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School–Based Staff Developers
Pilot at 25 elementary and middle schools

JCPS Staff Developer Exemplars:

- “How am I building capacity?”
- “How am I impacting student achievement?”
- “Have I created a clear, solid plan for my work?”
- “How do I know and what evidence do I have?”
Systemic and Coherent Plan

- SBSD Reflect
- Determine Next Steps
- Monitor Daily

- SBSD Exit Slips

- PD Log
  - Intentional Follow-up
  - Opportunities to Collaborate

- Rationale
  - Reflect on Work
  - Set Measurable Goals

- Monthly Meetings

- Student Data
  - Student Work
  - KCCT
  - Formative
  - MDA/MPA/SPA

JCPS Analytical & Applied Sciences
1. **What is the impact of the School–Based Staff Developers on instructional practice?**
   Data: SBSD exit slips, teacher surveys, PD logs, classroom observations

2. **To what extent has the leadership capacity of the school–based staff developers been strengthened and sustained in the 25 pilot schools?**
   Data: SBSD exit slips of PD, classroom teacher surveys, SBSD surveys

3. **To what extent have teachers and School–Based Staff Developers increased their content knowledge and pedagogy?**
   Data: PD Central survey results

4. **To what extent has student proficiency in Math and Science improved?**
   Data: CASCADE Diagnostic and Proficiency Assessment results, KCCT Math and Science scores, District NAEP scores
## Timeline of Evaluation Activities 2010–2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| August – October | Develop evaluation questions and design  
Identify measures for data collection  
Collaborate to complete briefing book |
| November - December | Develop surveys for teachers and school based staff developers  
Collect 1st semester program data (work logs, SBDM exit slips, PD surveys)  
Analyze program data |
| February       | Report on 1st semester implementation and initial findings                 |
| March - April  | Collect 2nd semester program data (work logs, SBDM exit slips, PD surveys)  
Analyze program data |
| June           | Compile evaluation report to include results from: proficiency assessments, teacher surveys, classroom observations, exit slips  
Report on spring survey results |
| Sept 2011      | Update evaluation report to include 2011 KCCT results                      |
What is the impact of the School–Based Staff Developers on instructional practice?
Key Activities

- School based staff developer’s key activities were coded into five general categories and then sub-categories (Planning with Teachers, Working with students, Classroom work, Data collection/Analysis, School/District Work)

- The categories were established from the SBSD’s narrative regarding their activities

- Initial inter-rater reliability was 75% agreement

- Over 3,000 activities were coded
Key Activities – Fall Semester

- **Classroom Work**
  (Co-teaching, modeling, observing, assisting)
- **Working with Students**
  (Interventions, successmaker, testing)
- **Planning with Teachers**
  (Planning, coaching, debriefing)
- **Data Analysis**
  (Identify RtI students, individual and group analysis, walkthrus)
- **School/District Work**
  (General, specialty and district work)
Key Activities – Spring Semester

- Classroom Work (Co-teaching, modeling, observing, assisting)
- Working with Students (Interventions, successmaker, testing)
- Planning with Teachers (Planning, coaching, debriefing)
- Data Analysis (Identify RtI students, individual and group analysis, walkthrus)
- School/District Work (General, speciality and district work)
Key Activities – Fall Semester

August
- Class Work: 23%
- Work with Students: 2.1%
- Planning with Teachers: 0%
- Data Analysis: 46.9%
- School/District Work: 3.7%

September
- Class Work: 23.8%
- Work with Students: 5.6%
- Planning with Teachers: 10%
- Data Analysis: 46.4%
- School/District Work: 9.5%

October
- Class Work: 18.1%
- Work with Students: 8.6%
- Planning with Teachers: 20%
- Data Analysis: 43.6%
- School/District Work: 7.8%

November
- Class Work: 21.2%
- Work with Students: 11.5%
- Planning with Teachers: 30%
- Data Analysis: 39.9%
- School/District Work: 8.8%

December
- Class Work: 25.1%
- Work with Students: 13.8%
- Planning with Teachers: 40%
- Data Analysis: 34.5%
- School/District Work: 8.3%
## Key Activities – Spring Semester

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Class Work</th>
<th>Work with Students</th>
<th>Planning with Teachers</th>
<th>Data Analysis</th>
<th>School/District Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions About Key Activities

- School–Based Staff Developers (SBSD) spend a majority of their time planning with groups of teachers in the form of embedded professional development, followed by working with teachers in their classrooms. The least amount of time is spent analyzing student data.

