

---

# *Project RISE* Evaluation

## Year 4

### DRAFT

---

Marcey Moss, Ph.D.  
*Senior Research Associate*

January 16, 2011



CENTER FOR EVALUATION  
& EDUCATION POLICY

Jonathan A. Plucker, Ph.D.  
*DIRECTOR*

1900 East Tenth Street, Bloomington, Indiana 47406  
tel: 1.800.511.6575 fax: 1.812.856.5890 web: [ceep.indiana.edu](http://ceep.indiana.edu)

---



# 1. Methods and Procedures

---

## 1.1. Introduction

Miami-Dade County Public Schools (M-DCPS) received a five-year Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) grant, which was originally administered by the Academic Improvement and Teacher Quality Programs office in the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education. The oversight of the program is now being administered by the office of Professional Development, in the division of Curriculum and Instruction at M-DCPS. The grant supports efforts to increase student achievement in high-need schools by promoting collaboration and sharing of best practices among teachers and encouraging them to seek National Board Certification. As a recipient of this grant, the M-DCPS has contracted with the Center for Evaluation and Education Policy (CEEP) to provide evaluation services for the *Project RISE* initiative.

Miami-Dade County Public Schools (M-DCPS) staff recently completed the fourth year of implementation of *Project RISE*, an innovative five-year initiative designed to increase teacher and administrator effectiveness at a minimum of 36 high-need schools over three to five years through incentives and support, with the goal of improved student achievement. *Project RISE – Rewards and Incentives for School Educators* – aims to provide a comprehensive approach to jump-start low-performing schools by providing financial incentives and a support system necessary to create a climate of change and high expectations through learning communities, systems of mentoring, embedded professional development (PD), and teacher collaboration. The goal for *Project RISE* was to reach a minimum of 36 high-need schools and this goal was surpassed as 37 schools participated in this fourth year of the program. Participants during the 2010-2011 school year included 11 of 12 Cohort I schools, which began the program in 2007-2008; 13 Cohort II schools, which began the program in 2008-2009; and 13 of 14 Cohort III schools which began the program in 2009-2010. During the 2010-2011 school year, the only *Project RISE* NBCT at a Cohort III school transferred to another school and the school was unable to fill the vacancy. Therefore, the school could not continue to participate in *Project RISE* during the fourth year of the program.

This chapter describes the methodology used in the evaluation; the purpose and processes of all data collection, including what evaluation questions are addressed; and presents background information on respondents to the survey.

## 1.2. Methodology

Both qualitative and quantitative methods are used to gather data necessary for the evaluation. These methods include: web-based participant surveys, professional development pre- and post-tests, site visits (classroom observations), and extant data collection. The purpose of data collection is two-fold. First, to measure the program's performance related to specified *Project RISE* Project Objectives and Performance Measures (Appendix A). The second purpose is to assess impact, effectiveness, and implementation of the *Project RISE* program. *Project RISE* Objectives are closely aligned with the overall goals and activities of *Project RISE* and include the following:

1. Increase student achievement in high-need schools so that increasing numbers of schools, administrators, and teachers qualify for existing performance-based compensation systems
2. Increase teacher effectiveness at high-need schools
3. Increase the number of principals in high-need schools that have a record of effectiveness
4. Increase student access to rigorous coursework

Each of these goals has associated Performance Measures or indicators/metrics that are used to gauge program performance (presented in Chapter 5). The processes and purpose of each data collection method is described below.

### **Web-based Participant Surveys**

Two surveys were distributed to *Project RISE* participants: the *Project RISE* Survey and the Organizational Performance Improvement Snapshot (OPIS).

#### **Project RISE Surveys**

Web-based surveys were developed to track various aspects of program participation and to measure program implementation and effectiveness across all participants in the *Project RISE* program, including school-site administrators (SSAs) (i.e., principals and actively involved assistant principals), National Board Certified Teachers (NBCTs), National Board candidates (NB candidates)/TakeOne! participants, and *Project RISE* PD participants. Data collected from the online surveys offer insight

into the actual implementation and outcomes of the program and are critical to the formative nature of this evaluation. The surveys were designed to collect compatible data across a number of topic areas so that participant perceptions could be compared. The Web-based surveys were issued by an emailed link to all participants on May 4, 2011, with a deadline of May 11. A reminder was sent May 11 to all participants, with a revised deadline of May 18.

The Web-based SSA survey (Appendix B) was sent to all 37 participating *Project RISE* principals and assistant principals (APs). The survey was completed by 32 principals (out of 37), resulting in a response rate of 86%. The survey was completed by 46 APs (out of 79) for a response rate of 58%. In all, the survey was sent to 116 SSAs and partially completed by 80; the overall response rate was 69%. The majority of survey questions were answered by between 78 and 93 of SSAs, and only 78 SSAs identified themselves as either a principal or assistant principal which alters the response rate.

