

**TITLE: Consideration of Acceptance of Report from Teach for America Educator Preparation Program**

---

---

The Hawaii Teacher Standards Board accepts the required report from Teach For America. The report provides evidence of the resolution of the weaknesses stated below:

Weakness in Quality Principle I, Component 1.3: The TFA-HI system for gauging readiness for taking full teaching responsibility is not consistently adequate.

*Actions Taken:* TFA Hawaii made three primary adjustments to strengthen their monitoring systems to ensure candidate readiness for full teaching responsibility: (1) strengthening communication and data collection at pre-service training institute; (2) regional support and observation during pre-service training institute; and (3) administrator meetings.

*Evidence of Weakness Resolved:* The additional steps put in place to consistently and comprehensively gauge readiness ensure teacher candidates' readiness to be full time teachers. The readiness of candidates is supported by administrator assessment and teacher performance indicators utilized by HIDOE.

Weakness in Quality Principle I, Component 1.5: The faculty have not fully demonstrated the validity of their assessments.

*Actions Taken:* In response to the review panel's findings TFA-HI engaged in a content validity study using Lawshe's Method (1975) (a method of measuring content validity that was developed by C. H. Lawshe) to demonstrate the validity of their assessments. In an online survey, content experts rated their assessment instruments as essential; useful, but not essential; or not necessary. Diverse panelists included current classroom teachers, teacher coaches, a college of education dean, and a college and career counselor.

*Evidence of Weakness Resolved:* Based on the results of the validity study, the validity of TFA-HI assessments has been confirmed.

Weakness in Quality Principle II, Component 2.2: The faculty have not systematically incorporated evidence of program and candidate/completer outcomes into their decision-making process.

*Actions Taken:* TFA-HI has enriched the existing analysis infrastructure to allow for more robust and consistent analysis of completer outcomes and program impact in decision-making throughout our program continuum.

*Evidence of Weakness Resolved:* With the additional actions to strengthen their data review and decision-making, systems incorporate evidence of program and candidate/completer outcomes in decision-making. Administrator assessment and teacher performance indicators utilized by HIDOE both provide evidence of a strong performance by candidates in TFA Hawai'i EPP.

Teach for America's current state approval will expire December 31, 2023. A memorandum will be sent to the unit informing them of the Board's acceptance.

**Submitted by:** Felicia Villalobos

**Referred to:** Teacher Education Committee

**Report to the Hawai'i Teacher Standards Board: Evidence of Resolving Weakness Areas  
Teach For America Hawai'i**

---

August 31, 2018

TO: The Hawai'i Teacher Standards Board

FROM: Teach For America Hawai'i

RE: NBI 15-37 Rev: Consideration of Full State Approval of Teach for America Educator Preparation Program

## **BACKGROUND**

The Inquiry Brief Commission of the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) granted Teach For America's Educator Preparation Program (TFA EPP) full Accreditation status for seven years, noting three weaknesses and no stipulations, effective May 2, 2016 through June 30, 2023.

The Hawai'i Teacher Standards Board (HTSB) granted TFA EPP full approval effective June 16, 2016 through December 31, 2018. Per New Business Item (NBI) 15-37 Rev, dated January 19, 2018, the purpose of this report is to provide HTSB with evidence that Teach For America Hawai'i has removed the three weaknesses identified. We respectfully request that the three weakness areas be deemed resolved and TFA EPP's approval be extended through December 31, 2023, as outlined in the NBI and aligned to the full Accreditation status granted by CAEP.

## **EVIDENCE OF RESOLVING WEAKNESS AREAS**

The three weaknesses noted were Quality Principal Components 1.3, 1.5, and 2.2. We feel confident in the growth and adjustments we have made to address and resolve all three weakness areas. Below please find our report on the actions we have taken and to address each of the areas noted.

### **A. Quality Principle I, Component 1.3**

---

The review panel identified the following weakness in component 1.3: The TFA-HI system for gauging readiness for taking full teaching responsibility is not consistently adequate.

**Actions Taken:** In response to the review panel's findings we have made three primary adjustments to strengthen our monitoring systems to ensure candidate readiness for full teaching responsibility: (1) strengthening communication and data collection at pre-service training institute; (2) regional support and observation during pre-service training institute; and (3) administrator meetings.

1. Communication & Data Collection at Pre-Service Training institute: Our pre-service training institute is a national training program directly managed by Teach For America's institute Management Team (IMT). The IMT is on-the-ground every day for all five weeks of the summer program. In partnership with the IMT, TFA HI designed a system to strengthen ongoing communication between institute staff and regional staff. Beginning in the summer of 2017 and ongoing, we now receive comprehensive performance data sets from the IMT. If candidates are not making progress as expected, improvement plans are created and implemented and shared with TFA Hawai'i so that growth areas can be targeted during regional orientation, prior to the start of the school year. This ensures that improvement plans from institute are continued in region. If a candidate does not meet expectations or growth outlined in a regional improvement plan they can be released from Teach For America. In the summer of 2018 and moving forward, we have also instituted additional reporting directly from the candidates' "corps member advisors" (CMAs) who directly oversee candidate daily teaching practice at the pre-service training institute. CMAs provide data reports to TFA Hawai'i both at the mid-point and end of institute training as an additional layer of support and accountability for progress toward readiness for full-time teaching.
  
2. TFA Hawai'i Regional Support & Observation During Pre-Service Training institute: In addition to strengthening communication and data collection, we have worked to strengthen our TFA HI oversight during summer training in a two ways:
  - a. During the pre-service training institute, TFA candidates enrolled in our TFA EPP in Hawai'i are directly coached and supervised by part-time staff members who have experience teaching in Hawai'i public schools. This includes all CMAs who coach teacher candidates, the School Director where candidates teach summer school, and a Diversity Equity and Inclusiveness (DEI) facilitator who works to integrate Hawai'i-specific context in culturally responsive teaching programming. In addition to providing strong continuity with our Hawai'i EPP, having Hawai'i-based institute staff allows us to provide additional training, support, and monitoring of our part-time staff and teacher candidates. Beginning in 2017, TFA Hawai'i has formalized regular touchpoints with Hawai'i-based institute staff before, during, and after institute to understand progress of individual candidates and institute trends. Learnings are used to gauge readiness for teaching, as well as strategically inform the topics for professional development.
  - b. In addition to working with our Hawai'i based staff on-site during the training institute, our Hawai'i regional staff members visit institute in person two times during the training program. Hawai'i staff conducts "Induction" (a pre-institute orientation to ground Hawai'i EPP candidates in Hawai'i specific context and prepare them for institute) the weekend before institute on-site where the training institute takes place. Beginning in 2017, TFA Hawai'i has formalized a pre-institute, in-person meeting with the IMT to align on objectives and communication. Hawai'i staff then returns to the institute training site mid-institute to monitor the progress of candidates. During this visit, TFA Hawai'i team conducts classroom observations, meets 1:1 with candidates, and meets with both Hawai'i-based institute staff as well as the IMT to check in on progress of candidates and continue to gauge readiness.
  
