

**Center X – Local District 7 Partnership:
Impact Evaluation:
Literacy Coach Teacher Survey Results
(2007-2008)**

Report Brief

**Nicole Gerardi
January, 2009**

**SRM Evaluation Group
Graduate School of Education & Information Studies
University of California Los Angeles**

Project Director: Marvin Alkin

into larger constructs, that could then be used in analyses of variance. Qualitative data analysis of the Teacher Survey was conducted using a grounded method.

The larger report based on the Teacher Survey instrument; Center X – Local District 7 Partnership: Impact Evaluation: Literacy Coach Teacher Survey Results (2007-2008), summarizes findings from the Teacher Survey and connects findings with other data sources. This executive summary briefly summarizes the main points and conclusions from the larger report. As similarly ordered in the larger report, we summarize: demographical information, quantitative findings of intended survey constructs, group differences between Novice and Veteran teachers, qualitative findings regarding definitions of content literacy and suggestions for the partnership, how findings compare to other data sources, and conclusions.

Survey Demographics

(Report pgs. 14-18)

- 151 surveys were returned by 12 coaches, yielding a 62% return rate. The proportion of teacher responses by school and content area is approximately equal to the placement of coaches by school and content area. Survey data is representative.
- 52% of respondents are from Fremont, 22% from Locke, 13% from Jordan, 9% from West Adams, and 4% from Manual Arts.
- Out of 151 teachers: 94 teach 9th grade, 102 teach 10th grade, 103 teach 11th grade, and 77 teach 12th grade.
- Out of 151 teachers: 38 teach social studies, 44 teach science, 28 teach math, and 45 teach English language arts.
- Looking at length of time teaching overall; 35% of teachers are Novice (teaching less than 3 years) and 65% of teachers are Veteran (teaching 3 or more years).
- 83% of respondents hold a single subject credential, 12% are working on an emergency permit, and 5% have no credential. Combined with the previous bullet point, we see there is a significant proportion of under-experienced faculty at the schools.
- 34% of teachers have been working with their coach less than 1 year, 15% have been working with their coach 1 year, 19% for 2 years, and 32% for 3 or more years. These percentages show that both coaches and teachers remain in the program for extended periods of time.

Quantitative Findings

(Report pgs. 19-45)

- **Occurrence of Coaching Activities-** The most frequently reported activity is meeting with coaches. At the minimum, coaches formally meet with 41% of teachers on a weekly basis and another 38% of teachers on a monthly basis. The least reported activity is co-teaching; the majority of teachers (56%) report never having co-taught with their coach. Teachers report engaging in the following activities between a few times during the year, to, once a month or more: attending coach PD, engaging in planning and reflective conversations, being observed by their coach, and observing their coach model a strategy. In the range of responses we see some teachers work with coaches a lot more than other teachers.

- **Evaluation of Coaching Services-** On average, teachers rate the program between good to excellent in the following areas: communication with their coach, support, quality of materials, engagement level, usefulness, level of coaching, and the overall experience. 65%, or more, of teachers rate each of the aspects of the program as excellent. Less than 10% rate aspects of the program as fair to poor.

Note: For the next 8 intended constructs, the scale is 1=strongly disagree, 2=moderately disagree, 3=neutral, 4=moderately agree, and 5=strongly agree

- **General Skills-** On average, teachers moderately to strongly agree that as a result of working with their UCLA Center X Coach, their classroom management skills have improved (mean=4.06,) they feel more positive about teaching (mean=4.44), and they have new ideas about how to initiate change in the classroom (mean=4.49).

- **Comfort and Satisfaction-** On average, teachers report they moderately to strongly agree that they are comfortable in their role as a teacher (mean=4.59), and that they are satisfied with their work as a teacher (mean=4.14). When teachers indicate their level of agreement that they are satisfied with their school overall, the mean scores are much lower (3.2), meaning that on average, teachers are relatively neutral to this item.

- **Pedagogical Practices and Resources-** On average, teachers moderately to strongly agree that working with their UCLA Center X Coach has helped improve their pedagogical practices and access to resources. For all of the teacher level short-term goals, the mean scores are above 4.00, and for the one teacher level medium-term goal, the mean score is 3.90. This means that teachers report the greatest gains in the more proximal desired program outcomes – as would be expected. Teachers most strongly agree with the statement regarding having been exposed to instructional resources and expertise (71% strongly agree).

