School Processes That Can Drive Scaling-up of an Innovation, or Contribute to its Abandonment

2015 NCSU Conference

Jenna Zacamy
Denis Newman
Valeriy Lazarev
Li Lin
Context of the RAISE Project

• 2010 WestEd’s Strategic Literacy Initiative won an i3 Validation grant

• Reading Apprenticeship:
  An instructional framework that helps teachers support discipline-specific literacy

• RAISE: “Reading Apprenticeship Improving Secondary Education”
Context of the RAISE Project

• Five year project that supported:
  o 42 school RCT in PA and CA
  o The Scale-up Project that followed 239 additional schools in PA, UT, IN, and MI

• Today, we report on the Scale-up Project
  o A significant part of independent evaluation
  o Focus on processes at school and district levels
  o Formative feedback to developers
## Projected vs. Actual Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Proposal Projection</th>
<th>Actual RAISE Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated no. of teachers</td>
<td>No. of teachers trained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated no. of schools</td>
<td>No. of schools trained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2754</td>
<td>1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#’s include all RAISE schools: RCT + scale-up
The RAISE Scale-up Project

• RAISE innovation: promote communities in the schools
  o Involve team of biology, history, ELA teachers
  o Develop cadre of “teacher leaders”
  o Convene monthly team meetings
  o Promote shift in local ownership and commitment
  o Assure sustainability

• Developed a logic model building on Coburn’s (2003) four dimensions
Overview of Logic Model

Stage 1. Development activities and intermediate outcomes

Stage 2. Shift in ownership of core components/activities to local level
- shared responsibility
- intermediate outcomes established and reinforced and becoming more independent from resources/direction of developer

Stage 3. Sustained ownership at local level
- Developer’s resources and direction fade

Stage 4. Reading Apprenticeship broadly institutionalized
- policy shifts and Reading Apprenticeship spreading with depth, beyond the original LEAs that were recruited to join the project
## RAISE Scale-up Cohorts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>Year 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>Year 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Year 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cohorts 1 - 4 = 239 schools
~1720 teachers
Data Collection

- Observed and documented key project activities
- Tracked the numbers of schools and teachers served
  - Based on attendance at training
  - Attrition tracked informally based on survey responses and follow-up
- Surveyed participating teachers and school administrators
  - Teachers: 3 times a year
  - Principals: once at the end of the year
- Survey responses decreased over time
## First Year of Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>Year 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>Year 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Year 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cohorts 1 Survey = 296 teachers (75%) from 61 schools
39 administrators (60%)
Uptake of Activities

RAISE professional development

- 90% felt that PD led to changes in their teaching practices

Use of pedagogical practices

- 67% used Reading Apprenticeship practices at least weekly
Support and Capacity Building

- Collaboration with other teachers (60%)
- Attendance at professional development (20%)
- Monthly team meetings (10%)
- Support from teacher leader (5%)
- Other (2%)
- Support from administration (1%)

Thinking Aloud website (0%)
# Buy-in & Commitment

## Teachers
- 92% agreed that RA is **appropriate framework for literacy instruction** in classroom
- 70% **fully or fairly committed** to making RA work at their schools

## Principals
- 97% believed **student learning would improve** if more teachers join RAISE
- 95% **fully or fairly committed** to making RA work at their schools
Challenges for Implementation and Sustainability

Teachers:
• Competing priorities
• RA slowed down pace of instruction
• Student behavior
• Student abilities

Principals:
• Competing priorities
• Budget constraints
## Longitudinal Results from Cohort 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>Year 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>Year 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Year 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Use of Reading Apprenticeship Practices

Y Axis Legend:
5: Throughout each lesson
4: A few times per lesson
3: A few times per week
2: A few times per month
1: A few times per grading period
0: Never
Attendance at Monthly Meetings

% of Teachers Participating in Monthly Meeting

Year

School Percent
Mean
Median
Buy-in to framework...

...as a means to improve student achievement

**Y Axis Legend**
- 5 = Strongly agree
- 4 = Agree
- 3 = Neither agree nor disagree
- 2 = Disagree
- 1 = Strongly disagree
Commitment to making it work...

...in the school

Y AXIS LEGEND
5 = Fully
4 = Fairly
3 = Willing to give it a chance
2 = Not a priority
1 = Not willing to do it
Relationship between Change in Average Usage and School-Level Commitment

Corr Coeff: .46

$p < .01$
But there was another trend...

Decline in survey response rates from Y1 to Y3
Looking for a Objective Indicator of Scale-up

- Decline in survey response rates from Y1 to Y3 raises concern about self report
  - Positive responses may be an over-estimate
  - Yet, we still see increase variability
  - Further analysis suggests “survey fatigue”
- Take a closer look at the “participant tracker”
Schools’ Gain and Loss of Teachers: “Churn”

- **Loser Schools (N=34)**
- **No change (N=77)**
- **Gainer Schools (N=56)**

![Bar chart showing mean number of teachers per school across different categories with labels for Churn, End point, and Starting point.](chart.png)
Identifying an Measurable Scale-up Outcome

• Recruitment process: Internal and external spread

• Continued focus on the school level
  o Growth or loss of teachers is an indicator of strength of an internal process

• Sample: Cohort 1 and 2 schools through 2014

The GL metric
### GL Metric

Cohorts 1 and 2 = 167 schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>2011-2012</th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
<th>2013-2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>Year 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Year 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Year 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(existing schools only)

---

Number of active RAISE teachers in those schools as of Spring 2014 — Number of teachers who were originally trained
Potential Predictors of GL

Data: NCES and surveys from each school’s first year of implementation

• Contextual variables
  - E.g., school characteristics

• RAISE program activities
  - E.g., monthly meetings

• Intermediate scale-up outcomes
  - E.g., Level of commitment to making program work at school
What Predicts GL? Contextual Variables

Reading Apprenticeship is equally scalable across all types of communities covered by this study

Marginal to no significant associations with GL

- School size; student-teacher ratio
- Student socio-economic status; ethnicity
- District resource allocation
- Rating of school leadership; principal involvement in district
- Teacher and principal turnover & retention
- Years of experience as teacher
What Predicts GL?

Contextual variables

Having a novice principal predicts GL

• Negative association with years served as administrator or if their immediate plan is to continue serving at school

• Greater enthusiasm for RA among younger principals?
What Predicts GL?
RAISE Program Activities

Establishing a community of practice early in implementation

• Attendance at monthly meeting and level of commitment to making RA work in the school predict GL

Classroom implementation (in initial year) does not predict GL

• No association with time for lesson planning, average use of RA practices
Principal involvement unclear

• Positive association with principal “involvement” (completed survey), but no significant association with school leadership rating, whether the principal attended training, recommended RAISE to others in the school, or if RAISE was required
**Take-aways**

- Measuring scale-up can’t just use # of teachers trained or schools affected
  - A program takes hold in a school to different degrees
- We can use variability in taking hold to identify factors that an innovation should focus on
- Our next question: can “success factors” in schools in the RCT and Scale-up be compared?
  - Characteristics in RCT associated with achievement gains
  - Characteristics in Scale-up associated with a positive internal process
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