

FEATURED ARTICLE



Jacy Ippolito and Francesca Pomerantz share their experiences in introducing protocols to teachers as a means to enhance the quality of productive talk in professional learning communities. Protocols were used by two groups of collaborating teachers to keep a laser-like focus and achieve their professional development goals.

PROTOCOLS AS ESSENTIAL TOOLS FOR LITERACY PROFESSIONAL LEARNING COMMUNITIES IN THE COMMON CORE ERA

JACY IPPOLITO AND FRANCESCA POMERANTZ

In the era of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS), the conversations teachers, reading specialists, and literacy coaches have in professional learning communities are more important than ever. The Common Core is refocusing the nation's attention on supporting students as they read informational texts, read complex texts closely, and craft text-based arguments in a wider array of writing forms than ever before. With the Common Core emphasizing learning goals, not instructional approaches or methods, literacy educators are left to talk amongst themselves to determine the means of education. In addition to new teacher evaluation systems being implemented at the state level (which in Massachusetts includes an evaluation of "professional collaboration"), new CCSS-linked standardized tests are on the horizon. It is perhaps more important than ever to look again at the power of literacy-focused professional learning communities (PLCs), and the practices within PLCs that build educators' capacity to examine student work and literacy achievement data, to analyze student performance, and subsequently to plan effective instruction and interventions in response.

Professional learning communities—small groups of adult educators working together to improve instructional practice and student learning—have been widely discussed and implemented in U.S. schools for decades (Dana & Yendol-Hoppey, 2008; Dufour, Eaker & DuFour, 2005; Lent, 2007; Louis & Kruse, 1995). Unfortunately, PLCs have become a buzzword, a "term ... used so ubiquitously that it is in danger of losing all meaning (Dufour, 2004, p. 6). Observers would be hard-pressed to find a school district in the

United States that does not claim to use PLCs as one of its mechanisms for changing practice and increasing student achievement. However, authentic adult professional learning is complex and requires skillful facilitation and leadership if we expect professional development to translate into student achievement (Breidenstein, Fahey, Glickman, & Hensley, 2012).

Many schools have shifted away from traditional PLCs in favor of what might seem like more goal-oriented groups focused on collecting and analyzing student data (Boudett, City, & Murnane, 2005). These evolutionary offspring of professional learning communities still retain many of the same underlying principles: making teacher practice public, increasing communication and collaboration, focusing on student work, and relying on reflective dialogue. Interestingly, they also retain perhaps one of the most important and yet least-documented elements of successful literacy-focused PLCs, the use of protocols or discussion structures to guide adult collaboration and dialogue (Allen & Blythe, 2004; McDonald, Mohr, Dichter, & McDonald, 2013). Protocols have long been a staple tool of Critical Friends Groups (CFGs) and other school reform organizations, but only recently have they been adopted and described as effective by literacy-focused PLCs (Ippolito, 2010, 2013; Peterson, Taylor, Burnham, & Schock, 2009). Conversations guided by the use of protocols can facilitate the sharing of instructional knowledge and can help ground decision-making in literacy assessment data connected to the new standards.

While researchers have explored issues of trust, respect, and coherence among adult educators (Bryk, Sebring, Allensworth, Luppescu, & Easton, 2010), how educators successfully use data (Boudett, City, & Murnane, 2005), and how making practice public can shift teaching and learning (City, Elmore, Fiarman, & Teitel, 2009), there have been far fewer descriptions of the effects of specific protocols used by groups of literacy educators to engage in reflective dialogue. More work must be done to understand how groups of literacy educators might use protocols to improve literacy instruction and learning as Common Core standards are implemented nationwide. Thus, the purpose of this article is to share two stories of districts that are successfully adopting, adapting, and implementing protocols in literacy PLCs to facilitate teacher collaboration. We share some of the learning processes and protocols developed in both districts so that others might adopt the methods and tools.

