

Session Transcript: 28-05-2020 University of Penn - C-SAIL 20/20 The Promise

May 28th, 2020

AMY STORNAIUOLO:

Hello everyone! Welcome to C-SAIL's revision. My name is Amy Stornaiuolo and I am an associate professor of literacy education at the University of Pennsylvania. I want to take this opportunity to thank you for joining and offer a few points of logistics. We have three sessions today.

This one, our first is tightly packed with content. We will move at a quick pace with all of your audio muted. There is a questions box and we will be complaining used to answer more fully on our website after the conference and as time allows in our other sessions today. Our second section at 12:30 will be a breakout session. In our final will be a keynote with Linda and Andy.

We have closed captioning available and you will find the link on the chat box on the right-hand side.

You also find these PowerPoint as well as all the other handouts for today. It is now my distinct pleasure to introduce the founding director of C-SAIL, Dr. Andy Porter.

I see you have turned on your camera. Andy is the former Dean at the top 10 education school of the University of Pennsylvania and considered the leading expert in the nation on standardized testing.

ANDY PORTER:

Thank you very much. Welcome everyone. We have a federally funded Center for standards alignment and learning. And it's called C-SAIL. We will tell you what we have learned and where we think things might go from here.

I want to thank the Institute for education of sciences for the generous funding they have provided for this work in recognizing the project officer who will make a few remarks during this virtual conference during today.

We have partners - institutional partners. The University of Pennsylvania. The American institutes for research. University of Southern California. Vanderbilt. And at the University of Delaware.

We have four special focus states. California, Massachusetts, Ohio and Texas. And later was the school District of Philadelphia. I wanted to say that we started this work in 2015 and more things in standard reform in 2015.

Five years earlier the common core state standard had been published and initially adopted by well over most of the states. Every student succeeds act had just been passed 'replacing no Child left behind.'

It was a time in leadership and education to the states. After the common core standards were adopted by many states, there was a big backlash in many of the states. At that time, the federal government created two multi-state testing consortia.

This is where we started the work. Our work has been guided by a policy attributes theory. This says that policies like ESSA will have target behaviors were as they are consistent with all of the policies with each other. And then they can appeal to have authority with people which means there are rewards and sanctions associated with compliance.

Finally, things are hypothesized to have a bigger effect if they are stable, they last overtime. What we found briefly with specificity was greater under ESSA then it had to been under NBOE.

The schedule was pretty consistent and at the time it aligned with their standards. The other things like curriculum, materials and teacher education ... The use of sanction power was less and the use of authority was more.

And the stability was variable across states. With many states having variable stability. They changed their standards and assessments almost annually during the beginning of our work but not all of the states - Texas and California, two of our partner states were quite stable.

Finally, there was no evidence at the aggregate level for the nation or the states that student improvement... Student achievement improved under ESSA. Now I will turn it back to Amy.

AMY STORNAIUOLO:

Thank you, Andy. Mengli is a co-director at C-SAIL.

MENGLI SONG:

Just to provide a little context. Between 2007 and 2015, most states adopted new standards. Over the past few years, there had been a lot of things about the new standards. Particularly about the common core. There has been research that has impacted new standards on student outcomes.

These studies felt on the gap. I tested the facts of the new standards. Student achievement and also high school graduation rate.

This study is based on a comparative interruptive time. Where it compares after to the new adoption of standards. Our classification was based on the rigor of each state - as measured by two types of indexes. The common and priority.

We treat states with less rigorous prior standards and others with harder prior standards.

And to create a contrast for our analysis we excluded certain states from our sample. Given the timing of two indexes that we used for the states, the overwhelmingly majority of the states adopted new standards in 2010 and our achievement analysis adopt new standards in 2010.

Our high school graduation rate analysis was restricted to states that adopted the new standard in 2010 or 2011. Our digital model is the CITS baseline trend model. Which sets up a model to exclude bias.

This slide shows the NAEP achievement trends. Before and after the adoption of new standards. In treatment and comparison states, we see in each case, the achievement prior to the new standards are approximately there and if this is reassuring because a pretreatment trend is a critical assumption toward the analysis.

State-level high school graduation rate... The pre-trend is clearly nonlinear. On the left side of the slide is shown in the graph. To address this, we decide to restrict the data to 2000 and after. So it would be approximately be there as is shown on the graph on the right. Now let's look at the results.

This will show the effects of the new standards for grade for reading. The black line shows the observed score. Both before and after. And the red dotted line shows the predicted scores in absence of the new standard in the post treatment time period.

Those are the scores that they would have achieved. There were four weeks available after the adoption of the standards. They allowed us to assess the effects of the new standards. One year, three years, five years, and is seven years after adoption.

