

I.D.viii
High Quality Professional Development

No Child Left Behind Goal 3: By 2005-2006, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.

No Child Left Behind Indicator 3.2: The percentage of teachers receiving high quality professional development.¹⁴

For purposes of this Update, a professional development initiative is defined as a set of integrated professional development activities that (1) extend over a relatively long period of time, (2) include direct follow-up in schools or classrooms, (3) provide opportunities for practice and feedback, and (4) require a substantial investment of resources.

I. KEY ELEMENTARY LEVEL INITIATIVE
READING FIRST

A. Introductory Description

Somerset County Public Schools enrolled in Maryland's implementation of *Reading First* in the summer of 2003 embracing Maryland's goal under Reading First of children achieving proficiency in reading by the end of Grade 3. The reauthorization of Title I, Subpart A, "Reading First," offers unequivocal direction for Maryland to close the gap in reading achievement by providing professional development in scientifically based reading research (SBRR) to teachers in order to:

- Demonstrate effective reading instruction delivery;
 - Assure trained instruction in phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension as the tools of highly qualified beginning reading teachers;
 - Increase teacher skill in tracking student progress through benchmark screening and progress-monitoring instrumentation;
 - Increase teacher skill in applying immediate feedback data from diagnostic assessments to modify instruction through supplemental and intervention strategies and materials that are grounded in SBRR and offer specialized and intensive support to students most at risk;
 - Increase planning, instructional practice, and reflective effectiveness through in-school coaches, supervised and mentored by trained specialists and county appointed coordinator(s) who provide on-site assistance and reinforcement; and
 - Achieve continuous improvement through Reading Action Plans (RAP) based on data-driven decisions.
-

B. Update High Quality Questions

1. What are the underlying student performance needs identified in the Maryland School Assessment section that the initiative was designed to address? (Be sure to include the specific Voluntary State Curriculum standards or indicators for each grade level, as applicable.)

There is a need to reduce the number of elementary students reading at the basic level. Although the trend for SCPS elementary reading achievement shows a continual increase, the Hispanic (47.9%), Limited English Proficient (31%), and African American (69.4%) sub-groups are not making acceptable annual growth. By the end of third grade, 26% of students are reading at the basic level. Of greater concern yet is the 32.6% of fifth graders assessed at the basic level in 2006 on MSA. These levels have improved slightly from 2005 with 29.7% of third graders' which is an improvement of 3.7 percentage points, and 44.1% of the fifth graders' improving reading skills which is an 11.5 percentage points, increase over the past year. Specific challenges were being seen in 5th Grade Special Education (53.1%), 5th Grade Composite (67.4%), 3rd & 5th Grade African American (68.4%), and 3rd & 5th Grade FARMS (Free and Reduced Meal Status) (64.2%)

Specific Implement Master Plan Action Steps in this area are:

- 1.1.29 Promote increased knowledge of the selected research based reading program
- 1.1.32 Continue to provide targeted professional development for the Pre K-5 reading series that include the five essential elements
- 1.1.33 Continue to maintain the reading coaches to meet the requirements of *Reading First* Program
- 1.1.35 Continue the use of the 120 minute block reading/language arts in PreK-5 schools
- 1.1.41 Purchase interventional supplemental materials from approved list of *Reading First*
- 1.1.50 Use DIBELS and core textbook assessments in grades K-5

Specific Voluntary State Curriculum Standards are:

3rd grade ESL subgroup

- 1.3.B.2.b- Break words into familiar parts
- 1.3.D.3.a; 1.3.D.3.b- Use context/word structure to determine the meanings of words
- 1.3.E.4.a; 1.3.E.4.b; 1.3.E.4.c; 1.3.E.4.d- Identify and explain the main idea/Draw Conclusions
- 2.3.A.2.b-Use graphic aids
- 2.3.A.3.a- Identify and analyze the organization of texts
- 2.3.A.4 g- Draw conclusions and inferences
- 2.3.A.6.a- Explain whether the text fulfills the reading purpose

4th Grade ESL/Hispanic subgroups

- 1.4.D.2.b- Identify and explain word relationships, to determine the meanings of words
- 1.4.D.3.b- Use word structure to determine the meaning of words

- 1.4.E.4.a- Identify and explain the main idea
- 2.4.A.1.a- Read, use, and identify the characteristics of nonfiction materials to gain information and content knowledge
- 3.4.A.3.b; 3.4.A.3.d- Identify and explain the elements of a story & Identify and analyze the characters

5th Grade ESL/Hispanic/ Special Education Subgroups

- 1.5.D.3.b- Use word structure to determine the meaning of words
- 1.5.E.4.a- Identify and explain the main idea
- 2.5.A.1.a- Read, use, and identify the characteristics of nonfiction materials to gain information and content knowledge
- 2.5.A.2.b- Use graphic aids
- 2.5.A.4.a; 2.5.A.4.g- Identify and explain the author's/text's purpose and intended audience & Draw conclusions and inferences
- 1.5.E.3.d- Skim the text to search for connections between and among ideas
- 1.5.E.4.b- Identify and explain what is directly stated in the text

2. What are the specific goals of the initiative in terms of student outcomes and teacher outcomes?

Reading First Goal 1: Every student will read at grade level or above no later than the close of the third grade instruction.

Students will be able to hear, identify and manipulate the individual sounds-phonemes in spoken words, to recognize familiar words accurately and automatically and to decode unfamiliar words, to read accurately and quickly, to learn meanings and pronunciations of words necessary for communication and to develop strategies for understanding, remembering, and communicating with others about what has been read. The assessment used to monitor students is DIBELS and this is completed a minimum of three times a year. Additional progress monitoring is completed for intensive and strategic students.

Reading First Goal 2: Each elementary teacher will effectively use a scientifically based reading program including core strategies and proven intervention programs.

Teachers will be able to successfully use the research based, five components of effective reading instruction including the selection high quality reading programs and materials, the application of instructional strategies that are based on scientifically based reading research, and the administration of classroom-based assessment data to guide instruction. Each teacher will understand how the core reading program aligns with the voluntary statewide curriculum and Maryland School Assessment. Intervention groups will be provided instruction with targeted intervention programs to meet individual student needs based on data. Reading coaches, classroom teachers, ELL teachers and special education teachers will be provided the necessary training to assure the programs selected for students are implemented with fidelity and are selected for use based on the acceptable *Reading First* criteria and meets the needs of each student. Intervention groups will begin the 2nd week of school and continue until the next to last week of school. Attendance sheets are used to track students and their time in intervention. Reading Coaches monitor the tracked time, intervention tools, and the assessment progress of students.

Reading First Goal 3: Teachers will increase instructional effectiveness through professional development provided by the reading coaches as they will closely monitor, model, and follow-up at the school and county level to assist Reading First Classroom Teachers.

Reading Coaches and Reading First Classroom teachers will work together to align weekly lessons as a follow up from the alignments that have been completed to the benchmark assessments to assure assessment limits noted on the VSC are taught. Coaches will help teachers to enhance their lessons in order to assure best practices are in place to reach all goals. SANE (Sign-in sheets, Agendas, Notes, and Evaluations) documentation will be kept and collected on professional development that is provided and for team meetings.

3. Who were the intended participants? (Be sure to include how many completed all the components of the initiative.)

Reading First Professional Development was intended for all elementary staff.

Participants included the Assistant Superintendent, Elementary/Title 1 Supervisor, *Reading First* Coordinator, ELL Supervisor, *Reading First* Principals, *Reading First* Coaches, Regular Education and ELL Teachers, Special Education Teachers, Intervention Teachers, and Instructional Assistants. SANE documentation was collected at all professional developments.

Professional Development Workshops within the *Reading First* Initiative

Date	Workshop Title	Participants
February 21, 2007 Full Day Training	SIPPS In-Service	Regular Ed Teachers 61% Participated 2-21 39% Trained by Coaches Special Ed Teachers- 100% Paraprofessionals-55% Administration-100% ELL Teachers- 100%
October 19, 2006 Full Day Training	Managing Differentiation/Grouping for Reading Success-	Regular Ed Teachers- 68% attended 10/19 32% trained by Coaches ELL Teachers- 75% Administration-100% Special Ed Teachers- 100% Paraprofessionals-62%
February 16, 2007	MacMillan McGraw Hill Differentiation of the Core Series-	Regular Ed Teachers-97% ELL Teachers- 100% Special Ed Teachers- 100% Administration-100% Paraprofessionals-88%

Date	Workshop Title	Participants
August 7, 2006 with Make Up Sessions (9-19; 9-27; & 10/16)	MIBR Modules- (Including Make-Up Sessions)-	Regular Ed Teachers-100% ELL Teachers- 100% Special Ed Teachers- 100% Administration-100% Paraprofessionals-100%
August 6, 2006; March 6, 2007; April 25, 2007	SBRR Training- (Including Make-Up Sessions)-	Regular Ed Teachers-100% ELL Teachers- 100% Special Ed Teachers- 100% Administration-100% Paraprofessionals-100%
Monthly Team Sessions	On-Going Team/Staff Development through Monthly Sessions on <i>Performance Matters</i> ; <i>DIBELS</i> ; and Centers	Regular Ed Teachers-100% Special Ed Teachers-50% ELL Teachers-50% Paraprofessionals-100% Administration-100%

4. Identify the resources invested in the initiative. (Be sure to include funding, people, and time.)

SCPS appropriates Federal *Reading First* Grant funds, Title I funds, and local funds to the *Reading First* program.