3. Administrator Meetings: To further gauge readiness and ongoing performance of teacher candidates, we have formalized and created a consistent cadence of meetings with administrators and/or coaches at our partner schools. These meetings inform our practices and support us in preparing teachers during onboarding, induction, institute, and orientation, which occur before candidates become teachers of record during the school year. Beginning 2017,

coaches logged their meetings with our partner schools. The cadence for these meeting can be found in the appendix (Supporting Evidence, A.6- Administrator Meeting Log). We discuss learnings in weekly team meetings to inform upcoming support of teachers and planning of professional development. We heard that an area for focus was “questioning,” so we held content learning communities on writing and scaffolding high level questions. We also heard positive feedback about the energy and creativity of corps members and in response, set up sessions at a full group professional development day, which was a structure that allowed corps members to present and share ideas with one another to continue to foster this strength.

**Evidence of Weakness Resolved:** With the additional steps we have put in place to consistently and comprehensively gauge readiness, we feel confident in our teacher candidates’ readiness to be full time teachers and respectfully request this weakness be deemed resolved. The readiness of candidates is supported by administrator assessment and teacher performance indicators utilized by HIDOE.

1. **Administrator Assessment:** In 2017-18 we met with administrators and school based coaches at 22 of our 24 partner schools. In addition to engaging in discussion on teacher candidates, administrators responded to six survey questions. The survey was a 7 point Likert scale: 1-3 disagree (1=strongly disagree), 4 (neutral), 5-7 agree (7=strongly agree). Average responses were all in “agree” and ranged from 5.8 - 6.51, see table below.

**SY2017.18**

I am satisfied with Teach For America teachers in my school.	TFA teachers are making a positive difference in my school.	I would hire another TFA teacher if a vacancy arose in my school.	I would recommend hiring TFA teachers to another principal.	Teach For America teachers perform as well as or better than other beginning teachers.	TFA teachers demonstrate leadership in my school.
6.27	6.23	6.41	6.27	5.81	5.80

2. **Teacher Performance:** HIDOE administers Danielson as a teacher performance assessment. Our TFA Hawai’i EPP candidates continue to have satisfactory performance on this evaluation, with no candidates receiving an unsatisfactory rating on any domain. In 17-18, no candidates were rated unsatisfactory, with predominantly proficient and distinguished. In “2b: Establishing a Culture for Learning,” 91% were rated proficient or distinguished; in “2d: Managing Student Behavior,” 88% were rated proficient or distinguished; in “3b: Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques,” 69% were rated proficient or distinguished; in “3c: Engaging Students in Learning,” 91% were rated proficient or distinguished; and in “3d: Using Assessment in Instruction,” 84% were rated proficient or distinguished.

**Appendix: Supporting Evidence**

- A.1 - 2017 Phoenix Institute Management Team Meeting Log
- A.2 - 2018 Tulsa Institute Management Team Meeting Log
- A.3 - Corps Member Outcomes
- A.4 - Corps Member Outcomes Institute Data
- A.5 - Administrator Input Form Template
- A.6 - Administrator Meeting Log

## B. Quality Principle I, Component 1.5

---

The review panel identified the following weakness in component 1.5: The faculty have not fully demonstrated the validity of their assessments.

**Actions Taken:** In response to the review panel’s findings we engaged in a content validity study. From our research, session attendance, and consultation, we selected [Lawshe’s Method](#) (1975), a method of measuring content validity that was developed by C. H. Lawshe, to demonstrate the validity of our assessments. The method gauges agreement among raters or judges regarding how essential a particular item is, asking: Is the skill (or knowledge) measured by this item: (a) Essential, (b) Useful, but not essential, or (3) Not necessary to the performance of the construct? According to Lawshe, if more than half of the panelists indicate that an item is essential, this indicates they did not arrive at this conclusion by chance.

To test the validity of our TFA Hawai’i EPP key assessments, we designed a study based on Lawshe’s Method. We created an online survey that asked content experts to rate our assessment instruments as essential; useful, but not essential; or not necessary. We received a total of 14 responses from diverse panelists including current classroom teachers, teacher coaches, a college of education dean, and a college and career counselor. All respondents are considered experts because they have classroom teaching experience and all were successful in their respective credentialing programs. Some panelists participated in our Alternative Route to Certification, some participated in other Hawai’i based educator preparation programs, and some participated in non-Hawai’i based educator preparation programs.

**Evidence of Weakness Resolved:** Based on the results of our validity study, we feel confident in the validity of our assessments and respectfully request this weakness be deemed resolved.

**Validity Study Results:** Content Validity Ratio (CVR) values were calculated for each assessment item in accordance to Lawshe’s approach and yielded results ranging from 0.429 to 1. All CVR values were positive, which means that more than half our panel of experts believed each assessment item to be essential. Given a panel of 14 experts, a minimum CVR value of 0.51 is necessary to satisfy a one-tailed test at the five percent level and to indicate that the data did not occur by chance. Of the 22 assessment items, 21 had CVR values above 0.51. For these 21 (of 22) items, we can conclude that the agreement reflected in the data did not occur by chance.

We also calculated the content validity index (CVI), the mean of the assessment items for each assessment instrument with significant CVR values. The CVI for each instrument ranged from 0.7855 to 1. The CVI values of our assessments suggest that there is a high degree of overlap between performance on our assessments and the constructs they intend to measure. We have significant evidence that content experts agree that all our assessments contain valid items. See table below for complete results.

