**Lakeland School District**

ESAIL Walk-through Implementation Analysis
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Walk-through dates: May 6-7, 2014

Introduction:

Dear Mike and Colleen,

Thank you for coordinating a wonderful site visit to Lakeland School District. The teachers were warm and welcoming. It was rewarding to see such caring classrooms where mutual respect between teachers and students is evident.

The PCL model is a decision making model based on strong understanding of the learning process. With that context, the intention of this particular PCL implementation analysis is to use the ESAIL data to create a district improvement plan with goals that will focus on transferring strong teaching practices into increased student achievement. To that end, current strengths will be celebrated and trends will be identified that would provide insights for short and long term goals.

The specific focus of the site visit was intentionally similar across the k-12 grades and was two-fold. Under the direction of Linda Dorn and Carla Soffos, we determined two broad categories that are relevant and critical right now in preparing students for 21st century college and careers. The first lens focused on procedural structures, routines and curricular materials. The second lens focused on how to use the curricular materials to achieve Common Core State Standards. The second focus, therefore, attended to the rigor of the curriculum. The analysis of current practice juxtaposed with the goals for where we want to be comprise this report. The teacher perception survey along with the ESAIL findings were used to draft a 5-year plan for stakeholders of Lakeland School District to react to as they determine and develop next steps in a continuous plan for school improvement that honors a collaborative spirit.

The ESAIL Summary of Findings provided here is organized by grade bands rather than by grades/classrooms in order to keep the focus on professional development opportunities for Learning Partner or Vertical Team meetings and avoid microanalysis of individual teachers. It is important to the integrity of the ESAIL process to think in terms of patterns across rooms that can lead to next steps and refrain from targeted focus on classrooms which is better left to the work of model classroom and coaching relationships.

A context is necessary for interpreting the benchmarks of M= Meeting, A= Approaching, and B= Below. Evidence based observations were used to determine if a preponderance of observable evidence satisfied the criterion in each grade of the grade band to warrant a score of M. Then, if there was a preponderance of observable evidence for the grade band but not observable in all rooms across the grade band the score of A was used. Finally, if the evidence was not observable in most rooms in the grade band or Specials area, a score of B was given. That said, each benchmark should be conceptualized on a continuum. So for example, even with a score of Meeting, we would always strive to further develop our pedagogy within the criterion.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Criterion 1: A Literate Environment** | Examples of Observable Evidence (across the rooms) for each Strand | M=Meeting  A=Approaching  B=Below |
| K - Grade 1 - Grade 2 |
| 1. Reading responses through writing are displayed on classroom walls, in hallways, and in students’ response logs   ESAIL 1.1 identifies as evidence of a literate environment, the display of **reading responses through writing** on classroom walls, in hallways, and in students’ reading logs. This is because reading responses through writing addresses comprehension. To teach for comprehension is to set up opportunities for students to engage in listening to and responding to complex text (at or above grade level) by talking, writing and reading with supportive scaffolds. Listening to, talking about, and writing about text at levels higher than they can read builds background knowledge that positively impacts reading achievement. In kindergarten this might look like drawing a picture and or writing about which character from *Goldilocks and the Three Bears* would make a good friend and why. | Yes. See sample artifacts. Well done!!  Next steps: In Learning Partner meetings, examine the depth of responses using the following resources:   * Cognitive Rigor Matrix by Karin Hess * Rubric for Assessing Log entries (PCL manual) * How Fiction/Nonfiction Readers’ Interaction with Text During Reading Influences Their Depth of Talk After Reading (PCL manual) * Dorn & Soffos: Levels of Thinking, Comprehension Self-Assessment, Sample Questions for Comprehending Literature & Informational Text | M |
| 2. Writing is taught as a process and published versions are displayed in the classroom and hallways. | Yes. See sample artifacts.  The spotlighting of all phases of the writing process provides tangible evidence to visitors that the writing process is worthy of sharing. It celebrates a growth mindset about writing as opposed to a fixed mindset. | M |
| 1. Diverse reading materials are enjoyed, discussed and analyzed across the curriculum.   ESAIL 1.3 highlights the need for diverse reading materials to be enjoyed, discussed and analyzed across the curriculum. Under this particular criterion, as a procedural structure we are looking to see if there is a broad range of text types to provide students with opportunities that consolidate and challenge their processing systems. Does the classroom library have within each category, single copies of: easy text, instructional text and complex text? Complex text refers to literary fiction and nonfiction text written by well-known authors such as those highlighted as exemplars in the CCSS and those for which a level cannot be determined. (See CCSS p. 31, triangulation for matching books to readers.) In the classroom library tubs we should see texts that are culturally and linguistically relevant rather than culturally and linguistically neutral (Hollie, 2011). Then, at the level of curricular rigor for ESAIL 1.3 we are looking to see how complex text is analyzed and revisited across the workshops. The teaching component must be rigorous to achieve CCSS. Rigorous teaching should be reflected in the rigor of the language charts. Note: there is a difference between complex text and hard text. Students can read complex text if the teacher spends time with close reading, revisiting the text for multiple teaching points, building of background knowledge and carefully choosing engaging texts that are meaningful and relevant to the students. Evidence of rigorous teaching in this area would be reflected in language charts and logs that show that the mentor texts have been “de-constructed” in several ways (vocabulary, grammar, text structure, genre characteristics, relationships such as how setting does or does not influence plot, character behaviors, etc.) The enjoyment part would be evidenced by entries that represent reactions to the story at a personal level without in-depth analysis and/or in anchor charts that might suggest for example: fun words we found… | Several interactive read alouds provided evidence during the observation of mentor texts being enjoyed and analyzed across all 3 rooms (examples include: *I’ll Love You Forever*; *I Love You the Purplest*; *Piggs, Eggs*).  Students were provided with text sets of books with sequential text structures to study life cycles in one room.  In another room, during a comprehension lesson, students analyzed a mentor text by recording words that helped them visualize the author’s message.  The Jim Arnosky author study language chart provided strong evidence of analysis of several mentor texts for wildlife/habitat facts.  iPads were used in one room to take notes  Next step: Further expand the classroom libraries to ensure the inclusion of a broad range of text types and complexities within categories. Also, further expand the classroom libraries to include texts that are culturally and linguistically relevant. Sample book lists have been provided.  Next step: Continue to revisit mentor texts for several different purposes. For example, with the Arnosky mentor texts, we can revisit them for an analysis of strong domain specific vocabulary to build webs of understanding for building background knowledge. Then, we can revisit them in Writer’s Workshop mini-lessons for the craft that Arnosky uses to convey meaning and how we might use that craft in our nonfiction writing. | M |