The Web-based NBCT survey (Appendix C) was sent to 61 participating NBCTs and 54 completed the entire survey for an 88% response rate. The majority of survey questions were answered by between 51 and 61 of NBCTs.

The Web-based NB candidate/TakeOne! participant survey (Appendix D) was sent to 122 candidates and participants (i.e., those in their first year participating as a candidate or who participated in the TakeOne! program). This survey was completed by 66 candidates and participants for a response rate of 54%. The majority of survey questions were answered by between 57 and 72 of NB candidates/TakeOne! participants.

The Web-based PD participant survey (Appendix E) was sent to the 1,487 teachers who NBCTs report participated in *Project RISE* PD. The survey was completed by 674 PD participants, resulting in a response rate of 45%. However, questions were answered by between 623 and 715 participants.

The PD participant survey included a set of survey questions (Appendix F) directly related to the level of rigor in the classroom. Participants who had attended *Project RISE* PD related to Marzano's *Classroom Instruction that Works* (CITW) were given the opportunity to respond to these questions. Of the 674 respondents to the PD participant survey, between 659 and 673 answered the rigor portion of the survey for a response rate of 97.7% to 99.9%. Level of rigor in the classroom is presented in Chapter 5 (Performance Measure 4.1).

Overall, the surveys gathered information on reasons for participating in grant activities; monetary incentives; support systems; successes, strengths and challenges; preparation for participation; roles and responsibilities; the *Project RISE* website; and *Project RISE* PD. The majority of *Project RISE* survey results are found in Chapter 2 and 3.

### **Organizational Performance Improvement Snapshot**

The Organizational Performance Improvement Snapshot (OPIS) (Appendix G) is based on Florida's Principal Leadership Standards and the Baldrige Criteria, and provides a measure of principal leadership competencies and skills. Beginning in year two of the project, CEEP was asked by M-DCPS to administer the survey for the purpose of gathering data for Performance Measure 3.1, because it was no longer being administered district-wide. The OPIS survey was distributed to the 37 *Project RISE* schools via a link to the survey on the *Project RISE* website on April 25, 2011. The principals forwarded the link to their schools' administrative, instructional, clerical, custodial, and other staff. The original deadline for completion was May 2; it was later extended to May 9.

There were 3,407 responses out of 3,929 (the number of staff according to school records) surveys distributed, which resulted in a response rate (preschool) ranging from 60% to 100% (Appendix H). A total of 34 schools met the greater than 75% requirement for the OPIS data to be released. The remaining 3 schools had completion rates lower than 75%, and their data was not released. OPIS results are presented in Chapter 5 (Performance Measure 3.1).

### **Professional Development Pre-/Post-Test**

A pre-/post-test was designed specifically to test the impact of *Project RISE*-PD sessions based on the research-based strategies included in the book *Classroom Instruction that Works (CITW)*, by Robert Marzano. In year four of the project, the *Project RISE* Project Director and CEEP researchers decided to implement a paper/pencil pre-/post-test strategy rather than distributing the tests online. The primary goal was to increase the number of "matched respondents" for analysis. The pre-test was administered prior to the *CITW* professional development session and the post-test was completed at the end of the *CITW* professional development session. There were 675 PD participants who took both the pre-test and the post-test out of the 1,487 teachers who attended *Project RISE* PD, for a response rate of 45%. Appendix I displays the number of matched and unmatched pre- and post-tests by module. In all, 829 pre-/post-tests were analyzed because PD

participants attended multiple sessions (between 1 and 4). *CITW* professional development pre-/post-test results are presented in Chapter 3 and Chapter 5 (Performance Measure 2.3).

### **Site Visits/Classroom Observations**

Site visits were conducted at *Project RISE* schools with National Board candidates in October 2011 and April 2011. Twenty-six classroom observations were conducted in the fall. However, only 17 classroom observations were conducted in the spring because 8 teachers withdrew from NB candidacy and one had a scheduling conflict. The teachers were observed to assess the change in the rigor of instruction in *Project RISE* schools.

Academic rigor was defined primarily in terms of higher-order thinking skills, or critical-thinking skills and specific teacher strategies that encourage higher-order thinking skills. Student engagement and classroom management were also measured. Appendix J presents the Observation protocol. Classroom observation results are presented in Chapter 4 and Chapter 5 (Performance Measure 4.2).