### Lawshe’s Method: Results

Assessment Items	CVR
------------------	-----

	Value
<b>A. Hoike, Culturally Responsive Pedagogy Portfolio</b>	<b>CVI = 1</b>
A1. The teacher can deconstruct the way in which they are privileged and not privileged and how that impacts their beliefs and actions.	1
A2. The teacher can recognize the full potential of each student and provide the challenges necessary for each student to achieve that potential.	1
A3. The teacher engages students academically, culturally, and socially.	1
A4. Teacher ensures students connect new and prior knowledge through student dialogue and student reflection.	1
A5. The teacher elicits student feedback throughout the lesson. Student ways of thinking, talking, and behaving that differ from the norm are respected and affirmed.	1
<b>B. Professional Dispositions Assessment</b>	<b>CVI = 0.857</b>
B1. Teacher maintains a system for collecting student progress and shares that progress proactively with TFA staff.	0.714
B2. Teacher communicates with families regarding students' progress.	0.857
B3. Teacher cooperates and collaborates effectively with colleagues.	1
B4. Teacher proactively seeks professional development and meets requirements of all mandated professional development.	0.857
B5. Teacher seeks out feedback and receives feedback in a professional manner.	0.857
B6. Teacher adheres to the TFA-Hawaii attendance policy and submits all deliverables according to deadlines.	0.429
B7. Teacher is deepening their connections to and understanding of their community context to build stronger relationships and create more relevant learning experiences, (e.g. understanding of cultural, ethnic, gender, and learning differences).	0.857
B8. Teacher is committed to deepening understanding of their own frames of reference (e.g., culture, gender, language, abilities, ways of knowing) and the potential biases in these frames, to better understand their own positionality and power as classroom leaders. Teacher accesses resources to deepen their own understanding and actively participates in reflection and discussion.	0.857
<b>C. Student Learning Assessment: Vision and Big Goals</b>	<b>CVI = 0.7855</b>

C1. Teacher creates a classroom vision that includes academic growth.	0.857
C2. Teacher creates a classroom vision that includes personal growth.	0.857
C3. Teacher creates a classroom vision that includes social, political, cultural consciousness.	0.714
C4. Teacher creates a classroom vision that includes access.	0.714
D. Student Learning Assessment: Data Analysis	CVI = 0.857
D1. Teacher meets requirements for data tracking.	0.857
D2. Teacher reflects on assessment data with depth and accurate analysis.	0.714
D3. Teacher reflects on assessment data to prioritize teacher actions aligned with student need.	1
E. Student Learning Assessment: Mid-Year and End-of-Year Reflections	CVI = 0.9285
E1. Teacher reflects on mid-year and end-of-year data with depth and accurate analysis.	0.857
E2. Teacher reflects on mid-year and end-of-year data to prioritize teacher actions aligned with student need.	1

## Appendix: Supporting Evidence

### B.1: Validity Study Panelists

## C. Quality Principle II, Component 2.2

---

The review panel identified the following weakness in component 2.2: The faculty have not systematically incorporated evidence of program and candidate/completer outcomes into their decision-making process.

**Actions Taken:** In response to the review panel’s findings we have enriched our existing analysis infrastructure to allow for more robust and consistent analysis of completer outcomes and program impact in decision-making throughout our program continuum.

1. Pre-Service Training: As discussed above in Section A, we have created a number of new systems to access greater data regarding candidate outcomes during pre-service training (e.g. communication and greater data sets from the institute Management Team, ongoing touchpoints with Hawai’i based institute staff, and on-site visits by Hawai’i regional staff). This data is used to inform decisions on targeted professional development.



2. In-Service Training: We have strengthened our data collection and analysis during in-service training in two key ways:
- a. First, we created more detailed and comprehensive systems for data collection. Beginning in 2016-17, we delineated the following finer-grained outcomes (FGO): (1) Depth of reflection and accuracy of data analysis; (2) Aligned teacher actions; (3) Broader student outcomes (academic growth; personal growth; social, political, and cultural consciousness; access); and (4) Professional disposition. We mapped our assessments to each of these finer grained outcomes to illuminate where these are evaluated over time and we created a more differentiated and detailed tracker to allow greater analysis of progress against finer grained outcomes. For example, whereas we previously entered an overall score for vision, a component of the Student Learning Assessment, we now track the score for each of the four components of vision - Knowledge and Skills Growth, Personal Growth, Access, and Social Political Cultural Consciousness. This data allows us to analyze more detailed outcome data and make decisions accordingly.
  - b. Second, we have strengthened our faculty's practice of analyzing, discussing, and using data to inform decisions in three ways:
    - **Ongoing**: As assessment components are turned in and graded we discuss outcomes in weekly team meetings to inform what responsive learning experiences should be offered and what focus areas need to be prioritized in coaching sessions with Managers of Teacher Leadership Development (MTLDs), our teacher coaches. Coaches' ability to support CMs to reflect on data has increased given this system in place to allow for these conversations.
    - **Bi-Annual Formal Review with Full Time staff**: Formal data step backs with our full time staff occur at the end of each semester to assess efficacy and inform planning. These are noted in the School Impact Data Meeting Log. These meetings include reviewing data on candidate survey responses, candidate performance, and student outcomes. To prepare for these, progress to goal data is entered mid-quarter and end-of-quarter. We are able to use the finer grained outcomes data to create responsive and targeted professional development. One example of how these data reviews inform our decision-making was our review of vision data. After analyzing the data of our four broader student outcomes – Knowledge and Skills Growth, Personal Growth, Access, and Social Political Cultural Consciousness (SPCC) – we were able to see that academic growth and personal growth were strengths across our candidates, while SPCC and access trended lower. We focused on SPCC and access in following vision support sessions and coaching and thereafter saw stronger outcomes and scores on those components in the second vision submission.
    - **Monthly Meetings with Content Specialists**: At each monthly meeting with Content Specialists, we review candidate feedback data in preparation for planning the next professional development. Meeting dates can be seen in the Content Specialist Meeting Log and survey data is summarized in the Learning Community Survey Data Overview in the appendix. In the first data analysis assignment, we saw the finer grained outcome of Depth of Reflection and Analysis Accuracy as an area of focus. After incorporating skill building in this area in content learning communities, we saw the average score increase by 3 points on this finer grained outcome in the next data analysis assignment.

**Evidence of Weakness Resolved:** With the additional actions to strengthen our data review and decision-making, we feel confident in our systems to systematically incorporate evidence of program and candidate/completer outcomes in decision-making and respectfully request this weakness be

deemed resolved. As discussed in section A above, administrator assessment and teacher performance indicators utilized by HIDOE both provide evidence of a strong performance by candidates in our TFA Hawai'i EPP.

**Appendix: Supporting Evidence**

- C.1 - Finer-grained outcomes tracker
- C.2 - School Impact Data Meeting Log
- C.3 - Content Specialist Meeting Log
- C.4 - Learning Community Survey Data Overview

**CLOSING**

We appreciate the opportunity to share our continued work to strengthen and evolve our program. As discussed, we feel confident that the improvements have adequately resolved the weakness areas noted. Further, we are committed to ongoing learning and will continue to assess candidate experience and program outcomes and make appropriate adjustments as needed. Please do not hesitate to reach out with any questions. Mahalo for the support.