**Summary of findings for Lakeland’s Grades K-2 Program**

Wow! The walk-through showed that this grade band has been working very hard to implement the Comprehensive Literacy Model at a high level of fidelity! What you have focused on you have achieved. The Workshop Model is in place. Routines, procedures and expectations are established. A respectful, literate culture is evident across the grades. Verbal and non-verbal scaffolds are used to guide instruction and shift the cognitive load of learning to the child. Common Core State Standards are reflected in anchor charts and student writing. Inquiry-based learning is reflected in every grade. High quality literature is enjoyed and analyzed. Data is used to drive instruction. You have so much to celebrate in terms of your professional practice.

As an area of focus, consider using Learning Partner Team meetings to work on ESAIL 2.5: Students’ logs are organized and reflect integrated learning across the curriculum and 4.9:Mentor texts and student logs are used as non-verbal scaffolds to promote independence. With the first criterion, focus on revisiting mentor texts for multiple teaching foci across the day, i.e. word study, craft writing, strategic reading behaviors such as rereading at difficulty, etc. Examples of integration were found throughout this grade band and because it is a high-leverage instructional practice for building comprehension, it warrants even more attention. With the second criterion, focus on change over time in the thinking represented in the logs. Are you seeing growth? How are you measuring this growth against CCSS and your assessment tools? What does it look like to lift the rigor? Are you modeling through a think aloud what an exemplar log response looks like? Are you having the class co-construct a rubric for what log entries look like in terms of the thinking aspect? Clearly, the observable evidence from the walk-through shows that you are mindful of teaching with rigor to meet CCSS expectations. It is helpful to look as a team at what is expected in the grades that come before and after your grade to help calibrate your expectations.

A second area of focus would focus on small group instruction. This suggestion is made not due to the walk-through but rather due to the critical nature and difficulty of work in this area. The success of a balanced literacy program is highly dependent on the teacher’s professional understanding of the literacy processing system and understanding of scaffolding theory to provide just the right amount of support at any given time to move a child closer to establishing a self-regulatory working system. Statistically, what we know to be true is that children must be reading at grade level by the end of third grade. For this to happen, we must analyze teaching interactions with students that achieve this goal. Refinement of this understanding must be a constant focus for us.

