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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

Special School District is committed to program evaluation as a foundation for the continuous improvement process. The program evaluation framework approved by the Board of Education (2003) guides Special School District staff in conducting program evaluation activities to measure, analyze and effectively manage special education services and operations. The Instructional Design Program Evaluation was a formative process occurring from November 2004 through July 2005. This summative report details the process, results and recommendations that will guide future improvement activities for this population.

Stakeholders were invited to be on the advisory committee members, work group members, and to participate in the study. The questions posed by the committee and approved by the Board of Education were designed to provide a review of the use of effective instructional design by SSD teachers in their first four years of teaching.

The focus of the program evaluation was to answer the following questions approved by the Board of Education.

1) What are the indicators of effective instructional design for students in special education and technical education programs?
2) What components of effective instructional design are implemented by SSD teachers in their first four years of teaching?
3) What factors (pre-service training, staff development, administrative support, and service delivery) influence the use of effective instructional design?

Literature Review

The program evaluation committee researched effective instructional design for students who are at-risk and students who are diagnosed with a special education diagnosis, subsets of the overall school age population. Two basic frameworks are used to discuss the literature review of research: the instructional core and the teaching/learning process.

The Instructional Core

The instructional core is described in the work of Elmore, Richard and Burney, Deanne (1997) although numerous variations can be found that describe the same
concepts. Effective instruction focuses on the interrelationship between the teacher, the student, and the content.

Cohen, David K. and Ball, D. Loewenberg (1999) describe the teacher relationship to the student and the content as the teacher’s “conceptions of knowledge, understanding of content, and flexibility of understanding; acquaintance with students’ knowledge and ability to relate to, interact with, and learn about students; and their repertoire of means to represent and extend knowledge, and to establish conducive classroom environments”. The student relationship is the student’s experiences, understandings, interests, commitments, and engagement. The student’s experience, prior knowledge and habits of mind influence how they comprehend, interpret, and respond to materials and teachers. The instructional content can be thought of as “what students need to know and do” and the materials used to mediate student engagement in learning.

The Teaching/Learning Process

The teacher works within the instructional core to design specific instruction. This process is described as the teaching/learning process. The teacher assesses the needs of the student in relation to the content, and plans instruction. Instruction is delivered based on the teacher’s assessment. Ongoing reflection and evaluation on student learning and the teacher’s instruction fuels this continual cycle or process.

Assessment

The beginning point for instruction is deciding “what to teach” through the assessment of student characteristics (e.g., skill levels, interests, prior knowledge), task characteristics (e.g., sequence, cognitive demands) and classroom characteristics (e.g., instructional groupings, materials). The teacher then makes decisions about “how to teach” based on instructional performance standards, methods and materials, and instructional pace to support student success. Effective instruction uses the assessment and analysis of the students’ current levels of skill development and expected skills to determine gaps in performance that form the basis of instruction (Algozzine et al., 1997, p. 19).
Planning

Instructional planning is complex and occurs not only prior to instruction but during and following instruction (Harper, K. and Jackson, R., 2003). Teachers use data from their assessments to plan effective instruction, determine goals, prioritize content, and individualize instruction taking into account their understanding of the student’s prior knowledge, background experiences and learning needs (Lenz, K., 2001). According to Algozzine, et al., (1997), effective instruction contains 75% previous knowledge and 25% unknown material.

When planning, the teacher must consider the frequency and quality of opportunities to involve the students in the content (Cohen, David K. and Ball, D. Loewenber, 1999). A large body of research consistently supports the idea that the more time students devote to a particular subject or skill, or their time on task, the more likely they are to master it. High engagement maximizes the students’ attention on critical learning.

Student engagement can be increased through technology. Technology extends the flexibility of the material used by the teacher and the student in the learning and teaching process. Teachers access technology to transform and adapt materials enabling teaching teams to function with greater efficiency and effectiveness (Harper, K., and Jackson, R., 2003).

According to the U.S. Department of Commerce, African-American, Asian American, and Latino students will comprise approximately 57 percent of all students in the United States by 2050. Contrarily, students in American schools are increasingly taught by middle class, white females (Howard, T., 2003). Never before has the need to introduce culturally relevant materials, instructional strategies, and teacher preparation been more apparent. This is an important component to consider as teachers mediate the learning and teaching connections. Howard’s (2003) research supports, “teachers must be able to construct pedagogical practices that have relevance and meaning to the students’ social and cultural realities “. According to Gay (2000), culturally relevant pedagogy uses “the cultural knowledge, prior experiences, frames of reference, and performance styles of ethnically diverse students to make learning relevant. Howard states this quality of teaching can only be achieved through critical teacher reflection, awareness and planning.

Delivery

The learning needs of students dictate the delivery of instruction (Cambourne, B., 1999). However, common to all of the research is the need for systematically planned, explicit, accurate instruction that is focused on specific learning needs. The delivery of instruction is meaningful and develops the student’s thinking skills.
Prior to new content, students need to review previous learning and be able to anticipate the focus for the new learning. The teacher must focus their instruction and the attention of the students on what they will be learning, how the lesson connects to previous learning, and why they need to learn the content (Englert, C., Tarrant, K., & Mariage, T., 1992). Researchers (Lenz, B. Keith, Ellis, E. S., & Scanlon, D., 1996) note that many students do not automatically make these connections. During the body of the lesson new skills are described and modeled. Students are given the opportunity to practice. Explicit teaching allows teachers, through demonstration, to make visible the thinking processes. Teachers look for gaps in prior knowledge and/or confusion about a specific skill or understanding (Cambourne, B., 1999). Teachers who are responsive during instruction continuously assess student learning, make specific instructional accommodations to meet student needs, and provide elaborated feedback. (Knight, J., 2004).

During instruction the teacher is mindful of student performance, adding scaffolding when needed and gradually increasing student responsibility for their learning as they become more fluent and confident. Generalization is then planned for students to use the skills learned across a variety of settings. Students who are at risk or have special education diagnoses need instruction in an environment that models where and when a skill is needed and the opportunity to problem solve how to use the skill in the “real world” (Englert, C., Tarrant, K., and Mariage, T., 1992).

**Reflection and Evaluation**

Effective teachers respond to student learning on an ongoing basis using their evaluations to modify their teaching. Frequent progress monitoring is a hallmark of effective teaching when it is followed by altering and modifying content and presentation according to the students’ reactions to instruction. Teachers use their evaluations to make on-the-spot decisions to shape future lesson content and presentation (Knight, J. 2004). Viadero (2004) found in high poverty, high performing schools, “two thirds of the teachers surveyed said they used test and other data at least several times a month to understand their students’ skills gaps, and sometimes several times a week.” A direct relationship was found between the teacher’s reflection and evaluation of instruction and their students’ performance. Both the quality of teaching and student learning increased as a result of reflection and evaluation.

In the area of technical education, the “High Schools That Work” program uses a foundation reflection and evaluation: “Assessment, evaluation, and feedback should drive the process and implementation of reform”.
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Effective instruction depends upon the teacher’s ability to mediate and connect the student to the content and themselves. The following factors are found to make an impact on the implementation of effective instruction:

1. Pre-service teacher preparation
2. Administrator support
3. Professional Development with embedded job support
4. Instructional environment and service delivery

**Methodology**

There were eight methods used to collect data: Literature review, Administrator Observation Checklist, Teacher Survey, and Classroom Observation of first year teachers, Student Interviews, Public Forum, Teacher Summatives, and Cost Analysis.

**Results**

The committee members met to review, assimilate, and analyze the program evaluation data. Through discussion and questioning, the committee identified areas of strength and “progressing” that were noted across multiple data sources.

**Strengths**

Based on the data sources, teachers, students, administrators and facilitators working with the new teachers to develop their skills, indicate strengths in describing and modeling new skills. The new teachers and their administrators also indicate strengths in 1) Providing direct instruction to teach skills and strategies to ensure that students have access to and benefit from general education curriculum, 2) Teaching strategies and content based on student’s individual needs, 3) Facilitating the practice of skills and strategies taught and 4) Using techniques to promote maximum student engagement.

The discrepancy of teacher perception and administrator observation should be noted since administrators rated teachers lower in: the use of assessments to make instructional decisions, regular monitoring of student performance through informal and formal assessments, changing classroom instruction based on observation of interactions and student questions, teaching strategies and content based on the student’s individual needs, and describing and modeling new skills. These areas are still considered strengths due to their high ratings. Certainly the overall results show new teachers and administrators agree that new teachers are demonstrating all but two of the quality indicators evaluated in this program evaluation.
Progressing

Both the teachers and administrators indicate “progressing” in the use of a post organizer and the integration of technology into instruction.

Cost Analysis

To analyze the costs associated with providing staff development and support for the new teacher, the following factors were calculated:

1. Payroll costs for New Teacher Orientation: facilitators and presenters. ($7,409.00)
2. Yearly payroll costs for professional development and support for new teachers based on one-fourth of the area coordinator salary, two-thirds of each of the 5 instructional facilitators salary, one eighth of three regional facilitators and one fourth of two regional facilitators. This percentage reflects the amount of time devoted to new teachers in the FY05 school year. ($365,604.00)
3. Instructional materials and printing for New Teacher Orientation and the professional development throughout the year. ($22,152.00)
4. Substitute pay for all new teachers attending three days of training. ($70,821.00)
5. Total amount of new teachers for FY05. (258 teachers) This number includes all new teacher level hires, including experienced and beginning teachers who participated in the year 1 Academy I program in the 2004-2005 school year. Totals costs from #1,2,3, and 4 ($465,986.00) were divided by the number of teacher level staff (258) for the average cost per teacher. ($1,806.00)
6. Mentor stipends for training and mentoring. ($10,174.95)
7. Mentor costs were divided by the number of beginning teachers (159) in FY06. ($63.98) The average mentor cost and the average cost per teacher cost in #5 ($1,806.00) is added to the total in #5 to calculate the total annual cost to train and support the beginning teacher. ($1,869.00)
8. Additional yearly costs for the new teacher to complete the professional development required by the district was calculated by adding the costs in # 2,3,4 and dividing by # 5. ($1,777.00)

The average cost for the first year of the program for new teacher level staff is $1,869.00 per beginning teacher. The total estimated cost for the teachers’ professional development for their first four years of employment is $3,646.00 per teacher. Monies for new teacher professional development are a combination of the Comprehensive School Personnel Development budget, Senate Bill 380: Professional Development Committee budget, and “local effort” budget.
Limitations

The data collected for this evaluation provided the committee with a significant amount of information that had not previously been reviewed as a whole to lead towards systemic improvement. However, in the process of data analysis, the committee noted several limitations that may have affected the reported results. These limitations should be taken into consideration when interpreting the results and designing future program evaluation activities.

1. Although there was a parent on the committee, additional parent input was minimal.
2. The questions related to the factors that impact instruction are open to different interpretations. It is not clear if teachers and administrators rated items as “no positive impact” because these factors did not matter to them or because the absence of these factors has a negative impact on instruction.
3. Survey fatigue limits reliability of responses
4. Student interviews represented the voice and opinion of students; however, actual student outcomes were not collected.
5. Pre and post observations of technical education teachers would have been a helpful source of data.

Recommendations

The recommendations address identified needs in the area of instruction. Action plans will be developed to address the recommendations and align with the SSD Rolling Plan objectives.

1. Collaborate with the technology specialists and facilitators to investigate the challenges new teacher have to integrating technology into instructional practices.
2. Continue training with new teachers and administrators in: 1) the use of ongoing data from assessments to plan and evaluate instruction, 2) providing closure at the end of a lesson using a post organizer, 4) the use of teaching meta-cognitive skills and 3) implementing effective instruction in a variety of service delivery models.
3. Share the results of this program evaluation with the universities involved in the program evaluation and explore opportunities to enhance partnerships.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background and Purpose

Special School District is committed to program evaluation as a foundation for the continuous improvement process. The program evaluation framework approved by the Board of Education (2003) guides Special School District staff in conducting program evaluation activities to measure, analyze and effectively manage special education services and operations. The Instructional Design Program Evaluation was a formative process occurring from November 2004 through July 2005. This summative report details the process, results and recommendations that will guide future improvement activities for this population.

Stakeholders were invited to be on the advisory committee members, work group members, and to participate in the study. The committee membership included facilitators, administrators, university professors and a parent (Appendix 1-1). The questions posed by the committee and approved by the Board of Education were designed to provide a review of the use of effective instructional design by SSD teachers in their first four years of teaching.

Focus for the Program Evaluation

The focus of the program evaluation was to answer the following questions approved by the Board of Education.

1) What are the indicators of effective instructional design for students in special education and technical education programs?
2) What components of effective instructional design are implemented by SSD teachers in their first four years of teaching?
3) What factors (pre-service training, staff development, administrative support, and service delivery) influence the use of effective instructional design?

Design of the Report

The report documents the review of current literature and the methodology used to evaluate the program. The results and discussion of data is based upon quality indicators that have been identified through literature review of effective instructional design for
students in technical and special education programs. The limitations of the program evaluation are addressed as well as recommendations of the advisory committee. The committee will develop action plans which will serve to guide the implementation of the recommendations that the Board of Education approves.
CHAPTER II

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Criteria

“Instructional Design” is defined as the process of assessment and planning, delivering and evaluating instruction for the purpose of this program evaluation. Effective instructional design is critical to the academic performance of students in SSD technical and special education programs across the county.