These are all small effects but statistically significant or marginally significant. This figure shows the effects for grade 8 reading. The effects are all very small and not significant. This shows the results for grade 4 math with state classifications based on the prior regular index. Most of the effects are small and nonsignificant.

This shows results for grade 8 math with state classifications based on the prior regular index. The three year, five year and a seven year effects are all negative.

But the effects are generally small. The seven year does read statistical significance with .1 standard deviation. The result of the new standard method achievement with the core context and none of the effects are significant.

This graph is the effect on high school graduation rate. They are all negative but only the one year effect is marginally significant reflecting out 1.2 percentage point difference. In summary, our results are a little disappointing. States adoption of a new standard do not lead to improve certain achievement or high school graduation rate during this time we examine.

Overall, most of the effects are nonsignificant and a few even reached statistical significance.

Why are we not seeing the effects that we had hoped to see? There are several possible explanations. One is that they are not as good as the old standards. Maybe they have not been

implemented, and I also wanted to point out that the results that were just presented, largely represented during the transition time period. Because it took states 3 – 5 years to move to the new standards. Finally, the results need to be interpreted with caution. I will now turn it back to Amy.

AMY STORNAIUOLO:

I'm going to welcome Morgan and Adam to video. Morgan is a professor at the University of California. Specializing in design implementation and standards assessment and accountability processes. Morgan will be co-facilitating this open session with me by leading discussions with experts to put C-SAIL findings and broader context. I'm going to turn to Morgan to introduce our first gas.

MORGAN POLIKOFF:

Thank you very much Amy. I'm delighted to introduce Adam Gamoran. Prior to joining WT Grant Adam was the chair in sociology and educational policy studies at the University of Wisconsin Madison. Adam, thanks very much for joining.

SPEAKER:

My pleasure.

MORGAN POLIKOFF:

Let's talk about these results. It's clear whatever achievement growth we were seen 10 or 20 years ago is not there anymore. Do you think there is hope for standards to continue to have effects on achievement if so what needs to happen for continued improvement?

ADAM GAMORAN:

... The challenge for US education is not the lack of achievement growth but it's the inequality and student trajectories. It remains to be seen the extent to which the standards are having effects on inequality. With that said I don't think there is much reason to expect the results to be very different for the subgroups once those are presented.

I think there are some reasons that we have seen unlimited benefits from the imposition of standards through the state adoption to the common core State standards through this period. First of all, the political context of the adoption of standards was not a smooth one. It was fraught and there has been resistance. We need to think about standards adoption and a challenging context.

Second of all, standards are merely a tool. They need to be supported. They need to be implemented in a context with adequate materials with the curriculum is aligned with the standards. With assessments that are designed to pick up the content that is introduced to the standards. It is not clear that NAEP is the right assessment for that. More importantly teachers need to be prepared to use new standards and to buy into the standards and we need to introduce standards in the context with rich support systems for struggling students who need more than the hour a day instruction in their eighth grade math class in order to succeed.

MORGAN POLIKOFF:

You know, I am writing a book about the struggle the standards movement so I might quote that. I hope we have a nice recording of that response. What other outcomes, and you questioned NAEP. And I'm not sure that is the right outcome we should be looking at here but what other outcome should we be looking at to fully capture the potential impacts of standards or is it not a question of whether they are working but more a question of where they are working well and what they are not working well?

ADAM GAMORAN:

I think those are both important points. We need to think about additional conditions that are necessary for standards to have any benefit. I talked about conditions that help teachers implement standards well, but there are conditions outside the classroom that are necessary. For example, time for teachers to collaborate with one another. Time is the teachers most precious resource and is allocated in a scarce way in our schools. If teachers had more time to collaborate they could work together more effectively on implementing standards. We also need to seek leadership focused on instruction. Good discipline and order. Frequent monitoring of student progress. All that is necessary for effective teaching and learning in any school.

Finally, this is about conditions outside of schools. There is no more important issue to think of now in our current reality than nutrition, safety, the absence of trauma. Standards are one small tool in this larger context. As we think about other outcomes, we can think about students' ability to work in teams. Students ability to achieve cultural competency as well as cognitive performance. A student's ability to use new tools such as the technology tools that are so widespread and thinking about where and who as much as how much as we see the dramatic inequalities being exacerbated by the pandemic that we are all facing.

MORGAN POLIKOFF:

Absolutely. Of course right now we are holding this conference virtually because of the pandemic and we are all thinking about what is going on around the country and around the world. I am wondering how does the COVID crisis intersect with the standards movement and to what extent are standards appropriate at this time and does COVID make you rethink standards in any way. What role should standards be playing right now?

