

Student Engagement and Coaching Around the 10-2-2 Strategy

Karen Ringewald

Reach Institute for School Leadership

*Submitted in partial completion of the Clear Administrative Services Credential and Master of Education
in Instructional Leadership*

Abstract

Student engagement is critical to academic success; researchers have found that student engagement is one of the strongest predictors of student outcomes and is highly correlated with academic achievement. Key factors that contribute to engagement include providing students with opportunities to collaborate, building in opportunities for students to process and make meaning of material, and setting clear expectations for students. The 10-2-2 strategy is one technique that incorporates many of these components. 10-2-2 is a teaching framework that advocates teachers talk for no more than ten minutes, provide students with two minutes of group processing time, and then provide two minutes of individual processing time. The focus of this action research was to increase teacher use of the 10-2-2 strategy during direct instruction. To reach this goal, the researcher provided professional development around 10-2-2. After the initial training, the researcher conducted weekly observation and feedback cycles with teachers that focused on 10-2-2 and incorporated video. By the end of the study, student engagement as measured by number of students on task during direct instruction increased by an average of 37 percent, and teachers reported that 10-2-2 helped improve student engagement. The results of the intervention also shed light on other key understandings about the positive role video can play in supporting teacher growth and the need to both build shared understandings with teachers and to engage teachers as partners in their own growth and development.

Context and Problem of Practice

Thrive Academy is a K-5 charter school located in the MacArthur neighborhood of Oakland. As a member of the Ambition Charter Management Organization (CMO), Thrive's mission is to prepare all students to earn a college degree. Thrive serves approximately 280 students, and the school's population is representative of the neighborhood's demographics; 93 percent of Thrive's students qualify for free or reduced lunch, and about 70 percent of Thrive's students are African American and 30 percent are Latino.

From 2004-2014, Thrive Academy existed as MacArthur Academy. Throughout its 10-year history, MacArthur underperformed other Ambition schools and had many leadership transitions; between 2007 and 2012, MacArthur had four principals, and in June 2014 MacArthur closed due to low performance. In August 2014 Ambition opened Thrive Technology Academy in MacArthur's building with MacArthur's students, a new staff, and a focus on technology.

Thrive is currently focused on accelerating student reading achievement, as only 30 percent of Thrive's students began the 2016-17 school year reading at or above grade level. As Thrive's leaders examine factors holding the school back from further achievement, a number of possible foci arise. Possible focus areas include trauma-informed practice, classroom management, data-driven lesson planning, reading instruction, and student engagement. Over the past two years Thrive focused on the first four areas, and the school's efforts in these areas will be described below. Because the school has focused on the first four areas, this action research project will focus on the fifth area, student engagement.

During Thrive's first two years, leaders focused on building a caring community and employing trauma-informed practice at Thrive as a result of student need. In recent years,

Oakland has had one of the highest violent crime rates in the country, and in 2013, Oakland had the second highest rate of violent crime in the United States (Abbey-Lambertz, 2014). As a result, many of Oakland's students and families have been affected by violent crime. Thrive's students reflect this reality; in April 2016 counselors with the Seneca Family of Agencies conducted a screener of Thrive's third graders, and approximately 70 percent of the students had symptoms of moderate to severe post-traumatic stress disorder.

To address this reality, Thrive has focused on supporting students' social-emotional needs. Thrive's retreats, preservice trainings, and mid-year staff developments have included sessions on the role of trauma and the brain, trauma-informed teaching, and restorative practices. In addition, classroom teachers lead social-emotional learning sessions twice a week focusing on the Toolbox and Zones of Regulation curriculum, and Thrive has four full-time instructional assistants who provide social-emotional supports to general education students throughout the day.

In addition to these ongoing school-wide supports, during the 2016-17 school year Thrive began providing Level 3 Mental Health supports to students most heavily impacted by trauma and mental health needs. Through this program, students with the highest behavioral health needs receive wrap-around services that include one-on-one support throughout the day, daily site-based counseling services, monthly parent meetings with the program's coordinator, and therapeutic behavioral services, which provide both home and school-based counseling. In addition to these student-based supports, teachers who have students in this program are given an extra planning period and meet weekly with Thrive's counselor, education specialist, school psychologist, the student's one-on-one aide, an administrator, and Thrive's behavior intervention

support coordinator. During these collaborative meetings the team discusses the student's progress, troubleshoots concerns, analyzes data, and plans next steps.

This comprehensive program has shifted Thrive's school culture. As a result of this program, Thrive's highest-need students have the supports they need to be meaningful members of their classroom community. As of February 2017 there were six students in this program, and five of the six students were on track to exceed one and a half year of growth in reading during the 2016-17 school year. In addition, suspensions among students in the program declined by 77 percent during the first year; at the start of February in the 2015-16 school year, students in the program had received a total of 31 days of suspension, and at the start of February 2017 they had received a total of seven days of suspension. Moreover, five of the six students had not received any suspensions since joining the program. Because these highest-need students receive designated supports, classrooms are calmer, and teachers and other support staff are able to provide more consistent support to other Thrive students.

As a result of the steps Thrive has taken to address mental and behavioral health needs, most staff employ a supportive, student-centered approach, use restorative methods, and treat students with respect and compassion. In spite of these strengths, overall reading achievement is still low; a warmer, more student-centered environment has created a more welcoming school community, but it has not led to increases in student achievement.

In addition to focusing on trauma-informed practice and students' social-emotional needs, Thrive spent much of its first two years focusing on classroom management. Thrive provides preservice training to teachers around classroom management and has quarterly school culture and classroom management check ins. In addition, during the first quarter of the 2016-17 school year, Thrive partnered with CT3 to bring real-time coaching to the school. Through this

partnership, the assistant principal and instructional coach provided twice-weekly real-time teacher coaching focused on classroom management. This intervention centered upon supporting teachers to consistently give clear directions, narrate student behavior, and provide incentives and consequences.

While this intervention was thorough, it was not effective; during the three months this intervention was implemented, there were not increases in student participation or decreases in classroom disruptions during baseline observations, and there was no evidence that it led to increases in student achievement. It seems that this intervention was not successful because it focused entirely on classroom management and did not address the instructional core. In *Instructional Rounds in Education* City, Elmore, Fiarman, and Teitel (2009) argue that “It is the relationship between the teacher, the student, and the content—not the qualities of any one of them by themselves—that determines the nature of instructional practice” (p. 23). Thus, interventions targeting student achievement must address content in addition to teacher and student actions, and an intervention focused entirely on classroom management will not lead to meaningful changes in student achievement. Through Thrive’s real-time teacher coaching experience, it became clear that future interventions at Thrive must focus on the instructional core and content, not just on classroom management.

Another area Thrive has focused on is data-driven planning; during the 2015-16 school year one of Thrive’s main professional development areas was data-driven lesson planning. To support data-driven planning during the ’15-16 school year, Thrive focused on the first two indicators of Ambition’s Instructional Rubric: the selection and measurability of objectives.

To support growth in data-driven planning during the ’15-16 school year, Thrive’s instructional coach led sessions on backward planning using the *Understanding by Design*

framework, teachers had quarterly release days to unit plan, and every Wednesday teachers, administrators, and the instructional coach gathered for an hour after school to lay out the next week's plans together. As a result of these steps, data-driven lesson planning improved as measured by Ambition's Instructional Rubric; teachers' average scores on the selection and measurability of objectives indicators rose from 2.6 out of 4 to 3.5 out of 4 between the '14-15 and '15-16 school years.

To maintain momentum in this area, during the 2016-17 school year teachers, administrators, and the instructional coach continue meeting weekly to focus on planning. Due to Ambition's adoption of the Lucy Calkins Reading Workshop curriculum, the structure of these meetings shifted during the '16-17 school year. While Lucy Calkins' curriculum is scripted, it is dense, and in order to be effective, teachers must take time to process and internalize each lesson. As a result, during planning meetings in the '16-17 school year, Thrive's instructional coach leads mini professional development sessions around elements of the workshop model, and teachers plan their objectives for the week and use an internalization protocol to process their upcoming Lucy Calkins lessons.

As a result of Thrive's focus on data-driven planning, scores on Ambition's Instructional Rubric indicate that data-driven planning has improved. However, student reading achievement is still alarmingly low. In order to accelerate student reading growth, Thrive must consider focusing on other elements of planning or other school-related factors that could be holding students and teachers back from meeting their potential.

A fourth area to consider focusing on is reading instruction. During the 2014-15 school year Thrive focused its professional development on guided reading instruction. Staff read Jan Richardson's *The Next Step in Guided Reading* (2009), collaborated on creating guided reading

lessons, and shared best practices around guided reading during monthly professional development sessions. Thrive worked to maintain this progress during the 2015-16 school year; during Thrive's second year, the principal and instructional coach conducted bi-weekly guided reading walk throughs and provided feedback to teachers around guided reading practice. As a result, all classroom teachers led daily guided reading sessions that aligned with best practices outlined in *The Next Step in Guided Reading*.

Frequent and targeted guided reading instruction led to incremental gains in reading performance, but Thrive's students still lag behind in reading achievement. While Thrive's students focus during small-group guided reading instruction, they are disengaged during independent work time and whole-group instruction. Focusing during a 15-20 minute small-group guided reading lesson each day will not meaningfully accelerate student growth; students need to be engaged in learning throughout the school day to make significant progress.

