

**An Implementation Evaluation of
Classroom Instructional Support Model (CISM)
The First Year**

Research and Accountability

Pinellas County Schools

October 2006

Prepared in partnership with
Bethany A. Bell-Ellison, MPH
Department of Educational Measurement & Research • College of Education
University of South Florida

Classroom Instructional Support Model (CISM) Evaluation

Executive Summary

The “Classroom Instructional Support Model” (CISM) is a newly created elementary school staff development model that aims to improve teachers’ knowledge and use of Reading and Mathematics teaching points developed by the Curriculum Support Team (CST). Pinellas County Schools began utilizing the model during the 2005-2006 school year. This study provides the first evaluation of the implementation practices of the model. Prior to publication of this report, changes deemed necessary to the administrators of the program, were made to improve the implementation. These changes are not reflected in this report.

Implementation data were obtained from school administrators, staff developers, and teachers in February 2006 through focus groups and an online survey. Findings from focus groups and the online survey suggest a lot of variability among school administrators, staff developers, and teachers in terms of implementation practices, with school administrators and staff developers typically indicating higher levels of implementation than teachers. Overall, there does not appear to be enough time to properly implement the model as currently designed, nor does there appear to be much support from teachers. Many of the demonstration teaching strategies are already endorsed and used by Pinellas County teachers, thus in order to improve teacher buy-in, staff developers should work with teachers to develop meaningful lessons for their teams. Also, each school has its own needs, thus in order to be effective, the district needs to rethink the current “one size fits all” mentality and perhaps refine the model allowing for more flexibility at the school level.

Recommendations for the 2006-2007 school year include:

- Staff developers need to meet the schools where they are -- assess what is already being done at each school and build the demonstration lessons from there.
- Staff developers need to get and use teacher input and focus on the unique needs of each school.
- The district needs to allow more flexibility with the model and allow staff developers to help teachers in ways that they think are best for their students. The teachers who work with students everyday should have more input regarding the roles and duties of their staff developers.
- School leaders also need to be given flexibility in terms of spreading the model to other grade levels with stronger needs.
- The model needs to be adjusted to allow for more adequate time to implement the model correctly. One possibility is to redistribute the staff developers so they are at schools more consecutive days each month.
- School level personnel preparation and training for involvement in CISM should be enhanced.
- District staff needs to brainstorm solutions to issues such as time for planning activities and class coverage, as well as ways to make the model less disruptive for teachers.
- In addition to addressing the issues related to implementation, district staff needs to further investigate school personnel’s low levels of perceived effectiveness of the model.

Background Information

CISM – “Classroom Instructional Support Model” – is an embedded elementary school staff development model with the overall goal of expanding elementary school teachers’ knowledge of explicit instruction and ensure that the Pinellas County model of instruction is deployed and practiced. More specifically, CISM is intended to expand and deepen teachers’ knowledge of the Reading teaching points developed by the Curriculum Support Team (CST) and to create effective lesson planning for Mathematics centered on meaningful classroom discussions. Pinellas County Schools began implementing CISM during the 2005 – 2006 school year.

The creation of CISM was prompted by several district needs: The district had not made AYP, thus Florida required a staff development plan for the district; during the 2004-2005 school year, Title 1 Funds had to be used for professional development due to schools being under sanction; and beginning with the 2005-2006 school year, the organizational changes in the district left the Area offices responsible to deploy and monitor the curriculum in all schools and to carry out the staff development plan in Non-Title 1 schools.

The purpose of the current evaluation is to evaluate the implementation practices of the model. More specifically, the level of understanding of the model, level of support from the leadership teams, level of the teacher buy-in (perceived effectiveness), and execution of the demonstration lessons and will be investigated.

Program Description

The essentials of this embedded model are based on modeling exemplary instruction, coaching and supporting teachers, transferring new knowledge, and monitoring the continued implementation of newly acquired teaching strategies. Leadership for the project at the District level included two elementary Area Superintendents, Assistant Superintendent of Elementary and ESE Education, Director of Elementary Education and Title I, and Reading, Mathematics, Title I, and ESE Supervisors. At the school level, the school principal, assistant principal, learning specialist, Reading First coach, Title I Facilitator, and Lead Reading and Mathematics teachers were responsible for leading the model in their schools.

Schools were divided into priority one (P1, n = 19) and priority two (P2, n = 30) based on their status on the AYP and the A+ grading system. The priority level determined the level of need and service that each school received. The P1 schools received three consecutive days of staff development every three weeks and the P2 schools received two non-consecutive days each month. Schools received either Reading or Mathematics staff development, with only a few schools receiving both. Reading staff development was emphasized for grades 2 and 3, whereas Mathematics was focused on grades 4 and 5.

Each staff developer was assigned one to three schools and was to work in collaboration with one classroom for each grade level for each focus area (2nd and 3rd grade for Reading and 4th and 5th grade for Mathematics) in a lab classroom setting. Demonstration lessons were to occur in the lab classroom, with same grade level teachers from other classrooms observing the lesson. The

staff developer was responsible for working with the lab classroom teacher, the school's leadership, and other teachers to plan and monitor the trainings. Staff developers attended District Curriculum Support Team (CST) meetings with their assigned schools. During the CST meetings, a school's plan was defined and prepared for deployment, after which the staff developer was to work with each school's leadership team and Professional Learning Communities to discuss deployment and results.

Analysis

Method

The program has not been in operation long enough to evaluate its effectiveness in terms of student achievement; the purpose of the current evaluation is to evaluate the implementation practices of the model. In order for a program to be effective, all the components of the program need to be implemented properly, thus it is important to conduct process evaluations. The result of this evaluation will assist and guide changes needed to improve the model. Information for the current evaluation was gathered from two different sources; an online survey and focus groups. Both were intended to gather data regarding implementation of the model.

Survey

To assess levels of implementation of CISM in participating elementary schools, an online survey was developed and conducted from February 2, 2006 to February 20, 2006. The survey was administered using Survey Monkey, an online hosting service. The survey consisted of 30 close-ended items and one open-ended "comments" item. Survey items asked respondents' about their perceptions and knowledge of CISM, implementation of CISM, and perceived effectiveness of CISM. The majority of items were measured on a four-point Likert scale with response options of *strongly agree*, *agree*, *disagree*, and *strongly disagree*, with some items including "don't know" as a fifth response option. Survey items were developed by Research and Accountability, with input from program administrators and were based on the actual design and specifications of the program, as presented by Curriculum Services. A series of three emails inviting participation in the online survey were sent to principals, assistant principals, learning specialists, reading and math coaches, lab classroom teachers, other classroom teachers, and staff developers at all 49 CISM schools (n =910). Copies of the survey recruitment emails and the online survey items are included in Appendices A and B.

Focus groups

In addition to gathering implementation data via the online survey, focus groups were also conducted with staff members of CISM schools during February 2006 by an external facilitator to gather information regarding the implementation of different elements of the model. Five separate focus groups were conducted - two with staff developers (02/10/06), one with school leaders (02/13/06), one with teachers (02/13/06), and one with principals (02/16/06). Dr. Marilyn Katzenmeyer, from Professional Development Center, Inc. conducted the focus groups and developed the focus group interview guides with input from Research and Accountability staff. Focus group recruitment letters were sent to randomly selected principals, assistant principals, learning specialists, reading and math coaches, lab classroom teachers, other classroom teachers,

and staff developers at both P1 and P2 schools (n = 129). Copies of the focus group recruitment memos and interview guides are provided in Appendices C and D.

Sample

The online survey had a 65% response rate with nearly 600 personnel involved with CISM completing the online survey (n = 594). Thirty-nine percent of survey respondents were classroom teachers, 12% principals, 11% model/lab classroom teacher, 9% assistant principals, 9% Title I facilitators, 6% reading and mathematics coaches, 6% staff developer, 6% other, and 2% learning specialist (Table 1). Furthermore, 50% of respondents reported being members of the Curriculum Support Team and 20% reported being at Center for Learning Schools.¹

Table 1. Online survey sample characteristics (N = 594)

Personnel Category	N	Percent
Assistant principal	52	8.8
Learning specialist	10	1.7
Math Coach	8	1.3
Model/lab classroom teacher	66	11.1
Other classroom teacher	233	39.2
Principal	72	12.1
Reading coach	29	4.9
Staff developer	35	5.9
Title I facilitator	51	8.6
Other	38	6.4
Total	594	100.0

A total of 55 county personnel participated across the five focus groups (Table 2). The staff developers’ and school leaders’ focus groups were the most well attended (n = 26 and n = 16, respectively), whereas the teacher and principal focus groups had relatively low participation (n = 5 and n = 8, respectively). Also, all five participants in the teacher focus group were demonstration classroom teachers – no regular classroom teachers participated in the focus groups.

Table 2. Characteristics of Focus Group Participants (N = 55)

Participant Characteristics	Feb. 10 th Focus Groups (Staff Developers)*	Feb.13 th Focus Group (School Leaders)	Feb.13 th Focus Group (Teachers)**	Feb. 16 th Focus Group (Principals)
Assistant principal		4		
Math Coach		1		

¹ The Centers for Learning Student Achievement Institute (CFL-SAI) is a four year classroom and school action research project. The Centers for Learning project integrates Teachers SAI, Principals SAI and Learning Specialist SAI into a single program for the purpose of collectively studying in school inquiry teams curriculum, instruction, assessment, systems implementation and learning cultures.

Model/lab				
classroom teacher			5	
Principal				8
Reading coach		3		
Staff developer	26			
Title I facilitator		8		
Total N	26	16	5	8
Priority 1 school	--	4	2	5
Priority 2 school	--	12	1	3
Mathematics area	11	8	0	3
Reading area	15	8	5	5

* 2 of the staff developers worked in both math and reading.

** 2 of the teachers were from “A” schools, which were neither P1 nor P2 schools

Limitations of the Study

As with any evaluation, there are some limitations that must be kept in mind when reviewing the findings presented in this report. First is the issue of social desirability of survey and focus group responses. Although this is a threat anytime we collect self reported data from people, the amount of subgroup variation on some of the survey items is alarming. The second area of caution pertains to the composition of survey respondents. Half of the respondents are members of the CST, which, like social desirability, can create bias in the results. Similarly, one-fifth of survey respondents are at Center for Learning schools, which approach curriculum and instruction differently than mainstream elementary schools, thus their opinion and thoughts on CISM may be significantly different from personnel at mainstream schools. Third, although the online survey had a 65% response rate, the 35% of personnel that did not participate may be different from those that did (i.e. may be more or less in favor of CISM). Because it is not possible to know who did and did not complete the online survey, we do not know if there are any significant differences between responders and non-responders. Fourth, because staff developers work with multiple schools, it was hard for them to answer the questions accurately. Implementation and effectiveness levels may not be the same across the schools they work in, but the survey did not allow responses for each school.

Responses provided through the open-ended “comments” section of the online survey reflect a variety of sentiments about the survey itself, as well as about CISM. For example, several respondents noted difficulty completing the survey stating it was too long and that they would have liked to have had “do not know” or “not sure” response options available for some of the items. Also, several respondents thought it would have been better to have separate questions for the Reading and Math coaches and for different schools (for the staff developers who are at multiple schools).

Results

The teacher and school administrator online survey provided information concerning the level of program perception and knowledge, level of support for CISM, level of perceived effectiveness, and implementation practices. The survey was conducted to assess the level of implementation practices and to identify how the model is being implemented. Results in this section are presented as they relate to these categories.

Additional information on the quantitative online survey findings are presented in Appendix E, Appendix F contains a summary of qualitative comments obtained from the online survey, and Appendix G contains a copy of the Focus Group Summary Report.

Program Perception and Knowledge

Understanding of and Commitment to CISM.

Overall, survey respondents perceived higher levels of understanding and lower levels of commitment to CISM among staff developers, school administrators, and teachers. More specifically, 93% of respondents agreed that staff developers understood the goals of CISM, whereas 88% agreed that school administrators understood the goals and 72% indicated that teachers understood the goals. In terms of perceived commitment to CISM, 92% of respondents agreed that staff developers were committed to CISM, whereas only 84% agreed that school administrators were committed to CISM, and 63% agreed teachers were committed. Interestingly, for both understanding and commitment, principals and staff developers' responses varied from the total group. More principals believed that school personnel had high levels of understanding and commitment to CISM whereas staff developers believed the opposite.

Findings from the five focus groups revealed a lot of variability in participants understanding of CISM. For the most part, principals, school leaders, staff developers, and demonstration classroom teachers felt confident in their understanding of the model as well as its rationale; however, except for principals, a few participants from each group were less confident in their understanding of the model. Participants in each group were also able to articulate their specific roles pertaining to CISM. However, as was with the comments from the online survey, the demonstration classroom teachers who participated in the focus group also reported the work in the demonstration classrooms to be repetitive, as they were already using the strategies introduced by the staff developers.

Support for CISM

On average, 77% of survey respondents agreed that the information presented at the CST meetings had supported CISM. A slightly smaller percent of regular classroom teachers agreed with this statement (69%) and a larger proportion of staff developers agreed (91%). In terms of CST members supporting CISM, 89% of respondents agreed that members of the school-based

CST had supported the implementation of CISM, with variations in agreement occurring among principals (97%) and staff developers (82%).

The majority of respondents also (82%) agreed that the staff developer had provided helpful, effective on-going assistance to teachers and school administrators. A larger proportion of staff developers (97%) and a smaller proportion of regular classroom teachers (76%) agreed with this statement.

Over three-quarters of school personnel (78%) agreed that there was collaboration and cooperation among the school administrators, teachers, and staff developers to support and implement CISM, with the largest proportion of agreement coming from principals and school leaders (90% and 85%, respectively) and the smallest proportion of agreement found among model/lab classroom teachers (67%).

Collectively, 79% of respondents agreed that staff developers had adapted the components of CISM based on the needs of the individual, with variation in opinions occurring among staff developers (94%), principals (87%), and regular classroom teachers (67%).

School Personnel Support of and Involvement with CISM.

Overall, survey respondents reported relatively high levels of agreement in terms of roles and activities of school personnel in relation to CISM. Interestingly, the highest levels of agreement were reported for the roles and activities performed by math and reading coaches and the lowest levels of agreement were reported for the roles and activities of assistant principals.

In terms of support and involvement from principals, over eighty percent of respondents agreed that principals: attended Professional Learning Community (PLC) meetings (88%); selected model/lab classroom(s) that had the required classroom essential elements and successful classroom management system (86%); provided opportunities for participating teachers to plan collaboratively (82%); and included the Title I Facilitator and reading/math coaches on the Leadership team (82%). Over seventy percent of respondents agreed that principals: had established and maintained a master schedule that provided teachers the time to participate in and debrief demonstration lessons (79%); released Assistant Principal/Title I/Coaches for district professional development (78%); participated in the planning and debriefing of at least one demonstration lesson (73%); and met with the staff developer at the conclusion of the trainings (72%).

Regarding model/lab classroom teachers support and involvement with CISM related activities, 90% of respondents agreed that they had examined and reflected on teaching practices, whereas over eighty percent of respondents agreed that they: had been open minded and willing learners (88%); had implemented new teaching strategies in the classroom (88%); had shared key learnings, successes and concerns with teammates through PLC discussions (85%); had shared key learnings, successes and concerns with the staff developer (84%); and were given time with the staff developer for a discussion before and after the model lesson demonstration (83%). Slightly less respondents agreed that model/lab classroom teachers were given time to collaborate with grade-level peers on the model lesson (79%); had co-taught with the staff

developer, Reading/Math Coach and/or Title 1 Facilitator as requested (75%); and were given time to meet and discuss progress with school-based instructional leaders (Title I Facilitator, Reading/Math Coach, Learning Specialist, 70%).