- The SBSD’s focus has changed over the course of the fall semester, with a decrease in time spent on school/district work and an increase in working with students.
To what extent has student proficiency in Math and Science improved?
## School Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># Days of Support</th>
<th>% Free &amp; Reduced Price Lunch</th>
<th>2010 KCCT Math Proficiency</th>
<th>2010 KCCT Science Proficiency</th>
<th>2010 Combined Math &amp; Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elementary SBSD Schools</strong></td>
<td>4 Days</td>
<td>72.8%</td>
<td>56.90</td>
<td>50.31</td>
<td>53.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comparison Schools</strong></td>
<td>.4 Day</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
<td>56.73</td>
<td>50.70</td>
<td>53.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Middle SBSD Schools</strong></td>
<td>4 Days</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comparison Schools</strong></td>
<td>1 Day</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
JCPS Elementary Schools Math Proficiency Assessments

SBSD

1st Assessment: 70.7
2nd Assessment: 69.1
3rd Assessment: 69.9

Comparison

1st Assessment: 70.2
2nd Assessment: 66.8
3rd Assessment: 68.0
JCPS Elementary Schools Growth from Diagnostic to Proficiency Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SBSD</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>70.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficiency</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>69.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>68.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficiency</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
JCPS Elementary Schools
Science Proficiency Assessments

SBSD

1st Assessment
2nd Assessment
3rd Assessment

Comparison

1st Assessment
2nd Assessment
3rd Assessment

73.5  74.1  75.1

72.5  73.9  74.9
JCPS Middle Schools Math Proficiency Assessments

1st Assessment | 2nd Assessment | 3rd Assessment

SBSD: 61.0 | 59.1 | 59.5
Comparison: 59.2 | 61.7 | 59.0
JCPH Middle Schools 
Growth from Diagnostic to Proficiency Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Diagnostic</th>
<th>Proficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>61.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>59.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>59.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>61.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>59.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SBSD 
Comparison
JCPS Middle Schools Science Proficiency Assessments

Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st Assessment</th>
<th>2nd Assessment</th>
<th>3rd Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SBSD</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>60.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>58.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Relationship Between SBSD Work and Proficiency

- There was a statistically significant correlation between SBSD practice and student outcomes at the elementary level.
  - There was a positive relationship between the amount of SBSD time spent working in the classroom and the gains from diagnostic to proficiency assessments in math (p=.01) and students’ proficiency in science assessments (p=.01).

- The schools with the SBSDs showed more student growth on average between the diagnostic and proficiency math assessments than a comparison group of schools, although the difference did not reach statistical significance.

- Elementary schools with SBSDs have higher rates of math proficiency (68.8%) when compared to a comparison group of schools (65.6%) as measured by district assessments. Schools with SBSDs also have higher rates of proficiency in science (74.5%) than the comparison group (71.6%).

- Middle schools with SBSDs have higher rates of proficiency in math (59.2%) than a comparison group (58.4%). However, middle schools with SBSDs did not show higher rates of proficiency in Science.
# Focus Group/Survey Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role Group</th>
<th>Sample Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>To what extent has the collaborative work between the SBSD and teachers improved: • Analyzing student work and data to plan next steps in instruction • Use of questioning strategies • Use of formative assessments • Intentionality in planning math and science lessons • Level of understanding of inquiry • Level of content knowledge • Differentiated instruction • Classroom management • Knowledge of available resources and supporting materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBSD</td>
<td>How has this experience impacted your: • Understanding of inquiry • Level of content knowledge • Ability to work with teachers in changing instructional practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals and SBSD</td>
<td>• To what extent have you been able to implement the collaboration plan? • What changes are you seeing in the instructional practices of teachers as a result of the collaborative model with a school based staff developer? • What do you see as the strengths of this model? What are your greatest challenges? • What can the district do to help strengthen the implementation of this model at your school?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
89.8% of elementary classroom teachers and 85.1% of middle school teachers with SBSD support responded that their use of inquiry based instructional approaches improved over the year.

91.4% of elementary classroom teachers and 79.9% of middle school teachers with SBSD support responded that their level of content knowledge improved over the year.

100% of School based staff developers reported that their level of content knowledge improved and 94.1% indicated that their level of understanding of inquiry improved over the course of the year.

69% of elementary teachers and 64% of middle school teachers indicated that their schedule allows for adequate time to teach math and science.

75.7% of elementary school teachers and 80% of middle school teachers reported that they had access to expertise when implementing district math and science programs.

78.5% of elementary teachers and 83.3% of middle school teachers report that they receive appropriate resources needed to effectively support implementation of district math and science programs.