ACTION RESEARCH REFLECTION

What stood out?
- Need to increase coherence across multiple levels of organization from classroom to coaches to principals to principal supervisor to central office supports and district level   - Level of understanding of Linked Learning at principal level is essential to implement systems changes and needs to be incorporated into all aspects of school   - What worked about AltEd collaborative is that they have pathway coach and principals working together which has made a shift in work   - Leadership required in schools to develop Linked Learning is dramatically different from old structure of administrators and roles; not enough research on this, Oakland could be leading the way   - Challenges in teacher hiring; need to have quality teachers in pathways in order to build out   - Needs to be level of inquiry around enrollment systems at the district level   - SPSA failing as a tool is an example of system level challenge; SPSA tool sat with Continuous School Improvement so we can influence it not control, this is example of larger district structures more than the tool itself   - Don't know that work hard enough to get buy-in beyond the money, schools that have had easier implementation have bought in   - Ability to operationalize expenditures at the school sites: district systems aren't set up around it and have hurt the initiative and this is highlighted by FCMAT report around simple basic financial operations that breakdown   - Emergence of dilemma around different PLCs in different sites, challenges between pathway teams, grade teams, departmental level teams that make challenges in big schools vs small schools   - District lacks an institutional capacity in supporting master schedule design   - Need for coherence and integration of all initiatives under the Linked Learning umbrella including Restorative Justice, Common Core, teacher growth and development, Social Emotional Learning, and PBIS at all levels of the system
What key questions emerged from what stood out?
- How are we influencing the development of a program of study that authentically impacts the instructional core to integrate the 4 pillars of Linked Learning?   - What is the effectiveness of pathway coach collaboration to impact student outcomes?   - How do we support sites to operationalize their budget to access funds?

- How do we hold school accountability to be true to Linked Learning and Measure N in way that feels supportive and not compliance driven?
- What is the role of Design Team after the Design Year?

What are the implications for next steps?

- Coherence at schools and Linked Learning Office (Principal Supervisors → Principals → Pathway Coaches → Classrooms)
  - Focusing on program of study
  - How does coaching supports and principal direction influence the adaptive and technical changes in the program of study?
- Operations, budget
  - Major shift to align budgeting process to support pathway implementation
  - How are sites effectively building out operational supports in alignment with Linked Learning?
- Collaboration at school sites
  - Looking at on track to graduate data, curriculum development, retreats, etc.
  - How are school sites building collaboration time to support Linked Learning?
- Master schedule
  - Still a large dilemma
- Instructional core
  - Project based learning, graduate capstone
  - How is the Linked Learning Office utilizing its resources to integrate Work-Based Learning, Dual Enrollment, CTE courses, and the Graduate Capstone?
  - What are the integrated projects that schools are doing that demonstrate best practices in Linked Learning?