- **Instructional Efficacy-** In general, teachers moderately to strongly agree that working with a UCLA Center X Coach has improved their level of Instructional Efficacy. Looking at the percentage distribution of responses, we see minimal variation in responses to these items. 88% of teachers agree that students are engaged in their lessons. 86% of teachers agree that students know they expect hard work and act accordingly. 85% of teachers agree that in general their classes are disciplined and well behaved. Similarly, 73% of teachers agree that they have found a way to get through to even the most difficult students. On the whole, teachers seem to have relatively high levels of Instructional Efficacy.

- **Test Efficacy-** Teachers are confident that they have the skills and knowledge needed for their students but less confident that they know how to teach so that students will do well on state tests. On the whole, teachers are confident in their level of Test Efficacy.

- **Expectations-** Mean scores are well above 4.00, meaning that for the most part, teachers moderately to strongly agree that as a result of working with a UCLA Center X Coach they expect more from students (mean=4.26), assign more challenging work (mean=4.27), expect more from themselves as teachers (mean=4.48), and assign more complex cognitive tasks (mean=4.26).

- **Connections and Communication-** The great majority of teachers agree that coaches have helped improve connections to students, other teachers, and the school in general. Approximately equal numbers of teachers are neutral to, or agree, that coaches have helped improve teacher communication with the administration. In this case, the coaching program is more effective in reaching its medium-term goal as opposed to reaching its short-term goal.

- **Collegiality-** Compared to other constructs on the survey, the responses to the Collegiality construct are quite varied. Teachers feel markedly differently about the level of Collegiality at the school. Significant numbers of teachers agree, disagree, and remain neutral in their responses for each item. This means that the impact of the Center X / LD7 Partnership is a little less straightforward on improving Collegiality. 3 out of 4 mean scores are above 3, which means, that on average, teachers at least mildly agree that the coaching program is helping improve Collegiality.

- **Knowledge and Use of Literacy Strategies-** For the most part, it is agreed that individual instructional literacy strategies (sub-strategies) fall under 4 more general literacy strategy categories; Reading Strategies, Writing Strategies, Inquiry Strategies, and Collaborative Strategies. The Teacher Survey asks respondents to indicate their level of knowledge of each sub-strategy. Teachers are given the option of marking: 1=none, 2=limited, 3=some, or 4=full. The Survey also asks respondents to indicate their level of use of each sub-strategy. Teachers were given the option of marking: 1=never used, 2=used once, 3=occasionally used, or 4=used often.

For the most part, teachers report high levels of knowledge of the individual literacy sub-strategies; 12 out of 15 mean scores are well over 3.00. Teachers report lower levels of use of the individual literacy sub-strategies; 6 out of 15 mean scores are well over 3.00. In general we see that knowledge is higher than use for each of the literacy strategies (exception being Vocabulary Strategies). This means that on the whole, teachers' *knowledge* of literacy strategies exceeds their *use* of literacy strategies. Another interesting observation is that the sub-strategy that is most known is not always the sub-strategy that is most used (i.e. KWL). Furthermore, the sub-strategy that is least known is not always the least used (i.e. Using Manipulatives). It seems that the Center X / LD7 Coaching Program is more effective in increasing knowledge of literacy strategies (short term goal) vs. increasing use of literacy strategies (medium-term goal).

Group Differences between Novice and Veteran Teachers

(Report pgs. 46-66)

- A primary questions of interest for the Center X / LD7 Partnership is whether Novice and Veteran Teachers equally utilize and benefit from coaching services. A program that helps both Novice and Veteran teachers alike is seen as a stronger and more effective program. Of the Teacher Survey sample with full data available, (N=143), approximately 36% of the teachers are considered as Novice, and 64% are considered as Veteran.

- **Factor Analyses**- We believed that responses to 46 survey items were driven by a smaller set of factors. Through 3 rounds of exploratory factor analysis, eight survey constructs (8/10) emerged: Expectations, Instructional Efficacy, Collegiality, Comfort / Satisfaction, Teacher Development, Communication, Check on Outputs, and Evaluation of Services. On average, teachers report high levels of program impact on all survey constructs.

