



Collaborative Data Inquiry Practitioner Toolkit: Team Reflection Protocol Example

February 2026



IHDSC

February 2026

Authors:

Adam Parrott-Sheffer, Harvard Graduate School of Education

Carmen Williams, Harvard Graduate School of Education

Candice Bocala, Harvard Graduate School of Education

Instructions:

The Collaborative Data Inquiry (CDI) Practitioner Toolkit's Team Reflection Protocol is designed to support the collective sense-making of your CDI Practitioner Toolkit Data Dashboard. This completed example of the protocol template is provided as a sample and reference as teams prepare to use the Team Reflection Protocol. Additional guidance on using the protocol and the Data Dashboard is available in the CDI Practitioner Toolkit's User Guide.

The research reported here was supported by the Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education, through Grant #R305A200292 to SRI International. The opinions expressed are those of the authors and do not represent views of the Institute or the U.S. Department of Education.

Team Reflection Protocol Example

Step 1: Examine the CDI evidence and capture low-inference observations (“noticings”) and questions (“wonderings”) you have about the team’s collaboration. Gather as many as you can find and then highlight the 2–3 ideas in each column that you think are most significant or helpful.

Noticings	Wonderings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our overall highest ratings were in Norms and Structures and Focus on Data Inquiry • Our overall lowest rating was in the area of data use • For Team 4 and 14, Norms and Structures were their lowest scores, and their overall scores were the lowest of the 17 teams • Within the Data Use construct, Data engagement received the highest score • Within the Data Use construct, equity-focused data use received the lowest score • Meeting agendas and relational trust were the highest-rated indicators 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are strong norms and structures being transferred from other meeting types or initiatives? • I’m curious about teams with a low <i>focus on data inquiry</i> score, but a high <i>constructive dialogue</i> score. • How do meeting agendas support or distract from the indicator ‘equity-focused data use’? • To what degree does the indicator of relational trust predict success? • What’s the average member per team? Do larger teams struggle with Norms and Structures? • Is it easier to score Norms and Structures?

Step 2: After everyone has shared and grouped their noticings, capture the themes and groupings below.

Themes and groupings	What additional evidence might you gather and how will you gather it?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting agendas appear to be a strong support. • Teams aren’t having the equity-focused conversations evaluators would expect • Teams may be bringing other topics into their data meetings 	<p>How much training have team members had? Are there equity-focused prompts in the meeting agenda? Is the data provided disaggregated by subgroups?</p>

Step 3: Discuss the following prompts and take notes.

- (1) Which team(s) is represented? For example: Is the data about teachers from a certain grade or department? School leaders?

Our focus for improvement is on school-based leadership teams. We have 17 teams charged with holding regular data inquiry meetings.

- (2) What are the assets or strengths of these teams related to collaborative data inquiry? How do we know?

Leadership teams appear to have set expectations around how they will work together, given the high ratings for Norms and Structures (5.4 of 7). Most teams were rated highly for meeting agendas and protocols. It is possible that communicating the agenda and aligning protocols contributes to relational trust, which is also an asset.

- (3) What are the learning gaps or challenges (e.g., related to knowledge, skills, or beliefs) related to collaborative data inquiry? How do we know?

A clear learning gap is in the equity-focused data use indicator. Only 6% of teams received a high rating, 47% received a low rating.

- (4) Who is responsible for supporting the team(s) to improve their collaborative data inquiry work? For example, school leaders, coaches, or district leaders might provide support for the team(s). What resources (e.g., time, people, materials) do they need in order to provide better support for the team(s)?

The Chief Academic Officer provides professional development on data inquiry cycles and supplies schools with assessment data. Principal supervisors check in with building leaders on progress towards goals.

We need to make equity-focused data use part of the structure of the meeting. Either the protocol for discussing data or the data itself must create the opportunity to discuss data by subgroup. Currently, the CAO provides professional development on culturally responsive teaching and some district-wide data reports are disaggregated by subgroup. However, local assessments are rarely provided in that format. Principal supervisors can support building leaders in developing a menu of protocols to prioritize equity-focused conversations.

- (5) What is the next step for the team(s)? What is the next step for those who support

the team(s)?

To include a question that has us consider the experience of teams at the margins in our reflection protocol and to ensure data is provided with information about groups we wish to prioritize and consider their differing experiences.

- (6) What would it look like for the team(s) if we successfully close learning gaps? Describe what it will look like and sound like in a data meeting, using the language of the CDI Practitioner Toolkit.

They will be more analytical in their approach to thinking about differing experiences and they will express more comfort talking about differences and their accountability for addressing different improvement needs.

Step 4: Summarize your story below in 2–3 sentences and decide who you will share your story with, how you will share it, and when you will share it.

Our school-based data teams have developed strong routines for holding data inquiry meetings. There appears to be great value in establishing meeting roles and protocols through a timed agenda. However, we are finding a need to focus our dialogue through an equity lens. Our central office leaders will be working on strategies to help teams prioritize equity-focused data use during our summer retreat.

This message will be shared by our superintendent at the closing district leadership meeting.



SRI Education, a division of SRI, is helping federal and state agencies, school districts, major foundations, nonprofit organizations, and international and commercial clients tackle some of the most complex issues in education to help students succeed. Our mission is **to reduce barriers and optimize outcomes for all children, youth, and families**. We do this by conducting high-quality research, supporting use of data and evidence, helping to strengthen state and local systems, and developing tools that improve teaching and accelerate and deepen learning. Our work covers a range of topics, including early learning and development, student behavior and well-being, teaching quality, digital learning, STEM and computer science, literacy and language arts, and college and career pathways.

© 2026 SRI International. All rights reserved. SRI International® is a registered trademark, and SRI Education™ is a trademark of SRI International. All other trademarks are the property of their respective owners.

Silicon Valley

(SRI headquarters)
333 Ravenswood Avenue
Menlo Park, CA 94025
1.650.859.2000

Washington, DC

1100 Wilson Boulevard
Suite 2700
Arlington, VA 22209
1.703.524.2053

education@sri.com

www.sri.com/education-learning/