ADAM GAMORAN:

I don't think the pandemic makes me rethink standards but it does put in perspective because in a time students are struggling to find food, to have safe places to live, secure environments, technology to keep up with their studies, at a time when students are isolated from their peers. At a time when teachers are struggling to reach their students to fulfil their duties as teachers often with important demands in the home competing for their time. We can see that yes we need standards. We need to identify what students need to learn and be able to do. But that won't get us very far if we can meet students basic needs. If we can provide them with nutrition and safety in the human interaction that they need to function as young adults.

MORGAN POLIKOFF:

All right. Thank you for the interesting discussion. I am now going to pass back to Amy.

ADAM GAMORAN:

Good work to the center and information you provided us.

AMY STORNAIUOLO:

Thank you so much, Adam. I'm going to invite our implementation team now to present their findings. We are joined by Nelson Flores associate professor at the in education at the University of Pennsylvania. We will also listen to Lynn and Doug Fuchs.

To begin the presentation of the implementation team findings, I first introduce Laura, director of research at the end of University of Delaware who specializes of and how state... To you Laura.

LAURA:

I am codirector of the center and I'm going to share some of the key findings from our implementation line of work. I first want to acknowledge and thank the wonderful team of graduate students and researchers who worked on this project over the past five years.

The research questions at the implementation stream focused on were examining the policy environment according to the policy attributes for people at different levels of the system. The nature and quality of support and guidance that educators were receiving and finally looking at alignment to standards and how that differed for teachers in elementary school, high school, teachers of math and English language arts and English partners and students with disabilities.

Look at the framework and aligned instruction with the idea that this would be moderated by resources, professional learning and challenges.

The data that we use to study implementation for state representative surveys in our partner states and in Ohio and Texas we had data from 2016 and most recently 2019 and 2020. Conducted interviews with state administrators every year of the study and we did a series of deep dive case studies in our partner states to observe teachers and talk with them and their principals and district administrators.

One key finding was that there were moderately high levels of the policy attributes across actors in different levels of the system. Notable here are that principals and superintendents had significantly higher buy-in than did teachers.

In terms of teachers, one of the key findings was that teachers of students with disabilities or significantly lower in the reported authority for the standards but teachers of math, ELA and DLs had significantly moderate levels of authority. There was no change in this pattern from 2016 to 2020.

In terms of the top five resources that teachers said they wanted to support their aligned instruction

they wanted aligned curricula, digital tools, professional learning, assessments, and information about instructional change. What is notable here are two things. Teachers in Ohio and Texas recorded the same five resources in second that wanting these resources didn't change from 2016 to 2020. Teachers don't want these resources to support their instruction.

In terms of challenges, the top five challenges teachers named was mostly related to students. Their ability, preparation, absenteeism, support from parents. The one infrastructure item was insufficient class time. As Adam said, time is very precious.

As notable here teachers from Ohio and Texas very similar responses across state in a change in pattern over time. These challenges are still being felt by teachers.

In terms of aligned instruction we found wide variation to the extent in which teacher aligned to standards. One key finding was that elementary math teachers had the best alignment to standards and they increase their alignment from 2016 to 2020.

What predicts online instruction? We found that variation in alignment was related to having access to specific aligned curricula. Support from effective high-quality professional learning and being in an environment with stable standards and assessments.

We also found that there was some tension between teachers wanting specificity and guidance in district and states been hesitant to provide it so as not to infringe on local control.

We found that there was a shift from hard power, the perceived sanctions how they associated with an NCLB to something we called smart power focused on rewards and reports.

Given all of our data collections we found that professional learning and adaptive leadership played a key role in building authority specificity and consistent standards implementation. I will turn the virtual podium over to my colleague Nelson Flores.

NELSON FLORES:

I'm going to be talking a little bit about our findings and focus specifically on English learners. Just to give you a sense of our different partners did you can see California and Texas are states that have long numbers of English learners and that is been a long-standing population. Massachusetts being a middle range state is a growing EL population and Kentucky and Ohio with historically low population. You can see 2003 and 2013 that number has doubled and has continued to increase.

You can also see that California and Texas are states that have long histories of supporting English learners whereas Kentucky, Massachusetts and Ohio are part of two different consortia. Kentucky in Massachusetts being part of WIDA...

I am just going to briefly go over some of the survey data that was focus specifically on English learners. We were able to collect survey data from Kentucky Ohio and Texas in 2016 in California

Ohio and Texas in 2020. Unsurprisingly text teachers reported feeling significantly more prepared to teach English learners and teachers in Ohio and Kentucky. In 2020 Ohio teachers continue to report feeling significantly less prepared to teach English learners in teachers in California or Texas and Ohio having not improved.

