

*Title 1 Teacher-Leaders  
Structured Teacher Planning  
A Story of Achievement*

*Marilyn E. Jordan, Coordinator - School Improvement  
Gwen Marchand, Coordinator - Research & Evaluation  
Arlene Lewis, Director – Research & School Improvement*

## *Title 1 Teacher-Leaders - Structured Teacher Planning A Story of Achievement*

“Public education is currently in an era of accountability, high-stakes standardized testing and standards-based reform” (Johnson, 2002).

Clark County School District has made a commitment to parents as well as the community to increase the achievement of students in real and substantial ways. The federal government made that same commitment in the form of the No Child Left Behind Act. To this end, the Division of Research, Accountability, and Innovation hired five region data coordinators (RDCs) in the spring of 2005 to help build capacity for school improvement. At the same time, the Department of School Improvement, in partnership with Title I, hired two teacher-leaders to provide technical assistance to schools needing additional support.

For ten weeks (March-May 2005) persons newly appointed to the region data coordinator positions and the Title 1 teacher-leaders participated in a comprehensive training program. This orientation overview included but was not limited to:

- Accountability
- Legislative mandates (NCLB, NRS 385, SAGE)
- Adequate Yearly Progress
- Assessment review
- Data analysis
- Instructional Data Management System (IDMS)
- Clark County School District’s School Improvement Process
- Facilitator’s Guide to School Improvement
- School Improvement Plan (SIP) analysis
- Focus on Standards (FOS) instructional model
- Structured Teacher Planning Time
- Facilitation and presentation skills and
- Region-specific priorities and timelines

The RDCs and the Title I teacher-leaders connected data analysis to instructional change and improved student achievement.

For the 2005-2006 school year, twenty *Needs Improvement Year II (N-2)* Title I schools were selected to be the recipients of technical assistance via Structured Teacher Planning Time to be delivered by the Title 1 teacher-leaders. The schools were chosen as a result of Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) designations from 2004-2005 and the evaluations from the June, 2005 Title I training that requested additional time and school support. Each teacher-leader was assigned to ten Title I schools throughout the five regions.

Letters, emails, and phone calls were made to principals of the 20 schools, notifying them of the availability of the technical assistance providers that would help them during the 2005-2006 school year. This service was offered and schools could choose whether or not they wished to receive technical assistance in the form of STPT. All 20 selected schools requested some level of service. RDCs and Marilyn Jordan, Coordinator of School Improvement, set up meetings with the principals to establish protocols, timelines and procedures for Structured Teacher Planning Time (STPT) facilitation.

School contacts were established and the teacher-leaders began meeting with school teams. Some schools began immediately; other schools started later in the year.

All schools in the *N-2* category are required to complete a Technical Assistance Partnership (TAP) plan prior to completing their School Improvement Plan (SIP). Most schools received teacher-leader support through participation on TAP teams during the early part of the 2005-2006 school year. As members of the TAP team, teacher-leaders were able to identify the factors that negatively impacted student achievement. Because a thorough analysis of a school's student achievement data is also a part of the process, both teacher-leaders had the opportunity to review their schools' CRT and NRT results, as well as results of CCSD interim assessments.

Teacher-leaders met with grade level chairpersons, department heads, and teacher teams to share assessment data, provide individual and class reports, analyze reports, and also to assist them in generating their own data reports. In addition, they facilitated team discussions of successful strategies and interventions teachers might wish to consider in improving their practice.

School leaders framed the direction they wished to take in regard to grade level participation, subject area focus, track participation, and scheduled dates and times. Some schools requested ongoing and continuous support throughout the year; others chose sporadic and flexible scheduling. Most schools received fifteen or more visits, scheduled over nine months.

Schools receiving technical assistance from STPT throughout the year demonstrated increased student achievement. Now, as we begin another school year, schools are clamoring for teacher-leaders to provide STPT for their teachers. What a wonderful success story!

