

# Collegial Circle Final Report

Please complete all information on this form. After it is complete, send it to the Teacher Center along with other supporting documentation. Electronic copies are preferred whenever possible.

## COLLEGIAL CIRCLE INFORMATION

Title of Circle: Using Scratch to Enhance Student Engagement Standards Area: \_\_\_\_\_  
Facilitator: Angela Carpin School(s): Mendon Center  
Beginning Date: 12-18-23 Ending Date: 5-2-24 # of Hours: 8  
*Please submit copies of the following to this report:*

- ✓ Collegial Circle Attendance Log
- ✓ Collegial Circle Meeting Log
- ✓ Samples of strategies implemented, materials created, or student work samples where applicable
- ✓ Collegial Circle Reflection Sheets - completed by each participant

## COLLEGIAL CIRCLE DESCRIPTION

### What was the anticipated goal(s) of this Collegial Circle?

Our anticipated goal was to become familiar with the free coding language, Scratch, which enables students to create stories, games and animations and to identify ways it can be used to increase choice and engagement for students in content areas. We hoped to become familiar enough with the tool to teach students to use it and to create and/or identify lessons in which Scratch can be tool to demonstrate learning.

### What grade level(s) and or subject area(s) will benefit from this Circle?

Our work will help inform teachers' (classroom, instructional tech, and others) decisions about using technology tools to enhance student learning experiences. Although our determination is that Scratch does NOT meet the needs of our students and programs at this time, this information helps us direct our energy toward more productive options.

### What level of Guskey's Professional Development Evaluation did you select for this Circle?

We selected Level 2: Participants' Learning for this collegial circle.

## FINAL REFLECTIONS

### Was the goal of your Collegial Circle met? Please explain.

Our goal was met, but the outcome was not what we anticipated. Our group worked to become familiar with Scratch through reading ([The Everything Kids' Scratch Coding Book](#)), referencing online resources (information about MIT's development of Scratch, Scratch vs. Scratch Jr, user/teacher reviews), building Scratch projects. During each meeting we discussed how the things we had learned and applied (or attempted to apply) would or would not transfer to the elementary classroom. We evaluated the learning experience through the eyes of both teacher and student. After several months of trying to become comfortable with the tool, we determined that the learning curve for both teachers and students would be too steep for it to be viable option with our students – the time and energy it would take to introduce the tool would outweigh any increases in student engagement. Additionally, we found the tool to be difficult to understand and apply. This lead us to conclude that, if it were to be taught to students, the instructor would need to have specialized knowledge/skill sets not common with classroom teachers.

### How did the members of this Collegial Circle assess whether the outcome was met? What evidence was utilized to assess your progress?

We completed Scratch activities suggested in the book. Some of these activities were completed as a group and others were completed independently. In both cases, we discussed as a group:  
What skills were applied in the activity? Do these skills resemble those we want our students to develop?

Can we envision a way to transfer or adapt the activity to enhance current curriculum or engage students as they demonstrate their learning in our current curriculum?  
Do the activities apply concepts (math, science, ELA) that students encounter in our core curricular areas?  
Do we believe we could prepare students to be capable of completing the activity (or similar activity)?

**How did your work impact teaching and learning? [Include student work samples, lesson plans, peer reviews, etc.]**

We did not apply our work to student learning, since our conclusion was that using Scratch would not be an effective option in our classrooms. Our work greatly benefited our own learning though: We learned that we did not want to pursue Scratch for student engagement, and discussion about challenges with Scratch led us to identify other tools that may provide more engagement with fewer difficulties. We discussed such alternate options as coding.org, Dash, BeeBots, Ozo bots for coding exposure and experience and BookCreator, Adobe Express, PowerPoint, and FlipGrid as alternate options as digital tools to demonstrate learning.

By familiarizing ourselves with Scratch, we can now also make informed decisions about allowing students who are already familiar with Scratch to access and use the tool as an enrichment option during WIN time or other independent working times.

**Did your work align with the Level of Evaluation you identified in your proposal? Please explain.**

Yes. We identified Level 2: Participant learning. We are all much more familiar with Scratch, including what it can do and how it works. We are also better informed about what it would require in order for us to involve students with the tool.

**Please included any additional comments you would like to share with the Collegial Circle Committee. This may include unanticipated outcomes, next steps, new learning, etc.**

We became interested in learning more about Scratch after hearing students rave about how much they enjoyed using it at home and observing it in use in the Fairport STEM lab. After learning more about Scratch and spending many hours trying out different functions, we determined it was not a tool we could use effectively in our classrooms. While highly engaging for students who are passionate about it, Scratch instruction would be better suited for an extracurricular club or for a dedicated STEM lab with a trained instructor.