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S.T.A.T. Evaluation Model

Professional Development
- Administrators
- S.T.A.T. Teachers
- Classroom Teachers

Measurable Outcomes
- Year 1+
  - Classroom Environment
- Teacher Practice
- Digital Content
- Year 1+
  - Student Engagement
- Year 2+
  - P21 Skills

Goals
- Years 3/4+
  - Student Achievement
    - MAP
  - PARCC
    - Graduate Globally Competitive Students
Data Sources

• S.T.A.T. Teacher Program Survey (BCPS survey)

• Classroom observations in Lighthouse Elementary Schools (10), Phase 2 Elementary Schools (10), Lighthouse Middle Schools (7), Phase 2 Middle Schools (7), Lighthouse High Schools (3) (OASIS-21 Instrument)

• Digital content usage (BCPSOne)

• Student Focus Groups
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Survey: PD Helpfulness

- **Large group**
  - Not at all helpful: 8.64%
  - Only slightly helpful: 28.19%
  - Somewhat helpful: 60.28%

- **Small group**
  - Not at all helpful: 5.64%
  - Only slightly helpful: 16.76%
  - Somewhat helpful: 75.53%

- **Individual/1:1 support**
  - Not at all helpful: 11.53%
  - Only slightly helpful: 22.54%
  - Somewhat helpful: 81.62%

- **Independent learning**
  - Not at all helpful: 6.37%
  - Only slightly helpful: 22.54%
  - Somewhat helpful: 67.15%
### Survey: Desired Future PD Mode

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training workshop(s)</td>
<td>38.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed teacher development plan</td>
<td>9.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning walk or instructional walkthrough</td>
<td>31.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of data</td>
<td>23.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation of another teacher's classroom</td>
<td>37.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study group or lesson study</td>
<td>26.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation of model teaching or conducting demonstration lesson</td>
<td>42.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed an SLO</td>
<td>8.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9.60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
S.T.A.T. Teacher Program

• Classroom teachers positive towards the S.T.A.T. teacher
  – Knowledgeable and supportive
  – Available for support and resources

• Needs:
  – Clear definition S.T.A.T. teacher roles and responsibilities
  – Pacing of PD
  – Professionalism
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S.T.A.T. Experience

2014-2015

LH Grades 1-3

2015-2016

LH Grades K, 4, 5
Ph 2 Grades 1-3
LH Grade 6

2016-2017

Ph 2 Grades K, 4, 5
Ph 2 Grade 6
LH Grade 7
LH Grades 9-12
Observation Rating Scales

• Not observed: Not observed in class
• Rarely: Received little emphasis/time in class
• Somewhat/Occasionally: Receives modest emphasis/time in class
• Frequently: Receives substantial emphasis/time in class
• Extensive(ly): Highly prevalent in class
### Impact on Classroom Environment

#### Display of materials and resources that support independent thinking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Not Observed</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Extensive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1 (2014-15) Schools</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>34.38%</td>
<td>15.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2 (2015-16) Schools</td>
<td>50.70%</td>
<td>28.17%</td>
<td>21.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3 (2016-17) Schools</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>31.25%</td>
<td>28.75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Information displayed reflects content being taught

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Not Observed</th>
<th>General subject</th>
<th>Lesson-specific</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1 (2014-15) Schools</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>46.88%</td>
<td>46.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2 (2015-16) Schools</td>
<td>7.04%</td>
<td>43.66%</td>
<td>49.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3 (2016-17) Schools</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>47.50%</td>
<td>48.75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ < 5.0%
## Impact on Teacher Practices

### Teachers acting as coach/facilitators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Not Observed</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Somewhat/Occasionally</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Extensively</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1 (2014-15) Schools</td>
<td>15.63%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>56.25%</td>
<td>9.38%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2 (2015-16) Schools</td>
<td>9.86%</td>
<td>22.54%</td>
<td>39.44%</td>
<td>18.31%</td>
<td>9.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3 (2016-17) Schools</td>
<td>15.00%</td>
<td>21.25%</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Teacher presentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Not Observed</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Somewhat/Occasionally</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Extensively</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1 (2014-15) Schools</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>21.88%</td>
<td>34.38%</td>
<td>15.63%</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2 (2015-16) Schools</td>
<td>23.94%</td>
<td>30.99%</td>
<td>26.76%</td>
<td>14.08%</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3 (2016-17) Schools</td>
<td>36.25%</td>
<td>17.50%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>8.75%</td>
<td>17.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ < 5.0%
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# Impact on Student Engagement