In order to draw some meaningful conclusions and evaluate the technical assistance provided by the two teacher-leaders for the 20 *N-2* Title I schools, a survey on STPT was developed by the Departments of Research and School Improvement, which are now part of the Superintendent's Schools. The survey was then given to leaders at the participating schools. The effect of the technical assistance was also assessed through an analysis of student achievement scores.

The evaluation survey was available on-line from late July through mid August of 2006 in order to include both nine-month schools and year-round schools. The on-line survey consisted of 17 scaled questions and six open-ended response questions. The open-ended items provided opportunities for school leaders to give more in-depth feedback regarding the services they received. Of the 30 school leaders invited to participate in the STPT web-based evaluation survey, 21 responded, representing 14 schools. The survey asked school leaders to share their perceptions of the organization, usefulness, and timeliness of the services. They also indicated whether the services made an impact on independent utilization of the various components of the FOS instructional model.

The scale included the following response categories:

- 1=strongly disagree
- 2=disagree
- 3= neither agree nor disagree
- 4= agree
- 5=strongly agree

All items were positively worded, meaning that higher scores indicated a more positive response. **The survey results were overwhelmingly positive**, with all item averages falling well above the possible scale average of 2.5 and only 2 out of 17 falling below 3.5. Leaders perceived that services received will both increase the quality of teacher intervention (average=4.24) and positively impact student achievement (average=4.29). School leaders also strongly believed that the training increased collaboration among teachers and data-driven decision making by teachers. Further responses indicated that the school leaders found the training team highly accessible and strongly valued the materials provided during sessions. Although participants agreed that teachers who received training were independently utilizing data, planning strategies and interventions, and unwrapping standards, they indicated that teachers were not as likely to independently retrieve data from IDMS (average=3.48) or train one another in the FOS model (average=3.48). The two areas of weaker agreement could be the result of the training or could be unrelated to it. For example, teachers might not have retrieved IDMS data due to time constraints or might not have trained one another in FOS because there was already a high level of understanding of the model.

**An analysis of the open-ended responses indicated that the additional support was highly valued.** The open-ended responses also suggested that schools that already were independently conducting a high level of STPT and data analysis found the services less helpful than schools with a weaker degree of STPT implementation.

Overall, the results of this survey and the accompanying analysis suggest:

- Collaboration enriches professional development.
- Face-to-face meeting time is one of the most valuable learning resources in our schools.
- Teachers need and want information about how to improve their practice.
- Teachers are better able to analyze and interpret IDMS data in order to better prepare students for future assessments.
- Data analysis supports a school staff's expertise, experience, and professional knowledge.
- School leaders must be a part of the process if STPT is going to impact student achievement.
- The work that is done in the context of a Professional Learning Community or during Structured Teacher Planning Time focuses on improving learning for both student and adult learners.
- Teacher-leaders must have the skills to help groups find meaning in data, prioritize student learning needs and identify strategies and interventions.
- Teacher-leaders were very knowledgeable, dependable, and supportive.
- STPT made a huge impact on increases in student achievement.

## Data Analysis of STPT Interventions

Analyses were conducted to determine whether improvements in student achievement were found at schools that received additional assistance from a STPT teacher-leader during the 2005-2006 academic year. The first step utilized CRT trend data from the 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 years. The focus of the analysis was to determine if there was a reduction in the distance from meeting the annual growth targets [Percent Above Cut (PAC)] in ELA and math from 2004-2005 to 2005-2006. **The analysis indicated an overall reduction in the distance from the PAC of 7.14 percentage points in ELA and 6.03 percentage points in math. In other words, on average, the 20 schools moved closer to reaching the annual growth targets in 2005-2006, the year they received an intervention.** The changes were most pronounced for the 6 middle schools that received extra services--Cashman, Fremont, Monaco, Orr, Robison, and JD Smith. **These schools moved an average of 11 percentage points closer to meeting targets in ELA and 6.20 percentage points closer in math. The elementary schools also showed overall growth, closing the distance to the targets by 5.49 percentage points in ELA and 5.95 percentage points in math.**