SSD’s Rolling Plan and CSIP plans focus on student performance as well as the professional development to support teacher implementation of effective instructional practices. Effective practices have been institutionalized in our organization through the revised SSD Teacher Evaluation (2004) and the SSD Professional Development Process (2004). SSD extends the skills of the newly hired teacher to meet the expectations of the district. Criterion from the teacher evaluation has been used to develop the skill sets for professional development.

Professional Development

The SSD Professional Development Process (2004) structures three actual strands for teacher learning based on years of SSD experience and specific skills sets. This professional development has evolved over the last 10 years. Teachers who are new to SSD and the teaching profession participate in a multi-year intensive professional development program with peer coaching, classroom visits and video reflection, to reinforce their knowledge and implementation of effective instructional practices.

“Academy I “describes the strand for new teachers. The skill sets (See Appendix 2-1) for their professional development are based on the three focus areas that support the goals of the district: 1) Student Behavior, 2) Quality Instruction, and 3) Student Performance/Literacy. Emphasis is placed on the following descriptors in the Quality Instruction strand:

1. Assesses student learning, uses assessment results in planning instruction and reflects on evidence of student learning. (Teacher Evaluation Standard 1, Criterion 1B, Descriptor 3, Indicators a and c, Criterion 1F Descriptors 14 and 15, Indicators a, b, and c).
2. Uses the components of lesson design -- an advance organizer, describes, models and facilitates the practice of these skills and strategies, teaches meta-cognitive
skills as part of the instructional process, and concludes the lesson through the use of a post organizer (Teacher Evaluation Standard 3, Criterion 3A, Descriptor 2, Indicators a, b, c, & d).

3. Demonstrates techniques to promote maximum student involvement/learning (Teacher Evaluation Standard 3, Criterion 3D, Descriptor 8, Indicator b).

4. Identifies cultural and diversity factors that contribute to student learning (Teacher Evaluation Standard 1, Criterion 1B, Descriptor 6, Indicator a).

Teaching Staff

This program evaluation looks at the implementation of effective components of instructional design, specifically by our SSD teachers who are participating in Academy I or who have completed the professional development program for new SSD teachers within the last 4 years. These teachers provide services to a wide variety of students enrolled in technical or special education programs across the county in a variety of settings.

Evaluation

The evaluation of effective instructional design is certainly a baseline study. In the past we have followed our new teachers during their “Academy I” professional development. Many of our “new teachers” continue to participate in SSD professional development, while others branch out into opportunities in their partner districts or in the community. Until now, we have not the opportunity to evaluate teacher implementation of effective instructional practices over an extended period of time.
CHAPTER III

LITERATURE REVIEW

Student achievement is a focus for all schools. A direct correlation can be made between student achievement and instruction. Many research studies have been conducted to determine the attributes of effective teachers and their instruction. The meta-analysis of the research projects in Texas and Tennessee (Tucker, Pamela D. and Stronge, James H., 2005) demonstrates this relationship. Both projects found elementary students taught by high performing teachers made significant gains in achievement scores over a three year period of time while students with low performing teachers made fewer gains and in some situations student achievement decreased. Looking at the broader picture of school reform, Darling-Hammond (1999) notes every aspect of school reform depends upon highly skilled teachers.

The program evaluation committee researched effective instructional design for students who are at-risk and students who are diagnosed with a special education diagnosis, subsets of the overall school age population. Two basic frameworks are used to discuss the literature review of research: the instructional core and the teaching/learning process.

The Instructional Core

The instructional core is described in the work of Elmore, Richard and Burney, Deanne (1997) although numerous variations can be found that describe the same concepts. Effective instruction focuses on the interrelationship between the teacher, the student, and the content.

Cohen, David K. and Ball, D. Loewenberg (1999) describe the teacher relationship to the student and the content as the teacher’s “conceptions of knowledge, understanding of content, and flexibility of understanding; acquaintance with students’ knowledge and ability to relate to, interact with, and learn about students; and their repertoire of means to represent and extend knowledge, and to establish conducive classroom environments”. The student relationship is the student’s experiences, understandings, interests, commitments, and engagement. The student’s experience, prior knowledge and habits of mind influence how they comprehend, interpret, and respond to materials and teachers. The instructional content can be thought of as “what students need to know and do” and the materials used to mediate student engagement in learning.
Over the last four years, this conceptual framework has guided many discussions within our district. The content piece continues to evolve as we think about the role of the SSD teacher. Depending upon the teaching context, content may be instruction in specific academic areas, technical skills, or strategies to access academic or technical content. The instructional core describes the crucial relationship between the learner, the teacher and the content.

The Teaching/Learning Process

The teacher works within the instructional core to design specific instruction. This process is described as the teaching/learning process. The teacher assesses the needs of the student in relation to the content, and plans instruction. Instruction is delivered based on the teacher’s assessment. Ongoing reflection and evaluation on student learning and the teacher’s instruction fuels this continual cycle or process.

Organization of the Literature Review

The program evaluation committee used the SSD Teacher Evaluation and the Academy I Professional Development skill sets, and the conceptual frameworks of the Instructional Core and the Teaching/Learning Process as a foundation for our discussions. Specific SSD performance indicators were used to clarify our focus on the Academy I: Quality Instruction skill sets. Each skill is cross-reference with the Teacher Evaluation standards, criterion, descriptors and indicators:

- Assesses student learning, uses assessment results in planning instruction and reflects on evidence of student learning. (SSD Teacher Evaluation Standard 1, Criterion 1B, Descriptor 3, Indicators a and c, Criterion 1F Descriptors 14 and 15, Indicators a, b, and c).

- Demonstrates techniques to promote maximum student involvement/learning (SSD Teacher Evaluation Standard 3, Criterion 3D, Descriptor 8, Indicator b).

- Identifies cultural and diversity factors that contribute to student learning (SSD Teacher Evaluation Standard 1, Criterion 1B, Descriptor 6, Indicator a).

- Uses the components of lesson design: an advance organizer, describes, models and facilitates the practice of these skills and strategies, teaches meta-cognitive skills as part of the instructional process, and concludes the lesson through the use of a post organizer (SSD Teacher Evaluation Standard 3, Criterion 3A, Descriptor 2, Indicators a, b, c, & d).
Factors that influence effective instruction are discussed to surface supports needed for effective instruction. These factors form a basis for some of the additional data collected through this program evaluation.

**Assessment**

The teacher relationship described by Cohen, David and Ball, D. Loewenberg (1999) can be observed through the teacher’s ability to assess student knowledge and skills and plan instruction based on their firm understanding of the content and the needs of the student. After delivering instruction, the teacher reflects on their teaching and student learning to continue the cycle of teaching and learning.

The beginning point for instruction is deciding "what to teach" through the assessment of student characteristics (e.g., skill levels, interests, prior knowledge), task characteristics (e.g., sequence, cognitive demands) and classroom characteristics (e.g., instructional groupings, materials). The teacher then makes decisions about "how to teach" based on instructional performance standards, methods and materials, and instructional pace to support student success. Effective instruction uses the assessment and analysis of the students’ current levels of skill development and expected skills to determine gaps in performance that form the basis of instruction (Algozzine et al., 1997, p. 19).

State and district-wide standards often inform and drive the definition of student standards (Jorgensen, C.M., 1997). The analysis of formal assessments and state and norm-referenced assessments are typically used for overall instructional planning; delineating student standards, curriculum, instruction, and assessment frameworks to define the key outcomes, topic, subjects, skills, and processes that are important for all students to master. These formal assessments often provide a way to assess whether students have met key concepts and skills (Wehmeyer et al., 2002, p. 125-126). These tests are useful in making decisions about what to teach: they tell the teacher the skills that students do and not have. They are limited in making decisions about how to teach (Algozzine, et al., 1997, p. 8).

Classroom assessments inform the teacher about the needs of the student based on the content and individual needs. Teachers use this information to determine the student’s instructional level and the extent to which instruction has been effective (Algozzine, et al., 1997, 21). Examples of classroom assessments are listed below:

1. Environmental inventories gather information about the skills and/or competencies that are necessary to function successfully in working and learning situations (Algozzine, et al., 1997, 21). The teacher analyzes which skills are already present.
then plans direct instruction on those skills necessary in the students’ natural environment.

2. Error analysis is used to determine the sources of errors in student work (Fleischner, J. E & Manheimer, M., 1997). Teachers analyze errors to determine what and how to teach.

3. Reading comprehension assessments identify reading behaviors, reading level, and document progress (Caldwell, J. S., 2002).

4. Informal observations of students and their level of engagement provide valuable information about the student and their learning within the school environment not captured on standardized tests (Stone, et al., 2004, p. 532).

5. Curriculum-based assessments (Tucker, J. A., 1987) provide professionals with an analysis of specific skills a student has mastered within a specific content area. These measurements provide professionals with data on general education outcomes. Curriculum-based assessments support the teacher in deciding what to teach. Students who receive instruction adjusted through the use of curriculum-based measurements show greater gains on global achievement tests than their peers (Stecker, P. M., & Fuchs, L. S., 2000).

6. Performance assessments are becoming prevalent in state testing. Performance assessments can be conducted through student portfolios. Assessments require students to create an answer or a product that demonstrate their knowledge or skills (Elliot, S. N., 1998). These performance measures are considered “authentic” when they reflect the conditions under which the student has constructed the meaning from instructional media such as texts, group discussions, individual projects, excerpts from student reading journals, written responses to open-ended questions, portfolios and videotapes of plays read by students and acted out in class (Stone, et al., 2004, p. 533).

Planning

Instructional planning is complex and occurs not only prior to instruction but during and following instruction (Harper, K. and Jackson, R., 2003). Teachers use data from their assessments to plan effective instruction, determine goals, prioritize content, and individualize instruction taking into account their understanding of the student’s prior knowledge, background experiences and learning needs (Lenz, K., 2001). According to Algozzine, et al., (1997), effective instruction contains 75% previous knowledge and 25% unknown material.
Snell (1993) states that a systematic approach to instruction is not only effective for academic content, but effective in teaching, daily living, oral communication, and transportation within the community. The goal for students with mild to moderate disabilities is to eventually use cues and strategies independently. Instruction for students with significant educational needs is planned to be purposeful and explicit, allowing scaffolding to prompt students to apply strategies.

Teachers must plan with their colleagues to provide a cohesive plan of study for students. In the case of special educators, collaborative team planning is essential to ensure the highest possible number of students successfully access the important concepts and skills in the general education curriculum. According to the Council for Exceptional Children, Special Education Teaching Conditions Initiative (2005):

“General educators bring rich curriculum and content specific resources, materials and knowledge, while special educators bring rich knowledge and resources in strategically altering instructional variables for students with exceptionalities and for teaching them the skills to become self-determined, achieving citizens. Special educators also bring expertise in intensive and focused instruction. This expertise is the hallmark of special educators.”

**Student Engagement**

When planning, the teacher must consider the frequency and quality of opportunities to involve the students in the content (Cohen, David K. and Ball, D. Loewenberg, 1999). A large body of research consistently supports the idea that the more time students devote to a particular subject or skill, or their time on task, the more likely they are to master it. High engagement maximizes the students’ attention on critical learning.

Marzano, et.al. (2001) have examined decades of research findings to identify a list of nine broad teaching strategies that have a strong and positive effect on student achievement. Effective teachers plan instruction that engages students at all phases of instruction:

1. At the *beginning* of a unit or lesson, the teacher includes strategies for setting learning goals (i.e. contracts and rubrics).
2. *During* a unit or lesson, the teacher includes strategies
   a. for monitoring progress toward learning goals (i.e. contracts, rubrics, and praise).
   b. for introducing new knowledge (i.e. contracts, rubrics, graphic organizers, summarizing strategies, frames, reciprocal teaching, note taking, webbing, cooperative learning, and a variety of grouping strategies).
c. for practicing, reviewing, and applying knowledge (summarizing, frames, reciprocal teaching, note taking, learning logs, webbing, homework, graphic organizers, and utilizing a variety of structured tasks to guide students, such as, decision making, problem solving, and investigation).

3. At the end of a unit or lesson, the teacher includes strategies for helping students determine how well they have achieved their goals (i.e. praise, contracts, opportunities for self-evaluation, and rubrics).

**Technology**

Student engagement can be increased through technology. Technology extends the flexibility of the material used by the teacher and the student in the learning and teaching process. Today, teachers can access new forms of media such as digital text, images, audio, multimedia and networked environments. This digital material increases the flexibility and the capacity to align content and tools more precisely with a wide range of student strengths and needs. Teachers access technology to transform and adapt materials enabling teaching teams to function with greater efficiency and effectiveness (Harper, K., and Jackson, R., 2003).

**Cultural and Diversity Factors**

According to the U.S. Department of Commerce, African-American, Asian American, and Latino students will comprise approximately 57 percent of all students in the United States by 2050. Contrarily, students in American schools are increasingly taught by middle class, white females (Howard, T., 2003). Never before has the need to introduce culturally relevant materials, instructional strategies, and teacher preparation been more apparent. This is an important component to consider as teachers mediate the learning and teaching connections.

Howard’s (2003) research supports, “teachers must be able to construct pedagogical practices that have relevance and meaning to the students’ social and cultural realities”. According to Gay (2000), culturally relevant pedagogy uses “the cultural knowledge, prior experiences, frames of reference, and performance styles of ethnically diverse students to make learning relevant. Howard states this quality of teaching can only be achieved through critical teacher reflection, awareness and planning.

