PLC/Teaching & Learning Tool

Please note, PLC and Teaching & Learning terms are used interchangeably

Intent/Use of Tool: This research-based tool has been developed to frame the enabling conditions for a high-functioning PLC that is focused on improving student learning, particularly for our Black and Native students.

Professional learning community (PLC)- An ongoing process in which educators work collaboratively in grade-level and content-like groups, grounded in high quality instructional materials, in recurring cycles of collective inquiry and action research (ie., unit planning cycle) to achieve better results for the students they serve. Professional learning communities operate under the assumption that the key to improved learning for students is continuous job-embedded learning for educators. (The Elements & Solution Tree - *see cited resources at the end of document for actual citation*)

PLC/Teaching & Learning Observation Metric: By May of 2025, 100% of observations of site-based Professional Learning activities (i.e. coaching, site-based Professional Learning sessions, and PLCs) at a representative sample of schools*, reflect movement of at least one level across the continuum domains.

Essential Question: What will be different for students in Tier 1 instruction tomorrow because of the PLC work today?

Domain	Establishing	Applying	Integrating	Innovating
Facilitation PLC Focus	**(<50% of the PLC)** Educators engage in productive struggle and complex thinking focused on advancing student learning by improving instruction, even when provided with scaffolds from the facilitator.	**(50-74% of the PLC)** Educators engage in productive struggle and complex thinking focused on advancing student learning by improving instruction, even when provided with scaffolds from the facilitator [IF 1.8].	**(At least 75% of the PLC)** Educators engage in productive struggle and complex thinking focused on advancing student learning by improving instruction, even when provided with scaffolds from the facilitator [IF 1.8].	**(>90% of the PLC)** Educators engage in productive struggle and complex thinking focused on advancing student learning by improving instruction, even when provided with scaffolds from the facilitator [IF 1.8].
Look Fors	At least **once** during the PLC… ☐ Facilitator poses questions and provides opportunities for educators to reflect but the discussion may not focus on grade level	During **some** of the PLC… ☐ Facilitator supports educators in deepening expertise in content and/or curriculum by posing questions, providing reflection time	During **most** of the PLC… ☐ Educators collectively consider student-centered learning strategies and pedagogy that support the implementation of content and/or curriculum with some	During **all** of the PLC… ☐ Educators are empowered to lead discussions about innovative, student-centered learning strategies that support the implementation of content and/or curriculum with

	aligned content, curriculum, standards, or pedagogy.	and leading collaborative planning. ☐ Facilitator encourages educators to consider effective instructional approaches to increase student access to grade level content standards.	guidance from the facilitator. ☐ Facilitator guides educators to collaboratively reflect on ways to integrate new practices into their existing instructional methods to increase student access to grade level content standards.	little if any facilitator guidance. ☐ Educators reflect on the effectiveness of their integration efforts and making adjustments based on feedback from peers and personal reflection.
Facilitation **Shared Ownership of Student Learning Outcomes**	Facilitator directs PLC with limited opportunities for educator engagement and/or building collective ownership of student learning outcomes.	Facilitator leverages the Unit Planning Cycle protocols to build engagement and shared ownership of student learning outcomes by **most** educators.	Facilitator leverages the Unit Planning Cycle protocol to build engagement and shared ownership of student learning outcomes by **all** educators. District Content/Grade level scope and sequences and adopted instructional materials are utilized, when available.	Facilitator leverages the Unit Planning Cycle protocol to build engagement and shared ownership of student learning outcomes by **all** educators.
Look Fors	☐ Unit Planning Cycle Protocols were not used ☐ District content/grade level scope and sequence and/or adopted instructional materials, when available were not used ☐ No discussion of student learning outcomes or instruction ☐ No evidence of Student work/artifacts/materials for the PLC.	☐ Facilitator uses one of the Unit Planning Cycle Protocols but skips steps or has personalized it to lose the intent and/or engagement of educator ☐ Facilitator vaguely references district content/grade level scope and sequence and/or adopted instructional materials, when available, in discussion about student learning outcomes. ☐ Educators inconsistently bring student work/artifacts/materials	☐ The Unit Planning Cycle Protocols are being used with the full intent/fidelity ☐ Facilitator consistently references district content/grade level scope and sequence and/or adopted instructional materials, when available, in discussion about student learning outcomes. ☐ Educators willingly bring student work/artifacts/materials to PLC and own their practice and results in an honest and vulnerable way.	☐ Educators are referencing and using the Unit Planning Protocols to engage in the process and facilitate the discussion themselves. ☐ Educators consistently reference district content/grade level scope and sequence and/or adopted instructional materials, when available, in discussion about student learning outcomes. ☐ Educators demonstrate a sense of collective ownership and growth for student learning by sharing their practice through their student work/artifacts/materials and