### **Extant Data Collection (M-DCPS)**

The collection of extant data from M-DCPS was needed to effectively measure each Performance Measure including the following: district scorecard metrics; list of schools that received Florida School Recognition Program “dollars”; Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) scores in Reading and Mathematics; number of teachers that received National Board Certification; and principal skill ratings from the School Climate Survey. Results from each of extant data set are presented in Chapter 5 (Performance Measures 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, and 3.2).

### **Evaluation Questions**

Based on the Project Objectives and Performance Measures and with the goal of assessing the quality and delivery of project activities (as planned and as implemented), and to provide feedback for program improvement, the following evaluation questions were developed to guide the evaluation.

- In what ways and to what extent has *Project RISE* impacted teacher and principal level variables, such as classroom instructional practices, teacher effectiveness, principal leadership, and school culture?

- In what ways and to what extent has *Project RISE* impacted student level variables, such as access to rigorous coursework and student achievement?
- What mechanism(s) or component(s) of *Project RISE* appear to be related to any observed changes in teacher and principal level variables, and/or student achievement (e.g., professional development workshops, professional partners, incentive pay structure, Leadership Summer Institute)?
- To what extent does impact vary depending on a variety of factors, including the following: (a) number of National Board Certified Teachers (NBCTs) situated in each school (i.e., one compared to two teachers placed); and (b) school of origin of the NBCT teacher (i.e., originally from the *Project RISE* school or from another school)?
- What have been the obstacles and/or challenges to achieving the goals of the *Project RISE* initiative? Are there unintended (both positive and negative) outcomes of the *Project RISE* initiative? (Qualitative)

### 1.3. Background Information

Background information on the respondents was collected via several survey items. The results, presented below, are separated by group: SSAs, NBCTs, NB candidates/TakeOne! participants, and PD participants. SSAs refers to both principals and APs. *Project RISE* survey results can be found in Appendix B (SSA) – [Appx B1-42], Appendix C (NBCT) – [Appx C1-41], Appendix D (NB candidate/TakeOne! participant) – [Appx D1-26], and Appendix E (PD participant) – [Appx E1-24]. In the remainder of this report the tables that correspond with each discussion will be indicated by the following: [Appx X, question #].

#### SSAs

A total of 78 SSAs (out of 80 survey respondents) answered the background section of the survey. Of those who responded, 32 (41.0%) were principals and 46 (59.0%) were APs, as shown in Table 1. Not all respondents answered every question in the survey.

**Table 1. SSAs' current position, according to *Project RISE* Survey**

	Frequency	Percent
Principal	32	41.0%
Assistant Principal	46	59.0%

N=78

The survey explored the experience levels of the SSAs, including SSAs' number of years in their current position and number of years in their current position at their current school. Principals had



been in their current position for 1 to 20 years, the majority between 6 and 10 years, averaging 7.0 years [Appx B39]. In addition, principals report being in their current position at their current school for 1 to 10 years, the majority between 3 and 4 years, at an average of 4.1 years [Appx B40].

Similarly, APs had been in their current position for 1 to 20 years, however, the majority between 1 and 5 years, and averaging 5.5 years [Appx B41]. APs had been in their current position at the current school for 1 to 10 years, the majority between 1 and 2 years, at an average of 3.4 years [Appx B42].

## **2. Project RISE Professional Development**

This section of the report presents findings related to the PD offered through *Project RISE*. First, an overview of the Year Four *Project RISE* PD is presented, provided by the Project Director. Next, results from the *Project RISE* surveys related to *Project RISE* PD are discussed. SSAs, NBCTs, NB candidates/TakeOne! participants, and PD participants were presented with sets of items exploring their perceptions, regarding effectiveness of this aspect of the program and its success in promoting individual professional growth. *Project RISE* survey results can be found in Appendix B (SSA), Appendix C (NBCT), Appendix D (NB candidate/TakeOne! participant), and Appendix E (PD participant). Lastly, results from the *Classroom Instruction that Works* pre-/post-test are discussed.

### **2.1. Overview of Year Four Project RISE PD**

*Project RISE* provides schools with guidelines for program implementation. These guidelines define the types of activities and expenditures that are allowed based on the funded Grant Proposal and United States Department of Education Teacher Incentive Fund restrictions. Within these established parameters, actual implementation varies according to the plan developed by each school's leadership team.

The grant includes the following four components intended to lead to achievement of grant objectives: Opportunities for teacher collaboration, Systems of mentoring/coaching/support, Embedded professional development, and *Project RISE* NBCT release time. A short description of each of the components follows.

