



*“Beyond the Checklist: Improving Instructional Practices and Collaboration Through a Defined Instructional Model”*

**Principal’s Name:** Brad Stoneking

**Email Address:** [bstoneking@batesville.k12.in.us](mailto:bstoneking@batesville.k12.in.us)

**Teachers’ Names:** Nicole Johnson and Cathy Ollier

**School Name:** Batesville Primary School

**Background Leading to Our Inquiry:**

Our school continues to ask, “How can we get better?” Our administrators and teachers want to continuously improve instructionally. We do not feel that our teacher evaluation rubric defines key instructional areas for all teachers. The hope through this action research project was to gather instructional practices to guide our teachers during daily lessons and activities. The creation of an instructional model is the first step to help guide administrators and staff through the teacher evaluation process. Once the model was created, it was our goal as a team to increase collaboration between our target groups (peer-to-peer collaboration, administrator-to-teacher feedback and self-reflection).

**Purpose of Our Inquiry:**

A defined instructional model was created through the guidance and leadership of both teacher leaders. The main focus was in kindergarten and first grade. Once the instructional model was finalized it was shared with all teachers. The instructional model was utilized as a check sheet during formal observations in order to create better conversations. Administrators needed to improve on giving relevant instructional feedback to all teachers. The goal was that all administrators would provide feedback, not only based on the teacher evaluation indicators, but also on the instructional components included in the “BPS Instructional Model”. The plan was to utilize the instructional model to increase collaboration, which is an area of need throughout Batesville Primary School. One area of improvement is also to have teachers complete self-reflections during instructional time (during or not during formal observations).

**Our Wondering:**

With this purpose, we wondered how a collaboratively written instructional model would provide opportunities for more specific feedback based on instructional practices (self-reflection, peer-to-peer, administrative-to-teacher, etc.)?

**Our Actions:**

To gain insights into our wondering, we created a “BPS Instructional Model” as a teaching staff. We rolled out this process within grade level collaboration meetings and full teacher meetings. During each meeting, our teachers provided feedback on what instructional practices should be seen daily, sometimes, and never within all classrooms. Once feedback was received, we condensed all information into one document. Following the completion of a finalized model, we presented the model to all teachers. Teachers were asked to self-reflect on their teaching practices during one lesson. Administrators informally tracked indicators during second semester formal observations.

### **Data Collection:**

To gain insights into our wondering, we collected quantitative data by tracking instructional model indicators during formal observations. Teachers collected quantitative data by completing self-reflections during instruction. Qualitative data was received by listening and taking notes based on teacher feedback regarding the overall process.

### **Timeline:**

#### October / November 2019

- Created an instructional model within grade level teams, allied arts and departments

#### December 2019

- Finalized the instructional model within grade level teams, allied arts and departments
- Discussed the instructional model as a checklist
- Presented the instructional model and the plan to the BEA Discussions Team

#### January 2020 and February 2020

Presented the instructional model as an informal checklist during a staff meeting

- Data collection
  - One informal walk-through was conducted on each certified staff
  - Qualitative data was collected through grade level meetings, teacher-to-teacher discussions and administration-to-teacher discussions.

#### March 2020

- Finalize data collection
  - Finalized one-on-one informal meetings with certified staff

### **Our Data:**

In order to create a picture of what we have learned, we collected data in the following ways:

#### Quantitative Data:

We utilized a check sheet for long observations

1. *See and hear daily* - 108
  - Collaboration - 28
  - Goals - 27
2. *Almost daily* - 100
  - Spiral review - 12
  - Group reading - 14
3. *Never* - 16
  - Disengaged students
  - Low expectations for students

We documented meetings with teachers - The discussions were based on the instructional model

### Qualitative Data:

We received feedback from teachers’ self-reflection during one-on-one meetings based on the instructional model

We received feedback from teacher-to-teacher conversations. Feedback was received through teacher quotes and comments. Some of those quotes and comments were:

1. Teacher A said, “The instructional model allowed me to reflect and improve myself instructionally”.
2. Teacher B said, “The instructional model helped maintain focus on the key instructional components of my position”.
3. Teacher C said, “It was difficult to meet every standard, especially during math instruction”.

### **Our Discoveries:**



As a result of analyzing our data, important discoveries we learned include:

1. Many teachers met certain targets of the instructional model
2. Daily targets are not always met, especially during math
  - a. There are different observations between math and reading, so it is important to focus on different instructional strategies during different observations and content areas.
3. Certain teachers viewed this task as “just another thing”
  - a. After speaking with some teachers, the creation of the instructional model was viewed as “just” another thing they had to do. All teachers did agree that self-reflection is an important component of their overall performance and improvement.

### **Where We Are Heading Next:**

We utilized the data, both qualitatively and quantitatively, to create additional wonderings. The questions below dig deeper into the overall goal of collaboration improving instruction:

1. What professional development is necessary to continue to drive effective instructional strategies?
2. How does the creation of this instructional model drive performance?
3. How does self-reflection, peer-to-peer feedback and administrator-to-teacher feedback drive performance?



# "Beyond the Checklist: Improving Instructional Practices and Collaboration Through a Defined Instructional Model"

**Principal Name:** Brad Stoneking

**Email Address:** [bstoneking@batesville.k12.in.us](mailto:bstoneking@batesville.k12.in.us)

**Teachers' Names:** Nicole Johnson and Cathy Ollier

**School:** Batesville Primary School



## Background Leading to Our Inquiry

- How can we continue to improve instructionally?
- What will an instructional model look like?
- The need for collaboration: Self-reflection, peer-to-peer feedback and administrator-to-teacher feedback

# The Purpose of Our Inquiry

- To improve instructional practices
- To improve collaboration and feedback

## Our Wondering

- How will a collaboratively written instructional model provide opportunities for more specific feedback based on instructional practices (self-reflection, peer-to-peer, administrative-to-teacher, etc.)?

# Our Actions

- Creation of the [Instructional model](#)
- Observations
  - Data summary based on observations
- Post Observation
  - S2S meetings - conferences
- Teacher feedback



# Data Collection

- Qualitative
  - S2S meetings
  - Grade level collaboration
- Quantitative
  - Number of targets observed and how often

# Our Data

## ➤ Qualitative Data

- Quotes
- Notes
- Feedback

### \*Notes\*

- Created an instructional model
- Observed
- Discussed

*“Difficult to meet every standard, especially during math instruction”*

*“Allowed me to reflect and improve myself”*

*“Helps to maintain focus”*

### \*Notes\*

- Instructional model used for self-reflection
- S2S meetings

# Our Data Continued...

## Quantitative

*See and hear daily - 108*

- Collaboration - 28
- Goals - 27

*Almost daily - 100*

- Spiral review - 12
- Group reading - 14

## Quantitative

*Never - 16*

- Disengaged students
- Low expectations for students

## Our Discoveries (What We Learned)

- Many teachers met certain targets
- Daily targets are not always met, especially during math
  - There are different observations between math and reading
- Certain teachers viewed this task as “just another thing”
- Teachers enjoyed the self-reflection

## Where We Are Headed Next

- Focused wonderings moving forward:
  - How does the creation of this instructional model drive performance?
  - How does self-reflection, peer-to-peer feedback and administrator-to-teacher feedback drive performance?
    - What professional development is necessary to continue to drive effective instructional strategies?