Texas teachers reported receiving significantly more PD in Ohio and Kentucky for English learners and that has remained the case for California and Texas reporting significantly higher PD than Ohio.

Finally in 2016 English learner teachers reported so teachers who are specifically designated as English learner teachers provide comparable mainstream... There were too few respondents in Kentucky to be able to make any claims about that. And that remains the case were EL teachers in 2020 for California, Ohio and Texas to report with consistency and power adjusting.

This is all happening within the context of increasing specificity of EL policy in each of the states that we worked with. State leaders reported taking the lead in developing more specific policies and estates that have that part of consortia, they highlighted the collaboration and supporting their work in developing more policies for English learners. The general accountability systems ... Most states are using one of two assessment systems for identifying and classifying EL's and that has been uncontroversial.

It's connecting to authority as opposed to power. Our deep dive data had a range of different things. People think about things in terms of urban, rural, and suburban. That was not the meaningful distinction. There were lots of contextual factors. Such as density, demographics and history. This is a beginning of a technology thinking about high numbers versus low numbers and the ways that these contextual factors are really important in understanding the capacities that districts and states have in supporting English learners and the type of programming that is possible in those districts and how we can begin to think about differentiating the types of support that they are providing for districts and schools.

Finally, some of the implications for this, simply covering grade level standards may not be sufficient at increasing EL achievement data as seen among other studies. Creating a state-level support of differentiated support for districts based on a typology proposed, might be a way of supporting academic achievement and I can imagine the national consortia playing a role in helping differentiate this. Finally, creating a research agenda that should be considered and conceptualizing this differentiated support can help create a more robust system of differentiation.

With that said, I will passed the mic over to Dr. Lynn Fuchs.

LYNN FUCHS:

I'm going to talk about major conclusions. We will summarize these conclusions briefly and Doug will be elaborating them in the breakout session of students with disabilities.

We derive this data both from a longitudinal study and from the implementation study which Laura

explained and described. Our first conclusion is the NAEP analysis provides little basis for thinking that academic standards reform boosts the reading or math performance of students with disabilities.

In the breakout, Doug will show some results from that. The second conclusion comes from the interview and survey data which suggests that the lack of effects that we see on the table may be exasperated by a lack of buy-in about the idea of universal applicability of standards.

And a need for more knowledge about structural practices to support students with disabilities and their teachers. For example, state officials believed that the standards are appropriate for students with disabilities.

Whereas local administrators and building personnel - as Laura mentioned - express skepticism. That degree increases with the proximity of personnel with the familiarity with students with disabilities.

Another example is state officials report messaging and increased accountability focus for students with disabilities but district leaders say this is not trickling down to schools and teachers don't remember receiving that messaging.

Additionally, state administrators report professional development initiatives involving universal design, accommodations and differentiation. But here again, teachers do not recall these forms of professional development and they request needs for development of more supplemental material.

And today report a lack of specific policies and programs to support students with disabilities achieving standards.

The third bullet on this slide refers to some interview data that begin to reveal some more encouraging levels. That actually support coordination. Better coordination between general and to address the needs of students with disabilities. I would just mention three examples. In Pennsylvania, General and special education teams attend professional education development seminars together.

They have weekly meetings that included special educators and Ohio State support teams work with schools to remove barriers to students with disabilities from meeting the standards.

We will talk more about these issues in the breakout. Right now I will turn it back to Amy.

AMY STORNAIUOLO:

Thank you so much Lynn, Doug, Laura and Nelson. I'm going to ask you to turn off your camera and mute yourself. And we will have Morgan, Cat, and Renée.

MORGAN POLIKOFF:

Going to introduce our panel here. Brent oversees the learning, K-12 instruction, and special

education. Renée Bradley, office of special education and rehabilitative services office. In the national research learning disabilities. And Cat the executive director of ELPA21.

Prior to joining the team, she worked as a program director for ELPA21 at the...

Brent, we have been doing standards for more than 20 years. What are the do's and don'ts? What you think of the potential of standards-based reform to improve instruction learning into the context of the structure of our educational systems?

BRENT MALICOTE:

Good morning everyone and thank you Morgan. It's really a pleasure to be here. I waylaid with some of the dues that I have done. I've been a classroom teacher, school principal - I worked with the California Department of education and now I work at the county office. Some of the do's probably the most important is that we really think about sustained time when we are thinking about professional development that's required to do standards implementation well.

Along with that sustainability... Adam was talking about this earlier as well. The idea of systematic collaboration both across systems and within systems. That opportunity for inter-collaboration at school sites within district. And also learning from others.

