



IMPACT

Fidelity Index

2015-2016 Results

District Summary

Lisa R. Holliday, PhD
The Evaluation Group
Lisa@Evaluationgroup.com



Table of Contents

Overview	1
Score Calculation	1
Score Interpretation	1
District Fidelity Score	2
Summary Fidelity Scores by Component	3
Core Component 1: Individualized Student Learning	3
Core Component 2: Student Transition Activities	3
Core Component 3: Professional Development	3
Core Component 4: Data Driven Decision Making	3
Fidelity Targets by Component	4
Core Component 1: Individualized Student Learning	4
Core Component 2: Student Transition Activities	6
Core Component 3: Professional Development	7
Core Component 4: Data Driven Decision Making	10

All Schools

2015-2016 Fidelity Snapshot

Overview

During 2015-2016, The Evaluation Group (TEG) conducted a fidelity of implementation study at all IMPACT schools. We assessed fidelity across four components:

1. Individualized Student Learning
2. Student Transition Activities
3. Professional Development
4. Data Driven Decision Making

We calculated a score for each component and the district. An overview of the full fidelity measure is available upon request.

Score Calculation

We measured the following aspects of each component: quality, dosage, reach, and reactions. Quality is “the extent to which the core component was delivered clearly and correctly according to known best practices and standards.” Dosage is “the amount of the component being delivered, expressed in terms of frequency, intensity, and duration.” Reach is “the extent to which targeted participants actually received the core component.” Lastly, reactions “assess the extent to which the core component stimulates interest and participants are satisfied with their experiences.”

We set targets set for each aspect measured (quality, dosage, reach, and reaction) that are based upon existing research, past district performance, and the IMPACT Management Team’s recommendations. Additionally, each aspect is differentially weighted. The differential weighting used in this index places more weight on activities under the direct control of the IMPACT Management Team, such as offering scheduled training sessions, and less weight on aspects such as reactions, which are out of the control of the IMPACT team.

Score Interpretation

To interpret school-level fidelity scores, we used the following guidelines presented in Table 1.

Table 1
School Score Interpretation Guidelines

Fidelity Score	Interpretation
.8 or greater	In Place
Less than .8	Emerging

District Fidelity Score

In addition to calculating school-level fidelity scores, we also assessed district fidelity. We determined annual district fidelity scores by calculating an overall fidelity score that combines data across core components from all IMPACT schools. District fidelity scores are interpreted using the same guidelines for school-level scores. **The district met 100% of its fidelity targets in 2015-2016.** Table 2 shows fidelity scores for the district.

Table 2
District Fidelity

Component	Score	Interpretation
Blended Learning Implementation	1.38	In Place
IMPACT Classrooms	0.81	In Place
Blended Learning Technology	0.85	In Place
Summer Transition Camp	1.01	In Place
College Readiness Institute	1.56	In Place
District PD For Priority Teachers	1.26	In Place
BL Coaching for Priority Teachers	0.90	In Place
Priority Teacher BL Self-Assessment	0.96	In Place
Using Data to Inform Instruction	0.95	In Place

Targets for 2015-2016 were calculated as a 3% increase over 2014-2015 actual scores. As shown in tables 3-16, most schools were well above their targets, which indicates significant growth in program implementation.

Table 3
School Summary

Component	Number of Schools with Component In Place
Blended Learning Implementation	12
IMPACT Classrooms	9
Blended Learning Technology	10
Summer Transition Camp	10
College Readiness Institute	15
District PD For Priority Teachers	15
BL Coaching for Priority Teachers	10
Priority Teacher BL Self-Assessment	15
Using Data to Inform Instruction	13

Summary Fidelity Scores by Component

Core Component 1: Individualized Student Learning

Table 4

Individualized Student Learning

Core Component 1: Individualized Student Learning		
Action	Score	Interpretation
Blended Learning Implementation	1.38	In Place
Impact Classrooms	0.81	In Place
Blended Learning Technology	0.85	In Place

Core Component 2: Student Transition Activities

Table 5

Student Transition Activities

Core Component 2: Student Transition Activities		
Action	Score	Interpretation
Summer Transition Camp	1.01	In Place
College Readiness Institute	1.56	In Place

Core Component 3: Professional Development

Table 6

Professional Development

Core Component 3: Professional Development		
Action	Score	Interpretation
District PD for Teachers	1.26	In Place
BL Coaching for Priority Teachers	0.90	In Place
Priority Teacher BL Self-Assessment	0.96	In Place

Core Component 4: Data Driven Decision Making

Table 7

Data Driven Decision Making

Core Component 4: Data Driven Decision Making		
Action	Score	Interpretation
Using Data to Inform Instruction	0.95	In Place

Fidelity Targets by Component

Core Component 1: Individualized Student Learning

Table 8
Blended Learning Implementation

Key Component	Measure	Data Source	Target	Actual	
Expand options for students to individualize their progress and learning path. (SOW 3.3 and 1.4.13)	Quality: % of blended learning best practices observed in classrooms.	School-Level CWT Data	82%	68.64%	
	Dosage: % of observations using....	Blended Learning	School-Level CWT Data	17%	17.76%
		Focused Groups		5.1%	5.06%
		Small Groups		24%	15.06%
		Stations/Centers		8.2%	6.43%
	Reach: % observations using at least one of these strategies (blended learning, focused groups, small groups, and stations/centers) at target levels.	School-Level CWT Data	13.3%	44.99%	
	Reactions: % of students and priority teachers who reported change in instruction was beneficial.	IMPACT Student survey	83%	82.69%	
		IMPACT Teacher survey	92%	87.63%	
			Score	1.38 In Place	