In terms of Staff developers' involvement with CISM related activities, nearly ninety percent of respondents agreed that they had prepared and delivered demonstration lessons that utilized research proven teaching practices (88%) and that they led discussions before and after the model/demonstration lessons (87%). Seventy-five percent of respondents agreed that staff developers had assisted in coordinating all aspects of CISM in collaboration with the leadership team at the school and over sixty percent agreed that they supported Project Focus (as appropriate, 66%) and that they met with the principal after each school visit to share progress (63%).

Regarding Title I Facilitators involvement with CISM related activities, 82% of respondents agreed that they assisted in coordinating all aspects of CISM in collaboration with the school leadership team and that they assisted the school administrator(s) in developing a climate of teacher collegial collaboration and continual improvement through PLC's and CST opportunities. Over seventy percent of respondents agreed that title I facilitators: participated in all CISM trainings and provided follow-up training at school (78%); assisted classroom teachers with the use of assessment results in developing instructional strategies to meet the needs of all learners (76%); and met with grade level teams for staff development, modeled effective instructional practices, and coached and supported teachers when the staff developer was out of the building (73%).

In terms of Reading/Math coaches involvement with CISM, over eighty percent of respondents agreed that they: assisted the school administrator(s) in developing a climate of teacher collegial collaboration and continual improvement through PLC's and CST opportunities (84%); met with grade level teams for staff development, modeled effective instructional practices, and coached and supported teachers when the staff developer was out of the building (84%); assisted classroom teachers with the use of assessment results in developing instructional strategies to meet the needs of all learners (84%); assisted in coordinating all aspects of CISM in collaboration with the school leadership team (83%); and participated in all CISM trainings and provided follow-up training at school (82%).

Regarding Assistant Principals' involvement with CISM, 73% of respondents agreed that they assisted the school administrator(s) in developing a climate of teacher collegial collaboration and continual improvement through PLC's and CST opportunities. Over sixty percent of respondents agreed that assistant principals assisted in coordinating all aspects of CISM in collaboration with the school leadership team (66%) and that they assisted classroom teachers with the use of assessment results in developing instructional strategies to meet the needs of all learners (62%). However, less than sixty percent of respondents agreed that assistant principals met with grade level teams for staff development, modeled effective instructional practices, and coached and supported teachers when the staff developer was out of the building (59%) and that they participated in all CISM trainings and provided follow-up training at school (58%).

Although the overwhelming majority of comments about CISM were negative, there were a lot of positive comments about the different staff developers and coaches, however, even though many appear to go above and beyond, respondents indicated that no matter how good the staff is, the limited time in each school does not allow for much to be accomplished. To remedy this, there were several suggestions to have the staff developers at each school for two or three weeks at a time to allow more meaningful involvement or to assign staff developers to the neediest schools full-time.

As with the findings from the online survey, lack of time was also mentioned by focus group participants in terms of debriefing lessons and collaborative planning with teachers. For example, school leaders were not positive about this component's implementation, reporting scheduling problems and confusion on the part of the CST and PLC as to the staff developers role and responsibilities. In terms of follow up and monitoring activities, both principals and staff developers reported positive experiences whereas teachers and school leaders were more negative in their responses.

Implementation Practices

Implementation of CISM Strategies.

Compared to same grade level classrooms, a higher proportion of respondents agreed that specific CISM strategies were being implemented in model/lab classrooms. More specifically, across the seven strategies (gathering areas, reading aloud, small group discussions, student to student accountable talk, 'just right' books for independent reading, 'just right' books for guided reading, and effective collaborative lesson planning), an average of 76% of respondents agreed that specific CISM strategies were being implemented in model/lab classrooms compared to 70% of respondents who agreed that the same strategies were being implemented in same grade level classrooms.

However, not all respondents agreed equally regarding the use of specific strategies in model/lab classrooms. For example, 97% of staff developers agreed that model/lab classrooms had been using gathering areas compared to only 74% of regular classroom teachers who agreed. Also, compared to the total group, a greater proportion of school leaders agreed that effective collaborative lesson planning was being implemented in the model/lab classrooms (81%) and a smaller proportion of regular classroom teachers agreed (59%).

Except for staff developers, there was little subgroup variation in the proportion of respondents who agreed each strategy was being used in same grade level classrooms. For example, 88% of staff developers agreed that other same grade level classrooms were using gathering areas, 61% agreed they were reading aloud, and 53% agreed other classrooms were using 'just right' books for independent reading.

Regarding activities that occurred when staff developers visited schools, nearly one half of survey respondents indicated that a debriefing of the model/demonstration lesson always

occurred (49%), whereas a little over one-third of respondents reported that: a presentation of an overview of the initial demonstration lesson with the theory and rationale for the lesson was always provided (38%); delivery of the model/demonstration lesson with all same grade-level teachers observing and taking notes always occurred (38%); discussions with teachers to review the observations, model/demonstration lessons, co-teaching, and collaborative planning completed by staff developers always occurred (38%); and that staff developers always collaborated with school administration, the title I facilitator, and reading/math coach to identify their responsibilities for observation and ongoing teacher support when the staff developer was not present (34%). Also, only 26% of respondents indicated that collaborative grade-level planning for the next lesson always occurred.

In terms of when CISM trainings were offered, 32% of respondents marked during PLC, 20% marked by flexible scheduling, 17% reported during faculty meetings, 14% of respondents marked on some early release days, and 10% reported through use of temporary duty elsewhere (TDE) days.

Comments Regarding CISM.

In terms of comments about the model and personnel involved with model, the majority of comments were negative in nature. Common sentiments and frustrations included that CISM brought nothing new to the classrooms and that many of the strategies were already being implemented before CISM, that the program is a waste of resources, that the model is disruptive to the teaching process, a lack of participation and adequate support from school administrators, lack of proper implementation, CISM is insulting to experienced teachers – is much more suited for new teachers, theoretically CISM could be a useful program, but two or three days a month is not enough to make a true impact, that the CISM personnel (staff developers and coaches) would be more effective back in the classroom as teachers, lack of collegial relationships from the staff developers, CISM would have been better if schools could have chosen the topic area (reading or math), and that staff developers were not experienced and simply presented scripted materials and could not answer more complicated questions.

Demonstration Lessons.

Regarding demonstration lessons, principals stated that success of the demonstration lessons varied with the trust and rapport that staff developer had established with the teachers. Also, school leaders often missed the demonstration lessons because they were covering classes for teachers to go to the demonstration or were handling discipline issues. Staff developers also commented the demonstration lessons had to evolve as class coverage issues were resolved and teacher buy-in grew.

Findings from the focus group also support findings from the online survey regarding orienting teachers to the model lessons. School leaders felt it was unsatisfactory in many schools, reporting that time for the orientation was a problem and often resulted in students losing instructional time with their own teacher or teachers losing their planning time. Staff developers also felt time for this orientation was very difficult to find.

Teacher and School Administrator's Perceived Effectiveness

Improvement in Professional Development.

When asked about issues related to CISM's impact on issues related to professional development, 80% of respondents agreed that CISM was supporting the development of school-based instructional leaders, whereas 75% agreed that CISM was supporting the staff developers' and teachers' proficiency to effectively identify students' strengths and needs by using assessment data and that CISM was supporting the development of a group of classroom teachers to serve as models/mentors in the delivery of effective instruction.

However, compared to the collective responses, a greater proportion of staff developers agreed that CISM was supporting the development of school-based instructional leaders (85%), that CISM was supporting the staff developers and teachers' proficiency to effectively identify students' strengths and needs by using assessment data (94%), and that CISM was supporting the development of a group of classroom teachers to serve as models/mentors in the delivery of effective instruction (88%).

Improvement in Instructional and Administrative Practices.

In terms of respondents perceived impact of CISM on school personnel's instructional and administrative practices, 86% agreed that teachers were learning effective instructional methods and techniques to reach students, 79% agreed that teachers had adapted the research-based strategies and proven methods to meet the needs of students, 76% agreed that school administrators had redefined roles and responsibilities based on the need for continuous improvement of the school, 74% agreed that teachers at the targeted grade-level(s) meet regularly to discuss and build upon materials from the Curriculum Support Team (CST) and the staff developer, 74% agreed that school administrator(s) conducted systematic classroom observation to analyze the impact of staff development on teaching practices, and 73% agreed that teachers had redefined roles and responsibilities based on the need for continuous improvement of the school.

However, there was a lot of subgroup variation related to agreement in the changes that occurred in the schools as a result of CISM. For example, whereas collectively, 74% of survey respondents agreed that teachers at the targeted grade-level(s) meet regularly to discuss and build upon materials from the Curriculum Support Team (CST) and the staff developer, higher proportions of principals and school leaders agreed with this statement (81% and 83%, respectively) but lower proportions of lab classroom teachers, regular classroom teachers, and staff developers agreed (67%, 69%, and 63% respectively). There was also a lot of discrepancy regarding respondents' opinions that teachers were learning effective instructional methods and techniques to reach students with more principals, school leaders, and staff developers agreeing and fewer regular classroom teachers in agreement.

Improvements in Reading Teachers' Planning and Delivery of Rich Reading Lessons.

In terms of Reading teachers' confidence in planning and teaching rich reading lessons, 82% of respondents agreed that Reading teachers were more confident in carrying out guided reading and in planning and teaching lessons that incorporated structures/routines for the reading block (e.g. read aloud, accountable talk, guided reading), 80% agreed Reading teachers were more confident matching students to 'just right' books, 78% agreed that Reading teachers were more confident in helping students to establish procedures and habits for independent reading/conferring, and 77% agreed that Reading teachers were more confident in using data/assessments to plan for differentiated instruction.

Improvements in Mathematics Teachers' Planning and Delivery of Rich Math Lessons.

Regarding Math teachers' confidence in planning and teaching rich math lessons, 89% of respondents agreed that Math teachers were more confident in using varied talk formats and grouping structures to increase student engagement, 87% agreed that Math teachers were more confident in using varied talk moves to build students mathematical comprehension, reasoning, and communication, 84% agreed Math teachers were more confident in using effective questioning strategies to extend mathematical ideas and in allowing opportunities for all students to explore mathematical concepts, and 79% agreed that Math teachers were more confident in analyzing student work (including classroom discussions) in order to make instructional decisions.

Overall Effectiveness.

Overall, only 58% of respondents agreed that CISM's effectiveness is evident from student performance, measured by informal assessments, with regular classroom teachers having the smallest proportion of respondents who agreed (50%) and staff developers having the largest proportion of respondents who agreed (65%).

When asked if CISM had worked as planned in their schools, focus group participants varied in their responses, with school leaders being the most negative and staff developers, principals, and teachers responding in the mid-range of the scale. Also, as with the comments from the online survey, focus group participants reported that the staff developers do not have an adequate amount of time at each of their schools. In addition, staff developers commented that having weeks in between school visits made it difficult to sustain any progress that might have been made. Nonetheless, compared to more traditional professional development approaches, the majority of focus group participants preferred the CISM approach.

In general, the most commonly cited barriers to CISM implementation are similar to comments provided in the online survey -- time, class coverage, lack of communication at the district level, lack of flexibility of the mandated model to individual school needs, conflicting messages, poor training and preparation, and teacher resistance.

Discussion

Theoretically, CISM could be an effective professional development model, however, after its first year of implementation, its effectiveness and acceptance within the schools is not evident. At first glance, many of the collective group responses to the online survey items appear to provide support for CISM, however, a closer examination of subgroup responses reveals a great deal of variability among school administrators, staff developers, and teachers. To be effective, CISM needs to be embraced and supported at all levels, not just among school administrators or staff developers, whose jobs are closely connected to the model. Without teacher support, the likelihood that CISM will be fully implemented and effective is not very high. Lack of time appears to be a key barrier to proper implementation of this professional development model, thus the implementation and effectiveness of CISM relies on district support and flexibility in better meeting the time demands and instructional needs of each school. Each school has its own needs, thus in order to be effective, the district needs to rethink the current “one size fits all” mentality.

Recommendations

The following are recommendations for the 2006-2007 school year:

- Staff developers need to meet the schools where they are -- assess what is already being done at each school and build the demonstration lessons from there.
- Staff developers need to get and use teacher input and focus on the unique needs of each school.
- The district needs to allow more flexibility with the model and allow staff developers to help teachers in ways that they think are best for their students. The teachers who work with students everyday should have more input regarding the roles and duties of their staff developers.
- School leaders also need to be given flexibility in terms of spreading the model to other grade levels with stronger needs.
- The model needs to be adjusted to allow for more adequate time to implement the model correctly. One possibility is to redistribute the staff developers so they are at schools more consecutive days each month.
- School level personnel preparation and training for involvement in CISM should be enhanced.
- District staff needs to brainstorm solutions to issues such as time for planning activities and class coverage, as well as ways to make the model less disruptive for teachers.
- In addition to addressing the issues related to implementation, district staff needs to further investigate school personnel’s low levels of perceived effectiveness of the model.

Appendix A

Online Survey Recruitment Emails

Pinellas County
Schools

MEMO

February 2, 2006

TO: XXX

FROM: XXX
Director, Program Evaluation
XXX
Research Specialist

SUBJECT: Evaluation of Classroom Instructional Support Model (CISM).

The Area Superintendents for elementary schools have asked the Research & Accountability Department to evaluate the implementation of the Classroom Instructional Support Model (CISM).

A variety of sources are being used to collect information which will be included in the evaluation report. This e-mail is being sent to you providing you with the information to complete an online survey. This online survey is aimed to ask questions about different aspects of CISM. Your responses to this survey are anonymous and will be reported only in summary.

The online survey is maintained on a secure survey site; this provides your responses the same level of security that you get when you make purchases online.

The link to go to the survey is as follows:

<http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.asp?u=685161709096&c=1>

If clicking on the link does not connect you to the survey web site, please copy and paste the entire link into your web browser to get to the survey site.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study, you may contact us at 588-6253 in the Research & Accountability office.

Pinellas County
Schools

MEMO

February 7, 2006

TO: XXX

FROM: XXX
Director, Program Evaluation
XXX
Research Specialist

SUBJECT: Evaluation of Classroom Instructional Support Model (CISM).

Last Thursday, you received an email asking you to complete a survey about the Classroom Instructional Support Model (CISM). CISM is the embedded staff development model in which a Reading, Math, and/or Writing Staff Developer is visiting your school on a regular basis. This model is currently present in all elementary schools in Pinellas County. If your school has more than one staff developer, please take all of them into account when answering the questions. If there are differences between them that you would like to point out, please describe those in the comment section at the end of the survey. Your candid thoughts and opinions are very important in shaping the future of this model.

The link to go to the survey is as follows:

<http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.asp?u=685161709096&c=18>

If clicking on the link does not connect you to the survey web site, please copy and paste the entire link into your web browser to get to the survey site.

If you have already completed the survey, THANK YOU!

If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study, you may contact us at 588-6253 in the Research & Accountability office.

Thank you very much.

Pinellas County
Schools

MEMO

February 16, 2006

TO: XXX

FROM: XXX
Director, Program Evaluation
XXX
Research Specialist

SUBJECT: Evaluation of Classroom Instructional Support Model (CISM).

We would like to thank you for taking the time to respond to the on-line survey on Classroom Instructional Support Model (CISM). Your feedback is valuable and will be used for the formative evaluation of this embedded staff development model.

If you have not yet had the opportunity to respond, and would like to give your feedback, the survey will be available until Monday, February 20 at 8:00 a.m.

The link to go to the survey is as follows:

<http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.asp?u=685161709096&c=14>

If clicking on the link does not connect you to the survey web site, please copy and paste the entire link into your web browser to get to the survey site.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study, you may contact us at 588-6253 in the Research & Accountability office.

Thank you very much.

Appendix B

Copy of the Online Survey

Classroom Instructional Support Model (CISM) 2005-06 Survey

This survey is being conducted by the Pinellas County Schools Research and Accountability Department using "SurveyMonkey.com". Surveys conducted by the District through this site have SSL encryption to protect any information you enter on the survey.

The purpose of this survey is to collect information concerning the Classroom Instructional Support Model (CISM) from classroom and school personnel.

We would like to know your opinion regarding CISM. You will not be identified to anyone and your answers will only be reported in summary.

