



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The goal of the Coaching for Technology Integration program was to help campus instructional staff and administrators improve their understanding of 1) ways of thinking and working directly with technology tools and resources, 2) how teaching and learning is changed when technologies are used, and 3) the way technology and subject area content influence and constrain each other. The approach is based on the interactions between three major knowledge categories: pedagogy, content, and technology. This work was supported using Blended Learning (BL) Instructional Lead Coaches (ILCs) to bridge instruction, content, and technology by providing onsite campus support to campus instructional staff and administrators. The program received \$1,099,610 in Title IV funding for the 2019-20 school year.¹

The purpose of this evaluation was to summarize program implementation, professional development (PD), perceptions of the program, and the use of teacher-created landing pages. The evaluator used program documents, interviews, observations, and surveys to evaluate the program. The district transitioned to at-home learning beginning March 23, 2020. Resulting changes in program implementation are discussed in the next section of the report.

EVALUATION QUESTIONS/OUTCOMES

How was the Coaching for Technology Integration program implemented during the 2019-20 school year?

The 2019-20 Coaching for Technology Integration program supported the districtwide initiative to have one device per student by creating a BL environment across the entire district. In 2018-19, the Instructional Technology (IT) Department began implementing 1:1 device use by distributing Chrome books to each middle school student. In 2019-20, 34 high schools received Chrome books for each student. Some elementary schools received digital devices (Kindles, grades K-2; Chrome books, grades 3 to 6, as applicable) for each of their students in 2019-20. Complete implementation at the elementary level was planned for the future; however, individual devices were distributed to many more elementary students after spring break to ensure

students had access to a device during the district's move to at-home learning.²

In addition to providing devices, the initiative was supported through the use of BL ILCs, whose roles were restructured in 2019-20. The changes between 2018-19 and 2019-20 are described in Table 1.

Table 1: Blended Learning ILC Role Changes from 2018-19 to 2019-20

Blended Learning ILCs...	
2018-19	2019-20
were not assigned to a network.	were each assigned to a network.
reported to the 2018-19 ILC program ED.	reported directly to EDs from their assigned network.
focused on supporting campuses that used BL instruction.	focused on supporting campuses from a content lens, as well as with BL technology.

Source: Interview with program director, 10/10/19.

In 2019-20, a total of nine BL ILCs provided onsite campus support to Campus Instructional Coaches (CICs), Principals, Assistant Principals (APs), and teachers (Monday-Thursday).³ While the BL ILCs focused on BL technology support, they also provided content support to the campuses in their assigned network.

BL ILCs supported campuses by:

- designing and providing on-site support activities to increase efficiencies in the use of the changing technology tools and resources,
- developing and delivering training to campus administrators and instructional staff,
- providing support to CICs to reinforce BL pedagogy through new routines and procedures to better integrate technology,
- providing differentiated support and PD for campus administrative teams to improve campus data-driven decision making and support school instructional design,
- providing BL support to all the content ILCs so they could expose their campuses to BL, and

¹ The funding amount was provided by Special Revenue Funds Management on 02/28/20.

² The district also provided hot spots, as possible, to give students internet access; however, hot spot distribution during the district's move to at-home learning is beyond the scope of this report.

³ BL ILCs spent time with their Executive Director (ED) on Fridays. BL ILCs received campus support assignments from their network ED.

- preparing CIC conference presentations with other ILCs to ensure that BL was included and that CICs could then take BL-related information back to their campuses.

BL ILCs also assisted campuses that participated in technology-related partnership grants. These included the private Verizon Innovative Learning (VIL) grant at seven campuses and the Middle School Innovation Zone (MIZ) grant, a TEA grant, at four campuses.

ILC responsibilities shifted after at-home learning began on March 23, 2020 because of COVID-19. The program manager reported that ILCs focused on supporting campuses with technology by troubleshooting virtual classrooms, working with CICs to troubleshoot any student technology needs, hosting virtual Professional Learning Communities as needed, and hosting virtual PD sessions for CICs and campuses as needed.

Blended Learning ILC Observations

To better understand the BL ILC role, the evaluator conducted half-day observations (one each) with three of the nine BL ILCs in 2019-20 (between December 2019 and February 2020). In general, BL ILCs were observed collaborating with others to support campus staff. One BL ILC was observed working with VIL coaches to support Medrano and Cary middle schools. The same BL ILC then visited Comstock Middle School to assist with Imagine Learning software training for six newly hired MIZ teachers, and to check in with the CIC about any concerns.

The second BL ILC and another ILC were observed assisting with the Dallas Blended Learning and Equity Support Middle School Cohort Foundations Workshop, a training for a cohort of six middle schools selected to participate in a pilot program to implement the BL model.⁴ The workshop was presented by Education Elements and provided foundational information about blended learning.

The third BL ILC and two other ILCs were observed assisting with a BL training provided by VIL presenters for four VIL middle school campuses.⁵

What BL professional development was provided to CICs in the 2019-20 school year?