Appendix: Report to the Hawai'i Teacher Standards Board: Evidence of Resolving Weakness Areas Supporting Evidence

Supporting Evidence	Item	Page Number
A.1	2017 Phoenix Institute Management Team Meeting Log	2
A.2	2018 Tulsa Institute Management Team Meeting Log	3
A.3	Corps Member Outcomes	5
A.4	Corps Member Outcomes Institute Data	7
A.5	Administrator Input Form Template	9
A.6	Administrator Meeting Log	10
A.7	Danielson Observation Data	13
B.1	Validity Study Panelists	16
C.1	Finer-grained outcomes tracker Due to the large size, please see supporting evidence for finer-grained outcomes via <a href="#">this Tracker</a> .	16
C.2	School Impact Data Meeting Log	17

C.3	Content Specialist Meeting Log	18
C.4	Learning Community Survey Data Overview	19

#### A.1 - 2017 Phoenix Institute Management Team Meeting Log

Date	Participants	Topic(s)
30 June 2017	Institute staff: Regan Balmoja, School Director Hawai'i staff: Kim Roman, Director School Impact; Lia Rozmiarek, Head of Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Updates on corps member experience, retention, and performance; trends</li> <li>• Individual teacher updates</li> <li>• Planning for regional development &amp; support.</li> </ul>
23 June 2017	Institute staff: Regan Balmoja, School Director Hawai'i staff: Lia Rozmiarek, Head of Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Individual teacher updates</li> <li>• Data insight, student outcomes</li> <li>• Learning Cycle impact</li> </ul>
15 June 2017	Institute staff: Regan Balmoja, School Director Hawai'i staff: Kim Roman, Director School Impact; Lia Rozmiarek, Head of Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Operations &amp; Logistics update</li> <li>• DEI &amp; affinity spaces at Institute</li> <li>• Individual teacher updates</li> <li>• Trends across schools</li> <li>• Developing Part Time staff</li> </ul>
15 May 2017	Institute staff: Regan Balmoja, School Director Hawai'i staff: Lia Rozmiarek, Head of Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incorporating Hawai'i context at Institute</li> <li>• Structures for DEI &amp; affinity spaces</li> <li>• Systems for communication</li> </ul>
3 May 2017	Institute staff: Regan Balmoja, School Director Hawai'i staff: Lia Rozmiarek, Head of Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incorporating Hawai'i context at Institute</li> <li>• Regional staff support for PT staff details</li> <li>• Regional staff visit to Institute</li> <li>• Systems for sharing teacher updates</li> <li>• Aligning participant experience from onboarding through to first eight weeks</li> </ul>

#### A.2 - 2018 Tulsa Institute Management Team Meeting Log

Date	Participants	Topic(s)
11.30.17	Institute Staff: Jamila Singleton Munson, SMD Tulsa Institute Hawai'i Staff: Lia Rozmiarek, Head of Program; Alyson Emrick, Director Pre-Service and ARC	Institute Programming: past, present, future

11.30.17	Institute Staff: Jamila Singleton Munson, SMD Tulsa Institute Hawai'i Staff: Alyson Emrick, Director Pre-Service and ARC	Institute staffing progress to goal
12.11.17	Institute Staff: Jamila Singleton Munson, SMD Tulsa Institute; Nicky DeMoss, MD Institute Program Hawai'i Staff: Jill Baldemor, Executive Director; Lia Rozmiarek, Head of Program; Kim Roman, Director School Impact; Alyson Emrick, Director Pre-Service and ARC; Lindsey Bailey, Manager Values, Diversity, Culture	Partnership, Priorities & staffing, Hawai'i school, Data needs, Induction
1.5.18	Institute Staff: Jamila Singleton, SMD, Tulsa Institute; Nicky DeMoss, MD Institute Program Hawai'i Staff: Alyson Emrick, Director Pre-Service and ARC; Lia Rozmiarek-Held, Head of Program	Certification Context
1.26.18	Institute Staff: Nick Kovalenko, Director Institute Operations Hawai'i Staff: Alyson Emrick, Director Pre-Service and ARC	Induction
2.7.18	Institute Staff: Jessica Putz, Sodexo at The University of Tulsa, Student Union and Conference Services Manager Hawai'i Staff: Alyson Emrick, Director Pre-Service and Alternate Route to Certification	Induction logistics
2.14.18	Institute Staff: Nick Kovalenko, Director Institute Operations Hawai'i Staff: Alyson Emrick, Director Pre-Service and Alternate Route to Certification	Induction
2.16.18	Institute Staff: Jamila Singleton, SMD, Tulsa Institute Hawai'i Staff: Lia Rozmiarek, Head of Program	Licensure/accreditation needs, Contextualization of DEI programming to include Hawai'i context
2.23.18	Institute Staff: Jamila Singleton, SMD, Tulsa Institute; Nicky DeMoss, MD Institute Program Hawai'i Staff: Lia Rozmiarek, Head of Program; Alyson Emrick, Director Pre-Service and ARC	Coalition and partnership building, alignment of onboarding, induction, institute
3.7.18	Institute Staff: Jamila Singleton, SMD, Tulsa Institute Hawai'i Staff: Lia Rozmiarek, Head of Program	Confirmation of structure and hiring Licensure and accreditation

		Native Alliance Initiative Call to Action
4.18.18	Institute Staff: Jamila Singleton, SMD, Tulsa Institute; Nicky DeMoss, MD Institute Program, Aaron Buchanan, Director Institute Data Hawai'i Staff: Lia Rozmiarek, Head of Program; Alyson Emrick, Director Pre-Service and ARC	Data Collection Institute Portfolio Corps Member Retention
5.16.18	Institute Staff: Jamila Singleton, SMD, Tulsa Institute; Nicky DeMoss, MD Institute Program, Aaron Buchanan, Director Institute Data Hawai'i Staff: Lia Rozmiarek, Head of Program; Alyson Emrick, Director Pre-Service and ARC	Corps Member Outcomes
6.16.18	Institute Staff: Jamila Singleton, SMD, Tulsa Institute; Nicky DeMoss, MD Institute Program Hawai'i Staff: Lia Rozmiarek, Head of Program; Alyson Emrick, Director Pre-Service and ARC	Final school and staff structure Summer communication
7.11.18	Institute Staff: Jamila Singleton, SMD, Tulsa Institute Hawai'i Staff: Jill Baldemor, Executive Director; Lia Rozmiarek, Head of Program; Kim Roman, Director School Impact	Native Alliance Initiative Impact of Learning Cycles Corps Member Progress Staff culture Diversity Equity Inclusiveness Programming

### A.3 - Corps Member Outcomes

<b>Corps Member Outcomes, All Corps members</b> <b>"The corps member is..."</b>		
<b>Area Assessed</b>	<b>Rating Choices</b>	
... pressing for evidence-based explanations in written and oral discourse, challenging and complicating student ideas--whether correct, incorrect or seemingly mis-aligned--for the purpose of deepening conceptual understandings.	Making Progress	Not Making Progress
... asking questions that students have been prepared to answer, which involves engaging talk moves, questioning, and scaffolding.	Making Progress	Not Making Progress
... establishing and maintaining a joyful, welcoming, nurturing, encouraging, and affirming classroom community that establishes a safe, productive Learning Environment.	Making Progress	Not Making Progress

