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The Coronado Success Initiative

The Coronado Success Initiative is a strategic partnership between the Scottsdale Unified School District (SUSD), Scottsdale Charros, and ASU’s Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College (MLFTC) to meet the CHS academic achievement challenge.

The partners?

Scottsdale Unified School District: The mission of SUSD is to deliver a world-class education promoting the highest level of academic achievement, creativity and personal growth that will inspire greatness in today’s students and tomorrow’s leaders. The district has 30 schools and 1,550 teachers who serve 24,000 students daily.

Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College: As the heart of ASU, the #1 most innovative university in the country, Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College creates knowledge, mobilizes people, and takes action to improve education. It is one of only a handful of institutions that excel at both teacher preparation and academic research. Ranked 11th by US News and World Report, MLFTC is a world-renowned hub of innovation where pioneering ideas and practices in education are created, refined, and scaled to have the greatest possible impact on individuals and communities.

Scottsdale Charros: Formed in 1961, The Scottsdale Charros is an all-volunteer, nonprofit group of business and civic leaders dedicated to supporting our community through youth sports, education and charitable causes. Over the past seventy years, the Charros have grown to over 200 members who volunteer and participate with many other civic organizations to make Scottsdale a special hometown.

The Education Innovation Engine

The Education Innovation Engine at MLFTC is an incubator for new ideas and systems in support of student success. As educators find themselves hard-pressed to resolve “wicked problems”, the Education Innovation Engine provided a space and designed pathway for SUSD, the Scottsdale Charros and the larger Coronado community to converge and collaborate on solutions driven by a spirit of creative intrapreneurship through design thinking.

The design thinking approach offers an open-ended, iterative, systematic, data informed, collaborative, and creative process to understanding user(s), developing hypotheses, generating ideas, and synthesizing solutions. The design process creates solutions that fit the context by bringing different perspectives, expertise and systems of knowledge together.

One model of the design thinking process
Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College

Education Innovation Engine

A partnership between MLFTC and school districts or community organizations, based at district/community sites.

A collaborative effort to design innovative solutions to wicked problems in education by using an open-ended design process that values local context, diverse perspectives, intrapreneurial thinking and iterative testing of solutions.

A professional learning opportunity for educators that builds capacity in schools and communities to bring a creative design lens to problem-solving and incorporate this approach into the district culture.

The MLFTC Design Process
Introducing the Design Days

Over the past six months the CSI has organized three key design-day events. These are:

**Community Design Day at Skysong**  
January 21, 2017  
One day session with over 160 participants that covered the gamut from students to teachers to community members and local business leaders and more.

**Students Design Day at CHS**  
April 17, 2017  
2 half-day sessions with 60+ high school students.

**Teachers Design Day at CHS**  
June 6/7, 2017  
2 half-day sessions, spread over two days with 50+ teachers and CHS school personnel.

Overall each session asked participants in small groups working together on open-ended tasks. Participants were explicitly asked NOT to think of solutions but rather focus on the process.

The first two events (the Community Design Day and the Students Design Day) were facilitated by trained facilitators at each table. The third design day with the teachers had fewer facilitators per table with the teachers themselves acting as team leaders.

Broadly, each group was asked to map out a day in the life of a high school student (or in the case of the community design day or that of a high school teacher) and then “tag” the events in the day with positive and negative affect. This then became the foundation of the next phase of discussion, which though differ somewhat across the sessions, broadly focused on identifying a range of opportunities, challenges, positives and negatives. The groups then attempted to list three or 5 main issues that they felt ought to be the core focus moving forward. Participants were also provide opportunities to see what other groups were doing and to “look, add or steal” ideas. Finally most groups made a video-pitch or an argument of what they would like to focus on in the future. The three key ideas and the videos were then analyzed as described in the sections below.

**Design of the Events**  
The three design day events broadly focused on generating ideas of what high school could or should be.

All three events focused on similar ideas and themes, though there were differences in implementation due to differences in the audience (size, who could attend) as well as more pragmatic constraints such as amount of time available for the session.
Overview
On January 21, 2017, the Coronado Success Initiative brought together 161 stakeholders committed to the success of CHS. Participants included students, parents, teachers, community members, SUSD administrators, and facilitators from ASU. Notably, many participants were also alumni of CHS. These stakeholders worked together to imagine alternative possibilities for CHS’s future through a series of activities facilitated by the MLFTC’s Education Innovation Engine. These activities leveraged empathy for teachers and students to identify key areas for the CSI to focus its efforts.