**Delivery**

Effective teachers are distinguished by their lesson presentation (Englert, C., Tarrant, K., and Mariage, T., 1992). They maintain a balance between movement through
the curriculum and high levels of accuracy and mastery (Bickel, W. and Bickel, D., 1986), actively mediating the relationship between the content and the students (Brophy, J. E., 1983). The learning needs of students dictate the delivery of instruction (Cambourne, B., 1999). However, common to all of the research is the need for systematically planned, explicit, accurate instruction that is focused on specific learning needs. The delivery of instruction is meaningful and develops the student’s thinking skills.

**Advance Organizer**

Prior to new content, students need to review previous learning and be able to anticipate the focus for the new learning. The teacher must focus their instruction and the attention of the students on what they will be learning, how the lesson connects to previous learning, and why they need to learn the content (Englert, C., Tarrant, K., & Mariage, T., 1992). Providing a rationale for learning provides motivation and helps the student recognize when to use their new skills or strategy. Researchers (Lenz, B. Keith, Ellis, E. S., & Scanlon, D., 1996) note that many students do not automatically make these connections. Advance organizers can promote learning for students with low levels of achievement. They provide students with descriptions of what to listen for, narrow the student’s focus on the target of instruction, and improve comprehension of information.

**Body of the lesson**

During the body of the lesson new skills are described and modeled. Students are given the opportunity to practice. Explicit teaching allows teachers, through demonstration, to make visible the thinking processes. Teachers look for gaps in prior knowledge and/or confusion about a specific skill or understanding (Cambourne, B., 1999).

Manning (1988) supports the use of modeling and demonstrating concepts, strategies and procedures related to problem-solving. Specifically, modeling is not a rote or mechanical process, but is meta-cognitive in nature. Meta-cognitive modeling (talking about how one thinks or self-instructs) while completing the task is recommended when students are cognitively able to understand and engage in such self-talk. During this portion of instruction, students are provided a blueprint of what to do, and the self-talk to direct the student through the process independently. Meta-cognitive modeling is needed for students who are at risk or require special education (Cambourne, B., 1999, Forget, Mark A., 2004, Lenz, K., 1998, and Deschler, D., & Schumacher, J. 1986) although it may look different depending on the student’s level of cognition.

“To reason effectively and solve problems, a developing mind needs to learn what it feels like to be in charge of its own thinking and learning process...and inhibiting responses to distractions...the mind needs to be interactive with its own thoughts and with those of others; and reading, writing,
speaking, listening, and thinking skills are the means to that end….The most effective solution…is teacher modeling of correct use of language and thought processes.” (Forget, Mark A, 2004)

Effective instruction includes opportunities to check for understanding and rehearse concepts, skills, and strategies. Instruction promotes frequent and equal learner participation. Increased opportunities and practice are needed for students with mental retardation to achieve mastery (Bloom, B. S., Madaus, G. F., & Hastings, J. T., 1981). The content and pace is manipulated to promote a high success rate during teacher-led instruction. Errors are corrected immediately and feedback is specific. Teachers who are responsive during instruction continuously assess student learning, make specific instructional accommodations to meet student needs, and provide elaborated feedback. (Knight, J., 2004).

Post Organizer

Finally, students are instructed to generalize skills across settings, situations and conditions. Knight (2000), indicates that lessons are deliberately planned in terms of “what and how” content, skills and strategies will be taught to students. He describes a cycle of continuous review which allows the teacher to connect new content with previously learned information and information to be presented to the students in the future. During instruction the teacher is mindful of student performance, adding scaffolding when needed and gradually increasing student responsibility for their learning as they become more fluent and confident. Generalization is then planned for students to use the skills learned across a variety of settings. Students who are at risk or have special education diagnoses need instruction in an environment that models where and when a skill is needed and the opportunity to problem solve how to use the skill in the “real world” (Englert, C., Tarrant, K., and Mariage, T., 1992). Instruction involves multiple correct solutions and guides students in generating multiple strategies. Cambourne (1999) concurs by saying the most effective approach includes explicit presentation and thoughtfully organized learning opportunities that promote problem-solving rather than rote learning, with direct application to daily life.

Reflection and Evaluation

Effective instruction includes teacher reflection about their practices, carefully examining learners with diverse skills and disabilities (Harper, K., and Jackson, R., 2003). Effective teachers respond to student learning on an ongoing basis using their evaluations to modify their teaching. Frequent progress monitoring is a hallmark of effective teaching.
when it is followed by altering and modifying content and presentation according to the students’ reactions to instruction. Teachers use their evaluations to make on-the-spot decisions to shape future lesson content and presentation (Knight, J. 2004). Viadero (2004) found in high poverty, high performing schools, “two thirds of the teachers surveyed said they used test and other data at least several times a month to understand their students’ skills gaps, and sometimes several times a week.” The studies by Tucker and Stronge (2005) which were previously mentioned, found high performing teachers held themselves accountable for the delivery of instruction as well as their students’ response to instruction. Teachers used student work samples to reflect and evaluate their instruction. A direct relationship was found between the teacher’s reflection and evaluation of instruction and their students’ performance. Both the quality of teaching and student learning increased as a result of reflection and evaluation.

In the area of technical education, the “High Schools That Work” program uses a foundation reflection and evaluation: “Assessment, evaluation, and feedback should drive the process and implementation of reform”.

**Factors that Influence Effective Instruction**

Effective instruction depends upon the teacher’s ability to mediate and connect the student to the content and themselves. The program evaluation committee explored the following factors:

1. Pre-service teacher preparation
2. Administrator support
3. Professional Development with embedded job support
4. Instructional environment and service delivery

**Pre-service teacher preparation**

Teacher preparation traditionally has included a series of courses focusing on child development, instructional and assessment techniques and methods and materials related to specific content areas or, in the area of special education, special education diagnosis. Alternative teacher preparation programs have been developed to prepare individuals with subject area degrees and varying backgrounds. Several studies have focused on teacher effectiveness related to the amount and type of educational coursework in teacher preparation programs. Studies support the finding that fully prepared teachers with background knowledge of pedagogy are better able to recognize individual student needs and individualized instruction. Alternatively prepared teachers have more difficulty in the classroom than traditionally prepared teachers. A strong predictor of teacher
performance is the amount of coursework in education and content knowledge (Tucker, Pamela D., and Stronge, James H., 2005). Darling-Hammond, et al., (2005) studied teacher preparation through the Teach for America program. She and her colleagues found certified teachers are more effective than non-certified teachers. Teacher preparation appears to be strongly related to teacher effectiveness.

**Administrator Support**

Instructional leaders shape the environment in which teachers and students succeed or fail (National Staff Development Council, 2005). Administrative support is crucial to support student achievement. Not only must school leaders perform what Richard Elmore calls “the ritualistic task of organizing, budgeting, managing and dealing with disruptions inside and outside the system,” today’s instructional leaders must be able to coach, teach, and develop teachers in their schools (Elmore, R., 2000). According to Elmore, leaders must focus on:

1. A culture that supports high achievement.
2. Continuous use of information about student performance to guide improvements.
3. Helping teachers improve their classroom instruction.
4. Making academic instruction the school’s top priority.

Effective instructional leaders spend large amounts of time in classrooms, observing teaching and encouraging higher performance (National Staff Development Council, 2005). Instructional leaders introduce a continuous process of improvement and build supportive cultures that link adult and student learning. Leaders advocate for large scale “coaching by people who know the content, know how to do it, and know how to help others to do it” (Alvarado, A., 1999). The improvement of instruction requires a focus on actual student performance, researching effective instructional practices, study groups or other forms of staff development which focus on school-wide student results and practices to improve instruction, and high quality coaching (Alvarado, A., 1999 and Knight, J., 2005).

**Professional Development and embedded support**

Elmore (2000) continually reiterates professional development is required for teachers and administrators to engage in quality teaching and learning. New policies or “reform” do not impart new knowledge, but create the occasion for educators to seek new knowledge and turn that knowledge into practice. Professional development is the main link connecting policy to practice (Elmore, R., & Burney, D., 1997).

Garet, Porter, Desimone, Birman and Yoon (2001) evaluated the Eisenhower Professional Development Program. Their findings revealed several key features of
professional development that have the greatest impact on teachers’ self-reported increase of knowledge and skills which resulted in changes in their classroom practices and skills:

1. focus on “content” knowledge,
2. opportunities for active learning,
3. coherence with other professional development activities,
4. the structure, type and duration of the activities, and the
5. team participation of teachers in the same school, grade or subject.

Sustained and intensive professional development is more likely to have an impact than shorter professional development. It is more likely that enhanced knowledge and skills will result when the professional development focuses on content, gives opportunities for “hands-on” work (or active learning) and is integrated into the daily life of the school.

Reviewing the cultural differences of teaching communities, Stigler and Hiebert (1999) note the power of the Japanese lesson study. Teachers in the American culture often reflect about their teaching in isolation. Conversely, the Japanese cultivate a culture of learning, for teachers and students alike, with the ultimate goal of student learning. In the study, every case in which student learning increased; the central goal was student learning. Teacher groups reviewed their lessons and their students’ responses to their lessons with the continual focus on improving their instruction to reap higher student success.

Effective teachers are allowed and encouraged to invent small changes in their instruction to improve student learning. Improving instruction is complex and requires collaborative support. Almost all successful attempts to improve teaching have involved teachers working together to improve student learning (Stigler and Hiebert, 1999).

**Instructional Environment and Service Delivery**

Effective instruction requires an environment that provides opportunities for direct instruction of knowledge, strategies, and skills. Sufficient instructional time is protected for academic instruction (Mastropieri, et.al.2004) to allow skill acquisition. Deschler (2003) concurs in his work that describes instructional conditions for students with learning disabilities:

1. Responsive instruction: continuous assessment, instructional accommodations and elaborate feedback.
2. Systematic instruction: structured, connected, scaffolded, and informative instruction.
3. Intensive instruction: sufficient time and high engagement.

Special education, impacted by IDEA, has developed into a system of supports and services for accessing general education, as opposed to a “place” for addressing disability
specific needs. Harper and Jackson (2003) also note the standards have not changed for students with disabilities but the means for learning and for demonstrating proficiency have changed. The implication is that quality instruction may take place in a variety of environments. The teacher must collaboratively design explicit instruction to address targeted needs, and make specific accommodations and curriculum modifications as needed.

Collaboration is a key to the process. Within a collaborative model, the general educator and special educator have differing roles but need to have complementary perspectives. The general educator examines and aligns standards, knowing how to connect prior learning knowledge, providing resource materials, and creating activities to enrich the learning environment and measure student outcomes. The special educator contributes to the understanding of the students’ abilities and disabilities, identifies accommodations and adaptations, and designs authentic means of benchmarking progress.

This review of literature underscores the conceptual framework of the instructional core and the teaching learning process. Most of the components are crucial to effective instruction for all students. We have focused on students who are at risk and students with special education diagnoses. Effective instruction is supported through teacher preparation, professional development, engineering the educational environment and administrative support.
CHAPTER IV

METHODOLOGY

The focus of this chapter includes the procedures involving the program evaluation process, population being reviewed, and methods of data collection and analysis used in the program evaluation for instructional design.

Process

The program evaluation process involved various stakeholders including parents and community members. A committee was established to work collaboratively on the program evaluation tasks. Committee members included a director, administrators, a parent, representatives from three local universities, and facilitators. The committee met at least monthly since November, 2004.

Population

While instructional design applies to all of the SSD teacher level staff, the program evaluation focuses on the 350 teachers who were newly employed by the district since September of 2001. These teachers were new to the profession and included: Applied Behavior Analysis associate analysts, Special education and Technical education teachers, and Speech and Language Pathologists. All of these teacher level staff participated in the 2 year professional development program for beginning teachers.

This population was chosen since their professional development through the district has focused on effective instructional design. The teacher level staff hired for the 2004-2005 school year, have participated in at least 48 hours of professional development during their first year: 18 hours for induction and 18 hours of additional professional development and a minimum of 4 hours of onsite peer coaching and 8 hours of after-school discussions in cohort groups. The teacher level staff employed since the 2003-2004 school, have participated in an additional year of training which constitutes an additional 23 hours of professional development: 18 hours of professional development with 5 hours of peer coaching and video reflection.

It is reasonable to assume this group of teacher level staff has an understanding of effective instructional design and share a common language around the components of the teaching learning cycle and specific lesson design. Hopefully this reduces the possibility of misinterpretation of the language used in the survey questions.
In addition, as the district builds the skills of the teacher level staff, this population is crucial in building the future culture of the district. The program evaluation committee was interested in the factors that influence the skill development and implementation of effective practices by these teachers to guide the recommendations and action plans.

**Methods for Data Collection and Analysis**

There were eight methods used to collect data. The data collection methods used in addressing the focus questions approved by the Board of Education are noted in Table 1 and Table 2.

**Table 1: Evaluation Focus Questions and Data Collection Methods**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Literature Review</th>
<th>Administrator Observation Checklist</th>
<th>Teacher Survey</th>
<th>Classroom observation of first year teachers</th>
<th>Student Interview</th>
<th>Public Forum</th>
<th>1-4 year Teacher Summatives</th>
<th>Cost Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>1. What are the indicators of effective instructional design for students in special education and technical education programs?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>1. What components of effective instructional design are implemented by SSD teachers in their first four years of teaching?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>2. What factors (pre-service training, staff development, administrative support, and service delivery) influence the use of effective instructional design?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Data Sources and Data Collection Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Literature Review</th>
<th>Administrator Observation Checklist</th>
<th>Teacher Survey</th>
<th>Classroom observation of first year teachers</th>
<th>Student Interview</th>
<th>Public Forum</th>
<th>1-4 year Teacher Summatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SSD Administrators of teacher in their first four years of teaching</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSD Teacher level staff in their first four years of teaching</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSD Parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students of teachers in their first four years of teaching</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Literature Review / Quality Indicators of Best Practices**

After conducting a literature review, the committee identified quality indicators that reflect effective practices in instructional design. These are based on the “instructional core” and “teaching learning cycle”, which are reflected in the district’s Teacher Evaluation Standards and the Professional Development Skill Sets for Academy I.