... planning and/or facilitating instructional activities that are closely aligned to the instructional goal.	Making Progress	Not Making Progress
... using Universal Design for Learning in their planning and/or execution of learning experiences, in order to remove instructional barriers to learning.	Making Progress	Not Making Progress
... utilizing Student Data Analysis and Student Work Analysis protocols to assess student learning and experience in their classroom against daily, weekly, and/or summer school goals.	Making Progress	Not Making Progress
...owns their ongoing DEI learning and development.	Making Progress	Not Making Progress
... views themselves as aspiring and developing culturally relevant practitioners and believe Culturally Relevant Pedagogy is at the heart of their practice.	Making Progress	Not Making Progress
... effectively utilizing Instructional Activity planning resources to build out lesson methods and plan for student engagement, in alignment with the instructional goals and broader vision for students.	Making Progress	Not Making Progress

**For CMs with Special Education placements only**

Area assessed	Rating Choices		
CMs with special education placements:	(1) understand their Toolkit,	(2) identify some key information in an IEP;	(3) have experience writing drafts of two IEP components.

**Corps Member Areas of Opportunity and Areas of Strength, All Corps members**

Rating Choices: Areas of Opportunity	Rating Choices: Areas of Strength
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Pressing for evidence-based explanations in written and oral discourse, challenging and complicating student ideas--whether correct, incorrect or seemingly mis-aligned--for the purpose of deepening conceptual understandings.</li> <li>● Asking questions that students have been prepared to answer, which involves engaging talk moves, questioning, and scaffolding.</li> <li>● Establishing and maintaining a joyful, welcoming, nurturing, encouraging, and affirming classroom</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Pressing for evidence-based explanations in written and oral discourse, challenging and complicating student ideas--whether correct, incorrect or seemingly mis-aligned--for the purpose of deepening conceptual understandings.</li> <li>● Asking questions that students have been prepared to answer, which involves engaging talk moves, questioning, and scaffolding.</li> <li>● Establishing and maintaining a joyful, welcoming, nurturing, encouraging, and affirming classroom</li> </ul>

<p>community that establishes a safe, productive Learning Environment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Planning and/or facilitating instructional activities that are closely aligned to the instructional goal.</li> <li>● Using Universal Design for Learning in their planning and/or execution of learning experiences, in order to remove instructional barriers to learning.</li> <li>● Utilizing Student Data Analysis and Student Work Analysis protocols to assess student learning and experience in their classroom against daily, weekly, and/or summer school goals.</li> <li>● Owns their ongoing DEI learning and development.</li> <li>● Views themselves as aspiring and developing culturally relevant practitioners and believe Culturally Relevant Pedagogy is at the heart of their practice.</li> <li>● Effectively utilizing Instructional Activity planning resources to build out lesson methods and plan for student engagement, in alignment with the instructional goals and broader vision for students.</li> </ul>	<p>community that establishes a safe, productive Learning Environment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Planning and/or facilitating instructional activities that are closely aligned to the instructional goal.</li> <li>● Using Universal Design for Learning in their planning and/or execution of learning experiences, in order to remove instructional barriers to learning.</li> <li>● Utilizing Student Data Analysis and Student Work Analysis protocols to assess student learning and experience in their classroom against daily, weekly, and/or summer school goals.</li> <li>● Owns their ongoing DEI learning and development.</li> <li>● Views themselves as aspiring and developing culturally relevant practitioners and believe Culturally Relevant Pedagogy is at the heart of their practice.</li> <li>● Effectively utilizing Instructional Activity planning resources to build out lesson methods and plan for student engagement, in alignment with the instructional goals and broader vision for students.</li> </ul>
---	---

#### A.4 - Corps Member Outcomes Institute Data

Corp Member Outcome		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Mid Institute	Making Progress	65/68* = 96%	69/69 = 100%	69/69 = 100%	69/69 = 100%	68/69 = 99%	69/69 = 100%	68/69 = 99%	68/69 = 99%	69/69 = 100%	12/22 = 55%
	Not Making Progress	3/68 = 4%	0/69 = 0%	0/69 = 0%	0/69 = 0%	1/69 = 1%	0/69 = 0%	1/69 = 1%	1/69 = 1%	0/69 = 0%	10/22 = 45%
End of Institute	Making Progress	69/69 = 100%	68/69 = 99%	68/69 = 99%	69/69 = 100%	68/69 = 99%	68/69 = 99%	64/69 = 93%	69/69 = 100%	69/69 = 100%	28/30 = 93%
	Not Making Progress	0/69 = 0%	1/69 = 1%	1/69 = 1%	0/69 = 0%	1/69 = 1%	1/69 = 1%	5/69 = 7%	0/69 = 0%	0/69 = 0%	2/30 = 7%

\*one missing response

#### Corps Member Outcomes: The CM is...

1. pressing for evidence-based explanations in written and oral discourse, challenging and complicating student ideas--whether correct, incorrect or seemingly mis-aligned--for the purpose of deepening conceptual understandings.
2. asking questions that students have been prepared to answer, which involves engaging talk moves, questioning, and scaffolding.
3. establishing and maintaining a joyful, welcoming, nurturing, encouraging, and affirming classroom community that establishes a safe, productive Learning Environment.

4. planning and/or facilitating instructional activities that are closely aligned to the instructional goal.
5. using Universal Design for Learning in their planning and/or execution of learning experiences, in order to remove instructional barriers to learning.
6. utilizing Student Data Analysis and Student Work Analysis protocols to assess student learning and experience in their classroom against daily, weekly, and/or summer school goals.
7. owns their ongoing DEI learning and development.
8. views themselves as aspiring and developing culturally relevant practitioners and believe Culturally Relevant Pedagogy is at the heart of their practice.
9. When provided with a lesson vision, (objective, key points, assessment), effectively utilizing Instructional Activity planning resources to build out lesson methods and plan for student engagement, in alignment with the instructional goals and broader vision for students.
10. For CMs with Special Ed placements only: The CMs with special education placements: (1) understand their Toolkit, (2) identify some key information in an IEP; (3) have experience writing drafts of two IEP components.