- **Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) Results**- Novice and Veteran teachers, alike, use and benefit from coaching services. Multivariate analyses of variance reveals there are no overall significant group differences between Novice and Veteran teacher responses to survey constructs. Finding no overall model significance, means that when we look at what the Center X / LD7 Coaching Program hopes to accomplish as a whole (i.e. see outcomes in logic model), we see it has similar impacts on Novice and Veteran Teachers. No matter how long the teacher has been teaching, the program as a whole is positively effective.

- **Univariate Analysis of Variance Results**- There is a significant group difference between Novice and Veteran teachers in their responses to the construct of Instructional Efficacy. Veteran teachers report greater gains, than Novice teachers, in Instructional Efficacy, as a result of working with their UCLA Center X Coach. On average, Veteran Teachers score .3 points higher (on a scale of 1-5) than Novice Teachers on this construct. Veteran Teachers report

greater gains in being able to engage students in lessons, expecting hard work and getting students to work hard, and maintaining disciplined and well behaved classes.

- **Novice vs. Veteran Teacher Conclusions-** Although not significant, Novice Teachers seem to score a little bit lower than Veteran Teachers on the constructs of Instructional Efficacy, Collegiality, and Comfort / Satisfaction; meaning, Veteran Teachers are getting more out of the work with coaches in these areas. On the other hand, Veteran teachers seem to score a little bit lower than Novice Teachers on the constructs of Expectations, Teacher Development, Connections / Communication, and Evaluation of Services; meaning, Novice Teachers report getting more out of the work with coaches in these areas. Novice and Veteran Teachers report almost identical reception of services (Check on Outputs). Even though, on average, Novice and Veteran teachers equally use and benefit from coaching services, the areas in which they benefit may be different.

Qualitative Findings

(Report pgs. 67-72)

- **Definitions of Content Literacy-** Teachers were given the opportunity to respond to the following open-ended question: What is your definition of content literacy? Teachers see content literacy differently for themselves as well as for their students. There is one phrase that appears over and over again: "Reading and writing in your content area." On the whole, it is clear that teachers do *not* share one common and concise understanding of content literacy. Similar themes do appear throughout the definitions of content literacy for both students and teachers alike. The words and themes echoed throughout responses include; reading, writing, comprehension, thinking, discussing, use of content specific vocabulary, application, making meaning, drawing connections, and teaching.

- **Suggestions for the Partnership-** Teachers were also given the opportunity to respond to the following open-ended survey item: What suggestions do you have for improving the quality of coaching you receive from your UCLA Center X Coach? Aside from the glowing accommodations of coaches, teachers also provide some suggestions for the program. The concrete suggestions for improvement include requests for more direct teacher contact and school site activities that coaches already engage in. Teachers asked for *more*: planning time, collaboration, professional development, follow-up, classroom interaction, co-teaching, and demonstrations. A couple of teachers asked for more help in tailoring teaching specifically to inner city or lower performing students.

How Teacher Survey Findings Compare to Other Data Sources

(Report pgs. 73-81)

- Throughout the course of the evaluation many sources of data have been collected and shared internally with the program. Ideally the findings from various data sources converge and validate each other. If the same patterns are emerging over time this increases the reliability of findings. If findings do not converge, then we know we need to dig deeper into the findings and explore areas of contradiction.

- **Coach Logs-** The partnership coaches spend time doing a series of different activities, all of which should contribute to the ultimate goal of the program. Center X / LD7 coaches are asked to complete logs of time spent on each activity. Coach Logs tell us if the program that was delivered is actually the program that is intended. Coaches spend 36% of their time engaged in Direct Teacher Contact, 15% of their time attending Meetings, 38% of their time dedicated to Professional Activities, and 11% of their time offering School Site PD. Coaches are instructed to spend 50% of their time working directly with teachers. During the 2007-2008 school year, coaches spent approximately 47% of their time (Direct Teacher Contact (36%) + School Site PD (11%)) working directly with teachers. In this case, we can say with some assurance that there was fidelity to implementation. Although not perfect, coaches did spend nearly half of their time working directly with teachers. Therefore, it is safe to assume that the outcome data obtained from the Teacher Survey is in fact reliable data.