RESOURCES INVESTED IN <i>READING FIRST</i> PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT	
Staffing	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff .5 Reading Coach at Deal Island Elementary School 	Cost: \$22,575 Source: <i>Reading First</i> Grant <i>*Duplicate Reference</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support three (3) Reading Coaches at Woodson, Princess Anne, and Greenwood Elementary Schools 	Cost: \$176,190 Source: Title I <i>*Duplicate Reference</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add One (1) Reading Intervention Teacher 	Cost: \$43,900 Source: Local
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add <i>Reading First</i> Coordinator position 	Cost: \$63,200 Source: Local <i>*Duplicate Reference</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access consultants from CORE Company 	Cost: \$2,600 Source: <i>Reading First</i>
Core Programs and Interventions	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Purchase <i>Reading First</i> materials and resources to support programs for training of teachers and associates. 	Cost: \$170,000 Source: <i>Reading First</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide SIPPS training for Reading Coaches, 2nd Grade & Intervention Teachers, and Assistants in the Core 	Cost: No Training Cost Source: Provided by the Developmental Study Center at

RESOURCES INVESTED IN <i>READING FIRST</i> PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT	
Program and Interventions	no cost to SCPS. Text Cost: \$6,000 Source: <i>Reading First</i>
Materials and Supplies	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide guided instruction materials for teachers for implementing the DIBELS Assessments 	Booklet Cost: \$2,500 Site Analysis Cost: \$1,200 Source: <i>Reading First</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide materials for SIPPS training 	Cost: \$1,000 Source: <i>Reading First</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide materials for Monthly PD Meetings 	Cost: \$4,000 Source: <i>Reading First</i>
Stipends	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide stipends to teachers attending Professional Development Trainings outside of paid days 	Cost: \$8,000 Source: <i>Reading First</i>
Travel for Conferences	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approved <i>Reading First Leadership Conference</i> attendance 	Cost: \$5,000 Source: <i>Reading First</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide Differentiation Training for Leadership Teams 	Cost: \$6,900 Source: <i>Reading First</i>

5. Did the initiative unfold as planned? Did all the activities take place for all the participants? If not, describe any changes to the original plans.

The *Reading First* Program was successfully implemented and carried out under guidance from MSDE and the *Reading First* Regional Coordinator.

The *Reading First* Initiative included sequential, guided professional development activities for elementary staff, administrators, and supervisors throughout the first, second, and third year of program delivery. The DIBELS (diagnostic assessment) training is ongoing through workshops, coaching, and job embedded activities such as grade level teacher reflection, walk-through data analysis, county collaborative meetings, cross building reading coach discussion, and instructional council guidance.

Two highly valued specific events during the year were: “The *Reading First* Leadership Conference: Research to Practice” as a MSDE sponsored, one-day institute for reading coaches, principals, and supervisors, and a “Differentiating Instruction in Reading Class Workshop” for regional reading specialists, teachers, paraprofessionals, and reading coaches.

The CORE Reading Program was implemented using Macmillan Reading Program consultants for large group presentations with follow up in individual schools by Regional Reading Specialists, *Reading First* Coordinator, and Reading Coaches. The TARGETED INTERVENTION Reading Program was implemented based on individual student needs as well as, grade level interventions by using the ERI (Early Reading Intervention) series for

Kindergarten, “Readwell” for first grade, SIPPS (Systematic Instruction in Phonemic Awareness, Phonics and Sight Words Identification) for Second Grade, “*Voyager*” for third, fourth, and fifth grades. Cross grade level training was implemented to meet specific needs of students. Training for intervention was delivered by Intervention company representatives, the Regional Coordinator, the Elementary Supervisor; site based reading coaches and the program coordinator.

Specific and on-going professional development that was planned and implemented included:

- SBRR (Scientifically Based Reading Research) Based Professional Development provided by MSDE
- MIBR (Maryland Institute of Beginning Reading) Based Professional Development provided by MSDE
- LETRS (Language Essentials for Teachers of Reading and Spelling) Professional Development provided to two Reading Coaches by MSDE in order to have the Coaches to be Trainers of Trainers (TOT) for Somerset
- Supplemental and Intervention Selection Committee: Two Reading Coaches selected to be trained by MSDE in order to gain and share knowledge on analyzing programs to be systematic and explicit in instructional strategies. These coaches were a part of the Maryland State Selection committee and are TOT’s for Somerset to meet future needs when adopting programs
- CORE program Consultant provided on site observations and professional development on best practices with Macmillan McGraw-Hill and its implementation strategies
- MSDE provided professional development for the reading coaches, principals and Central Office administrators on ways to analyze DIBELS data and data driven instruction.
- Coaches became TOT’s for the school level when providing local professional development on data analysis and data driven instruction.

6. What concrete evidence is available to suggest that the initiative achieved the intended outcomes for teachers and students? If the school system’s previous plans included an evaluation, indicate whether or not it was completed. If the evaluation was completed, was there a report? If so, what did it tell the reader? With whom was the report shared?

Students’ performance on assessments such as: DIBELS, SAT-10, and MSA data indicate accelerated achievement.

Quarterly benchmark data is stored in *Performance Matters*. Increases in benchmarked data appear to correlate with the implementation of provided professional development. Student Performance markers showed 79% of the kindergarteners met the benchmark for end of year testing in DIBELS, 52% of the first grade students met the benchmark for end of year testing for DIBELS, 46% of the second grade students met benchmark, 39% in 3rd grade, 41% in 4th grade, and 51% in 5th grade. SAT-10 testing was new this year. First grade students scored 75% at or above grade level. Second grade students showed 69% scoring at or above the 50th

percentile ranking (the passing percentile) on the SAT-10 assessment. MSA scores from 2003 to 2007 are showing an upward trend in reading proficiency in grades 1-5. Third Grade MSA Reading Scores have accelerated from 49.8% proficient/advanced in 2003 to 79.3% in 2007. Fourth grade have increased from 66.5% in 2003 to 82.6% in 2007. Fifth grade MSA Reading scores have gone from 55% to 63.2% proficient/advanced.

The Hispanic subgroup of students demonstrated pronounced accelerated achievement.

The Hispanic subgroup students receive a portion of their reading instruction through intervention groups taught by special education, ELL, and regular education teachers. The group work is based upon skill and strategy needs and comprised of ELL, special education and regular education students. ELL teachers' training in *Reading First* coupled with their knowledge of adaptive strategies and learning styles led to 24.8% increase in proficiency in this group with 3rd, 4th, and 5th grades on MSA. Other groups showing an increase in the percentage of students scoring proficiency are the white subgroup with a 10.6 percentage points, increase, and a 6.8 percentage points, increase over the last two years for male students in 3rd, 4th, and 5th grades.

Classroom walk-through and observation data indicate improved instructional skill delivery and intervention strategies by elementary teachers and aides.

Classroom walk-through data and observations by the Regional Reading Specialist, the Elementary Supervisor, the *Reading First* Coordinator, Reading Coaches, and School Principals indicated that:

- the program was being implemented with fidelity,
- instruction was being delivered in a systematic and explicit manner,
- flex groups were being used to differentiate instruction,
- students had many opportunities to develop vocabulary, practice fluency, and improve comprehension, and
- students had many opportunities to read independently.

Staff worked in grade level teams and demonstrated their skills in analyzing data and planning for instructional changes.

Documentation is also kept through sign-in sheets, agendas, notes, and evaluation sheets. Walk-through data is used to document instructional implementation of professional development. All *Reading First* staff demonstrated learned skills through assisting in the quarterly administration of DIBELS. Under the leadership of the School Principal and the Reading Coach, staff worked in grade level teams and demonstrated their skills in analyzing data and planning for instructional changes.

- 7. Does the review of progress under Part I of the Update suggest the need for any modification to the initiative? If so, describe the planned modifications for 2007-2008 and the corresponding resource allocations.**

A stronger model of implementation follow up and feedback is needed to assure full transfer of training to classroom practice.

Based on the walk-through data and the information submitted by the reading coaches, there is a need for systemic horizontal grade level direction. There is a need to more closely

monitor and promote a consistent implementation across the county following each professional development initiative, lesson studies, and data meetings. There is a need for grade level teachers to schedule times to meet individually with their coaches for collaborative, in-depth planning, for classroom modeling opportunities, and to plan for future professional development based in the needs of their particular students. Quarterly SANE documentation will be kept, as well as, walk-through data for evaluation. All data will continually be used to guide instruction, target intervention, and plan for individual student needs.