End of Institute Areas of Opportunity and Areas of Strength

CM Outcome	Area of Opportunity	Area of Strength
Pressing for evidence-based explanations in written and oral discourse, challenging and complicating student ideas--whether correct, incorrect or seemingly mis-aligned--for the purpose of deepening conceptual understandings.	8/69 = 12%	6/69 = 9%
Asking questions that students have been prepared to answer, which involves engaging talk moves, questioning, and scaffolding.	9/69 = 13%	6/69 = 9%
Establishing and maintaining a joyful, welcoming, nurturing, encouraging, and affirming classroom community that establishes a safe, productive Learning Environment.	10/69 = 14%	19/69 = 28%
Planning and/or facilitating instructional activities that are closely aligned to the instructional goal.	13/69 = 19%	7/69 = 10%
Using Universal Design for Learning in their planning and/or execution of learning experiences, in order to remove instructional barriers to learning.	0/69 = 0%	0/69 = 0%
Utilizing Student Data Analysis and Student Work Analysis protocols to assess student learning and experience in their classroom against daily, weekly, and/or summer school goals.	3/69 = 4%	2/69 = 3%
Owns their ongoing DEI learning and development.	12/69 = 17%	3/69 = 4%



Views themselves as aspiring and developing culturally relevant practitioners and believe Culturally Relevant Pedagogy is at the heart of their practice.	13/69 = 19%	25/69 = 36%
Effectively utilizing Instructional Activity planning resources to build out lesson methods and plan for student engagement, in alignment with the instructional goals and broader vision for students.	1/69 = 1%	1/69 = 1%

#### A.5 - Administrator Input Form Template

Strengths of TFA Teachers

Areas of Growth for TFA Teachers

Principal Survey Questions  
*(strongly disagree, disagree, somewhat disagree, neutral, somewhat agree, agree, strongly agree)*

I am satisfied with Teach For America teachers in my school.  
TFA teachers are making a positive difference in my school.  
I would hire another TFA teacher if a vacancy arose in my school.  
I would recommend hiring TFA teachers to another principal.  
Teach For America teachers perform as well as or better than other beginning teachers.  
TFA teachers demonstrate leadership in my school.

Other Input and Questions

Anticipated vacancies and hiring needs (second semester only)

Date:	Administrator Name:
School:	Administrator Signature:

A.6 - Administrator Meeting Log

SY 17-18 Meeting Log

Date	School	School Attendees	TFA Attendees	Admin Input Form (y/n)
10/23/17	Waianae Elementary	Ray Pikelny (Principal) Holly (Site coach)	Chanel Timmons (MTLD)	n
10/25/17	Konawaena MS	Teddy Burgess (principal)	Natalie Lalagos (MTLD)	y
10/25/17	Maili Elementary	Suzie Lee	Chanel Timmons (MTLD)	n
10/30/17	Kahakai Elementary	Jessica Dahlke (VP), Alicia Hamilton (coach), Janet Silberman (VP)	Natalie Lalagos (MTLD)	y
11/1/17	Kanu o Ka 'Aina	Mahina Paishon-Duarte (Principal)	Natalie Lalagos (MTLD)	y
11/27/17	Wai'anae High School	Bryson Mitchell (coach); Cameron Kubota (coach); Cindy Rivera (coach); Debby Ng (coach); Beth Dyjak (coach); Walter Young (coach); Kevin Nakamoto (coach); Disa Hauge (principal)	Chanel Timmons (MTLD) Colleen McEnearney (MTLD)	y
11/29/17	Konawaena High School	Diane Spencer, (vice principal), Shawn	Kim Roman, Natalie Lalagos	y

		Suzuki (principal)		
11/30/17	Keaau High School	Dean Cevallos (principal)	Kim Roman (Director, School Impact)	y
12/5/2017	Kealakehe High School	Tammy Furrer (Vice Principal)	Natalie Lalagos (MTLD)	y
12/6/2017	Ho'okena Elementary School	Nancy Jadallah	Natalie Lalagos (MTLD)	y
12/11/2017	Kealakehe Intermediate	Mark Hackelberg (Principal)	Natalie Lalagos (MTLD)	y
1/10/2018	Ka'u High and Pahala Elementary	Sharon Beck (Principal)	Kim Roman (D,SI)	y
2/5/18	Waianae High	Becky Gebreyesus (VP) Hayley Spears (VP)	Chanel Timmons (MTLD)	n
2/26/18	Waianae Elementary	Ray Pikelny (Principal)	Chanel Timmons (MTLD)	n
3/5/18	Kipapa Elementary School	Corinne Yogi (Principal)	Colleen McEnearney (MTLD)	y
3/5/18	Kealakehe Intermediate	Mark Hackelberg (Principal)	Natalie Lalagos (MTLD)	y
3/28/18	Waianae Elementary	Ray Pikelny (principal)	Chanel Timmons (MTLD)	n
4/3/18	Waianae High	Becky Gebreyesus (VP) Hayley Spears (VP)	Chanel Timmons (MTLD)	n
4/5/18	Nanaikapono Elementary	Debra Knight (Principal)	Leslie Toy (MTLD)	y
4/18/18	Wheeler Middle School	Brenda Vierra-Chun (Principal)	Leslie Toy (MTLD)	y
4/19/18	Leihoku Elementary School	Randall Miura (Principal)	Leslie Toy (MTLD)	y
4/20/18	Aiea Intermediate School	Tom Kurashige (Principal)	Leslie Toy (MTLD)	y

4/23/18	Wahiawa Middle School	Ursula Kawaguchi (Principal)	Leslie Toy (MTLD)	y
4/23/18	James Campbell High School	Jon Henry Lee (Principal)	Colleen McEnearney (MTLD)	y
4/25/18	Ho'okena Elementary	Nancy Jadallah (Principal)	Natalie Lalagos (MTLD) Lia Rozmiarek-Held (Head of Program)	n
4/27/18	Kaimiloa Elementary	Chad Nacapuy (Vice Principal)	Colleen McEnearney (MTLD)	y
4/30/18	Waianae Elementary	Ray Pikelny	Chanel Timmons (MTLD)	y
5/10/18	Waianae Elementary	Ray Pikelny	Chanel Timmons (MTLD)	n
5/11/18	Aiea High School	David Tanuvasa (Principal)	Leslie Toy (MTLD)	y
5/14/18	Waianae High School	Coaches	Colleen McEnearney & Chanel Timmons (MTLDs)	n
5/16/18	Waianae Intermediate School	John Wataoka (Principal)	Colleen McEnearney (MTLD)	y
5/31/18	Konawaena High School	Shawn Suzuki (Principal)	Natalie Lalagos (MTLD)	y
5/31/18	Konawaena Middle School	Teddy Burgess (Principal)	Natalie Lalagos (MTLD)	y
5/31/18	Kealakehe Intermediate	Mark Hackelberg (Principal)	Natalie Lalagos (MTLD)	y
5/31/18	Kealakehe High School	Tammy Furrer (Vice Principal)	Natalie Lalagos (MTLD)	y
6/6/18	Kanu o ka Aina	Mahina Paishon-Duarte (Principal)	Natalie Lalagos (MTLD)	n