#### **Opportunities for teacher collaboration**

*Project RISE* supports the premise that teacher effectiveness is enhanced by opportunities for high-quality, focused professional collaboration. To this end, during Year 4, schools were allocated funds to provide collaborative professional development and other teacher collaboration opportunities such as lesson study, book study, data chats, curriculum mapping, and professional learning communities. The guidelines mandate that the allocated funds be used for teacher collaboration and professional development. Collaborative activities must be identified in the *Project RISE* School Implementation Plan developed by each school's leadership team.

### **Systems of mentoring/coaching/support**

Through its systems of mentoring/coaching/support, *Project RISE* seeks to provide necessary support that enhances the progression of teachers and administrators along a continuum of professional competence, effectiveness, and excellence.

Mentoring/coaching was provided to teachers in participating schools by the *Project RISE* NBCTs. Mentoring and coaching support for teachers was tailored to the level of experience and expertise of the teacher receiving the support and may have taken many forms, from coaching conversations to modeling instruction. National Board candidates and *Take One!* participants received candidate support from the *Project RISE* NBCTs. Ethical candidate support provided was necessarily different from mentoring and coaching that was available to non-candidates. Because National Board Certification is intended to identify accomplished teachers and teaching, candidate support must always be non-prescriptive and non-judgmental. As ethical candidate support providers, NBCTs were prohibited from providing examples and models and from telling candidates what they should or should not do. The focus of candidate support was on helping the candidates assess themselves to determine when they met or did not meet the National Board Standards and to promote candidates' reflection on their teaching practice.

*Project RISE* schools were assigned a Professional Partner, a retired, high-performing school administrator, who served in a coaching/mentoring role providing support to the principal, assistant principals, and teacher leaders at the school. Professional Partners served as trusted advisors and lent another pair of hands to help the principal and leadership team as necessary.

*Project RISE* NBCTs, in addition to support they may have received from the Professional Partner, received individualized support from the *Project RISE* Instructional Supervisor. The *Project RISE* Instructional Supervisor visited schools and worked with each NBCT, assisting as needed to ensure successful performance of the *Project RISE* NBCT responsibilities.

### **Embedded professional development**

A critical component of each school's *Project RISE* Implementation Plan was the embedded professional development provided to instructional personnel. *Project RISE* guidelines call for sustained, high-quality, relevant professional development that includes follow-up support to encourage implementation of new learning. School leadership teams were responsible for identifying

the specific professional development needs at each school and planning appropriate learning activities to address the needs. *Project RISE* NBCTs were charged not only with facilitating the professional learning, but also with providing follow-up support to professional development participants. They were trained through an ongoing *Project RISE* NBCT Leadership Development program to develop and facilitate a variety of high-quality learning activities, and to provide the follow-up support to participants.

### **Project RISE NBCT release time**

*Project RISE* NBCTs served as teacher leaders in each *Project RISE* school. They were, first and foremost, teachers, and also served as members of the school's leadership team to plan and implement grant activities. Each *Project RISE* NBCT was provided release time of approximately five hours per week. Through grant funding, class coverage was provided for each *Project RISE* NBCT. During the release time, *Project RISE* NBCTs worked on grant-related activities such as planning and delivery of professional development, follow-up support to professional development participants, coaching/mentoring of individual teachers, support of National Board and *Take One!* candidates, collaboration with school administration, and completion of *Project RISE* reports.

## **2.2. Perceptions of *Project RISE* PD**

The SSA, NBCT, the NB candidate/*TakeOne!* participant, and PD participant surveys presented several items related to *Project RISE* PD opportunities offered by NBCTs and asked that respondents share their opinions on the following: reactions to PD, school-wide impact, impact on participants' teaching, and *Project RISE* PD component success.

### **PD participation**

First, NB candidates/*TakeOne!* participants were asked whether they participated in *Project RISE* PD [Appx D16]. The majority of NB candidates/*TakeOne!* participants (86.8%) indicated that they had. Respondents who indicated that they did not participate in PD automatically skipped the PD portion of the survey. Those who responded affirmatively were then asked to list the number of PD opportunities in which they participated. The majority (57.6%) of NB candidates/*TakeOne!* participants participated in one or two PD opportunities.

Surveyed PD participants were also asked about their participation in *Project RISE* PD opportunities [Appx E Screening]. Of the teachers who responded to the survey, 93.5% reported taking part in *Project RISE* PD. Although NBCTs were instructed to distribute the survey to teachers who they believed attended *Project RISE* PD, the teachers who responded either inadvertently credited another school program with the *Project RISE* PD they attended, or the teacher who was sent the survey did not attend *Project RISE* PD. Respondents who indicated they did not attend PD automatically skipped to the end of the survey. Those who participated in PD were also asked about the number of activities in which they participated. Most surveyed teachers indicated that they had participated in two or three PD opportunities. These results are similar to last year.