**Administrator Observation Checklist**

The administrator observation checklist was sent to 81 administrators who had at least one beginning teacher in their first through fourth year with the district. Administrators were asked to complete two observation checklists for two of their beginning teachers.

The administrators were asked to rate the degree to which they had evidence to support that the teacher is implementing the quality instructional skills using a five-point Likert scale with a rating of 1 denoting “not implementing the skills at all” and a rating of 5 denoting “always implementing the skills”.

**Teacher Survey**

A teacher survey was mailed to households of 350 beginning teachers in their first four years with the district who have participated in the professional development program for beginning teachers. The list of teachers was based on Learning and Assessment’s new teacher data base as of March 23, 2005.
Public Forum

A public forum was held to gather input from parents/guardians, partner district personnel, staff, and community members on quality indicator areas. Flyers were provided to the members of the Parent Advisory Council, the pupil personnel directors for the partner districts, staff development directors for the partner districts and all district administrators. Notification (Appendix 4-1) of the forum was also posted on the district website. The forum was held from 6:30-7:30 p.m. in the Special School District Central Office on April 21, 2005. A questionnaire (Appendix 4-2) was developed for parent comment which included the following areas:

1) Teachers use information (testing, student work/performance, teacher observations) to plan instruction to meet student needs.
2) Teachers use information (testing, student work/performance, teacher observations) to adjust instruction to maximize student progress.
3) There is evidence of testing, evaluative comments, and daily homework with anecdotal notes.
4) A step-by-step, organized approach is used to teaching specific skills or content.
5) Technology is used to support classroom teaching and learning.
6) Teachers consider cultural differences in the planning and delivery of instruction.
7) Teachers use techniques to maximize student involvement in teaching and learning.
8) Factors that get in the way of the teachers addressing these areas.

Classroom observation of first year teachers

Thirty one elementary and 87 secondary end of the year observations were completed by the facilitators responsible for the first year of staff development for the beginning teachers. This observation was a culminating activity for first year special education beginning teachers. The inter-rater reliability was managed through the facilitators’ common instruction and observation preparations prior to observations. This data was pulled by the program evaluation committee to specifically look at the beginning teachers’ execution of the delivery of instruction.

Observation of beginning teachers in technical education is conducted by the principal and assistant principals of the two Technical High Schools. These observations are mostly anecdotal and are not included in this data collection.

Teacher Summative Evaluations

The summative performance ratings of beginning teachers in their first four years with the district were reviewed. Ratings from the specific standards and criteria that reflected the professional development skill sets for the new teacher that are actually the quality indicators for the program evaluation were analyzed.

Standard 1: The employee demonstrates knowledge of content and instructional planning.
Criteria B: Demonstrates knowledge of students.
Criteria F: Assesses student learning.
Standard 3: The employee demonstrates effective instructional practices.
Criteria A: Teaches board approved curriculum.
Summative ratings were given a point value of 1=unsatisfactory, 2=needs improvement, 3=proficient and 4= superior to calculate averages.

Student Interviews

A random sample of students in beginning teacher classrooms was interviewed by administrators on the program evaluation committee. A total of 27 students from 13 sites that represent elementary, middle, high and technical schools across the county were individually asked a set of questions to elicit the student perception of effective teachers.

1) What does your teacher do to help you?
2) Do you have a suggestion for what else your teacher could do to help you learn new information?

Cost Analysis

Payroll costs for 1) Substitute pay for new teachers to attend training and participate in peer coaching, 2) stipends for mentors, and 3) the estimated percentage of salaries facilitators and administrators allocate to plan, deliver and evaluate three days of new teacher orientation, three training days during the year, cohort sessions and follow-up support were calculated. Instructional materials and printing costs to support orientation and training were added. Using the FY 05 budget expenses for payroll, instructional materials and indirect costs, a total annual cost was calculated. The annual cost was divided by the number of new teachers for the FY05 school year to arrive at an estimated annual per teacher cost and to calculate the cost of staff development for a teacher’s first four years of employment.
CHAPTER V

RESULTS

These analyses of the data collected purports to answer the program evaluation questions approved by the board:

1. What are the indicators of effective instructional design for students in special education and technical education programs?
2. What components of effective instructional design are implemented by SSD teachers in their first four years of teaching?
3. What factors (pre-service training, staff development, administrative support, and service delivery) influence the use of effective instructional design?

The sets of findings are listed below, along with the number corresponding to the evaluation focus questions related to the findings. Chapter VI will specifically address the strengths and the recommendations for improvement.

**Board of Education Question #1: What are the quality indicators of effective instructional design for students in special education and technical education programs?**

The committee reviewed professional literature and developed the quality indicators for effective instructional design. The indicators were used to serve as a basis for development of the teacher survey, administrator observation checklist, and classroom observation and teacher performance summative evaluation.

1. Make teaching decisions based on assessing student abilities and analyzing data.
2. Provide direct instruction to teach skills and strategies to ensure that students have access to and benefit from the general education curriculum.
3. Set the stage for learning through the use of an advanced organizer (anticipatory set).
4. Describe and model new skills.
5. Facilitate the practice of skills and strategies.
6. Teach meta-cognitive skills as a part of the instructional process (i.e., self instruction, self monitoring, problem solving).
7. Conclude lessons through the use of a post organizer (closure).
8. Use techniques to promote maximum student engagement.
9. Plan instruction by considering the needs and experiences of students representing different ethnic groups.
10. Regularly monitor student performance through formal and informal assessment.
11. Change instruction during lessons by observing classroom interactions and student questions.
12. Integrate technology into instruction through the use of computer supported learning.
13. Teach strategies and content based on the student’s individual needs

Teacher Surveys, Administrator Checklists, Classroom Observations, Teacher Summative Evaluations and Student Interviews

Board of Education Question #2: What components of effective instructional design are implemented by SSD teachers in their first four years of teaching?

Teacher Surveys

Surveys were returned by 209 of the 350 SSD teachers who were sent a survey, yielding a 60% return rate. There were responses from SSD teachers in 21 school districts and SSD special and technical schools. Of those teachers returning the survey, the majority (49%) work in elementary settings, 27% work in middle schools, 24% work in high schools and 1% work in the technical education schools. In terms of the length of years working in SSD, 44% of teachers indicated less than 1 year, 17% for 2 years, 19% for 3 years, and 20% for 4 years. In terms of the teacher’s primary assignment, 30% of teachers indicated they teach in self-contained cross categorical classrooms, 24% in cross-categorical resource rooms, and 18% in collaborative classrooms in partner district schools. Results can be found in Appendix 5-1.

In terms of teacher’s qualification, 50% of the teachers have a bachelor’s degree and 50% have a master’s degree. Based on the research, teacher preparation programs and certification influence the quality of instruction; therefore, in the survey, we asked teachers how they received their certification. Fifty-four percent reported that they received their certification through a traditional course of study, 32% through PRAXIS, and 7% through alternative programs. We also wanted to know the universities from which they graduated. Of those teachers returning the survey, 24% are from Fontbonne University, 20% from University of Missouri-St. Louis, 8% from St. Louis University, and 8% Southern Illinois University-Edwardsville.

There were 13 items on the teacher survey related to the degree that teachers implement the skills listed in the quality indicators of effective instruction. The ratings were based on a Likert scale, with a rating of 1 representing “not implementing the skills at all” and a rating of 5 denoting “always implementing the skills”. Overall, the teachers indicated that they often or always implemented the majority of the skills (quality indicators). Given the scores, it was determined strengths were scores at or above a 4.5
average. There were four areas of strength on the indicators. The strengths are noted in Table 3.

Table 3. Strength Areas on Teacher Survey (mean of 4.5 and above)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I make teaching decisions based on assessing student ability and analyzing data</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I describe and model new skills</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I teach strategies and content based on the student’s individual needs</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I provide direct instruction to teach skills and strategies to ensure that students have access to and benefit from the general education curriculum</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were five indicators for which the average scores were still “above average”, but fell below 3.9. These areas are considered progressing. They are itemized in Table 4.

Table 4. Progressing Areas on Teacher Survey (mean between 3.1 – 3.9)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I conclude lessons through the use of a post organizer (closure)</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I integrate technology into instruction through the use of computer supported learning</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Administrator Observation Checklist

Each administrator was asked to fill out 2 checklists for 2 of their beginning teachers based on the evidence they gathered from observation, from the students, parents, education staff, meetings and conversations. One hundred sixty six (166) Administrator Observation Checklists were sent. Of those 166 (83x2=166) checklists, 118 were returned, yielding a 71% return rate. There were responses from administrators from 18 school districts and SSD schools. Results can be found in Appendix 5-2.

There were 13 items on the administrator checklist about the degree their teachers implement the skills that are listed as quality indicators of effective instruction. The ratings were based on a Likert scale, with a rating of 1 representing “not implementing the skills at all” and a rating of 5 denoting “always implementing the skills”. Overall, administrators indicated that their teachers often or always implement the majority of the skills (quality indicators). Given the range of results and average score of 4.4 or above was considered strengths. There were five areas of strength. The strengths are noted in Table 5.

Table 5. Strength Areas on Administrator Observation Checklist (mean of 4.4 and above)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I describe and model new skills</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There were two indicators for which the average scores were still “above average”, but fell below 3.8. These areas are considered progressing. They are itemized in Table 6.

**Table 6. Progressing Areas on Administrator Observation Checklist (mean between 3.4 – 3.8)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I conclude lessons through the use of a post organizer (closure)</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I integrate technology into instruction through the use of computer supported learning</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comparison of Teacher Survey and Administrator Observation Checklist**

The purpose of comparing the teacher survey and administrator observation checklist is to examine whether there are discrepancies between teacher’s perceptions and their supervisor’s observation of teachers implementing quality instruction skills.

There were six significant differences in the ratings between teachers and administrators but means in these areas for both groups are at or above mean 4.0. See Appendix 5-3 for details. The only area that is significantly different between teachers and administrators shows one group’s mean lower than 4.0 which is displayed in Table 7. There is a discrepancy between teachers’ perception of implementation and their supervisors’ observation of teaching meta-cognitive skills as a part of the instructional process.

**Table 7. Comparison of Teacher Survey and Administrator Observation Checklist**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Administrator</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I/My teacher teaches meta-cognitive skills as a part of the instructional process</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i.e., self instruction, self monitoring, problem solving)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Classroom Observations

Observations of the 118 special education beginning teachers were analyzed by comparing pre and post observations of the components of lesson design evident in the teacher’s delivery of instruction. Table 8 shows this comparison:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components of Lesson Design in Delivery % of Teachers</th>
<th>Pre-visit: Elementary</th>
<th>Post-visit: Elementary</th>
<th>Pre-visit: Secondary</th>
<th>Post-visit: Secondary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advance Organizer</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe skill</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher modeling of skill (Mastery Model)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher elicits from student (Elicited Model)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Guided Practice</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Independent Practice</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Organizer</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the content during the lessons observed certain features of the components of lesson design may have been omitted appropriately. For example, for strategies and skills that have been previously introduced, the “describe” component of lesson design may have appropriately been included in the advance organizer. Factors such as the age of the student, the student’s ability and previous lessons taught impact the inclusion of certain components within the body of the lesson.

The comparison shows teacher consistently delivering the advance organizer and post organizer. This may reflect that both sections seem to be easier for teachers to systematically include. The components within the body of the lesson are the most complex. A decrease in independent practice was interpreted as positive outcome because
it indicates that teachers are using more of their instructional time for explicit and direct instruction as an outcome of their professional development.

**Teacher Summative Evaluation**

We also evaluated the summative evaluation ratings of new teachers (1-4 years of employment with the district) in three criteria in the two standards of the teacher evaluation.

- **Standard 1:** The employee demonstrates knowledge of content and instructional planning.
  - Criteria B: Demonstrates knowledge of students.
  - Criteria F: Assesses student learning.

- **Standard 3:** The employee demonstrates effective instructional practices.
  - Criteria A: Teaches board approved curriculum.

As of March 2005, there were 258 new teachers summative evaluations completed. The individual teacher scores were based on a “Likert” scale; a rating of 1 representing “unsatisfactory” and a rating of 4 denoting “superior”. All of the scores were then averaged to obtain an overall average score for each of the criteria. Results were:

- **Standard 1:** The employee demonstrates knowledge of content and instructional planning.
  - Criteria B: Demonstrates knowledge of students. (3.02)
  - Criteria F: Assesses student learning. (2.98)

- **Standard 3:** The employee demonstrates effective instructional practices.
  - Criteria A: Teaches board approved curriculum. (2.98)

The summative ratings were analyzed to see if the specific skills taught in the beginning teacher’s initial staff development became stronger over the four year period of time. We examined any differences between the ratings of the teachers who have worked at SSD less than 1.5 years and those who have worked at SSD more than 1.5 years. The data suggested that there were no differences in the evaluation of teacher performance in the two performance standard criteria between new teachers who have worked at SSD less than 1.5 years and those who have worked more than 1.5 years. A possible implication is that the longer the length of employment at SSD does not guarantee a better performance evaluation.