Our Roles, Research Questions, and Methods

Being longtime users of protocols, both as teachers in schools and as professors in higher education classrooms, we see great value in structured conversations for describing literacy instructional dilemmas and collaboratively designing new instruction. Two overarching questions about protocols connect the projects described below: *What protocols would teachers adopt, adapt, and find most useful when presented with an array of options? What processes would facilitate the adoption and implementation of the protocols?*

We began to answer these questions when financial support from district, state, and university grants targeting university-district collaborations allowed us to partner with two school districts within Massachusetts (identified as District A and District B for the purposes of this article). Both Francesca and Jacy spent one year (2011-2012) helping District A elementary and middle school reading specialists create and refine protocols for talking with teacher teams about using literacy assessment data. Jacy spent two years (2009-2011) working with school-based literacy coaches in District B to adopt and adapt protocols to increase the efficacy of coach-teacher conversations about instruction. While these districts were quite different in some respects—A) suburban vs. B) urban; A) less diverse student population vs. B) very diverse student population; A) investment primarily in reading specialists vs. B) investment in reading specialists *and* literacy coaches—both districts shared a commitment to adult learning and professional learning communities. With strong support from district administrators, these

districts were ideal contexts in which to explore the kind and quality of protocols for improving discussions about literacy practices and instruction. Below we present two cases describing our work and the outcomes in each district, including sample protocols from each group.

District A Reading Specialists and Protocols for Looking at Data

The reading specialists in District A routinely collected data on students' reading progress via the DIBELS (Dynamic Measurement Group, 2008) and Fountas and Pinnell's *Benchmark Assessment System* (Fountas & Pinnell, 2010a). But how could classroom teachers use these data to inform their instruction? This suburban district partnered with our university to train eight elementary and two middle school reading specialists as "data coaches" who could help classroom teachers examine the implications of these data for their instruction.

Over the 2011-2012 school year, we (Francesca and Jacy) conducted a series of 10, two-hour workshops, with seven meetings in the fall and three in the spring. The fall meetings focused on preparing the reading specialists to be data coaches for January and February "instructional data meetings" with classroom teachers. The spring meetings focused on debriefing the teacher meetings and planning for the future.

We began our specific exploration of protocols by examining two short case studies of struggling readers using the "Collaborative Assessment Conference" protocol (to see all protocols, visit the "protocols & resources" section of www.schoolreforminitiative.org). At first, Francesca played the role of the presenting teacher and facilitator and then turned responsibility for these roles over to the reading specialists so that each participant had the opportunity to play both roles in the first few sessions. Participants in the role of the presenting teacher wrote and brought in their own case studies that included the reading data collected by the district.

At the third meeting, we used the "Success Analysis" protocol in small groups to reflect on the process of using the "Collaborative Assessment" protocol to structure our case study discussions. Participants identified many advantages of using the protocol: increased professionalism, a common goal, mutual respect, validation from colleagues for one's ideas, and highly focused and productive conversation. All agreed that the protocol was useful in structuring a conversation about an individual

student. But such conversations were rare in their school settings and not part of the routine. They needed a protocol to discuss classroom data sets. We reviewed other protocols from the School Reform Initiative website, and participants determined which ones might suit their purpose better. This discussion led to one of the participants drafting a protocol for use in grade-level meetings with classroom teachers specifically to discuss DIBELS and *Benchmark Assessment System* data.

In our remaining fall sessions, participants tested the draft protocol in three small groups, switching roles, increasing their comfort levels with facilitation, and revising the protocols in response to our debriefing conversations. Additionally, many questions arose about the logistics of the upcoming meetings with teachers. When would they occur? Was there enough time? Who would cover the teachers' classrooms? Who would inform the principal about the need for the meetings? How would the school and district leadership "sell" the meetings to teachers? Here the support of the district administrative leadership was essential. The Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction drafted a letter to teachers explaining the purpose of the meetings and shared it with the reading specialists for their input.