Please answer these questions based on your knowledge of/experiences with CISM. The scale indicates how much you agree with the statement.

Please respond to all questions.

This survey is comprehensive in scope. If you do not have time to finish the survey, you can close it and return to where you left off (using the same computer) and the computer will save your previous responses.

For questions concerning the survey, contact Julie McLeod at 727- 893-2988, or email mcleodj@pcsb.org

Thank you very much for your participation.

1. **I am a:**
 - * Principal
 - * Assistant Principal
 - * Title I Facilitator
 - * Reading Coach
 - * Math Coach
 - * Learning Specialist
 - * Model/Lab Classroom Teacher
 - * Other Classroom Teacher
 - * Staff Developer
 - * Other (*Please Specify*):
2. **I am a member of the Curriculum Support Team (CST)**
 - Yes
 - No
3. **My school(s) are Centers for Learning (CFL)**
 - Yes
 - No

(For questions #4 through 11, please use this scale: Strongly Agree; Agree; Disagree; Strongly Disagree)

4. The goals of CISM are understood by:

- * teachers
- * school administrators
- * staff developers

5. There is a sense of commitment to CISM among:

- * teachers
- * school administrators
- * staff developers

6. The information presented at the CST meetings has supported CISM.

(Please use this scale: Strongly Agree; Agree; Disagree; Strongly Disagree; Does not Apply)

7. The members of the school-based CST have supported the implementation of CISM.

8. The staff developer has provided helpful, effective on-going assistance to teachers and school administrators.

9. There is collaboration and cooperation among the school administrators, teachers, and staff developers to support _____ and to implement CISM.

10. Staff developers have adapted the components of CISM based on the needs of the individual school.

11. A major role of the instructional leader is to assess the extent to which the instructional techniques demonstrated by CISM are being used in the classroom.

12. With what frequency do the following occur when the staff developer visits your school? (Please use the following

scale: Never; Sometimes; Frequently; Always)

* presentation of an overview of the initial model/demonstration lesson(s) with the theory and rationale for the _____ lesson

* delivery of the model/demonstration lesson with all same grade-level teachers observing and taking notes

* a debriefing of the model/demonstration lesson

* collaborative grade-level planning for the next lesson

* discussion with teachers to review the observations, model/ demonstration lessons, co-teaching and collaborative planning completed by staff developers

*collaboration with school administration, Title I facilitator, reading/math coach to identify their responsibilities for observation and on-going teacher support when the staff developer is not present

(For questions # 13-15, Please use this scale: Strongly Agree; Agree; Disagree; Strongly Disagree)

13. CISM is supporting:

* the development of school-based instructional leaders (Title 1 Facilitators, Learning Specialists, Reading/Math Coaches, Staff Developers)

* the staff developers and teachers proficiency to effectively identify students' strengths and needs by using assessment data

* the development of a group of classroom teachers to serve as models/mentors in the delivery of effective instruction

14. As a result of CISM, appropriate strategies have been implemented in the model/lab classroom(s) in the following areas:

* use of gathering area

* read aloud (reading)

* small group instruction

* use of student to student accountable talk

* use of "just right" books for independent reading

* use of "just right" books for guided reading

* effective collaborative lesson planning

15. As a result of CISM, appropriate strategies have been implemented in the other same grade level classroom(s) in the following areas:

* use of gathering area

* read aloud (reading)

* small group instruction

* use of student to student accountable talk

* use of "just right" books for independent reading

* use of "just right" books for guided reading

* effective collaborative lesson planning

16. Are your school(s) participating in CISM Reading?

Yes

No

17. As a result of this year's work with CISM, Reading teachers are more confident planning and teaching rich reading lessons that incorporate the following: *(Please use this scale: Strongly Agree; Agree; Disagree; Strongly Disagree)*

* using structures/routines for the reading block (e.g. read aloud, accountable talk, guided reading, choosing appropriate instructional material)

* using data/assessment to plan for differentiated instruction

* helping students to establish procedures and habits for independent reading/conferring

* matching students to "just right" books

* carrying out guided reading

18. Are your school(s) participating in CISM Math?

Yes

No

19. As a result of this year's work with CISM, Math teachers are more confident planning and teaching rich math lessons that incorporate the following: *(Please use this scale: Strongly Agree; Agree; Disagree; Strongly Disagree)*

* use of varied talk formats and grouping structures to increase student engagement

* use of varied talk moves to build students' mathematical comprehension, reasoning, and communication

* use of effective questioning strategies to extend mathematical ideas

* analysis of student work (including classroom discussions) in order to make instructional decisions

* opportunities for all students to explore mathematical concepts and ideas within a community of learners

20. As a result of CISM, *(Please use this scale: Strongly Agree; Agree; Disagree; Strongly Disagree)*

* teachers have adapted the research-based strategies and proven methods to meet the needs of their students

* teachers at the targeted grade-level(s) meet regularly to discuss and build upon materials from the Curriculum Support Team (CST) and the staff developer

* teachers are learning effective instructional methods and techniques to reach students

* teachers have redefined roles and responsibilities based on the need for continuous improvement of the school

* school administrators have redefined roles and responsibilities based on the need for continuous improvement of the school

* school administrators conduct systematic classroom observation to analyze the impact of staff development on teaching practices

21. The effectiveness of CISM is evident from student performance, as measured by informal assessments.

(Please use this scale: Strongly Agree; Agree; Disagree; Strongly Disagree)

22. CISM training was delivered: (mark all that apply)

* on some early release days

- * during PLC
- * during faculty meeting
- * through use of Temporary Duty Elsewhere (TDE) days
- * by flexible scheduling
- * other:

23. The principal(s) have: *(Please use this scale: Strongly Agree; Agree; Disagree; Strongly Disagree)*

- * provided opportunities for participating teachers to plan collaboratively
- * selected model/lab classroom(s) that have the required classroom essential elements and successful classroom management system
- * established and maintained a master schedule that provides teachers the time to participate in and debrief model/demonstration lessons
- * included the Title I Facilitator and reading/math coaches on the Leadership team
- * released the Assistant Principal/Title I Facilitator/Coaches for district professional development
- * participated in the planning and debriefing of at least one model/demonstration lesson
- * attended Professional Learning Community (PLC) Meetings
- * met with the staff developer at the conclusion of the trainings

24. The Model/Lab classroom teacher(s) were given: *(Please use this scale: Strongly Agree; Agree; Disagree; Strongly Disagree)*

- * time with the staff developer for a discussion before and after the model lesson demonstration
- * time to collaborate with grade-level peers on the model lesson
- * time to meet and discuss progress with school-based instructional leaders (Title I Facilitator, Reading/Math Coach, Learning Specialist)

25. The Model/Lab classroom teacher(s) have: *(Please use this scale: Strongly Agree; Agree; Disagree; Strongly Disagree)*

- * been open minded and willing learners
- * examined and reflected on teaching practices
- * implemented new teaching strategies in the classroom
- * shared key learnings, successes, and concerns with the staff developer
- * shared key learnings, successes, and concerns with teammates through PLC discussions
- * co-taught with the staff developer, Reading/Math Coach, and/or Title 1 Facilitator as requested

26. The Staff Developer(s) have: *(Please use this scale: Strongly Agree; Agree; Disagree; Strongly Disagree)*

- * assisted in coordinating all aspects of CISM in collaboration with the school leadership team at the school
- * prepared and delivered model/demonstration lessons that utilize research proven teaching practices
- * led discussions before and after the model/demonstration lessons
- * met with the principal after each school visit to share progress
- * supported Project Focus (as appropriate)

27. Do your school(s) have a Title I Facilitator?

Yes No

28. The Title I Facilitator(s) have: *(Please use this scale: Strongly Agree; Agree; Disagree; Strongly Disagree)*

* assisted in coordinating all aspects of CISM in collaboration with the school leadership team at the school

* participated in all CISM training and provided follow-up training at school

* assisted the school administrator(s) in developing a climate of teacher collegial collaboration and continual improvement through PLC's and CST opportunities

* met with grade-level teams for staff development, modeling effective instructional practices, coaching and supporting teachers, while the staff developer is out of the building

* assisted classroom teachers with the use of assessment results in developing specific instructional strategies to meet the needs of all learners

29. Do your school(s) have reading or math coaches?

Yes

No

30. The Reading/Math Coach(es) have: *(Please use this scale: Strongly Agree; Agree; Disagree; Strongly Disagree)*

* assisted in coordinating all aspects of CISM in collaboration with the school leadership team at the school

* participated in all CISM training and provided follow-up training at school

* assisted the school administrator(s) in developing a climate of teachers collegial collaboration and continual improvement through PLC's and CST opportunities

* met with grade-level teams for staff development, modeling effective instructional practices, coaching and supporting teachers, while the staff developer is out of the building

* assisted classroom teachers with the use of assessment results in developing specific instructional strategies to meet the needs of all learners

31. Do your school(s) have an AP?

Yes

No

32. The Assistant Principal(s) have: *(Please use this scale: Strongly Agree; Agree; Disagree; Strongly Disagree)*

* assisted in coordinating all aspects of CISM in collaboration with the school leadership team at school

* participated in all CISM training and provided follow-up training at the school

* assisted the school administrator(s) in developing a climate of teacher collegial collaboration and continual improvement through PLC's and CST opportunities

* met with grade-level teams for staff development, modeling effective instructional practices, coaching and supporting teachers, while staff developer is out of the building

* assisted classroom teachers with the use of assessment results in developing specific instructional strategies to meet the needs of all learners

33. Comments

Appendix C

Focus Group Recruitment Letters

January 31, 2006

To: Staff Developers
From: XXX, Director
Evaluation
Subject: CISM Focus Groups

Beginning with the 2005-2006 school year, an imbedded staff development model called "Classroom Instruction Support Model" (CISM) was introduced to elementary schools.

The goal of CISM is to "expand the teacher's knowledge of explicit instruction and ensure that the Pinellas County model of instruction is deployed and practiced."

Focus groups of instructional staff and school leadership are being convened to gather information that will be used as part of a formative evaluation. An outside facilitator will conduct the focus groups. The results of the formative evaluation will be used to guide the Curriculum and Instruction Team to improve this model and its implementation.

The anticipated outcomes of the focus groups are:

- an understanding of the level of implementation of CISM
- an understanding of staff's perceptions of the model's effectiveness
- to identify recommendations for implementation improvement

The identity of individuals' comments and discussions shared during the focus groups are confidential. The report will only include a summation of information shared.

The dates, times, and location of the two focus groups are listed below. Once you have chosen a session convenient for you, contact Jill Reales at 588-6253 or by email realesj@pcsb.org to add your name to that particular session. In order to maintain each focus group to a specific size, **sign-up is on a first-come, first-served basis.**

February 10

10:00 - 12:00 p.m.	Room 6, Title 1 Center
1:00 - 3:00 p.m.	Room 6, Title 1 Center

Your participation is highly valuable, as we will use the information reported by the consultant as part of the formative evaluation.

BA/mj

..

January 31, 2006

To: Selected Principals
From: XXX, Director
Evaluation
Subject: CISM Focus Groups

Beginning with the 2005-2006 school year, an imbedded staff development model called "Classroom Instruction Support Model" (CISM) was introduced to elementary schools.

The goal of CISM is to "expand the teacher's knowledge of explicit instruction and ensure that the Pinellas County model of instruction is deployed and practiced."

Focus groups of instructional staff and school leadership are being convened to gather information that will be used as part of a formative evaluation. An outside facilitator will conduct the focus groups. The results of the formative evaluation will be used to guide the Curriculum and Instruction Team to improve this model and its implementation.

The anticipated outcomes of the focus groups are:

- an understanding of the level of implementation of CISM
- an understanding of staff's perceptions of the model's effectiveness
- to identify recommendations for implementation improvement

The identity of individuals' comments and discussions shared during the focus groups are confidential. The report will only include a summation of information shared.

You have been randomly selected to participate in a focus group. The dates, times, and location of the two focus groups are listed below. Once you have chosen a session convenient for you, contact Jill Reales at 588-6253 or by email realesj@pcsb.org to add your name to that particular session. In order to maintain each focus group to a specific size, **sign-up is on a first-come, first-served basis.**

February 16

1:00-3:00 p.m.

Room A308, Largo Administration

Your participation is highly valuable, as we will use the information reported by the consultant as part of the formative evaluation.

BA/mj

January 31, 2006

To: Selected Teachers
From: XXX, Director
Evaluation
Subject: CISM Focus Groups

Beginning with the 2005-2006 school year, an imbedded staff development model called "Classroom Instruction Support Model" (CISM) was introduced to elementary schools.

The goal of CISM is to "expand the teacher's knowledge of explicit instruction and ensure that the Pinellas County model of instruction is deployed and practiced."

Focus groups of instructional staff and school leadership are being convened to gather information that will be used as part of a formative evaluation. An outside facilitator will conduct the focus groups. The results of the formative evaluation will be used to guide the Curriculum and Instruction Team to improve this model and its implementation.

The anticipated outcomes of the focus groups are:

- an understanding of the level of implementation of CISM
- an understanding of staff's perceptions of the model's effectiveness
- to identify recommendations for implementation improvement

The identity of individuals' comments and discussions shared during the focus groups are confidential. The report will only include a summation of information shared.

Teachers will receive a \$26 stipend to attend and participate in one two-hour focus group session. The Payroll Department will issue stipend checks after the conclusion of the focus groups. In order to be eligible for the stipend, you must sign in at the meeting and provide your Social Security Number for checks to be issued.

In appreciation for each teacher participating in the focus group, the Curriculum Services Department will contribute \$100.00 towards classroom library materials.

You have been randomly selected to participate in a focus group. The dates, times, and location of the two focus groups are listed below. Once you have chosen a session convenient for you, contact Jill Reales at 588-6253 or by email realesj@pcsb.org to add your name to that particular session. In order to maintain each focus group to a specific size, **sign-up is on a first-come, first-served basis.**

<u>February 13</u>	4:00-6:00 p.m.	Room 203ABC	Largo Administration
<u>February 16</u>	4:00-6:00 p.m.	Room A308	Largo Administration

Your participation is highly valuable, as we will use the information reported by the consultant as part of the formative evaluation.

BA/mj

January 31, 2006

To: School Administrator/Leadership Team
From: XXX, Director
Evaluation
Subject: CISM Focus Groups

Beginning with the 2005-2006 school year, an imbedded staff development model called "Classroom Instruction Support Model" (CISM) was introduced to elementary schools.

The goal of CISM is to "expand the teacher's knowledge of explicit instruction and ensure that the Pinellas County model of instruction is deployed and practiced."

Focus groups of instructional staff and school leadership are being convened to gather information that will be used as part of a formative evaluation. An outside facilitator will conduct the focus groups. The results of the formative evaluation will be used to guide the Curriculum and Instruction Team to improve this model and its implementation.

The anticipated outcomes of the focus groups are:

- an understanding of the level of implementation of CISM
- an understanding of staff's perceptions of the model's effectiveness
- to identify recommendations for implementation improvement

The identity of individuals' comments and discussions shared during the focus groups are confidential. The report will only include a summation of information shared.

You have been randomly selected to participate in a focus group. The dates, times, and location of the two focus groups are listed below. Once you have chosen a session convenient for you, contact Jill Reales at 588-6253 or by email realesj@pcsb.org to add your name to that particular session. In order to maintain each focus group to a specific size, **sign-up is on a first-come, first-served basis.**

February 13

8:00 - 10:00 a.m.	Room 203ABC, Largo Administration
11:00 - 1:00 p.m.	Room 203ABC, Largo Administration

Your participation is highly valuable, as we will use the information reported by the consultant as part of the formative evaluation.