A second analysis was conducted for the elementary schools. A matched comparison group was selected from all CCSD elementary schools who did not receive additional assistance from the STPT teacher-leaders through the Department of School Improvement. Fourteen schools were identified that statistically matched the 14 intervention schools on the following student variables: percent Free/Reduced Lunch (FRL), percent Limited English Proficiency (LEP), percent Individualized Education Plan (IEP), percent Hispanic, percent African American, percent Asian/Pacific Islander, percent Caucasian, and 3<sup>rd</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> grade 2004-2005 (pre-intervention) average raw CRT scores in math and ELA. The change between 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 distance from annual targets was also computed for these comparison schools. **Analyses indicated that there was a statistically significant difference between the comparison and intervention groups in the change in distance from the annual target in both ELA and math. Whereas the intervention group moved closer to meeting proficiency targets, the comparison group was static in ELA growth (change in distance to PAC = .34 percentage points) and actually showed a small movement away from meeting proficiency targets in math (change in distance to PAC = -2.1 percentage points).** A matched comparison group could not be obtained for the middle schools.

**These results indicate a positive trend in student achievement at schools that received assistance from the school improvement team of STPT teacher-leaders.** The method of comparing a statistically matched sample at the elementary level provides a powerful indicator that activity associated with intervention at the targeted schools made a difference in student achievement.

Due to design limitations, it is not possible to ascertain whether the STPT teacher-leader assistance was the only cause of the growth toward proficiency at the intervention schools; however, **it is highly probable that guiding teachers toward effectively evaluating data to design appropriate instructional strategies and interventions, providing timely and organized assistance, and focusing school leaders on the processes involved with the Focus on Standards model enhanced student achievement.**

## TITLE I – N2 SCHOOLS ~ GROWTH SUMMARY

### AYP Status

- 7 Schools Made AYP
- 3 Schools Made Safe Harbor
- 20 Schools Made Gains

### ELA

#### Change in Distance From PAC

All 20 Schools      +7.14%  
 Elementary        +5.49%  
 Middle                +11.0%

### Change Math

#### Change in Distance From PAC

All 20 Schools      +6.025%  
 Elementary        +5.950%  
 Middle                +6.200%

SCHOOL NAME	REGION	LEVEL	TEACHER-LEADER	2005-2006 AYP Designation	2004-2005 AYP Designation	GROWTH % Points Difference 04/05 to 05/06
Booker	Northwest	ES	Sharon Heyman	N2 - Hold	N2	ELA - +6.4% Math - -4.6%
Cashman	Southwest	MS	Denise Martin	N3	N2	ELA - +5.5% Math - +7.4%
Craig	Northeast	ES	Sharon Heyman	N3	N2	ELA - +6.9% Math - +2.6%
Dailey	East	ES(3-5)	Denise Martin	N3	N2	ELA - +4.7% Math - +9.8%
Fitzgerald	Northeast	ES	Sharon Heyman	N3	N2	ELA - +8.1% Math - +3.3%
Fremont	East	MS	Denise Martin	N2 - Hold	N2	ELA - +8.8% Math - +7.1%
Kelly	Northeast	ES	Sharon Heyman	N2 – Hold	N2	ELA - +1.5% Math - +9.6%
Lincoln (Edison)	Northeast	ES	Sharon Heyman	N2 – Hold	N2	ELA - +9.4% Math - +15.3%
Manch	Northeast	ES(3-5)	Sharon Heyman	N3	N2	ELA - -2.7% Math - -7.0%
Monaco	Northeast	MS	Sharon Heyman	N3	N2	ELA - +5.9% Math - +4.4%
Moore	East	ES	Denise Martin	N2 – Hold	N2	ELA - +4.7% Math - -2.4%