SCPS will continue to fund and support the *Reading First* program with embedded professional development for incumbent staff and with full scale professional development for new hires.

SCPS has appointed one Reading Coach to the coordinator's level to oversee the entire *Reading First* Program. The responsibility formerly had been with the Elementary/Title I Supervisor. Three Reading Coaches will be maintained and are funded by Title I and the LSS, and a .5 Reading Coach is funded by the *Reading First* Grant. Locally, a Reading Intervention Teacher at Woodson Elementary, and two assistants have been hired, one at Greenwood Elementary and one at Princess Anne Elementary to assist in delivering reading intervention increasing both the number of students served and the actual intervention time. On July 23 and 27, 2007, the reading coaches and assistants will facilitate center activities training in differentiating instruction.

Somerset County Public Schools with Reading First funding provided on site training led by Carol Tolman for all staff (July 23-26, 2007) focusing on 3 modules: 1) Assessment-Data Driven Instruction, 2) Differentiated Instruction and 3) Motivation. MSDE conducted regional training at the annual *Reading First* Conference (August 7-8, 2007). MacMillan's national consultants provided training for reading coaches and all teachers on the alignment of the Macmillan Series with Reading First core components. Principals/Administrators will be trained in *Reading First* during the winter of 2008.

In the Fall of 2007, RTI expansion (Response to Intervention) training will be conducted by core consultants for coaches, teachers, and all staff. This will increase classroom teachers' skill in aligning regular classroom instruction with intervention.

Locally, reading coach training will be provided by a consultant on the second grade intervention program. Coaches will then train teachers on the use of this program. All reading coaches will provide DIBELS refresher training before the three testing periods of September, February, and May. Team meetings will take place prior to each benchmark as a refresher using *Performance Matters*. Coaches will meet weekly to review tiered lessons as part of the on-going grade-level meetings. Monthly meetings with coaches, ELL teachers, Special Education teachers, and *Reading First* Coordinator on monitoring of subgroup progress will be held. Data driven instruction as well as, differentiated instruction lesson planning, co-teaching, and intervention strategies will continue to be monitored and coached.

8. Include the timeline for the modifications and anticipated dates for achieving the intended outcomes for teachers and students. If this has already been addressed under

the Maryland School Assessment section or other area of this document, note the page number. Be sure to include plans for an evaluation.

The timeline for modifications are included in the responses above on pages 149 and 150. Other references to modifications and alterations to the *Reading First* Professional Development are found on page 13,16, and 17. The Program Evaluation Guide for the *Reading First* Professional Development Program follows on the next page.

Somerset County Public Schools Program Evaluation Planning Guide

Name of Initiative: READING FIRST			
1. There is a need to effectively implement classroom strategies for increasing subgroup reading performance. (Update I, p. 14)			
2. There is a need to target intervention to meet specific deficits/needs of students. (Update I, p. 12)			
	Students	Teachers	Other Staff
Expected Participation	All Elementary Students	All Elementary Instructional Staff	
Expected Outcomes	<p>#1 African American, FARMS, and Special Education Subgroups will increase proficiency by no less than 10%</p> <p>#2 50% or more of the students in intervention will meet intervention goals and exit to regular program</p>	<p>Teachers will disaggregate data, analyze findings, link needs to appropriate classroom strategies, implement strategies, and monitor progress of students.</p> <p>Teachers will disaggregate data, analyze findings, link needs to appropriate interventions, implement interventions, and monitor progress of students.</p>	<p>Reading Coaches will be supporting teachers in classroom instruction 50% of each day</p> <p>Principals: will provide precise reading feedback to teachers following classroom walk throughs, observations and evaluations</p>
Change Levels	Planned Format	Planned Format	Planned Format
Level 1: (Reaction to Learning Experience)		Format: Written participant feedback on each workshop, in-service, training, etc...	Focus group discussion with principals and coaches
Level 2: (Measure of Participants' Learning)		Format: Center Lesson plans from Summer Workshop show application of learned skill or strategies	Observed work of support staff with teachers during workshops, in services, etc.
Level 3: (Assessment of Support for change)			Faculty Meeting topics and lead team discussions center on ways to support implementation
Level 4: (Assessment of Demonstrated Learning of Participants)		Format: Walk through data on frequency of application throughout the year Random review of lesson plans reveals differentiation in planning	Lesson plans created for teachers from learned skills from Differentiated Conference
Level 5: (Assessment of Student Learning)	Format: Student Benchmark Performance		
Level 6: (Assessment of Systemic Leverage)	Format: Data inspires upper levels to seek coordination across all grades		

II. KEY MIDDLE LEVEL INITIATIVE APD-AFTER-HOURS PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

A. Introductory Description

APD-the After-hours Professional Development Initiative was introduced in 2006-2007 for all secondary teachers and professional staff including both the High School and Middle School Levels. For purposes of this Update, APD was selected as the professional development initiative at the Middle Level that contributed most significantly to improvement efforts in Student Achievement. APD is a weekly 75 minute structure of integrated professional development activities that extend throughout the year; include direct follow-up in classrooms by instructional facilitators, administrators, and other personnel working with the teachers; and provide opportunities for practice and feedback in APD as well as in team meetings during the week. As a part of the negotiated teacher contract, APD is a salaried addition and required a substantial investment of resources.

The site selected is Somerset Intermediate School which houses grades 6 and 7 for the entire county and has an enrollment of 450 students and a staff of 61 professionals and classified workers. Pertinent positions at this site for integrated professional development include the principal as an instructional leader, reading coach, and instructional facilitator.

Areas of Emphasis for Somerset Intermediate School's 2006-2007 APD were:

- increased student achievement and engagement,
- increased higher level thinking skills and strategies
- improved classroom management skills
- improved school and classroom climate
- increased content collaboration across grade levels

B. Update High Quality Questions

1. What were the underlying student performance needs identified in the Maryland School Assessment section that the initiative was designed to address? (Be sure to include the specific Voluntary State Curriculum standards or indicators for each grade level, as applicable.)

2006 MSA ACHIEVEMENT DATA		
READING		
Grade	% Proficient	% Advanced
Grade 6	40.9%	16.7%
Grade 7	40.9%	15.7%
MATHEMATICS		
Grade 6	44.4%	13.5%
Grade 7	39.6%	9.4%

The intended academic teacher outcomes for teachers participating in APD were that teachers would appropriately integrate reading into all content areas and teachers would demonstrate a more frequent and consistent use of higher level questions during instruction. In addition to the academic teacher outcomes, there were also expected behavioral outcomes. The intended behavioral teacher outcomes were improved teacher classroom management skills including strategies to avoid confrontations with students, to keep students better engaged, and to deescalate disruptive situations. This included in-house PBIS (Positive Behavioral Intervention Strategies) training and external presentations that included modeling effective strategies.

3. Who were the intended participants? (Be sure to include how many completed all the components of the initiative.)

All 6th and 7th grade teachers and administrators were the intended participants in APD. This included Special Education staff, special subject teachers, the Behavior Intervention Specialist and counselors. If a session was missed for any reason, participants were expected to complete an assignment that would lead them through independent readings, responses, and activities designed to mirror the learning missed.

4. Identify the resources invested in the initiative. (Be sure to include funding, people, and time.)

RESOURCES INVESTED IN APD PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT	
STAFFING	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dedication of administrative time to Planning and delivery of APD Sessions 	Amount Budgeted: \$0 (180 hours of Principal’s time)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use of Instructional Facilitator to plan and lead APD 	Amount Budgeted: \$0 (90 hours of facilitator’s time)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase in Teacher Salary for additional 1.25 hours/week 	Amount Budgeted: \$287,713 Source: Thornton
MATERIALS	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide Easel on Wheels Provide Consumable Supplies 	Amount Budgeted: \$500 Source: Local
RESOURCES INVESTED IN APD PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT	
STIPENDS	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 8 people completed 3 full days of planning last summer 	Amount Budgeted: \$2,520 Source: Thornton
CONSULTANT	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partnership with <i>Coalition of Essential Schools</i> 	Amount Budgeted: \$12,000 Source: Local
**Other resources were used but not purchased explicitly for APD.	

5. Did the initiative unfold as planned? Did all the activities take place for all the participants? If not, describe any changes to the original plans.

Academic Impact Components

All intended staff participated in the APD professional development related to integrating reading instruction and assessment into all content areas. For nine (9) weeks, teachers were assigned to like-content APD groups (Math, Science, Social Studies, Language Arts, Special Areas) in order to develop classroom lessons and assessments that integrated reading instruction. The teachers then worked in these same groups reviewing and assessing student work while increasing their own understanding of the assessed reading indicators.