BA/mj

Appendix D

Focus Group Interview Guides

Classroom Instructional Support Model Staff Developers Questioning Route

1. Introduce self and describe your specific assignment within the CISM Project since August 2005. (possible probes or follow up: Math or Reading, Priority 1 or 2 Schools, # of schools)
2. Describe the role of a staff developer in implementing the CISM model.
3. To what extent do you feel confident in your understanding of the CISM model? Of the theory and rationale behind CISM?
4. Describe the training you have had to prepare you to be engaged in implementing the CISM Model.
5. The CISM model was designed to involve staff developers in working collaboratively with school site personnel. What specifically have you done with school-based leaders to develop a plan for the teachers at the school(s) to which you were assigned? What specifically have you done to meet with school leaders to suggest and plan for opportunities for coaching and support of teachers using new approaches?
6. How has the proposed schedule for CISM worked to provide adequate time at each school to which you were assigned?

Working in the same school for three consecutive days/every third week for Priority 1 schools

Working in the same school two days per month for Priority 2 schools

7. The CISM program has several components. Share with me how each of the following is working in the school(s) in which you have been assigned:

Orientation of teachers to the lesson including theory and rationale

Teaching of demonstration lesson with teachers observing

Debriefing of the lesson through discussion with teachers

Collaborative planning for the next lesson

Co-teaching with classroom teacher(s)

8. What have you observed the barriers to be in implementing the CISM Model?

9. Reflecting on your own experience in the schools, to what extent do you think the CISM has worked as it was planned. 1 = not at all and 5 = totally consistent with plans
10. If you were free to make changes to CISM, what would be the suggestions you would have for improving this approach to enabling teachers to gain new knowledge and to apply the knowledge in their classrooms?
11. When comparing CISM to more traditional professional development approaches, which do you think is more effective in preparing reading and math teachers to make significant improvements in student achievement? Why do you think so?
12. Is there anything else that you would like to tell me to help me understand your experience with the CISM model and its implementation in PCS?

Classroom Instructional Support Model Principals Questioning Route

1. Introduce self and tell me about your school's specific involvement with the CISM Project since August, 2005.
2. What is your understanding of the CISM model?
 - 2A. What is the rationale for its use as a school-based professional development model?
3. Describe the training you have had to prepare you to be engaged in implementing the CISM Model.
4. How specifically have you, as the principal, worked with staff developers from the area offices to develop a plan for the teachers at your school?
5. How has the master schedule at your school been modified for the CISM implementation? What, if any, changes have there been to the Leadership Team for the CISM implementation?
6. Have the job duties of any of the leaders at your school (AP, Title One Facilitator, Reading or Math Coach) been modified to provide time for these persons to carry out their responsibilities with regard to CISM?
7. To what extent has your school been adequately served in providing professional development in reading and/or math for your teachers by area office staff developers?
 - Staff Developer working in the same school for three consecutive days/every third week for Priority 1 schools
 - Staff Developer working in the same school two days per month for Priority 2 schools
8. The CISM program has several components. Share with me how each of the following is working in your school:

Selection of model demonstration classrooms by you or your staff

Staff Developer orienting teachers to the model lesson including theory and rationale

Staff Developer teaching demonstration lesson with teachers observing

School leaders holding meetings with grade level teams for reading or math staff development

Provision of coaching and support for classroom teacher(s) in reading and/or math strategies

9. In what ways have you personally been engaged in actively observing the CISM implementation in your school?
10. What have you observed the barriers to be in implementing the CISM Model?
11. Reflecting on your own experience at your school, to what extent do you think the CISM has worked as it was planned. 1 = not at all and 5 = totally consistent with plans
12. If you were free to make changes to CISM, what would be the suggestions you would have for improving this approach to enabling teachers to gain new knowledge and to apply the knowledge in their classrooms?
13. In what ways do you believe the CISM model is providing an improved approach to professional development of your schools' teachers when compared with more traditional professional development approaches?
14. Is there anything else that you would like to tell me that would be helpful in assessing the effectiveness of the implementation of the CISM model in Pinellas County Schools?

Classroom Instructional Support Model Teachers Questioning Route

1. Introduce self and tell me about your personal involvement with the CISM Project since August, 2005.

2. What is your understanding of the CISM model?
 - 2A. What is the rationale for its use as a school-based professional development model?

3. Describe the training you have had to prepare you to be engaged in implementing the CISM Model at your school.

4. In what ways has the CISM model assisted you personally in implementing new teaching strategies in your classroom? Assisted others on your grade level or team?

5. How have you been involved in working with Staff Developers from the Area Office in the implementation of CISM at your grade level?

6. To what extent has your school been visited on a regular basis by area office staff developers since the beginning of this school year?
 - Staff Developer working in the same school for three consecutive days/every third week for Priority 1 schools

 - Staff Developer working in the same school two days per month for Priority 2 schools

7. How have any of the leaders at your school (P, AP, Title One Facilitator, Reading or Math Coach) been involved in working with you as part of the CISM implementation? (Probe for training, co-planning, demo lessons, coaching and support, co-teaching, PLC discussions)

8. The CISM program has several components. Tell me how effective you think each of the following have been in providing teachers in your school with new knowledge and skills in working with students:

Staff Developer orienting teachers to the model lesson including theory and rationale

Staff Developer teaching demonstration lesson with teachers observing

School leaders holding meetings with grade level teams for reading or math staff development

Provision of coaching and support for classroom teacher(s) in reading and/or math strategies

Monitoring or classroom walk-throughs by administrators

9. Reflecting on your own experience at your school, to what extent do you think the CISM has worked as it was planned. 1 = not at all and 5 = totally consistent with plans
10. What, if any, barriers have there been to you applying what you have learned in the CISM implementation with your own students?
11. If you were free to tell the district about needed changes to CISM, what would be the suggestions you would have for improving this approach to enabling teachers to gain new knowledge and to apply the knowledge in their classrooms?
12. From your perspective as a classroom teacher, in what ways do you believe the CISM model is providing an improved approach to professional development of your schools' teachers when compared with more traditional professional development approaches?
13. Is there anything else that you would like to tell me that would be helpful in assessing the effectiveness of the implementation of the CISM model in Pinellas County Schools?

**Classroom Instructional Support Model
School Administrators' Questioning Route**

1. Introduce self and name your position (i.e. Reading Coach, Math Coach, Title One Facilitator, Assistant Principal, other)
2. Describe your specific involvement with the CISM Project since August, 2005.
3. What is your understanding of the CISM model?
 - a. A. What is the rationale for its use as a school-based professional development model?
4. Describe the training you have had to prepare you to be engaged in implementing the CISM Model.
5. How specifically have you as a school-based leader, worked with staff developers from the area offices to develop a plan for the teachers at your school?
6. Has the proposed schedule for the CISM implementation in your school worked to adequately provide professional development for your teachers?
 - Staff Developer working in the same school for three consecutive days/every third week for Priority 1 schools
 - Staff Developer working in the same school two days per month for Priority 2 schools
- 6A. Have any of your job duties been modified or deleted to provide time for you to carry out your responsibilities with regard to CISM?
7. The CISM program has several components. Share with me how each of the following is working in your school:
 - Staff Developer orienting teachers to the model lesson including theory and rationale
 - Staff Developer teaching demonstration lesson with teachers observing
 - Your holding meetings with grade level teams for reading or math staff development
 - Your coaching and supporting classroom teacher(s) in reading and/or math strategies
 - Your assisting teachers with using assessment results to plan instructional strategies to meet learners' needs
8. What have you observed the barriers to be in implementing the CISM Model?

9. Reflecting on your own experience at your school, to what extent do you think the CISM has worked as it was planned. 1 = not at all and 5 = totally consistent with plans
10. If you were free to make changes to CISM, what would be the suggestions you would have for improving this approach to enabling teachers to gain new knowledge and to apply the knowledge in their classrooms?
11. In what ways do you believe the CISM model is providing an improved approach to professional development of your schools' teachers when compared with more traditional approaches?
12. Is there anything else that you would like to tell me that would be helpful in assessing the effectiveness of the implementation of the CISM model?

Appendix E

Summary Table for Online Survey Quantitative Items

Survey Item	Principal	School Leadership*	Model/Lab Classroom Teacher	Other Classroom Teacher	Staff Developer	Other	All Groups
<i>Program Perception and Knowledge</i>							
Percent of respondents who selected "Agree" or "Strongly Agree"							
The goals of CISM are understood by:							
Teachers	86	73	73	70	56	66	72
School administrators	96	90	87	87	68	88	88
Staff developers	97	93	92	90	100	91	93
There is a sense of commitment to CISM among:							
Teachers	73	61	59	65	50	63	63
School administrators	87	86	82	84	68	91	84
Staff developers	96	95	93	87	100	94	92
A major role of the instructional leader is to assess the extent to which the instructional techniques demonstrated by CISM are being used in the classroom.	91	92	79	78	94	77	85

Survey Item	Principal	School Leadership*	Model/Lab Classroom Teacher	Other Classroom Teacher	Staff Developer	Other	All Groups
<i>Implementation</i>							
Percent of respondents who selected "Agree" or "Strongly Agree"							
The information presented at the CST meetings has supported CISM.	80	82	75	69	91	88	77
The members of the school-based CST have supported the implementation of CISM.	97	91	87	85	82	91	89
The staff developer has provided helpful, effective on-going assistance to teachers and school administrators.	83	84	84	76	97	82	82
There is collaboration and cooperation among the school administrators, teachers, and staff developers to support and to implement CISM.	90	85	67	73	77	76	78
Staff developers have adapted the components of CISM based on the needs to the individual.	87	86	81	67	94	73	79
As a result of CISM, appropriate strategies have been implemented in the model/lab classroom(s) in the following areas:							
Use of gathering area.	81	85	87	74	97	82	82

Survey Item	Principal	School Leadership*	Model/Lab Classroom Teacher	Other Classroom Teacher	Staff Developer	Other	All Groups
Read aloud (reading).	69	70	80	72	65	63	71
Small group discussion.	83	86	85	75	88	85	82
Use of student to student accountable talk.	86	90	95	81	91	79	87
Use of 'just right' books for independent reading.	68	73	76	73	62	67	71
Use of 'just right' books for guided reading.	72	72	76	69	56	67	70
Effective collaborative lesson planning.	71	81	70	59	71	71	70

As a result of CISM, appropriate strategies have been implemented in the other same grade level classroom(s) in the following areas:

Use of gathering area.	80	79	78	75	88	79	78
Read aloud (reading).	68	67	71	73	61	69	69
Small group discussion.	80	79	73	76	72	82	77
Use of student to student accountable talk.	75	79	80	76	82	75	77
Use of 'just right' books for independent reading.	64	65	71	72	53	66	67
Use of 'just right' books for guided reading.	64	64	60	69	44	62	64

Survey Item	Principal	School Leadership*	Model/Lab Classroom Teacher	Other Classroom Teacher	Staff Developer	Other	All Groups
Effective collaborative lesson planning.	64	67	57	58	56	57	61
The principal(s) have:							
Provided opportunities for participating teachers to plan collaboratively.	99	90	70	72	88	76	82
Selected model/lab classroom(s) that have the required classroom essential elements and successful classroom management system.	97	92	91	77	69	84	86
Established and maintained a master schedule that provides teachers the time to participate in and debrief model/demonstration lessons.	90	88	77	70	69	72	79
Included the Title I Facilitator and reading/math coaches on the Leadership team.	88	96	75	73	84	68	82
Released the Assistant Principal/Title I Facilitator/Coaches for district professional development.	92	95	66	64	81	64	78
Participated in the planning and debriefing of at least one model/demonstration lesson.	86	81	61	68	63	72	73
Attended Professional Learning	97	94	81	86	78	80	88

Survey Item	Principal	School Leadership*	Model/Lab Classroom Teacher	Other Classroom Teacher	Staff Developer	Other	All Groups
Community(PLC) Meetings. Met with the staff developer at the conclusion of the trainings.	93	88	60	52	78	68	72
The model/lab classroom teacher(s) were given:							
Time with the staff developer for a discussion before and after the model lesson demonstration.	94	93	85	72	75	68	83
Time to collaborate with grade-level peers on the model lesson.	94	91	80	63	81	60	79
Time to meet and discuss progress with school-based instructional leaders (Title I Facilitator, Reading/Math Coach, Learning Specialist).	85	86	65	53	69	52	70
The model/lab classroom teacher(s) have:							
Been open minded and willing learners.	94	93	98	79	84	88	88
Examined and reflected on teaching practices.	97	94	98	80	94	84	90
Implemented new teaching strategies in the classroom.	97	96	97	73	100	84	88
Shared key learnings, successes, and concerns with staff developer.	91	90	93	72	94	80	84

Survey Item	Principal	School Leadership*	Model/Lab Classroom Teacher	Other Classroom Teacher	Staff Developer	Other	All Groups
Shared key learnings, successes, and concerns with teammates through PLC discussions.	94	87	100	77	78	84	85
Co-taught with the staff developer, Reading/Math Coach, and/or Title I Facilitator as requested.	82	82	79	65	63	84	75
The staff developer(s) have:							
Assisted in coordinating all aspects of CISM in collaboration with the school leadership team at the school.	83	81	80	62	97	64	75
Prepared and delivered model/demonstration lessons that utilize research proven teaching practices.	96	90	93	80	97	80	88
Led discussions before and after the model/demonstration lessons.	93	93	93	77	94	80	87
Met with the principal after each school visit to share progress.	90	79	47	39	78	60	63
Supported Project Focus (as appropriate).	69	75	68	53	80	75	66
The title I facilitator(s) have:							
Assisted in coordinating all aspects of CISM in collaboration with the school leadership team at	93	90	67	71	83	94	82

Survey Item	Principal	School Leadership*	Model/Lab Classroom Teacher	Other Classroom Teacher	Staff Developer	Other	All Groups
the school. Participated in all CISM training and provided follow-up training at school.	98	91	67	64	67	75	78
Assisted the school administrator(s) in developing a climate of teacher collegial collaboration and continual improvement through PLC's and CST opportunities.	98	93	63	74	88	69	82
Met with grade-level teams for staff development, modeling effective instructional practices, coaching and supporting teachers, while the staff developer is out of the building.	93	80	56	69	50	75	73
Assisted classroom teachers with the use of assessment results in developing specific instructional strategies to meet the needs of all learners.	95	85	65	68	54	75	76
The reading/math coach(es) have:							
Assisted in coordinating all aspects of CISM in collaboration with the school leadership team at the school.	95	93	63	74	90	82	83
Participated in all CISM training and provided follow-up training at school.	100	93	68	73	68	65	82

Survey Item	Principal	School Leadership*	Model/Lab Classroom Teacher	Other Classroom Teacher	Staff Developer	Other	All Groups
Assisted the school administrator(s) in developing a climate of teacher collegial collaboration and continual improvement through PLC's and CST opportunities.	100	98	68	74	79	65	84
Met with grade-level teams for staff development, modeling effective instructional practices, coaching and supporting teachers, while the staff developer is out of the building.	100	96	71	75	68	77	84
Assisted classroom teachers with the use of assessment results in developing specific instructional strategies to meet the needs of all learners.	100	97	68	74	79	65	84
The assistant principal(s) have:							
Assisted in coordinating all aspects of CISM in collaboration with the school leadership team at school.	79	77	57	53	67	68	66
Participated in all CISM training and provided follow-up training at the school.	83	64	48	48	44	52	58
Assisted the school administrator(s) in developing a climate of teacher collegial	100	87	60	59	59	68	73

Survey Item	Principal	School Leadership*	Model/Lab Classroom Teacher	Other Classroom Teacher	Staff Developer	Other	All Groups
collaboration and continual improvement through PLC's and CST opportunities.							
Met with grade-level teams for staff development, modeling effective instructional practices, coaching and supporting teachers, while staff developer is out of the building.	88	70	50	48	30	52	59
Assisted classroom teachers with the use of assessment results in developing specific instructional strategies to meet the needs of all learners.	92	70	48	50	44	62	62

Percent of respondents who selected “Always”

With what frequency do the following occur when the staff developer visits your school:

Presentation of an overview of the initial model/demonstration lesson with the theory and rationale for the lesson.	38	41	43	31	50	43	38
Delivery of the model/demonstration lesson with all same grade-level teachers observing and taking notes.	34	42	39	37	41	32	38

Survey Item	Principal	School Leadership*	Model/Lab Classroom Teacher	Other Classroom Teacher	Staff Developer	Other	All Groups
A debriefing of the model/demonstration lesson.	49	56	53	41	59	46	49
Collaborative grade-level planning for the next lesson.	32	36	21	20	12	25	26
Discussion with teachers to review the observations, model/demonstration lessons, co-teaching, and collaborative planning completed by staff developers.	40	47	36	32	32	36	38
Collaboration with school administration, Title I facilitator, reading/ math coach to identify their responsibilities for observation and ongoing teacher support when the staff developer is not present.	44	48	18	21	38	37	34

Percent of respondents who marked each training option

CISM training was delivered:

On some early release days.	--	--	--	--	--	--	14
During PLC.	--	--	--	--	--	--	32
During Faculty meetings.	--	--	--	--	--	--	17
Through use of temporary duty elsewhere (TDE) days.	--	--	--	--	--	--	10
By flexible scheduling.	--	--	--	--	--	--	20

Survey Item	Principal	School Leadership*	Model/Lab Classroom Teacher	Other Classroom Teacher	Staff Developer	Other	All Groups
Other.	--	--	--	--	--	--	7

Perceived Effectiveness

Percent of respondents who selected "Agree" or "Strongly Agree"

CISM is supporting:

The development of school-based instructional leaders (Title 1 Facilitators, Learning Specialists, Reading/Math Coaches, Staff Developers).