The summative evaluation ratings represented an overall rating for a broad spectrum of discreet performance skills. Further study is really needed to make any specific conclusions.

**Student Interviews**

Student responses (Appendix 5-4) to the interview questions were reviewed by the program evaluation committee. The committee found the student responses to be fresh...
and in many cases somewhat profound. Student responses described strengths that teachers describe and model new skills or strategies, and provide opportunities for students to practice with feedback:

- “She explains the assignment to us. She gives us an example. Then we practice it. If necessary, we make changes.”
- “She teaches me strategies I can use in all of my classes and in college.”
- “She shows me how to do it, then I try by myself.”

Certainly the “student voice” describes challenges in addressing the student’s need for explicit instruction with opportunities for additional modeling and practice with specific feedback:

- “He could give us more examples, maybe more demonstration time so we see the new skill better.”
- “I wish she wouldn’t go so fast sometimes.”
- “I would like to do more experiments.”

Public Forum

The results from the public forum are not reported since it was not attended by any parents or members of the community.

---

**Board of Education Question #3: What factors influence the use of effective instructional design?**

**Teacher Survey**

Based on the literature review, there are factors in the area of pre-service training, staff development with embedded support, administrative support, and the instructional environment/service delivery that may impact the teachers’ use or implementation of effective instructional skills. There were 15 items on the teacher survey addressing the degree to which the factors positively impact the teacher’s use of the skills. The ratings were based on a Likert scale, with a rating of 1 representing “no positive impact” and a rating of 5 denoting “very strong positive impact”. Overall, the teachers indicated that these 15 factors have strong or very strong positive impact on their implementation of skills. There were three factors that impacted teachers the most on their implementation of skills for which scores were at or above a 4.0 average. The strengths are noted in Table 9.

**Table 9. Teacher Survey: Factors Perceived to Strongly Impact Teacher Implementation of Skills (mean of 4.0 and above)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College degree (i.e., BA, MA, etc)</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These findings may have some implications for our Human Resources department when recruiting new teachers. New teachers who felt strongly about the positive impact of their degree and college education coursework preparation, tended to implement effective instructional skills more often than those who did not feel their degree and college preparation work strongly impacted their implementation of effective instruction.

There were four factors for which the average scores were still above average, but fell at or below 3.5. These teachers indicated that these factors have “average positive impact” on their implementation of skills. They are itemized in Table 10.

Table 10. Teacher Survey: Factors Perceived to have Average Positive Impact on Teacher Implementation of Skills (mean between 3.1 – 3.5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Availability of instructional materials</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support to change class size of my classroom to provide direct instruction</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support from my peer coach</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional technology/software support</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Administrator Observation Checklist**

There were also 15 items on Administrator Observation Checklist asking administrators to what degree the same factors have a positive impact on their teachers’ implementation of the skills. The ratings were based on a Likert scale, with a rating of 1 representing “no positive impact” and a rating of 5 denoting “very strong positive impact”. Overall, administrators indicated that these 15 factors have strong or very strong positive impact their teachers’ implementation of skills. There were three factors that administrators observed impacted teachers the most for which scores were at or above a 4.0 average. The strengths are noted in Table 11.

Table 11. Administrator Observation Checklist: Factors that Strongly Impact Teacher Implementation of Skills (mean of 4.0 and above)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service delivery model (collaborative classroom, resource room)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative support: problem solving, feedback, coaching.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support from my peer coach: conversations and observations</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was one factor for which the average scores were still above average, but fell
below 3.5. This factor has average positive impact on teacher’s implementation of their skills. They are itemized in Table 12.

Table 12. Administrator Observation Checklist: Factor that has Average Positive Impact on Teacher Implementation of Skills (mean between 3.5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional technology/software support</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comparison of Teacher Survey and Administrator Observation Checklist**

The purpose of comparing the teacher survey and the administrator observation checklist is to again examine whether there are discrepancies between the teacher’s perceptions of factors that impact their implementation of skills and their supervisor’s observation of the factors that impact their teachers’ implementation of quality instructional skills.

There were eight significant differences of 15 factors in the ratings between teachers and administrators. See Appendix 5-3 for details. Within all of these 8 areas, at least one group, have means lower than 4.0 are displayed in Table 13. There is a discrepancy between teachers’ perceptions of factors impacting their implementation of their skills and their supervisors’ observations of factors impacting their teachers’ implementation of skills.

Table 13. Comparison of Teacher Survey and Administrator Observation Checklist on the Factors That Impact Teacher Implementation of Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Administrator</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College degree</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-service preparation</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative support</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support from my mentor</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support to change student or classroom scheduling to provide time for direct instruction</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of instructional materials</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support to change structure/class size of my classroom to provide direct instruction</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support from my peer coach</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These findings show discrepancies between teachers’ perceptions and their supervisors’ observation of factors impacting the implementation of instructional skills.
Supports or resources provided may not be the factors that matter to the teacher the most. Therefore, the two groups need to communicate effectively in terms of the factors that can help teachers implement quality instruction. For example, based on the data, administrators perceived support from peer coaches as positively impacting the use of effective instruction (M=4.0). Therefore, administrators might provide additional support for teachers to work with their peer coach. However, teachers perceived the impact of peer coaches differently and therefore may not perceive the action of the administrator and the support from their peer coach as beneficial and having a strong positive impact on their implementation of effective instructional skills (M=3.5; p<.05). The committee members discussed the findings and considered the possibility that the rating of impact may have been misinterpreted by the teachers and administrators, given the responses.

**Cost Foundation**

To analyze the costs associated with providing staff development and support for the new teacher, the following factors were calculated:

1. Payroll costs for New Teacher Orientation: facilitators and presenters. ($7,409.00)
2. Yearly payroll costs for professional development and support for new teachers based on one-fourth of the area coordinator salary, two-thirds of each of the 5 instructional facilitators salary, one eighth of three regional facilitators and one fourth of two regional facilitators. This percentage reflects the amount of time devoted to new teachers in the FY05 school year. ($365,604.00)
3. Instructional materials and printing for New Teacher Orientation and the professional development throughout the year. ($22,152.00)
4. Substitute pay for all new teachers attending three days of training. ($70,821.00)
5. Total amount of new teachers for FY05. (258 teachers) This number includes all new teacher level hires, including experienced and beginning teachers who participated in the year 1 Academy I program in the 2004-2005 school year. Totals costs from #1,2,3, and 4 ($465,986.00) were divided by the number of teacher level staff (258) for the average cost per teacher. ($1,806.00)
6. Mentor stipends for training and mentoring. ($10,174.95)
7. Mentor costs were divided by the number of beginning teachers (159) in FY06. ($63.98) The average mentor cost and the average cost per teacher cost in #5 ($1,806.00) is added to the total in #5 to calculate the total annual cost to train and support the beginning teacher. ($1,869.00)
8. Additional yearly costs for the new teacher to complete the professional development required by the district was calculated by adding the costs in # 2,3,4 and dividing by # 5. ($1,777.00)
The average cost for the first year of the program for new teacher level staff is $1,869.00 per beginning teacher. The total estimated cost for the teachers’ professional development for their first four years of employment is $3,646.00 per teacher. Monies for new teacher professional development are a combination of the Comprehensive School Personnel Development budget, Senate Bill 380: Professional Development Committee budget, and “local effort” budget.
CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The committee members met to review, assimilate, and analyze the program evaluation data. Through discussion and questioning, the committee identified areas of strength and weakness that were noted across multiple data sources.

Strengths

Several areas of strength were identified. Table 14 shows the strengths by data sources. The public forum was not used as a data source, since there was no response. Teacher summative data was not used to determine performance strengths due to the rating of broad performance areas. The student interview data is included however, this data is strictly anecdotal. It should also be noted that the classroom observation data focused specifically on the delivery of instruction and the components of the instruction. It did not include assessment and planning skills nor did it include maximum student engagement.

Table 14: Strengths by data sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
<th>Administrator Observation Checklist</th>
<th>Teacher Survey</th>
<th>Classroom observation of first year teachers</th>
<th>Student Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Making teaching decisions based on assessing student ability and analyzing data.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Providing direct instruction to teach skills and strategies to ensure that students have access to and benefit from general education curriculum.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Uses an advance organizer in delivery of instruction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Describing and modeling new skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Teaching strategies and content based on student’s individual needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Regularly monitors student performance through formal and informal assessment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Facilitates the practice of skills and strategies taught.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Changes instruction during lessons by observing classroom interactions and student questions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Techniques to promote maximum student engagement.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Uses a post organizer during the delivery of instruction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the data sources, teachers, students, administrators and facilitators working with the new teachers to develop their skills, indicate strengths in describing and
modeling new skills. The new teachers and their administrators also indicate strengths in
1) Providing direct instruction to teach skills and strategies to ensure that students have
access to and benefit from general education curriculum, 2) Teaching strategies and
content based on student’s individual needs, 3) Facilitating the practice of skills and
strategies taught and 4) Using techniques to promote maximum student engagement.

The discrepancy of teacher perception and administrator observation should be
noted since administrators rated teachers lower in: the use of assessments to make
instructional decisions, regular monitoring of student performance through informal and
formal assessments, changing classroom instruction based on observation of interactions
and student questions, teaching strategies and content based on the student’s individual
needs, and describing and modeling new skills. These areas are still considered strengths
due to their high ratings.

Certainly the overall results show new teachers and administrators agree that new
teachers are demonstrating all but two of the quality indicators evaluated in this program
evaluation.

Weaknesses

None of the quality indicators were seen as weaknesses. However, some areas are
considered “Progressing”. Table 15 shows the areas of “progressing” by data source. The
same sources were used to report strengths.

Table 15: “Progressing” by data sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Progressing areas</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
<th>Admin Survey</th>
<th>Teacher Survey</th>
<th>Classroom observation of first year teachers</th>
<th>Student Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Concludes lessons through the use of a post organizer.</td>
<td>Admin Survey</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Integrate technology into instruction through the use of computer supported learning.</td>
<td>Admin Survey</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Student guided practice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Student independent practice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Describing and modeling skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both the teachers and administrators indicate “progressing” in the use of a post
organizer and the integration of technology into instruction. The differences in the
teachers’ perceptions and the administrators’ observations are also areas for further
investigation:

Making decisions based on assessing student abilities and analyzing data.
Describing and modeling new skills.
Teaching strategies and content based on the individual student’s needs.
Regularly monitoring student performance through formal and informal assessments.
Teaching meta-cognitive skills as a part of the instructional process.
It would be helpful to know if teachers and administrators share a common understanding and vision of the implementation of these instructional skills.

*Factors that influence implementation of instructional skills*

The factors which positively impact the teacher’s implementation of instructional skills are: college degree, pre-service preparation and service delivery. Administrators observed that service delivery has a strong positive impact. Informal discussions with administrators reinforce this perception. In addition, administrators observed that staff development and administrator support have a high positive impact on a teacher implementing the instructional indicators. Regardless, the total package of preparation, continued learning, and support reflects much of the research around effective instruction, leadership and professional development for new teachers.

Further consideration of the factors that have less positive impact on the teachers’ instructional skills is needed. Although still considered “progressing”, teachers perceived the availability of instructional materials, support to change structure/class size to provide direct instruction, support from peer coach, and instructional technology and software support to have less of a positive impact on instruction than other factors. Both administrators and teachers agree instructional technology and software support is the lowest positive impact. This seems to indicate a need to investigate the availability of technology and software in the classroom.

*Limitations*

The data collected for this evaluation provided the committee with a significant amount of information that had not previously been reviewed as a whole to lead towards systemic improvement. However, in the process of data analysis, the committee noted several limitations that may have affected the reported results. These limitations should be taken into consideration when interpreting the results and designing future program evaluation activities.

1. Although there was a parent on the committee, additional parent input was minimal.
2. The questions related to the factors that impact instruction are open to different interpretations. It is not clear if teachers and administrators rated items as “no positive impact” because these factors did not matter to them or because the absence of these factors has a negative impact on instruction.
3. Survey fatigue limits reliability of responses
4. Student interviews represented the voice and opinion of students; however, actual student outcomes were not collected.
5. Pre and post observations of technical education teachers would have been a helpful source of data.

**Recommendations**

The recommendations address identified needs in the area of instruction. Action plans will be developed to address the recommendations and align with the SSD Rolling Plan objectives.