All but two staff members participated in higher level cognitive demand training with a team from the Coalition of Essential Schools. The team visited every classroom and teacher three times in order to collect data on the frequency and level of questioning taking place. Because the visits were completed over several different days, all teachers were seen at least once by each observer. The Coalition also lead a full day in-service for all staff using the data collected to initiate training on developing higher level questions.

The original plan utilized a Reading Coach who conducted "Explicit Instruction" training in APD with classroom follow up. The Reading Coach had participated in trainer-of-trainer training the previous year in preparation. She was unable to complete this training as she took an administrative position in another school. The training has been rescheduled for the 2007-2008 school year with a consultant from MSDE.

Behavioral Impact Components

An important component of the APD classroom management training was PBIS. The 2006-2007 school year was the first year for this site's implementation of PBIS strategies. The behavior intervention specialist along with the school administrators followed up in classroom observations and team discussions. Two sessions dealt exclusively with PBIS; two additional sessions were conducted by in house experts. These sessions were spread throughout the year with active participation by staff. Approximately 93% of professional staff were present for all four of these sessions.

6. What concrete evidence is available to suggest that the initiative achieved the intended outcomes for teachers and students?

Student Outcomes

One positive indicator of the APD efforts is that all subgroups increased in proficiency in 7th grade reading except white students. Of particular note, the African American male performance increased 6%. However, overall 7th grade reading scores fell by 0.2% for all students, largely a function of a 10.9% decrease in the White subgroup performance.

Teacher Outcomes

Close to 100% of the formal observations during the 06-07 year in non-math classrooms documented integrating a reading or a vocabulary activity, a dramatic change from the previous year and a direct result of APD initiatives. A review by the principal and the

instructional facilitator of the various team developed content assessments revealed an integration of reading within the assessment.

A review of the collected Walk Through Data regarding higher level questioning indicated that teachers were asking “higher level questions” approximately 78% of the observed times. However, teachers simply asking a higher level question is not an indicator of students’ ability to discuss or answer at higher levels.

Collected data of office referrals decreased by 52% and suspensions decreased by 66% for 2006-2007 suggests that teachers were more skilled in avoiding confrontations with students, keeping students better engaged, and deescalating disruptive situations as compared to the year before.

7. If the school system’s previous plans included an evaluation, indicate whether or not it was completed. If the evaluation was completed, was there a report? If so, what did it tell the reader? With whom was the report shared?

The system intended to evaluate APD from the staff’s perspective and did conduct a staff survey across all secondary buildings including Somerset Intermediate School. Data from the staff survey was compiled and summarized. A report was completed by the Supervisor of Secondary Education and shared with the administrators and supervisors. An analysis of the report of the surveyed staff of Somerset Intermediate School indicated that:

Related to instruction

- 62.8% agree or strongly agree that APD included significant opportunities for collaborative work
- 45.7% agree or strongly agree that APD contributed to a better common curriculum
- 68.6% agree or strongly agree that APD contributed to better common assessments

Related to Classroom Management

- 42.8% agree or strongly agree that APD helped them to learn techniques to improve student engagement
- 22.9% agree or strongly agree that APD helped them to learn techniques that they could use to improve classroom management
- 20% agree or strongly agree that APD included an appropriate number of sessions focused on developing a tone of respect

These results will be shared with the faculty at the first APD session in 2007-2008 and have been used to plan for the 2007-2008 APD sessions.

8. Does the review of progress under Part I of the Update suggest the need for any modification to the initiative? If so, describe the planned modifications for 2007-2008 and the corresponding resource allocations. Include the timeline for the modifications and anticipated dates for achieving the intended outcomes for teachers and students. If

this has already been addressed under the Maryland School Assessment section or other area of this document, note the page number.

The 2006-2007 year was the first year for the APD initiative. The initiative is geared for long term impact on student achievement: therefore, much of the training and activities that were accomplished in the 2006-2007 year have not had a chance to yield their intended full benefits. (i.e. common assessments; team collaboration; fluency with reading integration)

The following planning questions will be used to drive the APD Planning:

In Determining the Need:

1. What is the specific problem that needs to be addressed?
2. How large is the problem? Is it a single site or multiple sites?
3. Who is most affected by the problem?
4. What do we know about the persons involved in this need—previous trainings, characteristics, stakes involved, attitude, behavior, knowledge, and skill
5. What are the priorities?

In Planning the Program: (Design)

1. Who is participating and why?
2. Are the activities reasonable and are they the best ones for this need?
3. How will the staff be prepared?
4. What resources are being used? What resources are needed?
5. Are staff in place and prepared to facilitate, coordinate, direct, and monitor the program's activities?
6. Has an evaluation plan been developed and approved by all?

In Implementing the Program (Delivery)

1. Were the activities implemented as planned?
2. Is the program reaching everyone?
3. Have all participants completed everything?
4. What problems are surfacing and how were they being solved?
5. How is the program working outside of training and in action?
6. What stands out most about the program?

Assessing Impact

1. What are the results?
2. Are the intended outcomes being achieved?
3. Is there a beneficial impact on students? What? Can the teachers see it?
4. Is there a beneficial impact on teachers? What? Can they see the impact?

Applying Evaluation

1. Who needs to know the results and outcomes?
2. What went well and should be continued?
3. What needs to be adjusted or modified?
4. What needs to be eliminated?
5. What new problem or concern has emerged?

6. What learning from this implementation can be applied to other professional development initiatives and activities?

Summary of Prominent Modifications to the 07-08 APD Sessions:

RESOURCES INVESTED IN APD PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT	
Specific Program Component: "Professional Learning Community"	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contract <i>Coalition</i> Consultant Observing, Feedback, Facilitation 	Amount Budgeted: \$8,400 Source: Thornton Timeline:
Specific Program Component: "Explicit Instruction"	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use MSDE Consultant to conduct training, follow-up implementation and evaluation. 	Amount Budgeted: \$0 (No Charge) Source: MSDE and APD Timeline: 2007-2008
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pay Stipends for Extended APD 	Amount Budgeted: \$ 7,000 Source: Thornton Timeline: 2007-2008
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide Supplies 	Amount Budgeted: \$ 500 Source: Local Timeline: 1 st Session 9/12/07 4 th Session 12/5/07
Specific Program Component: "Technology Integration"	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planned Promethean Board Training <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Provided Staff: Trainer of Trainer Model: 2 staff ✓ Planned Principal & Facilitator Follow Up ✓ Student Evaluation Design and Administration ✓ Collaborative Lesson Development of integrated technology ✓ Development of program evaluation 	Cost: \$12,046 Source: Educational Technology Competitive Grant Timeline: 2007-2008

Program Evaluation Planning Guide

Name of Initiative: APD: AFTERHOURS PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT “EXPLICIT INSTRUCTION”			
<p>1. There is a need to expedite reading growth in <u>all</u> middle level subgroups. (Update I, p. 19) 2. There is a need to assess, monitor, and adjust instruction to increase each subgroup’s progress in reading skill and comprehension. . (Update I, p. 20)</p>			
	Students	Teachers	Other Staff
Expected Participation	448	25	15
Expected Outcomes	<p>Overall: Increases in the % of proficient and advanced reading & math performance</p> <p>Specific: Increases in students’ active and accurate response to higher level cognitive demand questions</p>	<p>Academic: Appropriate integration of reading into all content areas with</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a more frequent and consistent use of higher level questions during instruction • a more explicit instruction and assessment of the VSC objectives 	<p>Reading Coach; Instructional Facilitator; Principal: Increased skill in collaborating on the development of explicit content lessons for teachers and in observing those lessons in action</p>
CHANGE LEVELS	Planned Format	Planned Format	Planned Format
Level 1: (Reaction to Learning Experience)		Format: Staff survey of attitude	Format: Debriefing on benefits and hurdles in group planning for others
Level 2: (Measure of Participants’ Learning)		Format: “Ticket out” assessment of activities	
Level 3: (Assessment of Support for change)		Format: Quarterly Team Discussions and Review of Value of Explicit Instructional Process	Format: Tracking of teachers’ development of their own explicit lessons
Level 4: (Assessment of Demonstrated Learning of Participants)		Format: CES Team observations of explicit instruction process and teachers use of cognitive demand questions	Format : Interview of teachers’ reactions to using the lessons and their perception of the lessons’ success
Level 5: (Assessment of Student Learning)	Format: Student Benchmark Performance; common assessment performance and MSA Performance		Format : Analysis of data collected from student assessment in developed and observed lessons
Level 6: (Assessment of Systemic Leverage)		Format: Plan for transfer of successful practices to HS for coherency	Format: Plan for transfer of successful practices to HS for coherency

III. KEY SECONDARY LEVEL INITIATIVE

COALITION OF ESSENTIAL SCHOOLS

A. Introductory Description

The selected key professional development initiative for the high school level is the collaboration of Washington High School with the *Coalition of Essential Schools (Coalition)* to develop a consistent, coherent delivery of school improvement professional development. For the 2006-2007 school year, Washington High School was a first year "school in need of improvement". Based on the positive achievement performance and affect of the elementary schools when partnering with the *Coalition*, a decision was made to extend the partnership to the secondary level, specifically Washington. This association began in late fall of 2006 with negotiations and planning. Beginning in January of 2007, the *Coalition* assumed facilitation responsibility for professional development for the Afternoon Professional Development sessions and initiated a long term commitment. The *Coalition* is a non-profit organization based on the original research of Ted Sizer and is interested in facilitating effective change.

