans included six sections:

(a) the content standard and benchmark; (b) performance indicators that the lessons were to address; (c) the assessment that was to measure/evaluate the student's learning as it relates to the performance indicators; (d) an analysis of the assessment to determine the specific skills, concepts, and experiences that were prerequisite to successfully completing the assessment; (e) the instructional strategies that would engage students and focus on the skills needed for this assessment; and (f) an evaluation of the lesson that was completed after the instruction, which became a reflection section for the teacher (Leeward District Standards-based Lesson Plan, 2001).

Reflection logs. The teachers kept a reflection log, recording their reflections after each of the five large group sessions, and after each lesson that was observed. The author provided five guiding questions for their reflections: (a) What steps might I take to become more familiar with my State standards? (b) What are my beliefs about the statements “standards for all students” and “all children can learn”? (c) In what areas are my classroom practices traditional? (d) Which practices are standards-based? (e) Am I confident that students are learning, given my current classroom practices?

An initial analysis of the reflection logs revealed a tendency for the teachers to state the events and what their future plans would be rather than truly reflect on the process. Because of this initial analysis, the author decided to return to interview
the participants approximately six months after the end of the initiative. The interview was meant to verify their beliefs and check to see if any changes had taken place in their instruction. The teachers were asked an additional three questions at that time: (a) If you could sort your responses in your reflection log into types or categories of responses, what categories were evident in your reflections; (b) Has your thinking about standards implementation, classroom instruction, and student work changed since you wrote your reflections from last year; (c) Would you join another learning team and how would you like to see it structured? The author taped the interview and used the categories suggested to sort the reflections in the teachers' reflection logs. In subsequent chapters the reflections of the four teachers will be analyzed separately and then across participants.

*Teacher survey.* In April 2002, the four participants completed the Learning Team Survey (See Appendix F). The purpose of the survey was to gather more information on (a) the teachers' backgrounds, (b) why the teachers decided to participate in the TST program, (c) whether the sessions worked for them and if so, in what ways, and (d) the kinds of literacy activities they were implementing in their classrooms. Not all the information obtained on this survey was used for this study.

*Targeted standards teachers' evaluation session questionnaire:* After the last study group meeting, the teachers evaluated their participation in the learning team by responding to a questionnaire (See Appendix G).

*Follow-up interviews and teachers' sorting of their reflection log responses.* The author interviewed each of the teachers approximately six months after the last
study group meeting. The purpose of the interview was to gain the teachers' perspectives on their reflection log responses, to verify their beliefs about standards implementation, and to determine whether or not the teachers could identify changes in their instruction that resulted from their study group participation. The author asked the teachers three questions: (a) If you could sort your responses in your reflection log into types or categories of responses, what categories were evident in your reflections; (b) Has your thinking about standards implementation, classroom instruction, and student work changed since your wrote your reflections from last year; (c) If you join another learning team, how would you like to see it structured? The author audio taped the interview.

Data Analysis

The data from the above sources were analyzed to determine whether or not the teachers were more knowledgeable of the writing standards and better able to implement them in their classrooms. Using Strauss's (1987) constant comparison method, the data were examined as they were collected. The author noted themes and theoretical concepts that emerged, and constantly compared various sources of data across time. Some of the data (field notes, classroom observations, lesson plans, and reflection logs) were compared across time to determine whether or not the teachers were becoming more knowledgeable and better able in implementing the standards across time. The author read through and reviewed all of the data for each individual case to construct a profile of each of the four participants. When a finding emerged, validation from other sources including the evaluation
questionnaire and the follow-up interviews was obtained. This triangulation of data sources helped to validate the changes taking place in the teachers.

Seven months after the initiative ended, the teachers were asked to reread their reflections and sort their responses into categories. During this follow-up interview, the author asked the teachers what types of reflections they tended to put in their reflection journals. They decided that three themes: feelings, findings and outcomes, were reflected most in their writing. These categories suggested by the teachers during the follow-up interview were used to initially sort the teachers' reflections from their logs and lesson plans. After reviewing the interview transcript and rereading the teachers' reflections, it was decided these categories were too vague for connection to the theoretical concepts researched in this study. The author decided on the following categories to sort the data: confidence, change, influence of the team participation and implementation of the standards. These categories were chosen because they appeared throughout all the teachers' reflections. After consultation with the author's thesis committee chair these categories were refined and changed to: (a) early observations and philosophy, (b) experiences in the process of change, (c) influence of initiative on teaching, (d) knowledge and implementation of writing standards.
CHAPTER 4
RESULTS

In this chapter, the author presents the compilation of the data gathered from the reflection entries, observation notes and interview responses in the form of four narratives. The narratives present how each teacher changed from the beginning to the end of the initiative with respect to her knowledge and implementation of the writing standards.

Trudi

Background. Trudi is a third grade teacher with a B.Ed. She has 13 years of teaching experience, all in the Leeward District. The author saw her as the strongest of the four teachers and the one who made the highest gains. She began the initiative with a solid understanding of the writing process and the dimensions of quality that identify good writing. The previous year she participated in a writing in-service provided by the author at Trudi’s school to increase participant awareness of the writing process. Following the principles that she learned during that year-long in-service, Trudi started this initiative with a strong foundation in the writing process. She had a clear vision of what the writing process entailed and imparted that vision to her students. Participation in this initiative clearly showed further improvements in her standards-based approach to writing. She now used the writing process, as well as the other writing standards, to help her students improve their writing skills. For example, her instruction included examples of anchor papers that she compiled to give her students models of rubric score points. She confidently

\(^1\) All participants were given pseudonyms
could point out how and why the anchors were aligned or not aligned to the standards.

Trudi herself reported that the initiative helped her change her instruction. She was observed conferring with her students on one occasion when she noticed that several students had a similar problem with clearly illustrating meaning in their writing. Trudi stopped the students’ writing and conducted a mini-lesson on the quality of adding meaning to writing by using vivid details (Observation, December 2001). Her responses to the Learning Team Survey, which was administered at the end of the initiative, included statements such as, “It’s [the initiative] making me a better teacher” and “It’s [the initiative] affirmed what I’ve been doing ‘right’ all these years and taught me how to fix what was ‘wrong’” (Learning Team Survey, April 2002). In that same survey she identified these strengths of the initiative as the “collaboration between teachers” and the “alignment of curriculum to standards” (Learning Team Survey, April 2002). She also recognized her shift in having clear targets, sharing those targets with the students and creating a more student centered learning environment. These are all factors that contribute to a standards-based classroom.

Trudi’s writing class consisted of 22 third grade students comprised of students from her homeroom and the other third grade homeroom. Her students were those who were considered the highest achievers in language arts. After the first month of the initiative, Trudi set up a standards wall, a display of student work samples that met the writing standards. The wall also contained the writing standard and benchmark, written in language understandable to the students. When she was
observed teaching on October 16, 2001, the desks were arranged in rows facing the front of the room. By the end of the year, the room was arranged with groups of four desks facing each other. Trudi considered herself an “authoritarian teacher on her way towards becoming a collaborator and facilitator” (Learning Team Survey, April 2002).

Each monthly observation indicated that the students showed respect and admiration toward her. She was stern when students were not on task but showed a sense of caring as she conferred with the individual students.

Early observations and philosophy. As the observation notes from the beginning of the initiative to the end were analyzed, Trudi’s comments about her lessons showed increasing self-efficacy. Her beginning impressions of the value of the standards-based lesson centered on either reproducing the standards as handouts for the students and/or restating how confused the students were with regard to understanding the standards. An analysis of her entries from her reflection log shows a progression from feelings of inadequacy and “overwhelming sense of doom” (Reflection Log, September 2001) to feelings of confidence and joy in student progress.

Trudi began the standards based implementation process with many questions and self doubt, “Just don’t know what to say or think” and “I’ve had no real standards training” (Reflection Log, September 2001). Later in that same reflection she complained about the enormity of the TST program and her responsibility in being a part of it. She wrote in her reflection log on September 21, 2001, that she felt “stressed and scared” after learning the details of the initiative. In
analyzing the reflections found in her lesson plans dated October 2001, statements such as "Students enthusiastic about 'standards' [and] able to find accurate evidence of 6 traits in writing process" showed reflections more like a retelling of the events of the lessons and next steps which needed to be taken. She did not utilize the reflection section of the lesson plan to explore the reasons for her initial stress. At this point she had an opportunity to examine those feeling of stress and reduce them because of the results she saw happening with her students. She does not, however, reflect on her own shift in beliefs or behavior.

_Experience in the process of change._ Mid-year in the initiative, Trudi’s December lessons focused on criteria as the source for implementing the standards. Her December 3rd reflection stated, “Setting criteria ...is crucial at the beginning of learning and teaching. We need to...see where the kids are at to see what needs to be taught and measure growth” (Reflection Log, December 2001). During her January lesson she saw that growth in the students’ ability to set criteria and relate them to the standards (Observation, January 2002).

Her insights during the learning team debrief sessions helped all of us gain knowledge and understanding in how students grow in the standards-based learning process. She related specific examples in her class when students had opportunities to show their deeper understanding of the standards, and she often brought student work as evidence of their abilities to address the writing process standards. By February 2002, the students were familiar enough with criteria setting to make a student generated list of criteria to show essential components of a good song (Observation, February 2002).
As explained earlier, the initiative process began with the learning teams meeting prior to an observed lesson to plan and discuss the instructional strategies the teachers would use during the lesson. Each month the team met first to plan and then to debrief after the lesson was observed. As Trudi continued to meet with the learning team to discuss upcoming lessons, she started to get deeply involved in the standards implementation process and gave her full attention to the initiative. Her confidence showed a slight increase during the first three months as evidenced in her reflections on November 5, 2001, when she wrote, "I don’t know what [Anna] can do for me because I don’t know what I’m doing or will be doing yet" and December 17, 2001, "I was so excited to see all of my students writing about their experiences. We’ve certainly come a long way since we started" (Reflection Log, December 2001). This turning point occurred after the Anne Davies Session II on December 3, 2001. Anne explained the technique of setting criteria with the children and holding them accountable for their own learning. Trudi felt a sense of understanding and gained confidence, but continued to feel overwhelmed with too much work and not enough time.