A.7 - Danielson Observation Data  
SY15-16

Content Area	Danielson Rating for 2d: Managing Student Behavior	Danielson Rating for 3d: Using Assessment in Instruction	Danielson Ratings for 2b: Establishing a Culture for Learning	Danielson Ratings for 3b: Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques	Danielson Ratings for 3c: Engaging Students in Learning
ELA	D: 38%	D: 25%	D: 25%	D: 19%	D: 25%
	P: 44%	P: 57%	P: 57%	P: 62%	P: 63%
	B: 6%	B: 6%	B: 6%	B: 13%	B: 6%
	*Not Assessed: 12%	Not Assessed: 12%	Not Assessed: 12%	Not Assessed: 6%	Not Assessed: 6%
Math	D: 13%	D: 25%	D: 50%	D: 25%	D: 31%
	P: 75%	P: 63%	P: 38%	P: 69%	P: 63%
	B: 0%	B: 0%	B: 0%	B: 6%	B: 6%
	Not Assessed: 12%	Not Assessed: 12%	Not Assessed: 12%	Not Assessed: 0%	Not Assessed: 0%
Elementary	D: 5%	D: 9%	D: 9%	D: 0%	D: 5%
	P: 81%	P: 76%	P: 81%	P: 67%	P: 81%
	B: 5%	B: 5%	B: 0%	B: 24%	B: 5%
	Not Assessed: 9%	Not Assessed: 9%	Not Assessed: 9%	Not Assessed: 9%	Not Assessed: 9%
Science	D: 36%	D: 36%	D: 45%	D: 27%	D: 27%
	P: 54%	P: 54%	P: 55%	P: 73%	P: 73%
	B: 10%	B: 10%	B: 0%	B: 0%	B: 0%
	Not Assessed: 0%	Not Assessed: 0%	Not Assessed: 0%	Not Assessed: 0%	Not Assessed: 0%
Social Studies	D: 25%	D: 25%	D: 25%	D: 25%	D: 0%
	P: 75%	P: 75%	P: 75%	P: 25%	P: 100%
	B: 0%	B: 0%	B: 0%	B: 50%	B: 0%
	Not Assessed: 0%	Not Assessed: 0%	Not Assessed: 0%	Not Assessed: 0%	Not Assessed: 0%

D - Distinguished; P - Proficient; B - Basic

Ratings come from administrators charged with providing evaluations of non-tenured teachers, aligned to the Danielson framework, as implemented in SY2015-16.

*\* Of the 3 total individuals not assessed across the candidate group - one was on maternity leave; one was at a first-year charter; one, unknown. There were two other individuals partially assessed based on the implementation of the Danielson observations at their school site. School site administrators conducted school-specific evaluations, which allowed for some flexibility in application of the Danielson domains, aligned to school decision-making and priorities.*

SY16-17

Content Area	Danielson Ratings for 2d: Managing Student Behavior	Danielson Ratings for 3d: Using Assessment in Instruction	Danielson Ratings for 2b: Establishing a Culture for Learning	Danielson Ratings for 3b: Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques	Danielson Ratings for 3c: Engaging Students in Learning
ELA	D: 4/16 = 25%	D: 2/16 = 13%	D: 2/16 = 13%	D: 2/16 = 13%	D: 1/16 = 6%
	P: 10/16 = 63%	P: 10/16 = 63%	P: 13/16 = 81%	P: 10/16 = 63%	P: 13/16 = 81%
	B: 2/16 = 13%	B: 4/16 = 25%	B: 1/16 = 6%	B: 4/16 = 25%	B: 2/16 = 13%
	U: 0/16 = 0%	U: 0/16 = 0%	U: 0/16 = 0%	U: 0/16 = 0%	U: 0/16 = 0%
Math	D: 0/11 = 0%	D: 1/11 = 9%	D: 1/11 = 9%	D: 2/11 = 18%	D: 5/11 = 45%
	P: 11/11 = 100%	P: 10/11 = 91%	P: 10/11 = 91%	P: 8/11 = 73%	P: 6/11 = 55%
	B: 0/11 = 0%	B: 0/11 = 0%	B: 0/11 = 0%	B: 1/11 = 9%	B: 0/11 = 0%
	U: 0/11 = 0%	U: 0/11 = 0%	U: 0/11 = 0%	U: 0/11 = 0%	U: 0/11 = 0%
Elementary	D: 2/5 = 40%	D: 0/5 = 0%	D: 0/5 = 0%	D: 1/5 = 20%	D: 2/5 = 40%
	P: 3/5 = 60%	P: 4/5 = 80%	P: 4/5 = 80%	P: 2/5 = 40%	P: 2/5 = 40%
	B: 0/5 = 0%	B: 1/5 = 20%	B: 1/5 = 20%	B: 2/5 = 40%	B: 1/5 = 20%
	U: 0/5 = 0%	U: 0/5 = 0%	U: 0/5 = 0%	U: 0/5 = 0%	U: 0/5 = 0%
General	D: 1/6 = 17%	D: 1/6 = 17%	D: 1/6 = 17%	D: 1/6 = 17%	D: 1/6 = 17%

Science	P: 5/6 = 83%	P: 4/6 = 67%	P: 5/6 = 83%	P: 4/6 = 67%	P: 4/6 = 67%
	B: 0/6 = 0%	B: 1/6 = 17%	B: 0/6 = 0%	B: 1/6 = 17%	B: 1/6 = 17%
	U: 0/6 = 0%	U: 0/6 = 0%	U: 0/6 = 0%	U: 0/6 = 0%	U: 0/6 = 0%
Social Studies	D: 0/6 = 0%	D: 0/6 = 0%	D: 0/6 = 0%	D: 0/6 = 0%	D: 0/6 = 0%
	P: 6/6 = 100%	P: 5/6 = 83%	P: 5/6 = 83%	P: 5/6 = 83%	P: 5/6 = 83%
	B: 0/6 = 0%	B: 1/6 = 17%	B: 1/6 = 17%	B: 1/6 = 17%	B: 1/6 = 17%
	U: 0/6 = 0%	U: 0/6 = 0%	U: 0/6 = 0%	U: 0/6 = 0%	U: 0/6 = 0%

D – Distinguished; P – Proficient; B – Basic; U – Unsatisfactory

Ratings come from administrators charged with providing evaluations of non-tenured teachers, aligned to the Danielson framework, as implemented in SY2016.17.