SCHOOL NAME	REGION	LEVEL	TEACHER-LEADER	2005-2006 AYP Designation	2004-2005 AYP Designation	GROWTH % Points Difference 04/05 to 05/06
Orr	East	MS	Denise Martin	N2 – Hold	N2	ELA - +15.2% Math - +10.5%
Robison	East	MS	Denise Martin	N3	N2	ELA - +19.0% Math - -2.4%
Smith, J.D.	Northeast	MS	Sharon Heyman	N2 – Hold	N2	ELA - +11.6% Math - +10.2%
Sunrise Acres	East	ES	Denise Martin	N2 – Hold	N2	ELA - +8.2% Math - +12.0%
Taylor, Robert	Southeast	ES	Denise Martin	N3	N2	ELA - +3.1% Math - +8.0%
Thomas	East	ES	Denise Martin	N2 – Hold	N2	ELA - +8.7% Math - +12.0%
Twin Lakes	Northwest	ES	Sharon Heyman	N2 – Hold	N2	ELA - +10.1% Math - +17.5%
Ullom	East	ES	Denise Martin	N3	N2	ELA - +1.7% Math - +4.4%
Williams, Tom	Northeast	ES	Sharon Heyman	N3	N2	ELA - +6.0% Math - +2.8%

## TITLE 1 - N2 PRIORITY SCHOOLS - SCHOOL FEEDBACK

### Booker Elementary School...

Sharon, "Thank You," thank you, thank you, for the **Wonderful Assistance** you provided during our recent August 29th Staff Development Day. Kudos to you for the outstanding job you did in presenting to teachers a variety of data, walking everyone through data analysis, and just getting us on target with identifying academic goals for the 2006-2007 school year. Teachers were very receptive and expressed their joy in understanding data in a whole new light.

I also thank you for your continued support last year. Because of your time with teachers during STPT meetings, teachers are expressing their appreciation for having a greater understanding of aligning benchmarks and instruction, resulting in Booker's AYP status as N2hold. We say, "thank you".

Please know that Kermit R. Booker Sr. Elementary School looks forward to your support during this 2006-2007 school year. How will we do it without you?  
- Beverly Mathis, Principal

### William Orr Middle School...

"As per our discussion, I am writing you this message to once again thank you for providing Orr Middle School with Data Specialist, Denise Martin, during the 2005-06 school year. Denise was an integral part of our school improvement planning as well as providing us with a strong format for utilizing data analysis. Denise had a significant impact in helping Orr to meet Adequate Yearly Progress. Denise spent numerous days working with the administration and small groups of teachers where she provided individual student reports as well as individual class results. She met with teams and provided specific instruction on reading interim data and made great suggestions for interventions that would help to address any concerns that arose. The model for data analysis the Research and Accountability Department has developed is commendable. I hope that Orr can continue to receive these services and would hope that the program can be expanded so that more schools can be impacted."  
- George Leavens, Principal

### Twin Lakes Elementary School

Thanks to Research and Accountability for providing our school with excellent reinforcement of training and support regarding Structured Teacher Planning Time. Expertise in the management of the IDMS system provided Twin Lakes with instant results when Interim scores were posted.

Additionally, because we are a Title I school, we were able to release grade level chairs for full day professional development in unwrapping the standards. The training provided detailed instruction and assistance. Grade levels were able to plan appropriate interventions for standards not mastered.

It is our hope that this service will continue for at least another year at our school to continue to reinforce skills learned. Sustained professional development will ensure student achievement.

- Leary Adams, Principal

### Jack Dailey Elementary School...

"Denise first started working with last September when we developed our TAP. We worked out a schedule for her to come and work with all of my grade levels. We started with 5th grade, then 3rd, and finally 4th. She conducted a STPT and shared interim assessment data with the group. She gave the teachers the most important reports and engaged them in dialog concerning student achievement. Denise met with each grade level PLC three times during the year to assist them in their work. It was very helpful to learn how to generate reports and which reports were most useful to analyze. Denise usually followed each PLC meeting with a debriefing session with the administrators. We would discuss next steps at this time.

