

Final Narrative Report: Eagle Academy Public Charter School's Charter Dissemination Grant

Executive Summary: The *overarching goal* of the Eagle Academy's Charter Dissemination grant project was to successfully disseminate the PRIDE (Providing Responsive Interventions for Developmentally-Appropriate Expectations) Model to two dissemination sites (Bridges Public Charter School and Eagle Academy Public Charter School's Congress Heights campus). This central goal was to be accomplished through building school-wide policies and expectations around behavior and behavior support, administering professional development workshops designed to enhance teacher knowledge, providing in-class mentoring/coaching to improve fidelity to research based program usage, conducting off-site observations to build a professional learning community, developing resources for teachers to use when managing their classrooms, and delivering parent training. The expectation was that these pieces would dramatically improve school climate and thus promote the positive social, emotional, academic and behavioral development of students. Eagle's Charter Dissemination grant identified four additional goals that would likely measure achievement of the overarching goal: (1) Increase Student Academic Achievement for Bridges Public Charter School (as well as Eagle Academy's Congress Heights location); (2) Support instructional staff in their professional growth, learning, and practice in the classroom (at both Bridges Public Charter School and Eagle Academy's Congress Heights campus); (3) Reduce the number of behavioral referrals at Bridges (as well as at Eagle Academy's Congress Heights campus); (4) Assess the Impact and fidelity of PRIDE Model implementation at Bridges PCS (as well as at Eagle Academy's Congress Heights Campus).

Eagle's Charter Dissemination project made major strides in 2015-2016 towards successfully disseminating the PRIDE model outlined in their grant application. Key training, coaching, data collection, fidelity monitoring, observation, and collaboration initiatives were undertaken to support implementation of PRIDE at both targeted dissemination sites. Below is a summary of key tasks completed (including each tier or tiers the activity supported):

- 1) Meet quarterly (Eagle administrators/coaches and Bridges administrators/coaches) to discuss grant implementation, progress, continuous improvement, and sustainability at the close of the project.
- 2) Conducted School Climate Survey in pre (July/August)/post (May/June) format to assess changes in school climate as well as teacher knowledge at both dissemination sites.
- 3) Purchased key resources such as Second Step kits, play therapy resources, student incentives
- 4) Complete a PRIDE model handbook for both Bridges Public Charter School and Eagle Academy Public Charter School's Congress Heights campus. Each manual was developed specifically based on needs/issues identified by administrators and coaches for each school. The manual for both sites contains: a) Summary of behavioral policies/procedures, b) Student tiers of behavior charts with corresponding response/approach, c) School-wide behavioral expectations chart, d) Guided lessons for teaching school-wide behavioral expectations, e) Information about Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports, f) Information about Responsive Classroom components and strategies, g) Information about the Second Step social/emotional learning program and kits, h) a PRIDE model fidelity checklist.

- 5) Complete regular professional development (“PD”) in the form of Professional Learning Community (“PLC”) presentations on the following topics: Multi-Tiered Behavioral Frameworks, Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports, Responsive Classroom, Second Step, Morning Meeting, Guided Discovery, Rules and Logical Consequences, Setting Positively Stated Classroom Rules, Positive Acknowledgements, Successful Transition, De-escalation Techniques, and Pro-Active Classroom Management.
- 6) Offer on-going in-class coaching to teachers in need of support with PBIS implementation, Responsive Classroom implementation, and/or Second Step implementation. Two “Dissemination Mentors” were assigned a caseload of teachers to support over the course of the year, support overseen by the mentor ranged from in-class observations to lesson planning, modeling, collaborative consultation, viewing videos, and visits to other classrooms followed by reflection.
- 7) Offer on-going PD and a Professional Learning Community for selected teachers through a classroom observation program, whereby teachers in need of improvement were given the opportunity to go for observations of exceptional teachers at one of three school sites (Eagle Academy Congress Heights Campus, Eagle Academy Capitol Riverfront Campus, or Bridges Public Charter School), followed by a debrief with a project mentor and a written reflection of what was learned.
- 8) Completed regular fidelity observations in classrooms to ensure teachers were implementing PBIS, Responsive Classroom, and Second Step (used PRIDE Model Checklist in pre/post format to assess progress).
- 9) Completed regular positive acknowledgement observations (using positive acknowledgement checklist in a pre/post format to assess progress)
- 10) Held “sustainability” meeting to discuss how the impact of the grant might live on after the end of the grant period.
- 11) Identified “Teacher Leaders” to serve as mentors and sustainability personnel to complete training/mentoring of fellow teachers after the grant concluded.
- 12) Sent “Teacher Leaders” and other school personnel for additional training on key programs such as Second Step or other techniques.
- 13) Provided “Teacher Leaders” with a DVD containing all professional development presentations completed during 2015-2016 so the presentations can be utilized to train future teachers.

