Evaluation Questions

1. What activities were accomplished?
2. Was there evidence of changes in instructional practice?
3. Was there evidence of effective & sustainable leadership & management systems?
4. Did RF improve students’ reading skills? Reduce special education referrals?
5. What factors helped or hindered the implementation & effectiveness of APS RF?
Methods

- Teacher Survey
- IC questionnaire & group interview
- Cadre leader group interview
- CCT teacher survey
- Assessments (TPRI, KDPR, DIBELS, Terra Nova)
- Special education referrals
- Event & participation logs
Limitations

- Only 1 year of implementation
- Only 1 year of data.
- Assessments are not designed to answer outcome evaluation questions.
- Self-report biases inherent in teacher surveys.
- This report doesn’t include OEL results.
1. What activities were accomplished?

District-level:

- 21 assessment trainings (DIBELS, TPRI).
- 9 Six Components trainings for IC’s.
- 12 OEL events for 4 schools (technical assistance, training, observations).
- Ongoing coordination with IC’s, cadre leaders, schools, district, PED.
- Ongoing assessment assistance to schools.
1. What activities were accomplished (cont’d)?

Instructional Coaches:

- Spent over 30 hours per week, on average, on RF-related activities.
- Most regular support to teachers was in technology use and data use.
- Also provided support re: explicit instruction, differentiated instruction, educator team facilitation, palm use, materials acquisition.
2. Was there evidence of changes in instructional practice?

Dimensions:

a. Use of data to plan instruction & interventions.

b. Explicit instruction in the 6 components.

c. Use of small group differentiated instruction to address targeted needs.

d. Use of appropriate instructional materials.
2a. Use of data to plan instruction & interventions.

Gap between teachers’ perceptions of own practice & experts’ perceptions:

- Teachers rated selves very high.
  - 96% said they used formative assessments for ongoing instructional decision-making.

- IC’s and cadre leaders reported that teachers were good at giving assessments but not as skilled at interpreting & using results.
2a. Use of data to plan instruction & interventions (cont’d)

Staff reported that assessments made teachers:

- More aware of students’ risk areas.
- More likely to employ interventions to address reading deficiencies. [quote]
“Before if teachers had a low reader, they’d say, ‘well I taught it.’ Teachers tend to go back and teach the same thing if it didn’t work the first time. But a lot of times kids need an entirely new strategy. With the TPRI and the trainings they feel they have a pocketful of strategies to try.” “Which they didn’t have before.” -- Instructional Coach
2a. Use of data to plan instruction & interventions (cont’d).

Aggregate reports & grade-level discussions of assessment results:

- Allowed teacher to identify & discuss successful instructional strategies.
- Motivated teachers to learn new techniques & curricula.
- Increased teachers’ sense of accountability.
- Helped teachers become comfortable with public discussions about their instructional practices & deficiencies.
2b. Explicit instruction in the 6 components.

The amount of time teachers spent on reading instruction varied:

- 46.8% said they spent more time on reading instruction in 2003-04 than they did in 2002-03.
- The frequency with which teachers used collaboration time to discuss reading instruction and the 6 essential components varied from once a month to 4 or 5 times per month.
2b. Explicit instruction in the 6 components (cont’d).

Gap between teachers’ perceptions of own practice and experts’ perceptions of their practice.

- Most teachers reported high levels of integration of the 6 essential components into their reading practice [Figure 1].
- 89%-99% reported practicing explicit instruction in essential components [Table 1].
Figure 1. Percent Teachers Reporting Integration of Essential Components into Reading Instruction “A Lot” or “Completely.”

- Phonemic Awareness: 76%
- Comprehension: 92%
- Fluency: 78%
- Oral Lang Devt: 87%
- Phonics: 81%
- Vocabulary: 87%
2b. Explicit instruction in the 6 components (cont’d)

IC’s more conservative about teacher practice:

- Teachers acquired knowledge, awareness and understanding of the 6 components but most did not fully implement them.
- Teachers had not yet developed “automaticity” in their practice of the essential components.
- Teachers may have practiced skills but not yet practiced them well.
2b. Explicit instruction in the 6 components (cont’d).

