



wireless generation®

**State Board of Education  
Lead Partner Meeting**

*August 1, 2012*



# Agenda

- 1 Overview of Lead Partner Intervention
- 2 Key Results in 2011-12
- 3 Teacher Perspectives
- 4 Next Steps, Objectives for 2012-13
- 5 Questions and Answers

*Appendix – Detailed Deliverables/Metrics*



## WG Lead Partner Intervention Details

Wireless Generation focused on building staff capacity to use data to guide instruction. Services included:

Intervention Element	Topics Covered
<b>Teacher PLCs</b> (twice/week, 40 minutes)	Using data to drive differentiated instruction and student engagement
<b>Teacher Coaching</b> (once/week, 60 minutes)	Extension of topics from PLC, to ensure classroom implementation
<b>Leadership PLCs</b> (once/week, 85 minutes)	Using data to provide instructional support to teachers, manage resources, set consistent vision
<b>Leadership Coaching</b> (once/week, 60 minutes)	Extension of topics from PLC, to ensure implementation
<b>Professional Development</b> (as needed)	Special Education – IEP writing, scope and sequence workshop, parent night workshops

## WG Lead Partner Intervention Details

Services also included project management to intervention on track:

- Conducted needs assessment
- Measured success through teacher and leader growth metrics, aligned to teacher evaluation system and TNTP's work
- Project management included:
  - Weekly status calls with IDOE, IPS, and GWCHS
  - Weekly status calls with TNTP and GWCHS
  - Weekly delivery of intervention activity calendar
  - Weekly delivery of service delivery logs
  - Monthly Progress Reports
  - Monthly SBOE meeting preparation (general and Community Engagement)

## WG Lead Partner Intervention Details

All elements of the intervention focused around four instructional priorities:

- Priority #1 – Increase Rigor of Classroom Instruction
- Priority #2 – Examine and align critical resources (people, time, funding) to support instructional priorities
- Priority #3 – Evaluate/revise special education support services to increase special/general education staff support
- Priority #4 – Distribute leadership across expanded formal and informal assignments

## Key Results – ISTEP Growth

GWCHS teachers led students to impressive gains, moving almost 10 percentage points in one year.

Year	Total % Pass
2012	32.0%
2011	22.4%
2010	22.1%
2009	19.5%

- Math scores increased by almost 20 percentage points; testament to the Math team's collaboration and data-based planning
- This year will focus on helping Math teachers share best practices with ELA teachers, and will build strategies for teaching reading/writing across the content areas

## Key Results – ECA Growth

In the high school grades, overall scores increased slightly year-over-year.

Year	ECA Test N	ECA Pass %
2012	271	45.8%
2011	300	42.0%
2010	305	26.6%

- Content-specific PLCs will help middle school Math teachers share best practices with high school Math teachers
- A focus on RtI will provide early intervention to support reading difficulties in high school

## Summary of Impact – Qualitative

We have begun to see shifts in teacher practice and habits of mind that will lead to increased student achievement.

- Standards, learning objectives, and essential questions are posted; students are becoming more aware of expectations
- Teachers are beginning to use data and evidence to plan and adjust lesson plans and instruction
- Leadership team has delegated non-instructional responsibilities to enable more time in classrooms
- Special Education leadership is more accountable and taking responsibility for instruction (through data-driven IEPs)
- RtI is being implemented for next year, initial planning is taking place this summer





# Teacher Perspectives

## Andrew Maxson

7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade Social Studies teacher

At GWCHS since 2002

National Honor Society Advisor, Web Page Administrator

## Susan Sparks

8<sup>th</sup> grade ELA teacher  
AVID and College Summit teacher

At GWCHS since 2004

Advancing Academic Excellence (AAE) Project Director for AP Courses

## Next Steps for 2012-13

We have already begun planning and providing services for the upcoming school year with Principal Ezell and the staff at GWCHS.

- Agreed on scope of work, school-wide instructional priorities, and performance goals to meet school's needs
- Lead Partner kickoff is scheduled for August 2
- Scheduled PLC, coaching, PD, and intervention time for teachers and leaders
- Developed PLC roadmaps to outline topics for the year

## Instructional Priorities for 2012-13

We have jointly developed a new set of school-wide instructional priorities with GWCHS leadership.

1. Increase student engagement and instructional rigor
2. Build teachers' capacity to meet the educational needs of English Language Learners (ELL)
3. Assist in the implementation of a Response to Intervention (RtI) program
4. Improve reading and writing across all content areas in middle school
5. Support leaders in managing school change

# Elements of 2012-13 Lead Partner Intervention

To support the new instructional priorities, the elements of this year's intervention will build upon the initial progress of teachers and leaders.