These anxious feelings persisted until the end of the initiative even though Trudi’s confidence increased and she saw positive results in her students’ writing ability. Her last entry in her reflection log showed an appreciation for the initiative and a better understanding of the standards implementation process. She wrote,

I found that the changes I’ve made will allow my students to take ownership of their own learning, which is one of the State’s general learner outcomes...I think that now that I have an idea of the standards based
classroom, I can see the “how” [in achieving the general learner outcomes].

If we create such an environment, we will ensure that the students do achieve the general learner outcomes (Reflection Log, May 2002).

Toward the end of the initiative the observation forms noted that Trudi seemed at ease when conferencing with the students. She said she believed the students had an “easier time writing” (Observation, April 2002) and understanding the connection to the writing standards. By May, Trudi noted in her reflection log that the students were able to work independently and she could use their feedback to adjust her instruction. She felt the students had come further in their understanding of the writing standards than she had imagined they would. She saw the growth of the students in their synthesis of the information they had used during the year, and her growth as a “guide” rather than a “dictator” (Reflection Log, May 2002).

These later reflections revealed her metacognitive processes, which explored her feelings about the standards and their impact on her students. She mentioned such instructional skills as modeling, adjusting the pace of the lesson and reviewing constantly to keep the students on track. She had these insights through reflections about the lesson and her instructional delivery. This was evident in the comments she made during the interview conducted seven months after the learning team stopped meeting. “The standards-based lesson plan enabled me to reflect on my teaching, make adjustments in my instructional practices and reteach these same lessons to a new group of third grade students” (Follow-up Interview, December 2002).
Influence of initiative on teaching. In late May 2002 when Trudi responded to the targeted standards teachers’ evaluation session questionnaire, she again stated the benefits of having the students generate criteria, create rubrics and truly understand the standards and benchmarks as targets. She felt the students had a “better understanding of the standards” (Evaluation Questionnaire, May 2002), but lamented the “lack of time to go deeper with each standard before moving on to cover the remaining [writing] standards” (Evaluation Questionnaire, May 2002). She considered continuing this process with other content areas as well. At that time she stated that she would like to continue to be a part of the initiative but wanted “more depth with less activities” (Evaluation Questionnaire, May 2002). Her responses to statements in the evaluation questionnaire also supported her belief in the initiative as a valuable experience with comments such as,

Before the initiative, I had very little knowledge about implementing standards in my classroom. Although I had already begun to use some of the terminology and used simple rubrics in my classroom, it is much more meaningful to have the students generate the criteria and rubrics for the tasks. I could see a definite benefit of the learning team (Evaluation Questionnaire, May 2002).

The students generated criteria by listing essential components that were needed to produce an excellent piece of writing. They assessed these criteria by creating rubrics or scoring guides that stated descriptors which showed what work looked like at the various levels (exceeding the criteria, meeting the criteria, approaching the criteria and well below the criteria).
In the follow-up interview she felt “the kids had more ownership...and are more receptive to going through the [writing] process and using terms like rubric...setting criteria” (Follow-up Interview, December 2002). As her writing class was observed over the eight month period, she appeared as a teacher who was fully knowledgeable about the writing standards and who was continually implementing those standards in her classroom instruction. When interviewed seven months after the initiative had ended, she indicated was still implementing the standards in her instruction long after the learning team stopped meeting (Follow-up Interview, December 2002).

Knowledge and implementation of writing standards. Trudi moved from simply restating the writing standards for the comprehension of her students to actively implementing those standards as a daily part of her writing instruction. Her participation in the learning team enabled her to find meaning in the standards, to construct lessons to impart the standards, and to strengthen her commitment to implement the standards in her writing class.

When looking at the key elements of a standards-based classroom as defined by the Leeward District (Appendix B), Trudi addressed each element. Every lesson observed had standards as the target for student understanding. This understanding of the target was evident in their work products, which were displayed in the room along with teacher comments and connections to the writing standards. Trudi communicated to parents by letter and journal sharing, which gave parents insights into the writing standards that were taught in the classroom. Her parent conferences...
also used the standards as a basis for conversation. In addition, the song that was submitted for the song contest was based on the writing standards.

Trudi gave feedback as part of her instruction and assessed the student writing by using rubrics and checklists. Because she used her reflections to assess her instruction, she made adjustments in her instruction to help the students better understand the writing standards. As stated earlier, Trudi would walk around the room and confer with her students while they were writing their first drafts. Whenever she realized that several students were having the same difficulties, Trudi would stop the students and either have a whole class mini-lesson or bring the few students together for a mini-lesson. She was observed using this strategy in February 2002 and April 2002. On both occasions, she saw the need for further explanation and was flexible enough to provide it. This seamless overlap of assessment and instruction was evident in each lesson observed. The assessment of the writing was not limited to Trudi’s perspective, but included the students’ perspective as well. The students developed criteria and self-assessed against that criteria formatively, not just summatively.

The environment that Trudi created in the classroom invited collaboration and freedom from humiliation. Students felt comfortable sharing their work, receiving feedback from the teacher or peers, and displaying their work for public view. Students knew when and why their writing did not meet the standard and had the tools to make the necessary improvements.

Trudi connected their writing to the “real world” by exposing her students to news articles, song contests, published research and other printed material. The
students had an opportunity to apply their writing skills to composing a song for a healthy foods contest. Music was added to the lyrics and the song became a winner. The class performed their original song at Center Stage in Ala Moana Shopping Center during March 2002.

Trudi believed that she had accomplished the task of the initiative by implementing the writing standards:

The initiative gave me background to understand the writing standards and the standards-based process of lesson planning. The learning team helped me stay with the goal and gave me support. I would like to continue with this same [concept] this year if it’s available (Follow-up Interview, December 2002).

Ginny

Background. Ginny is a first grade teacher with a BA in Music and a MEd. She had ten years of experience as a piano teacher and 11 years as a lower elementary school teacher. She was a teacher who made tremendous gains in standards implementation although she had the most difficult class to teach. Her class had several special needs children, including an English Language Learner (ELL), one student with ADHD, and one with ADD, who had psychological problems. None of the youngsters were on medication. She wrote in her teacher survey that “there were many incidences where the entire class was disrupted due to their behaviors” (Evaluation Session Questionnaire, May 2002). On all the occasions that the class was observed, no incidents occurred; however, Ginny would often begin our debriefing sessions by discussing problems that had
happened in the previous class or earlier in the week. She needed a lot of emotional support to get through the year, implementing standards, changing her instructional delivery, adjusting her teaching style and dealing with troubled youngsters.

Ginny saw herself as “structured in some ways, but allowing enough freedom for students to make their own choices” (Learning Team Survey, April 2002). She believed her openness and caring attitude fostered a comfort level in her students. This was revealed in a statement on her personal teaching style when she said, “Students are comfortable when they talk to me and they do not feel inhibited or nervous” (Learning Team Survey, April 2002). Her beliefs of being a “nurturing” teacher showed in the care and concern she always showed while working with her students. She saw her classroom as a “place where students are interested and involved with the learning process” (Learning Team Survey, April 2002). She believed her first grade students were “enthusiastic and most of them are risk takers at this age...it’s important to nurture this enthusiasm for learning” (Learning Team Survey, April 2002).

Ginny’s classroom was inviting and engaging when observed on October 25, 2001. The desks were arranged in groups with a group leader in each grouping. There were twenty students across a range of ability levels. They were allowed freedom to use other spaces while they wrote and could use resources available in several resource areas of the room.

Throughout the initiative, Ginny had an upbeat attitude and a willingness to try new approaches. She felt the initiative enabled the students to “become aware of how to go about assessing themselves. In writing, learning to edit and proofread
was the first big step towards becoming independent writers” (Lesson Plan Reflection, November 2001). Analyzing her reflections, it was noted that although she felt the pressure to cover many topics in a small amount of time, she continued to have a positive, optimistic attitude about the initiative. She kept the larger goal in mind and continued to value the work we were doing. She wrote in her learning team survey sentiments such as “my long term goal is to continue gaining knowledge and learning effective skills in teaching, especially in elementary education” (Learning Team Survey, May 2002). Her reflections throughout the initiative were more than retelling or complaining. She gained insights into her students’ abilities and her instructional delivery.

*Early observations and philosophy.* Ginny’s first reflection on the initiative showed anxiety, but a willingness to participate. Comments such as “How am I going to do this with my class? When I calmed down, I decided to take things one step at a time. This was the only way” (Reflection Log, October 2001) showed her confidence and steadfastness. Ginny began the initiative by taking small steps in implementing the writing standards with her first grade students. She decided to start with introducing the students to editing symbols and concentrate on the conventions and skills of writing. When interviewed after the first observation, she was pleased with the first lesson and felt the stronger students could partner with those “not comfortable yet with the idea of peer editing” (Observation, October 2001). Her reflection in her log on this lesson supported her confidence in the process when she stated, “The lesson went smoothly, but as I reflect back on it, I think I’ll be able to think of some possible refinements” (Reflection Log, October
Right from the start, she wanted to get totally involved in the standards-based writing process. She wanted to develop rubrics for the students to use to self-assess their work. The first rubric followed the aforementioned lesson. She had the students assess their editing through proofreading. She took several class sessions to insure that the students understood the concept of a rubric and how it could improve their writing. At the end of this time period the ELL student joined the class and spoke no English. Ginny stated, “It was quite a challenge to include[the ELL student in] many of the writing activities” (Lesson Plan, November 2001).

Experiences in the process of change. By November, Ginny’s class was comfortable peer editing for conventions and skills and was ready to move on in the writing process. The students were asked to explain the writing process to their parents. Most of the students could confidently explain to Ginny what they would tell their parents. Two of the children had an extremely difficult time with this presentation, and Ginny did a mini-lesson on it just for them. By the end of the class period, both children were able to explain the writing process in their own words.

During the next few lessons, her instruction focused on the qualities of good writing and Ginny generated a rubric which she carefully went over with the students. In the reflection section in her lesson plan she stated,

The students were enthusiastic about the lesson... providing answers which made sense. Maile was the only student who did not provide an accurate assessment of her own writing. I will individually... review this lesson with her. Mini-lessons are more effective in introducing each section of the writing rubric... pointing out the ‘Met’ column first may be more effective
than pointing out the ‘Not Met’ since the students will focus in on what they want to attain rather than on what they should not be doing when writing (Lesson Plan, January 2002).