77

82

85

75

85

82

80

The staff developers and teachers proficiency to effectively identify students' strengths and needs by using assessment data.

73

76

75

70

94

79

75

The development of a group of classroom teachers to serve as models/mentors in the delivery of effective instruction.

73

75

80

72

88

75

75

As a result of this year's work with CISM, Reading teachers are more confident planning and teaching rich reading lessons that incorporate the following:

Using structures/routines for the reading block (e.g. read aloud, accountable talk, guided read.

--

--

--

--

--

--

82

Survey Item	Principal	School Leadership*	Model/Lab Classroom Teacher	Other Classroom Teacher	Staff Developer	Other	All Groups
Using data/assessment to plan for differentiated instruction.	--	--	--	--	--	--	77
Helping students to establish procedures and habits for independent reading/conferring.	--	--	--	--	--	--	75
Matching students to 'just right' books.	--	--	--	--	--	--	80
Carrying out guided reading.	--	--	--	--	--	--	82

As a result of this year's work with CISM, Math teachers are more confident planning and teaching rich math lessons that incorporate the following:

Use of varied talk formats and grouping structures to increase student engagement.	--	--	--	--	--	--	89
Use of varied talk moves to build students' mathematical comprehension, reasoning, and communication.	--	--	--	--	--	--	87
Use of effective questioning strategies to extend mathematical ideas.	--	--	--	--	--	--	84
Analysis of student work (including classroom discussions) in order to make instructional decisions.	--	--	--	--	--	--	79
Opportunities for all students to	--	--	--	--	--	--	84

Survey Item	Principal	School Leadership*	Model/Lab Classroom Teacher	Other Classroom Teacher	Staff Developer	Other	All Groups
explore mathematical concepts and ideas within a community of learners.							
As a result of CISM:							
Teachers have adapted the research-based strategies and proven methods to meet the needs of their students.	80	80	76	77	81	85	79
Teachers at the targeted grade-level(s) meet regularly to discuss and build upon materials from the Curriculum Support Team (CST) and the staff developer.	81	83	67	69	63	77	74
Teachers are learning effective instructional methods and techniques to reach students.	93	93	81	77	97	92	86
Teachers have redefined roles and responsibilities based on the need for continuous improvement of the school.	64	78	72	72	77	68	73
School administrators have redefined roles and responsibilities based on the need for continuous improvement of the school.	76	85	79	70	67	81	76
School administrator(s) conduct systematic classroom observation to analyze the impact of staff	86	76	72	71	46	84	74

Survey Item	Principal	School Leadership*	Model/Lab Classroom Teacher	Other Classroom Teacher	Staff Developer	Other	All Groups
development on teaching practices.							
The effectiveness of CISM is evident from student performance, measured by informal assessments.	63	59	62	50	65	62	58

*The school leadership category consists of responses provided by assistant principals, title I facilitators, reading and math coaches, and learning specialists.

Appendix F

Summary Table of Online Survey Qualitative Data

Theme	Description	Specific comments
About this survey	Comments relating to survey and why it was difficult to fill out.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This was a difficult survey to complete. Many questions I wanted to answer as 'not sure' yet it wasn't an option. I either had to answer as agree or disagree. I also had a hard time since I had to think of the schools together as one. This would have been more accurate if I answered this survey for each school. • Each of my CISM schools have unique situations, personnel, strengths & needs. When answering survey questions, I tried to think, 'what is true for MOST of my schools.' Many of the survey items addressed planning time. • Survey questions with several schools, the answer might be true for some of the schools but not all, making it a difficult were sometimes difficult answer due to significant variation among my schools. • I found this survey to be vague in many areas. It was often difficult to know if the question referred to the teachers we work with or all of the teachers in the school. Many times questions included several areas and part of it would be true while part would not, within the same question. Working answer to provide. • This survey is a bit ridiculous it is too long to read with too small of a print type. • Several questions from this survey are not applicable • This survey was very difficult to complete. Item numbers: 14., 15., 17., 24. and 25. would have been easier if the choices were: Some All Few None or something like a continuum. Number 26. I could only meet with those interested and available. ONE. Items 23. and 32. I have ONE PRINCIPAL/AP that would be Strongly Agree on ALL points (no surprise - both at the same school where it is working with teachers as well!)...But, the other TWO do NOTHING...so, I marked disagree for a couple of areas and agree on a couple. • Perhaps a survey separate for each school? • TOO MANY QUESTION!!!! We don't have time in our teaching day to answer 30 plus questions!! • A few questions were difficult to answer at this time due to the fact we are just in the first year and both grade levels are not at the same place of implementation or learning. Also, this survey does not take into account when a teacher goes on leave and you have to start over with a new teacher half way into the year. I wish there were some comment boxes at places throughout the survey. • I did not understand most of the questions on this survey. • Some of the questions were hard to answer because I did not agree or disagree whole heartedly. • I think that you should split the Math and Reading Coaches into two different questions. We have a Math and a Reading Coach at our school and I cannot give each of them the same scores. Our Math coach is far more effective than our Reading Coach. • The two staff developers that are at the two different schools were complete opposites- in personality, job understanding, implementation, etc. I feel that this was hard to complete as an average of the two. • Questions about the Reading and Math coach should be separate.

		<p>Our reading coach is wonderful and our Math coach is TERRIBLE.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where and how is this data used and disseminated? Is this an evaluative tool for individuals, or is this survey to be used to provide data for the continuation of a multi million dollar program? • Based upon the positive feedback from these basic components in this survey, we are on the right track to effectively reach each student and make a difference through them for tomorrow!
For new teachers	This program would be better if it were aimed at new or novice teachers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The resource would be better used with new and/or ineffective teachers. It takes away more planning periods every 3 wks. from the Math lead teacher and team. <p>also feel like we need to be much more supportive and nurturing to brand new teachers.</p>
Little knowledge of CISM project	The respondent did not know about the program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • little knowledge of the CISM project • I do not feel that the CISM has been very well addressed by the district. There is much confusion about the roles of the people involved and who takes responsibility. I feel that many people are left out of the loop and there is no discussion with our staff developer about what will be modeled. • I hate to admit this but I'm not really sure what CISM is?!!
Negative response	Some negative response regarding program. These may overlap with another theme.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our school is and has been doing well with teaching reading and it is NOT a result of CISM. • I thought that this program was a waste of resources. • I have no idea what you are calling CISM is • The lab teacher has been very positive and supportive of this plan. Other teachers, however, have not liked it at all. Also, too much extra time is taken from the lab teacher's planning time. • Our Staff developer has brought nothing new for us to use. There has not been a lesson our teachers could not do just as well or BETTER with less materials and time. You should use this money you are paying these people and put that towards the budget cuts and send them back in the classroom where students can benefit from their strategies that we all already use. • Also, our need is not always in math and it would be more effective at times to have access to a reading staff developer. In addition, the math has a focus on one teacher in one grade level. I do not feel that this is effective enough for the whole school to benefit. The other teachers on the team do participate but I do not feel that it has been a truly effective model. • A final comment involves our unique situation at our school. Our fourth grade team is the team involved in our math model. One member is a 2nd year teacher, one member is teaching his first year in regular ed, one member is a sub for someone on maternity leave, and one member is a substitute for a teacher who has just resigned. This has had a great effect on how much is being implemented in their classrooms. Any negative responses are a reflection of the model, not the staff developer. • The area that I would like to see improved is the monthly

		<p>conferencing with the reading or math visiting teacher. At no time has our reading person ever taken into account our experience in or our actual classroom practices. Our team has been talked down to on several occasions. I would appreciate a more peer to peer situation as opposed to a superior approach.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • My grade level only had one modeled lesson with feedback. The whole plan was disruptive to our daily schedule (2nd/3rd grades combined while the teachers watch and then debrief) I felt I had to do a special lesson since I had two classes. I did not like the interruption in my reading block. Also, I felt the staff developer talked down to us as if we did not know anything. When I discussed things I had learned this summer at STEPS training I was told that the county no longer wants me to do reading groups that way. I was very confused on why the county would offer a three day training on something they no longer valued. I did not have a trust level with the staff developer. Overall, I felt the program was a waste of resources. • Our staff developer did not have experience. This program was most unsuccessful in our school. A huge waste of precious educational dollars. • CISM is disruptive to schools with a high need for structure because it breaks the schedule to work. It is truly a dog a pony show that should be left behind. Although the trainers are nice it breeds resentment into a day that is already too full of needless paperwork and meetings. • With the exception of the 'accountable talk' segment, I was already using the reading instruction techniques. I feel with a master's degree in Reading and 35 years experience teaching reading, the training was not only not necessary but a bit insulting! Perhaps helpful to beginning teachers.... • We have too many people at our school that are going to the county curriculum meetings when it only takes one or two to deliver the information back to the team & staff. If there is a budget cut, I think this model needs to be looked at. Especially pulling teachers out of the classroom to be part time reading coaches/curric. support. • The staff developer at our school is excellent but the training is geared only toward beginning teachers making it basically useless. We were already doing most of what is being taught. No consideration for what we already know and do was taken into account nor was it modified once we indicated this to the trainer. The trainers are a waste of money. These lessons could be handled on an as needed basis by the reading/math coaches. There is no need for special staff developers. Dump the program. • CISM is a great concept to drive the improvement of teaching and learning. However, I believe we should go back to a train the trainer model where school-based teachers are trained to deliver the training to the staff and serve as the model teachers and classrooms. It is difficult to have someone come to the school twice a month and have a great or even fair impact on student achievement. We also need to streamline the 'best practices' that we are exposed to and expected to go back and deliver to our teachers. We need to focus on a few things and do them well rather than be masters of none.
--	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The reading coach did do the testing as only herself and the Title 1 Facilitator were trained on giving the DAR test. My comment if you are going to continue all this training then come out and demonstrate in our classrooms effective strategies and lessons. Enough video tapes. • I think the idea was good, showing you were trying to individualize staff development to each school. The problem arises that you are dealing with people who don't want it. At our school, as the demonstration teacher I worked with our staff developer, who told me our Title I facilitator was supposed to be continuing the program when the developer wasn't there. I passed that to my principal and Title I person, who told me the Title I person's job was only to schedule things for the teachers and staff developer and arrange coverage. Period. I have learned from last year never to question the Title I person. The AP attended one planning session. The principal and Title I person attended one demonstration, without previously attending the planning. The math CST person saw one demonstration without the planning, and felt lost. She then attended the planning of the next but not the demonstration, saying she had art and she had seen it before. The rest of the CST did not participate at all. So here's what I got from the model. It is a task for the teachers to do while the staff developer is there. When she is not, we don't worry about it. • The model was not implemented consistently and was different across grade levels. General expectations were clear but I do not think it was implemented to the extent it should have been. • Though the Professional Developers are well-intended, it is another meeting or two for teachers who are already on overload. Ideas are good, though sometimes not practical for the time allowed for instruction. Many lessons that look good on paper are just not effective in the everyday learning environment. • However, it seems to put more responsibilities and requirements on the teachers participating. The teachers, especially the model teacher, is not given enough notice as to when they will be observing/observed. There is a lack of implementation planning post staff developer days. Instead of adding additional 'things to do' for teachers, more support should be given to assist with day-to-day tasks that cannot seem to be completed due to the additional meetings/discussions/observations. For example, teachers are not given sufficient time to prepare lesson plans for when they are out of their rooms to observe in the model teacher's classroom. Additionally, no support is given to help brainstorm how to include these modeled lessons into their lesson plans for the future. The ideas that are presented/modeled/observed during staff developer times are exciting opportunities, however, it is more of a stress than a help at this time. • There are areas where the questions did not apply and 'does not apply' was not an option. Our math staff developer was great and has made a significant difference. It was however, our understanding that in the two days a month the developer was here, they were to work with one grade level, not the entire staff. That is what has happened, and it was well done. • Our staff developer has proven to be ineffective. She spends her days at our school on the compute. The one model lesson she did for our
--	--	---

		<p>grade level was very basic and less than what we do daily. I feel this position is a huge waste of money.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In theory I'm sure the district believes that the Classroom Instructional Support Model will improve the less effective teacher; however, it has made the established teacher with a proven record of high performing results resentful and at times frustrated that we are being treated like a first year intern. Our staff developer has been in the classroom less time than the least senior person on our team. We have a total of over 75 years of experience on our team. We were under the impression that the staff developer was to come to our school and demonstrate teaching. It has turned out that our team has to decide what needs to be taught and in some instances it has been suggested that she observe us teach! This has not been a 'growth experience' but rather another example of the district implementing something to possibly save someone's job (TSA). At the classroom level we are working harder with less, yet the demands from the district level just keep coming.(This CISM created additional meetings and preparation for 'demonstration lessons'). We are an 'A' school and have been each year except for one when we were a 'B'. I think we know what works. I am not opposed to learning new things but please make sure that the person that is coming to deliver the information can do it without reading from a script or presenting a canned lesson. • I have seen little to no benefit to having the CISM at our school this year. I think that those personnel would be better used as classroom teachers. The CISM are not in our school enough make a true impact or create a 'relationship' with school personnel. • I have had to spend TOO much of my own money to make this rdg. project effective in my classroom. I am STILL waiting for data on research that is suppose to on-going. I have asked for this research data for 4 yrs. now and have NEVER received a valid explanation. I find it odd that I see the words in this survey' research based' over and over. Where is the research?? • I honestly can't say that this 'rdg. projects' works one way or the other because of the lack of data. • I do not feel that the Reading Coach has made enough of an impact to warrant the cost. If these people are our 'experts' I feel their talents would best be used in the classroom working with children- full time. It could be that the impact was limited due to the limited time they had at each building. But I feel the entire program was just 'lip service'. • Our Reading Staff Developer has been of no help to me. She conducted one demonstration lesson for my team and when we asked her for a different approach that we felt would better meet our needs, she refused to accommodate us. I have not seen her in my room since. She has never come in to observe, co-teach or even see how things in my classroom are run. She even asked me to choose the book for her demonstration lesson!!!! I feel that her presence in my school is an enormous waste of time, money and energy. • What a huge waste of money. Get these people back in the classroom teaching, where they belong!!
--	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Much better having trainers IN THE CLASSROOMS! The old 'trickle down training' hasn't worked. The varied schedules of all the different trainers has been difficult to keep up with, how about 6 solid weeks with the math trainer, later on, 6 weeks solid weeks with reading, etc?
Personnel	There is a personnel problem with the organization of this program.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We are not a title one school, do not have reading/math coaches, etc. We have someone who comes weekly or biweekly to model lessons and help the 'model classrooms' add to their repertoire of best practices in reading, which are then shared with teammates. • We have 2 lab teachers at our school. One has been very effective and cooperative, while the other has been significantly less so. It was hard to answer some of the questions since one teacher was so effective while the other was not. • WE have a reading coach thru Reading First. Our reading coach works with K-3 and our trainer works with 4 and 5th. The coach supports every thing but not as involved as those questions ask, but there is no place to say does not apply. • I really enjoy having our staff developer... She is invigorating, encouraging and a great resource. When she leaves our meetings, I really feel refreshed and motivated to try new things. • While our staff developer is a very friendly person, I feel this has been a waste of her time-she would do a wonderful job as a classroom teacher. This may be a good place to trim the budget. • I feel that our staff developer is very effective. However, I do not feel that the current model is effective in regard to time she has at our school. • Again, this is no reflection at all on our staff developer. She is the best staff developer we could ask for but I feel that the model that is in place for math is not allowing her to spread her knowledge outside of one teacher. She goes above and beyond and works with our whole staff whenever she can but time constraints are an issue. • However, I feel the staff developer should be at the school sites more frequently than 2 days month. • My hope is that next year all schools will keep their same staff developer since, classroom teachers have developed a rapport and I believe that we can build on that for even greater things next year! • 63: Our Prof. Staff Developer has been VERY efficient and effective in modeling lessons and strategies in conjunction with the model teacher. She has kept the Principal/Leadership informed of the progress made. She meets with the Leadership Team regarding lesson planning, lesson modeling after researching the strengths and weaknesses of our students. Having her two days a month is just not efficient enough. It only allows her time to model and work with only one grade level at a time. She is very knowledgeable and has shared wonderful ideas and modeled great lessons! • Our staff developer did not have experience. This program was most unsuccessful in our school. A huge waste of precious educational dollars. • 80: Our Staff Developer could not have been more helpful.