Thrive has focused on social-emotional supports, classroom management, data-driven lesson planning, and reading instruction, but these efforts have not brought about meaningful improvement in reading achievement. However, Thrive has not focused on increasing student engagement to drive student achievement. During walk throughs of novice teachers' classrooms, students are not engaged in learning during whole-class instruction and independent work time; time sampling in novice teachers' classrooms demonstrates that students are engaged in the class' activity and on task approximately 30 percent of the time. Student engagement is a key area to focus on due to its impact on student learning, as it has been argued that engagement is the "student characteristic [that] has the largest correlation with achievement in reading literacy" (Parsons, Malloy, Parsons, & Burrowbridge, 2015, p. 224).

Because engagement is critical to academic achievement and because it is an area Thrive has not yet addressed, this project will focus on student engagement. For this project, the problem of practice is that teachers do not engage students during direct instruction because they do not plan and execute clear, well-structured opportunities for students to interact and practice with the material.

This project will focus on planning and executing engaging instruction because planning and execution are interconnected; if a teacher has not planned an engaging lesson, it will be nearly impossible to execute an engaging lesson. Likewise, this project will focus on the engagement component of planning because Thrive has focused on data-driven planning and internalizing pre-written lessons, but the school has not focused on planning engaging learning opportunities.

In addition, this project will focus on engagement during direct instruction and not independent practice. This project will focus on direct instruction because if students are not engaged during direct instruction, they will not have the knowledge they need to complete independent practice. In addition, Ambition has required curriculum teachers use across the organization. As a result, teachers cannot readily modify independent work assignments or make them more engaging. However, teachers can employ a range of engagement strategies during direct instruction regardless of curriculum, and as a result, it is more feasible to impact direct instruction than it is to affect independent practice assignments.

Review of Relevant Literature

Student engagement in learning is critical to student success. Even though student engagement is a prerequisite for learning, it is a quality that must be cultivated by teachers and school communities. Because this action research centers on increasing teacher planning and execution of well-structured opportunities for students to interact and practice with the material, this literature review will focus on student engagement and changing teacher practice.

This literature review will begin by defining engagement and discussing the connection between student engagement and achievement. After that, factors that lead to student engagement and disengagement will be discussed, and this discussion will inform the intervention the practitioner will implement during the action research project.

This literature review will end by discussing best practices around shifting teacher practice; this discussion will inform the practitioner's approach to working with teachers to increase their planning and execution of meaningful opportunities for students to interact and practice with the content.

Defining Engagement

Because student engagement is a critical component to student achievement, there are a wealth of studies that discuss student engagement and the impact of engagement on student learning (Parsons, Malloy, Parsons, & Burrowbridge, 2015; Doubet & Hockett, 2016; Moller, Stearns, Mickelson, Bottia, & Banerjee, 2014; Scott, Hirn, & Alter, 2014). There is agreement that three types of engagement contribute most meaningfully to student achievement; affective engagement, behavioral engagement, and cognitive engagement (Nicholson & Putwain, 2015).

Affective engagement centers around student interest, enjoyment, and enthusiasm in academic studies. If students are disinterested or do not enjoy their learning, they will not be engaged. In contrast, behavioral engagement focuses on the importance of students' demonstrating effort in their studies, and cognitive engagement stresses the importance of student persistence and student metacognition of the material they are studying (Parsons et al., 2015). All three components play a crucial role in student learning. In order to encompass each of these components, this study will define engagement as when students are attracted to their work, persist in their work in spite of challenges and obstacles, and take delight in accomplishing their work (Schlechy, 1994).

Engagement and Student Achievement

This action research project will focus on student engagement because a range of studies have found engagement to be a critical component of student success. For example, through a study of sixth-grade students, Parsons et al. (2008) found that “engagement is the direct (and only) pathway to cumulative learning, long- term achievement, and eventual academic success” (p. 224). In this study, the authors argue that engagement is the “student characteristic [that] has the largest correlation with achievement in reading literacy” (Parsons et al., 2008, p. 224). Similarly, a 2014 study found that “academic engagement, along with math and reading skills at school-entry, are consistently the strongest predictors of achievement” (Moller et al., pp. 3-4). Likewise, in their study that included over one thousand classroom observations, Scott et al. (2014) argue that “one of the most important variables associated with student achievement is time engaged with instruction” (p. 193).

Given that engagement occurs when students take an active role in their learning emotionally, behaviorally, and cognitively, it is not surprising that engagement is such a powerful predictor of student achievement. In their 2016 article, *The Icing or the Cake?*, Doubett and Hockett address the impact of engagement on student learning as it relates to investment. The authors argue that “an engaged student at any grade level will invest—and therefore achieve—more than will a disengaged student” (p. 17). Without high levels of investment, students will not attend to the material and will therefore be less likely to succeed academically. As a result, it is critical that students are engaged during class and take an active role in their learning.

While engagement is critical to student success, it is important to note that student disengagement leads to a range of negative outcomes. Pirrie, Cullen, and McCluskey (2011) argue that disengaged students are at an increased risk of a range of negative outcomes including poor mental and physical health and involvement in crime. Nicholson and Putwain (2015) argue that reengaging students who have left school or have become disengaged is a challenging, resource-intensive process. Because disengagement from school has strong, negative impacts on students and because it is difficult to re-engage disengaged students, it is critical that schools do all that they can to engage students and keep them actively involved in their learning.

Factors that Contribute to Student Engagement

Because student engagement encompasses affective, behavioral, and cognitive elements, there are a wide range of factors that contribute to student engagement. Through this review of literature, two areas emerged as key levers that impact student engagement. These areas are

relevance and opportunities to process material. Both of these areas will be discussed in more detail below.

Relevance and student engagement. A variety of authors have found that students are more engaged when the material is relevant and students have opportunities for voice and choice in classroom activities (Rubin, 2012; Nicholson & Putwain, 2015; Doubet & Hockett, 2016). Relevance is critical to engagement, and it can be defined as when students make connections to what they are learning, and when they are able to explain why what they are learning is important to them and their community (Duncan-Andrade & Morrell, 2008).

According to Doubet and Hockett (2016), one way to increase the relevance of curriculum is through strong relationships with students. Doubet and Hockett argue that by having strong relationships with students, teachers can use their knowledge of students to create classroom activities that students connect with. This ties closely with the affective component of student engagement; when students make connections to curriculum, they are more likely to be interested in the content and enjoy learning, which leads to increases in overall student engagement.

In his 2012 article, *Independence, Disengagement, and Discipline*, Ron Rubin advocates for relevant classroom experiences as he argues that it is critical for students to have voice and choice in their learning. According to Rubin, students become disengaged in school when they do not have independence and self-determination. Rubin argues that students are more motivated and more prepared for responsibilities outside of school when they are given opportunities to share their beliefs and are given choices in their learning (Rubin, 2012).

Similarly Doubet and Hockett (2016) echo the value of increasing relevance by infusing student choice in learning activities. Doubet and Hockett contend, “Few things motivate learners of all ages more than choice” (2016, p. 19). Doubet and Hockett have found that techniques such as asking students how they would like to learn or giving them the opportunity to choose a topic of study lead to increases in student engagement.

Processing activities and engagement. Another area that has a strong impact on student engagement is providing students with opportunities to process material. This literature review revealed two trends around processing activities. First, the literature showed that student engagement increases when students have opportunities to process material collaboratively. Second, the literature showed that engagement is higher when teachers provide feedback to students during processing activities.

A 2015 study of engagement among sixth graders highlights the importance of providing students with opportunities to process material collaboratively. In this study, Seth Parsons and his coauthors found that engagement was highest when students were given opportunities to collaborate with each other. When students were involved in collaborative activities, they were more interested in the task and put forth greater effort. This afforded students opportunities to process material and engage with the material in meaningful ways, which led to greater student engagement overall (Parsons et al., 2015).

In addition to providing students with collaborative processing opportunities, this literature review highlighted the importance of giving frequent feedback to students during processing activities. According to Harbour, Evanovich, Sweigart, and Hughes (2015), providing students with opportunities to respond and giving them feedback throughout a lesson are critical to keeping students engaged. Similarly, in their 2016 article, *Whole-Group Response*

Strategies to Promote Student Engagement in Inclusive Classrooms, Nagro, Hooks, Fraser, and Cornelius discuss a number of specific strategies that effectively engage students throughout a lesson. The authors argue that teachers can keep students engaged throughout a lesson by using hand signals, response cards, and written response strategies (Nagro, Hooks, Fraser, & Cornelius, 2016). Some examples of these techniques include asking students to show how well they understand a concept by giving a “fist to five,” utilizing hand signals to promote academic discourse, and using whiteboards and exit tickets. The authors argue that “finding ways to question all students can promote student interest in learning, activate prior knowledge, and improve comprehension in an inclusive manner” (Nagro, Hooks, Fraser, & Cornelius, 2016, p. 224).

The literature repeatedly highlighted the importance of providing feedback to students and allocating time for students to process material. One strategy that incorporates these components is the 10-2-2 strategy. The 10-2-2 strategy is a teaching technique that was developed from research around wait time. 10-2-2 incorporates wait time, processing time, and feedback from the instructor. This strategy is straightforward and includes the following components: the teacher talks for no more than ten minutes, provides two minutes for small-group reflection and interaction, and then gives students two minutes for individual reflection. During the processing time, the teacher circulates and provides feedback to students (Venuto, 2015).

In her 2015 article, *Exploring New Teaching Goals: The 10-2-2 Strategy*, Allison Venuto shares her experiences using the 10-2-2 Strategy. Venuto argues that this strategy led to greater engagement among her students. According to Venuto, one key strength of this strategy was that it pushed her to chunk information, to provide students with time to process information, and to

give feedback to students (Venuto, 2015). In addition, a range of educators and the Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID) program advocate implementing 10-2-2. Proponents argue that this strategy increases student engagement because it allows students to process and engage with material throughout a lesson (Nickerson, 2011). As a result, the 10-2-2 strategy represents a promising approach to increasing engagement; it is clear cut, transferrable across content areas and grade levels, and incorporates a range of factors that lead to increased student engagement.