Ginny thought about the rubric in her reflection log and wrote,

[the rubric] needs to be in easily understandable language for first grade students... by introducing the writing process rubric, the students and parents will further understand why having a standard is important... to improve their writing [and] improve the quality of education (Reflection Log, January 2002).

The students continued to be surrounded by a classroom showing evidence of standards with standards wall, student writing, and rubrics. Ginny used standards-based lesson plans for her instructional delivery and gave many opportunities for self-assessment. The students understood the standards language and felt confident in their writing.

In Ginny’s evaluation interview, she stated that at the beginning of the school year, she was “not very clear as to which direction... to take with the writing standards.” As the year progressed, she became “more comfortable about the standards... class began using the writing rubric... students understood what they needed to do in order to achieve these standards” (Evaluation Session, May 2002).

**Influence of initiative on teaching.** Ginny used reflection as a means to increase her self-efficacy and deepen her understanding of the standards-based process. The other three teachers wrote short entries in their reflection logs, but
Ginny wrote extensive reflections that analyzed her thoughts and often came to conclusions. She wrote more meaningful reflections than the other three teachers and inspired her students to also reflect on their writing and the writing process. In her reflection log she wrote, “I enjoyed reading the responses since most of them were positive . . . [they] enjoy writing now because [they] are confident” (Reflection Log, May 2002). Ginny was surprised at the depth of her students’ reflections and how “far these students have come with writing” (Reflection Log, May 2002).

Ginny was positively influenced by the learning team and stated in her reflection log, “When the teachers shared their lessons in small groups, going over the strengths of the lesson, as well as the needed areas of improvements, helped me to gain new insights” (Reflection Log, May 2002).

At the end of the initiative reflections in her log, lesson plans and observations all mentioned the intent to continue the practices started this year. In her log she stated, “I am going to continue working on peer editing skills with my students so that they will be able to provide better suggestions to help improve each other’s writing in class” (Reflection Log, May 2002). She also wrote in her lesson plan reflection that next year she would “begin these lessons earlier in the school year by having a classroom library of Caldecott award winning books, then starting our descriptive word bank sooner . . . [which should make the students] feel comfortable using them daily in their writing projects or their journals” (Lesson Plan, May 2002). This same feeling was echoed in the final observation when she said, “Next year . . . [I] want to continue to have students reflect on lesson to
explain portfolio to their parents . . . grade partner needs training in this process so that standards can be implemented an entire grade level” (Observation, May 2002).

When asked if she would join another learning team, Ginny responded positively and noted that this year for the first time, she was part of the Standards Implementation Design (SID) leadership team at her school. The author requested that the principal select her to be part of the SID team for the new school year because she had gone through the initiative and had learned so much. At a faculty in-service in October 2002 Ginny was more of a leader than she had been in the past and was willing to share her own standards implementation with her grade level cluster. She appeared to enjoy the collaboration with the other members of the team.

Her final reflection was an indication of her successful standards implementation with support from the learning team. She wrote,

As I reflect back on my journey, it has been a challenging, sometimes frustrating, but mostly a very fulfilling experience. I realize I still have to revisit and refine many of the activities I have done, but I am feeling more confident and comfortable with the standards-based writing lessons...this journey has been filled with positives experiences and many new insights (Reflection Log, May 2002).

Her comments on the evaluation survey supported this by stating, “At times I felt overwhelmed . . . having someone to talk to helped . . . need to refine what I have started, then slowly begin to implement the standards in other content areas”
(Evaluation Questionnaire, May 2002). She has done just that by working on the reading standards this year and looking at the math standards for later in the year.

Knowledge and implementation of writing standards. Toward the end of the initiative Ginny already felt comfortable with standard implementation in the writing process. She stated, “I now have a better understanding of how the performance standards could be implemented into the classroom” (Learning Team Survey, April 2002). When asked how she went about planning a lesson now as opposed to how she planned her lessons before the initiative, she responded, “I am much more aware of the standards and criteria for each lesson. Students assessing their own work plays a major role now as compared to previous lessons” (Learning Team Survey, April 2002). The lessons observed showed this awareness of the standards and the students using self-assessment against their rubrics.

The key elements of a standards-based classroom state, “Standards are stated as clear targets that are understood by students, teachers and parents” (Leeward District Key Elements, 2001). Ginny believed that her students understood what they needed to do in order to achieve these standards . . . [because] the students understand the expectations and assessment criteria at the beginning of the lesson . . . now the students are involved through the use of rubrics (Evaluation Questionnaire, May 2002).

Parents were informed about the writing process through letters sent home, conferences during report cards and a culminating activity that showcased the children’s puppet shows and their writing portfolios. The writing standards were displayed along with the individual portfolios, and Ginny was available to discuss
the writing process and the writing standards with the parents. The learning team members attended this activity and supported Ginny in her efforts.

Another aspect of standards implementation is the feedback given to students through interactions with Ginny and classmates. This feedback aspect was very evident in the classes observed, especially while the students were working on their final project. The observations revealed students offering assistance to other students at the computers as they wrote their collaborative fairy tales with accompanying illustrations. One child, who was not a fluent reader, had computer skills that enabled him to help others. They, in turn, helped him read the story he had written and offered suggestions for improvement (Observation, April 2002).

By the end of the year it was evident the students had learned to “self-assess against targets on an on-going basis” (Leeward District Key Elements, 2001). Ginny noted in her final evaluation, “The teacher also observes how students are doing by watching students in action, and then keeping a file of students’ work as evidence. The students will reflect on their work to make improvements” (Evaluation Questionnaire, May 2002).

The last key element of a standards-based classroom is that “the environment is safe, and it invites and involves students actively in the learning process” (Leeward District Key Elements, 2001). Ginny’s method of teaching invited all students to participate, help each other, feel comfortable sharing and learning from their teacher and each other. The students were enthusiastic and productive as they compiled their portfolios and presented their puppet
performances. Each child had a chance to develop their original fairy tale into a play. They enlisted the help of classmates to present their final performance.

Ginny valued the experience she gained from the learning team and believed it helped her implement the standards and she said, “I think having the support of the [resource teacher] was important. At times, I felt overwhelmed and having someone to talk to helped” (Evaluation Questionnaire, May 2002). She also replied positively when asked at the follow-up interview if she would consider joining another learning team. “I think knowing that other teachers were going through the same process and being able to share my trials and successes with them helped me with the [writing] standards” (Follow-up Interview, December 2002).

Shirley

Background. Shirley has a B.Ed. and 15 years experience teaching fourth grade. She became a part of the initiative to “help improve...as an effective teacher” and “gain a better knowledge of our standards and standards-based lessons” (Teacher Survey, April 2002). Statements she made in the teacher survey showed she cared deeply about her class and had the basic philosophy “that every child can learn, achieve their greatest potential” (Teacher Survey, April 2002).

Shirley is a traditional teacher who kept strict rules in her class. She believed an exemplary teacher had “good classroom management [where] students know what is expected of them” (Teacher Survey, April 2002). She struggled with her desire for a “quiet classroom [with] desks ...in rows with everyone facing the front” (Teacher Survey, April 2002). She believed this arrangement helped to maintain good classroom management and fostered learning. Because she wanted to maintain
classroom management, she rearranged the desks to face front after the first observation. She knew pedagogically that students needed to confer during the writing process, which created a noisy classroom, but she still preferred a quiet classroom for most of the writing class period.

At times Shirley’s stated beliefs were not consistent with her new actions. Although her classroom was changing, she still answered the teacher survey from a more traditional viewpoint. As her class was observed, it was apparent that her initial feelings for control soon gave way to ones of mutual trust with the students, eventually loosening some of her more traditional values. She even read her own writing to the students and asked them to offer suggestions for improvement. This was risk-taking for her to be so vulnerable in front of her students and provided a very valuable model for them to follow.

Shirley’s class consisted of a mix of students from her own homeroom and an additional group from the other fourth grade homeroom. There was a range of abilities, and most students were comfortable in responding to class discussion prompts. There was very little peer interaction in the beginning of the initiative, due in part because of Shirley’s belief that good classroom management meant a silent classroom.

As the author analyzed her reflections from her lesson plans and the comments she made during the debrief sessions throughout the initiative, it was noted that Shirley was very concerned with not having enough time to complete all of the lessons she planned for implementing the writing standards. She mentions time constraints in seven out of the eight lesson plan reflections with comments
such as, "I wish I could get to more people [to conference] . . . spend at least five minutes with each of the six students seen during [the] time period" (Lesson Plan, December 2001). She also mentioned time issues in five out of the eight observation debriefings with comments such as "wanted all students to share but felt time constraint" (Observation, February 2002) and "they needed more time for revisions" (Observation, April 2002). Unfortunately, she did not keep a reflection log and only reflected briefly on two of the large group sessions. These reflections were more of a retelling of the tasks accomplished in the sessions and her feeling of being "rushed into trying to complete" (Large Group Reflection, October 2001) the tasks at hand. There was no triangulation of her lesson plan reflections with other data, particularly her own reflections on what was happening during the initiative.

**Early observations and philosophy.** Shirley began her standards-based lessons by introducing her class to the components of the writing standards including benchmarks and performance indicators. She proceeded slowly with these initial lessons because she did "not want to overload students," (Lesson Plan, November 2001) and gave the students an overview in order for them to know enough to explain the writing standards to their parents. She was very systematic in creating a wall for displaying the standards and benchmarks with examples of student work, information letters to parents and handouts detailing the writing standards to be included in the student journals.

*Her philosophy of learning centered on the belief that "learning occurs when children are involved in their learning and interested [in knowing] the criteria . . . in how to achieve those goals"* (Teacher Survey, April 2002). Because of this belief,
she began by teaching criteria setting and showed students how to self-assess using a teacher created self-assessment sheet. The first criteria the class set were the rules for their writing period.

Shirley focused the first quarter of the school year on the definition of writing standards and their connection to the writing process. Mini-lessons were used to reinforce the notion of the key elements of a standards-based classroom. The students were given the opportunity to reflect on their work and kept a writer's notebook to store topic ideas. Standards-based terms were repeatedly stressed so that the class used similar vocabulary terms when responding to their writing.