A small area of focus might be to revisit the characteristics of high quality anchor charts for consistency across the grade levels.

Again, wow! You have provided a sound footing for the grades to come.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Criterion 1: A Literate Environment** | Examples of Observable Evidence (across the rooms) for each Strand | M=Meeting  A=Approaching  B=Below |
| 3 – 4 – 5 -6 |
| 1. Reading response through writing are displayed on classroom walls, in hallways, and in students’ response logs | In some rooms, Thoughtful logs are used to respond to reading through writing, such as with inferring and visualizing comprehending strategies.  Observable evidence was not seen beyond the logs.  Remember that this type of writing is very different than writing done in Writer’s Workshop. This writing is about lifting comprehension and not about the writing process. It is about making thinking visible. It completes the active testing part of the learning cycle as described in *The Art of Changing the Brain, by Dr. James Zull.*  Next Steps:  Use Learning Partner or Vertical Team Meetings to analyze student response in the Thoughtful Logs. The log responses that were examined against the CC Reading Standards for Literature tended to be below grade level. Using the gradual release of responsibility model teach students how to lift the level of their writing. Model through a think aloud what a strong entry would require. Provide guided practice by writing an entry together. Provide collaborative practice by having pairs of students write an entry. Co-construct a rubric on an anchor chart for what entries would look like from levels 1-4 with 4 being the strongest. Look at the Smarter Balanced Assessment rubrics for support. | A |
| 2. Writing is taught as a process and published versions are displayed in the classroom and hallways. | Inconsistent across grades.  Observable evidence seen in some grades:   * Writing folders with pre-writing, drafting and writing guides * Co-constructed anchor (language charts) depicting the phases of the writing process * Writer’s Notebook * Published pieces displayed for most grades * Writing process included with display of published pieces for most grades * Conferencing and conference notes   Next step:   * Work towards consistency of teaching the writing process across all grades. * As a Learning Partner team watch and analyze videos of mini-lessons in Writer’s Workshop * Study the CCSS Writing Standards and compare/contrast what this would look like for teaching mini-lessons across the 3-6 grade band * Together, score a piece of writing for each grade using the rubrics from *AIL* for each grade level. | A |
| 3. Diverse reading materials are enjoyed, discussed and analyzed across the curriculum. | Observable evidence included:   * Math Read alouds * Solar System Read alouds * Plant read alouds * Analysis of narrative text structure * Analysis of persuasive texts * Mentor texts used to analyze figurative language, inferential thinking, synthesis * “Shopping” opportunities to pick texts from the classroom library based on choice * Eve Bunting author study   Next step:  Continue to explore how mentor texts can be enjoyed, discussed and analyzed across the curriculum. As a team, use the CCSS to determine a focus, and then discuss how the learning target might be addressed through a mini-lesson. When analyzing a mentor text include cite based evidence with page numbers, text language and significance. There was some strong evidence of this criterion but it was not across the grade band. | A |

**Summary of findings for Lakeland’s Grades 3-6 Program**

Across this grade band there was evidence of the Workshop Model in place. Whole group, small group, collaborative group work and individual conferencing occurred across grades. Respectful talk by students and teachers was observed. Routines and expectations were observable through co-constructed anchor charts and also evidenced by student behavior. Strong mentor texts were used for mini-lessons and students were engaged in their learning. Invitational prompting language that encouraged chains of discourse that elaborated ideas was seen in every room. These are important accomplishments that provide the groundwork for deeper learning.

As an area of focus, tighten up the ESAIL findings that showed inconsistency across the grade band. For example, beginning with classroom environment, ensure that all rooms are organized and clutter free. In the area of anchor charts, dialogue around the characteristics of strong anchor charts as scaffolds including, size of print, amount of print on page, color, examples and icons provided with definitions, etc. Also, develop a shared understanding of the various types of anchor charts: procedural, instructional and assessment.

Another area of focus might be a shared understanding of the writing process. There was evidence of this understanding across all rooms; yet, there is an opportunity to tighten it up. For example, we saw evidence of the process taken from rough drafts, through revision to published pieces. Now, a next step would be to lift the level of student writing by engaging in more write aloud type writing. *Interventions That Work* describes the Write Aloud Intervention, which explains this instructional practice. Work with your literacy coaches to deepen your understanding around this high-leverage teaching practice. There is a great opportunity here to dramatically lift the level of writing being produced by students.