### **Participants' reaction to PD**

SSAs and NBCTs were presented with the following four items, related to the PD offered through *Project RISE* and asked their perceptions of participants' reaction to the PD:

- Teachers liked the professional development offered
- Teachers' time was well spent
- The materials associated with the professional development made sense to the teachers
- The professional development met the classroom practice needs of the teachers at my school.

SSAs and NBCTs responses to the items related to participants' reactions to the PD were very positive overall. Nearly all of the responding SSAs [Appx B25] and NBCTs [Appx C24] agreed (one-third) or strongly agreed (two-thirds) that teachers liked the PD offered, that teachers' time was well spent, that the materials made sense to the teachers, and that the PD met the classroom practice needs of the teachers at their school. The one to two remaining respondents strongly disagreed or disagreed to this query and others in this portion of the survey. This year, a lower percentage (6%-14%) of NBCTs strongly agreed with these statements related to participants' reactions to *Project RISE* PD. This decrease could be associated with the fact that *CITW* has been offered multiple years in *Project RISE* schools. The response "not observed" was added as an option to this question this year, however, only one SSA and one NBCT responded in this way to these statements.

NB candidates/"TakeOne! participants and PD participants were asked about their perception of the PD offered through *Project RISE* similar to the statements above: I liked the professional

development offered, my time was well spent, the materials associated with the PD made sense, and the professional development met the needs of the teachers at my school. In addition, these two groups were asked if the person presenting the professional development was knowledgeable and helpful, and if they received follow-up support that helped with the classroom application of what was learned.

Overall, respondents who participated in *Project RISE* PD opportunities expressed positive opinions about the PD. Almost all of the NB candidates/'TakeOne! participants [Appx D17] and PD participants [Appx E7] either agreed (one-third) or strongly agreed (two-thirds) with the statement that the person presenting the PD was knowledgeable and helpful. About half of NB candidates/'TakeOne! participants strongly agreed that the materials associated with the PD made sense, they liked the PD offered, and the PD met the needs of the teachers at their school. There was slightly less agreement with the statement regarding receiving follow-up support that helped with classroom application of what NB candidates/'TakeOne! participants and PD participants learned, and slightly more disagreement. Although agreement was still high, respondents opinion about whether their time was well spent was somewhat evenly divided between strongly agreed and agreed for NB candidates/'TakeOne! participants. PD participants more strongly agreed that their time in PD was well spent. This year, almost 13% fewer NB candidates/'TakeOne! participants strongly agreed that their time was well spent. Less strong support of the PD could be an indicator of multiple years of the similar topics or method of delivery.

### **School-wide impact**

SSAs and NBCTs were asked to offer their view on several statements related to the school-wide impact of *Project RISE* PD. These included the following:

- The professional development had a positive impact on the school's culture and climate
- Teachers throughout the school have participated in the professional development
- Problems associated with the professional development were addressed quickly and efficiently
- Sufficient resources were made available to conduct the professional development

SSAs' and NBCTs' observations of the school-wide impact of *Project RISE* PD was also very positive. The majority of SSAs [Appx B26] and NBCTs [Appx C25] (averaging about two-thirds)

strongly agreed that sufficient resources were made available to conduct the PD and that teachers throughout the school participated in the PD. Regarding PDs positive impact on the school's culture and climate, SSAs strongly agreed (63.7%) at a higher percentage than NBCTs (51.8%). Comparing all statements, both SSAs and NBCTs were less positive about the statement that problems associated with PD were addressed quickly and efficiently. The response "not observed" was added as an option to this question this year and almost 9.0% of NBCTs and 5.0% of SSAs report not observing whether problems associated with PD were addressed. This year, higher percentages (6-8%) of SSAs chose the strongly agree category, compared to last year. In addition, almost 13% more NBCTs strongly agreed that teachers throughout the school had participated in *Project RISE* PD. This could be an indication that efforts to engage more teachers in PD have been effective.

*Project RISE* NB candidates/TakeOne! participants [Appx D18] and PD participants [Appx E8] were presented with two statements related to the school-wide impact of *Project RISE* PD: the PD had a positive impact on the school's culture and climate, and teachers throughout the school had participated in the PD. These two groups also gave overall positive reviews of the school-wide impact of the PD opportunities, however, not as strongly as those held by SSAs and NBCTs. The majority of NB candidates/TakeOne! participants and PD participants agreed (averaging one-half) that the PD had a positive impact on the school's culture and climate, and that teachers throughout the school participated in the PD. Dissimilar to responses from SSAs and NBCTs, a number of NB candidates/TakeOne! participants and PD participants disagreed and strongly disagreed with each of these statements. For example, 14.1% of NB candidates/TakeOne! participants and 6.9% of PD participants disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement that PD had a positive impact on school's culture and climate. These results are similar to last year.