The BL ILCs worked with 64 ILCs to provide PD for the CIC Conferences using BL so that CICs could then expose their campuses to BL. ILCs provided training to the CICs at two full-day CIC conferences.⁶ CICs attended one content (English Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, or Social Studies) and two Choice sessions at each conference.⁷

Of the 350 CICs, 38 percent ($n = 133$; 91 elementary, 17 middle, and 25 high school level) participated in the October 2019 CIC Conference, which included 11 available Choice sessions. The most attended Choice sessions included Coaching: Observation and Feedback ($n = 50$, 38%), Google Toolbox: Tools for Tracking ($n = 42$, 32%), and Coaching in the Moment ($n = 32$, 24%).

Twenty-five percent ($n = 89$, 64 elementary, 15 middle, and 10 high school level) of the 350 CICs attended the January 2020 CIC Conference. The most attended Choice sessions included Map Data and Reports ($n = 28$, 31%), Google Toolbox ($n = 20$, 22%), and Let's Get This Write ($n = 15$, 17%).

What were the perceptions of the Coaching for Technology Integration Program during the 2019-20 school year?

Perceptions of BL ILCs

A survey about perceptions of ILCs was administered in May 2020 and responses were received from 8 EDs, 51 APs, 219 CICs, and 65 ILCs as part of the Differentiated Instructional Support for District Needs Program evaluation (Barton, 2020). Results applicable to this project are provided.

Prior to at-home learning, almost half (49%) of ILCs indicated that they provided technology/BL support to their CICs. Regarding BL ILCs specifically, 75 percent of CICs, 62 percent of ILCs, and 37 percent of EDs reported that technology use was adequately supported. Many CICs (68%) responded that the technology supports received from their ILC in 2019-20 were helpful or very helpful. Over 50 percent of the APs agreed or strongly agreed that the ILCs provided technology support that met the needs of students (53%), teachers (55%), and CICs (55%).

CIC Perceptions of CIC Conferences

Program staff members provided the evaluator with CIC feedback results from the two CIC conferences. The October 2020 conference data showed that, overall, 77 percent of the 133 CICs in attendance were satisfied or very satisfied with the Choice session training provided. Ninety-two percent of the 89 CICs that attended the January 2020 CIC conference were satisfied or very satisfied with the Choice sessions provided.

What percentage of teachers created landing pages during the 2019-20 school year?

The Learning Management System (LMS), a technology system adopted by the District in 2018, could be used by

⁴ Pilot program schools included: Dade, Holmes, Kennedy-Curry, Piedmont, Seagoville, and Young Men's Leadership Academy.

⁵ VIL training was provided to Atwell, Lang, Medrano, and Quintanilla middle schools.

⁶ Conferences occurred in October 2019 and January 2020. Additional conferences were scheduled in November 2019 and March 2020 but

canceled because of damage to district buildings after widespread storms and CICs needing to be on campus to prepare for spring testing, respectively.

⁷ Conference attendance was not mandatory for the CICs.

teachers to access the curriculum provided by the Teaching and Learning department, create lessons for each class, and give class assignments to students. Assignments were provided to students through a landing page for each class created in each teacher's LMS. Students could use their devices to access and complete assignments virtually as well as view their grades.

In 2019-20, a districtwide goal of the Coaching for Technology Integration program was to increase the number of middle and high school teachers who created landing pages. Program staff members provided end-of-year data about the number of middle and high school teachers who created landing pages for each class that they taught.⁸ In 2019-20, 56 percent of classes had landing pages created by teachers (class *N* = 14,427). This was slightly higher than the 55 percent of classes that had pages (class *N* = 12,138) in 2018-19.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Continue to provide campuses with blended learning and technology support through BL ILCs. Ongoing technology support and training will be imperative as the district seeks to build buy-in for BL, expand BL in the future,

and help campus staff through COVID-19-related technology challenges. BL ILCs were observed assisting vendors in providing BL training to campus staff members, and campus staff members positively rated BL ILC support. Over 50 percent of the APs indicated that they agreed or strongly agreed that the ILCs provided technology support that met the needs of students (53%), teachers (55%), and CICs (55%). Most CICs (68%) responded that the technology support received from their ILC in 2019-20 was helpful or very helpful.

Continue to provide CIC Conferences and encourage CIC attendance. Of the 350 CICs, 38 percent (*n* = 133) participated in the October 2019 CIC Conference and 25 percent (*n* = 89) attended the January 2020 CIC conference. Increased CIC attendance will allow CICs to further expose their campuses to BL and grow BL proficiency in the district.

REFERENCE

Barton, M. (2020). 2019-20 Evaluation of the Differentiated Instructional Support for District Needs Program. Dallas, TX. Dallas Independent School District.

EA20-634-4
Rosemary Garcia-Rincón, B.S., Evaluation Analyst I

©2020 Dallas Independent School District (Dallas ISD)
Mail a written request for permission to use or reproduce any part of this document to:
Dallas ISD Department of Evaluation and Assessment; H. B. Bell School Support Center; 2909 Buckner Blvd.; Box10; Dallas, TX 75228

An electronic version of this report can be found at www.dallasisd.org/Page/888.
For more information, please contact Program Evaluation at evaluation@dallasisd.org.

⁸ The number of middle and high school teachers was provided; however, the number of courses taught was not. The number of courses taught was calculated using estimates provided by department staff indicating that, at

minimum, teachers taught six classes at the middle school level and five at the high school level.