		<p>Whatever we asked her to do, she did with enthusiasm and professionalism. She has certainly gone beyond the call of duty. I just can't say enough to sing her praises.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many of these questions had to be answered as 'all or nothing'. Not every teacher has embraced the idea of the staff developer. Hopefully next year they will open their doors a little wider. Also, the model teacher really needs to be part of the CST to help promote learning in the school. • The questions pertaining to the coach were difficult because the school has a reading coach and a math staff developer. The reading coach was in no way expected to support mathematics, although they did sit in on several exit meetings with the math staff developer and leadership. • Especially pulling teachers out of the classroom to be part time reading coaches/curric. support. Put them back in the classroom and save the money. AP's should be able to deliver the curriculum the way it has been in the past. The support person that comes has good ideas to share, most of which were shared with the 4 other staff members that attended the meeting. She does model. But with a tight budget, there has to be more 'bang for the buck.' The model teacher then has to make a schedule with her team for this person. This adds duties to their existing load. • I have found our Math Coach to be far more effective than the Staff Developer. I work with the Math Coach daily. I see the Staff Developer once every 3 weeks. I get the feeling he is just there to 'check up' on us. He doesn't know any more than I do about how to reach my struggling students. I really don't understand why we need a Staff Developer when we have such an effective math coach. Send the Math Staff Developers back into schools to be effective math coaches - this is still a need at some schools. • The staff developer at our school is excellent but the training is geared only toward beginning teachers making it basically useless. • Our staff developer has been one of the best and most supportive resources available to our team this year. She has been the ONLY person who has really tried to help us (in a professional, collaborative, friendly way) with instruction. • We have been thrilled with the efforts of our staff developer this year and want to continue with our same staff developer next year!! • Our Reading Coach has been the main contact for help and guiding the teachers. The District CST meetings are very long and sometimes repetitive with regard to content. The District CST meetings pull to many people out of the building. • I feel that she should have went to each class to do lessons. I feel that the Instructor was very critical to the lab teacher and some of her comments in regards to her classroom and set up should not have been said. • However, given the time she had to spend in our school our staff developer gave her best. She attended the CST meetings with us. She attended the Reading Leadership Team meetings here at our school to help deploy the CST training and other curriculum initiatives we have going on. She was very instrumental in the development of Reading initiatives here. Also she helped our lead math teacher plan fishbowl observations in Math.
--	--	---

		<p>She helped us secure other curriculum support from the district and generally gave great counsel to our teachers. If we expect to gain deep deployment of the innovative curriculum in all schools, this CISM model should be done the way our Staff developer did it, only more often.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coverage for 'Fishbowl' lessons and demonstrations have been a challenge. Those persons involved in the delivery of the CISM model have too many responsibilities and these should be lessened to accommodate full employment. • I am hoping that if we are a reading CISM school next year, that we will have a different staff developer. Ours was wonderful, however it would be nice to get someone's view and expertise. • Our staff developer was excellent! She did a fabulous job and was extremely professional. • The reading coach at our school has been very busy with paper work, testing and ordering to assist by modeling effective lessons in the classroom or working with teachers to explain testing (ex: DAR and how to interpret the results). • The Reading Coach was not expected to provide follow-up for the Math Staff Developer. Progress with the lab classroom teachers was tremendous, but I was not able to express that level of success in all of my responses. The level of administrative support was relatively low, and that greatly hindered buy-in and deployment of the model beyond the two lab classrooms. • We are a CFL SAI school and many of the instructional strategies learned at CST we implemented before attending those meetings. Many of the strategies were • Schools need to CHOOSE to have Staff Developers. I think Staff Developers could be much more effective in schools where the additional support is requested. • Having a math staff developer was a waste of district money--not the person but the help they provided for our staff and students. Our reading staff developer was rarely there. She was almost invisible. These TSAs could have helped impact struggling students as we thought they were coming to do, but instead 'trained' teachers who were already teaching using the models taught. They did not go into classrooms to gauge any previous knowledge to adjust the training to fit the strengths or weakness of the individual staff members. This means the time spent being trained on Math Talk was not valuable. These TSAs need to get back into the classroom. Also as an ESE teacher, I was never observed teaching so how can anyone give me feedback if no one ever enters my room to observe me implementing the model, which by the way I have been utilizing for 3 years already. It was an insult that my students were not good enough to need this 'expert's' help. • We have wonderful CFL_SAI Coaches and we also have a wonderful Math Coach. Our Reading Coach has not been effective. • I believe that the staff developers need to be very clear on what their role is in the school and as your survey questions indicate, be delivering model lessons and conducting follow up discussions. Wanting to observe and see the model classroom teacher (Teach) first puts an
--	--	---

		<p>evaluative spin on what is hoped to be a collegial/coaching relationship.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have benefited from the demonstration lessons and from being able to talk with someone who knows the current research in Reading. She was always willing to listen and coach! • Our PLC time is pre-assigned with discussion topics from which we are not to deviate. We are not afforded a time to meet as a grade level team and do not have a time to meet to discuss assessment data, teaching strategies, etc. • The staff developer must build an environment of trust with the teams he/she is working with. Without this level of trust, teachers will only be resistant to anything the developer does. The modeling should be relevant to the needs of the team. There must be positive interactions between the developer and the team he/she works with. As soon as the developer handles things in a negative way, all is lost and the team will not cooperate. If the team feels that the staff developer is not competent, it will be a wasted year with no progress being made. There needs to be frequent communication between the team served and the staff developer. This also holds true for the developer and the leadership team - if the developer isn't able to be at the school at the leadership team meeting time, then the information which is passed on to him/her takes on less meaning. The roles of each person at the school should be clearly delineated next year. Exactly what is each person responsible for doing? This would allow the leadership team to sit down and do a much better job planning, thus alleviating some of the stress of the job. • Due to the 'take charge' nature of our reading coach I do not feel I was used to the best of my ability. There wasn't any follow up strategy for the implementation of the lesson focus' for the intermediate grades. • Our staff developer has proven to be ineffective. She spends her days at our school on the compute. The one model lesson she did for our grade level was very basic and less than what we do daily. I feel this position is a huge waste of money. • Our staff developer is wonderful. She is very helpful. I think that a way to improve would be to allow the SDs to be at a school for 2 weeks at a time. The 3 days doesn't seem to be enough time to really grasp what is going on in the school. • The staff developers have been wonderful this year. However, having no input on the days when they are assigned to our school has made it difficult for scheduling. Also, teachers who feel they are already the best teachers they can be have been roadblocks to what could have been even greater success on the part of the staff developers. • I value the CISM; it has afforded me direct, immediately relevant support in my instruction. • I would gladly join a team of administrators to help tweak this process. I am a firm believer of getting the right person in to do these jobs. Our Staff Professional developer is phenomenal. She has earned the respect of our staff which makes her very valuable. The reading coach and title I facilitator might be organized but are completely ineffective at delivering training to teachers. • Our staff developer has done model teaching once in our building.
--	--	---

		<p>Her teaching was outstanding, we could use a lot more though.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The staff developers working were tireless and skilled. They encountered more resistance than I anticipated from some teachers. With this knowledge, my approach will be different next year in order to enhance the benefit of the model. • The writing trainer had a clear path and direction. In the area of math, we were fuzzy. One challenge is that the staff developers were both targeting 4th grade, this was too much for the one grade level. • Our Principal is involved with CISM and watched XX model a lesson but wasn't there to see her talk to us ahead of time or debrief the lesson. Since our Principal is heavily involved with CST our AP doesn't attend those meetings, but stays involved by attending PLCs to hear debriefing of data and even made up our PLC form that we fill out each week and promptly return to her before the day is over. We also have a wonderful Title 1 Facilitator and Reading Coach who have attended a few of our PLC meetings to debrief data, complete 'By the Numbers' and help us by getting us instructional materials as well as suggestions to any lessons we have questions about. They're great. • My staff developer said she was only required to teach 1 lesson a semester. That is not the information I received. There needs to be clear and effective communication with Principals, APs, Coaches, and Title 1 Facilitators as to exactly how the staff developer should be functioning at their school and the role of each of the previously mentioned. • I am extremely pleased with the staff developers!!! They are wonderful and provide much needed training on site. They are nonthreatening, aware of the subject matter needed to implement best practices, and VERY helpful! Hope nothing changes for next year!! Have a great day! • I really don't think we have a reading and math coach. I think our AP does all that. I checked the box wrong, sorry. • staff developer was very kind and gracious but I don't think it was necessary. • I'm sure this model has been useful at other schools, but we are an 'A' school and we don't need someone belittling us and talking down to us about what we are doing in the classroom. Our trainer has been a complete failure because of her lack of enthusiasm and unwillingness to treat us as peers. • My colleagues were reprimanded by the staff developer in front of my students because we didn't 'replicate' what she had modeled. During the debriefing, we shared our concerns and reasons why we didn't do exactly what the staff developer had done. When we asked for ideas to help the struggling writers the staff developer could not share any new ideas with my team. • It was disappointing to hear XX defend the staff developer when we addressed the issues of her reprimanding us. She basically called us the liars and said she had never heard this staff developer say those kinds of things. I was ready at that point to walk out of the meeting but instead I stayed. The staff developer mentioned that XX hired me and she wouldn't have hired me if she thought I couldn't have done the job.' I have been
--	--	--

		<p>teaching for 11 years at X, XX informed us. I wanted to call XX at that moment in time to chuckle and make her aware of the unprofessional situation we were in. I didn't do that because I respect the fact that my principal had been following proper steps in order to improve this situation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The staff developer has been wonderful!
<p>Positive response</p>	<p>A positive response about the program. These may overlap with another theme.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I highly recommend the continuation of the staff developer program. • I think the reading coach model it a great idea, if they actually came into the classroom • The lab teacher has been very positive and supportive of this plan. • I feel the CISM model has been effective in providing useful techniques/strategies for promoting highest student acheivement. However, I feel the staff developer should be at the school sites more frequently than 2 days month. This collaboration with teachers/coaches has enhanced teacher learning as well as providing an excellent model for support in instruction. • My hope is that next year all schools will keep their same staff developer since, classroom teachers have developed a rapport and I believe that we can build on that for even greater things next year! • Our Prof. Staff Developer has been VERY efficient and effective in modeling lessons and strategies in conjunction with the model teacher. She has kept the Principal/Leadership informed of the progress made. She meets with the Leadership Team regarding lesson planning, lesson modeling after researching the strengths and weaknesses of our students. Having her two days a month is just not efficient enough. It only allows her time to model and work with only one grade level at a time. She is very knowledgeable and has shared wonderful ideas and modeled great lessons! • The CISM initiative has been one of the best the county has implemented in years!! We have seen great progress with our 4th and 5th grade math scores!! • CISM is a powerful model for teacher development and I look forward to continuing to implement the model at my school. • I have found that although the CST team has grown to include both administrators and the Reading First Coach (a total of 5 members), only the Reading & Math lead teachers have been responsible for presenting all the training info. to staff members. I believe these training responsibilities should be more equally shared. After all, shouldn't Administrators, as the Instructional Leaders, share the responsibility for modeling & implementing these research based strategies? It seems you can better evaluate implementation, if you yourself have demonstrated the use of these strategies! In other words, walk the walk, not just talk the talk! • I feel that even though progress with the staff has not been what I would have wished, I made marked progress in the development and knowledge of the principal and assistant principal as instructional leaders. • I have loved the CISM model as a Reading Coach. It's major benefit for me has been to be received in the classrooms to do side-by-side, and therefore hold the teachers accountable for their lessons! I hope

		<p>this model continues and is used in first and second grade next year which I feel are the critical years for children to be learning these strategies they will use in reading.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff development and the instructional strategies were very interesting and motivating. • I feel that the CISM model has been very helpful for the teachers who WANT to become better teachers. • I have only been at the school for 2 months and feel that the roles being evaluated here are vital to student achievement. Given more time at the school I will be able to be a stronger part of implementing and facilitating the CISM model. • On the upside, I got valuable training. I especially like the math games I was given to help my students understanding of concepts. They love them and play them all the time while I have math groups. My team has learned some things but does not feel as positively about it as I do. Most of the other grade level who came to observe felt it(talk moves) was one step above stupid but did get some value out of seeing me work with my students whole group where they had math partners. So perhaps some inroads have been made. I have been candid and hope my comments do not get directly back to my CST with the repercussions that would follow. • The supportive structure of the CST meetings combined with time to meet in PLC's to analyze ways to effectively meet the needs of all my students has promoted collaborative differentiation! • The training provided has been easily adapted to individual classrooms (ESE) and is easily utilized. • I value the CISM; it has afforded me direct, immediately relevant support in my instruction. • 224: I would gladly join a team of administrators to help tweak this process. I am a firm believer of getting the right person in to do these jobs. Our Staff Professional developer is phenomenal. She has earned the respect of our staff which makes her very valuable. The reading coach and title I facilitator might be organized but are completely ineffective at delivering training to teachers. • We have had great experiences with writing and math curriculum support personnel this year. The most powerful has been the growth of our fourth grade writing program with the assistance of county support. We are currently in the middle of FCAT writing testing and hope that the results are shown through data. Thank you for the help. • I have grown tremendously as a math teacher through the implementation of this model. It has been very much worthwhile. Please continue. The downside as always, is finding teachers willing to be flexible and try new teaching strategies. • The program would be more successful if it was with a beginning or struggling teacher. It would also be beneficial to branch out to the other teachers in the school (not just lab classes). The 2 teachers chosen were strong teachers before CISM. Now, we are even better! • I have enjoyed seeing known practices put to use, and be able to watch it in progress. This works for me being a visual learner! :) I hope we will continue to receive this type of training next year. I didn't know
--	--	--