I think clearly there is no silver bullet on this in terms of doing standards of implementation well. It is that element of collaboration. It's interesting, everyone claims they have a professional learning community and now we start to see a shift where we have the professional learning opportunity. We call them huddles now. We call them professional learning networks. We call them communities of practice. There's all these different names, and I don't get caught up in the name or the intricacies that goes with these different types of collaboration.

It's that idea of systematic collaboration both within the system and across the system which is the common denominator that I continue to see when standards implementation.

I would point out quickly that we need to think about our school leaders in all of this. Principals, vice principals... Teachers that are on leadership teams. All of those folks really need to be front and center in this if we want to position our principals and other school leaders as instructional leaders.

We have to support them with the right kinds of professional development and opportunity for them to be able to collaborate.

MORGAN POLIKOFF:

Thank you, I should say to all of the panelists, feel free to pop and if you want to respond to anything. Renée, we heard some discouraging findings from Lynn and Doug. How might schools address the tensions between these ambitious career and needs of students with disabilities in order to actually enhance outcomes for the students.

RENEE BRADLEY:

Thank you for giving me an uncomplicated question to address in a really short time period.

MORGAN POLIKOFF:

You have three minutes to solve special education.

RENEE BRADLEY:

There's definitely a tension but I wonder how much is dominant of the history. It's not just from students with disabilities. It's many children who are failing to make expected progress.

Your question asked about suggestions on how to address. I will throw out for possibilities. Number one, I would say that we need to be careful not to let the tensions or the level of difficulty serve as an excuse for inaction or failure to apply these standards.

For students with disabilities, almost 45 year history of the predecessor to IDA was passed. The students had defied time and time again the common misperception of their common limited performance achievement. We have numerous examples existing and coexisting quite well with individualization.

Secondly, I would say that instruction should be organized in a systemic tiered system of support for all children. By design a perverse individualization for all and it's based on their needs. Not a label, not gender not geography. This universal instruction can provide the foundation for us to be able to align grade level instruction and standards for all children, not just children with disabilities. Additional tiers provide the framework for more levels of individualization.

Not only the instructional content, but most important, the instruction delivery. The strategies and supports that are needed to ensure access and progress. Third, the coaching support that has already been addressed. We say it's critical but rarely sufficient time provided. And we have to focus on the things that we know make the biggest difference. Lastly, we should continue to work on our policy outcome and that has yet to be conquered by anyone. The intent might be appropriate and aspirational but we continue to struggle on implementation.

Good instruction closes gaps and to address that we have to invest in our teachers and how we deliver that instruction and individualized that for those who need more.

MORGAN POLIKOFF:

Thank you very much. Can what are some of the challenges that states and districts have encountered to have English learners meet the standards and how has ELPA21 supported these challenges?

CAT STILL:

There are numerous challenges in supporting English learners. They are growing diverse subgroup.

The presence in the classroom offers tremendous opportunities. It is critical that both DL specialists and general education teachers implement proficiency standards. This promotes learners and their growing mastery of the English language and academic language and content area instruction. That is one of the challenges that we see. This ties back to collaboration. The more we can collaborate across these areas would better support these English learners.

For example when planning instruction that engages English learners it is important that content teachers and language specialists can work together to ensure English learners are afforded a standards-based instruction while they are progressing towards proficiency in English.

In terms of how we meet the challenges, the ELPA 21 system was built from the ground up. Our ELP standards carry embedded linkages to the language, skills required to participate in grade level academic work in this course. Leading up this new college and career standards from the start ELPA21 was poised to meet these challenges. We support continue to support our partners states by treat being true partners. They reflect current research and understanding of how the brain learns and uses language and how language is developed in academic and social settings. They wanted standards to be informed by educators who know English learners and not just by researchers wanted to avoid the prescriptive nature of prior standards. Our standards are state lead in research informed. As they meet the needs of agencies, EL programs and classroom educators.

MORGAN POLIKOFF:

It was a brief discussion. Hopefully just the start. I will pass it back to Amy.

AMY STORNAIUOLO:

Thank you so much Morgan, Kat, Brent and Renée. I will look forward to more of these discussions in the breakout sessions. You cannot turn off your camera's. I'm going to welcome Toni to turn on audio and video. Toni Smith is a principal researcher at AIR. Specializing in teacher professional learning and math education.

SPEAKER:

... Virtual coaching program on teacher's instruction in their student achievement. I co-lead the study along with my colleague Mike Garret is a vice president at AI are and also codirector at C-SAIL. In this presentation I will provide an overview of the program provide a design study ensure preliminary results from that study.

The FAST program is to help student teachers understand the state standards and help them aligned to the standards. It focuses on fourth grade math and fifth grade ELA.

