



# IMPACT

2014-2015 Fidelity Index

District Summary

Lisa R. Holliday, PhD  
The Evaluation Group  
[Lisa@Evaluationgroup.com](mailto:Lisa@Evaluationgroup.com)



## **Table of Contents**

Overview .....	1
Score Calculation .....	1
Score Interpretation.....	1
District Fidelity Score .....	2
Core Component 1: Individualized Student Learning.....	2
Core Component 2: Student Transition Activities.....	3
Core Component 3: Professional Development.....	3
Core Component 4: Data Driven Decision Making .....	4
Appendix A: Detail Fidelity Scores by Component .....	5
Core Component 1: Individualized Student Learning.....	5
Core Component 2: Student Transition Activities.....	8
Core Component 3: Professional Development.....	9
Core Component 4: Data Driven Decision Making .....	11
Appendix B: Summary of School Fidelity Scores .....	12

# District Summary

## 2014-2015 Fidelity Snapshot

### Overview

During 2014-2015, 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 for each aspect measured (quality, dosage, reach, and reaction) based upon existing research, past district performance, and the IMPACT management team’s recommendations. Additionally, each aspect was 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 beyond 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
1 or greater	In Place
Less than 1	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. Tables 2-5 show fidelity scores for the district.

## Core Component 1: Individualized Student Learning

Table 2

### *Individualized Student Learning*

Core Component 1: Individualized Student Learning	
Action	Score
Blended Learning Implementation	0.63
Impact Classrooms	<b>0.94</b>
Blended Learning Technology	0.97

### Blended Learning Implementation

- **All schools** received a rating of “**Emerging**” for this component. The areas with the lowest scores included the dosage and reach of blended learning activities, focused groups, small groups, and stations/centers.

### Impact Classrooms

- **Seventy-five percent** of schools received a rating of “**In Place**” for this component. All schools had at least one IMPACT classroom/faculty member available for observation. However, the availability of classrooms varied by school, with some classrooms not available for observation until mid to late spring. This likely affected the number of priority teachers who were able to view the impact classroom, which resulted in lower scores for that area.

### Blended Learning Technology

- **Forty-four percent** of schools received a rating of “**In Place**” for this component. For one school, lack of survey results negatively impacted its score. For other schools, the areas with the lower scores included the dosage and reach of student and faculty technology use.

## Core Component 2: Student Transition Activities

Table 3

### *Student Transition Activities*

Core Component 2: Student Transition Activities	
Action	Score
Summer Transition Camp	1.36
College Readiness Institute	1.82

### Summer Transition Camp

- **One hundred percent** of schools received a rating of “**In Place**” for this component.

### College Readiness Institute

- **One hundred percent** of schools received a rating of “**In Place**” for this component.

## Core Component 3: Professional Development

Table 4

### *Professional Development*

Core Component 3: Professional Development	
Action	Score
District PD for Priority Teachers	1.12
BL Coaching for Priority Teachers	1.32
Priority Teacher BL Self-Assessment	0.99

### District PD for Priority Teachers

- **Ninety-four percent** of schools received a rating of “**In Place**” for this component. For one school, lack of survey results negatively impacted its score. Schools submitted a variety of professional development attendance records, including ERPD and PLCs. However, the types of records varied by school. For the upcoming year, it is recommended that schools submit records for ERPD only.

### BL Coaching for Priority Teachers

- **Eighty-eight percent** of schools received a rating of “**In Place**” for his component. For one school, lack of survey results negatively impacted its score. At all schools, more than eighty-five percent of priority teachers received coaching.

### Priority Teacher Blended Learning Self-Assessment

- **Sixty-nine percent** of schools received a rating of “**In Place**” for this component. The number of priority teachers who completed the self-assessment in the fall was low ( $n=107$ ), which negatively impacted dosage.

### Core Component 4: Data Driven Decision Making

Table 5

#### *Data Driven Decision Making*

Core Component 4: Data Driven Decision Making	
Action	Score
Using Data to Inform Instruction	1.10

#### Using Data to Inform Instruction

- **Seventy-five percent** of schools received a rating of “**In Place**” for this component. For one school, lack of survey results negatively impacted its score. For other schools, the PLC minutes did not clearly indicate the use of performance data.

## Appendix A: Detail Fidelity Scores by Component

Due to rounding, the component score may differ slightly from the sum score total.

