



Developing a High Reliability Instructional Framework at Dayton Elementary School

Principal Name: Ryan Simmons

School Name: Dayton Elementary School

Team Members' Names: Aspen Kitchell & Alexis Vesey

Principal's Email Contact: rmsimmons@tsc.k12.in.us

Background Leading to Our Inquiry (Slide 2)

We knew we wanted to focus on vertical alignment and having common academic expectations for our staff members. In looking at test scores and expectations from teachers in the building, it was obvious that we needed to build some consistency with our approach to instruction. We also knew that we needed to have our teachers help us build this instructional framework.

The Purpose of Our Inquiry (Slide 3)

Therefore, our team looked at our curriculum and expectations and understood that we do not currently have an instructional framework. We feel like it is very important to create a framework that our existing staff can utilize and new staff members can use when coming to our school. We believe these common expectations can better help us with our vertical alignment. We have also provided internal professional development to our staff in areas where they told us they needed the most assistance.

Our Wondering (Slide 4)

With this purpose, we wonder how would a school-wide instructional framework assist our teachers in including expected instructional strategies into their daily practice and help new teachers acclimate to our instructional expectations at Dayton?

Our Actions (Slide 5)

We started our journey by looking at a staff survey that was sent out in the summer regarding decision-making in the school. We then used that data and HRS Level 1 and 2 data to focus on building an instructional framework and focusing on providing professional development in areas that teachers felt that they need more guidance. We met as a staff to build the instructional framework and then surveyed staff on areas where they felt that need more professional development. We provided professional development in the areas of learning objectives, engagement and classroom transformations as the teachers said these were areas

they needed additional assistance. We also implemented instructional rounds so that teachers had the opportunity to observe effective teaching within the building.

Data Collection (Slides 6-7)

For our data collection, we sent google surveys to the teachers, we used a Padlet to gather responses, we took anecdotal notes, and collected quantitative data on participation on optional professional development opportunities that we created.

Our Data (Slides 8-21)

For our data, we used both qualitative and quantitative data. Ways that we gathered feedback were through:

- Open-ended Padlet survey
- Open-ended survey on “always, sometimes and never” in regards to creating an instructional framework
- Compared Hattie’s Effect Size to the “always, sometimes and never” response
- Pictures from professional developments that we led
- Pictures from classrooms in regards to learning objectives
- Google surveys on the comfort level of the instructional framework
- Google surveys on instructional rounds feedback

Our Discoveries (Slide 22)

During our action research we discovered that our teachers:

- Wanted more input on the decision-making in the building
- Wanted to observe effective teaching within the building
- Wanted more help on learning objectives, engagement and common expectations for vertical alignment
 - Our research revealed that our teachers wanted more input on decision-making in the building. In a summer survey that we sent out, the majority of teachers wanted to know that their opinions were being considered in decision-making.
 - In an HRS survey, our teachers revealed that they wanted to observe effective teaching in the building. For this reason, we implemented instructional rounds for our teachers and allowed them the opportunity to observe other teachers.
 - When creating our instructional framework, our teachers revealed that they thought engagement and learning objectives should always be present in a lesson. They also advised that they wanted more guidance in those areas.

Where We Are Headed Next (Slide 23)

- Throughout our action research, we learned that our teachers wanted more input in decision-making and in creating our framework. We also learned that our teachers wanted more time to learn from and observe one another. Through this journey, we built consensus on our instructional framework and started the vertical alignment process.
- As we continue our work in the future, we will create cross-curricular teams that will work on priority standards and vocabulary. We will also continue to implement instructional rounds. We also plan to look at ways that we can use the “always, sometimes, never” framework to create consistent behavior expectations in our school.

Bibliography (Slide 24)

Hattie, J. and Zierer, K. (2018). *10 Mindframes for Visible Learning*. New York, NY: Routledge

Marzano, R. J., Warrick, P. B., Raines, C.L., & Dufour, R. (2018). *Leading A High Reliability School*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.