1. Collaborate with the technology specialists and facilitators to investigate the challenges new teacher have to integrating technology into instructional practices.
2. Continue training with new teachers and administrators in: 1) the use of ongoing data from assessments to plan and evaluate instruction, 2) providing closure at the end of a lesson using a post organizer, 4) the use of teaching meta-cognitive skills and 3) implementing effective instruction in a variety of service delivery models.
3. Share the results of this program evaluation with the universities involved in the program evaluation and explore opportunities to enhance partnerships.
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## Professional Development
### Skill Sets for
#### Academy I, II and Research and Collaborative Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme Areas</th>
<th>Induction Skill Sets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
  2. Adheres to Universal Precautions in the workplace. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme Areas</th>
<th>Academy I Skill Sets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A. Student Behavior (Standard 1: G 2: A, B, C, D, E) | 1. Uses effective techniques to maintain positive behaviors by recognizing and reinforcing appropriate behavior (positive ratio 4:1) (PBE Standard 2, Criterion 2D, Descriptor 12, Indicator c).  
  2. Uses effective techniques to maintain positive behavior by making effective use of preventative strategies including sensory supports (PBE Standard 2, Criterion 2D, Descriptor 12, Indicator j).  
  4. Identifies the essential components of a functional assessment and resources to support the teacher in the team process. (PBE Standard 2, Criterion 2D, Descriptor 13, Indicator b). |
| B. Quality Instruction (Standard 1: A, B, C, D, E 2: G, 3: A, C, D, E) | 1. Assesses student learning, uses assessment results to plan, selects learning experiences, delivers instruction and reflects on evidence of student learning. (PBE Standard 1, Criterion 1B, Descriptor 3, Indicators a, c, and d, Criterion 1F Descriptors 14 and 15, Indicators a, b, and c).  
  2. Provides direct instruction in skills and strategies to ensure that students have access to and benefit from the general education curriculum using the components of lesson design in the advance organizer, body and post organizer. (PBE Standard 3, Criterion 3A, Descriptor 2, Indicators a, b, c, & d).  
  3. Demonstrates techniques to promote maximum student involvement/learning (PBE Standard 3, Criterion 3D, Descriptor 8, Indicator b).  
  4. Identifies cultural and diversity factors that contribute to student learning (PBE Standard 1, Criterion 1B, Descriptor 6, Indicator a). |
| C. Student Performance/Literacy (Standard 1: F 2: A 3: A, F) | 1. Identifies the components of balanced literacy and ensures student schedules reflect all of the components (PBE Standard 3, Criterion 3A, Descriptor 1, Indicator a).  
  2. Delivers instruction in literacy strategies, demonstrating the Academy I Quality Instruction skill set. (PBE Standard 1, Criterion B, Descriptor 5 Indicator a). |
  2. Demonstrates basic technology skills to comply with district procedures such as e-mail and Encore (PBE Standard 4, Criteria 4F and 4G). |

---

Special School District of St. Louis County  
June 16, 2005
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme Areas</th>
<th>Academy I Skill Sets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E. Professional Growth (Standard 4: C, D)</td>
<td>1. Reflects on teaching and learning through job-embedded staff development, self-reflection and collecting teacher and student data (PBE Standard 4, Criteria 4C &amp; 4D).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All standards are based on Special School District’s Performance Based Evaluation, 2004.
SSD is in the process of evaluating the use of instructional
design to assess, plan, and evaluate student learning. We are
gathering information from staff, parents and the community to
provide input regarding our instructional practices.

The forum will be held from 6:30 to 7:30 p.m. on Thursday,
April 21, 2005 in room 60 at the district’s Administrative
Offices located at 12110 Clayton Road in Town and
Country.

For more information contact Ros VanHecke at 314.989.7803
Appendix 4-2
As a parent, community member, or SSD staff member, please comment on the instruction by SSD staff in any of the following areas……

Teachers use information (testing, student work/performance, teacher observations) to plan instruction to meet student needs.

Teachers use information (testing, student work/performance, teacher observations) to adjust instruction to maximize student progress.

There is evidence of testing, evaluative comments, and daily homework with anecdotal notes.

A step-by-step, organized approach is used to teaching specific skills or content.

Technology is used to support classroom teaching and learning.

Teachers consider cultural differences in the planning and delivery of instruction.

Teachers use techniques to maximize student involvement in teaching and learning.

Are there any factors that get in the way?
Appendix 5-1-1
You have received this survey because you are a teacher with 1 to 4 years of experiences. This survey is part of the Instructional Design Program Evaluation and is intended to assist the Special School District (SSD) in assessing the implementation and delivery of instruction by you who are in the first four years of teaching. Please complete the survey and return it by Pony mail to Dr. Chialin Hsieh, Program Evaluation at SSD CO by May 20, 2005. If you have any questions regarding the survey, please contact Ros VanHecke, Director of Learning and Assessment at 314.989.7803.

To what degree are you implementing these indicators of effective instructional design?

Response Definition: N=Not at all  L=Limited  S=Some  O=Often  A=Always  NA=Do not know/Not applicable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I make teaching decisions based on assessing student abilities and analyzing data.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I provide direct instruction to teach skills and strategies to ensure that students have access to and benefit from the general education curriculum.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I set the stage for learning through the use of an advanced organizer (anticipatory set).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I describe and model new skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I facilitate the practice of skills and strategies I teach.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I teach metacognitive skills as a part of the instructional process (i.e., self instruction, self monitoring, problem solving, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I conclude lessons through the use of a post organizer (closure).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I use techniques to promote maximum student involvement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I plan instruction by considering the needs and experiences of students representing different ethnic groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I regularly monitor student performance through formal and informal assessment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I change instruction during my lessons by observing classroom interactions and student questions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I integrate technology into instruction through the use of computer supported learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I teach strategies and content based on the student's individual needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To what degree do the following factors positively impact your use of the indicators of effective instructional design listed in questions 1 to 13?

Response Definition: 1=No Positive Impact  2=Weak Positive Impact  3=Average Positive Impact  4=Strong Positive Impact  5=Very Strong Positive Impact  NA=Not applicable/Do not know

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. College Degree (i.e., BA, MA, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Preservice preparation (i.e., college education coursework, student teaching)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Service delivery model (i.e., collaborative classroom, resource room, self-contained classroom)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. SSD first and second year staff development (i.e., Effective Teaching, Thoughtful Teaching, Mentor).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Availability of instructional materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Instructional technology/software support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Administrative support: problem solving, feedback, coaching about my instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Support to change student or classroom scheduling to provide time for direct instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Support to change structure/class size of my program or classroom to provide direct instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Support to modify partner district curriculum expectations to teach strategies based on student needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Support to adapt/modify partner district expectations of me when they compete with planning and delivering instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
25. Support for ongoing staff development/training ................................................................. $12345NA$
26. Support from my mentor: conversations and/or observations ........................................ $12345NA$
27. Support from my peer coach: conversations and/or observations ...................................... $12345NA$
28. Support from my partner district colleagues: conversations and/or observations ............... $12345NA$

**Demographic Information**

29. My role is
   - ○ Special education teacher
   - ○ Technical education teacher
   - ○ Speech/Language pathologist

30. Year(s) with SSD
   - ○ 0-1 year
   - ○ 2 years
   - ○ 3 years
   - ○ 4 years

31. I primary work in
   - ○ Elementary, Kindergarten to 5th grade
   - ○ High School, 9th grade to 12th grade
   - ○ Middle School, 6th grade to 8th grade
   - ○ 12th+ grade

32. I primary teach in
   - ○ Collaborative classroom in general education
   - ○ Self-contained cross categorical classroom
   - ○ Cross categorical resource room teacher
   - ○ Academic or trade technical education classroom
   - ○ Other __________

33. I mainly work in
   - ○ Affton
   - ○ Clayton
   - ○ Hazelwood
   - ○ Ladue
   - ○ Mehlville
   - ○ Pattonville
   - ○ Rockwood
   - ○ Webster Groves
   - ○ Technical education school
   - ○ Bayless
   - ○ Ferguson-Florissant
   - ○ Jennings
   - ○ Lindbergh
   - ○ Normandy
   - ○ Ritenour
   - ○ University City
   - ○ Wellston
   - ○ Other __________
   - ○ Brentwood
   - ○ Hancock Place
   - ○ Kirkwood
   - ○ Maplewood Richmond Heights
   - ○ Parkway
   - ○ Riverview Gardens
   - ○ Valley Park
   - ○ Special education school
Qualification & Certification

34. I have
   ○ Bachelor's degree   ○ Master's degree   ○ Doctoral degree   ○ Other _________

35. I earned my teaching degree from
   ○ Central Missouri State University
   ○ Lindenwood University
   ○ Northwest Missouri State University
   ○ Southeast Missouri State University
   ○ Southwest Missouri State University
   ○ University of Missouri-Columbia
   ○ Webster University
   ○ Fontbonne University
   ○ Maryville University
   ○ St. Louis University
   ○ Southern Illinois University-Edwardsville
   ○ Truman State University
   ○ University of Missouri-St. Louis
   ○ Other________

36. To teach in my current position, I received my certification by:
   ○ Traditional course of study
   ○ Alternative program
   ○ PRAXIS
   ○ Other

   ○ Vocational program

37. Additional Comments
Appendix 5-1-2
1. I make teaching decisions based on assessing student abilities and analyzing data.
   - Not at all: 0 (0%)
   - Limited: 2 (1%)
   - Some: 4 (2%)
   - Often: 73 (36%)
   - Always: 126 (61%)
   - Do not know/Not applicable: 0 (0%)
   - Total Responses: 205
   - Mean: 4.58
   - Standard Deviation: 0.59

2. I provide direct instruction to teach skills and strategies to ensure that students have access to and benefit from the general education curriculum.
   - Not at all: 0 (0%)
   - Limited: 12 (6%)
   - Some: 64 (31%)
   - Often: 124 (60%)
   - Always: 4 (2%)
   - Do not know/Not applicable: 205
   - Total Responses: 205
   - Mean: 4.55
   - Standard Deviation: 0.63

3. I set the stage for learning through the use of an advanced organizer (anticipatory set).
   - Not at all: 0 (0%)
   - Limited: 12 (8%)
   - Some: 39 (19%)
   - Often: 95 (46%)
   - Always: 60 (29%)
   - Do not know/Not applicable: 3 (1%)
   - Total Responses: 205
   - Mean: 4.02
   - Standard Deviation: 0.81
4. I describe and model new skills.

5. I facilitate the practice of skills and strategies I teach.

6. I teach metacognitive skills as a part of the instructional process (i.e., self instruction, self monitoring, problem solving, etc.).

7. I conclude lessons through the use of a post organizer (closure).
8. I use techniques to promote maximum student involvement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Not at all</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Limited</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Some</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Often</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Always</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Do not know/ Not applicable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses:</td>
<td>206</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean: 4.50</td>
<td>Standard Deviation: 0.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. I plan instruction by considering the needs and experiences of students representing different ethnic groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Not at all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Limited</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Some</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Often</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Always</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Do not know/ Not applicable</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses:</td>
<td>204</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean: 4.13</td>
<td>Standard Deviation: 0.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. I regularly monitor student performance through formal and informal assessment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Not at all</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Limited</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Some</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Often</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Always</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Do not know/ Not applicable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses:</td>
<td>205</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean: 4.51</td>
<td>Standard Deviation: 0.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. I change instruction during my lessons by observing classroom interactions and student questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Not at all</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Limited</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Some</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Often</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Always</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Do not know/ Not applicable</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses:</td>
<td>205</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean: 4.46</td>
<td>Standard Deviation: 0.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. I integrate technology into instruction through the use of computer supported learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Not at all</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Limited</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Some</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Often</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Always</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Do not know/ Not applicable</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Responses: 206
Mean: 3.12 Standard Deviation: 1.09

13. I teach strategies and content based on the student's individual needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Not at all</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Limited</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Some</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Often</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Always</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Do not know/ Not applicable</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Responses: 205
Mean: 4.56 Standard Deviation: 0.58

14. College Degree (i.e., BA, MA, etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. No Positive Impact</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Weak Positive Impact</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Average Positive Impact</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Strong Positive Impact</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Very Strong Positive Impact</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Not applicable/Do not know</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Responses: 205
Mean: 4.06 Standard Deviation: 0.91

15. Preservice preparation (i.e., college education coursework, student teaching)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. No Positive Impact</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Weak Positive Impact</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Average Positive Impact</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Strong Positive Impact</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Very Strong Positive Impact</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Not applicable/Do not know</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Responses: 205
Mean: 4.04 Standard Deviation: 0.89
16. Service delivery model (i.e., collaborative classroom, resource room, self-contained classroom)

- No Positive Impact: 1 (0%)
- Weak Positive Impact: 5 (2%)
- Average Positive Impact: 40 (20%)
- Strong Positive Impact: 90 (44%)
- Very Strong Positive Impact: 58 (29%)
- Not applicable/Do not know: 9 (4%)

Total Responses: 203
Mean: 4.03  Standard Deviation: 0.81

17. SSD first and second year staff development (i.e., Effective Teaching, Thoughtful Teaching, Mentor)

- No Positive Impact: 52 (28%)
- Weak Positive Impact: 28 (14%)
- Average Positive Impact: 59 (29%)
- Strong Positive Impact: 66 (32%)
- Very Strong Positive Impact: 45 (22%)
- Not applicable/Do not know: 3 (1%)

Total Responses: 206
Mean: 3.58  Standard Deviation: 1.06

18. Availability of instructional materials

- No Positive Impact: 42 (25%)
- Weak Positive Impact: 25 (12%)
- Average Positive Impact: 67 (33%)
- Strong Positive Impact: 70 (34%)
- Very Strong Positive Impact: 34 (17%)
- Not applicable/Do not know: 5 (2%)

Total Responses: 205
Mean: 3.52  Standard Deviation: 0.98

19. Instructional technology/software support

- No Positive Impact: 41 (20%)
- Weak Positive Impact: 13 (6%)
- Average Positive Impact: 66 (32%)
- Strong Positive Impact: 54 (26%)
- Very Strong Positive Impact: 16 (8%)
- Not applicable/Do not know: 16 (8%)

Total Responses: 206
Mean: 3.10  Standard Deviation: 1.05
20. Administrative support: problem solving, feedback, coaching about my instruction