Engagement factors summary. This literature review found a variety of factors that contribute to student engagement. According to this literature review, the following factors are critical to student engagement:

- Relevance
- Providing students with opportunities to process material
- Providing students with feedback on their performance

One intervention that combines these components is the 10-2-2 strategy. The 10-2-2 strategy advocates teachers provide two minutes of collaborative processing time and two minutes of individual processing time for every ten minutes of teacher talk. To deepen this discussion of student engagement, the next section will discuss school-based factors that contribute to student disengagement.

Factors that Contribute to Student Disengagement

One common theme that emerged from this literature review is that students are more engaged when their classrooms and schools are student centered. Likewise, this literature review

found that students tend to be disengaged when schools and classrooms are not student centered, when students do not feel connected to their learning, and when they do not feel successful. For example, Washor and Mojkowski (2014) found that schools often expect students to adapt to them and do not work to meet students' needs. The authors argue that this type of approach leads to disengagement because "Young people feel that who they are and what they want to become doesn't matter to teachers and schools. While students are required to fit into a restrictive school structure, culture, and curriculum, schools do little to fit themselves to their students" (Washor and Mojkowski, 2014, p. 8). Washor and Mojkowski argue that in order to engage students, schools must work to meet students' needs and interests and need to be more student centered (Washor & Mojkowski, 2014).

Likewise, Rubin (2012) finds that students become disengaged in school when they lack independence and autonomy. Rubin argues that "compliance and control are still schools' primary tools to meet academic goals," but these tools are ineffective and lead to disengagement among students (p. 43). Rubin continues, "When needs for independence are ignored, young people become disengaged or resistant. They retreat from the challenge of learning and fail to develop social, emotional, and academic competence" (p.43). Thus, Rubin argues that student autonomy and a student-centered environment are critical to keeping students engaged in school (Rubin, 2012).

Through this literature review, it became clear that students are more successful when schools take student-centered approaches, meet students where they are, and build on student strengths. Stephan, Caudroit, Boiché, and Sarrazin's 2011 study of 120 students in France supports this conclusion. In this study, the researchers found that students become disengaged when they feel unsuccessful and withdraw when they receive frequent negative feedback.

Stephan and his colleagues argue that this happens because students want to protect themselves from the “ego implications of failure” (Stephan et al., 2011, p. 453). Thus, this study reinforces the notion that students become disengaged when schools and classes are not student centered and do not meet students where they are.

Changing Teacher Practice

This action research project focuses on shifting teacher practice around student engagement. As a result, this section of the literature review will focus on best practices for shifting teacher practice. This section will first discuss the importance of taking a multifaceted approach to working with teachers, after that it will explain the importance of introducing feedback to teachers one step at a time, and it will close by discussing the role video can play in shifting teacher practice.

Multifaceted approach to supporting teachers. There are a range of approaches coaches and administrators can take when working to affect teacher practice. Some examples of supports that can be provided include workshop and conference attendance, modeling, providing additional resources, and coaching teachers. In the 2006 article *Instructional Coaching*, Jim Knight argues that coaching is one of the most effective ways to improve instruction in schools because it offers a multifaceted approach of “support, feedback, and intensive, individualized professional learning” (p. 36). Knight (2009) elaborated on this in the article *Coaching* when he argued that “traditional one-shot approaches to professional development- where teachers hear about practices but do not receive follow-up support are ineffective at improving teaching practices. Much more support is needed to help teachers translate research into practice” (Knight, 2009, p. 18).

In *Coaching*, Knight (2009) cites a study that found follow-up coaching to be critical to teachers' incorporating a skill into their practice. In the study, teachers attended a training on unit planning. When teachers did not receive follow-up coaching, 30 percent of participants incorporated the skill into their classrooms. When teachers received follow-up coaching, 90 percent of teachers integrated the techniques into their practice (Knight, 2009). This study provides additional support for the notion that teachers internalize and process new learning best when a multifaceted approach that includes coaching is utilized.

Because there are many resources and approaches available to teacher coaches, it is important to have clarity around the most effective ways to work with teachers to impact their practice. The 2015 article *3 Steps to Great Coaching* outlines a multifaceted approach to shifting teacher practice. This article argues that it is important to set a goal with teachers, explain and model a strategy for meeting the goal, observe teachers to see how well they have implemented the practice, and meet to discuss if the goal was met and determine next steps (Knight, J., Elford, M., Hock, M., Dunekack, D., Bradley, B., Deshler, D., & Knight, D., 2015).

In *Leverage Leadership* Paul Bambrick-Santoyo (2012) advocates a similar approach. Bambrick-Santoyo argues that teacher growth can be radically accelerated when teachers receive weekly face-to-face feedback that follows a similar protocol. Bambrick-Santoyo upholds that weekly coaching cycles should include goal setting, time to discuss a strategy and practice the strategy, an observation focused on implementation of the strategy, and a debrief to discuss progress and next steps (Bambrick-Santoyo, 2012).

Focused feedback. A key component of the multifaceted approach to teacher support is providing teachers with ongoing feedback. One common theme that emerged is the importance of focusing on one goal at a time (Knight et al. 2015). Both research on effective practices and

teacher perception of best practices offer support for this approach. Knight (2009) argues that when a coach works to implement too many practices at once, teachers become overwhelmed and practice does not change. Knight (2009) found the most successful coaches offered sustained support on a limited number of high-leverage strategies.

Similarly, researchers at the University of Illinois and Chicago Public Schools found that teachers also sought a “less is more” approach to feedback. Through a series of focus groups with teachers, Elisa Shernoff and her fellow researchers found that “teachers wanted more information about fewer strategies and specific instructions regarding exactly when to implement them” (Shernoff, Maríñez-Lora, Frazier, Jakobsons, Atkins, & Bonner, 2011, p. 480).

In addition to a preference among teachers, practitioners have found that “going into immense depth on one skill at a time, each building on the last” leads to accelerated growth with teachers (Bambrick-Santoyo, 2016, p. 5). Bambrick-Santoyo (2016) compares effective coaching to dominoes; if you “pile on too many skills at once...the chain of dominoes will tumble and scatter: the teacher will run out of both the time and the energy to internalize them all” (p. 5). Thus, to attain sustained growth with teachers, it is important to provide ongoing focused feedback that builds off previous steps the teacher has taken.

Video feedback. This review of literature highlighted the role that video can play in shifting teacher practice. Sharing and reflecting upon recorded observations shifts teacher practice because it increases reflection, and reflective practice leads to teacher growth (Reitano & Sim, 2010). Specifically, video leads to improvement in teacher practice by promoting greater specificity, focus, and autonomy in teacher reflection (Baecher, McCormack, & Kung, 2014).

One reason video promotes reflection is because it enables teachers to recall their thoughts from the time of the lesson and helps them reflect more deeply on their delivery (Reitano & Sim, 2010). Likewise, video captures “thick” descriptions of teacher practice; video captures “descriptions of classroom dynamics that are hard or impossible to access or describe in other ways,” and as a result it helps teachers develop noticing skills and helps them move beyond surface-level reflections (Marsh & Mitchell, 2014, p. 204).

Video may also improve teacher practice by helping teachers notice patterns in their teaching. In *How People Learn* (2000) it is argued that across a range of fields, experts differ from novices because of their ability to recognize meaningful patterns of information. According to the authors, pattern recognition allows experts to “begin problem solving at ‘a higher place,’” and provides “triggering conditions for accessing knowledge that is relevant to a task” (National Research Council, 2000, p. 48). Because pattern recognition aids problem solving and knowledge retrieval, it represents an important component of teacher development. Reflecting on performance with video affords teachers the opportunity to revisit their practice and take note of patterns, which should accelerate their growth. For example, if novice teachers watch video on a weekly basis, pay attention to when students begin to lose focus, and reflect on their noticings, they will most likely begin to recognize patterns, which will accelerate their progress toward becoming experts.

In addition to the benefits individual teachers derive from video reflection, this literature review showed that video reflection becomes even more powerful when teachers reflect on video with their peers (Reitano & Sim, 2010). For example, in her case study of pre-service teachers, Betil Eröz-Tuğa (2013) found that when teachers used video to reflect on their and others’ performance, their “awareness as teachers” improved markedly (p. 178). Similarly, Marsh and

Mitchell (2014) argue that video is a great collaborative reflection tool because it allows many viewers to experience the same practice in the same way and therefore collaborate around next steps.

Conclusion

This literature review found that student engagement is a key component to student learning, and there are a range of techniques teachers can employ to engage students and keep them involved in their learning. The literature repeatedly reinforced the notion that to increase student engagement, teachers must make learning relevant to students, provide students with processing opportunities, and give ongoing feedback to students.

In terms of supporting teachers' development, this literature review found that it is important to focus on only one or two areas of improvement with teachers at a time, and that teachers improve their practice most rapidly when they receive multifaceted supports and are given focused feedback that builds off of previous feedback. In addition, this literature review found that video can be a powerful tool to shift teacher practice because it promotes teacher reflection, and when peers work together to reflect on video, the power of video reflection increases.

As a result of this literature review, this practitioner will focus on one specific engagement strategy, the 10-2-2 approach, with a small group of teachers in order to increase teachers' planning and execution of well-structured opportunities for students to engage with the material. The 10-2-2 approach was chosen because when implemented appropriately, it makes learning more relevant, provides students with processing time at appropriate intervals, and

provides built-in opportunities for teachers to provide ongoing feedback to students, which have all been found to increase student engagement. This strategy was also chosen because it represents one clear strategy that can be applied in almost any content area and at almost any grade level; it is a highly transferrable yet clear-cut strategy to focus on with teachers.