The program includes three components. These are all described in detail in the conference and out. The first component is personalized coaching. Teachers meet with the BEST coach as part of collaborative teams to discuss the content of their instruction and identify ways to strengthen their alignment of their instruction to their state standards. These meetings occur virtually using video conferencing technology.

The second component is a pair of tools to support alignment on reflection. Teachers use instructional logs in which they can document the content they taught as well as lesson video recordings to analyze their teaching with their instructional coaches during the individual coaching sessions.

Finally, the FAST program offers an online library of resources. This library includes resources to help better understand their standards and lesson activities they can learn in their teaching. After the individual coaching sessions they recommend sources from this library that teachers can draw upon as they enact the next steps identified in their meanings together.

Our experimental study of the PAST program is designed to answer three research questions. How is it implemented? Does it lead to greater instruction of state standards? Does it lead to better student achievement?

We conduct the study in five districts located in three states. Across the five districts we recruited 56 schools to participate. When compared with the national population of public schools serving students in the study target grades of four and five the schools in the study tended to be larger, they were more concentrated in urban areas and they served higher percentages of minority and disadvantaged students.

Within each district we randomly assigned half of the study schools to the treatment condition or control condition. Two of our five districts had an odd number of school so in those districts we assigned more to treatment and control giving us a total of 29 schools in the treatment condition and 27 schools in the control condition in our study overall.

We implemented the PAST program in the treatment schools during the 2017 – 18 and 2019 – 2020 school years. We had five minutes, five individual coaching sessions, five videos and five logs in the two years.

To address our first research question regarding implementation of the program we collected program artifacts like teacher attendance sheets and coach logs documenting activity in the coaching sessions throughout implementation.

To address our second research question regarding the fast program on teacher instruction to state standards. We asked treatment and control teachers to complete a survey enacted curriculum. Where to the start of any FAST activity. So at baseline and then again at the end of each study year. May complete the SEC they were asked to report on the emphasis they gave at various levels of cognitive demand during the school year. This information was used to analyze the limit of their instruction to state standards.

Finally, we use student scores on state tests to examine the impact on student impact and achievement. This data was collected at the end of each study year. Let's look at what we found in

our preliminary analyses of the data after two years.

We focused our analyses on the regular fourth grade math and fifth grade ELA classroom teachers who were in the studies goals in the spring of the second year in their students. Our analyses on the impact on instruction included the teachers from that group who had provided SEC data at the end of the second year as well as study schools that had at least... For math the impact example included 85% of the study schools and 85% of the study teachers. For ELA included 81% of the study teachers and 66% of the study teachers.

Our analysis on the impact of student achievement included the study students for whom we had spring 2019 state test scores. The teachers and whose classes they were enrolled as well as the students schools. In those subjects almost all students had achievement it is almost all studies schools, teachers and students were included in the analysis.

Although the BEST program was made available to all treatment teachers in the target grades, they didn't all participate. In some cases principals decline participation for the whole school after random assignment and citing too many competing initiatives at the time. In some cases principals didn't decline but teachers did not participate. It is important to note that however, over half the teachers included in that sample I just described did participate in at least one FAST activity across the two years they were exposed to treatment.

Overall teachers who completed in FAST... Participation was a bit higher in math and then ELA but overall they participated in about half of the total number of sessions that we had initially planned for. This was due in part to a delayed start in the first year of the study as it took us a little bit longer than anticipated to collect that baseline SEC data which then delayed the actual startup of the FAST activities. The teachers who did participate found the activities to be valuable for reflecting on improving their instruction.

Despite lower participation in PAST activities than expected preliminary analyses suggest the fast program had a statistically significant positive impact on the alignment teachers instruction and statement. In ELA suggested it had a positive but not statistically impact on the instruction in the second year.

The effects appear to be larger in year two than they were in year one. Analysis on the impact of student achievement are ongoing for year two but we did not find a significant effect in year one.

One explanation may be that the treatment teachers in our study did not complete the full set of intended FAST activities that they do not get the full dosage of treatment. Another explanation may be the relationship between alignment and achievement in our data. We had anticipated that teachers whose instruction is better line would have students that make better gains but that wasn't true in our year one data. Analyses of year to our ongoing so we will be interested to see what the data shows.

Finally the third explanation could be the state test which we use to measure student achievement are not well aligned to the standards but we would need to do more exploration to see if that was the case.

Thank you and I will not turn back to him.

AMY STORNAIUOLO:

Thank you so much Toni. I will invite Morgan, Sarah and Chrystalla determine your cameras and audio.