Although these activities generated a diverse set of ideas, a number of themes appeared regularly across the 17 working groups. In particular, participants often emphasized a need for student-centered approaches to education, exploratory opportunities where students can try different educational paths and more flexible programming to enable autonomy and choice for both teachers and students. These themes often overlapped with one another as groups identified key areas for the CSI to address.

This report is based on feedback from stakeholders who participated in the Design Day event. In particular, this report focuses on the ideas generated at each of the 17 working groups during the Design Day activities. These 8-10 person groups consisted of a balanced mixed of students, teachers, parents and community members. Each group also had a facilitator from the Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College. Facilitators guided the groups through the first part of the “Design Thinking Process” to help them empathize with other stakeholders, define the challenges CHS, and ideate how the CSI can think about and address these challenges. Appendix A contains a complete list of the ideas generated during the event.

Design Day participants
Students 26
Parents 14
Teachers and staff 48
Community Members 46
Administrators 15
ASU-affiliated 21
Themes

Student-centered
Participants stressed that the redesign of CHS should be guided by student-centered concerns such as the individual interests, needs and goals of students. Additionally, participants spoke of student-centeredness as a general disposition that should guide the work of teachers, administrators and district leaders.

One of the most common examples of student-centered education was the idea that students should have a greater ability to choose their academic path. Many working groups suggested variations on this idea, including one where students could incrementally assume responsibility for designing an individualized educational path in alignment with their own academic and career goals.

Participants also suggested that student-centeredness was a value that could infuse every aspect of the school, from the bell schedule to opportunities students have to interact with adults and one another. For example, teachers and administrators might think of making curriculum and instruction relevant in terms of students’ goals and interests instead of external standards.

Exploratory
Whereas high school can often seem regimented and standardized, participants consistently advocated providing students with opportunities to explore a variety of educational paths. Many groups suggested that a broader set of elective offerings, combined with fewer requirements, would be helpful. Others stressed the importance of making it easier for students to switch between different paths and providing multiple opportunities to pursue these paths in real-world contexts.

A significant number of groups made explicit reference to a need for vocational and career experiences as part of the curriculum. These suggestions ranged from on-site career mentorships to expanded vocational offerings on campus, but all emphasized an experiential approach to exploring educational paths.
Themes contd.

Flexibility
The theme of flexibility united a number of issues raised by participants. For example, flexible scheduling was the most common idea because groups suggested it was needed in order to enable other changes. However, groups also referenced flexibility as a way to alleviate stress for both students and teachers. A number of groups identified an excess of structures and requirements as a key barrier to improving CHS. In particular, groups emphasized a need for greater flexibility in the bell schedule, course requirements and demands placed on teachers.

Other notable ideas
Groups also raised a number of ideas that overlapped significantly with the themes already described, but deserve additional attention. Participants expressed a desire for greater connectedness between the school, community and students. Generally, participants indicated that the school needed to make the first move in facilitating this process. Participants also raised concerns about the relevance of some aspects of the educational process, such as the need for frequent standardized testing and certain course requirements. While many of these concerns related to state policies, participants connected the relevance of educational activities to student interest and engagement.

Conclusion
The Design Day activities encouraged participants to adopt the perspectives of others when thinking about CHS. Overwhelmingly, groups identified ideas that focused on the structures and programs rather than the behaviors of individuals and groups. While this is likely related to the framing of activities, it also suggests that participants value the contributions of students, teachers and parents to CHS. As groups identified key areas that need attention at CHS, they often touched more fundamental issues that can provide a path forward for the CSI. Participants frequently connected the issues they identified to broader goals of improving student engagement, creating supportive learning environments, and student success after high school. To take the example of giving students greater choice in their courses and schedules, participants saw a way for students to engage in topics that interest them and prepare themselves for life after high school.

For many, the redesign of CHS appears to represent an opportunity to empower students to take control of their own educational experience.
Interim Report:

Students Design Day

Overview

On Monday, April 17, Coronado High School and ASU’s Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College hosted a Design Day to involve more students in the process of re-imagining the high school experience. Facilitators from MLFTC guided students through a series of activities that explored the “empathy” stage of the design process, so that students could reflect on their experiences in high school and share ideas about where the Coronado Success Initiative should focus its efforts. Workshop leaders made an effort to create a safe environment for students to share their honest opinions.