Equally important was the recognition that some of the reading specialists were anxious about their new roles as meeting facilitator and data coach. They were concerned about encountering resistance from their colleagues and about conversations that could become "gripe sessions." Consequently, the final session prior to the first instructional data meeting focused on framing the relationship between the reading specialists and the teachers, explaining the purpose and goals of the meetings, and overcoming resistance. Participants drafted and shared introductory statements of their roles and the purpose of the meetings. They brainstormed what might get in the way of accomplishing the purpose/goals of the meetings, worries about working with colleagues, and the kinds of resistance they expected. They then discussed where the resistance might come from and the key messages teachers would need to hear in response to their resistance. With this discussion in mind, participants revised their introductory statements.

Reconvening in March, we reflected on the instructional data meetings. Participants shared successes, challenges, and best practices. Some best practices included partnering with each other so that one reading specialist acted as facilitator and one as timekeeper (this was possible because there were two

reading specialists in each school) and providing data to teachers ahead of the meeting to save time. Challenges included needing more time for the meetings and concerns about teachers not following up on the suggestions that emerged from the conversations. We also revisited and revised the protocol based on their experiences (see Appendix A for the final version of the protocol).

The question of how this work connected to the Common Core (recently adopted by Massachusetts) emerged from our conversation. So, in our final meeting we discussed how to ground instruction in assessment and the Common Core. We used a case study, inviting participants to analyze assessment results, make instructional recommendations, and then link them to the standards. In their role as data coaches, they can now make this link for teachers.

Participants evaluated the project, responding to the following three prompts in writing: *What did you learn? How did you use what you learned? What needs to happen next?* In all of the responses, participants emphasized the value of protocols for structuring their conversations with teachers. Many cited the careful preparation we did as essential in building their confidence to lead the instructional data meetings. For example, one participant wrote, "Running through the protocols built my confidence to hold the instructional data meetings. When the meeting began to go astray, we referred back to the protocol. This helped to lessen the side conversations." Another participant responded, "This partnership has prepared us to conduct different types of data meetings using protocols. It has given us the confidence to encourage rich conversation among our teachers with a mutual end goal—to move students along and encourage success." One participant commented that "our data meetings and use of a protocol gave everyone a voice—I didn't realize that in meetings, some teachers really do have most of the 'mic' time (without a protocol)." Another participant wrote that teachers valued the protocol. She stated, "I learned that the teachers want us to lead them in the right direction and respect the idea of using data to drive instruction. They saw the benefits of the protocol in keeping the meetings focused and productive (valuing their time)." One participant cited the importance of the reading specialists collaboratively developing their own protocol: "I felt empowered in the implementation of our protocols for data team meetings because I had participated in the development of those protocols."

Interestingly, almost all of the participants stated how much they learned from meeting with each other and sharing ideas through the series of 10 workshops. Many of the reading specialists in the district did not know each other prior to the workshop series. One participant explained, "We rarely have the time to have sustained conversations with colleagues. It surely is in these continued, rich conversations that we grow professionally and become more effective as teachers and as supporters of classroom teachers." Some common themes in the reading specialists' recommendations for the future were the need for richer and more performance-based reading assessment data, such as running records, and increased time for and frequency of meetings with teachers.

District B Literacy Coaches and Protocols for Talking about Instruction

District B has invested heavily in Literacy Collaborative, a research-based framework for literacy instruction and intervention that includes a strong model for training and sustaining adult learning through coaching (Rebora, 2012). As a result of adopting this model, District B slowly built a cadre of expert literacy coaches, reaching a highpoint during 2009-2010 of 23 coaches working across one K-5 and eleven K-8 schools. The coaches were mostly trained in Literacy Collaborative, and their classroom experience ranged from a few years to decades. These school-based coaches were supported by several district-level English language Arts (ELA) directors, who initially contacted Jacy and began a conversation about designing new ways of supporting the coaches' own professional learning.