MORGAN POLIKOFF:

I'm happy to introduce Sarah Woulfin who is an associate professor at the University of Connecticut school of education department in educational leadership. Sarah studies the relationship between education policy and equitable instruction in co-edits educational researcher. Doctor Chrystalla Mouza is a distinguished professor at the school of education University of Delaware. She has expertise in the learning sciences including teacher learning, applications of technology in K-12 classrooms in teaching and learning outcomes in ubiquitous and mobile computing environments.

So Sarah, the best intervention results suggest that we can move enable on instruction in the desired ways but this progress is spotty and uneven, for instance we saw bigger changes in math than in English-language arts. What are you seeing out there in terms of way to consistently improve instruction and drive alignment that work at scale and what about ways to effectively demonstrate instruction for English learners with disabilities?

SPEAKER:

To answer the question about sustainable and consistent improvement in instruction, I want to draw back and kind of amplify points that Doctor Flores and Brent Malicote made. From Doctor floors this point he brought up system support for districts and Brent mentioned this notion of levels.

I think one emerging and promising practice is this idea of bringing levels to better link in policy and practice in the partnering being a really active form of collaboration between researchers, university instructors and educator prep programs, district leaders, school leaders that would include principals and coaches as well as teachers. I think in the partnering spaces and partnering practices their ways to develop capacity. Their ways to think through what are the enabling and restraining conditions in different contexts that are shaping instruction, shaping some of these patterns in teachers work that then lead to the stubborn gaps amongst different types of students in these various outcomes.

I want to mention this partnership approach is perhaps one strategy to sustainably and consistently improve instruction. To your second session with regard to promising practices related to English learners and also for students with disabilities, I think that again thinking through how do we make these messages for consistent. How do we think about serving English learners are serving students with disabilities the one more thing whereas a place or the responsibility of someone else but how do we make this a consistent coherent part of the work that we do in structural improvement. So can I

think there are ways to bring in principles in this. I think there are ways to make sure the coaching is fully aligned across these different – for these various students and subgroups into sort of improve instruction for all through that.

MORGAN POLIKOFF:

Just to follow up briefly, I'm wondering if there are examples of sites or places where you think this is going well or research where you have seen this collaboration across levels highlighted.

SARAH WOULFIN:

I think one long-term project was the missed project related to method instruction. It was based at Vanderbilt. Jan Russell also has a good approach at math coaching in Tennessee. Those are the two I'm thinking of right now.

MORGAN POLIKOFF:

We are in a new online world right now. Who knows how long it's going to last, but clearly there will be ripple effects for years. What are the FAST intervention results telling you about the promise and challenges of online teacher support and learning?

CHRYSTALLA MOUZA:

Thank you for having me out of think you for the question. Which is very timely. They need to be working on new models of teacher professional development and support. There's a ton online, its potential to support teacher learning.

It's a little bit under investigated we do need more rigorous studies such as the coaching and being able to facilitate the teacher learning and really identifying strengths and weaknesses. We do know that online professional development could be effective. It could provide the time and space for synchronous and asynchronous interactions. They could offer opportunities for teachers to reflect on issues of practice pain either individually or in collaboration.

And coupled with this idea of virtual coaching which I think is getting a lot of lamenting. I think it could provide more of a customized learning experience that could directly support teachers pedagogical practice. I would say there's plenty of literature in support of this. Many I have done face-to-face of one of the challenges we have is thinking about online and thinking about what has been done in face-to-face and how we can translate it in ways we can scale and sustain after the end of the intervention. For example, some of the new approaches to online professional development would allow for more personalized feedback but also opportunities for peers to provide feedback.

For example, new tools would allow teachers to annotate videos together. Rather than having one directional approach, it provides feedback to the teacher. You have teachers working together. In terms of challenges, this has not come easy and we have seen it through the pandemic. How challenging it was for teachers across the board. Including teacher aggregators. They are encouraging people to include these aspects. This type of online approach has one thing, Time. You

said it nicely in the introductory remarks. Time is the most pressured resource for teachers.

How we structure it and the idea that teachers think they can do something outside of school time...

Could be possible to leverage tools where schools are already learning, and technology changes very rapidly so mastering new tools such as time could be really time-consuming and really turn them off.

The last thing I would say is a lot of times we think about online as just simply doing activities that put teachers in front of screens. I would say the value and how they approach is this combination of digital and nondigital activities so teachers have the ability to meet with a virtual coach. When we think about opportunities where we can combine the virtual and digital with face-to-face - any experience would be beneficial.

MORGAN POLIKOFF:

Thank you for the answer. Your answer makes me think that it would be really valuable to have some guidance for districts that are making decisions about teaching learnings in the coming years. As someone who has had to move to online instruction, I feel like we have had the resources we need on how to do that. Because lots of us have no experience. That could be a really valuable resource. Thank you so much for your comments and I will give it back to Amy.