The following component services are provided by Chesapeake Coalition of Essential Schools:

- Student achievement data analysis and review with SIT or other leadership team
- Review of School Improvement and other plans
- Development of comprehensive professional development plans and assistance in finding professional development resources
- Invitations to Network events and activities, many at no cost
- Access to our interactive website beginning July 2004
- 10 copies of our quarterly newsletter, *Chesapeake Crossings*, highlighting work in progress in our schools
- Arrangement of site visits throughout our network to learn about promising practices from the people making them happen
- *-Grant Watch*, through which we seek and share information about funding opportunities to support projects in our schools

All Secondary *Coalition* Initiative professional development activities are congruent with the Maryland Professional Development Standards.

Activities address the following: content knowledge, research based practices, collaborative work, diverse learning needs, positive environment, and family and community involvement. Design and implementation of activities is based on data, evaluated for affect and effect, and structured on learning research.

B. Update High Quality Questions

1. **What are the underlying student performance needs identified in the Maryland School Assessment section (Goal 1) the initiative was designed to address, including the specific Voluntary State Curriculum standards or indicators for each grade level as applicable.**

There was a need to increase teacher effectiveness in meeting the need of subgroups to demonstrate proficiency on high stakes assessments.

Specific concerns include:

- The WHS African American subgroup scored significantly lower than the general population on the 2006 Biology HSA.
- The WHS Special Education students scored significantly lower than the general population on the 2006 Algebra/Data Analysis HSA.
- WHS African American and Special Education subgroups scored significantly lower than the general population on the 2005 Government HSA.
- The general population at WHS and the African-American, Special Education, FARMS, and Hispanic subgroups all failed to meet the AMO on the 2006 Grade 8 Reading MSA.
- The African-American subgroup at WHS failed to make AYP on the 2006 Grade 8 Reading MSA.

There was a need to increase the graduation rate for the white and special education subgroups.

The graduation rate for the white subgroup at Washington High School decreased in 2006 from 83.70% to 69.44%. The special education subgroup decreased from 83.33% in 2004 to 66.67% in 2006.

There was a need to decrease the drop out rate for Washington High School.

The drop out rate for the county for the 2005-2006 year exceeds the state standard by 4.27 percentage points, and has increased for every subgroup. The aggregate percentage increased for 2005-2006 by nearly 2 percentage points, moving from 5.36% in 04-05 to 7.27% in 05-06.

In comparing the two high schools of the county, Washington High School suffers the greater percentage of dropouts and is posting a 3% higher rate over the past 4 years. Male students are dropping out of school at a significantly higher rate than female students.

There was a need to decrease the suspension rate for students at the high school level.

The suspension rate has increased dramatically during the 2005-2006 school year. The number of fighting offenses increased by 56% from 2004-2005 to 2005-2006. This was the primary cause of student suspension.

There was a need to continue to increase high school level attendance rates in order to meet the 94% standard.

The attendance rate for the high school aggregate group increased in 2005; however the high school (90.9%) did not meet the standard 94%. High school attendance dropped from 94.5% (2002) to 90.9% (2005).

Subgroup attendance at these levels has also declined steadily over the past four (4) years. High school subgroups showing a declining trend in attendance over this same period are the African American (-3.5%), White (-3.9%), FARMS (-3.9%) and Special Education (-6.9%) students. Comparing the data from 2004 to 2005 reveals the same results. High school subgroups showed a decrease in attendance rate from 2004 to 2005 for White (-.1%) and Special Education (-1.4%) students.

Specific Implemented Master Plans Steps in this area are:

- 1.1.11 Develop a comprehensive professional development plan to meet the needs of SCPS and based on MSDE Professional Development guidelines
- 1.1.9 Differentiate professional development to accommodate diverse levels of expertise and need
- 1.1.29 Promote research based reading practices through differentiated professional development
- 1.1.49 Provide professional development for instructional practices that support differentiated instruction
- 1.4.4 Include ELL teachers in all content area professional development
- 1.7.7 Provide professional development for teacher analysis of individual student work
- 3.5.2 Provide professional development on use of data warehouse (*Performance Matters*) for instructional decision making
- 3.6.5 Provide an opportunity for differentiated professional development on two days as Flex Days
- 3.6.6 Provide ongoing professional development for effective reading and math pedagogy
- 3.7.2 Provide ongoing support to teachers as they incorporate differentiated learning strategies
- 4.3.2 Provide professional development for relating grading and assessment to instruction
- 5.2.4 Provide professional development for bullying and harassment

2. What are the specific goals of the initiative in terms of student outcomes and teacher outcomes?

The priority outcome for Coalition work is proficient or better student achievement for all students. Specific goals would be those identified in (1) above including improvement in MSA and HSA scores, less suspensions, better attendance, a reduced drop-out rate, and a better graduation rate for the general population and all subgroups.

Student and teacher outcomes of professional development through the **Coalition** are Common Principles of the Chesapeake Coalition of Essential Schools:

The Common Principles (abbreviated form)

- 1. Learning to use one's mind well
- 2. Pursuing depth over coverage; Less is More
- 3. Applying goals to **all** students; pursuing the needs of all students
- 4. Personalizing teaching and learning
- 5. Establishing student-as-worker and teacher-as-coach

6. Demonstrating mastery with multiple forms of evidence
7. Setting tone of decency and trust
8. Gaining and maintaining the commitment to the entire school
(generalists first and specialists second)
9. Dedicating resources to teaching and learning
10. Operating as a Democracy and maintaining equity

<http://chesapeakeces.org/about.htm#TheCommonPrinciples>

The following content priorities were originally set forth in county Professional Development Secondary planning for APD—After Hours Professional Development:

*Student Achievement	with a focus on Student Engagement in all subjects and all grade level
*Assessment and Data Analysis	with a focus on Performance Matters— Developing Data Content, Entering Data; Correlation Data, Analysis, and Application
*Safe Schools and Positive all Cultures	with an emphasis on Developing Respect in subjects and all grade level

The 10 principles of the Coalition are aligned with these content priorities. Professional development was to be provided in a differentiated manner befitting a population with diverse skill levels and needs. Somerset recognizes three levels of professional development:

- Level I- Awareness and Understanding
- Level II- Modeling and Practice
- Level III- Mastery, Reflection and Extension

The minimum expected teacher outcome is to have all certificated staff reach Level 1 Awareness of the ten CES principles at minimum.

Some of the initiatives will require only Level I or awareness by some staff, while other staff will require a Level III Understanding, Mastery, Reflection and Extension. All groups are expected to have at least a Level I awareness of most initiatives.

The targeted teacher outcome is to have a critical mass (87%) of the certificated staff achieve the application of their professional development at Level II and Level III engagement.

The evaluation plan at the close of this sections describes the means by which the county plans to assess the level impact of the professional development under the *Coalition's* leadership.

3. Who were the intended participants? (Be sure to include how many completed all the components of the initiative.)

The intended participants were the certificated faculty of Washington High School.

All certificated staff members were required to attend the weekly professional development sessions. If a staff member had to miss for professional reasons, then they were required to meet with an administrator to find a way to cover the same content. The sessions were also attended by the Secondary Supervisor, the Assistant Superintendent for Instruction, and the Superintendent.

4. Identify the resources invested in the initiative. (Be sure to include funding, people, and time.)

Somerset County has invested extensive resources for the WHS/Coalition Partnership.

RESOURCES INVESTED IN THE SECONDARY 2007-2008 COALITION OF ESSENTIAL SCHOOLS PARTNERSHIP FOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT	
Staff	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide Weekly 75 minute professional development for all certificated staff at WHS 	Cost: \$111,650 Source: Thornton
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contract 20 days of on site assistance by <i>Coalition</i> staff members 	Cost: \$12,000 Source: Title V: (\$8,000) Local: (\$4,000)
Materials and Supplies	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Miscellaneous 	Cost: \$300 Source: Local

5. Did the initiative unfold as planned? Did all the activities take place for all the participants? If not, describe any changes to the original plans.

The Secondary Coalition Initiative at WHS unfolded as planned and as adjusted to meet the emerging needs. Coalition staff members met initially with the administrators and then with the school improvement team (SIT). The initiative began with a student engagement survey of classroom observations conducted by coalition staff. Based on discussions with the SIT, a schedule of professional development sessions was created that included team building activities, instructional methodology, and data analysis. Teachers were vertically teamed and worked collaboratively to develop essential questions and big ideas that promoted conceptual

learning. New scope and sequences were developed in these teams and some teams forged ahead and began their work on benchmark assessments.