District B's literacy coaches were already quite expert in literacy instructional practices, and they had successfully helped teachers in the district use the Fountas and Pinnell *Benchmark Assessment System* (2010a) as well as *The Continuum of Literacy Learning*, (2010b). The ELA directors were eager to move the group toward a Critical Friends Group (CFG) model in which coaches could meet together in small, flexible affinity groups (by interest, grade-level, content-area, etc.) and wrestle with and collaboratively solve complex dilemmas of practice. Stand-and-deliver instruction was disappearing from classrooms, and it was time for it to fade from professional development settings, too.

As a result of conversations with district ELA directors, we designed a yearlong sequence of sessions with school-based literacy coaches in which Jacy introduced a continuum of discussion-based protocols, modeled those protocols with the group,

and encouraged the coaches to use the protocols with teachers in their respective schools. The *Continuum of Protocols* was devised as a way to help coaches consider the wide range of purposes for discussions within literacy learning communities and structures for facilitating those discussions. This continuum, following a similar logic to the "literacy coaching continuum" of coaching practices (Moran, 2007), suggests that some discussions can be entered into quite easily with new groups, without requiring high levels of trust or knowledge of one another. As a coach/facilitator moves along the continuum (over time with a group), she might need to engage the group in more complicated, personal, difficult, or intense discussions; therefore, different sets of protocols might be introduced. The continuum is perhaps more art than science, and borrows heavily on CFG tools and traditions, but given our experiences working with adults in schools, we have found it important to introduce new discussions/protocols in roughly this order (for full continuum and links to protocols referenced throughout this article see Ippolito, 2013, or download from http://adlitpd.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/Continuum_of_Protocols.pdf):

- Sharing Experiences
- Text-based Discussions
- Looking at Student Work
- Tuning
- Looking at Data
- Planning & Observing
- Dilemmas of Practice
- Equity & Social Justice

During the 2009-2010 school year, Jacy introduced this continuum to the literacy coaches and engaged the group in protocol-based discussions once per month from October 2009 through May 2010. In the first two sessions in October and November we introduced the continuum and engaged the coaches in conversations about setting norms ("Compass Points" protocol), describing the work of a school-based coach and the successes/challenges inherent in working with adult learners ("Chalk Talk" protocol), and describing the tensions felt between the roles of coaches as described by the district and as enacted in schools ("Continuum Dialogue" protocol). In our third session we explored the power of text-based discussions, introducing the "Four As" and "Text-Rendering" protocols to investigate implications for coaching work in Roland S. Barth's article "Improving Relationships Within the Schoolhouse"

(Barth, 2006), and Margaret Wheatley's "Willing to be Disturbed" (Wheatley, 2002). These first sessions set the groundwork for later more complicated experiences in which the coaches would share student work, share their own professional development plans, and explore dilemmas of practice.

During the winter sessions, having gotten to know one another and become a bit more accustomed to a different way of working, the coaches brought student work to share and analyze using protocols such as the "ATLAS" and "Collaborative Assessment Conference." Next, coaches brought drafts of their own professional development plans (for working with teachers during and after school hours), and we "tuned" those plans in large and small groups—just as a musician would "tune" her instrument, the presenter's work is "tuned" by the group through a process of noticing where work products meet or miss stated goals. Toward the end of the year we introduced protocols that could be used to explore (and begin to solve) dilemmas of practice (the "Consultancy," "Issaquah," "Charrette," and "Back to the Future" protocols).

While the coaches learned a great deal as they practiced discussions along the continuum of protocols, a particularly memorable event occurred toward the end of the spring. One elementary school coach offered a professional development plan to be "tuned" by a group of colleagues. A major insight emerged that the coach was asking teachers to engage in a great deal of "noticing," "reflecting," and "wondering" about each others' lessons without providing scaffolding for those qualitatively different ways of talking about each others' work. Essentially, the coach was adopting the language and structures of the protocols, but she had not laid the groundwork with teachers by modeling and talking about the importance of seemingly simple steps such as observing, describing, and wondering. In the coach's next sessions with teachers, she introduced rounds of noticing, questioning, and wondering that were supported by sentence stems, prompts, and examples (for examples, see the "Pocket Guide to Probing Questions,"

http://schoolreforminitiative.org/doc/probing_questions_guide.pdf). She described and modeled the kind of thinking and talking she hoped the teachers would adopt, and indeed she reported that during subsequent sessions the teachers were more comfortable with what they previously described as ambiguous directions. The modeling helped them "try on" new ways of talking and thinking about each other's work and, as a result, the coach reported that they grew more focused and productive as a small group. The cadre of coaches reported that participating in the

tuning process and hearing the results of the coach's work demonstrated the power of protocol-based discussions.