In terms of shifting teacher practice, the literature reinforced the importance of offering direct instruction and modeling around strategies with teachers, co-planning, and providing targeted, ongoing observations and feedback. As a result, during this project the practitioner will provide direct instruction around the 10-2-2 approach, will conduct weekly observations of teacher practice, and will meet with teachers each week to debrief the observation, plan next steps, and lesson plan. In addition, because the literature showed that group reflection on video observations can be a powerful tool for shifting teacher practice, during debriefs the practitioner will share video clips from teaching sessions and teachers will work in groups to discuss their noticings and plan next steps.

Theory of Action

The review of literature led to the following Theory of Action to address the problem of practice around teachers' engaging students during direct instruction.

Theory of Action: If I provide professional development focused on the importance of including well-planned and well-structured engagement opportunities for students using the 10-2-2 strategy, and I meet with teachers weekly to plan these activities, and I conduct weekly observations and provide feedback on the implementation of this intervention, then teachers will

plan and execute well-structured active engagement opportunities which will lead to an increase in teachers' engaging students during direct instruction.

This Theory of Action is outlined in Table 1 on page 24.

Table 1: Theory of Action

Problem of Practice	Literature Review	Intervention	Expected Change
<p>Teachers do not engage students because they do not plan and execute clear, well-structured opportunities for students to interact and practice with the material.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engagement is critical to student learning. • Engagement increases when material is relevant, when students have opportunities to process material and collaborate with peers, and when teachers have high expectations and provide students with the support they need. • The 10-2-2 strategy increases student engagement by providing students with opportunities to make meaning and connections with the material, process with peers, and receive feedback from their teacher. • Teacher practice changes with weekly coaching focused on one specific goal and group video reflection. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide professional development around the importance of well-planned and well-structured engagement opportunities and the 10-2-2 strategy. • Conduct weekly coaching sessions with focus teachers. Sessions include weekly observations, debriefs, and planning sessions. • Utilize video during debriefs and reflect on video in groups. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers will plan and execute well-structured active engagement opportunities. • Teachers will engage students more during direct instruction.

Intervention and Data Collection Plan

To realize this Theory of Action, the practitioner created the Intervention and Data Collection Plan included in Table 2 below. The intervention centered around providing weekly coaching to teachers around the 10-2-2 technique. To begin the intervention, the practitioner provided professional development around the 10-2-2 strategy to participating teachers. Following this professional development, the practitioner worked with each teacher on a weekly basis. These weekly sessions included classroom observations focused on the 10-2-2 strategy, feedback sessions around implementation of the technique, and collaborative lesson planning to help teachers further incorporate this strategy into their practice. To capitalize on the power of group video reflection, when feasible, teachers met as a group to analyze video and brainstorm next steps together.

Observations and surveys represent the main sources of data for this project. Pre- and post-intervention observations were conducted to measure the impact of the intervention. This data source was included because if teachers implement more engagement strategies at the end of the intervention than at the start of the intervention, and if students are more engaged at the end of the intervention, this data will show that it is likely that the intervention helped shift teacher practice. In addition to this impact data, the practitioner conducted weekly classroom observations to provide process data. Weekly observations helped determine focus areas and informed next steps for each teacher.

The second main source of data was teacher responses to surveys at the start and close of the intervention. On the surveys, scale questions were used to gauge teachers' perception of student engagement, teachers' perceived roles in student engagement, and teachers' sense of efficacy and effectiveness. Surveys also included reflective questions about teachers' perceived

roles in student engagement and their use of engagement strategies. Pre-intervention survey results provided process data; teachers’ responses informed supports provided during the intervention. In addition, pre-intervention survey results coupled with post-intervention results provided impact data; changes in teachers’ responses demonstrated the degree to which this project shifted teachers’ beliefs. A more detailed description of the Intervention and Data Collection Plan is included in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Intervention and Data Collection Plan

Component	Activities	Purpose	Data to be Collected	Type of Data
Baseline observations to gauge student engagement and teacher use of engagement strategies/techniques	Conduct 15-minute observation of focus teachers. Use time sampling to gauge student engagement. Use scripting to capture teacher engagement techniques.	- Determine baseline levels of student on taskness. - Determine baseline level of teacher use of engagement strategies.	- Quantitative: Percent of students on task; number of engagement techniques used per 15 minutes. - Qualitative: Types of off-task behavior; types of engagement techniques used.	- Process: Needs identified through baseline observations inform next steps. - Impact: Establishes baseline for comparison at the end.

Component	Activities	Purpose	Data to be Collected	Type of Data
Pre intervention teacher survey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Scale questions about student engagement. - Scale questions about teacher role in student engagement and teacher sense of efficacy. - Reflective questions about teacher role in student engagement and their use of engagement strategies/techniques. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Determine how teachers perceive current levels of student engagement. - Determine how teachers perceive their role in student engagement. - Identify barriers that prevent teachers from incorporating more engagement techniques in their practice. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Responses to scale questions - Open ended responses to reflective questions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Process: Responses inform steps forward. - Impact: Establishes baseline for comparison at end of intervention.
Pre intervention professional development session	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Overview literature review findings and best practices for increasing student engagement. - Introduce 10-2-2 strategy, practice 10-2-2, and incorporate strategy into lesson plans. 	Introduce and practice intervention with focus teachers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Exit tickets - Observation notes from discussion during PD 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Impact: Exit tickets show how well teachers understood and processed information shared at PD. - Process: Exit tickets and observation notes inform next steps.

Component	Activities	Purpose	Data to be Collected	Type of Data
<p>Weekly observations, feedback, and planning with focus teachers</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Observe focus teachers once a week. Include time sampling to determine student engagement and capture teacher use of engagement strategies. - Meet with teachers once a week to review data and problem solve/design additional next steps. - Lesson plan with teachers to incorporate 10-2-2 strategy in the week's lessons. - Use video to debrief as a group and reflect on practice. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Determine how thoroughly teachers implement 10-2-2 strategy. - Determine how accurately teachers assess their success at engaging students in class. - Determine how well teachers incorporate engagement techniques into their planning. - Assist teachers in incorporating 10-2-2 strategy into their practice. - Provide teachers with opportunities to reflect on their and their peers' practice. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Quantitative: Percent of students on task and number of engagement techniques used per 15 minutes. - Qualitative: Types of off-task behavior and types of engagement techniques used. - Coaching log from discussions during debrief and planning meetings. - Recorded coaching meetings to monitor teacher reflection and change in practice 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Impact: Teacher progress, actions, and reflections show impact of intervention. - Process: Observation notes, coaching log, and recorded coaching meetings inform coaching next steps.

Component	Activities	Purpose	Data to be Collected	Type of Data
End of intervention observations and surveys	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Conduct two 15-minute observations of focus teachers. Use time sampling to gauge student engagement; use scripting to capture teacher engagement techniques. - Teachers retake pre-intervention survey to measure their growth and progress. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Determine end of intervention level of student engagement. - Determine if intervention increased teacher use of engagement strategies and student engagement. - Determine how teachers perceive their role in student engagement. - Identify changes in teacher practice. - Identify teacher perception of barriers that prevent them from engaging students. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Quantitative observation data: Percent of students on task and number of engagement techniques used per 15 minutes. - Qualitative observation data: Types of off-task behavior and types of engagement techniques used. - Responses to scale questions - Responses to open-ended reflective questions 	Impact: Establishes progress for comparison from beginning to end of intervention.

Research Methods

The focus group of teachers for this Action Research was Thrive’s fourth and fifth grade teachers who engaged less than 85 percent of their students during a pre-intervention time-sampling observation. I began this intervention the week I returned from maternity leave; as a result, Thrive’s principal conducted time-sampling observations two weeks before my return to

determine engagement techniques teachers already employed and to determine which teachers demonstrated a need for additional support around engagement. During these observations, student engagement was measured by number of students on task and completing their work. Three of Thrive's fourth and fifth grade teachers engaged fewer than 85 percent of their students during these observations and were therefore included in this project. Two fifth grade teachers were included and one fourth grade teacher was included; on average, students were on task 47 percent of the time during initial observations in these classrooms.

The core questions this Action Research sought to answer were:

1. *If teachers incorporate more frequent and well-structured opportunities for active engagement throughout their direct instruction, will student time on task increase?*
2. *What supports and interventions best help teachers create and implement more engaging lessons?*

To answer these questions I collected the following data: classroom observation notes, video recordings of classroom observations, meeting exit slips, notes during meetings with teachers, pre- and post-intervention surveys, and a research journal of my own notes. Table three contains additional information about each of these data sources.

Table 3: Data Sources

Data Source	Additional Information
Classroom observation notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recorded low-inference notes; scripted teacher and student actions. • Tallied the number of students on and off task every three minutes in order to monitor student engagement.
Classroom observation video recordings	Weekly observations were recorded using Swivl and stored on Swivl cloud.
Meeting exit slips	Weekly exit tickets included the following questions: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the most important takeaway you have from today's session? 2. What went well during our session? 3. How could the session have been improved?
Notes from weekly teacher meetings	During weekly meetings with teachers the practitioner scribed notes.
Pre- and post-intervention surveys	The pre- and post- intervention survey included the following components: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scale questions about student engagement. • Scale questions about teacher role in student engagement and teacher sense of efficacy. • Reflective questions about teacher role in student engagement and their use of engagement strategies/techniques. • Post-survey only: Reflective and scale questions about the effectiveness of various components of the intervention. Full copies of the pre- and post-intervention surveys are included in Appendix A and Appendix B.
Research journal	Throughout the Action Research the practitioner recorded notes about the intervention twice weekly. In this journal the practitioner noted teacher action steps, questions and wonderings, and details from classroom observations and teacher meetings that stood out to her.