Table 9

IMPACT Classrooms

Key Component	Measure	Documents Needed	Target	Actual
Expand options for students to individualize their progress and learning path. (SOW 3.3 and 1.4.13)	Quality: % of priority teachers who “agree” to “strongly agree” that IMPACT classrooms gave knowledge and skills needed to implement BL.	IMPACT Teacher Survey	88%	82.65%
	Dosage: # of IMPACT classrooms available for teacher use.	IMPACT Classroom Attendance	1 per school	14
	Reach: % of priority teachers observing at least 1 IMPACT classroom per year.	IMPACT Classroom Attendance	75%	52.19%
	Reactions: % of priority teachers who “agree” to “strongly agree” that observing IMPACT classrooms was a good use of their time.	IMPACT Teacher Survey	83%	72.94%
			Score	0.81 In Place

Table 10
Blended Learning Technology

Key Component	Measure	Documents Needed	Target	Actual
Expand options for students to individualize their progress and learning path. (SOW 3.3 and 1.4.13)	Quality: % of students and priority teachers who “agree” to “strongly agree” they are able to use technology to complete school work.	IMPACT Student Survey	94%	92.17%
		IMPACT Teacher Survey	99%	95.29%
	Dosage: % of classrooms observed using technology devices to complete classwork.	CWT – Student Tech Use	40%	39.24%
		CWT – Teacher Tech Use	57%	34.73%
	Reactions: % of students and priority teachers who “agree” or “strongly agree” that the quality of student work is improved with technology.	IMPACT Student Survey	83%	81.24%
		IMPACT Teacher Survey	67%	53.53%
			Score	0.85 In Place

Core Component 2: Student Transition Activities

Table 11
Summer Transition Camp

Key Component	Measure	Documents Needed	Target	Actual
Expand and support student transition activities (SOW 4.1)	Dosage: % of targeted students attending 1 day.	STC Attendance Records	80%	61.36%
	Reach: % of targeted students attending.	STC Attendance Records	45%	61.36%
			Score	1.01 In Place

Table 12
College Readiness Institute

Key Component	Measure	Documents Needed	Target	Actual
Expand and support student transition activities (SOW 4.1)	Quality: % students who “agree” or “strongly agree” that they learned new information that will be useful as they prepare for life after high school.	IMPACT Student Survey	85%	85.34%
	Dosage: # of sessions offered.	CRI Events	7 per school	250
	Reach: % of schools who maintained attendance records for at least 4 events.	CRI Attendance Records	100%	0.65%
	Reactions: % students who “agree” or “strongly agree” that the CRI was a good use of time.	IMPACT Student Survey	88%	85.34%
Score				1.56 In Place

Core Component 3: Professional Development

Table 13

District PD for Priority Teachers

Key Component	Measure	Documents Needed	Target	Actual
Offer faculty professional development (SOW 2.1.7)	Quality: % of priority teachers who “agree” to “strongly agree” that PD gave knowledge and skills needed to implement BL.	IMPACT Teacher Survey	93%	88.53%
	Dosage: # of ERPD sessions that offer IMPACT-related professional development.	Attendance Records	6 per school	96
	Reach: % of priority teachers who attend 4 Early Release Professional Development (ERPD).	Attendance Records	30%	57.28%
	Reactions: % of priority teachers who “agree” to “strongly agree” that ERPD opportunities were time well spent.	IMPACT Teacher Survey	88%	82.65%
Score				1.26 In Place

Table 14

BL Coaching for Priority Teachers

Key Component	Measure	Documents Needed	Target	Actual
Offer faculty professional development (SOW 2.1.7)	Quality: % of priority teachers who “agree” to “strongly” agree that BL coaching gave knowledge and skills needed to implement BL.	IMPACT Teacher Survey	90%	87.65%
	Dosage: Number of days per year BL coaches provided support (DA, PD) to priority teachers.	BLC Coaching Logs	72 total days per year per school	966
	Reach: % of priority teachers who received monthly coaching.	BLC Coaching Logs	98%	91.10%
	Reactions: % of priority teachers who “agree” to “strongly agree” that BLC’s are responsive to their PD needs.	IMPACT Teacher Survey	90%	88.53%
			Score	0.90 In Place

Table 15
Priority Teacher Blended Learning Self-Assessment

Key Component	Measure	Documents Needed	Target	Actual
Expand and support	Quality: % change shown in self-assessment	BL Self-Assessment		1

student transition activities (SOW 4.1)	scores from previous administration by priority teachers (=1 if positive change, 0 if negative).		1	
	Dosage: % of priority teachers who completed the self-assessment.	BL Self-Assessment	60%	79.19%
	Reach: % of growth in self-assessment scores from the fall assessment.	BL Self-Assessment	+8.03%	4.79%
	Reactions: % of priority teachers who “agree” to “strongly agree” that the self-assessment and PDP’s have helped to improve their ability to implement BL.	IMPACT Teacher Survey	87%	81.76%
			Score	0.96 In Place

Core Component 4: Data Driven Decision Making

Table 16

Using Data to Inform Instruction

Key Component	Measure	Documents Needed	Target	Actual
---------------	---------	------------------	--------	--------

Expand PLC's to support new reform models, instructional strategies, and use of data to include instruction (SOW 2.1.13)	Quality: % of priority teachers who “agree” to “strongly agree” that they learned actionable strategies they can apply in the classroom.	IMPACT Teacher Survey	85%	86.76%
	Dosage: # of times per year targeted PLC's met.	School-Level PLC Meeting Minutes	8 per quarter per school	407
	Reach: % of PLC meeting minutes that note the use of performance data (Math and ELA/ENG).	School-Level PLC Meeting Minutes	87%	95.09%
	Reactions: % of priority teachers who “agree” to “strongly agree” that they learned new skills and strategies as a result of personalized learning teams.	IMPACT Teacher Survey	89%	86.76%
			Score	0.95 In Place