Examining log responses for depth of thinking can be done by examining CCSS, Smarter Balanced Assessment rubrics, and PCL rubrics. This work is done well in Learning Partner teams where teachers look at grade level expectations that come before and after their specific grade.

Small group reading instruction, as was also suggested for the K-2 grade band would be another high-leverage focus for this grade band. The success of a balanced literacy program is highly dependent on the teacher’s professional understanding of the literacy processing system and understanding of scaffolding theory to provide just the right amount of support at any given time to move a child closer to establishing a self-regulatory working system. Refinement of this understanding must be a constant focus for us. Students in this grade band are at a critical juncture as they consolidate their reading skills prior to middle and high school. Coaching cycles for small group reading instruction is a recommendation for this grade band.

In summary, for this grade level band, a focus on the environmental ESAIL criteria will provide consistent and measurable successes that pave the way for deeper work. From there, it is recommended that one area of focus be chosen, either log responses, the writing process, or small group reading instruction as the topic of Learning Partner Teams.

Please know that it is exciting to see so much of what is already in place. There is much to celebrate as identified in the findings and reflected in the introductory paragraph. This is about “glow” and “grow.” We celebrate, and we choose a focus to grow. Congratulations on all of your hard work thus far!

\*Special note: Consider including 6th grade as part of the middle school grade band. The rationale for this move is that the Common Core State Standards and testing programs are based on grade configurations of K-5 and 6-12. Moving the 6th grade to the middle school provides the 6th grade teacher with a professional learning community that supports the level of academic expectations set forth by our state mandates and our state superintendent’s Agenda 2017 – Every Child a Graduate.

**Introduction to Secondary ESAIL Walk-through**

It is important to read the ESAIL findings for the next two sections through the proper lens. The ESAIL walk-through for all of secondary classes from the fine arts and technical education classes to the ELA, Science, Math, Social Studies classes served as base line data prior to any professional development. This in a sense then is the pre-test. Therefore, we would not expect professionals to be held accountable for what they have not been given the opportunities to learn just as we would never expect our students to be held accountable for end of the year grade level standards in September. In sum, we would expect to see the rating of a “B” in each of the following categories. It cannot be over stated that in this regard, we are separating content knowledge of teachers from currently accepted best practices in pedagogy as defined through the ESAIL criteria. It is understood that teachers must be held accountable for all that is inherent to the teaching license they posses. Observable evidence from the walk-through revealed that the secondary teachers are top notch in their fields of expertise. The next step is to provide professional development to the secondary staff in the cognitive apprenticeship model so as to take their teaching to the next level. This is an exciting beginning. I look forward to seeing your ESAIL findings next year at this time!