PLC/Teaching & Learning Tool

		for the PLC.		giving feedback.
Domain	**Establishing**	**Applying**	**Integrating**	**Innovating**
<mark>Culture</mark> **Norms & relationships** (Applies to all protocols)	Educators work primarily as individuals and/or are disengaged during the PLC/TL. Discussions about improving instruction favor a narrow group of voices and perspectives and do not center students.	Educator interactions are congenial. A majority of educators actively participate in student centered discussion about improving instruction.	Educators demonstrate positive relationships with evidence of trust (i.e. sharing their own areas of growth, asking for help or feedback, being willing to do things differently, experiencing discomfort, adhering to the norms of the group). All voices are included in student-centered and instruction focused conversation with targeted invitations for individuals to provide input.	Educators leverage high-trust relationships to be fully accountable for providing high quality instruction for all students. All educators are encouraged to talk about each other's thinking, and engage in challenging their individual practices/belief systems to improve learning outcomes for students. [IF 3.4]
Look Fors	☐ Educators are disengaged and/or discussion does not focus on improving student learning outcomes ☐ No evidence of PLC/TL norms and/or multiple team members are not demonstrating commitment to norms.	☐ Most (more than half) of the educators engage in discussion focused on improving student learning outcomes. ☐ Facilitator references the norms and monitors team accountability.	☐ Most (more than 75%) of educators engage in discussion focused on improving student learning outcomes. ☐ Educators and facilitators reference and/or demonstrate commitment to norms.	☐ All educators engage in discussion focused on improving student learning outcomes. ☐ Educators collectively monitor team commitment to norms by holding one another accountable and calling each other in when agreements are broken.
~~Culture~~ **~~(Feedback & Discussion)~~** ~~(Applies to all protocols)~~	~~Facilitator and/or educators do not explicitly reference PLC/TL team culture, processes, and effectiveness.~~ ~~Conflict/divergent opinions are avoided and/or negatively impact group dynamics.~~	~~Facilitator poses questions to encourage discussion and reflection about PLC/TL team culture, processes, and effectiveness.~~ ~~Conflict/divergent opinions are shared but may not be addressed or fully unpacked.~~	~~Facilitator leverages different strategies to promote dialogue and reflection about PLC/TL team culture, processes and effectiveness.~~ ~~Conflict/divergent opinions are surfaced and effectively navigated by all educators.~~	~~Educators lead reflective discussions on PLC/TL culture, processes, and effectiveness lead to adjustments and improvements in future meetings.~~ ~~Conflict/divergent opinions are embraced and navigated as opportunities for growth by demonstrating awareness of educators'~~