Eagle Academy’s progress towards achieving its overarching goal (disseminate the PRIDE Model to two dissemination sites) as well as supporting goals (1. Increase Student Academic Achievement for Bridges Public Charter School as well as Eagle Academy’s Congress Heights location, 2. Support instructional staff in their professional growth, learning, and practice in the classroom at both Bridges Public Charter School and Eagle Academy’s Congress Heights campus, 3. Reduce the number of behavioral referrals at Bridges as well as at Eagle Academy’s Congress Heights campus, 4. Assess the impact and fidelity of PRIDE Model implementation at Bridges PCS as well as at Eagle Academy’s Congress Heights Campus). This progress is demonstrated clearly by: improved academic achievement results, increases in teacher knowledge and fidelity of PRIDE model implementation, and decreases in referrals at both dissemination sites. These increases are covered in greater detail in the remainder of the narrative.

Program Description: The Charter Dissemination grant started in July with a meeting between the key stakeholders from Bridges Public Charter School (“BRIDGES”) and Eagle Academy Public Charter School (“EAGLE”). At this initial meeting (7/1/15), the stakeholders from both schools shared their concerns, hopes/wishes, need for resources, and preferences regarding scheduling. The team planned the professional development schedule for the entire year and scheduled three more meetings to discuss project implementation, monitoring, continuous improvement, and sustainability. Finally, the team set a deadline to identify “high” and “low” performing teachers (with low performing teachers being the first to receive coaching/mentoring).

After meeting with administrators to discuss school needs, a curriculum and professional development specialist was tasked with creating a PRIDE resource manual for both dissemination sites (BRIDGES and EAGLE-Congress Heights campus). Each manual was created specifically for the dissemination site it was intended for, after considering decisions and feedback from school stakeholders. Each PRIDE resource manual contained a) School-specific summary of behavioral policies/procedures, b) School-specific student tiers of behavior charts with corresponding response/approach, c) School-specific school-wide behavioral expectations chart, d) School-specific guided lessons for teaching school-wide behavioral expectations, e) Information about Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports, f) Information about Responsive Classroom components and strategies, g) Information about the Second Step social/emotional learning program and kits, h) a PRIDE model fidelity checklist. All teachers, administrators, coaches, and resource personnel at each dissemination site were given a hard copy of this manual at the initial induction workshop referenced below.

Prior to conducting professional development, teachers from both dissemination sites (BRIDGES and EAGLE-Congress Heights campus) were given a “School Climate Teacher Survey” that took into account anything from the site they taught at to the grade level they served to their role (assistant, lead, resource teachers, etc.). The survey included a basic analysis of teacher knowledge; asking teachers to identify things such as school wide expectations, definitions for programs like PBIS/Second Step/Responsive Classroom, and the PRIDE model. Additionally, the survey assessed how teachers felt about their school from student behavior to referrals out of the classroom, in school and out of school suspensions, overall climate, school support of teachers, and provision of training. The “pre” version of this survey was administered in July (BRIDGES) and August (EAGLE’s Congress Heights campus) of 2015. The “post” version of the survey was administered in May/June 2016. Results of the pre/post survey were compared and demonstrated some nice improvements in teacher knowledge and overall school climate (see ANALYSIS section for formal results).

A day long induction training occurred at BRIDGES (8/11/14) and EAGLE Congress Heights campus (8/12/15) in August 2015. At this initial training teachers received an introduction to multi-tiered behavioral frameworks, Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS), school-wide expectations, and classroom level rules. Follow up workshops at both sites (8/13/15, 8/25/15, 9/2/15, 10/13/15, 11/7/15, 12/15/15, 2/12/16, 2/17/16, 3/2/16, 3/8/16, 3/15/16, 3/22/16, 4/18/16, 4/19/16, 4/21/16, 5/4/16) covered topics such as Responsive Classroom, Guided Discovery, Morning Meeting, Rules and Logical Consequences, Second Step, Managing Transitions, Positive Acknowledgements, De-Escalation Techniques, and Managing Recess Safely. Both schools also conducted regular parent training events ranging from learning alphabet knowledge to literacy at home to managing challenging behaviors at home.