IC’s reported that:

- Teachers were aware of own limitations (what they didn’t know and needed to learn) and therefore were more likely to request resources and/or help in specific areas of reading and writing.

- Teachers showed interest and took action to deepen knowledge, skills and practice.
2c. Use of Small Group Differentiated Instruction

Increased awareness among teachers that:

- Student groupings should be fluid over the course of the year.
- Assessment results can help them group students appropriately and change groupings as students’ needs change.
2c. Use of Small Group Differentiated Instruction (cont’d)

- Over two-thirds of teachers reported devoting 60 minutes or more daily to differentiated reading instruction.
- Almost two-thirds said they had students work in heterogeneous (mixed ability) small groups daily.
- Just over half said they provided students with differentiated class work on a daily basis.

[Figure 2]
2c. Percent Teachers Reporting Small Group Differentiated Instruction

- Devote 60 mins+ daily to differentiated reading instruction: 69%
- Students work in mixed ability small groups daily: 63%
- Give differentiated classwork daily: 54%
IC’s played an important role in securing instructional materials and other resources for teachers.

RF funds allowed schools to purchase new instructional materials.

Teachers indicated improvements in the availability of instructional materials at their schools and in their classrooms [Figure 3].
Figure 3. Percent Teachers Reporting Adequate Instructional Materials

- Independent reading library stocked appropriately: 52% (Fall), 73% (Spring)
- Manipulatives available & well organized: 40% (Fall), 74% (Spring)
3. Was there evidence of effective & sustainable leadership & management systems?

- According to teacher reports, time for reading instruction increased at all 8 schools [Figure 4].
- By spring, at least half the teachers at all 8 schools reported having at least 90 minutes for reading instruction, with minimal or no interruptions.
Figure 4. Percent Teachers Reporting 90 Minutes + for Reading Instruction
3. Was there evidence of effective & sustainable leadership & management systems?

- Principals at 4 schools discussed effective reading instruction with staff 2 times or fewer all year [Figure 5].

- Almost half of teachers at one school (42%) reported that their principal had never participated in discussions about effective reading instruction with them.
Figure 5. Percent teachers reporting that their principal discussed effective reading instruction with them 2 times or fewer.

- School 1: 70.6%
- School 2: 59.4%
- School 3: 46.6%
- School 4: 73.7%
- School 5: 92.3%
- School 6: 38.9%
- School 7: 25.7%
3. Was there evidence of effective & sustainable leadership & management systems?

- Just over half (54%) of teachers surveyed said their schools provided the support they needed to employ instructional strategies for helping at-risk students.

- Over one-quarter (29%) said their schools did not [Figure 6].
Figure 6. Percent Teachers Reporting Adequate School Support for Employing Strategies for At-Risk Students.

- 54% Agree
- 29% Disagree
4. Did RF reduce special education referrals?

- 5 out of 8 schools (63%) showed a decrease in the number of K – 3rd grade special education referrals (for testing) compared to the 3 preceding years [Figure 7].

- 30% of teachers surveyed said they referred fewer students to Special Education for testing.
Figure 7. Special Education Referrals (K-3) by School & Year

Graph showing the number of referrals by school and year from 2000-01 to 2003-04. Schools include Alamosa, Atrisco, D Gonzales, Duranes, Hodgin, La Mesa, Tomasita, and Whittier.
4. Did RF improve students’ reading skills?

KDPR -- Kindergarten

- 7 out of 8 schools increased the proportion of kindergarten students achieving proficiency (compared to 2002-03) [Figure 8].
Figure 8. KDPR Percent Proficient by School: 2002-03 Compared to 2003-04

- School 1: 96% (2003), 77% (2004)
- School 2: 85% (2003), 80% (2004)
- School 3: 94% (2003), 76% (2004)
- School 4: 86% (2003), 61% (2004)
- School 5: 89% (2003), 75% (2004)
- School 7: 91% (2003), 84% (2004)
- School 8: 61% (2003), 77% (2004)
4. Did RF improve students’ reading skills?