Building administrators and instructional facilitators noted that the new techniques discussed in APD Secondary Coalition sessions were put into practice by many teachers (as evidenced in follow up email discussions). These opportunities for collaboration exceeded any previous opportunities given the staff and they appeared to be using them well and understanding the benefits..

- 6. What concrete evidence is available to suggest that the initiative achieved the intended outcomes for teachers and students? If the school system’s previous plans included an evaluation, indicate whether or not it was completed. If the evaluation was completed, was there a report? If so, what did it tell the reader? With whom was the report shared?**

An online survey on the APD (Afternoon Professional Development) was conducted in June 2007 and completed by certificated staff who participated in the Secondary Coalition activities.

The survey consisted of 26 selected response questions that required a Likert scale response and three free form constructed questions that asked participants to identify useful sessions from this first year, desired topics for next year, and suggestions for improvement of APD. The survey was designed to answer the following questions.

- a. Were the content priorities covered?**

In regard to the content priority of “Student Achievement and Student Engagement for all subjects in all grade levels,” 77.7% of WHS staff agreed that they learned techniques to improve student engagement that they could use in the classroom.

Regarding the second content priority, “Assessment and Data Analysis through *Performance Matters*,” 47.3% of WHS staff agreed that an appropriate number of sessions centered on system performance data including collection, analysis and use of instructional decision making.

Regarding third content priority “Safe Schools and Positive Cultures,” 27.8% of WHS staff agreed that an appropriate number of sessions focused on developing a tone of respect. Additionally, 38.9% of WHS staff agreed that appropriate number of topics were devoted to improving school culture and climate. While low response, a full review of the survey results do not indicate that staff believe other topics and content areas should have been dropped for explicit work on school culture, climate, and respect. Leadership puts forth the point that a great deal of work was actually done in school culture and respect but is was implicitly integrated into other topics.

- b. Was the attendance policy applied fairly?**

The survey revealed that 77.8% of WHS staff agreed that all staff participated unless there was an unavoidable conflict with another educational event. Only 52.8% believe

that those staff members who missed a session had to complete some sort of make-up activity.

c. Did the selection of topics meet the local needs of the school?

The survey revealed that 69.4% of WHS staff agreed or acknowledged that APD topics seemed to address the needs of the school.

d. How was the instructional methodology?

The survey revealed that 75% of WHS staff agreed that session leaders designed activities that encouraged participants to be active learners.

e. Was there a successful effort to develop a positive affect?

The survey revealed that 84.5% of WHS staff agreed that refreshments were served that made the experience more enjoyable.

f. Was this new learning?

The survey revealed that 38.9% of WHS staff agreed that staff was now better informed about programs within the school.

g. Were the information and skills useful in the classroom?

The survey revealed that 50% of WHS staff agreed that they learned techniques and strategies that would make them better teachers. 77.7% of WHS staff agreed that they learned techniques to improve student engagement that they could use in the classroom.

h. Was the involvement of the *Coalition of Essential Schools* a positive influence?

(1) The Open Ended Response section of the survey gave one measure of positive impact.

In a free form question that asked which “activities were interesting and useful,” 75% of the positive comments identified topics provided by *Coalition* staff members such as

- Chalk Talk
- Taxonomy of Personal Engagement
- Modeling
- Step by step cross curricular activities
- Interactive Notes
- Micro-lab
- Developing Interactive Questions

The survey results were provided to each principal for application at a professional development planning meeting held during July. Additional planning meetings are conducted throughout the year and include *Coalition* staff members. Pertinent results of the survey were shared with staff at the opening of the 2007-2008 session.

Coalition staff members worked along side teachers at each of the secondary content area core curriculum and assessment workshops during the summer. The work started at WHS during the spring provided a useful base and starting point for work done by

county teachers from all schools during the summer. Coalition formats were used for essential questions and scope and sequences.

Achievement Data is another form of evidence regarding the impact of professional development.

Key Data includes the four High School Assessments (HSA) and graduation and drop out data. On the *English HSA*, all subgroups except ELL have significantly increased in percent passing the HSA/English II. Two subgroups, the FARMS subgroup and the White subgroup met the AMO Target for percent proficient in Reading/English II as it relates to AYP. On the *Biology HSA*, the passing rate at WHS went up 9.4 points. For the *Algebra HSA*, the overall passing rate went down 4.2 points although the aggregate and all subgroups made AYP. In regard to the *Government HSA*, the overall passing rate went down by one point although it is important to point out that only re-takers took the government HSA this year due to a re-alignment of the course sequence.

The graduation rate percentage at Washington High School improved by 7.78 points. The dropout rate percentage at Washington High School decreased by 2.8 points.

7. Does the review of progress under Part I of the Update suggest the need for any modification to the initiative? If so, describe the planned modifications for 2007-2008 and the corresponding resource allocations.

More time for collaborative work by content area will be allotted during 07-08 APD.

Critical Friends training will began during the fall at WHS. Administrators are working with Coalition staff members to design appropriate professional development activities within and outside of APD. Coalition activities will be scheduled throughout the 2007-2008 session.

Based on the positive effect and outcomes achieved at Washington High School, Coalition will begin a partnership with Crisfield, the other high school in the school system.

Since CHS is now a school in need of local attention for improvement, professional development funds have been dedicated to using CES during APD, faculty workshops, and in observation and coaching follow up for CHS staff. WHS and CHS have agreed that Coalition work will center on the following three principles for the 2007-2008 session:

- Making instruction as personalized as possible to meet student needs and take advantage of strengths
- Promoting a tone of decency and respect that will ensure every student will feel safe and wanted at school
- Helping students to use their minds well

New (2007-2008) Activities for Secondary Coalition on Essential Schools High Quality Professional Development	
Preparation for 2007-2008 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide APD Survey Data to administrators and supervisors 	Amount Budgeted: \$0 Source: Staff Time Timeline: Summer '07

New (2007-2008) Activities for Secondary Coalition on Essential Schools High Quality Professional Development	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Facilitate discussion of survey analysis among WHS administrators, team leaders, and central office supervisors Complete APD year long schedule 	(July 5) (July 18) (August 20)
Staffing/Consultation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meet with <i>Coalition</i> staff to schedule professional development Contract <i>Coalition</i> Staff for .5 instructional facilitator opening at CHS 	Amount Budgeted: \$600 Source: Local Timeline: July 23 Amount Budgeted: \$30,000 Source: Local Timeline: September 14
Implementation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Begin APD Conduct Critical Friends Training Address Differentiation in Teaching Infuse Problem Solving and Active Learning Teach, model, practice, and measure “Tone of Decency” Address Learning Styles and Teaching Modalities 	Amount Budgeted: \$24,000 Source: Thornton Timeline: September 5
New (2007-2008) Activities for Secondary Coalition on Essential Schools High Quality Professional Development	
Program Evaluation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complete Evaluation Plan to address teacher and student outcomes at multiple levels of effect Complete and analyze <i>Coalition</i> Survey of 07-08 certificated staff 	Amount Budgeted: \$0 Source: Staff Time Timeline: September 30 (No additional cost)

8. Include the timeline for the modifications and anticipated dates for achieving the intended outcomes for teachers and students. If this has already been addressed under the Maryland School Assessment section or other area of this document, note the page number. Be sure to include plans for an evaluation.

Program Evaluation Planning Guide

Name of Initiative: COALITION OF ESSENTIAL SCHOOLS			
1. There is a need effectively implement classroom strategies to increase subgroup performance.			
2. There is a need to build staff cohesion.			
	Students	Teachers	Other Staff
Expected Participation Data	All	All	
Expected Outcomes	Overall; Increase in the % of participation in active engagement in learning		Instructional Facilitator: Principal:
Levels of Change	Planned Format	Planned Format	Planned Format
Level 1: (Reaction to Learning Experience)		Format: APD Survey	
Level 2: (Measure of Participants' Learning)		Format: Individual Activity Assessments	
Level 3: (Assessment of Support for change)		Format: APD Survey	Facilitator Logs
Level 4: (Assessment of Demonstrated Learning of Participants)		Format: Observations of Teachers and Walk Through Findings	Observations of Teachers and Walk Through Findings from Instructional Facilitators
Level 5: (Assessment of Student Learning)	Format: Student Benchmark Performance & MSA Performance	Format: Collaborative analysis of benchmark data Format: Findings from review of student work by teams	Findings from review of student work by the Coalition Instructional Facilitator
Level 6: (Assessment of Systemic Leverage)			

IV. KEY SYSTEM LEVEL INITIATIVE FOCUSED MATHEMATICS K-8

A. Introductory Description

The Focused Math program was originally initiated approximately six years ago to address the weak mathematics achievement of SCPS students, at the elementary grades during MSA testing. SCPS students were performing below state averages in all mathematical domains. The original elementary program aligned the curriculum, developed spiral reviews and benchmark assessments with the VSC. Teachers were trained in the use of the curriculum, assessments, and analyzing data, and provided intervention strategies. After the initial training, teachers were monitored at least three times a year by the math consultants and observed by principals and facilitators for use of the strategies. Student weaknesses were identified, and curriculum and instructional strategies were modified to address these weaknesses.