### **PD's impact on participants' teaching**

Next, the survey presented several statements to SSAs and NBCTs and were asked to what extent the *Project RISE* PD had affected participants' teaching practice in these areas.

- Teachers are effectively applying new knowledge and skills
- Teachers are effectively applying new instructional strategies
- Teachers are becoming committed to new teaching strategies

- Teachers are noticing positive changes in student achievement

Again, SSAs' [Appx B27] and NBCTs' [Appx C26] responses were very positive. A majority (averaging one-half) of both groups of respondents agreed that teachers were becoming committed to new teaching strategies, noticing positive changes in student achievement, effectively applying new instructional strategies, and effectively applying new knowledge and skills as a result of participation in *Project RISE* PD. The response "not observed" was added as an option to this question this year, and 16.1% of NBCTs report not observing whether teachers have noticed positive changes in student achievement as a result of the PD. It should be noted that the majority of SSAs and NBCTs agreed rather than strongly agreed with these statements, and, for SSAs, there was little to no disagreement. Agreeing rather than strongly agreeing could be a reflection of SSAs and NBCTs not observing teachers and teaching practices on a regular basis and being able to attribute their effects to *Project RISE* PD.

The survey also asked NB candidates/TakeOne! participants [Appx D19] and PD participants [Appx E9] to reflect on the impact of the *Project RISE* PD on their teaching practice. Specifically, the degree to which the *Project RISE* PD has affected their application of: new knowledge and skills, new instructional strategies, commitment to new teaching strategies, and whether they have noticed positive changes in student performance due to attending professional development. The results indicate that NB candidates/TakeOne! participants and PD participants generally thought the PD had a positive impact. The majority (over one-half) of NB candidates/TakeOne! participants and PD participants strongly agreed that they had become committed to new teaching strategies, that they were applying new instructional strategies they had learned and the new knowledge and skills they had acquired as a result of the PD. Although agreement was still high, both groups of respondents opinion about noticing positive changes in student performance and achievement was somewhat evenly divided between agreed and strongly agreed. Last year saw a considerable amount of negative responses (18.6% disagreed and 2.9% strongly disagreed) among NB candidates/TakeOne! participants in regard to noticing positive changes in student performance and achievement. This year, disagreement decreased and the agree category grew by 13.5%. This could be due in part to the longevity of the program and adoption of the classroom practices promoted in the *Project RISE* PD.



### **Project RISE PD components**

Finally, SSAs and NBCTs were asked to rate the extent to which they felt teachers had been provided with the following four components of *Project RISE* PD:

- Practical instructional strategies
- New knowledge and skills
- The theory behind the practice
- New concepts connected to prior knowledge

Again, nearly all SSA respondents either agreed or strongly agreed to this question [Appx B24]. Over half (51.3%-53.8%) of the SSAs reported agreeing that *Project RISE* PD provided teachers with new knowledge and skills, the theory behind the practice, and new concepts connected to prior knowledge. In the fourth area, practical instructional strategies, half (51.3%) of responding SSAs strongly agreed this was provided through *Project RISE* PD. Although the majority agreed rather than strongly agreed with these statements, there was little to no disagreement. Agreeing rather than strongly agreeing could be a reflection of SSAs not being familiar with all the components related to *Project RISE* PD, but ultimately having a positive opinion.

NBCTs responses [Appx C23] were somewhat different compared to SSAs. All respondents strongly agreed (67.8%-76.8%) that the PD had provided teachers with practical instructional strategies, new knowledge and skills, the theory behind the practice, and that new concepts were connected to prior knowledge. These results are similar to last year's survey results. For NBCTs, the response "not observed" was added as an option to this question this year, however, only one NBCT responded in this way to these statements.

## **2.3. NBCT Facilitated PD Opportunities**

Each *Project RISE* NBCT was expected to facilitate at least four PD activities/opportunities for the teachers at their school; the online survey asked them to list these (Table 5). The PD opportunity reported most frequently was *Classroom Instruction that Works* (CITW). CITW was listed by 33.0% of the respondents. Other commonly listed PD topics included Book Study, which was reported by 20.6% of respondents; Professional Learning Communities was indicated by 12.9% of respondents;

and Lesson Study was indicated by 12.4% of NBCTs [Appx C22]. Several responses were collapsed into type (for example, Book Study) or topic area (for example, Data Analysis) to construct the table below. Appendix C (NBCT Survey) lists individual responses by type or topic.