### Core Component 1: Individualized Student Learning

#### A. Blended Learning Implementation

Key Component	Measure	Data Source	Target	Weight	Score	
<b>Expand options for students to individualize their progress and learning path. (SOW 3.3 and 1.4.13)</b>	<b>Quality:</b> % of blended learning best practices observed to “some degree” or a “great degree” in classrooms.	Spring Site Observation	60%	.20	0.27	
	<b>Dosage:</b> % of observations using....	Blended Learning	School-Level CWT Data	70%	.10	0.02
		Focused Groups		70%	.10	0.01
		Small Groups		70%	.10	0.03
		Stations/Centers		70%	.10	0.01
	<b>Reach:</b> % observations using at least one of these strategies (blended learning, focused groups, small groups, and stations/centers) at target levels.	School-Level CWT Data	60%	.20	0.04	
	<b>Reactions:</b> % of students and priority teachers who reported change in instruction was beneficial.	IMPACT Student survey	70%	.10	0.12	
		IMPACT Teacher survey	70%	.10	0.13	
<b>COMPONENT SCORE: 0.63</b>						

B. IMPACT Classrooms

Key Component	Measure	Documents Needed	Target	Weight	Score
<b>Expand options for students to individualize their progress and learning path. (SOW 3.3 and 1.4.13)</b>	<b>Quality:</b> % of priority teachers who “agree” to “strongly” agree that IMPACT classrooms gave knowledge and skills needed to implement BL.	IMPACT Teacher Survey	60%	.10	0.14
	<b>Dosage:</b> # of IMPACT classrooms available for teacher use.	IMPACT Classroom Attendance	1 per school	.40	0.40
	<b>Reach:</b> % of priority teachers observing at least 1 IMPACT classroom per year.	IMPACT Classroom Attendance	70%	.40	<b>0.27</b>
	<b>Reactions:</b> % of priority teachers who “agree” to “strongly” agree that observing IMPACT classrooms was a good use of their time.	IMPACT Teacher Survey	60%	.10	0.13
<b>COMPONENT SCORE: 0.94</b>					



C. Blended Learning Technology

Key Component	Measure	Documents Needed	Target	Weight	Score
<b>Expand options for students to individualize their progress and learning path. (SOW 3.3 and 1.4.13)</b>	<b>Quality:</b> % of students and priority teachers who “agree” to “strongly agree” they are able to use technology to complete school work.	IMPACT Student Survey	70%	.10	0.13
		IMPACT Teacher Survey	70%	.10	0.14
	<b>Dosage:</b> % of classrooms observed using technology devices to complete classwork.	CWT – Student Tech Use	60%	.25	0.16
		CWT – Teacher Tech Use	60%	.25	0.23
	<b>Reach:</b> % of students observed using laptops in class.	Spring Site Observations	60%	.10	0.11
	<b>Reactions:</b> % of students and priority teachers who “agree” or “strongly agree” that the quality of student work is improved with technology.	IMPACT Student Survey	70%	.10	0.12
		IMPACT Teacher Survey	70%	.10	0.09
<b>COMPONENT SCORE:</b>					<b>0.97</b>

## Core Component 2: Student Transition Activities

### A. Summer Transition Camp

Key Component	Measure	Documents Needed	Target	Weight	Score
<b>Expand and support student transition activities (SOW 4.1)</b>	<b>Quality:</b> % of best practices implemented.	STC Focus Group	70%	.10	0.14
	<b>Dosage:</b> % of participating students attending 1 day.	STC Attendance Records	70%	.50	0.71
	<b>Reach:</b> % of targeted students attending.	STC Attendance Records	40%	.20	<b>0.22</b>
	<b>Reactions:</b> % of students who rate the Summer Transition Camp as “Useful” to “Very Useful”.	STC Focus Group	70%	.20	0.29
<b>COMPONENT SCORE: 1.36</b>					

### B. College Readiness Institute

Key Component	Measure	Documents Needed	Target	Weight	Score
<b>Expand and support student transition activities (SOW 4.1)</b>	<b>Quality:</b> % 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	70%	.10	0.12
	<b>Dosage:</b> # of sessions offered.	CRI Attendance Records	7 per school	.50	0.96
	<b>Reach:</b> % of schools who maintained attendance records for at least 1 event.	CRI Attendance Records	40%	.20	0.50
	<b>Reactions:</b> % students who “agree” or “strongly agree” that the CRI was a good use of time.	IMPACT Student Survey	70%	.20	0.24
<b>COMPONENT SCORE: 1.82</b>					

## Core Component 3: Professional Development

### A. District PD for Priority Teachers

Key Component	Measure	Documents Needed	Target	Weight	Score
<b>Offer faculty professional development (SOW 2.1.7)</b>	<b>Quality:</b> % of priority teachers who “agree” to “strongly” agree that PD gave knowledge and skills needed to implement BL.	IMPACT Teacher Survey	70%	.10	0.13
	<b>Dosage:</b> # of PD sessions offered to priority teachers.	Attendance Records	10 per school	.50	0.50
	<b>Reach:</b> % of priority teachers who attended professional development.	Attendance Records	80%	.30	0.37
	<b>Reactions:</b> % of priority teachers who “agree” to “strongly agree” that PD opportunities were time well spent.	IMPACT Teacher Survey	70%	.10	0.13
<b>COMPONENT SCORE:</b>					<b>1.12</b>