At the end of the spring of 2010, coaches were given the opportunity to formally report on their experiences using protocols throughout the year (via SurveyMonkey). Thirteen coaches responded at length to open-ended questions, seven of whom never had experienced protocol-based discussions before. The responses were overwhelmingly positive. Coaches reported using text-based student work, and tuning protocols most frequently. Protocols were also used across a variety of settings: in coaches' own professional development sessions, teacher cluster meetings (i.e., grade-level or content-area teams), literacy leadership meetings with reading specialists and teachers, and instructional leadership team meetings with administrators. When asked about the effects of using protocols with teachers, the coaches responded:

- "I feel they [the protocols] have improved my work. Sessions are focused, structured, and reach a level of depth not reached as easily before."
- "[The protocols] have provided a structure to look at student work which led to rich discussions around teaching practice."
- "Using a protocol moves the focus from the *coach's* advice to the *group's* advice. It spreads the responsibility to the team rather than the teacher and coach. It gives a feeling of camaraderie and greater collegiality."
- "Using a LASW protocol has helped focus our cluster meetings and helped teachers feel comfortable sharing because it has become a risk-free zone."

Building on the coaches' positive responses, the ELA directors and we deepened the commitment to protocols in the second year of the project by modifying the "Consultancy" and "Issaquah" dilemma-focused protocols and using them while debriefing coaching dilemmas around one-on-one coaching. In 2010-2011, a significant portion of monthly coaching meetings were devoted to small groups of coaches watching video footage of one another having coaching conversations with teachers one-on-one. The presenting coach would first pose a question to the group about her/his own coaching practice (e.g., "How can I ask better questions during coaching conversations in order to improve teachers' thinking about students' instructional needs?") and

describe the larger context of her/his work. The group would ask clarifying questions, factual details necessary to better understand the context. Then the group would watch a video clip of a conversation between the presenting coach and a teacher. Finally, the group would offer specific thoughts on next steps the presenting coach might take (for the final version of the dilemma-focused protocol, see Appendix B). At the end of the 2011 school year, in final written surveys, coaches reported powerful learning as the result of this work:

- “The coaching video sessions definitely helped me improve my practice. It forced me to move out of my comfort zone and to be more thoughtful about my coaching moves with teachers.”
- “I do this type of work with the teachers at my school, and engaging in this process myself has helped me run more efficient sessions with my teachers.”
- “I’ve been thinking a lot about how directive I can be when working with teachers. Finding a balance between allowing a teacher to arrive at his/her own conclusions and telling them what to do (to save time) is hard for me. This [coaching] group has helped me grapple with this and bring it to the forefront so to speak.”

Implications

1. Protocols can be powerful, but they need to be collaboratively explored, tweaked, and designed.

While an introduction to a wide range of protocols and adoption of basic structures and language is useful, many literacy leaders and teachers might find that they need to strategically and selectively adopt and adapt protocols in order to find a perfect fit for their purposes and context. We believe the process of collaboratively exploring and designing protocols was key to sparking interest and a sense of ownership on the part of the reading specialists and coaches in these two districts. As Doyle (2007) states in the introduction to *The Facilitator’s Guide to Participatory Decision-Making*, “if people don’t participate in and ‘own’ the solution to the problems or agree to the decision, implementation will be half-hearted at best, probably misunderstood, and, more likely than not, will fail” (p. xi). The processes of exploring and developing the protocols in these districts provide examples of what Doyle means when he writes, “the key

differentiating factor in the success of an organization is not just the products and services ... but the organization’s ability to elicit, harness, and focus the vast intellectual capital and goodwill resident in their members, employees, and stakeholders” (p. xii). The reading specialists and coaches in these cases had deep knowledge of the processes involved in learning to read, of their colleagues, of the meaning of assessment data, and of teaching methodologies. If they had been limited to existing protocols or structures, all of this knowledge might have remained untapped, or the existing protocols may not have met the discipline-specific needs of these literacy experts.