**Table 2. *Project RISE PD opportunities at NBCT's school***

<b>PD Opportunity</b>	<b>Freq</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Book Study	<b>40</b>	<b>20.6%</b>
Classroom Instruction that Works	<b>64</b>	<b>33.0%</b>
Classroom Management	2	1.0%
Data Analysis	6	3.1%
Effective Instructional Strategies	19	9.8%
Grant Writing	4	2.1%
Lesson Study	24	12.4%
Professional Learning Community	25	12.9%
Response to Intervention	2	1.0%
Technology	8	4.1%

N=194

## **2.4. Professional Growth**

SSAs, NBCTs, NB candidates/TakeOne! participants, and PD participants were asked to rate the success of several professional development models in promoting individual professional growth. In particular, SSAs and NBCTs were asked to rate the success of each PD model for promoting individual teacher growth at their schools. NB candidates/TakeOne! participants were asked to rate the overall success of each model and success in promoting teacher collaboration, while PD participants were asked to assess how well each model promoted their professional growth, as well as how successful the professional development was in promoting teacher collaboration. The professional development models are listed below:

- One day workshop session
- After school workshop
- Professional learning communities
- Lesson study
- Book study
- *Project RISE* NBCT assistance

### **PD success at promoting individual professional growth**

The majority of both SSAs [Appx B28] and NBCTs [Appx C27] found the NBCT assistance (61.2%, 55.4%) and the professional learning communities (45.6%, 41.1%) very successful in promoting individual teacher professional growth. Another area SSAs and NBCTs found successful were the one day workshop sessions, however, SSAs were split on whether they found this PD model successful or very successful at promoting individual teacher professional growth. More SSAs found the lesson study successful (45.0%), but more NBCTs reported not observing (50.9%) this PD model. The majority of NBCTs found the book study very successful while the majority of SSAs found them successful. This year, compared to last, NBCTs moderated their view on the one day workshop sessions in that fewer found them very successful and more found them successful. Fewer NBCTs report not observing after school workshops. More SSAs found the lesson study very successful and fewer NBCTs report not observing this PD model. Much fewer SSAs and NBCT report not observing book study compared to last year. *Project RISE* NBCT assistance continued to be seen as very successful. These results indicate an increase in use of after school workshops, lesson study, and book study PD models in promoting individual teacher professional growth by *Project RISE* NBCTs.

### **PD success overall and at promoting teacher collaboration**

NB candidates/TakeOne! participants were asked to rate the success of each type of professional development in which they participated [Appx D20], and then to rate each type of PD in promoting teacher collaboration at their school [Appx D21]. A majority of NB candidate/TakeOne! participant survey respondents felt that the one day workshop sessions, after school workshops, professional learning communities, and *Project RISE* NBCT assistance were successful or very successful overall and at promoting teacher collaboration. In particular, the one day workshop session was the PD activity that was most frequently considered as very successful overall (56.4%), and *Project RISE* NBCT assistance was most frequently cited as very successful at promoting teacher collaboration (50.0%). Additionally, the majority of NB candidates/TakeOne! participants rated after school workshops and professional learning communities as very successful. The majority of NB candidates/TakeOne! participants reported not participating in the remaining two types of PD, lesson study or book study. These results are similar to last year's, however, fewer NB candidates/TakeOne! participants report not participating in the lesson study and book study; and

more report not participating in professional learning communities and *Project RISE* NBCT assistance.

### **PD success at promoting professional growth and at promoting teacher collaboration**

PD participants were also asked to rate the success of the PD activities as it related to their professional growth, and then to rate each type of PD in promoting teacher collaboration at their school. Much like the results from the NB candidate/TakeOne! survey, the activities most frequently rated as very successful, both as related to participants' professional growth and promotion of teacher collaboration, included the one day workshop, professional learning communities, and after school workshop. Specifically, a majority of the respondents reported that the one day workshop, professional learning community, and after school workshop were very successful, as they related to professional growth [Appx E10]. Similarly, the majority of respondents indicated the one day workshop, professional learning communities, and after school workshops were very successful in terms of promoting teacher collaboration [Appx E11]. However, the majority of respondents report not participating in lesson study (43.4%), book study (45.4%), and *Project RISE* NBCT assistance (43.5%). Although there were many similarities between survey results from this year and last year, fewer PD participants report not participating in the after school workshop and in the book study. Compared to last year, approximately 15% more participants report participation in book study and approximately 7% more participated in after school workshops.