### B. BL Coaching for Priority Teachers

Key Component	Measure	Documents Needed	Target	Weight	Score
<b>Offer faculty professional development (SOW 2.1.7)</b>	<b>Quality:</b> % of priority teachers who “agree” to “strongly” agree that BL coaching gave knowledge and skills needed to implement BL.	IMPACT Teacher Survey	70%	.10	0.12
	<b>Dosage:</b> % of days per month BL coaches provided support (DA, PD) to priority teachers.	BLC Coaching Logs	72 total days per year	.40	0.52
	<b>Reach:</b> % of priority teachers who received monthly coaching.	BLC Coaching Logs	70%	.40	0.54
	<b>Reactions:</b> % of priority teachers who “agree” to “strongly agree” that BLC’s are responsive to their PD needs.	IMPACT Teacher Survey	70%	.10	0.13
<b>COMPONENT SCORE:</b>					<b>1.32</b>

C. Priority Teacher Blended Learning Self-Assessment

Key Component	Measure	Documents Needed	Target	Weight	Score
<b>Expand and support student transition activities (SOW 4.1)</b>	<b>Quality:</b> % of priority teachers who demonstrated growth in self-assessment scores from previous administration.	BL Self-Assessment	60%	Not measured in 2015 <sup>1</sup>	Not Measured
	<b>Dosage:</b> % of priority teachers who completed the self-assessment.	BL Self-Assessment	80%	.50	0.36
	<b>Reach:</b> % of schools that showed growth in self-assessment scores from the fall assessment (If an individual school showed growth, they received 100%).	BL Self-Assessment	80%	.40	0.50
	<b>Reactions:</b> % 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	70%	.10	0.12
<b>COMPONENT SCORE:</b>					<b>0.99</b>

<sup>1</sup> For many schools, faculty who completed the self-assessment in the fall did not complete it in the spring. It was not possible to track the change in individual teachers’ scores.

## Core Component 4: Data Driven Decision Making

### A. Using Data to Inform Instruction

Key Component	Measure	Documents Needed	Target	Weight	Score
<b>Expand PLC's to support new reform models, instructional strategies, and use of data to include instruction (SOW 2.1.13)</b>	<b>Quality:</b> % of priority teachers who "agree" to "strongly agree" that they learned actionable strategies they can apply in the classroom.	IMPACT Teacher Survey	70%	.10	0.12
	<b>Dosage:</b> # of times per year targeted PLC's met.	School-Level PLC Meeting Minutes	8 per quarter per school	.40	0.38
	<b>Reach:</b> % of PLC meeting minutes that noted the use of performance data.	School-Level PLC Meeting Minutes	70%	.40	0.48
	<b>Reactions:</b> % 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	70%	.10	0.12
<b>COMPONENT SCORE: 1.10</b>					

## Appendix B: Summary of School Fidelity Scores

School	Blended Learning Implementation	Impact Classrooms	Blended Learning Technology	Summer Transition Camp	College Readiness Instituted	District PD for Teachers	BL Coaching for Priority Teachers	Priority Teacher BL Self-Assessment	Using Data to Inform Instruction
Brawley Middle	Emerging	In Place	Emerging	In Place	In Place	In Place	In Place	In Place	In Place
East Iredell Middle	Emerging	<b>In Place</b>	In Place	In Place	In Place	In Place	In Place	In Place	In Place
Lake Norman High	Emerging	In Place	Emerging	In Place	In Place	In Place	In Place	Emerging	In Place
Lakeshore Middle	Emerging	In Place	In Place	In Place	In Place	In Place	In Place	In Place	In Place
Monticello	Emerging	Emerging	In Place	In Place	In Place	In Place	Emerging	In Place	Emerging
Mount Mourne	Emerging	In Place	In Place	In Place	In Place	In Place	In Place	Emerging	Emerging
North Iredell High	Emerging	Emerging	Emerging	In Place	In Place	In Place	In Place	In Place	In Place
North Iredell Middle	Emerging	In Place	Emerging	In Place	In Place	In Place	In Place	In Place	In Place
Northview Middle	Emerging	In Place	In Place	In Place	In Place	In Place	In Place	Emerging	In Place
Pressly	Emerging	Emerging	Emerging	In Place	In Place	Emerging	Emerging	In Place	Emerging
South Iredell High	Emerging	In Place	Emerging	In Place	In Place	In Place	In Place	In Place	In Place
Statesville High	Emerging	Emerging	In Place	In Place	In Place	In Place	In Place	Emerging	Emerging
Statesville Middle	Emerging	In Place	In Place	In Place	In Place	In Place	In Place	In Place	In Place
Troutman Middle	Emerging	In Place	Emerging	In Place	In Place	In Place	In Place	In Place	In Place
West Iredell High	Emerging	In Place	Emerging	In Place	In Place	In Place	In Place	Emerging	In Place
West Iredell Middle	Emerging	In Place	Emerging	In Place	In Place	In Place	In Place	In Place	In Place
<b>District</b>	<b>Emerging</b>	<b>Emerging</b>	<b>Emerging</b>	<b>In Place</b>	<b>In Place</b>	<b>In Place</b>	<b>In Place</b>	<b>Emerging</b>	<b>In Place</b>