2. Purpose is key, and groups need to keep a laser-like focus on their goals and use protocols to achieve those goals, not as goals in and of themselves.

It is essential in this work to make sure that groups stay focused on the reason for protocol-based discussions. In the case of District A, the purpose of the discussions was to better understand and make instructional decisions based on literacy assessment data. In District B during the second year, the purpose was to better understand the intricacies of one-on-one coaching conversations and maximize the efficacy of those coaching structures. It is easy for groups to lose sight of their purpose and become frustrated at the rigidity of a protocol, or to focus too closely on a protocol’s structure (e.g., keeping time too closely, not allowing the conversation to flow). Ultimately, protocols are structures that allow professionals to have meaningful, insightful discussions about challenging topics—our own professional practices—without becoming too emotional, judgmental, or overbearing in terms of participation. However, the point is not the protocol, the point is the powerful conversation. Over time, these groups might modify or abandon the structured protocols once they have embraced the ways of talking, questioning, and wondering upon which the protocols are based. All of this work builds professional capacity for collegiality (Barth, 2006).

3. This work flourished because of funding, district support, and university partnerships—we need more (and more documentation of) such collaborations.

Just as the Common Core is refocusing our literacy instructional goals, we also need to increase and refocus collaborations between districts and universities. While literacy learning communities have been widely heralded as effective (Lent, 2007), we have found that both of the districts described here benefitted enormously from university faculty support in forming, energizing, and equipping those communities. Too often university-district

collaborations go undocumented, and too often effective tools developed in schools (such as the protocols shared in this article) fail to reach colleagues nationwide. Universities, school districts, and state and federal funding agencies must support more collaborative opportunities, following in the footsteps of organizations such as the School Reform Initiative in their effort to design, distribute, and research effective tools that improve teaching and learning. Only by documenting and sharing successful collaborations and tools can we create the knowledge and skill base needed to support reflective 21st century literacy teachers and leaders.

References

- Allen, D., & Blythe, T. (2004). *The facilitator's book of questions: Tools for looking together at student and teacher work*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Barth, R. S. (2006). Improving relationships within the schoolhouse. *Educational Leadership*, 63(6), 8-13.
- Boudett, K. P., City, E., & Murnane, R. (2005). *Data wise: A step-by-step guide to using assessment results to improve teaching and learning*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Breidenstein, A., Fahey, K., Glickman, C., & Hensley, F. (2012). *Leadership for powerful learning: A guide for instructional leaders*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Bryk, A. S., Sebring, P. S., Allensworth, E., Luppescu, S., & Easton, J. (2010). *Organizing schools for improvement: Lessons from Chicago*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- City, E. A., Elmore, R. F., Fiarman, S. E., & Teitel, L. (2009). *Instructional rounds in education: A network approach to improving teaching and learning*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Dana, N. F., & Yendol-Hoppey, D. (2008). *The reflective educator's guide to professional development: Coaching inquiry-oriented learning communities*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Doyle, M. (1996/2007). Foreword. In S. Kaner, *Facilitator's guide to participatory decision-making* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- DuFour, R. (2004). What is a "professional learning community"? *Educational Leadership*, 61(8), 6-11.
- DuFour, R., Eaker, R., & DuFour, R. (2005). *On common ground: The power of professional learning communities*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree.
- Fountas, I., & Pinnell, G. S. (2010a). *Benchmark assessment system 1* (2nd ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Fountas, I., & Pinnell, G. S. (2010b). *The continuum of literacy learning, grades prek-8* (2nd ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Ippolito, J. (2010). Three ways that literacy coaches balance responsive and directive relationships with teachers. *The Elementary School Journal*, 111(1), 164-190.
- Ippolito, J. (2013). Professional learning as the key to linking content and literacy instruction. In J. Ippolito, J. F. Lawrence, & C. Zaller (Eds.), *Adolescent literacy in the era of the common core: From research into practice* (pp. 215-234). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Lent, R. C. (2007). *Literacy learning communities: A guide for creating sustainable change in secondary schools*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Louis, K. S., & Kruse, S. D. (1995). *Professionalism and community: Perspectives on reforming urban schools*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- McDonald, J., Mohr, N., Dichter, A., & McDonald, E. C. (2013). *The power of protocols: An educator's guide to better practice* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Moran, M. C. (2007). *Differentiated literacy coaching: Scaffolding for student and teacher success*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Peterson, D. S., Taylor, B. M., Burnham, B., & Schock, R. (2009). Reflective coaching conversations: A missing piece. *The Reading Teacher*, 62(6), 500-509.
- Rebora, A. (2012). Turning teachers into coaches. *EdWeek*, 2(5), 34-37.
- Wheatley, M. J. (2002). Willing to be disturbed. In *Turning to one another: Simple conversations to restore hope to the future*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc. Retrieved July 14, 2012, from http://www.schoolreforminitiative.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/02/WILLING_TO_BE_DISTURBED.pdf

