

Assessing Fidelity & Improving Understanding in an Illinois Mathematics & Science Program

Oyer, E. J. , Cullen, M., Downey, G., Greaney, D., Jarosewich, T., & Salzman, J. Paper presented at the 2010 Annual Meeting of the American Evaluation Association in San Antonio, Texas.

IMSP Background

The IMSP program was initiated by the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) as a response to achievement needs for Illinois students in mathematics and science. The ISBE has developed two MSP programs. The first model centers around Master's Degree programs that represent partnerships across colleges of Arts and Science and Education with school districts to provide degree programs. In 2008-2009 and 2009-2010, the ISBE funded a second model, the Workshop Institute MSP programs (WIP-1, WIP-2). This model focuses on two week intensive training sessions complemented by shorter training and mentoring sessions throughout the year.

Participants: 20 Graduate grants, 9 WIP-1 grants, 10 WIP-2 grants

Data Sources: State surveys, site-level interview protocol, teacher and student achievement data, implementation and school background data. Data are combined into meta-analyses models.

Implementation Fidelity Lessons Learned:

Local Grant Implementation Fidelity:

- Data Sources: independent observations (Danielson Protocol), teachers' journaling logs, and teachers' action research projects
- The majority of teachers in both observations were judged to be proficient or distinguished across the elements of the planning, classroom environment, and instruction.

- Conversations to clearly specify goals, operationalize project goals, and identify valid instruments and/or processes are key.

Site Level Implementation Fidelity:

- Site visits triangulate data sources (interviews, extant data) and stake-holder perspectives (multiple partners are present) to provide evidence of how local grants leverage different resources, experiences, and commitments to cultivate partnerships of different quality.
- Partnership composition & structure are strongest elements; action plans and evaluation implementation are weakest for 2009-2010.
- Site interview prove to be beneficial for participants with strong partnerships, for participants with limited communication, provide evaluators with opportunities to observe collaboration in action
- Triangulation of data sources and stake holders is key.

State Level Implementation Fidelity:

- There are five categories of outcomes for which local grants submit data to the state each year:
 1. Quality of PD Activities
 2. Change in teacher content knowledge
 3. Change in instructional practice (including strategies, resources, and content knowledge)
 4. Change in student achievement
 5. Quality of Partnerships
- At the state level, there are lessons from the evaluation results related to the proposal process, resources provided for the grant, and technical assistance.

Download full paper at www.evalexolutions.com/AEA/AEA_Panel_2010.pdf