At the end of the year - Denise joined us at our Off-campus planning retreat (Frontier Hotel). She again pulled the survey data for us and the current CRT data. She was a full participant in the day's agenda and she kept notes for the group that she shared with the PLC leadership team. Denise has been a very effective support to the school and we really enjoyed working with her this year."

- Pauline Mills, Principal

### Lois Craig Elementary School

I wanted to inform you that we had an extremely positive experience with Sharon Heyman and our STPT. Ms. Heyman worked with our testing coordinator and administration, coordinating training for our staff. She assisted teachers in reading and understanding their own testing data. She facilitated discussions focused on utilizing this information in order to drive teacher instruction. We feel these meetings guided us in following our School Improvement Plan. It also focused classroom teacher instruction, which we feel was one of the reasons for our improved test scores. Thank you.

- Domenic J. Russo, Assistant Principal

### Fitzgerald Elementary School

I am writing this letter to express my appreciation for having Sharon Heyman and Marilyn Jordan serve at my school as Research, Accountability and Innovation Division representatives for the 2005-2006 school year. Ms. Heyman and Ms. Jordan assisted my staff with understanding the Focus On Standards Model, Unwrapping the Power Standards and Structured Teacher Planning Time. They were both passionate about teaching and their work within the Research, Accountability and Innovation Division. Ms. Heyman and Ms. Jordan availed themselves to meet with teachers before school and during grade level time as invited. H.P. Fitzgerald was a "Needs Improvement Year 2" school during the 2005-2006. This meant that intensive teacher training was needed to ensure that all staff members knew how to interpret IDMS, CRT, NRT and Nevada Writing Proficiency Exam data, successfully unwrapped the Power Standards to know what to teach and ensured strategic teaching geared at improving instruction and increasing student achievement was clearly communicated to all teachers. Ms. Heyman and Ms. Jordan were role models and truly related to the high demand of accountability put on teachers and the administration. They were a true team players and an asset to H.P. Fitzgerald Elementary School. I look forward to working with both Ms. Heyman and Marilyn Jordan again during the 2006-2007 school year.

- Alasha Woods, Principal

### **Monaco Middle School**

Sharon Heyman came to Monaco Middle School on several occasions last year to meet with our English Department. We had the good fortune to have a small group in the eighth grade, so Sharon was able to give us some special attention. We were able to access the IDMS data and learn how to use it. With her guidance, we were able to identify the standards that had not been met and use the interim assessments to guide us as to how to remediate the students. Without her guidance, it would have been an impenetrable maze of incomprehensible data. In addition, we were helped to scaffold the skills that the students would need to master in order to master the standards. It was truly one of the most useful professional development activities that I have been involved with. Having Sharon come to our school was a major benefit in that we didn't have to spend additional time or resources for the information. I do hope that she is able to return to Monaco this year to continue her program.

- E. Kay Peck, English Department Chair

During the 2005-2006 school year, Ms. Sharon Heyman acted as a Title I Project Facilitator at Monaco Middle School. She presented on topics such as how to utilize the IDMS system to generate data and reports on each student, how to unwrap a standard, and how to analyze reports and develop intervention strategies. Ms. Heyman met with departments for half-day long sessions several times throughout the year, during which time she provided strategies for collaborating with grade level department teams to assess data. The department members had overwhelmingly positive feedback regarding Ms. Heyman and her presentations. The staff of Monaco Middle School found her to be very professional and dependable. Ms. Heyman was on time for all of our meetings and went out of her way to be flexible in any changes that had to be made on our part. Ms. Heyman was an important member of our school team and played an integral role in getting our school's focus to be on the standards.

- Ana Maria Crosby, Assistant Principal