DIBELS

- Half of the 8 schools decreased the proportion of kindergarten students “at risk” for future reading failure due to **Letter Naming Fluency**.

- All schools decreased the proportion of students “at risk” due to **Nonsense Word Fluency** in at least 1 of 2 grade levels.
4. Did RF improve students’ reading skills?

DIBELS (cont’d)

- 7 out of 8 schools decreased the proportion “at risk” due to Initial Sound Fluency.

- All schools decreased the proportion “at risk” due to Phoneme Segmentation Fluency in both K and 1st grade (except one which did so only in 1st grade).
4. Did RF improve students’ reading skills?

DIBELS (cont’d)

- Schools had the hardest time decreasing the proportion “at risk” due to Oral Reading Fluency.
Figure 9. Proportion of Pre-Post DIBELS Administrations Showing Decrease in % “At Risk” for Future Reading Failure.
4. Did RF improve students’ reading skills?

TPRI/Tejas-LEE – 1\textsuperscript{st} and 2\textsuperscript{nd} Grades

- Administered for the first time to all 1\textsuperscript{st} & 2\textsuperscript{nd} grade RF students in 2003-04.
- Test provides excellent diagnostic information for instructional decision-making.
- RDA and teachers collaborated to develop grade-level cut-scores so that proficiency levels similar to ARI could be calculated.
- One year of results does not allow evaluative analyses. Future years will permit comparisons.
4. Did RF improve students’ reading skills?

TerraNova – 3rd Grade

- Terra Nova scores from 2003-04, 2002-03 and 2001-02 show no consistent pattern of improvement or lack of improvement in 3rd grade reading skills.
5. What factors helped the implementation & effectiveness of RF?

- Essential Components trainings for IC’s
- Monthly IC and cadre leader meetings at TLS
- RDA technical assistance and training
- District-level staff (RF project coordinator, assessment coordinator, technical support coordinator, OEL coordinator)
- Training by grade level.
5. What factors helped the implementation & effectiveness of RF?

- Funding to purchase instructional materials and computer supplies and to pay for RFET stipends.
- Making reading the one area of a school’s focus. Need clear & specific commitments from principal.
- Palm pilots, Mclass
- DIBELS progress monitoring
5. What factors **hindered** the implementation & effectiveness of RF?

- Principal lack of commitment to complete RF vision and/or lack of understanding about RF
- School commitments to many different initiatives.
- SINOI school pressure, finger pointing, negativity.
- Some school schedules constrained time for teacher collaboration.
- Lack of accountability regarding how principals used RF funds. Concern about supplanting.
5. What factors hindered the implementation & effectiveness of RF?

- SINOI schools have to do PD without leaving the school.
- Lack of consensus/clarity about cadre leader role.
- IC’s sometimes diverted to coordinate data collections, data entry, etc. away from coaching.
- Lack of collaboration from technology staff (at one school).
- Teacher turnover (significant at one school).
Conclusions

- Teacher knowledge of explicit reading instruction in 6 components improved.
- Practice of explicit instruction is emerging.
- 1st year assessment results indicate RF holds promise for improving students’ reading skills.
- 1st year results indicate RF holds promise for decreasing referrals to special education.
Conclusions (cont’d)

- District supports are essential to successful implementation.
- Principals hold key to RF implementation and outcomes.
- Great variation in principal leadership & involvement in RF
- APS RF focused activities at the levels of teachers & IC’s. Not as much at level of school administration and systems.
Recommendations

- More/continued PD in interpreting data results and selecting interventions.
- Set and reinforce expectation for strong Educator Teams, within which decisions are made about budget & other issues, and whose members take care of data entry & other key tasks.
- Pay stipends to Educator Team members.
Recommendations

- Create formal signed contracts with school principals delineating expectations & responsibilities.
- Review contracts & school-level implementation regularly.