Jacy Ippolito Biographical Sketch: Jacy Ippolito, Ed.D., is Assistant Professor in the Adolescent Education and Leadership Department, of the School of Education at Salem State University. He is the coordinator of district-based teacher leadership courses for cohorts of Salem State affiliates, and he teaches undergraduate and graduate courses in adolescent literacy, literacy coaching, and teacher leadership. Having previously worked full-time as a reading specialist and literacy coach, he continues to work in schools as a coach and consultant and has co-authored and co-directed multiple literacy and leadership grants aimed at improving disciplinary literacy and literacy coaching efforts in schools. Jacy's most recent edited book, *Adolescent Literacy in the Era of the Common Core* (2013), describes his professional work with colleagues helping middle and high schools connect research and classroom practices to the Common Core State Standards. Jacy regularly presents his research at the following national and state conferences: the Literacy Research Association (LRA), the American Educational Research Association (AERA), the International Reading Association (IRA), the School Reform Initiative (SRI), and the Massachusetts Reading Association (MRA). His research interests include investigating how literacy coaches and teacher leaders support instructional improvement efforts, how coaches and teachers at the middle and high school levels implement disciplinary literacy practices, and how discussion-based protocols can support adult learning in schools. He can be reached at jippolito@salemstate.edu.

Francesca Pomerantz Biographical Sketch: Francesca Pomerantz Ed.D., is Professor and the former chair of the Literacy, Counseling and Learner Development Department at Salem State University. She currently coordinates the M.Ed. in Reading at SSU and teaches in the elementary and reading teacher preparation programs. She works in schools as a coach and consultant and has directed several state/university literacy grants aimed at improving the teaching of reading in schools. Francesca, along with colleague Michelle Pierce, recently published an article about literacy coaching in *Reading Improvement*. She presents research regularly at regional, national, and international literacy conferences. Her research interests include investigating how teacher preparation courses influence literacy teaching practices and beliefs, the effects of literacy coaching on teachers' instructional practices, and fostering motivation to read and independent reading in the elementary school classroom. She can be reached at fpomerantz@salemstate.edu.

Appendix A

Instructional Data Meeting Protocol

Developed by reading specialists in District A to examine classroom data sets.

Meeting Norms:

- Be respectful,
- Contribute to substantive discourse,
- Appreciate the facilitator & timekeeper,
- Collaborate.

Steps in the Process:

- Examine the data,
- Share observations about the data (in rounds),
- Share implications for classroom practice (in rounds),
- Share reflections (in rounds).