- Professional Learning Communities (PLCs), organized by content area and grade level
- School Leadership PLCs and individual administrator coaching
- Individual teacher coaching with differentiated support
- Targeted Professional Development
- Implement a Response to Intervention (RtI) Process
- Increase Cross-Partner Collaboration

## Staffing for 2012-13

We will begin the year with dedicated onsite coaches, who have been working with leaders and teachers already this summer, and additional part-time specialists as needed.

- Monica Peavy, Project Manager
- Claudia Rodriguez, Leadership Coach
- Bryan Edney, Coach
- Kimberly Hill, Coach
- Alicia Pangrac, Intervention Specialist
- Meredith Smith, Special Education Consultant
- Leslie Kerner, Executive Sponsor
- PD Consultants TBD as needed

# Questions & Answers



# Appendix

Detailed Deliverables/Metrics by Priority




# Metrics and Results – Priority #1

To increase rigor of classroom instruction, we measured teacher and leader skills in five areas, on a rubric scale of 1-4 (4 being Mastery).

Metric	Score (Pre)	Score (Post)		Ending Score Details	Mastery Score Details
Evidence: Uses relevant student data	1.5	2.0	↑	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recognizes patterns</li> <li>Begins to see necessary adjustments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Uses multiple sources of evidence to plan/adjust</li> <li>Uses data to make class, grade, school decisions</li> <li>Works with colleagues to determine formative assessment</li> </ul>
Student Engagement and Questioning Strategies	1.5	2.2	↑	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Elicits responses from select students</li> <li>Engages majority of students in responding to questions</li> <li>Begins to ask questions that drive deep understanding</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Uses purposeful, data-driven questioning techniques,</li> <li>Regularly asks questions that require application</li> <li>Has students transferring learning to new contexts</li> </ul>



## Metrics and Results – Priority #1, cont.

Metric	Score (Pre)	Score (Post)		Ending Score Details	Mastery Score Details
Differentiation – Pace and Method	2.0*	1.9		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Begins to modify lessons based on major subgroups</li> <li>• Some division of whole/ small group instruction</li> <li>• Some mixture of instructional practices in intervention</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistently adjusts lessons</li> <li>• Determines appropriate strategies based on individual student data</li> <li>• Modifies strategies per real-time observations</li> <li>• Supplemental materials incorporate varied strategies</li> </ul>
Assessments: Teacher Checks for Understanding	1.5	2.0		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses predetermined curricular assessments</li> <li>• Attempts to adjust instruction using data</li> <li>• Provides limited student feedback</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Makes real-time adjustments</li> <li>• Prepares a variety of valid assessments</li> <li>• Provides feedback to students that is high-quality and timely</li> </ul>
Leadership – Providing Relevant Teacher Feedback	1.0	1.5		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Observation/feedback sessions occur sporadically</li> <li>• Focus on non-instructional elements of classroom practice</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Observation/feedback sessions occur regularly</li> <li>• Focus on engagement strategies, instr. practice</li> <li>• Teachers report meaningful feedback from instructional leaders</li> </ul>

## Metrics and Results – Priority #2


To examine/align critical resources, we completed a series of deliverables targeted at providing leaders with more time to give higher quality instructional feedback to teachers.

- Protect instructional focus of administrators
  - Completed time study for each administrator, including observations conducting “regular work day responsibilities”
  - Coached each admin on time management strategies
  - Helped administrators spend 25% more time in classrooms
- Create master schedule development plan
  - Provided input into Principal Leser’s scheduling process, to ensure common content planning time in 2012-13
- Develop teacher growth plans
  - Created 28 Individual Teacher Development Plans (for each core teacher); shared with leadership and each teacher

## Metrics and Results – Priority #3

To evaluate/revise special education support services, we coached teachers on using differentiation techniques, and completed deliverables aimed at increasing support for special education.

- Conduct Special Education program audit
  - Provided audit and delivered report of findings and recommendations in April
- Identify/plan for additional training for Spec Ed plan, skills
  - Initial training in June, additional training planned

Metric	Score (Pre)	Score (Post)		Ending Score Details	Mastery Score Details
Differentiation for Special Education	1.5	1.9		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adheres to IEP</li> <li>• Differentiates instruction when other Gen. Ed. students also need support</li> <li>• Works with Spec. Ed. staff during common planning</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regularly plans with Spec. Ed. staff to modify upcoming instruction/ assessment</li> <li>• Connects all students with appropriate external resources/ opportunities</li> </ul>

## Metrics and Results – Priority #4

To distribute leadership across expanded assignments, we helped additional administrators and stakeholders take on leadership roles, allowing principal and VPs more time in classrooms.

- Identify and engage others in the leadership team
  - Added guidance and compliance directors to leadership team, bringing new perspectives and capacity
- Coordinate student support with appropriate community partners
  - Launched Community PLC
  - Got commitment from community partners to increase academic support in their activities
- Broaden responsibility and career experience of Vice Principals and teacher leaders
  - Several VPs / teacher leaders were promoted to perform higher-level roles