## **2.5. *Project RISE* Professional Development: Classroom Instruction that Works Modules 1-9 Pre-/Post-Test**

### **Background Information**

Since the 2008-2009 school year, *Project RISE* professional development has been centered on *Classroom Instruction that Works* (CITW). CEEP and M-DCPS program personnel collaborated in both the summers of 2008 and 2009 to develop a PD pre-/post-test for *Project RISE* schools. The test was designed to assess the effectiveness of the *Project RISE* PD related to the book, "*Classroom Instruction that Works*," by Robert Marzano. Nine distinct PD workshop modules were developed by the *Project RISE* district staff. Each one addresses one of the nine strategy categories described by "*Classroom Instruction that Works*." *Project RISE* NBCTs are required to offer at least one PD based on these modules. During the 2010-2011 school year, each NBCT provided training on one or more of the

following topics: Setting Objectives and Providing Feedback; Cues, Questions and Advance Organizers; Identifying Similarities and Differences; Homework and Practice; Summarizing and Note Taking; Reinforcing Effort and Providing Recognition; Nonlinguistic Representations; Generating and Testing Hypotheses; and Cooperative Learning. The PD pre-/post-test allows the Performance Measure 2.3 to be assessed (see Chapter 5).

- 2.3 By June of each project year, 70% of the faculty participating in targeted *Project RISE* professional development will increase in knowledge and skills as measured by pre-/post-tests

In year four of the project, the *Project RISE* Project Director and CEEP researchers decided to implement a paper/pencil pre-/post-test strategy rather than distributing the tests online. The primary goal was to increase the number of “matched respondents” for analysis. Distributing the pre-/post-test online relied on PD participants to take all nine *CITW* category pre-tests, attend the *CITW* PD, and then return to the website to take the post-test for the *CITW* module(s) in which they attended PD. The paper/pencil pre-test was administered prior to the *CITW* professional development session and the post-test was completed at the end of the *CITW* professional development session. Test administration instructions were distributed to pre-/post-test administrators, including a script to read to participants, sealable envelopes, and instructions for delivery of completed tests to CEEP. (Test administration instructions and script can be found in Appendix K.)

There were 877 responses to the pre-test, 867 responses to the post-test, and 829 respondents took both the pre-test and the post-test. The largest number of “matched” surveys were from the following modules: Cues, Questions and Advance Organizers; Cooperative Learning; and Nonlinguistic Representations (Table 6). Five-hundred, twenty-seven individuals took both pre- and post-test for one module, 144 individuals took pre- and post-test for two modules, 2 individuals participated in three modules, and 2 took pre- and post-tests for four modules.

**Table 3. CITW module topics and number of pre and post respondents**

	Frequency	Percent
Setting Objectives and Providing Feedback	36	4.3%
Cues, Questions and Advance Organizers	149	18.0%
Identifying Similarities and Differences	68	8.2%
Homework and Practice	135	16.3%
Summarizing and Note Taking	44	5.3%
Reinforcing Effort and Providing Recognition	88	10.6%
Nonlinguistic Representations	140	16.9%
Generating and Testing Hypotheses	27	3.3%
Cooperative Learning	142	17.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>829</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

The pre-/post-test presented 98 items (10-12 questions per module) based on these selected topics. For analysis purposes, the items were grouped according to topic. To assess whether attending PD specifically related to one of the nine modules had an effect on test scores, responses to each pair of items (pre- and post-test) were included in the analysis. For each response that was included in the analysis, the post-test response was compared to the corresponding pre-test response. If the pre-test response was incorrect, but post-test response was correct (wrong/right), then the item was scored as an increase in knowledge/skills. If the pre- and post-test responses to an item were either both correct (right/right) or both incorrect (wrong/wrong), this was considered to be no change in knowledge/skills, with regard to that item. If the pre-test response was correct, but the post-test response was incorrect (right/wrong), the item was scored as a decrease in knowledge/skills. The items are presented below according to topic and include the percentages of increase, no change, and decrease in knowledge/skills. The percentages are based on the number of respondents who attended.

### **2.5.1. Setting Objectives and Providing Feedback**

Thirty-six teachers completed both the pre- and post-test on the topic of setting objective and providing feedback. Their responses were analyzed, and the results are presented in Figure 1 below. The percentage of responses that were incorrect on the pre-test but correct on the post-test, indicating an increase in knowledge/skills, ranged from 5.6% to 41.7%, with an average of 19.0%. For the majority (an average of 73.9%) of responses, there was no change from pre- and post-test. However, more (an average of 14.6%) of responses were right on both the pre- and post-test, and fewer (an average of 7.2%) of responses were wrong on both tests.