After a brief introduction to the CSI, students completed a Journey Map to reflect on the events of a typical school day. Then, students organized these events in terms of their positive and negative aspects. Afterwards, students had an opportunity to walk from table to table and see what other groups came up with. Each group then identified the top three areas in need of improvement that they believe the CSI should focus on. In the final activity, each group created a 90 second video to pitch the importance of their three areas for improvement.

This report summarizes the data produced during the April 17 event. It focuses on the key areas that each group identified, which are also reported in full in Appendix B. While students raised a wide range of concerns, they mostly fell within the general categories of 1) curriculum and instruction; 2) student-staff relationships; and 3) non-instructional time.

Themes

Curriculum and Instruction

Students identified several concerns related to curriculum and instruction, and suggested that both could make more engaging, relevant and attuned to students’ learning needs. A common concern was that the workload, and especially homework, felt overwhelming at times. Students noted that tests were too long and too frequent, and that assignments could be better coordinated by staff so that students did not have excessive workloads when too many assignments coincided.

Another instructional concern related to how teachers delivered instruction. Students preferred interactive and interpersonal forms of learning and wished that teachers could spend more one-on-one time with students. They suggested that more enthusiasm and encouragement from their teachers could make instruction more engaging. Finally, students also raised concerns about the four-point grading system, which they felt left too little opportunity for students to recover from mistakes.
**Themes contd.**

**Student – staff relationships**
A third general area students identified for improvement was student-staff relationships. Students indicated that positive and supportive relationships with teachers and other staff were among the most valuable aspects of their educational experience. For many students, these positive relationships were based on teachers caring about the content they taught and students’ personal needs. They expressed a desire for encouragement and constructive feedback from their teachers. Notably, students’ concerns about student-staff relationships were frequently linked to concerns about instruction and the structure of the school day.

Students suggested that less strict rules and more flexible time might create more opportunities for positive interactions. For example, students described rules related to dress code, bathroom use and phone use as “belittling.” These positive interactions would also carry over to academics by helping students feel motivated to learn.

**Non-instructional time**
Students also pointed to non-instructional time as an area for improvement. These concerns focused on a perceived lack of freedom, which students linked to motivation and relationships with staff and peers. They suggested that longer passing times could lead to more positive interactions between staff as well as other students. Relatedly, students also felt that lunch time was to brief, especially since the lines for food are long. Students also asked for higher quality, fresher food options, and for special events like pep assemblies, dances and field trips.

**Conclusion**
Throughout the course of the Design Day activities, students thought constructively about how to improve the educational experience at CHS. Their feedback offers the unique perspective of students’ daily experience in school and the specific issues that they view as barriers to learning. In common with the community-wide Design Day in January, students identified areas of concern related to the nature of instruction, interpersonal relationships, and the structure of the school day. However, in contrast to the community-wide event, students’ perspectives focused much more on the quality of day-to-day experiences, and less explicitly on how these experiences translated to college and career readiness. In this sense, the students’ perspective complements the feedback from the community-wide event by offering insight into the particulars of the educational process that determine its success.
Overview
Building on prior Design Day events with Coronado students, parents and other community members, Coronado High School and ASU’s Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College hosted a two-day Design Day event on June 6 and 7 to involve almost 60 Coronado teachers in the process of improving CHS. On the first day, teachers learned how to think like designers to address issues at CHS. This training included an overview of the history and origins of design thinking and activities where teachers applied design principles to real-life scenarios. As with previous Design Day events, teachers identified Key Areas for improvement based on their experience as teachers. These Key Areas represent a starting point for re-imagining CHS by identifying priorities to focus on. On the second day, teachers had an opportunity to engage with the Key Areas identified at previous Design Days that reflect the concerns of students and the broader CHS community. In small groups, teachers analyzed Key Areas from all Design Day events to identify themes emerging from across the Coronado community. Drawing on what they learned through this process, each group created a “Pitch” for how to improve CHS. Groups then presented their pitches to other groups for feedback before creating a video of their final version.