Elementary MSA scores moved steadily up from 2003-2006. In the summer of 2006, this initiative was carried forward into the secondary math programs. Secondary (grades 6-12) math teachers attended two "four day" workshops during the summer of 2006 with the math consultants to work on aligning the curriculum to the math VSC, develop benchmark assessments, and spiral reviews. Teachers were also shown different instructional strategies and a new lesson plan form. The math consultants visited the secondary schools three times during the 06-07 school year to monitor for the use of the lesson plan, use of spiral reviews, instructional strategies and to help teachers analyze data.

B. Update High Quality Questions

- 1. What are the underlying student performance needs identified in the Maryland School Assessment section (Goal 1) the initiative was designed to address, including the specific Voluntary State Curriculum standards or indicators for each grade level as applicable.**

There is a need to increase the number of students achieving at the proficient/advanced level in Mathematics.

Results of the 2006 MSA scores for mathematics show 25.4% of third graders, 13.6% of fourth graders, 27.9% of fifth graders, 42.4% of sixth graders, 51.3% of seventh graders, and 56.4% of eighth graders performed at the basic level. Algebra High School Assessment data showed 31.2% of students performed at the basic level. The algebra HSA passing rate of 68.8% was high compared to the 7th and 8th grade MSA passing rates results of 48.7% and 43.6% respectively.

Specific Implemented Master Plan Steps in this area are:

- 1.1.43 Continue to use extended block for Math in grades 6-9
- 1.1.44 Modify and revise math curriculum and instruction based on student performance assessments
- 1.1.47 Implement math portfolios at elementary and intermediate levels
- 1.1.48 Assess impact of spiral reviews on instructional time and student achievement
- 1.1.50 Use Math quarterly assessments K-9

- 1.1.51 Increase Instructional Facilitator time coaching 6th and 7th grade math teachers
- 1.1.52 Assign Instructional Facilitators to coach and support math teachers' use of effective strategies
- 1.1.53 Continue the assessment of math consultants' guidance for fine tuning of the PreK-7 math program
- 1.1.54 Implement math program revisions based on data analysis
- 1.1.55 Continue to make necessary instruction revisions based on quarterly math assessments

The 2006 MSA data in grades 3-5 indicated the local curriculum and instruction is aligned with the Maryland School Assessment limits and VSC standards. Student achievement in all 7 strands is consistent across each grade with no particular strand showing an exceptionally higher or lower achievement rate. Fourth graders scored better in 6 of the 7 strands than both third and fifth graders.

At the 6th grade level, performance in all 7 strands was below the fifth grade performance at least 9%. Algebra, Geometry and Measurement and the Process of Mathematics were 13%, 21% and 18% respectively, below the fifth grade performance. At the seventh grade level, students scored highest in the Algebra standard at 64% proficient as compared to the other areas which had a 51%-55% proficiency level. Eighth grade performance across all 7 strands was consistently low with a range of 48% to 39% proficiency, and not meeting AMO overall or with any subgroup.

2. What are the specific goals of the initiative in terms of student and teacher outcomes?

Students will perform at the proficient or higher level in Mathematics.

Students will demonstrate mastery of taught units through math quarterly assessments, demonstrate mastery of taught concepts on the MSA by achieving a proficient or advanced score, and demonstrate mastery of taught concepts on the HSA by achieving a passing or excelling score.

Teachers will use research based effective instruction and assessment in Mathematics.

Teachers will know and use a revised math curriculum aligned with the VSC, apply quarterly benchmark results to planned instruction, increase ability to differentiate instruction, provide intervention, and promote student mastery through the use of spiral reviews. Teachers will follow a consistent curriculum, use improved instructional practices, and track progress through pacing guides.

3. Who were the intended participants?

Participants were drawn from elementary through secondary math staff and administrators.

Participants included 100% of K-5 mathematics teachers in training activities with follow up during the instructional day, 80 % of the 6-12 math teachers completed the summer activities, 100% participated in the follow up during the school year. Other staff participating in activities were; 42% (6 of 14) of the Special Education Teachers, 80% (4 of

5) of the Instructional Facilitators, all the School Principals, and the Elementary and Secondary Supervisors.

4. Identify the resources invested in the initiative.

Somerset County has invested extensive resources in the Focused Mathematics Initiative.

RESOURCES INVESTED IN FOCUSED MATHEMATICS PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT	
Staffing	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contracted with consultants for 2006-2007 school year to provide monitoring, observing, and coaching with the Pre-K-5 teachers three times during the year. 	Cost: \$10,250 Source: Local <i>*Duplicated Reference</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contracted with consultants for 2006-2007 to provide Focused Math workshops for skill and strategy training, to assist with coordination and articulation of Math instruction 6-12, assessment guidelines, and in class real time coaching. 	Cost: \$34,000 Source: <i>GEAR UP</i> Grant
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintained the positions of Elementary Math Instructional Facilitators 	Cost: \$271,105 Source: Local (\$224,264) Thornton (\$ 54,900) <i>*Duplicated Reference</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintained the positions of Secondary Instructional Facilitators with specific Math responsibilities 	Cost: \$157,500 Source: Local
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provided stipends to teachers participating in after hours workshops 	Cost: \$7,562 Source: Local \$ 6,097 School Improvement Grant (\$730) <i>GEAR UP</i> (\$735)
Materials & Supplies	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provided quarterly assessments for math for grades 6-9 (Math Consultants) which will diagnose proficiencies and deficiencies in state standards 	Cost: \$10,000 Source: <i>GEAR UP</i>

5. Did the initiative unfold as planned? If not, describe any changes to the original plans.

The Focused Mathematics Initiative has met expectations over the last five years producing accelerated math proficiency and has been expanded from the elementary level through the secondary level.

The Focused Mathematics Instruction and Assessment Initiative has involved a variety of job embedded professional development activities including: fully aligning the SCPS curriculum with the VSC; aligning Core Learning Goals; developing and revising instruction to include

spiral review strategies; developing explicit quarterly milestones; developing and discussing math portfolios; reviewing, analyzing, and discussing the data from the quarterly assessments. The Focused Mathematics Instruction and Assessment Initiative accesses two consultants to serve as coaches who have been contracted to periodically visit schools and classrooms in order to

- observe math lessons,
- talk with students about their work,
- conduct model lessons,
- meet with teachers to process observations of the classroom visits, and
- meet with the Supervisors of Elementary Education and Secondary Education to review and analyze quarterly assessment data.

The Supervisor of Secondary Education conducted periodic vertical teaming meetings and workshops throughout the year with all secondary math teachers. This initiative is a continuation of work SCPS has been doing since 2002. The initiative has unfolded each year as planned in the elementary schools and in the upper grades (6-8) through regular monitoring and coaching by SCPS math consultants.

6. What concrete evidence is available to suggest that the initiative achieved the intended outcomes for teachers and students

Student Outcome: Mathematics achievement as measured on the MSA continue to improve with greater percentages of students achieving proficient and advanced scores.

Mathematics achievement on MSA at the elementary level increased in Grades 5, 6, and 7, and decreased in grades 3, 4, and 8 from 2006 to 2007. Improvement is occurring but not universally across all grade levels or at the anticipated rate. The steady rise SCPS has experienced over the last few years seems to have slowed. Slight regressions in math achievement are evident at some grade levels.

The charted performance is as follows:

	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>
3 rd Grade	60%	73.2%	74.6%	74.3%
4 th Grade	61.2%	70.3%	86.4%	79.9%
5 th Grade	53.7%	60.8%	72.1%	75.1%
6 th Grade	48.6%	51.5%	57.5%	59.0%
7 th Grade	40.5%	43.6%	48.7%	49.1%
8 th Grade	36.2%	41.1%	43.6%	40.7%

All subgroups, as well as the aggregate total performance, met AYP for math at the elementary level. The subgroup trend data for elementary math also shows steady progress from 2004 to 2006. However, in 2007, growth slowed, with several subgroups experiencing a drop in performance. This occurred at the 3rd and 4th grades particularly with 5 of 8 subgroups showing a slight drop. Of particular note is the African American subgroup's significant (8.8%) gain at the 3rd grade level as well as the Hispanic subgroups that shows growth at every grade level.

At the middle level mathematic achievement on MSA went up for grades 6 and 7, but fell for grade 8. At the 6th grade level all subgroups except Special Education and Hispanic made AMO. At the 7th grade level, all groups went up on MSA except the White and ELL subgroups. Only the White subgroup made AMO. At the 8th grade level, all sub groups fell in math MSA achievement.