## Students using digital tools for learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Not Observed</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Somewhat/Occasionally</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Extensively</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 1 (2014-15) Schools</strong></td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
<td>21.88%</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
<td>15.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 2 (2015-16) Schools</strong></td>
<td>36.62%</td>
<td>16.90%</td>
<td>9.86%</td>
<td>22.54%</td>
<td>14.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 3 (2016-17) Schools</strong></td>
<td>47.50%</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Students completing independent work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Not Observed</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Somewhat/Occasionally</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Extensively</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 1 (2014-15) Schools</strong></td>
<td>9.38%</td>
<td>15.63%</td>
<td>28.13%</td>
<td>31.25%</td>
<td>15.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 2 (2015-16) Schools</strong></td>
<td>36.62%</td>
<td>16.90%</td>
<td>9.86%</td>
<td>22.54%</td>
<td>14.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 3 (2016-17) Schools</strong></td>
<td>16.25%</td>
<td>7.50%</td>
<td>16.25%</td>
<td>31.25%</td>
<td>28.75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Impact on P21 Skills

### Learning incorporates authentic/real world contexts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59.38%</td>
<td>60.56%</td>
<td>62.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Observed</td>
<td>9.38%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>15.49%</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat/Occasionally</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>11.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Extensively</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ < 5.0%

*Legend:* Not Observed, Rarely, Somewhat/Occasionally, Frequently, Extensively
Student Perceptions of S.T.A.T.

• Appreciate technology
  – Grading, electronic communication, access to information, organization, creativity
• Mixed views on time spent using
  – Testing increases time
• Devices used primarily for independent work
• Issues with Internet connections, access
S.T.A.T. Evaluation Model

Professional Development
- Administrators
- S.T.A.T. Teachers
- Classroom Teachers

Measurable Outcomes
- Year 1+
  - Classroom Environment
- Teacher Practice
- Digital Content
- Year 1+
  - Student Engagement
- Year 2+
  - P21 Skills

Goals
- Years 3/4+
  - Student Achievement
    - MAP
  - Graduate Globally Competitive Students
    - PARCC
Student Achievement

• Reading/ELA
  – Upward trend for Lighthouse Grades 1-3 students
  – Upward trend for non-Lighthouse Grades 1-2

• Mathematics
  – Upward trend for Lighthouse Grades 1-3 students
  – Upward trend for non-Lighthouse Grades 1-3 students

• Lighthouse outperforming non-Lighthouse except Grade 1 Reading
Grade 1 Reading: MAP

![Graph showing percentage met growth expectations for Lighthouse Schools and Non-Lighthouse Schools over years 2013-14, 2014-15, and 2015-16.](image)
Grade 2 Reading: MAP

Percentage Met Growth Expectations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Lighthouse Schools</th>
<th>Non-Lighthouse Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(n = 10) (n = 97)
Grade 3 ELA: PARCC

Percentage Met or Exceeded Growth Expectations

2014-15 (Year 1)  2015-16 (Year 2)

- Lighthouse Schools ($n = 10$)
- Non-Lighthouse Schools ($n = 96$)
- State ($n = 866$)
Grade 1 Mathematics: MAP

Percentage Met Growth Expectations

2013-14  (Pre-Program)  2014-15  (Year 1)  2015-16  (Year 2)

Lighthouse Schools  (n = 10)  Non-Lighthouse Schools  (n = 97)
Grade 2 Mathematics: MAP

Percentage Met Growth Expectations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Lighthouse Schools (n = 10)</th>
<th>Non-Lighthouse Schools (n = 97)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Grade 3 Mathematics: PARCC

Percentage Met or Exceeded Growth Expectations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Lighthouse Schools (n = 10)</th>
<th>Non-Lighthouse Schools (n = 96)</th>
<th>State (n = 866)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014-15 (Year 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16 (Year 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendations

• Narrow S.T.A.T. teacher position expectations, with focus on instructional leadership
• Offer professional development on desired teaching practices
• Increase modelling of inquiry-based and project-based lessons
• Increase opportunities for device use in pairs or small groups
• Monitor and proactively address technology glitches
Conclusion

• Classroom teachers view S.T.A.T. teacher favorably

• Professional development appears to be influencing teaching practice in accord with the logic model
  – Active student learning and device use integrated with core teaching practices
  – Stronger impact as school experience increases

• Students have positive views towards using devices for learning

• Positive trends in student achievement