1. No Positive Impact: 3 (1%)
2. Weak Positive Impact: 20 (10%)
3. Average Positive Impact: 54 (26%)
4. Strong Positive Impact: 80 (39%)
5. Very Strong Positive Impact: 46 (22%)
6. Not applicable/Do not know: 2 (1%)

Total Responses: 205
Mean: 3.72 Standard Deviation: 0.97

21. Support to change student or classroom scheduling to provide time for direct instruction

1. No Positive Impact: 1 (0%)
2. Weak Positive Impact: 21 (10%)
3. Average Positive Impact: 63 (31%)
4. Strong Positive Impact: 64 (32%)
5. Very Strong Positive Impact: 39 (19%)
6. Not applicable/Do not know: 14 (7%)

Total Responses: 202
Mean: 3.63 Standard Deviation: 0.95

22. Support to change structure/class size of my program or classroom to provide direct instruction

1. No Positive Impact: 0 (0%)
2. Weak Positive Impact: 31 (15%)
3. Average Positive Impact: 63 (31%)
4. Strong Positive Impact: 52 (25%)
5. Very Strong Positive Impact: 35 (17%)
6. Not applicable/Do not know: 24 (12%)

Total Responses: 205
Mean: 3.50 Standard Deviation: 0.99

23. Support to modify partner district curriculum expectations to teach strategies based on student needs

1. No Positive Impact: 2 (1%)
2. Weak Positive Impact: 18 (9%)
3. Average Positive Impact: 58 (28%)
4. Strong Positive Impact: 56 (27%)
5. Very Strong Positive Impact: 46 (23%)
6. Not applicable/Do not know: 24 (12%)

Total Responses: 204
Mean: 3.70 Standard Deviation: 1.00
24. Support to adapt/modify partner district expectations of me when they compete with planning and delivering instruction

1. No Positive Impact 3 1%
2. Weak Positive Impact 13 6%
3. Average Positive Impact 60 29%
4. Strong Positive Impact 61 30%
5. Very Strong Positive Impact 34 17%
6. Not applicable/Do not know 34 17%
Total Responses: 205
Mean: 3.64    Standard Deviation: 0.94

25. Support for ongoing staff development/training

1. No Positive Impact 2 1%
2. Weak Positive Impact 18 9%
3. Average Positive Impact 64 32%
4. Strong Positive Impact 69 34%
5. Very Strong Positive Impact 48 24%
6. Not applicable/Do not know 2 1%
Total Responses: 203
Mean: 3.71    Standard Deviation: 0.96

26. Support from my mentor: conversations and/or observations

1. No Positive Impact 6 3%
2. Weak Positive Impact 25 12%
3. Average Positive Impact 44 22%
4. Strong Positive Impact 55 27%
5. Very Strong Positive Impact 49 24%
6. Not applicable/Do not know 24 12%
Total Responses: 203
Mean: 3.65    Standard Deviation: 1.12

27. Support from my peer coach: conversations and/or observations

1. No Positive Impact 5 2%
2. Weak Positive Impact 26 13%
3. Average Positive Impact 58 29%
4. Strong Positive Impact 54 27%
5. Very Strong Positive Impact 32 16%
6. Not applicable/Do not know 28 14%
Total Responses: 203
Mean: 3.47    Standard Deviation: 1.04
28. Support from my partner district colleagues: conversations and/or observations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Positive Impact</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak Positive Impact</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Positive Impact</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong Positive Impact</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong Positive Impact</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable/Do not know</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Responses: 203
Mean: 3.63  Standard Deviation: 0.96

29. My role is

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special education teacher</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical education teacher</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech/Language pathologist</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Responses: 206

30. Year(s) with SSD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year(s)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1 year</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Responses: 202

31. I primary work in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary, Kindergarten to 5th grade</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School, 6th grade to 8th grade</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School, 9th grade to 12th grade</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th+ grade</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Responses: 203
32. I primary teach in

- Collaborative classroom in general education: 35 (18%)
- Cross categorical resource room teacher: 47 (24%)
- Self-contained cross categorical classroom: 59 (30%)
- Academic or trade technical education classroom: 4 (2%)
- Other: 55 (28%)

Total Responses: 200

33. I mainly work in

- Affton: 31 (14%)
- Bayless: 0 (0%)
- Brentwood: 31 (15%)
- Clayton: 13 (6%)
- Ferguson-Florissant: 15 (7%)
- Hancock Place: 2 (1%)
- Hazelwood: 26 (13%)
- Jennings: 7 (3%)
- Kirkwood: 4 (2%)
- Ladue: 6 (3%)
- Lindbergh: 7 (3%)
- Maplewood Richmond Heights: 1 (0%)
- Mehlville: 10 (5%)
- Normandy: 6 (3%)
- Parkway: 25 (12%)
- Pattonville: 3 (1%)
- Ritenour: 11 (5%)
- Riverview Gardens: 18 (9%)
- Rockwood: 15 (7%)
- University City: 7 (3%)
- Valley Park: 1 (0%)
- Webster Groves: 4 (2%)
- Wellston: 0 (0%)
- Special education school: 14 (7%)
- Technical education school: 2 (1%)
- Other: 1 (0%)

Total Responses: 204

Mean: 1.50    Standard Deviation: 0.51
35. I earned my teaching degree from

![Bar chart showing the distribution of degrees earned from various universities.]

1. Central Missouri State University 6 3%
2. Fontbonne University 49 24%
3. Lindenwood University 5 2%
4. Maryville University 2 1%
5. Northwest Missouri State University 1 0%
6. St. Louis University 17 8%
7. Southeast Missouri State University 11 6%
8. Southern Illinois University-Edwardsville 17 8%
9. Southwest Missouri State University 4 2%
10. Truman State University 7 4%
11. University of Missouri-Columbia 4 2%
12. University of Missouri-St. Louis 41 20%
13. Webster University 5 2%
14. Other_ 31 16%
Total Responses: 200

36. To teach in my current position, I received my certification by:

![Bar chart showing the distribution of certification methods.]

1. Traditional course of study 109 54%
2. Alternative program 14 7%
3. Vocational program 0 0%
4. PRAXIS 64 32%
5. Other_ 14 7%
Total Responses: 201
Appendix 5-2-1
Administrator Observation Checklist

This Observation Checklist is part of the Instructional Design Program Evaluation and is intended to assess teachers with 1 to 4 years of experience in implementing and delivering instruction. Please complete TWO Observation Checklists on 2 separate teachers you supervise within their first 4 years with the district based on the evidence you gathered from observations, non observed data from the students, parents, education staff, community members, drop-in visits, conferences, staff meetings, and conversations. Please return TWO completed Observation Checklists to Chialin Hsieh, Program Evaluation at SSD CO by May 20, 2005. If you have any questions regarding the survey, please contact Ros VanHecke, Director of Learning and Assessment at 314.989.7803.

Rate the degree to which you currently have evidence to support that the teacher is implementing the following skills in his/her classroom. If you have not had the opportunity to observe the teacher implementing the following skills, please darken the "NA" for not applicable.

**To what degree is your teacher implementing these indicators of effective instructional design?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Definition: N=Not at all  L=Limited  S=Some  O=Often  A=Always  NA=Do not know/ Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. He/She makes teaching decisions based on assessing student abilities and analyzing data. ...........................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. He/She provides direct instruction to teach skills and strategies to ensure that students have access to and benefit from the general education curriculum. .......................................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. He/She sets the stage for learning through the use of an advanced organizer (anticipatory set). .................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. He/She describes and models new skills ............................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. He/She facilitates the practice of skills and strategies he/she teaches. .............................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. He/She teaches metacognitive skills as a part of the instructional process (i.e., self instruction, self monitoring, problem solving, etc.). ............................................................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. He/She concludes lessons through the use of a post organizer (closure). ..........................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. He/She uses techniques to promote maximum student involvement. ..................................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. He/She plans instruction by considering the needs and experiences of students representing different ethnic groups. ..........................................................................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. He/She regularly monitors student performance through formal and informal assessment. .............................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. He/She changes instruction during the lessons by observing classroom interactions and student questions. .......................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. He/She integrates technology into instruction through the use of computer supported learning ......................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. He/She teaches strategies and content based on the student's individual needs. ...............................................................</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**To what degree do the following factors positively impact your teacher's use of the indicators of effective instructional design listed in questions 1 to 13?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Definition: 1=No Positive Impact  2=Weak Positive Impact  3=Average Positive Impact  4=Strong Positive Impact  5=Very Strong Positive Impact  NA=Not applicable/Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. College Degree (i.e., BA, MA, etc.) ................................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Preservice preparation (i.e., college education coursework, student teaching) ...........</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Service delivery model (i.e., collaborative classroom, resource room, self-contained classroom) ..............................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. SSD first and second year staff development (i.e., Effective Teaching, Thoughtful Teaching, Mentor). ................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Availability of instructional materials ................................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Instructional technology/software support .........................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Administrative support: problem solving, feedback, coaching about instruction .....................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Support to change student or classroom scheduling to provide time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for direct instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Support to change structure/class size of my program or classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to provide direct instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Support to modify partner district curriculum expectations to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teach strategies based on student needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Support to adapt/modify partner district expectations of me when</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they compete with planning and delivering instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Support for ongoing staff development/training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Support from their mentor: conversations and/or observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Support from their peer coach: conversations and/or observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Support from their partner district colleagues: conversations and/or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>observations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Demographic Information

29. This teacher works at
   - Elementary, Kindergarten to 5th grade
   - High School, 9th grade to 12th grade
   - Middle School, 6th grade to 8th grade
   - 12th+ grade

30. This teacher I supervise works in:
   - Affton
   - Clayton
   - Hazelwood
   - Ladue
   - Mehlville
   - Pattonville
   - Rockwood
   - Webster Groves
   - Technical education school
   - Bayless
   - Ferguson-Florissant
   - Jennings
   - Lindbergh
   - Normandy
   - Ritenour
   - University City
   - Wellston
   - Brentwood
   - Hancock Place
   - Kirkwood
   - Maplewood Richmond Heights
   - Parkway
   - Riverview Gardens
   - Valley Park
   - Special education school
Appendix 5-2-2
1. He/She makes teaching decisions based on assessing student abilities and analyzing data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>1 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>2 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>11 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>50 43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>50 43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know/ Not applicable</td>
<td>2 2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Responses: 116

Mean: 4.28    Standard Deviation: 0.78

2. He/She provides direct instruction to teach skills and strategies to ensure that students have access to and benefit from the general education curriculum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>1 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>8 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>46 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>54 47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know/ Not applicable</td>
<td>6 5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Responses: 115

Mean: 4.40    Standard Deviation: 0.67

3. He/She sets the stage for learning through the use of an advanced organizer (anticipatory set).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>1 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>6 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>16 14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>40 34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>40 34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know/ Not applicable</td>
<td>13 11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Responses: 116

Mean: 4.09    Standard Deviation: 0.93
4. He/She describes and models new skills.

1. Not at all 1 1%
2. Limited 6 5%
3. Some 7 6%
4. Often 35 30%
5. Always 67 58%
6. Do not know/ Not applicable 0 0%
Total Responses: 116
Mean: 4.39 Standard Deviation: 0.88

5. He/She facilitates the practice of skills and strategies he/she teaches.

1. Not at all 0 0%
2. Limited 4 3%
3. Some 8 7%
4. Often 42 36%
5. Always 62 53%
6. Do not know/ Not applicable 0 0%
Total Responses: 116
Mean: 4.40 Standard Deviation: 0.77

6. He/She teaches metacognitive skills as a part of the instructional process (i.e., self instruction, self monitoring, problem solving, etc.).

1. Not at all 3 3%
2. Limited 8 7%
3. Some 23 20%
4. Often 44 38%
5. Always 33 28%
6. Do not know/ Not applicable 5 4%
Total Responses: 116
Mean: 3.86 Standard Deviation: 1.01

7. He/She concludes lessons through the use of a post organizer (closure).

1. Not at all 4 3%
2. Limited 9 8%
3. Some 19 16%
4. Often 46 40%
5. Always 27 23%
6. Do not know/ Not applicable 11 9%
Total Responses: 116
Mean: 3.79 Standard Deviation: 1.04
8. He/She uses techniques to promote maximum student involvement.