Introduction (6-8 minutes):

- Facilitator reminds group of meeting norms.
- Facilitator explains he/she will make sure that the group stays focused on each step of the process.
- Facilitator presents and frames the data.
- Facilitator invites the group to interpret the data and share implications for classroom practice using the protocol outlined below.

PROTOCOL

1. Examining the data (8 minutes)

- Participants review student data in silence and make notes about what they observe.

2. Sharing observations about the data (10 minutes)

- Group members describe what they see in the data, avoiding judgments or interpretations.
- For example, “I notice that John reached benchmark on the DIBELS, but his guided reading score is below grade level” rather than “John is a poor reader.”
- Examples of statements: I notice... I observe... Some patterns I notice are... This student has made growth in... This student continues to struggle with

3. Implications for classroom practice (15-20 minutes)

- The facilitator asks:
 - What does the data suggest?
 - Are there any surprises?
 - What more do we need to know?

- The facilitator asks:
 - What are the implications of this work for teaching and assessment?
- Discuss the following:
 - What steps could be taken next?
 - What strategies might be most effective?
 - Which students have similar needs?
 - Who should be progress monitored?
 - What does this conversation make you think about in terms of your own practice?
 - Examples of statements: I'm thinking... The student or group needs help with... I'd like to try... Next I would... I'd like to do further assessments to determine....

4. Reflection (5 minutes)

- Each group member shares 1-2 things he/she intends to do based on today's data examination and group discussion.
 - How well did the process work? (Can be a written response if time is running short?)
 - What could be improved? (Can be a written response if time is running short?)

Appendix B

Protocol for Discussing Coaching Videos — Issaquah/Dilemma Focus

Developed by Lisa Messina and District B Literacy Coaches, 2011

I. Coach presents (5 min.)

- What is the central question that will help me move my coaching practice forward? What do I want out of this conversation? Why did I choose this clip?

II. Clarifying questions (3-5 min.)

- What does the “group” need to know more about to better understand the coach’s question and context?

III. Viewing the video (8-20 min.)

- Group views video clip and transcribes as much as possible.
- T-chart (coach/teacher language); marking time; noting questions; coaching moves

IV. “What?” (5 min.)

- Mirroring back to coach/presenter -- What do we see and hear?
- These are statements of fact, not interpretations/judgments.

V. “So What?” (5 min.)

- What this means to me is ...
- These are interpretative statements, based on evidence, of how we “read” the situation.
- What do we think is going on here? How are we making sense of this?

VI. Coach Check-in (2 min.)

- Are we on track? Are we “reading” the situation in a way that makes sense?
- Anything wildly off-base? Or any “key information” that’s missing?

VII. Probing Questions (10 min.)

- These are meant to push the coach’s thinking.
- Write one or two probing questions on sticky notes -- pass the notes to the presenter, who chooses one or two that pushed her thinking the most.

VIII. “Now What?” (10 min.)

- If we were in this coach’s shoes, what next steps might we take and why?

IX. Coach Reflection (3 min.)

- Presenter reflects back to the group.
- What am I thinking now? What next steps might I try?

X. Group Debrief (5 min.)

- Given this conversation, what are implications for our own practice? New insights?
- How did we do in this conversation -- what might we do similarly/differently next time?

Appendix C

Resources for Finding and Developing Protocols (in Addition to References)

Books, Chapters, and Articles

- Blythe, T., Allen, D., & Powell, B. S. (2007). *Looking together at student work* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Easton, L. B. (2009). *Protocols for professional learning*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Kaner, S., Lind, L., Toldi, C., Fisk, S., & Berger, D. (2007). *Facilitator's guide to participatory decision making*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- McDonald, J. P., Zydney, J. M., Dichter, A., & McDonald, E. C. (2012). *Going online with protocols: New tools for teaching and learning*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Websites

- School Reform Initiative: <http://www.schoolreforminitiative.org/>
- National School Reform Faculty: <http://www.nsrffharmony.org/>
- Literacy Coaching Clearinghouse Tools: <http://www.literacycoachingonline.org/tools.html>