This report describes the main output of day 1 (Key Areas for improvement that the teachers identified), and day 2 (Pitches to improve CHS that reflect results from all of the design days). The Key Areas that teachers identified are summarized in the following section and reported in full in Appendix C. Teachers identified several areas that overlapped with those of students and the community, while also calling greater attention to factors that affect teachers’ ability to work effectively. The Pitches represent the summation of teachers’ reflection on the Key Areas from students and the community as well as those reported here. Additionally, the Pitches reflect a collaborative effort among teachers to prioritize the efforts of the Coronado Success Initiative. These results are reported in full in Appendix D, and the videos are also available from SUSD or MLFTC.
Themes
This section summarizes the Key Areas identified by teachers on the first day of the event. Despite the variety of ideas that teachers generated, most fit within the general categories of teacher well-being, relationships, collaboration, time and technology. Appendix I contains a complete list of the ideas collected from teachers.

Teacher Well Being
Many of the areas that teachers identified related to how their well-being affected their ability to succeed at their work. Teachers identified a need for a positive school environment overall, but also attending to their own personal concerns so that they could have the energy to support students. Health stood out as a salient issue, as teachers highlighted the importance of both physical and mental aspects of health, especially managing stress.

Relationships
Teachers expressed a desire for improved relationships between students and staff, as well as with administration, parents and the broader Coronado community. Teachers noted the importance of investing time in getting to know students and working to build relationships. Toward these ends, teachers indicated a need for students and staff to have positive connection outside of the classroom through school-based programs like tutoring, clubs, sports and mentoring. Overall, teachers emphasized that building these relationships as process that requires time, effort and opportunity for positive relationships to develop.

Collaboration
Teachers indicated that they wanted improved collaboration among all stakeholders, including ways that teachers work with administration, parents and one another. They identified productive meetings and effective communication as ways to support effective teaching. Teachers also wanted more opportunities to collaborate with one another and develop positive working relationships.
Technology
Technology emerged as an important area, with teachers stressing the need for technology needs to be reliable and well-integrated with school facilities. Otherwise, teachers pointed out, the use of technology could itself become a problem. Along similar lines, teachers noted that time must be devoted to training teachers on some technology resources.

Time
Among the Key Areas mentioned, teachers most frequently identified a need for time to attend to the other areas they had identified. One group of teachers noted that the school day simply does not allow enough time for teachers to attend to all of their responsibilities. Another group suggested that the way time was structured during that day did not align with the needs of the community. Groups also noted a need for time to collaborate with peers, plan, analyze data, work with students, and learn to use new technologies.

Pitches
On the second day of the event, teachers analyzed the Key Areas generated by students, parents and community members to get a clear sense of Coronado’s needs from different perspectives. In series of activities, teachers became familiar with all of the Key Areas and worked in groups to sort them into thematic categories. Afterward, teachers had an opportunity to see how other groups had sorted the Key Areas and reflect on the activity as a staff. As a cumulative activity, teachers synthesized all of the themes from Design Day events to create a “pitch” for improving CHS.

The Pitches that teachers presented contained detailed elaborations of the Key Areas they believed the CSI should focus on. In most cases, groups identified three main areas that often combined a number of ideas together. For example, a few groups combined the idea of teacher collaboration with ideas about changing the schedule and creating more time for professional development. In other cases, groups detailed how an idea related to all stakeholders in the school. For example, one group noted that improving relationships applied to students, support staff, teachers, parents, administration, feeder schools, and post-screening.
Appendices
# Appendix A: Community Design Day Output