Two Dissemination Mentors began supporting teachers in classrooms in late September/early October. The coaches utilized an adult learning model that took into account the needs of adult learners, as well as using techniques recommended by Joyce and Showers (2002) to include theory and discussion, demonstration in training, practice and feedback during training, and coaching in the classroom. The first mentor, [REDACTED], is a licensed professional counselor with training/certification in child centered play therapy, cognitive behavioral therapy, PBIS, Responsive Classroom, and Second Step. The second mentor, [REDACTED], has a Ph.D. in Special Education and is trained/certified in PBIS, Responsive Classroom, Second Step, and Classroom Assessment Scoring System. Each mentor was assigned a caseload of teachers and teachers were seen for 6-8 week cycles. If teachers made progress, they were removed from the caseload and new teachers were added, if they didn't make progress they were kept on the caseload. Dissemination Mentors administered PRIDE Model Fidelity Checklists in a pre (beginning of mentoring) and post (end of mentoring) format to assess the fidelity of implementation for PBIS, Responsive Classroom, and Second Step. Additionally, Dissemination Mentors administered Positive Acknowledgement checklists in a pre (beginning of mentoring) and post (end of mentoring) format to assess the overall classroom climate (i.e., do positive acknowledgements outweigh negative corrections, and are teachers getting closer to the goal of a 4-1 ratio of positive acknowledgements to negative corrections?). Teachers from both dissemination sites made positive strides in improving their fidelity to implementing all three programs from the PRIDE Model (PBIS, Responsive Classroom, Second Step). See the ANALYSIS section for details on gains.

During November and December, the Dissemination Mentors and the stakeholders from each dissemination site developed a list of "high implementation" and "low implementation" teachers. The point of this list was to assess which teachers might benefit from going to observe teaching techniques in other classrooms ("low implementation"), and which teachers might be the best teachers to be observed ("high implementation). Once this list was developed, EAGLE contracted with a company that provides substitutes to schedule subs for days when "low implementation" teachers would be scheduled to observe in the classrooms of "high implementation" teachers. The first observations began occurring in January 2016. "Low implementation" teachers were scheduled to be off for a full day to observe in "high implementation" classrooms and reflect on their observations. A Dissemination Mentor was scheduled to attend observations with "low implementation" teachers. The Dissemination Mentor and "low implementation" teacher would observe for a 90 minute block in a "high implementation" classroom. Then, the mentor would debrief with the "low implementation" teacher asking them to reflect on what they observed. The mentor would also ask some probing questions and ask the teacher to look out for certain things for the next block. This process would then be repeated, including observing another 90 minute block and debriefing. Then, the mentor would assign the "low implementation" teacher to: 1) write a written reflection on what they observed, 2) spending the rest of the day creating a lesson plan that would include something positive from their observation. This observation process ran from January 2016 to June 2016, with teachers from Bridges observing at Eagle and teachers from Eagle observing at Bridges. These observations were universally well received by all participating teachers.

As the final step in the Charter Dissemination Grant process, key stakeholders from BRIDGES and EAGLE met to discuss sustaining the project after the grant period ended. Key stakeholders from both sites decided that selecting "teacher leaders" was the best way to sustain the project. These "teacher leaders" would be high implementation teachers that would be well

equipped to learn new information, model for their fellow teachers, and serve as a mentor/coach for struggling teachers. The team decided that the “teacher leaders” would need additional training and materials to prepare them to support/train their fellow teachers in future years. As a result, grant funds were expended to send these teachers for additional training and a training DVD was created (with copies of all professional development workshops completed during 2015-2016).

Analysis: Project data demonstrated positive gains with regards to all project goals, a clear indication that EAGLE successfully disseminated the PRIDE model and that this project had a moderate to large impact on the dissemination sites. Project data is summarized below according to each individual goal:

Goal #1: Increase student academic achievement at dissemination sites (Bridges Public Charter School and Eagle Academy Public Charter School's Congress Heights Campus).

Summary of Data for BRIDGES (Dissemination Site #1): Kindergarten students at BRIDGES had a 11% increase in Fountas and Pinnell (FP) literacy scores, first graders had a 22% increase in FP literacy scores, second graders had a 3% increase in FP literacy scores, and third graders had a 4% increase in FP literacy scores. 80.2% of Bridges K-3 students met PPVT language achievement goal and 74.2% of Bridges K-3 students met the TEMA math achievement goal.

Summary of Data for EAGLE-Congress Heights Campus (Dissemination Site #2): 97.1% of Congress Heights' PK students met or exceeded Creative Curriculum Gold Literacy goals, 96.1% of Congress Heights' PK students met or exceeded Creative Curriculum Gold Math goals, 97.4% of Congress Heights' PK students met or exceeded Creative Curriculum Gold Social Emotional goals. 62.9% of Congress Heights' K-3 students met NWEA MAP ELA growth, 72.8% of Congress Heights' K-3 students met NWEA MAP Math growth.

Data Analysis: Students made moderate (11%-22%) to average gains (3%-4%) in their FP literacy scores at BRIDGES. Overall, high percentages of the BRIDGES population met language and math achievement goals, a significant accomplishment for a school that serves large percentages of special education and English language learners. Congress Heights PK students scored exceedingly high on all measures of literacy, math, and social/emotional goals. A moderate percentage of students K-3 students met math and ELA goals on the NWEA MAP. Initial academic results are promising, likely indicating that an improved school environment had a small to moderate impact on student academic performance. Like with all dissemination projects, significant time is needed for programs to become implemented with fidelity school-wide. Additional time to train/mentor teachers to further improve fidelity of implementation over a time period longer than a year would likely result in even greater increases.