		<p>that we were going to be receiving this training until I met our CISM facilitator the week before. I would have liked some more advanced notice.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CISM model is awesome, however the flexibility is needed for other grade levels especially first grade. A writing CISM model would also be very wonderful for our fourth grade teachers. • CISM is a step in the right direction - trainers need to be in classrooms with teachers instead of having district meetings where information is expected to 'trickle down' to teachers.
Program pushed on school	This program was not offered it was pushed on the school.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I feel that this program was pushed on administration, staff developers and teachers • I also believe that there would have been a greater teacher buy-in if schools could have chosen which CISM model (i.e., math or reading) they received. Forced training doesn't always result in learning. • It would have been beneficial if schools could have chosen this staff development model rather than being told they would receive it. • I would feel more effective if I could plan with my team itself instead of having all this BS to worry about and more bureaucracy thrown (ineffectively) in our faces. <p>More training needed to be done with the staff developer and the lab teachers prior to working in their classroom. It was not clearly presented to the administration or the teachers as to the goals of CISM and it made the first months extremely difficult as to their willingness to change what they see as being effective enough to achieve good school grades.</p>
Schools	Working in multiple schools has caused difficulties for the program.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I had difficulty answering some of the questions due to the fact that I am a Staff Developer for THREE schools. Each of my schools is unique and my answers reflect my OVERALL opinion of the three schools not necessarily the opinion for each individual school. • fact that we are a CFL-SAI school, and not necessarily because of the CISM training received this year. However, I felt it was important to reflect that these strategies are effective and implemented regularly. • It was a little hard to give overall observations of my schools. I have 4 different schools and all are very different. 2 are title 1 2 are not! Only 1 has an AP! Some teachers do so much and some do not... therefore I am choosing answers that are an average of the 4 schools. It may be that the survey needs to be individualized by type of school! • I also had a hard time since I had to think of the schools together as one. This would have been more accurate if I answered this survey for each school. • Each of my CISM schools have unique situations, personnel, strengths & needs. When answering survey questions, I tried to think, 'what is true for MOST of my schools.' Many of the survey items addressed planning time. • This was a difficult survey to answer when I was considering more than one school site. I went with the majority on many items. In some cases I could have answered agree for one school but not for all. • Survey questions were sometimes difficult answer due to significant variation among my schools. Lab classroom teachers were eager to learn

		<p>and grow. They were wonderful to work with.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was often difficult to know if the question referred to the teachers we work with or all of the teachers in the school. Many times questions included several areas and part of it would be true while part would not, within the same question. Working with several schools, the answer might be true for some of the schools but not all, making it a difficult answer to provide. • This was difficult because I have 3 different schools with three different situations. In two of my three schools leadership was not supportive in one school leadership was extremely supportive. Also, in one school the AP worked with the team and me, in another school a Title One person was the support and at another school the learning specialist was the support. Of course each situation was different with different kinds of support. I tried to look across my schools and state the commonalities. • In the case of the principals, I had two different extremes and because 2 out of the 3 were not supportive, that's what the survey reflects. • It was hard to answer all of the questions because of the fact that I have two schools and different things happen in those two schools. • Perhaps a survey separate for each school? • I work with 5 schools. One of them does not have a title one facilitator or a coach. Also, I work with all K-2 teachers at my 5 schools, as well as the coaches, assistant principals, and principals.
Specific people	Specific names of staff developers or other personnel.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • XX has been a wonderful support to our school. • Our staff developer has made a significant contribution to the professional development of the teachers and staff. Please let us have her again next year for more days. • The math staff developer (XX) assigned to my school demonstrates a superior knowledge of her subject area and how to best deliver instruction to elementary students. • Our Instructional Support person is XX. She is incredible. We have had a difficult time getting teachers other than the demonstration teachers to get on board with this form of staff development. They do not all see the value in spending the time with the Instructional support person. • I feel that our Staff Developer, XX, is working very well with our teachers. She has a great deal of patience and is gradually bring our teachers up to speed. • Take us to the next step--give us some credit and let XX lead us beyond---while other schools catch up.... • XX is an excellent trainer and has a great attitude. She is not at XX often but we sure do get a great bang for the buck! Teachers love her and she has accomplished much in the short time we have her. We do not have extra help at XX and appreciate any help she can give us. I want her back next year....PLEASE • XX was a great resource for our school. • XX is an outstanding staff developer. She is competent, professional, articulate and very knowledgeable. We have greatly benefited from her presence. Thank you! • XX needs to be back in the classroom. We learn more from her as a

		<p>nonexample. This sentiment is nearly unanimous at our school.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our school has been fortunate to have XX as our staff developer. She has been so helpful to all grade levels and is such a pleasure to work with. X is always full of new ideas and strategies to help promote high student achievement. I hope that X will continue to work with XX in the future. I think this model is very beneficial to our students. They have really come to know XX. They call her by name and treat her as another teacher. I look forward to continuing the working relationship we have with XX. • XX really is a wonderful person and an excellent resource, yet we only see her a couple times a month. We have only observed one lesson so far; another is in the works. But she seems to spread out. I think it might be beneficial if she worked with less schools. • I very much appreciate XX coming to our school and demonstrating reading instruction practices. She has helped me individually to level my library, test my students sight word ability, and to suggest practices that have proven very effective with my students. This is my first year in a VE classroom, and XX has been a very much appreciated asset! • XX has provided excellent training and support to our school. Her knowledge and professionalism have had a large impact on our teachers and staff. • Staff developer XX is exemplary. She works very well with the entire staff and has a vast knowledge and understanding of all material/strategies she presents at our school. She is a great teacher and a great lady. We love having her and hope she is with us next year. • We appreciate XX very much. She has contributed greatly to our professional development at XX. • I have enjoyed having my class be the model classroom. It has given me a new look on my teaching practices and I especially like working with XX. She is very personable and has a lot of great ideas to implement. • XX has been informative and professional. I have enjoyed her presence here at our school. • I would like for the school to decide what grade level is best suited for this model. • We have just scratched the surface of the project. We need another year to get it really going. We had some surgery issues and pregnancy this year on the original team which affected 2/3 of the team so we had to start over more or less after Christmas break. XX was WONDERFUL! • Our staff developers are XX and XX and are both vital assets to Pinellas County! They are absolutely wonderful and I know my team has enjoyed learning from them both by watching them model lessons, talk & ask for suggestions, and help us with planning. We couldn't have asked for a better pair! • I have grown a lot as a teacher. I had a lot of base line knowledge before XX came in. Therefore some of the answers reflect my knowledge before, and what the school was doing before CISM. • XX has been a delight to work with. We have enjoyed CISM. The accountable talk was delivered in a beautiful fashion, and our students,
--	--	--

		<p>staff embraced this topic.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • XX was our Reading Coach and I can't say enough about her! I learned more from her than any workshop or class I have attended in the county. She helped arrange a TDE for me to observe 4 teachers during reading or writing workshops. She helped me set up a class library, demonstrated 'Accountable Talk' read aloud, how to select 'Just Right' books for my students, demonstrated a guided reading lesson with leveled books, and is scheduled to do a non-fiction small group guided reading lesson soon. She was also helpful with selecting appropriate materials for our team to share. I would love to work with her again next year. I feel that we have just gotten started!
Strategies do not fit school	Generally, the respondents felt that the program did not bring the success. The school or teachers were already doing what they were being taught by the program.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have little knowledge of the CISM project and often cannot give training to teachers because I have not received the training. • We felt that we were unable to look at our needs in reading because there were preset strategies that we focused on each month. Most teachers were already doing most of the strategies that we were asked to focus on and therefore some days this seemed like a waste of our valuable time as teachers. • In regard to math at our CST meetings, I do not feel as if I have received any valuable information that I would be able to implement back at school. I do not feel as if I have gained the knowledge to come back and model in classrooms based on what we have received. This is not a reflection on the presenters, but the content. • Our classroom teachers were using many strategies that were listed such as gathering areas, read aloud, small group instruction. Those did not happen as a result of CISM. Most of the strategies were in place prior to this program. • The staff developer has good intentions, however, it is unnecessary at our school, as we already implement the various strategies. • My responses that disagree have to do with the wording that CISM is the factor causing things to happen. Most of these things were being done before CISM. • Many questions that were asked were worded 'As a result of CISM' Many teachers are using research based teaching techniques and to give sole credit to the CISM model is not my intent. The CISM model has had an impact on our school. Many classes however, continue to grow due to simple classroom management adjustments including processes to further their students learning. • In theory the model appears to work; however, deployment has been a real issue at our school. Let the CST developer work with the building leadership team to determine best use of the CISM model and the staff developer. • The CST meetings have affirmed the research, design and implementation of what the CFL schools have been working on for the last 4 years. The actual meetings have not met the needs of this school for reading. These five schools could and should have spent the time during reading presentations in different training. A differentiated instruction model would have been helpful. • The strategies the demonstration teacher was to model were already

		<p>being implemented.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This was beneficial in some ways. Most of these strategies I am already using. • I think a better option would be to have the district 'experts' spend their time with the teacher's that need more hand holding and demonstrations, side by side teaching. To have the Title I Facilitator/Reading Coach/Math Coach/ etc move those teacher's forward is a very difficult task. The 'expert' should be the one to help those along with the support of the Leadership team and those mentioned above. • Most of our processes were in place and our staff developer is taking us to a higher level-which has been good. • Once again we ask to have the school level of expertise evaluated and training be based on that. We learned and do much of what we are 'learning' this year a long time ago • Many of the strategies were NOT the RESULT of CISM, but strategies the model teachers (and other teachers) were ALREADY using. There seems to be no :KWL: model here, as in 'what do you already know?' Much of the training was redundant, considering what we were already doing. The AP & reading coach were often not on the 'same page' as the trainer & this resulted in arguments & directives instead of discussion. ESE teachers were not always included or else their schedules were not taken into consideration. Also the trainers were not very experienced & while they could present what we could also read in our books or have already read, they had difficulty answering more complicated questions. • Our school was already effectively utilizing read aloud, gathering centers, conferencing, just right/easy/challenging text identification training, etc. CISM at our school has focused on guided reading. This has been helpful, but also more experienced teachers felt it was quite redundant. They had experienced training of this nature for years. • In my opinion, our CISM staffer did not take into account that our school and teachers were already an 'A' place to be. She did not show us anything new that we were not already doing. Even though we asked for several things and asked for specific demos she did not come through for us. We were ready to embrace new ideas- let down! • I like the turn and talk strategy, however I do not think the gathering area is the only place for it's use. I have taken years of Kagan strategies and these can and should be used at the tables as well as the gathering area. • I do not attribute the use of the gathering area, small group instruction or collaborative planning to CISM. These were practices already firmly established. • Effective strategies were already in place in our classrooms. CISM has helped to refine and improve those strategies. • I feel these staff support people should all be at struggling schools--not that we don't have things to learn, I just think they would be better used at those schools. • Our school had already implemented a lot of the strategies. • The CISM benefits those who are closest to it.
--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many strategies discussed in CISM were already in place at our school. I disliked leaving my classroom for the 'fish-bowl'. • Many of the items were being acted upon and successfully accomplished prior to the introduction of the staff developer. Our curriculum team instituted those same items for the past two to three years and changes in curriculum and materials developed accordingly. Our strategy in using the staff developer was a little towards our individual needs. • Staff developers need to focus on the unique needs of each school. • Teachers at this school have already implemented the strategies demonstrated by the CIS teacher and therefore I feel her job is totally unnecessary and a waste of money. If a teacher is struggling and test results are low, then send in the CIS teacher to help that specific teacher. Many teachers do not need this instruction! • I believe it would be much more beneficial if the staff developer assigned to our school would be permitted to help teachers in ways that WE think best for our students. We are the professionals that work with students every single day, but no one seems to listen to what we have to say! Many times we've asked for help in certain areas and were told that our staff developer couldn't assist us with those things. We had training and observation sessions in areas that we are already pros at! The teachers who work with children everyday should have much more input regarding the duties of our staff developer. Thank you! • As a requirement of the reading first grant and the guidance of our reading coach we already had these items in place. Thus the items were not 'a result of CISM' although they have been discussed and improved upon. • Even though we learned several new strategies we don't always have time to implement them. • I feel that a majority of what our staff development person has taught us regarding reading has already been in practice in our school prior to her involvement. • Our school has been an 'A' school for years and has had several of their own 'Best Practices' study groups voluntarily after school. Many of our teachers felt that the Staff Developer was not a necessary element in our instruction (as we have been doing Turn and Talk, Just Right Books, and Gathering Area activities for quite a while), and that her time on campus was not particularly useful. Therefore, many teachers would not 'credit' her with teaching them these techniques. Perhaps she should have been 'assigned' to those teachers who did not use those methods instead of trying to 'remediate' the already efficient. (That I feel should have been an administrative decision, not one decided by the Lead Teacher.) I feel that the amount of money spent on TDE-Training-Staff Developer salaries might be more efficiently spent. • Our school would have made the same progress without the model. The information would have been taken back and deliver by the CST Team. Teachers would have grown the same or more. They resented the way the model was set up and resisted it.
time	There was a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 days every 3 weeks is not effective. Pick the neediest schools and

	<p>time related problem with this program – too little time, too much time demanded, etc.</p>	<p>assign the staff developers to 1 school each.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our team does not meet often enough in PLC's to plan or discuss strategies as there seems to be too many other meetings, conferences, staffings etc. • However, I do not feel that the current model is effective in regard to time she has at our school. We only have our staff developer twice a month. This makes it very difficult to have consistency. • One shortfall of CISM is that there was no time built in for teachers, leaders and staff developer to plan together. Reading Coaches and Title 1 Facilitators worked hard to find co-planning time. I believe that more progress would have occurred if there had been time to plan together. • My major concern is with the 2 day a month model. I think this is ineffective. The staff developer is not in the school enough to make a difference. I would prefer that schools with greater needs have more time. It would be more effective. The training is spread too thin to make a difference. • CISM is also takes away from valuable planning time within the team's themselves and focus's on Project focus only in my school. I would feel more effective if I could plan with my team itself instead of having all this BS to worry about and more bureaucracy thrown (ineffectively) in our faces. • The time involved for an across the county, cookie cutter approach to staff development was extensive for the product. • The constraints on their time as the sole administrators made it VERY difficult to follow through with all aspects of the CISM project, especially interim support. With only two days in the school per month, it was extremely difficult to maintain a forward momentum of professional growth for the teachers, when the follow through was minimal once I left. There was change in this high-performing school climate regarding the acceptance of this support, but the work has just begun. I believe it would take more consistent and concentrated support to effect sustained change in our focus area of small group guided reading. We also had work to do in the areas of gathering areas, classroom libraries and accountable talk that made it difficult to give small group guided reading the attention it needed and receive more than lip service from the teachers. There was not time provided up front to build the knowledge and relationships which would have made this work more productive and less of an 'intrusion' on these teachers who perceive themselves to be very high performing. • Our Reading First Coach has done an outstanding job and we didn't need to have another demonstration outside our own classes, we needed the time to plan for teaching. • We would benefit by having our CISM person more than only twice per month. Area 1 (D) schools lack the kind of curriculum support on an ongoing basis that other areas have. • The teachers have generously given up precious planning time to add this to their schedule and so far don't think that the extra time has actually been as beneficial as should be. • This is not to say that she has not met with some teachers, but in having had 6 students that needed DAR testing and requested assistance in
--	---	--

		<p>reading the results and applying them to classroom instruction, she has not had time.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have only been at the school for 2 months and feel that the roles being evaluated here are vital to student achievement. Given more time at the school I will be able to be a stronger part of implementing and facilitating the CISM model. • The CST meetings are a repeat of the information shared by the Staff Developers, not really necessary to hear it repeated. If it does need to be reviewed, be more precise and condense it. It would be nice to meet as a school for 1/2 of the day or even an hour to plan as a CST team. Unfortunately, much time is spent with repeating information. • The CST training needs to be differentiated training. I feel right now, it is a waste of my team's time. It serves no purpose. All of the reading and writing ideas we implemented 2 years ago through CFL-SAI. I think it is very improbable to expect a classroom teacher in charge of math or reading to be knowledgeable in that subject area K-5. Math uses material from a person who was forced to resign from the New York system because of the manner in which she taught. The video tapes are horrible. It is not best practice nor does it include accountable talk. As you can see, I feel that this was not the best use of our time. • Therefore the teachers on our team often feel that they are spending time going over what they already know i.e. how to figure out what book/reading level to use for what student, how to use test results data to determine reading level, how to set up and use the gathering areas, etc. Although we feel the trainer is doing a fine job - we feel our time is needed teaching - especially with the FCAT approaching! • The most difficult and challenging aspect of the CISM model has been the coordination and scheduling of the fishbowl lessons, including the pre-conferencing and debriefing. Teachers have very limited time as it is for planning and this has added an additional responsibility. There have been complaints from the staff about the Title I personnel who have to cover for these lessons and then not be able to work with students during these times. • The demonstrations have been very helpful and our demonstrator is excellent, however, the time of demonstrations (with the PE teachers watching my class) cause me to think more about what I should be doing with my students. No follow-up at the school level is being done to encourage deeper understanding of that which is being demonstrated. • We don't have time to meet with these people before school, or after. The regular classroom t • Two days a month was not sufficient time to adequately achieve the goals the staff developers were to accomplish. I needed our staff developer to take more initiative to demonstrate lessons.
--	--	---

Appendix G

Focus Group Summary Report

Evaluation of the Classroom Instructional Support
Group Model
Pinellas County Schools
Department of Research and Accountability

Focus Group Summary Report
March, 2006

Prepared by
Dr. Marilyn Katzenmeyer
Professional Development Center, Inc.
P.O. 46609
Tampa, Florida 33647

Introduction

Focus Group sessions were conducted to gather data regarding the recently implemented Classroom Instructional Support Model (CISM). The model provides job-embedded training to teachers in Priority 1 and Priority 2 schools at specific grade levels in math and reading. The model is designed to provide opportunities for staff developers to plan with teachers, to model lessons in demonstration classrooms, and to debrief the lesson with teachers. To assure the participants their responses were confidential, the focus groups were conducted by a facilitator external to the Pinellas County School district and notes were recorded by an outside recorder. Data were analyzed and a summary report developed.