#### SY17-18 Overall Danielson Ratings

2b Danielson: Establishing a Culture for Learning	2d Danielson: Managing Student Behavior	3b Danielson: Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques	3c Danielson: Engaging Students in Learning	3d Danielson: Using Assessment in Instruction
D: 12/57 = 21%	D: 8/57 = 14%	D: 9/57 = 16%	D: 7/57 = 12%	D: 6/57 = 10%
P: 40/57 = 70%	P: 42/57 = 74%	P: 30/57 = 53%	P: 45/57 = 79%	P: 42/57 = 74%
B: 5/57 = 9%	B: 7/57 = 12%	B: 18/57 = 31%	B: 5/57 = 9%	B: 9/57 = 16%
U: 0/57 = 0%	U: 0/57 = 0%	U: 0/57 = 0%	U: 0/57 = 0%	U: 0/57 = 0%

D – Distinguished; P – Proficient; B – Basic; U – Unsatisfactory

Ratings come from administrators charged with providing evaluations of non-tenured teachers, aligned to the Danielson framework, as first implemented in SY2016.17.

#### B.1 - Validity Study Panelists

First Name	Last Name	Current Position
Colleen	McEneaney	Teacher Coach

Leslie	Toy	Teacher Coach
Kim	Roman	Teacher Coach
Chanel	Timmons	Teacher Coach
Natalie	Lalagos	Teacher Coach
Debbie	Moon	Classroom Teacher
Annie	Wynters	Special Education Department Head
Sarah	Kern	Classroom Teacher
Cameron	Kubota	Teacher Coach
Meilan	Akaka Manfre	Teacher Coach
Phillip	Hon	Classroom Teacher
Dale	Fryxell	University Personnel (professor, program manager, dean etc)
Christina	Torres	Classroom Teacher
Allie	Serina	College Career Counselor

### C.1 - Finer-grained outcomes tracker

Due to the large size, please see supporting evidence for finer-grained outcomes via this Tracker [at this box link](#)

### C.2 - School Impact Data Meeting Log

Date	Participants	Topic(s)
10/17/17	Alyson Emrick, Kim Roman, Leslie Toy, Colleen McEnearney, Chanel Timmons, Natalie Lalagos	Q1 Progress towards goals review and responsive planning
11/10/17	Alyson Emrick, Kim Roman, Leslie Toy, Colleen	First 8 Weeks Survey Data Review and



	McEnearney, Chanel Timmons, Natalie Lalagos	Responsive Planning
1/9/18	Alyson Emrick, Kim Roman, Leslie Toy, Colleen McEnearney, Chanel Timmons, Natalie Lalagos	Q2 Progress towards goals review and responsive planning
2/2/18	Alyson Emrick, Kim Roman, Leslie Toy, Colleen McEnearney, Chanel Timmons, Natalie Lalagos, Lia Rozmiarek, Meilan Akaka Manfre, Lindsey Bailey, Isaiah Peacott-Ricardos	Spring Program Retreat: Holistic Progress to Goals
4/3/18	Alyson Emrick, Kim Roman, Leslie Toy, Colleen McEnearney, Chanel Timmons, Natalie Lalagos	Q3 Progress towards goals review and responsive planning
4/10/18	Alyson Emrick, Kim Roman, Leslie Toy, Colleen McEnearney, Chanel Timmons, Natalie Lalagos	Mid Year Survey Data Review and Responsive Planning
6/5/18	Alyson Emrick, Kim Roman, Leslie Toy, Colleen McEnearney, Chanel Timmons, Natalie Lalagos	Q4 and End of Year Goals data review, celebration, and discussion of following year goals and metrics

### C.3 - Content Specialist Meeting Log

Date	Participants	Topic(s)
7/24/17	Aly, Kim, Natalie, Colleen, Leslie, Chanel, Sarah, Cameron, Debbie, Annie, Topher, Viviana, Justin	Kick-off Meeting, Syllabus, Scope and Sequence
8/8/17	Kim, Colleen, Annie, Leslie, Aly, Sarah, Christina, Natalie, Chanel Cameron, Viviana, Justin	Vision, Assignments, Grading, CLC survey, Measuring student outcomes
9/6/17	Leslie, Viviana, Debbie, Topher, Aly, Natalie, Colleen, Chanel, Sarah, Cameron, Justin, CT	CLC#1 Debrief and Data, Implications for scope and sequence, Resource Share, Collaborative work time
10/18/17	Aly, Sarah, Topher, Debbie, Annie, Colleen, Cameron, CT, Viviana, Justin, Leslie, Chanel	7 Dimensions of Culture, Debrief and Data Review, Scope and sequence share
11/21/17	Col, Aly, CT, Chanel, Debbie, Leslie, Kim, Topher, Justin, Viviana, Sarah	Systems Management, Debrief and Data, 1x1 Feedback cycle
1/9/18	CT, Aly, Chanel, Leslie, Sarah, Debbie, Natalie, Topher, Justin, Annie, Kim, Colleen, Viviana	Systems Management and Updates, Semester 2 Planning, Collaborative work time
2/13/18	Annie, Cameron, Sarah, Kim, Leslie, Chanel, Topher, CT, Debbie, Colleen, Aly, Justin, Viviana	Grade Norming, Hō`ike Portfolio

3/13/18	Natalie, Annie, Cameron, Colleen, Kim, Chanel, Debbie, Viviana, Topher, Justin, Christina	Hō`ike Portfolio Grade Norming, Data Review and Planning
4/25/18	Annie, Aly, Cameron, Natalie, Sarah, Debbie, Topher, Colleen, Chanel, Leslie, Justin, Kim, Viviana	Systems Management, Special Education Content, input, and Support, Planning for next school Year, Data Review and Content Team Time
5/15/18	Sarah, Aly, Cameron, Justin, Leslie, CT, Chanel, Debbie, Annie, Colleen, Natalie	Systems Management, Input, Looking Forward

#### C.4 - Learning Community Survey Data Overview

	This session will help me to achieve the vision and goals that I have for my students.	This session will help me to improve the rigor of my content area instruction.	What I learned in my session will directly impact student achievement in my classroom.	What I learned in this session contained ideas/resources that I plan to implement in my classroom.	I feel part of a learning community where CMs collaborate and support one another towards our collective impact.	Overall Average
LC #1 (August)	5.76	5.76	5.83	6.17	6.10	5.92
LC #2 (September)	6.29	5.92	6.16	6.27	6.36	6.2
LC #3 (October)	6.12	5.93	6.3	6.57	6.39	6.26
LC #4 (December)	6.13	6.01	6.19	6.31	6.36	6.2
LC #5 (January)	5.84	5.66	5.84	6.1	6.08	5.904
LC #6 (February)	6.13	6.12	6.07	6.19	6.34	6.17
LC #7 (April)	6.22	6.02	6.08	6.23	6.22	6.154
LC #8 (May)	6.46	6.19	6.4	6.5	6.55	6.42
<i>Overall Averages</i>	6.12	5.95	6.11	6.29	6.30	6.15

The survey was a 7 point Likert scale: 1-3 disagree (1=strongly disagree), 4 (neutral), 5-7 agree (7=strongly agree).