Shirley continued to conference on a daily basis with the student writers and gave feedback orally and on post-it notes. Rubrics were developed by the teacher during this period and were used to “evaluate [the] final draft by the teacher” (Lesson Plan, November 2001). Revision was also introduced during this early period, but caused Shirley some anxiety because of her focus on time. She stated, “We could probably spend more than one quarter on the same writing piece, and still some students may not meet/exceed the criteria...at what point do you stop and move on?” (Lesson Plan, November 2001)

Experiences in the process of change. The class did move on to poetry, book reviews, folk tales and research/report writing during the second and third quarter. Shirley continued to write standards-based lesson plans and implemented the writing standards by constantly addressing the performance indicators and reviewing the criteria of good writing with her students. During all classroom observations, most students could explain about their writing and what standard
being addressed. One student, Nainoa, was especially adept at relating the connection to the standards and whether or not his work had met those standards. The class began using the language of standards and reflecting on the writing process in their journals.

*Influence of initiative on teaching.* Shirley did not volunteer to be part of the learning team but was recruited by her principal. At the end of the year she saw her participation as positive and according to her statements in the evaluation questionnaire said,

I think the students understand the writing standards better now (so do I)! I think just going through the writing process, having the writing standards with them, and referring to the standards periodically . . . helped them to better understand the writing standards (Evaluation Questionnaire, May 2002).

She regarded the learning team experience as positive and would consider joining another team in the future. She said, “Just having the support, and knowing that I had to follow through with everything I did, made a difference” (Follow-up Interview, December 2002).

In the learning team survey the teachers were asked, “Which of your lessons did you feel went well?” Shirley responded, “I feel the lesson that involved my students helping me to revise my own writing was successful. They seemed eager to ‘help’ me . . . were interested in my personal life, and seemed highly motivated” (Learning Team Survey, April 2002). She also recalled this lesson in our follow-up interview one year later. The lesson involved Shirley reading a piece of writing that
she had written about a Christmas ornament made by her daughter. The lesson focused on revision. She asked the students what she might do to revise her piece. Shirley observed that “some good questions came from the students about the writing” (Follow-up Interview, December 2002) and how to improve it. When asked if she would have done that same lesson the previous year, she responded that she “had never shared personal writing with the class and that first time had been difficult because it was an emotional piece” (Follow-up Interview, December 2002). She revealed that she continued to share with that class but had not done the same with her present class. She considered doing the same lesson with this new class, but realized they needed more background in the revision process. Her writing lessons this year had not included enough practice with peer editing and recognizing the qualities of writing for them to contribute sufficiently in this activity.

Shirley is knowledgeable of the standards, but she needs reinforced self-efficacy to continue to implement them with this new group of students. If she were still in the learning team, she would “be forced to continue at the pace . . . like last year” (Follow-up Interview, December 2002). Without the support of a learning team, Shirley has allowed “the writing process to go at a slower pace and standards implementation to slide and make room for other school responsibilities like the HCPS II test” (Follow-up Interview, December 2002).

Her growth through the learning team experience helped to change some of her traditional beliefs. She appeared to change less than she might have if she had engaged in and documented more reflection. It was not surprising that the interview
in December showed that much of what she had done last year was not solidly imbedded in her instructional delivery in the following year. Although she stated in several lesson plan reflections that she “would start self-assessing earlier” (Lesson Plan, December 2001) and “have students generate their own rubrics” (Lesson Plan, January 2002) at the beginning of the year, when interviewed in December 2002, she had not followed her plan. She attributed a more difficult class and concentrating “on other content areas” as reasons for detouring from last year’s model.

Knowledge and implementation of writing standards. Shirley worked consistently in implementing the writing standards throughout the initiative and believed that it worked for her because “focusing on writing standards alone and providing meaningful corresponding activities with criteria is time consuming but worthwhile. I see how the students have grown from the beginning of the year” (Evaluation Questionnaire, May 2002). She had many issues with time but continued to implement and follow the key elements of a standards-based classroom.

After learning about implementation of writing standards, Shirley planned her writing lessons by mak[ing] sure that I have a rubric that the students have helped to create/or is in kid-friendly terms. I’ll relate the writing subject back to the standards, have anchor papers, use graphic organizers, and go over specific revisions (Learning Team Survey, April 2002).
It is interesting to note that when asked about planning lessons for other content areas, Shirley responded, “For science, math, social studies I’ll use a text with various hands on activities where applicable (Learning Team Survey, April 2002). The skills and knowledge of implementing practices that she had learned in the other content standards was not part of her schema. She did, however, see the importance of standards in reading and wrote at the end of the initiative, “I’d like to continue next year with implementing the reading content standards” (Evaluation Questionnaire, May 2002).

When noting the progress she made with the key elements of a standards-based classroom, Shirley believed she had achieved what she needed to do for the initiative. She stated,

Knowing that I was expected to implement the writing standards, it was necessary to understand the terms connected with the standards and relay this knowledge to the students and their parents . . . Now that I know and understand the writing standards, I plan my lessons/units according to the students’ needs, and what they should know and be able to do at their grade level benchmark (Evaluation Questionnaire, May 2002).

Shirley communicated regularly with her students’ parents through informational letters and a take home journal with the writing standards stated and examples of the students’ work.

When analyzing whether or not Shirley addressed the key elements of seamless instruction and assessment with feedback to students and student self-
assessment, it appeared that she was making gains in this area over time. She also noted this change when she wrote,

I now try to plan my lessons/units with the writing standards in mind. For instance, my students are presently working on writing their own folktales, based on their cultural heritages . . . Prior to writing their folktales, I referred to the reading standards for help in planning a prewriting activity. This activity involved paired readings of different folktales, with a story map that was to be written/illustrated based on their tale. Before starting the story map, the students came up with their own criteria for grading the map (Evaluation Questionnaire, May 2002).

Shirley’s students were becoming adept at setting criteria and judging whether or not their work met the criteria. They understood the language of the writing standards and could make the transfer to the newly introduced reading standards.

Because of Shirley’s philosophy of enabling every learner, her students felt safe to share, get feedback and perform at a higher level. The fourth key element of a standards-based classroom also includes students using real world reasons for their learning (Leeward District Key Elements, 2001). The students demonstrated the importance of writing for information when they completed their Hawaiian research papers and shared them at the school’s curriculum night. The students had gone to the Big Island and their research was meaningful because of the connections they made during the trip.
Although Shirley was diligent about completing each key element and showing a firm understanding of the writing standards, she was not thoroughly convinced of the long term benefit. Shirley believed completing “every enabling activity for every performance indicator of our key elements of a standards-based classroom was a lot! I felt as though I did not do a thorough enough job” (Evaluation Questionnaire, May 2002). Her final comment on implementing the writing standards was an indication of her preoccupation with the issue of time. When asked what additional help she could use, she replied “I could use help with time-management! I felt I spent so much time on writing alone this year! How will I be able to cope with trying to implement other content areas next year?” (Evaluation Questionnaire, May 2002). It was not surprising that her diligence with the writing standards did not weather the test of time.

Wilma

Background. Wilma is the youngest of the four teachers with only 8 years teaching experience, all at the same school and same grade. Although she held both a B.Ed. and M.Ed., Wilma had the least amount of confidence in her teaching ability. She relied on the other members of the initiative, especially Ginny who also taught at her school, to gain insights and did not feel comfortable sharing her own abilities.

Her class consisted of 28 third grade students of upper level ability with no SPED or ESLL students. Wilma and her grade partner combined their class for reading and writing. Of the 28 students, 11 were from the other third grade class. When asked to describe her class, Wilma said, “Some of [the students] might have
been placed in GT. Behavior was very good but some were lazy and unmotivated, just wanted to get it done without putting in the extra effort” (Informal Interview, February 2003) The classroom was arranged in linear groups with all the desks facing the front of the room. She rarely smiled and maintained a stance of separateness from the class. She never shared her writing with her students and did not appear to be a warm and caring teacher, although she thought of herself as one. She had stated that she “enjoyed working with children . . . wanted to help them make a difference with their lives” (Teacher Survey, April 2002).

Throughout her reflections, she lamented about next time doing an activity or a practice earlier. After returning from the winter break, she created a bulletin board with words her students discovered in their reading and wanted to use again. For instance in her reflection dated January 30, 2002, she stated, “Word bank had plenty of words. Some words students didn’t know meaning of. Next year begin word wall earlier and keep adding and checking if class knows the word” (Reflection Log, January 2002). Her earlier reflections focused on inabilities and deficiencies in her teaching, the students and the parents’ understanding with remarks such as, “class might be unprepared for standards” (Lesson Plan, October 2001) and “not sure how knowledgeable parents are to standards” (Reflection Log, October 2001). These statements of insecurity continued until the end with remarks on her evaluation of the initiative which included, 

This year was probably the first year that my group of students heard so much about the standards. They responded mostly with blank looks and responses to my questions during discussions on standards...were simple
and few. They seemed to have just accepted what I was telling them (Evaluation Questionnaire, May 2002).

Although she tried new ways of approaching the writing process and was willing to implement the standards, she always began each new step with self-doubt and skepticism. She was the neediest of the four teachers and the one with the least knowledge of the principles behind a learning team. She saw herself as “a little old-fashioned” (Learning Team Survey, April 2002). She said she liked “a quiet, disciplined classroom...[and that she] expect[s] students to listen when appropriate and do their work” (Learning Team Survey, April 2002).

*Early observations and philosophy.* Wilma began her writing instruction with similar lessons as Ginny. Wilma was prone to follow Ginny throughout the initiative instead of devising her own plan. She started with proofreading and allowed the students to chose their own proofreading marks. She wanted to start with a process the students already understood before moving them to the more difficult concepts in standards. Her students had already been using proofreading marks but now she showed the connection with the standards.

Wilma believed learning occurred when students are “listening, practicing, talking with others” (Learning Team Survey, April 2002). Her lesson plans involved lots of listening and practicing, but not as much talking with others. The students worked in groups but did not get sufficient feedback from the teacher to show considerable improvement in their writing. The class engaged in peer editing, but limited their suggestions to changes in conventions and skills rather than deeper meaning, clarity or voice. Wilma had asked for guiding questions for the students to
use during this process. A set of questions was provided but a suggestion was made to do a mini-lesson on setting criteria and have the students generate their own guiding questions. In the subsequent lesson observed, no peer editing or conferencing took place and no mention of this activity is recorded in her reflection log or lesson plans.