- **PD Evaluations-** Coaches spend approximately 11% of their time leading school site PD's with teachers. This roughly translates to 2 coach led PD activities with teachers per month. At the end of these activities teachers are asked to evaluate the professional development workshops by completing a standardized rating form. In 2007-2008, 371 PD Evaluation's were completed. Findings suggest that teachers value the professional development workshops that they receive. Teacher's rate all aspects of the PD's highly and indicate qualitatively that their interactions with coaches help them overcome some of the challenges they face in their work at schools. Overall, findings from the PD Evaluation's converge nicely with findings from the Teacher Survey, suggesting reliability and interpretability of Teacher Survey findings.

- **Success Case Study-** In 2007, three coaches and six teachers were observed and interviewed as part of the Success Case Study. The focus was on understanding the social processes, such as relationships and other forms of social interaction that take place in order to move towards achieving the program's long-term goal. It was hoped that in following coaches and teachers who were believed to be achieving desired programmatic outcomes, the social processes necessary to achieve those outcomes would be highlighted. Overall, findings from the Success Case Study suggest that the Center X / LD7 Coaching Program is in fact achieving some (the particular outcomes studied) of the intended short- and medium-term programmatic outcomes; and, the ways

(social processes) in which this is occurring. Findings from the Teacher Survey and the Success Case Study complement each other and converge quite nicely. Both data sources show evidence of the Center X / LD7 Partnership success.

- **Cognitive Coach Survey**- UCLA coaches have been trained in the Cognitive Coaching model. Within the cognitive coaching model there are five competencies - also referred to as five states of mind, that individuals are expected to embody. The ultimate goal of cognitive coaching is to develop skillful and effective individuals who will serve as agents of change within the educational system. This is supposed to happen by becoming more resourceful in all five states of mind; consciousness, craftsmanship, efficacy, flexibility, and interdependence. In an effort to gauge individual coach's growth over time, coaches were invited to complete a cognitive coaching survey that was administered online. The intent of the survey was to assess the coaches' current status and growth toward the five states of mind. 5 coaches completed the pre- and post-survey. On average, coaches scored relatively high on the pre- and post-survey in all five competencies, with coaches (as a whole) experiencing positive growth across competencies. It is expected that the gains coaches make will be transferred to teachers; and, that the gains teachers make will be transferred to students. Therefore, the gains individual coaches make can be seen as evidence that the program is on the right track to achieving its ultimate goal. In this case, the findings from the Cognitive Coach Survey indicate that coaches are growing as professionals during the year, likewise suggesting that teachers are growing as professionals, as evidenced in the Teacher Survey.

Conclusions

(Report pgs. 83-86)

- Because the Center X / LD7 Coaching Program is in full implementation, and is seeing fidelity to implementation, outcome data can be reliably assessed. Because the Teacher Survey consists of many previously validated measures, and triangulates well with other data sources, we can assume that we have obtained valid and reliable results with the Teacher Survey.

- In general, teacher responses are largely positive to the Teacher Survey. We find evidence that the Center X / LD7 Partnership is successfully achieving the following short- and medium-term program outcomes: improving the problem solving skills of teachers, increasing teachers' comfort, increasing teachers' satisfaction with their work, increasing opportunities for teachers to reflect on practice, increasing teachers' knowledge in content areas, increasing teachers' understanding of culturally relevant pedagogy, increasing teachers' exposure to research, expertise, and resources, improving teachers' lesson / unit planning, increasing interdisciplinary projects, improving teachers' alignment of instruction with CA standards, increasing creating and fostering college going learning environments, increasing networking, collaboration, and

communication between teachers, and increasing teachers' *knowledge of literacy instructional strategies*.

- For the following three outcomes, evidence of success is either mixed or neutral: increasing teachers' satisfaction with the school, improving teacher and administration communication, and increasing teachers' use of literacy instructional strategies.

- Novice and Veteran teachers, alike, use and benefit from coaching services. There are no overall significant group differences between Novice and Veteran teacher responses to survey constructs. However, the areas in which they benefit may be different. Compared to Novice teachers, Veteran teachers report significantly greater gains in Instructional Efficacy.

- The Center X / LD7 Coaching Program appears to be currently more effective at reaching short-term vs. medium-term goals. The data from the Teacher Survey instrument is highly positive for the Center X / LD7 Coaching Partnership, indicating that the program is, in fact, on the road to successfully achieving their long-term goal.