AMY STORNAIUOLO:

Thank you. Morgan, you can stay on and you too can move off. We can invite Jeff to jump on video and audio as we transition to our final topic of the session.

MORGAN POLIKOFF:

Jeff is the superintendent of the Newhall School District in California, up the road for me. Prior to his appointment he served as Assistant Superintendent...

Jeff, in terms of standards implementation what do you think the district leaders need most from their state departments of education or other state run agencies like conferences and counties in California. How can the state support the districts better?

You are muted. Oh, no - our first technical difficulty.

JEFF PELZEL:

I'm good. When I think about state supporting school districts and those things, the biggest part is the funding structures that are in place to be able to put systems and structures.

What I have loved and heard this morning and I think about the work we are doing, it's really about ongoing systemic approach to the work that we are doing. It cannot be this drive-by fad this year.

This is what we are taking on and then we are moving on the following year. I also do think

accountability is important in this. When I think that you want to support English learners and students with disabilities, it's this aggregating the data into looking at student group outcomes overall. That accountability is a benefit for school districts whether we like it or not and the outcomes we might be getting are rough but I do think that accountability does drive us to improve what we are doing. Each and every day across the district.

MORGAN POLIKOFF:

When you look at peer districts that are also succeeding, what do you think are the common threads you observe and what about the flipside? What about districts that are struggling. What are they missing? We've already talked about collaboration, but are there other things that may be important that you have not heard about so far?

JEFF PELZEL:

it was mentioned about the aligned curriculum and I think school districts that are accelerating... When they make a decision around the curriculum that they choose to adopt, they go through a really vetted process that involves stakeholders from across your district or the entire district. And they really take time to think through the important decision. When you are adopting curriculum, you will sit with that for five, seven, 10 years depending on the funding source.

It's easy to get caught up in bells and whistles but from the packaging perspective, you have to have your teachers look at the curriculum and understand the standards that are expected to teach and if it allows for what we are aiming to do.

MORGAN POLIKOFF:

The curriculum issue I think is a great one. It's something that Newhall has a very coherent approach to. Believe it or not, we are ahead of schedule. I was wondering if you could talk about Newhall's approach to curriculum and what you have learned over the last few years of you have been implementing these new core curriculum programs in your district.

JEFF PELZEL:

I will speak in particular around math because I think we are really proud of that. Our efforts around mathematic instruction. We began five years ago as we were transitioning to common core standards and those things in our district. We really grounded ourselves in the standards before we ever really looked at the resources that were out there. We wanted our teachers to unwrap the standards. We brought in a professional consultant that works with our teachers for four years.

We spent four years having ongoing professional developer. Three or four times a year classroom teachers were pulled out and working with this expert and deepening their knowledge around the effective practices and looking at the mathematical practices - not just the standards.

They offered instruction for more teacher facilitated learning and then we looked at the curriculum that was going to match our approach to teaching that we knew would move kids along in academic progress. That's when I talk about "not a drive-by," it took an ongoing effort over those years. Also

the other part that resonated with me in the last conversation – we hired for instructional math coaches in our district. We are tense close but we have format coaches that focus in primary and upper grade and worked with classroom teachers to build the capacity.

It's this coaching model, curriculum, and the alignment to the standards that has made a difference and we have an ongoing data analysis system that we use all the time looking at student group data to disaggregate which kids are getting at and which are not. We have response to intervention time built in.

MORGAN POLIKOFF:

I'm going to give you 30 seconds for this answer. How are you thinking about teaching and learning for the coming year in light of COVID-19 and what support do you need aside from the money. Maybe the answer is just money.

JEFF PELZEL:

the issue right now is that we're probably going to have two models. We will have a distanced model and another learning model... It was just talked about helping teachers understand the most efficient way to engage kids in a distance learning model and we will have to provide ongoing professional develop meant to support teachers in the work as we move forward.

MORGAN POLIKOFF:

Thank you so much, Jeff. Good luck and I'm going to pass it back to Amy.

AMY STORNAIUOLO:

Thank you so much. That was a really interesting discussion. You both can turn off your cameras and I just want to tell everyone thank you so much for joining today for our first session. A reminder that our breakout sessions begin at 1230 Eastern time which is 15 minutes from now and you can see those topics on the screen. We have curriculum, multilingualism, leadership and governance, professional learning and working with standards and students with disabilities. If you need the link to register for one of the sessions in the chat... And I believe the next slide will give us information about the closing keynote discussion at 1:30 today Eastern time.

You should have received your join link for those sessions but you can also go on the website more quickly and to decide. Thank you again for coming and we are going to leave this information on the screen but closed the session shortly. Have a great rest of your day.