As the year progressed, Wilma began to focus on students’ understanding of the entire writing process, including the use of rubrics to improve writing. Wilma sent home a letter explaining the writing process to students’ parents and had her students practice explaining the standards to each other and then to their parents. In her reflection on November 28, 2001, she stated, “not sure whether students would understand writing standards...not sure whether they could explain to parents about writing standard...not sure if our parents would understand the assignment themselves” (Reflection Log, November 2001).

Wilma’s students kept writing in their journals and collaborated with first grade students to write a fairy tale and illustrate it on the computer. Wilma’s reflection on the first meeting between the two grades stated, “next time we should have an ice breaker...so the students will not feel so uncomfortable working together” (Reflection Log, February 2002). This statement is not a reflection at all. Wilma was merely reiterating the advice to her after the lesson. She did not reflect on how an ice breaker would have helped the students feel comfortable with each other and allow them to collaborate more easily. Shallow reflections such as this did not allow her to get to any deeper insights.
Experiences in the process of change. As the class moved along in their understanding of the standards, Wilma wrote in her reflection log, "feel like I want to align all other subjects to standards but not enough time to do it" (Reflection Log, March 2002). The class learned to set criteria, assess their work against a rubric, analyze anchor papers and revise their own work through peer interaction and editing. Much of their prewriting and foundational instruction was done together as a large group. The same children dominated the discussion, which led Wilma to write in her reflection log, "I need to find a way to get the louder children to allow the quieter children to give input" (Reflection Log, October 2001). This outcome never changed in the classroom. Wilma had peer conferencing and conferenced with individuals.

Influence of initiative on teaching. Like Shirley, Wilma also complained about starting earlier in the year to put standards in place and prepare the students for the independent projects planned as culminating activities. She was considering giving the students more choice in their projects next year. She said, "Students [would] pick their own Caldecott book. Students might pick one that they are capable of reading and finishing. Interest would be better if they chose their own" (Reflection Log, May 2002) When asked at the follow-up interview in December 2002 if she tried having the students pick their own books and corresponding project, she state, "This class is not at that level yet and...will need to see how they behave in the spring" (Follow-up Interview, December 2002).

Her reflections in her log and on the lesson plans did not go beyond retelling the events of the class and next steps to make. Her insights were often shallow, such
as “ah ha, I realized that I don’t have their work in their portfolio dated!” (Reflection Log, May 2002).

She did not contribute much in grade level sharing during the large sessions and relied on the other teacher at her school to suggest instructional strategies and plans of actions. She worked well with the first grade teacher and often followed her lead. In the interview conducted in December 2002, it did not surprise me that her idea of an ideal learning team would be one where she could “learn from teachers who knew more than her” and that she “did not have to share what [she] did” (Follow-up Interview, December 2002).

She wrote that the most she received from the initiative were the “free books” and “ideas from other teachers to improve her lessons” (Evaluation Questionnaire, May 2002). Except for allowing the students to work in groups and to peer edit, her teaching seemed to remain the same throughout the initiative. Her thoughts on feedback were reflected in her log when she said, “I can see the value in teacher comments as feedback valuable but takes more time for grading.” She did not completely make the shift in thinking to have a true standards-based classroom.

*Knowledge and implementation of writing standards.* Wilma was not overly enthusiastic about implementing and understanding the writing standards and was consistent in her beliefs about this implementation. When asked if the initiative was beneficial to her, her complete answer stated, “Taught me a little more about the standards” and “Now, I’m more conscious about making a lesson standards-based” (Learning Team Survey, April 2002). She was a little more descriptive when a month later she wrote,
I feel that this initiative has helped me to learn more about standards implementation. It forced me to open up the standards booklets and look over the standards, benchmarks, and performance indicators. I got some practice with starting to discuss “I Can” statements with the students and going over what the standards are and what benchmarks are (Evaluation Questionnaire, May 2002).

Wilma used the key elements of a standards-based classroom as a kind of checklist to stay on target with the initiative; as she completed one, she went on to the next. She discussed the standards with her class and clarified the targets they needed to understand with regard to their writing. She had charts with the content and performance standards on her walls and the students could explain what the standards meant. She wrote, “I think some students do understand the writing standards better. We practiced the writings (sic) process throughout the school year and they are familiar with it” (Evaluation Questionnaire, May 2002).

Wilma followed Ginny’s example and communicated with the parents of her students at the beginning of the initiative, when she first had the students explain the writing standards to their family, and at the very end when she invited parents to come to the culminating activity in the school library. Ginny also influenced Wilma to produce a writing standards display, which included Wilma’s student portfolios.

Although teacher generated rubrics were used by the students, they never developed their own. Wilma had some difficulty giving feedback and often asked for help with writing commentary. Her difficulty came from her insecurities as mentioned earlier. She believed her “delivery of instruction has changed since the
beginning of the school year in the sense that I am more consciously referring back to the standards” (Evaluation Questionnaire, May 2002).

Wilma would have benefited more from the learning team if she had a higher level of motivation. She saw as the most valuable aspect of the initiative “hearing and seeing the teachers who presented their lessons . . . [and] were doing great things in their classrooms and it was very informative and a learning experience seeing what others were doing” (Evaluation Questionnaire, May 2002). She saw as the least valuable the workshops that didn’t have teachers sharing . . . Talking and sharing in small groups were okay but I would rather hear from the “experts” and the district should know best who they are . . . I also was a little more than stressed with the observations. I wasn’t comfortable with them and feel that we could have discussed the lessons with the [resource teacher] without having been observed. I felt that was not too valuable (Evaluation Questionnaire, May 2002).

Her final statement was an indication of the shallow level of commitment that she had in the implementation of standards. She wrote,

I could use more help with examples of standards-based lessons in all areas of the curriculum. Going out and observing teachers from other schools to see how their classroom is run would be very beneficial. I think I would also need more help with reading some of the standards ‘language’ from the rainbow books to better understand them. It would be hard to try to get my
students to understand them if I don’t fully understand it myself (Evaluation Questionnaire, May 2002).
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to investigate how participation in a learning team influenced four elementary teachers in the Leeward District in the implementation of standards-based instruction in their classroom. The Leeward District Key Elements define a standards-based classroom as those classrooms where:

(a) Standards are stated as clear targets understood by students, teachers, and parents. (b) Instruction overlaps assessment seamlessly and provides feedback to students through interaction with their teachers. (c) Students self-assess against targets (criteria/standards) on an on-going basis, thereby demonstrating their understanding of whether or not their work has met the standards, and to what degree. (d) The environment is safe, and it invites and involves students actively in the learning process (Leeward District, 2001, p. 1).

The four teachers who participated in the study had varied experiences with the writing process but all implemented the writing standards into their classroom instruction while involved in the writing initiative.

Theoretical Implications

This study was based on several concepts from Bandura’s theory of behavior change. The author viewed these concepts as consistent with the change brought about by the cognitive coaching portion of the initiative. The theories
underlying the principles of cognitive coaching are similar to those presented by Bandura.

*Triadic reciprocal determinism.* Bandura explained human behavior in terms of three sources of influence: behavior, cognition and other personal factors, and the external environment (Bandura, 1989). When Trudi gained insights by thinking about her thinking in her reflection log, she made adjustments in her instructional delivery. As seen in Bandura’s triadic reciprocal determinism (Bandura, 1989), this change in behavior influenced a change in her metacognitive perceptions which then changed the environment of her classroom. Her implementation of the standards was strengthened by her increased understanding of the standards. Trudi was attempting to analyze what she knew, make adjustments and then continue with the process. Ginny, too, reflected frequently and changed as she progressed in the initiative. Her understanding of the writing standards was evident at the end of the initiative and showed in her participation this year on her school’s leadership team. This is in contrast to Wilma, who did not feel she thoroughly understood the standards even at the end of the initiative. Shirley made changes in her instruction but because she did not reflect as much as the others on her practice, she did not become as grounded in standards implementation when the initiative ended, nor did her newly learned skills and knowledge transfer over time to another group.

Trudi’s and Ginny’s change in behavior affected their classroom environment not only for the year of the initiative, but for the next school year as well. Because they saw the benefit of implementing the writing standards, they
continued the process. Wilma, however, was not convinced of the long-term benefit and viewed implementation of the writing standards as part of an initiative that ended at the end of the school year. Although Shirley stated that she saw the benefit of the standards implementation, she admitted that she wasn’t integrating it as much the following year. Perhaps because she was so focused on time constraints and did not reflect as much on her practice. Shirley did not internalize the process.

The TST program was consistent with Bandura’s model in that the evidence of a change in behavior (i.e. teacher’s implementing the standards) affected the environment by creating a classroom that showed signs of standards-based learning. The greater the likelihood that the classroom reflected the standards, the greater the evidence of the teacher’s continued implementation of standards as a means of informing instruction. The learning team was designed to modify the teachers thinking (cognition) about their instructional practices, including implementation of the standards, in the delivery of their lesson (behavior). As the teachers began to internalize the standards as a keystone of their instruction, they became more conscious of standards-based instruction.

*Reinforced self-efficacy.* The TST program teachers often felt stressed when planning lessons, that were to be observed by someone external to the school. Much of this stress was due to the anxieties of being observed and judged. However, as the teachers began the teaching observation process, their stress levels seemed to diminish as they focused more on feedback from the team debrief sessions and less on the perception of being judged on their teaching ability.
In order for the four teachers to feel comfortable with the initiative, they needed to feel confident enough to be observed while they taught. Three of the four teachers felt some stress during my observations, but it did not distract them from their teaching. Wilma, on the other hand, felt so stressed because of her feelings of being judged, that she felt the observations were the worst part of the initiative. Her feelings about the observations were not evident until she stated in her evaluation at the end of the initiative, “I wasn’t comfortable with [the observations] and feel that we could have discussed the lessons with the [resource teacher] without having been observed. I felt that was not too valuable” (Evaluation Questionnaire, May 2002). She never mentioned this at the debrief sessions and did not give much feedback when asked how she felt about the lesson. She did not make the long term changes in her instruction because of her constant self doubt.

In contrast, the other teachers seemed to grow in confidence and ability. Trudi and Shirley were confident enough about the changes in their instruction to present their portfolios and lead a faculty in-service at their school. Ginny agreed to be part of her school’s leadership team and helped to lead a waiver day on standards-based writing.