To analyze the qualitative data, I created a coding system that corresponded with my expected outcomes. Next, I gathered my meeting exit slips, notes from weekly teacher meetings, narrative responses to survey questions, and my research journal. I aligned each portion of these qualitative notes with a code or number of codes. During this process I created new codes as the data revealed new or initially unexpected tendencies. As I sorted this data I noticed trends across data sources and within each code.

In addition, I analyzed quantitative data from scale questions on the pre-and post-intervention surveys and from classroom observation time sampling. To analyze quantitative data from the surveys, I determined the mean response for each question on the pre-intervention survey and compared that with the mean response to the same question on the post-intervention survey. Likewise, to measure change in student engagement, I compared the average percent of time students were on task and engaged during the pre-intervention time sampling to the average percent of time students were on task and engaged during the end of intervention observations.

Data Analysis and Findings

This intervention had two main objectives. First, this intervention intended to shift teacher practice so teachers planned and executed more well-structured engagement opportunities for students. Second, this intervention intended to increase student engagement as a result of a shift in teacher practice. Evidence collected from classroom observations, teacher feedback, and pre- and post-intervention surveys indicates that these goals were met; this will be elaborated on in the Impact Data sections below.

In addition to the information provided by the impact data, a number of themes emerged from the Implementation Data. Notably, this data revealed that in Thrive's context, video is helpful for shifting teacher practice, group debriefs are not always an effective tool to shift teacher practice, and when working with teachers to shift practice, it is important to enroll teachers in the change and plan the change with them. These findings will be elaborated in the Implementation Data section below.

Impact Data Overview

One central theme that emerged from the literature review is that when teachers provide students with opportunities to make meaning of their work and provide opportunities for students to process collaboratively, student engagement increases (Parsons et al., 2015; Nagro, Hooks, Fraser, & Cornelius, 2016). A specific strategy to engage students that incorporates these findings is the 10-2-2 strategy (Venuto, A 2015). Data from this intervention indicate that providing professional development and ongoing coaching around the 10-2-2 strategy seemed to shift teacher practice; by the end of this project teachers provided additional opportunities for students to interact with the material, and observations indicate that student engagement increased as a result.

Shifts in Teacher Practice. A key aim of this intervention was to shift teacher practice in order to increase student engagement. To reach this goal, this intervention sought to increase teacher use of the 10-2-2 strategy during direct instruction. Three data sources gauged shifts in teacher practice: observation notes that include the types of opportunities teachers provided to process material, changes in teacher responses on pre- and post-intervention surveys, and observation data showing how teachers structured their direct instruction. Each of these sources indicate that teachers shifted their practice and incorporated 10-2-2 into their teaching by the end of the intervention.

First, notes taken during observations show that teachers provided students with a broader range of opportunities to process data at the end of the intervention than they did at the start of the intervention. During the pre-intervention observations, teachers invited students to

process information during direct instruction through turn and talks and opportunities for call and response. During the post-intervention observations, students were observed participating in turn and talks, stop and jot activities, fist-to-five checks for understanding, show of hands interactions, call and response opportunities, and responding to questions using whiteboards both individually and with partners. While teachers offered two types of opportunities for students to interact with material during the pre-intervention observations, they provided six types of opportunities to interact with the material during post-intervention observations. As a result, this qualitative data indicates that teacher practice changed during the course of this intervention.

A second source that measured teacher implementation of 10-2-2 is teacher responses to the post-intervention survey. In response to the post-intervention survey question, “To what extent did you incorporate the 10-2-2 strategy in your practice?” all three teachers responded that they implemented the 10-2-2 strategy into their practice. In addition to this self reporting, teachers indicated that they spent six percent less time speaking during direct instruction than they reported at the start of the intervention. Moreover, teachers reported that the percent of time students spent discussing the content during direct instruction increased by 27 percent from the beginning to the end of the intervention. Changes in teacher responses are included in Table four on page 35.

Table 4: Impact of Intervention on Teacher Practice

Survey Question	Pre intervention average response	Post intervention average response	Percent change
Estimate the average percent of time you talk during direct instruction in your class.	83%	77%	-6%
Estimate the average percent of time students spend discussing the content during direct instruction in your class.	23%	50%	+27%

In addition, observation notes indicate a shift among all three teachers in the way they structured their direct instruction. This intervention was implemented over a five-week period. Teacher A restructured her direct instruction with the practitioner during their first weekly debrief, and during each of the observations throughout the rest of the project, she spoke for no more than ten consecutive minutes and provided students with group and independent processing time following her instruction.

Teacher B began implementing the 10-2-2 structure during the third week of the intervention; this teacher began implementing the intervention with fidelity after seeing a video of his colleague implementing the process in her classroom. Similarly, after this teacher adjusted his lessons to incorporate 10-2-2, he consistently spoke for ten minutes or less and provided students with group and individual processing time every time he spoke. Teacher C began implementing 10-2-2 during observations in the fourth week of the intervention, and during observations in the fourth and fifth week she implemented the 10-2-2 technique with fidelity.

By the end of the intervention, all three teachers spoke for no more than ten consecutive minutes and provided students with opportunities to process new information after they spoke. In contrast, during pre-intervention observations, teachers spoke for an average of 14 minutes

before they provided students with an opportunity to process or interact with the material either with partners or individually.

As a result, data from classroom observations indicate that through this intervention teacher practice shifted and teachers provided students with more frequent opportunities to interact with the material. However, different teachers implemented the 10-2-2 strategy at different rates. This finding will be discussed in more detail in the Implementation Data section of this report.

Increases in Student Engagement. The second main goal of this intervention was to increase student engagement as a result of changes in teacher practice. To measure changes in student engagement, the researcher analyzed changes in teacher responses on the pre- and post-intervention surveys, data from pre- and post-intervention observations, and feedback from teachers on the post-intervention survey.

First, at the end of the intervention, teachers reported a 15 percent increase in the average percent of time students were on task during direct instruction in their classes. In the pre-intervention survey, teachers reported that students were on task 65 percent of the time during direct instruction, and in the post-intervention survey teachers reported that students were on task 80 percent of the time.

In addition, time sampling observations before the intervention and at the end of the intervention indicate that students were more on task 37 percent more of the time during direct instruction at the end of the intervention than they were at the start. To conduct these observations, the observer scripted teacher and student actions during a 15-minute observation. Every three minutes the observer scanned the room and counted the number of students on task

and the number of students off task. During each 15-minute observation, the observer conducted four scans to determine the number of students on and off task.

During the pre-intervention observations, on average, students were on task 47 percent of the time. During the post-intervention observations, students were on task 83 percent of the time. More details from these observations are included in Table five below.

Table 5: Percent of Students on Task Pre and Post Intervention

	Pre intervention: Average percent students on task	Post intervention: Average percent students on task	Percent change
Teacher A	47	98	51
Teacher B	47	69	22
Teacher C	48	84	37
Average	47	84	37

As shown in table five, all classrooms showed an increase in the average percent of students on task by the end of the intervention. Notably, there was a wide range in the end of intervention percent of students on task and a wide range in the percent change among teachers. This finding is discussed more in the Implementation Data section of this report.

In addition to these quantitative measures, teacher responses to survey questions also indicated their belief that 10-2-2 led to increases in student engagement. In the post-intervention survey, all three teachers indicated their belief that 10-2-2 had helped increase student engagement. For example, one teacher shared that 10-2-2 “Kept urgency, alleviated boredom.” Another teacher responded that the biggest takeaway from this project was that a “small tweak helped engagement a lot!” Likewise, the third teacher responded 10-2-2 is “Simple and easy to implement. It’s a powerful tool because it puts collective responsibility on students to work together to solve problems orally, then individual responsibility on students to solve them

independently.” This teacher also commented, “ALL learning should be set up this way. It’s easy and engaging, plus it helps keep the whole group engaged.”

Implementation Data Overview

This action research sought to increase teacher implementation of the 10-2-2 strategy in order to increase student engagement. To reach this goal, this practitioner held an initial training session around the 10-2-2 strategy and followed up with weekly observation and feedback sessions. In addition, weekly debriefs incorporated video of teacher practice, and two of the teachers met as a team during debriefs at the beginning of the intervention. The intervention was designed this way because research indicates that frequent observation and feedback sessions are critical to teacher growth (Bambrick-Santoyo, 2012; Knight, J., Elford, M., Hock, M., Dunekack, D., Bradley, B., Deshler, D., & Knight, D., 2015). In addition, research shows that sharing and analyzing video with teachers is a powerful tool and that group debriefs can accelerate teacher growth (Marsh & Mitchell, 2014; Reitano & Sim, 2010; Betil Eröz-Tuğa, 2013).

This section will analyze ways the design and implementation of this intervention impacted teacher and student outcomes. Implementation data from this action research show that video was helpful for shifting teacher practice at Thrive, but group debriefs were not an effective tool in Thrive’s context. In addition, implementation data indicate that when working with teachers to shift practice, it is important to enroll teachers in the change and plan the change with them.

Using Video to Shift Practice. Throughout the literature review, a range of researchers noted that video can be a powerful tool to shift teacher practice. Notably, Reitano and Sim argue

that sharing and reflecting upon recorded observations shifts teacher practice because it increases reflection, and reflective practice leads to teacher growth (2010). As a result, during weekly coaching sessions, teachers watched a video of their or a peer's teaching, reflected on the video, and planned next steps based on the video. A range of data including exit slips, notes taken by the researcher, and the post-intervention survey indicate that using video helped shift teacher practice.