*Indicates topic that each table chose to focus on

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Key Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1     | Develop a way to provide support for parents to engage/help/support/motivate the learning of their children  
Provide flexibility in the school schedule  
*Develop career/college preparation/exploration options for students |
| 2     | *Restructuring bell schedule  
Relevant work  
Teacher support |
| 3     | *Learning teams (communities): Access to learning groups focused on common goals and mentoring: a) Hold accountable, b) Goal setting - group activity - shared resources  
Technology: technology enhanced learning environment w/ cell phones crowd sourcing info and interactions. Internal campus social network  
Flexible/individual/self-directed: Students move at pace and ability with a college schedule model. With emphasis on growth, achievement and not standard grades |
| 4     | *Prioritizing teacher/family/student relationship thru community-school integration  
Strategic admin balancing purpose/priority |
| 5     | *Student engagement / active classroom: a) Less testing, b) Ill w/teachers, c) Extra adults in classroom  
More time for teachers: a) Observation cross subject, b) Plan, c) Time w/students, d) Adults, e) Exercise  
*College and career: a) Creating confident learners, b) Relevant, c) Explore |
| 6     | Engagement throughout entire student experience (parents, teachers, classes, extras)  
*Student-centric learning w/individual education paths per student  
Connection to career paths |
| 7     | NA |
| 8     | Communicate / collaborate to establish high expectations for all stakeholders  
*Support for students- mentors, guidance counselors |
| 9     | *Feeling valued: school that adapts to the community, not students trying to adapt to the school  
Establish trust through relationships: Break the structure  
Flexible schedule: a) Student ownership of learning, b) stu/teacher expectations |
| 10    | *time : usage / allocation /management / giving enough time / sequencing & schedule  
Connectivity / engagement / relationship building  
Student choice in course offerings |
| 11    | *Connect school to career exploration opportunities on site  
Schedule structure that prioritizes student-teacher interactions (individualized)  
Student choice in course offerings |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>*Flexible schedule: choice and autonomy: More electives - tech shop, careers (graphic design, hospitality)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parent buy-in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>*Flexible school schedule: how do we manipulate current schedule to allow for student exploration and teacher autonomy (curriculum, pedagogy, content).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student engagement: approaches or pedagogy that facilitates student learning and rethinks how we teach / get students engaged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher time: how do we rethink the teacher’s day to allow for more teaching time, time w/ kids - less admin tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Student motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>*Student engagement / leadership / recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parent engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Bell schedules: making our student fit our bell schedule instead of us fit into their ideal schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>*Vocational training: training/dual enrollment opportunities for students to increase confidence and engagement of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>design their individual education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Students Design Day Output
The following data has been directly transcribed from the artifacts generated during group activities (i.e. poster paper and post-it notes). Any changes or omissions have been made in the interest of clarity and protecting personally identifying information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Key Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>We are told we cannot achieve the highest standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People who are assigning work are not coordinated with each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers think students don’t have anything better to do than homework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English Class Structure: Prepares you to fail by:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Socratics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Grading Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Not Interesting (Outdated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inequality: Students aren’t given right to be comfortable and have freedom:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Dress Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Bathrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Phone Usage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Belittling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philosophies: Teachers need to be more engaging and care about what they teach students:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Enthusiastic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Constructive Criticism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Encouragement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Open Minded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Care more about student’s personal needs than grades (emotionally too – balance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Ex. Be like [name of teacher]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Coronado is so plain&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- No animals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- No ice cream machines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Poor pep assemblies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Not a large variety of food options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More Interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Less use of pen and paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- More technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Teachers should check for understanding and have 1 on 1 time with students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Test should be shorter and simpler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Homework is not always the content students know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>School starts too early</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lunch time is too short (food is nasty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Longer passing periods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 6 | English Department |
|   | □ Unreasonable amount of homework (Ex. Read Atlas shrugged and Grapes of Wrath in 1 month) |
|   | □ Grading Scale |
|   | □ Socratic (Lack participation) |

| 6 | Lunch |
|   | □ Don Time (Bring that back!!!) |
|   | □ Lines are too long…. (People push) |
|   | □ Open Campus (For juniors and seniors) |
|   | □ More FRESH food options |

| 6 | Extra-Curricular |
|   | □ Field Trips! |
|   | □ Dances |
|   | □ Bring “Step” back |

| 7 | Motivation |
|   | □ Motivation through positive interactions |
|   | □ No time to interact with peers during class/between classes |
|   | □ Student-Teachers |
|   | □ Student-Security |

| 7 | School=Passing NOT Learning |
|   | □ Excessive testing |
|   | □ 4 Point Scale |
|   | □ “They have the core that they are supposed to follow, but all students learn differently” |