According to Bandura (1986), behavior depends on what an individual thinks, believes and feels. This applied to the TSTs in that they were changing the way they were thinking about their lessons. All the targeted teachers appeared to value the standards-based system and aligned their existing behaviors with the values inherent in a standards-based system. They became passionate about the standards because of the results they had with their students. This excitement was
particularly evident as they saw the profits resulting from their standards-based instruction. The teachers believed in their capabilities to structure their lessons and deliver their instructional strategies in a manageable way (Bandura, 1986). The greater the knowledge about standards they acquired, the more comfortable they became with introducing standards-based instruction into the class (Bandura, 1997).

The teachers made choices in their instructional strategies, perfected their delivery, and persevered with the support of their learning team to overcome obstacles and complete the initiative. Meeting these successes contributed to their reinforced self-efficacy in three of the four teachers.

Bandura's basic human capacities. Bandura suggests that all humans have the capacity to symbolize, to have forethought, and to be self-regulatory, vicarious and self-reflective. Each of these capacities was reflected to some degree in the targeted teachers' change process. Because of observational learning, modeling and imitation, the teachers were able to increase their ability to implement the writing standards. They all valued the opportunities to discuss lessons and student work with colleagues, see other teachers present at the large group sessions, and try some of the ideas in their own classrooms. Having a coach to listen to ideas, make suggestions and scaffold learning, helped the teachers increase their ability in implementing the writing standards. Because they could plan their lessons with their learning team, the teachers were able to anticipate possible problems and have alternate plans in place to avoid those problems.

Symbolizing capability is the ability to process and manipulate symbols such as imagination, thought process, and language (Bandura, 1989). The
benchmarks in the standards were symbols of the levels of achievement the teachers wanted the students to demonstrate. In their classrooms, the teachers needed to communicate with students about these benchmarks. The four teachers used various methods to convey these benchmarks to their classes. Trudi had the students match benchmarks with indicators; Ginny wrote the benchmarks in language understandable by her first graders; Shirley displayed the benchmarks on her standards wall; and Wilma had the students copy the benchmarks in their journals. All of these are examples in which the teachers are using language or other symbols to guide the students to change their behavior.

Forethought capability refers to the ability to anticipate outcomes by recognizing events in the environment and planning accordingly (Bandura, 1989). The teachers could predict the results of their lessons by thinking through their planning and discussing expectations with the other teachers. When the teachers attended the large group sessions, they heard other teachers share their lessons and outcomes. The four teachers could go back to their classrooms and use these same lessons with modifications and ideas about potential outcomes.

The teachers to differing extents all self-regulated to continue with the learning team, complete their portfolios, and earn their nine credits. Each of these teachers completed all requirements and received the nine professional development credits offered by the DOE. After talking to other resource teacher facilitators, the author realized that not all the TSTs in the initiative completed the process. Some dropped out of the program and others continued in the initiative, but did not complete a portfolio.
Vicarious capabilities refer to the human ability to learn through observation of models, in addition to direct experience (Bandura, 1989). For example, each session had blocks of time for grade level sharing. Teachers from each school brought student work, shared strategies, and received feedback from teachers in their same grade level. On some occasions, pre-selected teachers shared with the entire large group about their experiences in implementing standards. In addition, the discussions during learning team meetings enabled the teachers to predict future consequences based on others' experiences and allowed them to plan for corrective actions. At the debrief sessions, the teachers had an opportunity to analyze their lessons and make adjustments for the next time they delivered similar lessons. Listening to other TSTs discuss similar lessons, helped the TSTs in this study realize new opportunities to improve their instruction.

Self-reflective capability is taking the time to think about one’s thinking, analyzing it and then altering the thinking to create better results (Bandura, 1994). Effective teachers use reflection to improve their teaching and to critique their performance. As life long learners, Stronge concluded in his review of research on effective teaching that self-reflection helped teachers become better practitioners (Stronge, 2002). The teachers’ reflective stance (Serafini, 2002) after the initiative ended, enabled them to distance themselves from their personal experience to reflect on the benefits of the initiative and the learning team. They all agreed that they benefited from the initiative and participation in the learning team. They all said they would participate in another learning team; however, Wilma had a different view of how that learning team would look and function.
The issue of time that plagued the four teachers could have been alleviated through critically reflecting on the more important parts of standards implementation and emphasizing depth rather than breadth. All of the teachers reported feeling constrained by time, but none of them used reflection to help solve this situation. “Reflection is the vehicle for knowing to what extent connections are being made” (Ellis, 2001, p.32).

Throughout the initiative, the four teachers were asked to reflect on the changes taking place in their classroom. Ginny used this reflection to see implications for improved instruction. Trudi never used her reflections to calm her anxieties about the initiative. Shirley never took full advantage of the power of reflection because she did not keep a reflection log and only reflected on her lesson plan. Wilma used reflection as a way to complain and did not get any answers through her reflection.

Prior knowledge. Social Cognitive Theory suggests that learning occurs when new ideas are connected to prior knowledge (Bandura, 1989). This could explain why Trudi showed the most gains in the initiative. Compared to the others, she had the most previous training in the writing process and connecting that process to the content standards. She could rely on the prior knowledge she received the previous year. The author had worked with her grade level on the writing process, recognizing quality writing and constructing rubrics. None of the other three teachers had the depth that provided this background. They had to first learn about the writing process themselves before they felt comfortable instructing their students.
Change Process in Classroom Delivery

The changes that took place in the four classrooms were evident as compared to the beginning of the initiative. Their classrooms had evidence of the standards on bulletin boards and in the journals the students kept. The teachers modified their instructional delivery to include discussions on the writing standards and using those standards to set criteria and use rubrics. All four teachers began conferencing with their students on a regular basis and allowed the students to peer edit during the writing process. Shirley’s classroom delivery changed the most because she was observed to move from a traditional, closed viewpoint to one of openness with her students. She went from being the judge of quality of student work to allowing the students to judge the quality of her own work. The author believes the change would have continued this year if she had reflected on this process and internalized it. Trudi’s change was positive but not as dramatic as Shirley’s because Trudi had already begun the change process in her instructional delivery through the previous year’s writing in-service. The initiative reinforced her good teaching and gave her the confidence to continue in the same manner. Wilma lacked confidence and her change was short lived. Ginny reflected on her change and made it a part of her teaching.

Learning Team as Professional Development

The idea of professional development has changed during the past decade because of the need to implement standards in the educational setting. James Stigler states that “professional development should be . . . related to teachers’ practice. It should be site-based and long-term” (Willis, 2002, p. 6) The teachers need an
opportunity to reflect on their current practices, see other ways to teach and decide on best practices (Willis, 2002).

Research shows teachers get more out of professional development when it is at their own school, ongoing, and collaborative (Johnson & Kardos, 2002). The previous notion of teacher in-servicing, which was done at random intervals by visiting guest lecturers, does not achieve the same results as collaborative coaching, feedback from peers and a continuous support system. The initiative provided all of these elements.

All four teachers were at different levels and years of teaching. They were all willing to participate in this initiative to deepen their knowledge of the writing standards and increase student achievement. Stronge found strong evidence in the literature that suggests improved student achievement was positively related to the proximity of their teachers’ professional development opportunity (Stronge, 2002). The intent of the initiative was to increase student achievement in the area of writing. The teachers interviewed seven months after the initiative ended felt the classes they were teaching during the initiative did make gains in achievement in the area of writing.

In order for teaching to improve, teachers must have support and feedback on an ongoing basis. If the teachers are observed only on a few occasions as an evaluative process for certification, they will not grow as teachers (Glickman, 2002). Teachers need to analyze their lessons, get feedback from colleagues, observe master teachers, attend workshops, read professionally, and be observed by “critical friends” (Glickman, 2002) in order to grow in the teaching profession. The
TST initiative provided all of this in order for the teachers to grow in their knowledge and implementation of the writing standards.

In a sense, the learning team acted as a study group, which required voluntary commitment and a chance to put theory into practice (Birchak, et al, 1998). The large group sessions provided the standards-based theories while the observation sessions allowed the teachers to practice what they learned.

When comparing the professional development offered through the TST initiative to the Standards for Staff Development (National Staff Development Council, 2001), approximately 83% of the standards were met (See Tables A, B, and C below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff development that improves the learning of all students:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizes adults into learning communities whose goals are aligned with those of the school and district.</td>
<td><strong>Met.</strong> Learning teams were established and followed Leeward District Key Elements of a Standards-based Classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires skillful school and district leaders who guide continuous instructional improvement.</td>
<td><strong>Met.</strong> District Superintendent lead initiative and provided training for the district resource teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires resources to support adult learning and collaboration.</td>
<td><strong>Met.</strong> Leeward District provided money for substitute teachers to enable the Targeted Standards Teachers to attend large group sessions. Resources were provided to increase participant knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff development that improves the learning of all students:</td>
<td>Not met. Student data was never collected and analyzed to see if</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses disaggregated student data to determine adult learning priorities,</td>
<td>improvement was made in student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>monitor progress, and help sustain continuous improvement.</td>
<td>achievement because of initiative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses multiple sources of information to guide improvement and</td>
<td>Met. Teachers used standards-based lesson plans, reflection logs,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demonstrate its impact.</td>
<td>observational interviews and evaluations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepares educators to apply research to decision making.</td>
<td>Met. Large group sessions supplied research based knowledge in order for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses learning strategies appropriate to the intended goal.</td>
<td>teachers to improve instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applies knowledge about human learning and change.</td>
<td>Not met. Resources did not include cognitive learning theories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides educators with the knowledge and skills to collaborate.</td>
<td>Met. Use of cognitive coaching enabled participants to learn from each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3 National Content Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff development that improves the learning of all students:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Met.</strong> These goals were part of the Leeward District Key Elements for a Standards-based Classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepares educators to understand and appreciate all students, create safe, orderly and supportive learning environments, and hold high expectations for their academic achievement.</td>
<td><strong>Met.</strong> Five large group sessions provided in-service in all of these areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deepens educators' content knowledge, provides them with research-based instructional strategies to assist students in meeting rigorous academic standards, and prepares them to use various types of classroom assessments appropriately.</td>
<td><strong>Met.</strong> Family involvement was part of the Leeward District Key Elements for a Standards-based Classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides educators with knowledge and skills to involve families and other stakeholders appropriately.</td>
<td><strong>Met.</strong> Family involvement was part of the Leeward District Key Elements for a Standards-based Classroom.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implementation of the Writing Standards