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Criterion 1: A Literate Environment** | Examples of Observable Evidence (across the rooms) for each Strand | M=Meeting  A=Approaching  B=Below |
| 7 – 8 – 9 – 10 – 11 – 12 |
| 1. Reading response through writing are displayed on classroom walls, in hallways, and in students’ response logs | Limited observable evidence.  Logs were used in some subject areas in very autonomous ways.  When examining log responses, it was noted that on the entries surveyed, student responses did not reflect grade level expectations. See CCSS RL 8.1 and RL 8.3 for example. Use these criteria to examine the log entries. Model through a think aloud what a strong entry would require. Provide guided practice by writing an entry together. Provide collaborative practice by having pairs of students write an entry. Co-construct a rubric on an anchor chart for what entries would look like from levels 1-4 with 4 being the strongest. Look at the Smarter Balanced Assessment rubrics for support.  Next steps:  Here we are looking for thinking made transparent. We want to see evidence of thinking. We want to spotlight deep level thinking. This is about comprehension. (See Karin Hess’ Cognitive Rigor Matrix noted in Smarter Balanced Assessments). Another example might be showcasing annotated text with analysis in the margins. | B |
| 2. Writing is taught as a process and published versions are displayed in the classroom and hallways. | n/a and no observable evidence | B |
| 3. Diverse reading materials are enjoyed, discussed and analyzed across the curriculum. | No observable evidence. | B |
| 4. Co-constructed language charts display academic language and reflect grade-level expectations, and are used in student logs to scaffold independent learning. | No observable evidence.  Here we are looking for process charts or vocabulary charts | B |
| 5. Tables, clusters of desks and/or areas are arranged to promote collaborative learning and problem solving. | No observable evidence.  See 10th grade close reading lesson and look at how the room arrangement promotes collaboration at the end of the video:  <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XFRClI2q18Y> | B |
| 6. Problem solving is collaborative (pairs or groups) and talk is purposeful and goal directed. | Observable evidence consisted of:  Collaborative problem solving was not evident. However, talk was goal directed.  Talk was purposeful and goal directed overall. | A |
| 7. Engagement is maintained by meaningfulness and relevance of the task. | Engagement is an area for further growth. In almost all rooms, students were respectful and attentive but this is not the same as being engaged.    Observable evidence consisted of:  Questions and Answers game in one room with teams where students wrote the question down and the answer after the person called upon gave an answer. What is the level of engagement for all students? How is the teacher able to assess the level of understanding of all students?  Games are engaging. Yet, might there be another way to increase the number of students engaged as well as assess and scaffold instruction?  Also, analyze the types of assessment questions being asked. Are they all literal? Should they be?  Finally, computer use by some students lent itself higher level of engagement.  In another room, students took turns problem solving but this left several students out of the conversation.  Next step:  Employ the Darla Brinks activities to increase student engagement and sharing. | A |
| 8. Respectful talk and attitudes are promoted and used among all learners. | Yes, mostly. In one room there was disrespectful talk.  No collaborative group norms were posted anywhere.  Next Step:  Consider adopting the 7 Collaborative Norms for Group Work | A |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Criterion 4: Uses a Differentiated Approach to Learning** | Examples of Observable Evidence (across the rooms) for each Strand | M=Meeting  A=Approaching  B=Below |
| 7 – 8 – 9 – 10 – 11 – 12 |
| 1. Instruction is delivered within an integrated workshop that links reading, writing, language, and content areas. | No observable evidence  See this video link that shows how content and language objectives are identified in all secondary content areas. Discuss the power of consistency and how predictable structures aid student learning.  <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NBdRdZKULKg&index=1&list=UU5mN2B-2JYc9XiK1qFQjeSg> | B |
| 2. Whole –group mini-lessons include clear models, explicit language, and guided practice for assisting students to learn and apply new information. | No observable evidence  Here we are looking for the gradual release of responsibility model where a mini-lesson consists of distinct characteristics that occur in a short 15 min. lesson followed by guided practice, collaborative group work, 1:1 conferencing and debriefing at the end of the period.  Next Steps:  Please see this video on gradual release of responsibility with Doug Fisher. This is a video for middle and high school teachers. Doug teaches at a high school.  <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cjURdvzty4c> | B |

**Summary of findings for Lakeland’s Secondary and Technical Subjects Programming**

The largest impact at the secondary level will come from studying the gradual release of responsibility model. A book study of *Better Learning Through Structured Teaching* by Fisher and Frey along with video analysis of the Fisher and Frey videos on You-tube will take the Lakeland secondary grades to the next level. Guaranteed. This should be the yearlong focus for the secondary staff. Vertical team meetings that are protected for this laser beam focus will be important. A second area of focus that would be high-leverage for the secondary staff would be to focus on generative instructional strategies that could be used across all content areas for teaching content specific vocabulary. A future area of focus as a team or with a Literacy Coach would be to calibrate student log writing expectations against CCSS.

A final comment on the secondary and technical studies walk-through is warranted. Please know that it was an extreme pleasure to witness such high-end instruction. Additionally, it was exciting to see state of the art resources to prepare the secondary students for college and careers! It was also heart-warming to see the spotlighting of student talent through the awards presented in several areas. Your work as a school district reflects your understanding of the need to teach and develop the whole child. Because you offer such high end and varied coursework you demonstrate your recognition of each child’s unique gifts and potential. This understanding brings to mind a quote from Albert Einstein, “*Everyone is a genius. But if you judge a fish by its ability to climb a tree, it will live its whole life believing that it is stupid.”*  The Lakeland School District is an excellent example of how small school districts can achieve the expectations of 21st century learning goals mandated by state law. Moreover, every student’s right to a top-notch education is offered through your school district. Good for you! This is a proud moment.