First, data from exit slips indicate that teachers felt video reflections were beneficial. In response to the exit slip question, "What went well during our session?" teachers mentioned reflecting on their video or a colleague's video 67 percent of the time. For example, one teacher noted, "Watching [teacher A's] video helped me see how important it is to circulate and narrate immediately." Another teacher noted, "Seeing my video helped me see which students I should check in with during group time."

Similarly, notes taken by the practitioner indicate that video was an effective tool. For example, the practitioner noted that one teacher who had been reluctant to implement the intervention committed to having a timer visible during student work time after she saw her colleague using a timer. Similarly, the researcher noted, "It was so exciting to see how much more optimistic and committed [Teachers B and C] became after seeing [Teacher A's] video. Seeing [Teacher A] being so effective seemed to light a spark under them and pressed them to action." The reflective journal also noted times that watching video helped teachers push their own practice. For example, one entry noted:

"It was great to have [Teacher B] watch his video today! He can get sucked into working 1:1 with students before he gets all students on task. During our debrief I asked what he noticed about his role in student urgency, and he said he noticed that when he spent a long time with [a student], other

students got off task, and he needs to be sure almost all students are on task before helping others.”

In addition, teacher feedback in the post-intervention survey also showed that they found video helpful. In response to the question, “To what extent did using video during our debriefs help you increase student engagement in your class?” two teachers selected “helpful” and one teacher selected “extremely helpful.” During this project, video provided a window into others’ practice as well as a mirror to reflect teachers’ practice. Based on exit slip feedback, practitioner notes, and end of intervention survey data, it seems that using video was an important component of this project’s design. It seems that video helped move teacher practice because it provided insight into teachers’ own practice and their peers’ practice. Video highlighted progress teachers and their peers were making and allowed teachers to more fully understand their missteps and create plans to address them.

Challenges of Group Debriefs. Another key feature of the project design was holding group debriefs with two teachers in the study. The project included group debriefs because researchers reported that group reflection helps improve teacher performance (Reitano & Sim, 2010; Marsh & Mitchell, 2014) and increases participants’ “awareness as teachers” (Eröz-Tuğa, 2013, p. 178). While literature suggests that group debriefs accelerate teacher growth, data from teacher exit slips, the researcher’s reflective journal, and classroom observations indicate that group debriefs were not beneficial to the teachers in this study. Because group debriefs did not seem effective, the practitioner began meeting with all teachers individually after the third week of the project.

First, exit slip data indicate that teachers did not feel group debriefs were effective. For example, after a group debrief Teacher C responded to the question, “How could the session

have been improved?” by saying “There wasn’t a lot of time to discuss my class and my work with students- I’d want more time to focus on my class.” Similarly, Teacher B wrote, “I like meeting with [Teacher C], but it seems like we don’t get to go in depth on our own classes when we meet together.”

In addition to this exit slip data, the researcher also questioned the effectiveness of group debriefs in her reflective journal. In the journal the researcher noted that during group debriefs it was hard to find action steps that were appropriate for both teachers since they had different areas for growth, and when one teacher did not implement 10-2-2 it was hard to get to the root of the problem in group debriefs. For example, following a group debrief, the researcher noted that Teacher C:

“Didn’t do anything related to 10-2-2 during her observation and didn’t circulate during independent practice...she didn’t follow through with her previous action step at all. As a result I cancelled our group meeting so I could meet with her 1:1—I didn’t think I’d be able to get through to her if we met with [Teacher B]—I felt that I needed to be more directive. I also wanted her to watch parts of her video that showed how...things got when she didn’t follow through with her action steps, but I didn’t want [Teacher B] to be there since it wouldn’t benefit his practice and I didn’t want her to be [upset] by the video in front of him.”

The researcher noted that during her first one on one debrief with Teacher C, she took a more directive approach and had a chance to “repeatedly [ask Teacher C] how [her action step] would impact student learning, and [Teacher C] explained that it was important to provide structured opportunities to respond and work together to keep them engaged.” In the reflective journal, the researcher noted that it was much easier to have a direct conversation with Teacher C without Teacher B present.

A third data point that suggests group debriefs were not an effective approach for the teachers in this intervention comes from observation notes. As previously noted, Teacher A implemented the 10-2-2 structure two weeks sooner than Teacher B and three weeks sooner than Teacher C. Teacher A met individually with the practitioner from the beginning of the intervention while Teachers B and C originally met in a group with the practitioner. During their first debrief, Teacher A and the practitioner spent most of the time planning adjustments to Teacher A's class structure that would allow her to incorporate 10-2-2. After this one on one planning session Teacher A began implementing 10-2-2 with fidelity. In contrast, observation notes show that Teacher B began implementing 10-2-2 two weeks later and Teacher C began implementing 10-2-2 three weeks later.

It seems that Teacher A implemented 10-2-2 sooner than others because she had an opportunity to think deeply about her practice with the practitioner during their first one on one session, and she adjusted her practice in a meaningful way as a result of their individual time together. Likewise, Teachers B and C incorporated 10-2-2 into their practice more fully once the practitioner began meeting with them individually. At Thrive, teachers shifted their practice more deeply when they had individual coaching sessions with the practitioner. While the literature review suggests that group debriefs are helpful, this research was not supported at Thrive. The limited success of group debriefs will be discussed in the next Implementation Data section.

Importance of Creating Shared Understandings *with* Teachers. As discussed in the previous section, one finding from this action research is that group debriefs were not highly effective with teachers in this study. Teacher A, the teacher that worked with the practitioner individually throughout the project, implemented the intervention much sooner and more

thoroughly than the other teachers. As noted above, Teacher A and the practitioner spent the first debrief session diving deep into 10-2-2. During this meeting, Teacher A and the practitioner worked together to adjust the structure of her math direct instruction so it aligned with the 10-2-2 framework in a way that worked for her. In reviewing exit tickets, notes from the researcher's reflections, and meeting notes, it is clear that the first planning session with this teacher was highly collaborative, and that the teacher acted as a partner with the practitioner during this session. This section will discuss this finding around collaborating with teachers by first outlining evidence showing this session was collaborative and then discussing collaboration with teachers more in depth.

One piece of evidence showing that Teacher A found the initial planning session to be collaborative are her exit slip responses following the first debrief. In response to the question, "What went well during our session?" Teacher A responded, "Super helpful to talk through how to make 10-2-2 work for me and my students—I'm ready to do this!" In contrast, following the first group debrief, Teacher B responded to the same question with, "Planning time and video was helpful." Teacher C responded with, "Looking at my video helped me see where I need to move faster." While all three teachers identified a way the session helped them, Teacher A's responses demonstrated that she had made meaning of the strategy during the session and was ready to adapt it to fit her needs.

In addition, notes from the researcher's reflective journal following this initial meeting demonstrate that the meeting felt collaborative. An excerpt from the journal is included below:

My meeting ... went very well—she was very receptive to feedback and excited to make 10-2-2 her own. I was surprised by how well we were able to fit 10-2-2 into her context. We spent much of our time talking about how [Teacher A] could adjust her timing to make 10-2-2 work for her... She shared that she appreciated having time to ask

questions and think implementation through. I also found this time helpful and am excited to continue our work, especially now that this feels more like something that she's ready to own and take on.

Likewise, notes taken during the initial debrief with Teacher A demonstrate that the meeting was collaborative. During the meeting, Teacher A and the practitioner began by discussing the beginning of the teacher's lesson. In the initial observation, the teacher had spoken for 12 minutes before inviting students to process the material. Included below is an excerpt from this initial debrief:

Teacher: "I'm not quite sure how this can fit with Eureka."

Practitioner: "I noticed that you talked for 12 minutes before providing students with a chance to process the material. Your vocabulary review took six minutes. What is the purpose of your vocabulary work at the start of the lesson?"

Teacher: "We do vocabulary to review what they know and frontload for the day's lesson."

Practitioner: "Do you feel that you're meeting that goal?"

Teacher: "They are reviewing and getting frontloading."

Practitioner: "Does it feel like a high-leverage use of time?"

Teacher: "Well, it's taking a lot of talking time. I want to talk less there so I can get into the meat of the lesson and give them a chance to process the lesson instead of the previous day's vocabulary. What if I had them fill in the blanks for the vocabulary? I think if we did that I could cut vocabulary to about two minutes which would give me enough time to introduce new material during the first ten minute chunk."

In this interaction, the practitioner and the teacher worked together to determine the best way for the teacher to structure the first ten minutes of her lesson. Throughout this meeting the practitioner and the teacher had similar exchanges. Later in the meeting the two discussed having the teacher model one problem in its entirety before releasing students to work on problems with partners. An excerpt from that discussion is included here:

Practitioner: “Another place where you strayed from the 10-2-2 structure was during the practice problems. I noticed that you didn’t do a complete modeling—can you tell me about it?”

Teacher: “I have students help me answer the first problem so they don’t get bored. I think it helps keep them focused if they can help answer it with me.”

Practitioner: “I see. Is this helping them master the content?”

Teacher: “I think so. I think they like helping me.”

Practitioner: “I noticed that during that time about 40 percent of the class was chiming in and following along, and the rest of the class wasn’t participating. When you released students to do the work, I noticed there were a lot of questions. It seemed to me that there were a lot of questions because you didn’t do a clear modeling—I think things got confused because when student volunteers offered their ideas you tried to build off of them, even if it led you in the wrong direction. What would happen if you modeled a whole problem and then released them?”