In all four cases, the writing standards were fully implemented by the end of the initiative. Through my observations it appeared that students in the TST’s classrooms understood the writing standards and had produced writing that met those standards. The teachers all communicated to parents the writing standards, explaining and showing how their children were doing against those standards. Students used rubrics to help them assess their writing and make improvements. In each of the four classes students also received feedback through teacher conferencing and peer editing. Wilma’s class did not use the time to make meaningful contributions during peer editing, but this may have been due to the shallow type of peer editing that was suggested by the teacher. Assessment occurred throughout the writing process in the four classrooms and this progress was evident in the students’ writings. Each classroom environment seemed safe and nurturing increasing chances for the students to demonstrate their growing ability in the writing process. Each teacher demonstrated to the students the place writing has in the real world and gave them opportunities to write for public viewing. Trudi’s class wrote and sang an original song; Ginny and Wilma’s classes wrote fairy tales and turned those stories into plays; and Shirley’s class wrote research papers that were shared at the school’s curriculum night. The author believes that participating on a learning team helped these four teachers implement to varying extents the Hawai’i Writing Standards into their classroom instruction.
Student Outcomes

Only observational notes and reflections supplied by the four teachers gave an indication of the students' understanding of the writing standards. Changes were observed in all four classrooms. The walls of the classrooms became "standards walls" with examples of student work that met the criteria established by the class. The students could explain the writing standards during observations, and evidence of their standards-based writing could be found in their portfolios. No specific indicators or measures of student achievement were noted. This study assumed that the change in cognition influenced student behavior in terms of increased achievement, but this was not documented during this study.

Limitations

The initiative has ended and the learning teams that were established as a result of it no longer meet. The author sees the four teachers at other Leeward District in-services and workshops and has contacted them after the follow-up interview to offer help with any of their concerns. They are now consumed with the state assessment test and feel writing is taking a back seat to reading and math. They have a stronger background with the writing standards after having participated in the learning team for one school year. It is the belief of this author that the learning team participation did help these four teachers implement the writing standards in their classroom instruction; however, in order to sustain that implementation, the learning team would have needed to offer continued support.

Triangulation of the data substantiated my conclusions. It was unfortunate that Shirley did not have a reflection log to help me understand her thinking. The
other four teachers completed reflection logs, but some of the reflections were not very insightful and seemed to be more of a retelling of events rather than deep metacognitive dialogues. For change to take place, an individual must think about their reflections and make conscious decisions to change. This was not always evident in the change associated with the TSTs.

Future Directions

Learning team participation. The four teachers all expressed a desire to participate in another learning team situation but as noted previously, one participant had a different concept of a subsequent learning team than the other three. Wilma expected the team to consist of members who had more knowledge than she had and who would be willing to enlighten her. She did not feel that she would have much to contribute to another learning team, but could gain a great deal from a more knowledgeable group. A year later, the teachers continued to agree that standards implementation takes time and a great deal of effort. However, it did not appear that they were all implementing the standards to the same extent as the previous year. In order to have sustained action in the standards implementation, a link to the learning team must be maintained. This would help to hold the teachers accountable for standards implementation until this process becomes more internalized.

The Leeward District has begun another writing initiative that is similar to the Targeted Standards Teacher initiative; however, the learning team structure has changed. The TSTs from the first year are not included in the learning team, and they have no responsibility for in-servicing their grade partners. The schools can
have more than two participants take part in this initiative, and they do not meet as a team between the large group sessions. The author is now responsible for supporting 11 teachers. This limits the number of times for classroom observation and feedback. The planning and debrief sessions are not as focused and the teachers are more independent in their instruction. Emphasis on this initiative is more on the writing process than on standards implementation.

*Future research.* Standards-based instruction is also designed to promote students' understanding of the connection between the benchmarks set for their grade level and the indicators evidenced in their work as proof of attainment of those benchmarks. In future research this aspect of standards-based instruction could also be determined through Bandura’s use of cognition influencing behavior, while behavior influences environment. In future research, looking at student achievement could help determine if standards are being implemented. Matching student scores on the HCPS II State Assessment in relationship to teachers who have had professional development in standards implementation could show whether the professional development made a difference.

In order to meet all the National Staff Development Council Standards for Staff Development, another research study could look at the impact of professional development infused with research on human learning and change. This type of research could also collect and analyze student data to determine teachers' learning.
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LEEWARD DISTRICT STANDARDS-BASED LEARNING & PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN
SY 2001-2002

VISION STATEMENT – In the Leeward district, our schools focus on all students achieving high standards in a safe and nurturing environment and work collaboratively with our school communities toward common goals.

WE VALUE the Hawaiian beliefs of Ho’ihi (Respect, appreciation for individual differences); Malama ana (Caring, having true aloha for everyone); ‘Omanawanui (Perseverance, an unrelenting desire to provide ultimate opportunities for learning); Ku’Io (integrity, the courage to do what’s right); and Na’auao (Lifelong learning, the motivation and desire to expand one’s knowledge).

DISTRICT DIRECTION #1—standards will be incorporated into classrooms in every school in the district.

I. Desired Outcomes:
A. Targeted number of teachers (minimum of 2) will systematically and regularly implement relevant standards in their lesson plans in every Leeward school, with assistance provided by District Resource Teachers and SRSs. The standards-based lessons implemented by Target Teachers will be directly related to the school’s SID focus.
B. Leeward District Resource Teachers (DRTs) and SRSs will provide systematic and effective assistance to schools and teachers in the implementation of standards and assessments in lessons.

II. Professional Development Framework:
A. Schools choosing to receive assistance from district staff will commit to a series of five (5) all-day sessions, approximately every other month.
1. School will bring a team to the sessions consisting of administrator, 2 Target Teachers, and curriculum coordinator (maximum of 4 per school).
2. Sessions will be a series that builds from one to the next.
3. Each session will be a combination of presentation coupled with how-to, i.e. how to bring the idea back to the classroom or to the total faculty. All sessions will allow time for articulation among Target Teachers and will also include time for school planning (for their own next steps).
4. Sessions will be facilitated by district and state staff.
5. Professional readings, provided to all participants, will be incorporated into sessions.
6. Professional Development credits will be offered for the series of sessions and will incorporate reflection on an on-going basis.
7. "Homework" assignments between sessions will be completed by a coordinated team including school and district personnel.

8. Schools choosing not to participate will nonetheless be held to the expectation that at least two teachers will implement standards regularly into lessons and will commit to be observed during district school visitations.

9. Schools adopting a Comprehensive School Reform model will be required to meet the same expectations as the other schools.

B. The Two Target Teachers at each school will commit to implementing standards-based lessons in the classroom regularly.

1. Target Teachers must be classroom teachers, not resource or coordinators.

2. At least one (1) Target Teacher per complex should be either a full-time special education or ESLL teacher.

3. They must be willing to accept the inherent responsibilities entailed in capacity-building, i.e. multi-year commitment.

C. All schools will have a district Point of Contact (POC)

1. SRSSs and their RT teams will decide on assignments, i.e., who will be the Point of Contact for which schools. See III below for listing of district personnel available to provide assistance to schools.

2. Following each day-long session, RTs/SRSSs will visit with their Target Teachers to work on lesson planning and classroom implementation.

D. Lesson plans will focus on the school's SID area of focus.

1. One of the lessons for the year will encompass all Target Teachers in the complex coordinating and aligning to the complex focus.

E. Long-term plan:

1. During Year 2 (2002-2003), school will expand project to a whole grade level or department, with Target Teachers from Year 1 implementing standards independently and coaching new Target Teachers at the school.

2. DRTs will coach new Target Teachers in cooperation with Year 1 Teachers.

3. Therefore, dual Professional Development tracks will be done in Year 2, for Year 1 Teachers (Coaching skills), and for Year 2 Teachers.

4. Year 3—continued expansion to additional grade level or total school, depending on school's readiness.

F. Separate series of staff development will be arranged for district/state personnel for PD credit:

1. Coaching skills (Peer, Cognitive, etc.)

2. Deeper understanding of reading/writing standards

3. How to combine coaching skills with conveying understanding of standards

4. Effective ways to improve parent participation

5. Develop common definition and description of standards-based classroom.
6. Develop or adopt/adapt a framework for standards-based lesson planning.
7. Mini-inservices as needed for revisiting of the SID process, etc.
8. Development of classroom assessments appropriate to standards-based lessons.
9. Peer teaching, i.e. from SALs about assessment concepts, from CSSS RTs about CSSS umbrella, from GT about aspects of differentiation, from America’s Choice Cluster Leaders about the CSR model, etc. This can be done during weekly Complex Team meetings.
10. Weekly District staff meetings will focus on in-depth discussions about specific schools (one per complex per week); Monday morning complex team meetings should center around the school to be discussed later by staff.

III. District resources available as POC’s:
A. School Renewal Specialists (5; 1 school apiece)
B. GT RTs (3; 2 schools each)
C. Literacy Standards RTs (3; 2 schools each)
D. State Reading RT (1; 1 school)
E. CSSS RTs (6; 2 schools each)
F. SALs (5; 2 schools each)
G. New Teacher Advisors (5; 1 school apiece)
H. PE RT (1; 2 schools)
I. Title I Linker (1; 1 school)
J. School to Work (1; 2 schools)
K. Compliance RTs may assist Target Teachers from that area, i.e.:
   1. ESLL (3)
   2. School Support Services (12 sped/special services)

IV. Content of the Sessions
A. Session #1 – Standards-Based Classroom, i.e., elements of a standards-based classroom in the Leeward District:
   1. Standards are stated as clear targets that are understood by students, teachers, and parents.
   2. Assessment overlaps instruction seamlessly and provides feedback to students through their interaction with teachers while the learning is happening.
   3. Students self-assess against targets on an on-going basis, thereby demonstrating and communicating their understanding of whether their work has met the standards, and to what degree.
   4. The environment is safe, and it invites and involves students actively in the learning process.
B. Session #2—Assessment
   1. Anne Davies will be the guest facilitator on Assessment.
   2. Focus on assessment and its implications on standards-based lesson planning.
   3. Importance of pre-assessments, i.e., setting of clear targets before planning for lessons.
C. Session #3—Standards-based Lesson Planning
   1. Jay McTighe/Grant Wiggins template (Understanding by Design) may be used as starting point.
   2. There must be a clear connection between the activity and the targets.
   3. There must also be a clear connection between the targets and the assessments.
   4. These should not be stand-alone lessons; they must be connected to a larger standard that goes beyond a single lesson.
   5. Begin with the standards approach tool to help focus in on the specific target being addressed, then do the lesson plan.
   6. District sessions will focus on the content area of writing.
   7. Lessons also should connect back to the area of focus in the school’s SID.