| 7 | Knowing how kids learn |
|   | Not just getting through the material |
### Appendix C: Teacher Design Day 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Key Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1     | Communication between staff, parents, students and administration must be emphasized in order for student success  
Technology training must be increased to fit each individual teacher’s needs  
The environment of the school should be reflected in a positive manner daily |
| 2     | Technology: Improve tech infrastructure so that it supports district requirements for teacher and student active usage of devices  
Fire Drill/ Lockdown: Administration equally disperse drills so that they do not always land on the last day of the month/during same time period  
Last Minute: Improve back up plan for last minute changes through the day |
| 3     | Technology issues: Technology is great….when it works, but most days it does not  
Time Management: There is not enough time during the school day to get everything done  
Lack of student engagement makes teaching challenging |
| 4     | Stress: Need to reduce the stress level  
Money: Need to increase available funding  
Tired: Need to find ways to invigorate the staff both physically and mentally |
| 5     | Technology and facilities need to work well together, be more reliable, and consistent  
Meetings: Need to be more productive, organized, efficient, on task, and pertinent (with practical application) |
| 6     | Technology can be a negative  
Unprepared teachers fall into a “snowball”  
Timing and structure of day doesn’t meet needs of school community |
| 7     | Technology down – any tech that will affect a teacher’s day/plan  
Student behavior – any behavior/action of students that is detrimental to their education or others  
Personal health – being physically & mentally fit |
| 8     | Time: planning, team time with colleagues, to work with students  
Curriculum: More flexibility to monitor and adjust  
Getting to know students and build relationships |
| 9 | **Access to reliable technology – printer, copier, internet, laptop (class sets)**
Need opportunities to make positive connections outside of class
  - Tutoring
  - Clubs
  - Sports
  - Mentoring

|  | **Need time with peers**
  - Problem solving
  - Bonding
  - Collaboration
  - Celebration
  - Planning
  - Data analysis |
Appendix D: Pitches for how to improve Coronado High School: Results from Teacher Design Day 2

Pitch #1: CHS and TET= Endless Opportunities!
- Commitment to a safe and healthy learning environment
- Honor towards all stakeholders time
- Showing respect towards all tools and resources

Pitch #2: Connectedness
- Sincere relationships
- Open communication
- Complete investment
Voices: Student, teacher, community
Pitch #3: Coronado

- **Engagement:**
  - Buy in/commitment from students and staff alike
  - Relevant lessons (Why? How?)
  - Real world connections
  - Increase time= increase creative thinking/application
  - PowerPoint application
  - Simulation

- **Time**
  - Flexibility
  - Alternative block schedule
  - Meets needs of students, parents, and teachers
  - Tech takes time across the board
  - Increase time= increase creative thinking/application

- **Technology**
  - Digital citizenship
  - Real world application/career readiness
  - Access to work in working technology
  - Proper/effective teacher training

Voices: Students, parents, teachers, administrators, district, community

Resources: Money, time, technology, support

Pitch #4: Coronado Learning Tree

- **The Management**
  - Meetings
  - Collaboration
- Schedules
- Prep

- Curriculum
  - Tech
  - Class offerings
  - Relevance
  - Flexibility

- Relationships
  - Students
  - Support staff
  - Teachers
  - Parents
  - Administration
  - Feeder schools
  - Post-screening

---

Pitch #5: Coronado Success Initiative

- Relationships
  - Foundation to success
  - Building up feeder schools
  - S:S
  - T:T
  - T:S
Technology
   o Preparation
      ▪ Career
      ▪ College
      ▪ Real world
   o Global world
      ▪ Global citizen
   o More 1:1
      ▪ Chrome book
      ▪ Tablet
      ▪ iPad

Time
   o Structures
   o Never wise to waste time
   o Collaboration
      ▪ T:T
      ▪ T:S
      ▪ S:S

Voices: Teachers, students, administration, district representatives, community members, parents
Pitch #6: CSI Topics

- **Collaboration**
  - Teachers collaboration via PD
  - Need more collaboration to overcome learning obstacles. We cannot do it by ourselves. As a result, we need to rebalance the time we have.

- **Time**- administration: giving more time

Voices: Students, teachers, administrators, parents, community

Pitch #7: Thematic Areas

- **Parent involvement**
  - Bridge gap between school and home disconnect
  - Everyone, but especially the non-involved parent population

- **Soft skills/lessons beyond content**
  - Developing a skillful leaner
  - Student-teacher while including relevant job qualifications
  - Time and effort; communication with professional

- **Technology and teacher resources**
  - Ensure that technology is NOT barrier to teachers 21st century skill development

Voices: Teachers, IT, administrators, district

Resources: Money, accountability, responsible
Pitch #8: Success

- The empathetic experience (the whole learner)
- Communication to build relationships
- Build structures for success
  - Scaffolding
  - Daily structures
  - Choices

Voices: Parents, community, students, district teachers

Resources: Time, money, community involvement, post-secondary involvement
Pitch #9: We need to!

- Build relationships in order to understand each other’s needs!
- Create community

Voices: Staff, students, parents, community

Resources: Technology, funding, community projects