Data on the Focus Group participants:

- On February 10, 2006 a total of 26 staff developers were interviewed in two focus groups. Of the 26 staff developers ten worked in math, 14 in reading and two in both areas.
- On February 13, 2006 a school leaders' focus group was held. There were 16 school-based personnel who attended this focus group. There were eight Title I facilitators, four assistant principals, three reading coaches, and one math coach. There were four Priority 1 (P1) schools (three in math and one in reading) and 12 Priority 2 (P2) schools (seven in reading and five in math).
- On February 13, 2006 a teacher focus group was conducted. There were five teachers in attendance who represented 3rd grade demonstration classrooms. This is a rather small sample, representing only teachers who worked in demonstration classrooms, and comments attributed to teachers should be considered with that in mind. These demonstration classroom teachers represented a cross-section of schools. Only one school received Title I funding and one was a Fundamental School. Two schools were Priority 1 (P1) schools, one school was a Priority 2 (P2) school, and two schools were A schools, which were neither P1 nor P2 schools.
- On February 16, 2006 a principal's focus group was attended by eight principals, representing five Priority 1 (P1) schools and three Priority 2 (P2) schools. Of the five P1 schools, three implemented reading strategies and two implemented math strategies. Of the three P2 schools, two were focusing on reading strategies and one focused on math strategies. Six of the eight were Title I schools. There was one fundamental school and one ESE school represented. One of the original five schools selected to research and pilot the CISM staff development model for the district was represented.

Understanding of the CISM Model and Roles

Principals reported they were very clear about both the CISM model and its rationale. There was variability in the understanding of the model and its rationale among participants in the other groups. Of the staff developers group about 4/5 of the group reported feeling very confident in their understanding of the model and its rationale, while 1/5 of the group

expressed they were only somewhat confident. Of the teachers, 2/5 felt very confident, 2/5 felt somewhat confident, and 1/5 felt not at all confident in terms of understanding the model and its rationale. Of the school leaders group 3/4 reported they felt very confident and 1/4 felt somewhat confident in understanding the model and its rationale.

The staff developers attributed the variability in understanding to the fact that the reading and math models vary. In addition they commented that those involved with model development were most clear about it and that unanticipated changes to the original model led to less clarity.

Preparation for implementation of the model varied. Principals attended an informational session in the spring prior to implementation. Staff developers reported training related to the CISM model included Steve Barkley's coaching training, Reading First training, content specific training in math strategies, and on-going training on Fridays, book studies, and informal sharing, brainstorming and debriefing with one another. Teachers reported on the job preparation for implementation of the CISM through working with the staff developer. Several teachers reported learning the strategies as a part of the summer program and believed the demonstration classroom work to be repetitive for them as they were already using the strategies.

Participants in each of the groups were able to articulate their specific roles in the CISM model implementation. Principals reported they were involved in planning, modifying the schedule, observing model lessons and debriefing with the staff developer and curriculum support team members. Staff developers reported their roles included planning, pre/post lesson conferences, modeling, co-teaching, debriefing and meeting the individual school's needs. School leaders reported they were involved through selection of demonstration classrooms, co-teaching or video taping fish bowl lessons, planning with the staff developer and teacher, scheduling or providing class coverage, and following up in the classrooms.

CISM Components: Selection of Demonstration Classrooms

Principals reported that strong to moderately strong teachers were selected for demonstration classrooms. Some schools used feedback on teachers from curriculum specialists to guide the selection; others reported allowing teachers to make the selections and still others reported the principal made the selections. Teacher participants in the Focus Group reported benefit to themselves and their students from having been selected.

CISM Components: Orienting Teacher to Model Lessons

Demonstration classroom teachers reported the planning and orientation to the lesson to be helpful to their work and to other teachers involved in the fishbowl process. School leaders felt it was unsatisfactory in many schools. They reported that time for the orientation was a problem and often resulted in students losing instructional time with their own teacher or teachers losing their planning time. Staff developers felt that time for this orientation was very difficult to find; some said it varied according to the school's schedule and teacher buy-

in. Some staff developers said they had to do the orientation by e-mail in order to accomplish it. Principals reported that teacher understanding of the need for orientation was low in the beginning but grew over the months of implementation. A school leader suggested that forty minutes of pre-planning for every lesson is not realistic given the demands on teachers' time and planning opportunities during the school day.

CISM Components: Demonstration Lessons with Teacher Observing

Principals stated that success of the demonstration lessons varied with the trust and rapport the staff developer had established with the teachers. School leaders reported they often missed the demonstration lessons as they had to cover classes to release teachers or handle discipline issues. Staff developers felt the model lessons were powerful; however, they reported the implementation of demonstration lessons had to evolve as class coverage issues were solved and teacher buy-in gained. One reported teaching the model lesson six times to accommodate the school's coverage issues. Staff developers reported that model lessons were often repeated by Assistant Principals, Title One Facilitators or Reading or Math coaches in other classrooms. Most staff developers agreed progress was made toward implementing the demonstration lessons over time. Several teachers felt demonstration lessons with the fish bowl were effective in their schools.

CISM Components: Debriefing Lessons and Collaborative Planning with Teachers

Staff developers reported the evolving nature of this CISM component citing success being dependent on the teacher, coverage for teachers, the schedule, etc. Finding time with the staff developer was often difficult for other teachers outside the demonstration lesson time. One staff developer reported debriefing the lessons with teachers who had observed in the fishbowl while the students in the model lesson were "on task". Most principals felt this component of CISM was working well, particularly if the staff developer was able to build rapport with the teachers. Involvement of the Title One facilitator, the principal and assistant principal in the debriefing and planning for future sessions was reported. School leaders seemed less positive about this component's implementation, reporting scheduling problems and confusion on the part of the Curriculum Support team and the Professional Learning Community as to the staff developer's role and work. School leaders also reported other problems: AP unable to view model lesson therefore debrief not helpful, coordination of the model lessons and debriefing with pacing and spiral curriculum, and teacher resistance to trying new strategies. Teachers' responses to the success of this component varied; some felt it successful, others reported it did not happen; one suggested it occurred through the Professional Learning Community meetings.

CISM Components: Follow Up and Monitoring

Teachers responses varied from no monitoring in one school to several different examples of monitoring (i.e. principal monitors and discusses classroom observations, area staff monitors and reviews data with teachers). School leaders' responses in this area were negative; several expressed concern that the rigid CISM model does not address specific needs at their schools. Several principals reported the staff developer went above and beyond to provide follow up

and support (i.e. parent workshops) and to find extra time when it was needed to spend at the school beyond the requirement. Staff developers reported doing co-teaching in reading and in math classrooms and with reading coaches; where teacher confidence was lacking staff developers provided additional follow up.

Implementation of CISM

When asked if the CISM model had worked as planned, wide variability in responses resulted. School leaders responses were weighted toward the low end of the scale; staff developers responses were in the mid range of the scale. Principal responses loaded in the mid range of the scale with one principal feeling implementation was totally consistent with plans and one who felt implementation was not at all consistent. Teachers' responses generally loaded from the mid-range to the positive end of the scale.

When asked about the adequacy of the time staff developers were scheduled to be in P1 and P2 schools, all groups strongly felt the two days allocated for work in P2 schools was insufficient. In many cases the two days were not consecutive further adding to the inadequacy and lack of impact on teacher performance/student achievement. Repeatedly focus group participants surfaced the issue that in non Title One schools, staff members are not available to provide coaching, support and follow-up so the reinforcement for the teachers was sorely lacking. A few staff developers reported they were sometimes able to spend more than the two days in P2 schools through creative scheduling. One staff developer was lauded for dropping in before and after school, and at lunch time to talk and follow up with teachers.

For P1 schools, the three day per month model was reported to be more adequate, but nearly all groups cited the need for additional time with the staff developer. Time for planning with teachers was especially difficult to schedule. Principals stated more flexibility in the use of time would be helpful due to unique school needs such as the number of new teachers, needs at different grade levels, etc. Staff developers concurred that finding time for planning with teachers was the most difficult scheduling challenge, and the three week gap in time before returning to the school made it hard for the staff developer to sustain progress.

When asked if duties were modified to provide time for the implementation of CISM responsibilities, school leaders reported only that duties were added and nothing went away. Staff developers reported feeling stretched thin with many other duties competing for their time on CISM. One principal reported that her view of her job and that of her assistants had changed to spending more time on instructional strategies.

Barriers to CISM Implementation

1. Focus group participants unanimously cited time as a major barrier to CISM implementation. It was difficult to find enough time for planning and debriefing with the staff developers for teachers and for school leaders. In schools where block schedules did not exist, loss of teacher planning time for CISM activities was cited as a

big difficulty. Teachers reported staying after school when “sacred” planning time was taken up with CISM activities. Some schools used PE time or Professional Learning Communities time to provide follow up activities. Staff developers had multiple duties in addition to the priority placed on their time with CISM. It was reported that instructional time away from their own students worried some teachers whose classes were covered by paraprofessionals or others.

2. Class coverage issues hindered CISM implementation. Finding ways to cover teachers’ classes so they could attend model lessons, planning and debriefs was a major challenge in some schools. Administrators in some schools could not participate in model lessons and debriefs as they had to cover classes to release teachers. The lack of administrator participation was cited frequently as a barrier to reinforcing the skills in classrooms. Participants reported great difficulty in schools which did not have Title One resource persons to assist with coverage. TDE’s were not made available. Often no subs were available.
3. Better communication from the district level was needed. The lack of flexibility of the mandated CISM model to individual school needs was also cited as a barrier. Clarity about the model and district expectations is needed. Conflicting messages were received by schools. The plan as well as present and future direction of CISM need to be more clearly articulated and championed; participants reported teachers do not trust that it will continue. Participants felt additional training and preparation for CISM would have been valuable prior to implementation. Last minute changes as to the number of schools involved hindered the understanding of the model by some P2 schools. The alignment with CSR work and congruence with pacing calendar and curriculum requirements was lacking according to representatives of some schools. Individual school needs and data should be considered in assignment of staff developers; some schools reported low AYP scores and need for help in math but were assigned reading staff developers. Some were unclear as to how schools were selected for involvement and felt schools should have had input not mandates to participate. Some felt help was more sorely needed at grade levels other than those mandated. Some felt schools should have input into selection of their staff developer rather than having assignments made. Some reported that staff developers felt they had to be “sneaky” to vary from the perceived rigid model in order to meet school needs.
4. Teacher resistance was cited as a barrier. Some felt this was due to lack of teacher training, knowledge and buy-in. Up front leadership and support by the principal and assistant principal were seen as key to teachers engagement in the model and accountability for classroom changes. In schools in which follow up and support by other school leaders (i.e. Title One Facilitators, Reading and Math coaches) was lacking due to time constraints, other duties, or lack of will or skill, implementation was also hindered.

CISM vs. Traditional Staff Development Model

When asked if CISM was providing an improved approach to professional development when compared with more traditional approaches, the majority of participants from all

focus groups preferred the CISM approach. The staff developers felt CISM was superior as it is ongoing, deepens collegiality, promotes robust conversations, is a more sustained effort and offers feedback to teachers to aid them in changing behaviors. Teachers preferred the job-embedded nature of the CISM model and cited the modeling as especially helpful to new teachers. Principals cited the application in classrooms as a benefit of the CISM approach; they felt that CISM needs to be funded adequately to assure enough time in the school by the staff developer. School leaders and principals offered the possibility of blending traditional workshops and CISM approaches, believing traditional workshop sessions may be valuable when content expertise is needed by teachers.

Recommendations on CISM Implementation

1. In any large scale change effort, the role of those sponsoring the change must be to communicate, communicate, communicate. Focus group participants' responses indicate a need to increase the breadth and intensity of communication about the CISM model. School level personnel preparation and training for involvement in CISM implementation should be enhanced; some reported being "thrown into it". Align the CISM implementation with other initiatives to avoid mixed messages to schools and teachers; congruence with the CISM work and Curriculum Support Teams is needed. Staff developers and teachers recommended more in depth summer workshops for demonstration model teachers. One to two days of pre-planning staff development on CISM was suggested by focus group participants to assure a consistent message being communicated. It appears that other school leaders (Assistant Principals, Title One Facilitators, Reading and Math Coaches) could benefit from more in depth understanding of CISM and its implications for their work and work assignments.
2. The intention by district staff to provide consistency in CISM implementation appears to be at odds with the perception by school personnel that their needs should be met and their input valued. Focus group participants suggested one size does not fit all; some teachers already know these skills and some school level leaders want to spread the model to other grade levels where stronger needs exist. School personnel expressed the desire to individualize staff development for their teachers, and to have flexibility in scheduling the staff developers at their schools. Principals and teachers wanted continuity in the assignment of staff developers to schools next year as trust has been built and relationships developed. Focus group participants stated the number of priority instructional skills should be limited to three to four priorities that are supported fully with time and resources.
3. There is a clear perception from focus group data that the CISM model is a promising staff development approach. Most all participants felt the P2 model of two days per month was inadequate and need to be re-examined. The issues of time for planning, follow up and support and the issues of class coverage need to be investigated and solutions proposed to enhance schools' abilities to change teacher behavior and improve student outcomes. District staff should weigh the possible unintended consequences and possible negative impact of frequently usurping teacher planning

time as well as the inadequate number of personnel to coach and support teachers' implementation of CISM skills especially in non Title One schools.

4. Based on data from the Focus Group discussions, staff developers are highly regarded by school personnel. Comments suggest that Staff developers are a committed group of people, who could benefit by more flexibility in scheduling their time in schools, by removing other duties that conflict with attention to CISM and by being given more time for planning on Fridays instead of meeting together every week. Some staff developers feel they could benefit by having all schools assigned with similar needs while other staff developers prefer a mix of schools. There may be a need for more math staff developers since some schools reported having a reading person assigned when math was the need. School personnel felt staff developers should have CISM as their primary responsibility and not be spread so thin. Most focus group participants felt more time in schools by staff developers would enhance the ability to change teacher behaviors and improve student achievement.