D. Session #4—Family Support
   1. Connections to tutoring, adult literacy, and adult education may be featured.
   2. Continued support of standards-based lesson planning.
   3. Concentration on parent/teacher/student conferencing and reporting.
   4. Incorporate increased awareness of standards and criteria students are expected to attain.
   5. Use Conferencing and Reporting (Davies, 2000) as basis for discussions and sharing.

E. Session #5—Setting Goals, Reflecting on the Journey, Celebration
   1. JoAnn Wong-Kam will be guest speaker.
   2. Several Target Teachers will share insights of their journey.
   3. Use Elevating Expectations (Wong-Kam, et al, 2002) and But Are They Learning? (Stiggins, 1998) as basis for discussions and sharing.

F. All Sessions will be centered on student work
   1. Use “Making Sense of Standards” to see if student work reflects standards.
   2. Ask the question, “What do students think about their work?”
   3. Get students to assess their own work against the standards.
   4. CSSS umbrella is pervasive through all the sessions and concepts.

G. Financial Support for this plan
   1. A total of 10 substitute days will be allocated to each participating school.
   2. Anne Davies will be brought to Leeward District through the State SAL office (Randall Braman).
   3. State SAL office will provide the second Anne Davies book for all participants.
   4. Other resources may be purchased using funds allocated to the district for this purpose.
In a search of the research relative to standards and standards-based education, some common threads emerge that, together, describe what the elements ought to be of a standards-based classroom. The following key elements may be interpreted by a school or a teacher differently from other schools or teachers; however, a set of indicators will allow more uniformity to be observed when visiting classrooms in the Leeward District. These indicators will be developed shortly.

1. **Standards are stated as clear targets that are understood by students, teachers, and parents.**
   - Student work reflects both content and performance standards.
   - Standards are the basis for communication between the school and the home.
   - Standards are the single point of reference for learning materials, tasks, expectations, i.e., standards are the foundation upon which all learning tasks are aligned.

2. **Instruction overlaps assessment seamlessly and provides feedback to students through interaction with their teachers.**
   - This feedback occurs through a recursive process of instruction and learning, and leads to modifications in teaching and learning. Although the focus is on learning, the teaching process is recognized as integral to facilitating that learning.
   - Tasks/Activities are opportunities for high quality teaching and learning which occur during the interaction that goes on between teacher and student while the task is being done.

3. **Students self-assess against targets (criteria/standards) on an on-going basis, thereby demonstrating their understanding of whether their work has met the standards, and to what degree.**
   - Assessment must drive instruction and must involve students.
   - Assessment cannot be done only at the end, to measure attainment of the standards (summative assessment). It must also be FASI (Formative Assessment, Student Involved).

4. **The environment is safe, and it invites and involves students actively in the learning process.**
   - Students know and understand the “real world” reasons for their learning.
   - With support from their teachers, students make choices about their learning.
   - They have responsibility for their learning and know to what level they are succeeding.
• Students work together with their teachers to enhance their learning process.
• The classroom is free of threats, sarcasm, and put-downs and allows students to take risks necessary for learning.
• Students see the teachers as learners themselves who also take risks, make mistakes, get feedback, and learn.
AGREEMENT TO PARTICIPATE IN

The Influence of Learning Team Participation on Four Teachers' Implementation of Standards in Classroom Instruction

Investigated by
Anna Viggiano
94-186 Kupuna Loop
Waipahu HI 96797
808/677-2362

A learning team for this particular study is described as individual teachers working together to learn about Content Standards and implementing them into the classroom. The idea is to have a more in-depth training in Standards implementation than just attending in-service sessions. This follows the belief that professional development should have focused and sustained action in order to produce long lasting changes. The purpose of this study is to address whether participation in the learning team aspect of the Leeward District Targeted Standards Teachers initiative creates teachers that are more knowledgeable about Standards and better able to implement those Standards into their classrooms. This study will last for the school year 2001-02 and will be conducted through meetings held twice per month at the participants individual schools. Each meeting will last approximately one hour.

This study assures confidentiality; however, if a participant feels obliged to voluntarily withdraw participation at any time, it shall be granted.

The benefits of this study will be a deeper understanding of the Content Standards by the participants and feedback for the researcher to improve delivery of services for future participants in this initiative.

The results of this study will be made available to all participants upon its completion.

I certify that I have read and that I understand the foregoing, that I have been given satisfactory answers to my inquiries concerning project procedures and other matters and that I have been advised that I am free to withdraw my consent and to discontinue participation in the project or activity at any time without prejudice.

I herewith give my consent to participate in this project with the understanding that such consent does not waive any of my legal rights, nor does it release the principal Investigator or the institution or any employee or agent thereof from liability for negligence.

Signature of individual participant

Date

(If you cannot obtain satisfactory answers to your questions or have comments or complaints about your treatment in this study, contact: Committee on Human Studies, University of Hawai‘i, 2540 Maile Way, Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96822. Phone: (808) 956-5007)
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Observation Sheet

Enabling Activity Demonstrated

What Happened

Evidence of Achievement

Effectiveness of Strategies & Decisions

Summarize Impressions & Assessment of Event:

Recall Supporting Information:

Analyze, Infer & Determine Cause & Effect Relationships:

Construct New Learning & Applications:

Reflect on Coaching Process & Recommend Refinements:
(Please send this to me)

My own recommendations:
### Leeward District
Standards-Based Lesson Plan Template

**Content Area:** __________________________  **Unit or Topic:** __________________________  **Grade Level:** __________

**PART 1. PLANNING THE LESSON**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. <strong>Select content standard(s).</strong> Have I clearly pinpointed the instructional focus?</th>
<th>B. <strong>Select the Benchmark(s).</strong> Have I identified what is expected for this specific grade level?</th>
<th>C. <strong>Identify the performance standard/indicator(s) specific to the assessment.</strong> What are the observable actions that demonstrate learning?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**D. Design/choose assessment that will measure/evaluate the student's learning as it relates to the performance indicator(s).**

- Do students understand the expectations and assessment criteria at the beginning of the lesson?
- What evidence will we collect to reflect student learning?
- How will students be involved in self-assessment?
- What opportunities will students be given to utilize the assessment feedback to improve their work?

---

Template adapted from “The Jefferson County Aligned Lesson/Unit Planning Template and Guide”

*Anne Devries, 2000 Classroom Connections International*
PART 2. GUIDING THE LEARNING

E. Determine the instructional strategies that will engage students and focus on the skills needed to attain the identified standards.
   What prior knowledge and skills do students already have or need to have?
   Describe the lesson, activity or performance task.
   What adjustments have you considered to address the needs of ALL students (gap, unmotivated, GT, ESL, special ed, etc.)

Template adapted from "The Jefferson County Aligned Lesson/Unit Planning Template and Guide"
*Anne Perry, 2000 Classroom Connections International
PART 3. REFLECTING ON THE LESSON

F. Assess student learning.
   What evidence is there that the student is working toward/has met/exceeded the standard?
   How did your students' involvement in the self-assessment process (in Section D) affect the quality of their work?

G. Reflect on the teaching/learning process.
   (For PD credit participants, reflections may be included in your journal.)
   What went well? What do I need to adjust to help all students achieve the standards? What are my next steps?
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Learning Team Survey

Please complete this questionnaire and return it to me at our next observation meeting. I really appreciate your participation as a Target Teacher this year.

1. Date graduated from High School:

2. Post-secondary education:

3. Why did you decide to become an elementary school teacher?

4. How long have you been teaching? What subjects and grade levels have you taught and where?

5. Why did you decide to get involved the Targeted Standards Teachers initiative?

6. How has the initiative worked for you?

7. What do you see as the strengths and weaknesses of this initiative?

8. How do you think learning occurs?

9. What are your goals as a teacher?

10. How would you describe your personal teaching style? Why?

11. How do you go about planning a lesson now as opposed to how you planned a lesson before participating in the initiative?

12. Which of your lessons did you feel went well? Why do you think it was a good lesson?

13. What do you see as your strengths and weaknesses as a teacher?

14. What do you hope to get out of the Targeted Standards Teacher initiative?

15. Do you think the Leeward District Targeted Standards Teachers initiative should continue?

16. How do the TST sessions and lesson plans fit with what you do and want to do as a teacher?
17. What kinds of writing assignments do you have your students complete? On average, how much writing does a student in one of your classes complete per week? What are different about the writing assignments you have given this year from those given in the past?

18. When do students express themselves orally in class? What do you do to get students to talk? Do all students talk in class? On average, what is the ratio of your talk to student talk?

19. How would you describe an “instructional conversation?” What key elements make up this type of conversation? During the average week, how often do you engage your students in an instructional conversation? Could you give me an example?
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**Targeted Standards Teachers**

**Evaluation Session**

1. Did this initiative help you learn more about standards implementation? How?

2. Do your students understand the writing standards better than they did at the beginning of the year?

3. How has your delivery of instruction changed since the beginning of the year?

4. Do you feel that you could continue to implement standards in other content areas after participating in this initiative?

5. What is happening in the classroom during a standards-based lesson?

6. How do students respond to understanding Standards?

7. What was the most valuable aspect of the Targeted Standards Teachers initiative?

8. What was the least valuable aspect of the Targeted Standards Teachers initiative?

9. What could you use more help with?

10. Do you think the Leeward District Targeted Standards Teachers initiative should continue?

11. Would you participate in the initiative if it did? To what extent?

12. To what degree did you find the content of this initiative valuable (1 = low, 4 = high)

   1 2 3 4
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