				positionality, biases and identities as well as those of their students, and how this impacts dynamics of power, social norms, privilege, and oppression in the classroom [IF 2.5].
Look Fors	☐ Facilitator provides no opportunities for reflection on PLC/TL culture, processes, or effectiveness (e.g. Warm Welcome, Norms, Optimistic Closure).	☐ Facilitator provides some opportunities for educators to reflect on PLC/TL team culture, processes and effectiveness (e.g. Warm Welcome, Norms, Optimistic Closure). ☐ When conflict or divergent opinions arise, educators do not ask questions and first respond and/or rely on the facilitator to navigate.	☐ Facilitator provides multiple opportunities for educators to reflect on PLC/TL team culture, processes and effectiveness (e.g. Warm Welcome, Norms, Optimistic Closure). ☐ When conflict or divergent opinions arise, educators first ask questions to understand and then attempt to respond, but may not come to consensus for solutions that are best for students.	☐ Educators lead discussions about PLC/TL team culture, processes and effectiveness that lead to improvements in team functioning (e.g. Warm Welcome, Norms, Optimistic Closure). ☐ When conflict or divergent opinions arise, educators ask questions and engage in a discussion to come to consensus for solutions that are best for students ☐ Educators demonstrate awareness of their own identity and interrupt implicit and/or explicit bias using strategies such as: asking for clarification ("What did you mean when you said '....'"), pausing and reflecting, etc.
Culture **Asset-based Problem Solving** (Applies to all protocols)	Challenges are framed in fixed terms, outside the locus of PLC/TL control and/or discussed with deficit langage.	PLC/TL primarily addresses challenges as individual teacher or student needs and/or focuses on a limited range of solutions.	Educators collaborate to identify solutions that are best for students, centering the learning of our Black and Native students.	Educators seek multiple perspectives for creative problem-solving that builds on students' assets, strengths, and funds of knowledge by race and program centering the learning of our Black and Native students.

PLC/Teaching & Learning Tool

Look Fors				
	☐ One or more educators are not participating and/or are not engaged in the work of the session ☐ Educators do not provide any student focused solutions and in some cases may blame students	☐ Educators ask questions of the facilitator only ☐ Educators may not focus on determining the best solution based on student needs	☐ Educators ask questions, respond to each other; and call in others to respond in order to determine solutions to meet student needs, centering the learning of our Black and Native students ☐ Educators celebrate their instruction and student learning successes as individuals, centering the learning of our Black and Native students	☐ Educators ask questions of each other that help deepen an awareness of student assets, strengths, and funds of knowledge, centering the learning of our Black and Native students ☐ Educators celebrate their instruction and student learning successes that is focused on the prior work of the collective PLC/T&L and that name where there is still room for improvement in instruction, centering the learning of our Black and Native students

Domain	Unit Unpacking	Lesson Unpacking	Lesson Rehearsal	Student Learning Analysis	Student Learning Analysis - Benchmark Assessment
Protocol Components **(Unit Planning Cycle)**	☐ Warm Welcome ☐ Norms ☐ Protocol Introduction ☐ Identify Standards ☐ Do Student Work (end of unit assessment)	☐ Warm Welcome ☐ Norms ☐ Protocol Introduction ☐ Identify Standards ☐ Do Student Work (most important lesson task) ☐ Read Lesson	☐ Warm Welcome ☐ Norms ☐ Protocol Introduction ☐ Lesson Rehearsal - Model ☐ Post Rehearsal Debrief ☐ Next Steps ☐ Optimistic Closure	☐ Warm Welcome ☐ Norms ☐ Protocol Introduction ☐ Identify Standards ☐ Review Rubric ☐ Review Work ☐ Discussion & Reflection ☐ Next Steps	☐ Warm Welcome ☐ Norms ☐ Protocol Introduction ☐ Analyze Results ☐ Compare Results ☐ Review Tiered Support Needs ☐ Create Action Plan ☐ Next Steps

	☐ Read Unit Overview ☐ Write Lesson Objectives ☐ Write Learning Goals ☐ Essential or Assisting Lessons ☐ Culturally Affirming ☐ Next Steps ☐ Optimistic Closure	☐ Write Learning Objectives ☐ Write Learning Goals ☐ Essential or Assisting Lessons ☐ Scaffolds ☐ Productive Struggle ☐ Culturally Affirming ☐ Next Steps ☐ Optimistic Closure	☐ Optimistic Closure	☐ Optimistic Closure

***Identify the components of each protocol within the Unit Planning Cycle that were observed*

Resources Used to Create the Continuum:
- Consultation with New Teacher Center (NTC) & The New Teacher Project (TNTP)
- Buffum, A., Mattos, M., and Malone, J. (2018). *Taking action: A handbook for RTI at Work.* Solution Tree Press: Bloomington, IN.
- Short, J. B., and Hirsh, S. (2023). *Transforming teaching through curriculum-based professional learning: The elements*. Corwin Press: Thousand Oaks, CA.