Teacher: “Hmmm... If I did that then maybe it would be easier for them to answer the question because they would have seen it modeled... This would reduce my talking time so it would fit in the 10-2-2. I would then talk for less than ten minutes as I modeled and they could work on a problem together and then do independent practice. Do you think it would be ok if the group practice and independent practice parts are longer than two minutes?”

These meeting notes show that this coaching session did not center around a technical fix in the form of bite-sized feedback and action steps. During this debrief, a deeper discussion began when the teacher shared that she was not sure how to incorporate 10-2-2 with the math curriculum. When the teacher asked that question, the practitioner moved away from her planned agenda and prepared action step and worked with the teacher to adjust her structure and incorporate the 10-2-2 strategy into her practice. This led to a rich discussion where the practitioner and the teacher built off of each others’ ideas and came to a shared understanding.

In contrast to the initial meeting with Teacher A, the practitioner began planning bite-sized action steps with Teachers B and C during the first debrief. Instead of checking in with the teachers to gauge their level of comfort with 10-2-2, the practitioner dove into technical fixes and did not build a shared understanding with the teachers. It seems that building a shared understanding with Teacher A and enrolling her as a partner in the work was critical to her

implementing the intervention more thoroughly and more immediately than the other two teachers.

While the practitioner dove into discussing action steps with Teachers B and C in order to accelerate progress on 10-2-2, this pace impeded progress in the long run because both teachers took longer than Teacher A to implement 10-2-2. In addition, once these teachers incorporated 10-2-2 into their practice, they did not demonstrate much ownership around the strategy; during informal classroom visits, Teachers B and C did not regularly use the 10-2-2 structure. Moreover, by the end of the study, Teacher A showed the highest change in average percent of students on task and had the highest percent of students on task during the post-intervention observation.

In this study the practitioner worked *with* Teacher A to determine the best way for 10-2-2 to fit into her context, and impact data demonstrates that this teacher experienced greater success with the intervention. In *Restorative Circles in Schools* Costello, Wachtel & Wachtel share that people, “Are happier and more likely to make positive change when those in authority... do things *with* them, rather than *to* them or *for* them” (2010, p. 7-8). It is clear that the practitioner and Teacher A worked *with* each other to envision implementation of 10-2-2, and this process of making meaning together may have contributed to Teacher A’s greater success during this project.

In addition, research around coaching also highlights the importance of working *with* teachers and building a shared understanding with them. For example, in *The Art of Coaching* Elena Aguilar argues that in order to bring about change, “Adults need to see very clearly the relevance of what they’re being asked to learn; they need to have some say in what they’re doing” (Aguilar, 2013, p. 56). It seems that one shortcoming of this Action Research was that

the practitioner did not set aside time to create a shared understanding with all of the teachers. A shared understanding was created organically with Teacher A, and she experienced greater success than the other two teachers.

In this Action Research the practitioner focused on more what Ronald Hiefetz (2003) would consider technical components of coaching such as weekly debriefs, use of video, and bite-sized action steps at the expense of more adaptive components of coaching such as building relationships and shared understandings. While it seemed that diving into technical tweaks around 10-2-2 would save time, it is clear that not taking the time to slow down and build a shared understanding detracted from the intervention's success. This suggests that future practitioners should build time into interventions to enroll teachers and build understandings with them.

Implications and Conclusions

This Action Research sought to address the following problem of practice at Thrive Academy: Teachers do not engage students during direct instruction because they do not plan and execute clear, well-structured opportunities for students to interact and practice with the material. To address this problem of practice, the practitioner introduced the 10-2-2 engagement strategy to a group of teachers and then conducted weekly observation and feedback cycles with these teachers.

Impact data from this project indicate that teachers who participated in this action research planned and executed clearer, better-structured opportunities for students to interact and practice with the material by the end of the project. In addition, student engagement in work

completion during direct instruction increased by an average of 37 percent by the end of this project. As a result, it seems that 10-2-2 was an effective strategy for increasing student engagement in work at Thrive Academy.

In addition, engaging teachers in weekly observation and feedback cycles focused on a specific strategy seems to have been an effective way to shift teacher practice at Thrive. Likewise, there is evidence to support continued use of video during coaching sessions with teachers; data from this study suggests that video was a useful tool for shifting teacher practice.

While video seemed to help shift teacher practice, group debriefs did not emerge as a high-leverage tool for moving teacher practice. In this study, group debriefs were less effective than individual debriefs; it seems that group debriefs were not as effective because it can be challenging to push teachers during group debriefs especially if teachers have different areas for growth. As a result of these challenges, the practitioner began meeting with all teachers individually partway through this study.

Possible Limitations of the Study and Ideas for Future Research

In analyzing this study's data, a number of possible limitations and ideas for future research emerged. Key areas for reflection that will be discussed in this section include refining a measure of engagement, revisiting measures of success, and exploring ways to strengthen group debriefs.

Measuring Engagement. One potential limitation of this study was the way engagement was measured in classroom observations. This study defined engagement as when students are attracted to their work, persist in their work in spite of challenges and obstacles, and take delight

in accomplishing their work (Schlechy, 1994). During this project the practitioner measured student engagement by counting the number of students on task and scripted student interactions to gauge persistence and delight in work. Unfortunately, it was difficult to quantify level of delight and persistence from scripted notes. As a result, the practitioner relied most heavily on number of students on task to measure changes in student engagement.

Upon reflection, it seems that this measure of engagement captures more of what Schlechy (2002) would consider either passive compliance or ritual engagement. According to Schlechy, in both passive compliance and ritual engagement students complete their work, but their work does not have meaning for them and does not bring them joy. As a result, neither passive compliance nor ritual engagement leads to long-lasting learning.

Because this study predominantly categorized time on task as engagement, it seems that this study actually measured changes in compliance rather than changes in authentic engagement. By the end of this study, students were on task 37 percent more of the time than they were at the start of the study, and this represents a meaningful shift in student experiences and a marked increase in compliance. However, it seems that this study did not measure authentic engagement, and it is unclear that changes made by teachers led to increases in meaningful engagement. As a result, practitioners may want to investigate ways to measure authentic engagement and may want to explore interventions aimed more specifically at increasing authentic engagement.

Revisiting Measures of Success. Another potential limitation to this study was the observation structure. In an effort to make the process feel supportive and fair, the practitioner announced when she would be observing teachers for their implementation of 10-2-2, and by the end of the study all of the teachers implemented 10-2-2 during announced weekly observations.

However, informal classroom visits revealed that not all of the teachers implemented the 10-2-2 structure during math direct instruction consistently. Based on informal classroom visits, it seems that Teacher A implemented 10-2-2 during almost all of her direct instruction in math. It seems that Teacher B implemented 10-2-2 during about 60 percent of his math direct instruction, and it seems that Teacher C incorporated it about 25 percent of the time during her math direct instruction. Because the practitioner did not script notes during these informal classroom visits, it is not clear how large the implementation disparity was between announced observations and daily implementation. As a result, future studies should consider including unannounced classroom visits to measure authentic implementation of an intervention.

In addition, this feedback from informal visits also indicates that there was limited teacher ownership and belief in the intervention. It seems that if teachers felt invested in the intervention and believed that it improved their practice, they would implement it even when they were not being observed for it. This underscores a key conclusion from this study around the importance of engaging teachers as meaningful partners and highlights an area of growth for the practitioner.

Strengthening Group Debriefs. A third limitation in this study is its findings around group debriefs. The literature review indicated that group debriefs can be a powerful tool for shifting teacher practice. However, teachers who participated in group debriefs did not change their practice during the initial weeks of the project. In order to accelerate the pace of change, the practitioner abandoned group debriefs during the third week of the project.

Findings from the project indicate that building a shared understanding with teachers around student engagement and the 10-2-2 strategy was key to success. The practitioner and Teacher A organically created this understanding as a result of an inquiry from the teacher. The

practitioner did not create this with Teachers B and C. While the practitioner abandoned group debriefs because they were not effective, it is not clear what caused them to be ineffective.

If the practitioner had built a stronger sense of team among the teachers, or if the practitioner had developed more shared understanding with these teachers, group debriefs may have been successful. As a result, it is not clear if group debriefs were ineffective due to the practitioner's planning and facilitation or due to intrinsic challenges with group debriefs. Because group debriefs have the potential to engage teachers in meaningful discourse with each other, they have the potential to lead to deep, authentic changes in practice. As a result, future practitioners may want to investigate the best conditions for group debriefs before embarking on group debriefs in order to capitalize on this meeting structure and ensure their success.

Implications for School Leaders

This study revealed a number of key takeaways for school leaders. On the technical side, this study provides support for more widespread use of 10-2-2 as a technique to increase student engagement or time on task. This study also provides additional evidence that weekly observation and coaching sessions can help move teacher practice and that video can be an effective tool to move teacher practice.

On the adaptive side, implementation data from this study carries a resounding reminder about the importance of building shared understandings with stakeholders and of doing work *with* teachers, not to them or for them. In this study the teacher who was the most engaged in making meaning of the intervention and adapting it to her context implemented the intervention with the most fidelity and saw the most growth among her students. This finding echoes the key

tenant of restorative practices that “human beings are happier, more cooperative and productive, and more likely to make positive changes in their behavior when those in positions of authority do things with them, rather than to them or for them” (Wachtel, 2016, p. 3). While this study focused on shifting teacher practice in order to increase student engagement, this lesson around engaging others as partners in work is applicable to almost any context and may be a key prerequisite to an initiative’s success.