**Four-Year-Old Kindergarten**

The nature of 4K does not lend itself to the design of the ESAIL tool because there is a unique program focus in 4K that is unlike 5K. The link below takes you to the DPI website on 4K. Information from that website has been included here.

Because the nature of 4K is vastly different from the focus of 5K, efforts need to be made to provide professional development geared to the unique needs of 4K students. <http://ec.dpi.wi.gov/ec_ec4yrpag>

Does Wisconsin's 4K program positively impact children's development? Yes. Wisconsin does not have data to correlate student performance on statewide tests with past 4K participation. We can, however, explore the impact by reviewing data from the National SWEEP study and from several Wisconsin school districts. See a summary [here](http://ec.dpi.wi.gov/files/fscp/pdf/ec-impact-dev.pdf).

**Research Related to 4K**

As enrollment in Wisconsin’s four-year-old kindergarten (4K) grows, interest in measuring 4K’s impact on child development has also increased. A variety of studies explore the positive impact of these programs on children, society, and the economy: [Research on 4YK](http://ec.dpi.wi.gov/ec_ec4k-research)

**Summary of findings for Lakeland’s 4K Program**

Wow! Remarkable! Several characteristics of this program make it an exemplar for other programs. First and foremost, specifically related to literacy, we know that a critical aspect of 4K is to provide students with a plethora of opportunities to engage in language and to participate in activities that build background knowledge and vocabulary that become the bedrock for developing their literacy working system. During the walk-through we saw observable evidence of this theoretical understanding on the part of the 4K teacher in action. She seized every opportunity as a teachable moment to extend their linguistic system while at the same time teaching, through play, how to build self-regulation skills. For example, when several students wanted to see the “doctor” she directed them to take their places in the waiting room and wait to be called by the nurse. The waiting room consisted of sitting on their carpet squares. This is a perfect example, of how to prepare these children for the 5K experience of sitting in their designated carpet square spots but through play. Perfect! Another example of intentional teaching was observed when the 4K teacher authentically and purposefully weaved academic vocabulary into her teaching when she expanded student language of “hurt” to “injury” and used domain specific vocabulary when she explained to the “doctor” that he would need to write a prescription for the shot he was about to give. This conversation gave way to a dialogue about knees, and bones and joints. Further observable evidence of a rich literate environment was captured through artifacts shared at the end of this report. ESAIL notes included the following observations:

4K Strengths:

* Routines in place; children demonstrate understanding of procedures
* Classroom design is set for whole group, small group and independent learning and is well organized with many instructional areas
* Materials are easily accessible
* Classroom library is started and organized by topics,
* Mentor texts are displayed
* Strong inquiry based learning is very evident across learning environments
* Respectful talk among teacher and students
* Children are excited and happy and very much engaged! Learning is everywhere and all the time!

4K Next Steps:

* Library needs to be expanded
* Continue to focus on vocabulary and background knowledge expansion.

**Closing**

Mike, Colleen, Lynn, Kathy, and Lakeland staff, with heartfelt congratulations I offer you this ESAIL Summary of Findings Analysis! It was a true privilege to celebrate your accomplishments by identifying observable evidence of ESAIL criteria. Your high standards for quality implementation of the PCL model is evidenced through the systemic structures you’ve created for continuous school improvement. Your 5-year plan based on these findings positions you well for the transition to a new superintendent. Mike, as you know, Colleen is a remarkable literacy coach who is doing outstanding work. She has accomplished significant changes since your affiliation with the model in 2009. Your leadership, Mike, has been a tremendous influence in the success of the Comprehensive Literacy Model. You have supported Colleen, Lynn and your teachers by your commitment to sending school teams to the summer institutes as well as supporting the necessary ongoing training for Colleen and Lynn. Mike, you are leaving a well-earned literacy focused legacy and I appreciated the opportunity to work with you.

**ESAIL ARTIFACTS**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Example of** | **Artifact** |
| Inquiry-based learning | IMG_20140507_140944_508  IMG_20140507_115141_230IMG_20140507_115130_591IMG_20140507_122933_403IMG_20140507_123219_744IMG_20140507_123234_473IMG_20140507_123253_297 |
| Classroom Libraries | IMG_20140506_101402_801IMG_20140507_101618_286IMG_20140507_101608_421IMG_20140507_095015_025IMG_20140507_085925_307IMG_20140507_122920_081 |