The local benchmark assessments are used primarily for three purposes; to identify specific student weaknesses in particular indicators; to identify the need to change instruction and to predict MSA scoring for identified students. The 2007 mathematics benchmark data suggests a tighter alignment for indicators as well as scoring threshold adjustment is needed. The 4th grade data shows 67% of students scoring basic on the local benchmark scored proficient or advanced on MSA. At the 5th grade level, 56% of students scoring basic on the local assessment scored proficient on MSA, while 14% scoring proficient on the local assessment scored basic on MSA. At the 6th grade level, 43% of students scoring basic on the local assessment scored proficient on MSA while 13% scoring proficient on the local assessment scored basic on MSA. At the 7th grade level 42% scoring basic on the local assessments scored proficient on MSA.

The rise in MSA scores at the Pre-K to 5 level from 2003-2006 was considered “substantial” and an accurate measure the focused mathematics program was meeting its objectives. In the spring of 2007, the math consultants and elementary and secondary supervisors analyzed the benchmark assessment data and identified student weaknesses in using measurement and units, and answering “ECR, BCR” questions. This was shared with principals informally and used to plan the 2007 math workshops.

Teacher Outcome: Teachers will apply research based instructional strategies and assessment practices in their classrooms on a daily basis.

Teachers are teaching a more consistent curriculum and are using common assessments. Their students’ performances on the common assessments is submitted to the Central Office quarterly which documents their use of the assessment and enables teacher collaboration on common measures of student performance. Quarterly assessments of students’ progress have revealed instructional “holes” among some classes and have served to refocus teachers. Teachers at the elementary level report a greater confidence in using the math instructional strategies.

The math consultants conduct follow up with teachers three times during the school year. This follow up includes observing, coaching and data analysis of the milestones. The observations of lessons by the consultants were analyzed to determine the level of implementation of prescribed teaching strategies. A total of 175 observations of 70 different teachers were examined.

At the elementary level, 54 teachers were observed 112 times. Implementation of the strategies occurred in 66.1% of the observations. The 33.9% observations lacking evidence of targeted strategies can be linked to new and/or inexperienced teachers at the elementary level. At the secondary level (6-12), 16 teachers were observed 63 times. Implementation

of the strategies occurred in 28.6% of the observations. The high rate at the elementary level was predictable as the elementary teachers have been included in the math initiative for approximately six years. The low rate of implementation at the secondary level may be attributed to this being year 1 of the math initiative at this level.

- 7. Does your review of progress under Goal 1 suggest the need for any modification to the initiative? If so, please describe the planned modifications for 2006-2007 and include the timeline for the modifications and anticipated dates for achieving the intended outcomes for teachers and students.**

The Focused Mathematics Initiative will continue at the PreK-7 levels and will be carried forward into the grade 8-10 level with minor modifications.

SCPS will continue the Focused Mathematics Initiative through Grade 8, Algebra I and Geometry. The hallmarks of the program are the use of quarterly milestone formative assessments, spiral reviews, curriculum matched to the VSC with pacing guides for consistency, portfolios, and a revised lesson plan format to maximize extended blocks of instruction. Quarterly assessment data will be included in the *Performance Matters* data warehouse to help teachers identify students needing intervention, as well as identifying areas of needed instructional change. Professional Development directed at helping teachers target the essential concepts and critical thinking strategies for students will be the next step in moving the last group of students from basic to proficient mathematics achievement. Elementary math instruction is ready to move to the next level: embedding higher order instructional questioning. Professional development trainings and workshops will be targeted toward recognizing and developing higher order questions to encourage students to a higher level of thinking will be provided by the Coalition of Essential Schools and involve all elementary teachers and administrators.

The Pre-K to 5 group of teachers will also collaborate and develop new milestones which more tightly align with the VSC and MSA. Extra BCR's will be developed for additional student practice.

More training for teachers in data analysis will be provided by the site instructional facilitators and math consultants to enable a more accurate review of specific interventions needed for individual students. Teachers will continue to be trained in the effective matching of interventions to needs through *Success Maker* software, spiral reviews, and differentiation by flexible grouping. Math consultants will facilitate this training at the Summer 07 workshop and days supported with planned follow up by the facilitators throughout the 07-08 school year. Observations will continue on the same schedule as last year with the elementary teachers with somewhat more attention given to new, inexperienced teachers in order to boost their implementation rate.

At the secondary level, teachers will participate in 07 Summer Workshops under the leadership of the Math consultants. They will strengthen the 8th grade curriculum integration of HSA (Core Learning Goals) and MSA indicators creating an integrated algebra and geometry course as an option to isolated forms. The secondary math instructional facilitator and teachers aligned the indicators and developed a course sequence that incorporated 8th

Grade Math MSA and Algebra HSA. The implementation of the summer’s work will be monitored by both the consultants and site facilitators. Benchmark assessments will also be developed and implemented for Geometry and Algebra II by the math consultants. The results of the assessments will provide content for professional collaboration.

The Focused Mathematics Initiative 07-08 adds the development of effective strategies for maximizing *Cognitive Tutor* as an instructional tool to complement the classroom teacher’s instruction. Guided work with the consultants and with site facilitators at the high school will occur during the school year through individuals’ planning times and during after school professional development.

Observations of concept into effective practice will continue with secondary teachers being observed at a higher rate than elementary teachers. The intent is to assure a full implementation of the instructional strategies identified by the math consultants as leading to high student achievement.

RESOURCES INVESTED IN SYSTEMWIDE FOCUSED MATHEMATICS HIGH QUALITY PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT	
Staffing	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contract with consultants to facilitate the development of additional benchmark assessment through a 5-day summer PD to Pre-K to 12 Mathematics teachers 	<p>Amount Budgeted: \$ 12,410 Source: <i>GEAR UP</i> \$ 11,250 Local \$ 1,160 Timeline: Summer, 2007</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide teacher stipends for 5-day summer workshop 	<p>Amount Budgeted \$ 5,290 Source: <i>GEAR UP</i> \$ 2,560 Local: \$ 2,730 Timeline: Summer, 2007</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contract with consultants to provide monitoring, observing, and coaching with the new Pre-K-5 teachers three times during the year. 	<p>Amount Budgeted: \$22,500 Source: Local \$ 17,500 Title I \$ 5,000 Timeline: 2007-2008 <i>*Duplicated Reference</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contract with consultants to provide monitoring, observing, and coaching with the 6-12 teachers regarding the new benchmarks three times during the year. 	<p>Amount Budgeted \$ 25,500 Source: <i>GEAR UP</i> \$ 22,500 Local \$ 3,000 Timeline: 2007-2008 <i>*Duplicated Reference</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide in-house training for facilitators on three forms of leadership communication: consulting, collaborating, and coaching 	<p>Amount Budgeted \$0 Timeline: Monthly Meetings throughout 2007-2008</p>
Materials & Supplies	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contract with consultants to provide benchmark assessments for Geometry and Algebra II 	<p>Amount Budgeted: \$10,000 Source: <i>GEAR UP</i> Grant Timeline: Fall, 2007</p>

8. Include the timeline for the modifications and anticipated dates for achieving the intended outcomes for teachers and students. If this has already been addressed under the Maryland School Assessment section or other area of this document, note the page number. Be sure to include plans for an evaluation.

Name of Initiative: FOCUSED MATHEMATICS			
1. There is a need for greater percentages of students to achieve proficient and advanced math scores on the MSA. 2. There is a need for teachers to increase their skill in applying research based instructional strategies and assessment practices in their classrooms on a daily basis.			
	Students	Teachers	Other Staff
Expected Participation Data	All students at all levels	All elementary, math and CTE teachers	Administrator and Instructional Facilitators
Expected Outcomes	Overall: Student MSA Achievement increases Specific: The percentage of student achievement advanced status increases	Teachers demonstrate stronger command of best practices Teachers implement designed curriculum and assessments with fidelity	Instructional Facilitator: Principal:
Level of Change	Planned Format	Planned Format	Planned Format
Level 1: (Reaction to Learning Experience)			
Level 2: (Measure of Participants' Learning)		Format: Product Teachers complete <ul style="list-style-type: none"> new elementary benchmark assessments revised 8th grade math curriculum 	
Level 3: (Assessment of Support for change)	Format: Documentation Students use CAI	Format: Focus Group Teachers rate constructive support of consultants	
Level 4: (Assessment of Demonstrated Learning of Participants)	Format: Documentation Students growth reported on CAI reports	Format: Product Teachers implement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> elementary benchmarks and assessment revised 8th grade math curriculums Format: Observations Consultants track fidelity of teacher implementation	
Level 5: (Assessment of Student Learning)	Format: Student MSA Performance in Math includes a 5% or more increase in proficiency		
Level 6: (Assessment of Systemic Leverage)			Format: Data Analysis Significant correlation between benchmark performance and MSA performance

