

## Part One

The literacy coaches at my school have a certain framework that they follow. Their job is to help the teachers implement strategies that will improve their students' reading and writing. In order to determine the content of the training and professional development, the literacy coaches normally send out a staff email beforehand, asking the staff which topics they would find most beneficial. Another way they determine content of PD is by looking at reading scores. The literacy coaches have access to our Wonder's Curriculum and can see how well the students are doing. The tests are graded online and in groupings, based on common core standards. Often students will all get questions wrong that correlate with one specific standard. Then, the literacy coach can come in and help the teacher figure out how to fill that gap. I believe that developers know what to focus on because Literacy coaches typically use the five essential components of reading: phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. These are used at five different grade levels. They use strategies that involve these essential components to help teachers to implement effective strategies in the classroom. The literacy coach that I spoke to reads tons of research on best practices, peer reviewed journals, and anything co authored by Nell Duke.

An instructional objective refers to a knowledge that is to be obtained. Therefore, I believe the literacy coaches use an instructional objective when implementing professional development. The topic is normally narrow and focused on one specific learning target. This is measurable in the sense that the educator will glean knowledge from the content, implement this knowledge in the classroom, and students will benefit from it in return.

When I think of the literacy coach's strategy when implementing PD, I think of Kliebard's critique of the Tyler Rationale. According to Kliebard, Tyler's stance on objectives is more of a philosophy and not very specific. The literacy coaches are a contrast to this because they plan their instruction in a very specific way with explicit instruction and clear objectives. According to Silberman (2015), objectives must be clear and easy to follow. He also recommends setting general learning goals, stressing that objectives are pillars and not limits.

The developers determine the sequencing based on need. They work daily with teachers and often the younger grades that are learning to read need the most help. Post covid the literacy coaches have been working a lot with second and third grade teachers. If they have been working a lot with a specific grade level that is where they will start with the PD. If the coaches are planning PD for multiple grade levels they often choose sort of a tiered instruction where we are talking about read aloud for example at each grade level. We work in groups with our grade level and what we learn is grade level appropriate. For example they might discuss read aloud and K-3 will learn a few new ideas on how to keep students engaged. This is often by making it more interactive. They might bring templates with boxes for the younger students to fill in during the reading. There was one template that had a box for a hand drawn picture of a scene from the reading, a box to write a couple descriptive words that caught their attention, etc. Then the 4-5th grade teachers might be learning strategies of engagement for read aloud at their grade level, such as having students keep a journal and completing an entry during or after the reading. Students could write a summary of the reading and how they connect with it.

## Part Two

I can see how Susan uses Bradbury's approach when it comes to collaboration, team work, and recreating reflection. She consistently asks teachers to think about what methods they use to teach, how effective it is, and in which ways they can improve. She encourages teachers to work together, think critically, and have meaningful conversations. Susan is also very structured when working one on one with teachers. She is to the point and offers tons of resources. She has checklists and evaluations that she uses to see where a student is at. Based on those results, she determines how to best help them. Her strategies remind me of Branch, she uses the ADDIE to approach intentional learning. Similar to Branch, Susan is very intentional with her teaching. She stresses the importance of explaining why they are doing something to the student and how it will help them. She talks a lot about being big brained and uses growth mindset language. She explains how every step of the process will benefit their overall learning. This is the same way she teaches when working with adults. I believe that Susan exemplifies a mixture of Branch's technical approach and Bradbury's more reflective approach. I can also see the reflective approach in some of her favorite strategies such as journaling and deeper level thinking.

Need is addressed in the planning and development part of the process based on student's test scores and what teachers express as an area of interest. The coaches check those test scores and send the teachers interest inventories to see what areas they would like training in. There have also been some interesting trainings when there

are new concepts out there that they would like to share. I attended a PD recently on how picture books can be used in upper elementary classrooms. It was something I thought I would never be interested in but after attending, I was motivated and inspired to try something new. I also think that sometimes need evolves after a PD because the educators can see what questions or areas of concern arise and that can be useful when planning follow up or additional training.

Chapter two by Silberman mentions how setting specific objectives lets the learner know what is expected of them and what they are accountable for. This gives them a sense of responsibility and makes them more active in the learning process. He also discusses how often the job is not exactly to train but to educate by offering up new perspectives and viewpoints. I have experienced this with Susan because she is so excited to share her new ideas that she gets everyone excited and inspired. By having PD in person instead of virtual we get to see more perspectives as well, most educators have different backgrounds and bring something new to the table. I really don't have any weaknesses or improvements to mention at this time except for the fact that sometimes the PD is geared more towards a specific grade level and teachers from other grade levels need differentiation.