References

- Abbey-Lambertz, K. (2014, November 12). These are the major U.S. cities with the highest murder rates, according to the FBI. *Huffington Post*. Retrieved from: http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2014/11/12/highest-murder-rate-us-cities-2013_n_6145404.html
- Aguilar, E. (2013). *The art of coaching: effective strategies for school transformation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, A Wiley Brand.
- Baecher, L., McCormack, B., & Shiao-Chuan Kung, S. (2014). Supervisor Use of Video as a Tool in Teacher Reflection. *Test-Ej*, 18(3), 1-16.
- Bambrick-Santoyo, P. (2016). *Get better faster: a 90-day plan for coaching new teachers*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bambrick-Santoyo, P. (2012). *Leverage leadership: a practical guide to building exceptional schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bondy, E., & Ross, D. D. (2008). The Teacher as Warm Demander. *Educational Leadership*, 66(1), 54-58.
- 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.
- Costello, B., Wachtel, J., & Wachtel, T. (2010). *Restorative circles in schools: Building community and enhancing learning*. Bethlehem, Pennsylvania: International Institute for Restorative Practices.
- Delpit, Lisa D. (2012). *"Multiplication is for white people": raising expectations for other people's children*. New York, New Press: Distributed by Perseus Distribution.
- Duncan-Andrade, J. M. R., & Morrell, E. (2008). *The art of critical pedagogy: Possibilities for moving from theory to practice in urban schools*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Doubet, K. D., & Hockett, J. J. (2016). The Icing or the Cake?. *Educational Leadership*, 74(2), 16-20.
- Eröz-Tuğa, B. (2013). Reflective feedback sessions using video recordings. *ELT Journal: English Language Teaching Journal*, 67(2), 175-183.
- Goodwin, B. (2012). Research says new teachers face three common challenges. *Educational Leadership*, 69(3), 84-85.

- Harbour, K. E., Evanovich, L. L., Sweigart, C. A., & Hughes, L. E. (2015). A Brief Review of Effective Teaching Practices That Maximize Student Engagement. *Preventing School Failure, 59*(1), 5-13.
- Heifetz, R. (2003). *Leadership without Easy Answers*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Belknap Press.
- Knight, J. (2009). Coaching. *Journal Of Staff Development, 30*(1), 18-22.
- Knight, J. (2006). Instructional Coaching. *School Administrator, 63*(4), 36-40.
- Knight, J., Elford, M., Hock, M., Dunekack, D., Bradley, B., Deshler, D., & Knight, D. (2015). 3 Steps to Great Coaching. *Journal Of Staff Development, 36*(1), 10-18.
- Marsh, B., & Mitchell, N. (2014). The role of video in teacher professional development. *Teacher Development, 18*(3), 403-417.
- Moller, S., Stearns, E., Mickelson, R. A., Bottia, M. C., & Banerjee, N. (2014). Is Academic Engagement the Panacea for Achievement in Mathematics across Racial/Ethnic Groups? Assessing the Role of Teacher Culture. *Social Forces, 92*(4), 1513-1544.
- Nagro, S. S., Hooks, S. D., Fraser, D. W., & Cornelius, K. E. (2016). Whole-Group Response Strategies to Promote Student Engagement in Inclusive Classrooms. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 48*(5), 243-249.
- National Research Council. 2000. *How People Learn: Brain, Mind, Experience, and School: Expanded Edition*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.
- Nicholson, L. L., & Putwain, D. W. (2015). Facilitating re-engagement in learning: A disengaged student perspective. *Psychology Of Education Review, 39*(2), 37-41.
- Nickerson, E. (2011). Focused Note-taking in your classroom. Presented at the 2011 AVID National Conference, Orlando, Florida. Presentation retrieved from http://www.avid.org/dl/eve_natcon/nc11_focusednotetaking.pdf
- Parsons, S., Malloy, J., Parsons, A., & Burrowbridge, S. (2015). Students' Engagement in Literacy Tasks. *Reading Teacher, 69*(2), 223-231.
- Pirrie, A., Macleod, G., Cullen, M. A., & McCluskey, G. (2011). What happens to pupils permanently excluded from special schools and pupil referral units in England?. *British Educational Research Journal, 37*(3), 519-538.
- Reitano, P., & Sim, C. (2010). The value of video in professional development to promote teacher reflective practices. *International Journal Of Multiple Research Approaches, 4*(3), 214-224.

- Richardson, J. (2009). *The next step in guided reading: Focused assessments and targeted lessons for helping every student become a better reader*. New York: Scholastic Inc.
- Rubin, R. R. (2012). Independence, Disengagement, and Discipline. *Reclaiming Children & Youth, 21*(1), 42-45.
- Schlechy, P. (January 1994). "Increasing Student Engagement." Missouri Leadership Academy.
- Schlechty, P. (2002). *Working on the work: An action plan for teachers, principals, and superintendents*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Scott, T. M., Hirn, R. G., & Alter, P. J. (2014). Teacher Instruction as a Predictor for Student Engagement and Disruptive Behaviors. *Preventing School Failure, 58*(4), 193-200.
- Shernoff, E. E., Maríñez-Lora, A. M., Frazier, S. L., Jakobsons, L. J., Atkins, M. S., & Bonner, D. (2011). Teachers Supporting Teachers in Urban Schools: What Iterative Research Designs Can Teach Us. *School Psychology Review, 40*(4), 465-485.
- Stephan, Y., Caudroit, J., Boiché, J., & Sarrazin, P. (2011). Predictors of situational disengagement in the academic setting: The contribution of grades, perceived competence, and academic motivation. *British Journal Of Educational Psychology, 81*(3), 441-455.
- Venuto, A. A. (2015). Exploring new teaching goals: The 10-2-2 Strategy. *Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin, 82*(2), 11-12.
- Wachtel, T. (2016). *Defining Restorative*. International Institute for Restorative Practices. Retrieved from: http://www.iirp.edu/images/pdf/Defining-Restorative_Nov-2016.pdf.
- Washor, E., & Mojkowski, C. (2014). Student Disengagement: It's deeper than you think. *Phi Delta Kappan, 95*(8), 8-10.

Appendix A: Pre-Intervention Survey Questions

1. Estimate the average percent of time students are on task during direct instruction in your class (10%, 20%, 30%, 40%, 50%, 60%, 70%, 80%, 90%, 100%).
2. Estimate the average percent of time you talk during direct instruction in your class (10%, 20%, 30%, 40%, 50%, 60%, 70%, 80%, 90%, 100%).
3. Estimate the average percent of time students spend discussing the content during direct instruction in your class (10%, 20%, 30%, 40%, 50%, 60%, 70%, 80%, 90%, 100%).
4. How much control do you have over student engagement during direct instruction in your class? (No control; a little control; moderate control; complete control).
5. How knowledgeable are you about strategies to engage students during direct instruction? (Not at all knowledgeable; a little knowledgeable; knowledgeable; extremely knowledgeable).
6. How engaged are students during direct instruction in your class? (Not at all engaged; a little engaged; engaged; extremely engaged).
7. What strategies and approaches do you use to engage students during direct instruction?
8. When students are not engaged during direct instruction in your classroom, what do you think are the causes?
9. What changes in your practice do you think would lead to increased student engagement during direct instruction?
10. What prevents or hinders you from engaging students during direct instruction?
11. What support would you like to have to increase student engagement during direct instruction?

Appendix B: Post-Intervention Survey Questions

12. Estimate the average percent of time students are on task during direct instruction in your class (10%, 20%, 30%, 40%, 50%, 60%, 70%, 80%, 90%, 100%).
13. Estimate the average percent of time you talk during direct instruction in your class (10%, 20%, 30%, 40%, 50%, 60%, 70%, 80%, 90%, 100%).
14. Estimate the average percent of time students spend discussing the content during direct instruction in your class (10%, 20%, 30%, 40%, 50%, 60%, 70%, 80%, 90%, 100%).
15. How much control do you have over student engagement during direct instruction in your class? (No control; a little control; moderate control; complete control).
16. How knowledgeable are you about strategies to engage students during direct instruction? (Not at all knowledgeable; a little knowledgeable; knowledgeable; extremely knowledgeable).
17. How engaged are students during direct instruction in your class? (Not at all engaged; a little engaged; engaged; extremely engaged).
18. What strategies and approaches do you use to engage students during direct instruction?
19. When students are not engaged during direct instruction in your classroom, what do you think are the causes?
20. What changes in your practice do you think would lead to increased student engagement during direct instruction?
21. What prevents or hinders you from engaging students during direct instruction?
22. What support would you like to have to increase student engagement during direct instruction?
23. How helpful was the initial PD on 10-2-2 in increasing student engagement in your class? (Not at all helpful; a little helpful; helpful; extremely helpful).
24. What would have made the training more helpful?
25. To what extent did our weekly coaching/debrief sessions help increase student engagement in your class? (Not at all helpful; a little helpful; helpful; extremely helpful).
26. What would have made these sessions more helpful?
27. To what extent did using video during our debriefs help you increase student engagement in your class? (Not at all helpful; a little helpful; helpful; extremely helpful).

28. What would have made the use of video more helpful?
29. To what extent did you incorporate the 10-2-2 strategy in your practice? Did not implement at all; implemented a little; implemented; implemented thoroughly).
30. Why did you implement 10-2-2/not implement 10-2-2 to the extent you did?
31. To what extent did using the 10-2-2 strategy help increase student engagement in your class? (Not at all helpful; a little helpful; helpful; extremely helpful)
32. What made using 10-2-2 to increase engagement as helpful/unhelpful as it was?
33. Please share any additional thoughts/feedback on 10-2-2 as a strategy or your experience in this training, coaching, and feedback process.