1. Not at all 1 1%
2. Limited 4 3%
3. Some 11 9%
4. Often 32 28%
5. Always 66 57%
6. Do not know/ Not applicable 2 2%
Total Responses: 116
Mean: 4.39    Standard Deviation: 0.87

9. He/She plans instruction by considering the needs and experiences of students representing different ethnic groups.

1. Not at all 4 4%
2. Limited 1 1%
3. Some 14 12%
4. Often 40 35%
5. Always 41 36%
6. Do not know/ Not applicable 14 12%
Total Responses: 114
Mean: 4.13    Standard Deviation: 0.97

10. He/She regularly monitors student performance through formal and informal assessment.

1. Not at all 0 0%
2. Limited 4 3%
3. Some 15 13%
4. Often 38 33%
5. Always 56 48%
6. Do not know/ Not applicable 3 3%
Total Responses: 116
Mean: 4.29    Standard Deviation: 0.83

11. He/She changes instruction during the lessons by observing classroom interactions and student questions.

1. Not at all 1 1%
2. Limited 3 3%
3. Some 22 19%
4. Often 31 27%
5. Always 51 44%
6. Do not know/ Not applicable 7 6%
Total Responses: 115
Mean: 4.19    Standard Deviation: 0.92
12. He/She integrates technology into instruction through the use of computer supported learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know/ Not applicable</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Responses: 115
Mean: 3.35    Standard Deviation: 1.08

13. He/She teaches strategies and content based on the student's individual needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know/ Not applicable</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Responses: 115
Mean: 4.39    Standard Deviation: 0.74

14. College Degree (i.e., BA, MA, etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Positive Impact</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak Positive Impact</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Positive Impact</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong Positive Impact</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong Positive Impact</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable/Do not know</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Responses: 116
Mean: 3.80    Standard Deviation: 0.92

15. Preservice preparation (i.e., college education coursework, student teaching)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Positive Impact</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak Positive Impact</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Positive Impact</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong Positive Impact</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong Positive Impact</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable/Do not know</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Responses: 116
Mean: 3.82    Standard Deviation: 0.89
16. Service delivery model (i.e., collaborative classroom, resource room, self-contained classroom)

1. No Positive Impact 0 0%
2. Weak Positive Impact 6 5%
3. Average Positive Impact 24 21%
4. Strong Positive Impact 45 39%
5. Very Strong Positive Impact 31 27%
6. Not applicable/Do not know 10 9%

Total Responses: 116

Mean: 3.95 Standard Deviation: 0.87
17. SSD first and second year staff development (i.e., Effective Teaching, Thoughtful Teaching, Mentor)

1. No Positive Impact 3 3%
2. Weak Positive Impact 6 5%
3. Average Positive Impact 37 32%
4. Strong Positive Impact 39 34%
5. Very Strong Positive Impact 21 18%
6. Not applicable/Do not know 10 9%

Total Responses: 116
Mean: 3.65  Standard Deviation: 0.96

18. Availability of instructional materials

1. No Positive Impact 0 0%
2. Weak Positive Impact 6 5%
3. Average Positive Impact 35 30%
4. Strong Positive Impact 47 41%
5. Very Strong Positive Impact 22 19%
6. Not applicable/Do not know 6 5%

Total Responses: 116
Mean: 3.77  Standard Deviation: 0.83

19. Instructional technology/software support

1. No Positive Impact 4 3%
2. Weak Positive Impact 16 14%
3. Average Positive Impact 42 37%
4. Strong Positive Impact 29 25%
5. Very Strong Positive Impact 11 10%
6. Not applicable/Do not know 13 11%

Total Responses: 115
Mean: 3.26  Standard Deviation: 0.98

20. Administrative support: problem solving, feedback, coaching about instruction

1. No Positive Impact 0 0%
2. Weak Positive Impact 4 3%
3. Average Positive Impact 20 17%
4. Strong Positive Impact 62 53%
5. Very Strong Positive Impact 26 22%
6. Not applicable/Do not know 4 3%

Total Responses: 116
Mean: 3.98  Standard Deviation: 0.75
21. Support to change student or classroom scheduling to provide time for direct instruction

- No Positive Impact: 1 (1%)
- Weak Positive Impact: 4 (3%)
- Average Positive Impact: 26 (22%)
- Strong Positive Impact: 52 (45%)
- Very Strong Positive Impact: 22 (19%)
- Not applicable/Do not know: 11 (9%)

Total Responses: 116
Mean: 3.86 Standard Deviation: 0.83

22. Support to change structure/class size of my program or classroom to provide direct instruction

- No Positive Impact: 0 (0%)
- Weak Positive Impact: 3 (3%)
- Average Positive Impact: 26 (23%)
- Strong Positive Impact: 53 (46%)
- Very Strong Positive Impact: 21 (18%)
- Not applicable/Do not know: 12 (10%)

Total Responses: 115
Mean: 3.89 Standard Deviation: 0.75

23. Support to modify partner district curriculum expectations to teach strategies based on student needs

- No Positive Impact: 0 (0%)
- Weak Positive Impact: 8 (7%)
- Average Positive Impact: 26 (23%)
- Strong Positive Impact: 40 (35%)
- Very Strong Positive Impact: 21 (18%)
- Not applicable/Do not know: 19 (17%)

Total Responses: 114
Mean: 3.78 Standard Deviation: 0.89

24. Support to adapt/modify partner district expectations of me when they compete with planning and delivering instruction

- No Positive Impact: 0 (0%)
- Weak Positive Impact: 8 (7%)
- Average Positive Impact: 17 (15%)
- Strong Positive Impact: 47 (42%)
- Very Strong Positive Impact: 14 (12%)
- Not applicable/Do not know: 26 (23%)

Total Responses: 112
Mean: 3.78 Standard Deviation: 0.83
25. Support for ongoing staff development/training

- No Positive Impact: 2 (2%)
- Weak Positive Impact: 5 (4%)
- Average Positive Impact: 23 (20%)
- Strong Positive Impact: 54 (47%)
- Very Strong Positive Impact: 30 (26%)
- Not applicable/Do not know: 1 (1%)

Total Responses: 115
Mean: 3.92 Standard Deviation: 0.89

26. Support from their mentor: conversations and/or observations

- No Positive Impact: 2 (2%)
- Weak Positive Impact: 7 (6%)
- Average Positive Impact: 19 (17%)
- Strong Positive Impact: 37 (32%)
- Very Strong Positive Impact: 32 (28%)
- Not applicable/Do not know: 18 (16%)

Total Responses: 115
Mean: 3.93 Standard Deviation: 1.00

27. Support from their peer coach: conversations and/or observations

- No Positive Impact: 1 (1%)
- Weak Positive Impact: 7 (6%)
- Average Positive Impact: 22 (19%)
- Strong Positive Impact: 36 (31%)
- Very Strong Positive Impact: 35 (30%)
- Not applicable/Do not know: 14 (12%)

Total Responses: 115
Mean: 3.96 Standard Deviation: 0.97

28. Support from their partner district colleagues: conversations and/or observations

- No Positive Impact: 3 (3%)
- Weak Positive Impact: 7 (6%)
- Average Positive Impact: 24 (21%)
- Strong Positive Impact: 49 (43%)
- Very Strong Positive Impact: 22 (19%)
- Not applicable/Do not know: 10 (9%)

Total Responses: 115
Mean: 3.76 Standard Deviation: 0.96
29. This teacher works at

- 1. Elementary, Kindergarten to 5th grade: 45, 44%
- 2. Middle School, 6th grade to 8th grade: 27, 26%
- 3. High School, 9th grade to 12th grade: 30, 29%
- 4. 12th+ grade: 0, 0%

Total Responses: 102

30. This teacher I supervise works in:

- 1. Affton: 0, 0%
- 2. Bayless: 0, 0%
- 3. Brentwood: 0, 0%
- 4. Clayton: 0, 0%
- 5. Ferguson-Florissant: 11, 10%
- 6. Hancock Place: 2, 2%
- 7. Hazelwood: 8, 7%
- 8. Jennings: 3, 3%
- 9. Kirkwood: 4, 4%
- 10. Ladue: 3, 3%
- 11. Lindbergh: 5, 4%
- 12. Maplewood Richmond Heights: 2, 2%
- 13. Mehlville: 11, 10%
- 14. Normandy: 2, 2%
- 15. Parkway: 19, 17%
- 16. Pattonville: 4, 4%
- 17. Ritenour: 3, 3%
- 18. Riverview Gardens: 5, 4%
- 19. Rockwood: 11, 10%
- 20. University City: 2, 2%
- 21. Valley Park: 0, 0%
- 22. Webster Groves: 3, 3%
- 23. Wellston: 2, 2%
- 24. Special education school: 6, 5%
- 25. Technical education school: 4, 4%
- 26. Other: 4, 4%

Total Responses: 114
Appendix 5-3
## Instructional Design Program Evaluation Teacher vs. Admin Survey for 2005

### Teacher Item #

**Strength >=4; Progressing 3-4; Challenge <3**  
1= Strongly disagree; 5= Strongly agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Teacher N=209</th>
<th>Admin N=118</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I make teaching decisions based on assessing student abilities and analyzing data.</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I describe and model new skills.</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I teach strategies and content based on the student's individual needs.</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I provide direct instruction to teach skills and strategies to ensure that students have access to and benefit from the general education curriculum.</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I facilitate the practice of skills and strategies I teach.</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I regularly monitor student performance through formal and informal assessment.</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use techniques to promote maximum student engagement.</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I teach metacognitive skills as a part of the instructional process (i.e., self instruction, self monitoring, problem solving.</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I plan instruction by considering the needs and experiences of students representing different ethnic groups.</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I set the stage for learning through the use of an advanced organizer (anticipatory set).</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I conclude lessons through the use of a post organizer (closure).</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I integrate technology into instruction through the use of computer supported learning.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Admin Item #

**Strength >=4; Progressing 3-4; Challenge <3**  
1= no positive impact; 5=very strongly positive impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Teacher N=209</th>
<th>Admin N=118</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College Degree (i.e., BA, MA, etc.)</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservice preparation (i.e., college education coursework, student teaching).</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service delivery model (i.e., collaborative classroom, resource room, self-contained classroom)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for ongoing staff development/training.</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative support: problem solving, feedback, coaching about my instruction.</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support to modify partner district curriculum expectations to teach strategies based on student needs.</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support from my mentor: conversations and/or observations.</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support to change student or classroom scheduling to provide time for direct instruction.</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support to adapt/modify partner district expectations of me when they compete with planning and delivering instruction.</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support from my partner district colleagues: conversations and/or observations.</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSD first and second year staff development (i.e., Effective Teaching, Thoughtful Teaching, Mentor).</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of instructional materials.</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support to change structure/class size of my program or classroom to provide direct instruction.</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support from my peer coach: conversations and/or observations.</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional technology/software support.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p means statistically significant difference between teacher and administrator.
Appendix 5-4
**Student Interviews**

Student responses to the interview questions were reviewed by the program evaluation committee:

What does your teacher do to help you learn new information?

1) My teacher explains more than most teachers I have had. He is more complete with giving us explanations...more elaborate. Not too much info, just enough.

2) My teacher does several steps. First, she gives us a packet that explains the background for the new material; then she does a demonstration. We get to try the new skill ourselves with hands-on project work. Finally, she grades us while working around the room and see how we are doing...she uses a checklist.

3) My teacher explains things, especially new stuff very well. She gives us the information we need to start new stuff instead of just giving us a worksheet and saying "read the directions". She explains clearly...gives us lots of background...and we can ask questions at any time, not just at the end of the period.

4) With my reading material she will have me to sound out the words when I cannot pronounce them. Sometimes she will read along with me. She also gives me lots of praise when I do good. She asks me questions like- “what is the character’s name”?

5) We sit and she explains what I am supposed to do. She then sometimes shows me how to do the assignment. Then she will ask me to do a problem on my own.

6) My resource teacher will read the directions to me, explain them and break it down for me so I can understand what I am supposed to be doing.

7) She breaks-it-down and shows me step-by-step how to do my assignments. She always asks me if I need more help or directions.

8) We read over the material. My teacher will rephrase it if I don’t understand. If necessary she’ll reread it to herself and come up with a different explanation or example. Sometimes if she is not certain of the subject she goes back to my classroom teacher and gets more information for me.

9) My teacher will show me how to do the problem, then have me try it on my own. When I get a new word I cannot read she will have me sound it out. Then she says the word and then I write it and then we practice reading it over again.

10) She explains the assignment to us. She gives us an example. Then we practice it. If necessary, we make corrections.

11) She helps me because she explains it so I understand it.

12) She is good.

13) She helps me after we are done to make sure I can do it by myself.

14) Lot’s of stuff; I never have to guess what I’m going to learn

15) She explains it to me again if I need help.

16) She always go over the information the same way. So I can remember from before.

17) She teaches me strategies I can use in all of my classes and in college

18) She shows me how to do it, then I try by myself.
19) The class learns things together, then we can pick out our assignment.
20) She helps alot. Helps me read, write, and study and gives me ideas about how to
study.
21) She helps by teaching me over and over until I learn it.
22) She shows us books and talks to us. We have to do a lot of homework. I don’t
know, she just teaches us.
23) She uses the board a lot. Talk about new stuff. Worksheets.
24) Boardwork, discussion, and worksheets. Sometimes we do projects.
25) They don’t.
26) Overhead projector, discussion, worksheets, lecture.
27) I go to the hospital everyday. I learn new things here. They just show us.

Do you have a suggestion for what else your teacher could do to help you learn new
information?

1) There is nothing that I would say here. I learn new skills pretty well from her.
2) He could give us more examples maybe more demonstration time so we see the
new skill better.
3) I can't think of anything else right now...I understand most of the new material.
4) If I do bad on my homework; I wish she would help me some more.
5) My teacher is good.
6) When we learn new things sometimes it’s hard for me to get it and then I don’t do
so good.
7) No she is alright.
8) I like having two teachers. (collaborative teaching)
9) I need more help with my work, I don’t get good grades.
10) I wish she wouldn’t go so fast sometimes.
11) I learn from her well, my grades are good.
12) I wish sometimes I had more time to practice before we move on.
13) She does everything right.
14) Nothing, she is pretty good at it.
15) I’d like to go on trips.
16) Less homework.
17) I would like to do more experiments.
18) Experiments or projects.
19) Work with my friends in groups.
20) Just keep showing me stuff.

The committee found the student responses to be fresh and in many cases somewhat
profound. Certainly the “student voice” reiterates the need for explicit instruction with
opportunities for modeling and practice with specific feedback. However, this data was not
analyzed any further but used to keep the student perspective in mind as the program evaluation
work continued.