Goal #2: Support instructional staff in their professional growth at dissemination sites (Bridges Public Charter School and Eagle Academy Public Charter School's Congress Heights Campus).

Summary of Data for BRIDGES (Dissemination Site #1): Based on pre/post surveys of teachers as well as pre/post project fidelity checklists, BRIDGES staff members made a 35 percent increase in teacher knowledge of PRIDE model and a 27 percent increase in teacher knowledge of individual PRIDE model programs (Second Step, Responsive Classroom, PBIS). BRIDGES staff members made a 4% increase in their knowledge of school behavioral expectations/practices, 22% increase in PBIS knowledge, 40% increase in Second Step knowledge, and a 7% increase in Responsive Classroom Knowledge. Fidelity of PBIS implementation increased by 17%, fidelity of Responsive Classroom implementation increased by 23%, and fidelity of Second Step implementation increased by 20% at BRIDGES. Overall, BRIDGES had a 59% increase in positive acknowledgement ratio.

Summary of Data for EAGLE-Congress Heights Campus (Dissemination Site #2): Based on pre/post surveys of teachers as well as pre/post project fidelity checklists, EAGLE staff members made a 34 percent increase in teacher knowledge of PRIDE model and a 43 percent increase in teacher knowledge of individual PRIDE model programs (Second Step, Responsive Classroom, PBIS). EAGLE staff members made a 62% increase in their knowledge of school behavioral expectations/practices, 5% increase in PBIS knowledge, 16% increase in Second Step knowledge, and a 13% increase in Responsive Classroom Knowledge. Fidelity of PBIS implementation increased by 6%, fidelity of Responsive Classroom implementation increased by 19%, and fidelity of Second Step implementation increased by 23% at EAGLE. Overall, EAGLE had a 262% increase in positive acknowledgement ratio.

Data Analysis: In an extremely compressed year-long project, teachers at both dissemination sites (BRIDGES and EAGLE) made significant increases in their knowledge of key programs and fidelity of implementation. Additional focus on implementation of PRIDE programs over a period longer than a year will likely continue to have a significant impact on teacher knowledge as well as fidelity of implementation.

Goal #3: Reduce the number of behavioral referrals at dissemination sites (Bridges Public Charter School and Eagle Academy Public Charter School's Congress Heights Campus).

Summary of Data for BRIDGES (Dissemination Site #1): BRIDGES didn't collect behavioral data during 2014-2015, so a comparison between 2014-2015 data and 2015-2016 data is not possible. However, during 2015-2016 Bridges did collect copious data by quarter, enabling a snapshot of how behavioral referral data changed the longer the Charter Dissemination project went on. During 2015-2016, Bridges had a 91% decrease in Seclusion room referrals/use from Quarter 1 (Q1) to Quarter 4 (Q4), 67% decrease in Restraint referrals/use Q1 to Q4, 67% decrease in Restraint referrals/use from Q1 to Q4, and a 57% decrease of Step 1 Exclusion from Q1 to Q4.

Summary of Data for EAGLE-Congress Heights Campus (Dissemination Site #2):

EAGLE collected behavioral data during 2014-2015, so a comparison between 2014-2015 data and 2015-2016 data is possible for EAGLE. From 2014-2015 to 2015-2016, EAGLE's Congress Heights campus experienced a 14% decrease in referrals for discipline (201 LESS referrals in 2015-2016)

Data Analysis: PRIDE model implementation had a significant impact on student referrals for discipline, meaning far fewer students spent time out of the classroom in 2015-2016 thanks to the Charter Dissemination project. Spending increased time in classrooms may have been a factor in students making moderate academic gains. Given time to implement a dissemination project over a longer period, both sites would expect additional decreases in behavioral referrals and a greater academic impact.

Goal #4: Assess the impact and fidelity of the PRIDE model implementation at dissemination sites (Bridges Public Charter School and Eagle Academy Public Charter School's Congress Heights Campus).

Summary of Overall Project Data: Both dissemination sites experiences decreases in referrals for discipline at both dissemination campuses, increases in student academic performance at both dissemination campuses, increases in teacher knowledge and fidelity of Implementation at both dissemination campuses.

Data Analysis: EAGLE's Charter Dissemination grant had small to significant impacts across three different domains (student academic performance, teacher knowledge/fidelity of implementation, and referrals for discipline). Achieving positive results across three different domains increases the likelihood that the project did have a significant impact for teachers and students. This positive initial data shows promise for a project that would likely have a much greater impact if completed over a period longer than one year. Much of the research around professional development and school change indicates that it is a long-term process that often takes 2-5 years.