

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The 2020-21 Differentiated Instructional and Technology Support program in the Dallas Independent School District (ISD) is the result of a recent merge of the Differentiated Instructional Support for the District Needs program and the Coaching for Technology Integration program. The goal is to provide instructional support to Dallas ISD campuses. To accomplish this goal, Network Coordinators (NCs) and instructional lead coaches (ILCs) served as the bridge between School Leadership (SL) and campuses – with NCs and ILCs providing instructional support to Dallas ISD teachers, campus instructional coaches (CICs), principals, and assistant principals (APs). NCs provide leadership training to campus staff while ILCs report to feeder pattern executive directors (EDs) and work with content and instructional experts from Teaching and Learning (T&L) to provide training for curriculum development in four content areas: reading, mathematics, social studies, and science. With the support of ILCs, each campus developed a structured plan for campus staff to design lessons that increase the use of technology within content instruction. The budget for the 2020-21 Differentiated Instructional and Technology Support program was \$8,741,431 from Title I funds, an increase of \$750,605 from the previous year.

A total of 68 ILCs provided instructional support to campuses. Example supports include: 1) assisting with the implementation of district curricula, 2) developing action plans, 3) providing feedback for reaction plans, 4) on-site coaching of teachers, 5) designing and providing on-site support activities to increase efficiencies in the use of the changing technology tools and resources, and 6) providing technology support to all the content ILCs.

Nine NCs provided leadership training to campus staff and each NC supported their three Executive Directors from their assigned network (e.g., Central, Southeast, and Northeast). NCs provided support to Dallas ISD campuses. Example supports include: 1) designing, coordinating, and delivering professional development on various topics; 2) coordinating principal and AP meetings with EDs and ILCs within their network; 3) locating, analyzing, and presenting various types and levels of data; 4) coordinating with other departments for network and campus-level trainings.

EVALUATION QUESTIONS/OUTCOMES

What were the characteristics of ILCs and NCs in 2020-21?

During the 2020-21 school year, of the 68 ILCs worked in the Dallas ISD, the majority were female (84%) and more

than half (60%) were African American. Most ILCs (70%) held a master's degree. In addition, 100 percent of ILCs remained in their role for the entire 2020-21 school year. In addition, of the nine NCs who worked in the district, the majority were female (71%) and 43 percent were each White or African American. Most NCs (57%) held a bachelor's degree. In addition, 86 percent of NCs were retained as district NCs for the 2020-21 school year.

What was the distribution of ED and ILC campus visits by network during the 2020-21 school year?

During the 2020-21 school year, 1,597 ED/SL visits and 4,059 ILC visits were conducted on Dallas ISD campuses (Table 1). The largest percentage of visits occurred in the Central (ED/SL: 42.9%; ILC: 34.0%) and Northwest (ED/SL: 20.7%; ILC: 14.3%) networks, and the smallest percentage occurred in the Magnet (ED/SL: 3.9%; ILC: 3.4%) and Transformation (ED/SL: 0.6%; ILC: 4.8%) networks. ED spot observations were not reported in 2020-21 because of incomplete data.

Table 1: 2020-21 ED/SL and ILC Visits by Network

Network	ED/SL Visits		ILC Visits	
	N	%	N	%
ACE	130	8.1	184	4.5
Central	685	42.9	1,382	34.0
Magnet	63	3.9	139	3.4
Northeast	317	19.8	441	10.9
Northwest	331	20.7	580	14.3
Southeast	29	1.8	550	13.6
Southwest	32	2.0	589	14.5
Transformation	10	0.6	194	4.8
District	1,597	100.0	4,059	100.0

Source: Campus Coaching Tracker data files.

Note: Some percentages do not sum to 100 due to rounding.

What professional development opportunities were offered and completed by ILCs in 2020-21?

Three ILC Summit Sessions were held. Attendees included 73 ILCs on January 11, 2021, 64 on February 8, 2021; and 58 on April 19, 2021.

What were the perceptions of EDs, ILCs, NCs, CICs, and APs regarding the implementation of the Differentiated Instructional and Technology Support program in 2020-21?

Similar to 2019-20, survey responses regarding the Differentiated Instructional and Technology Support program were generally positive.

Executive Director Survey

Of the 21 EDs invited, 11 (52%) completed at least part of the survey. The most common service that EDs assigned to their reading and mathematics ILCs included guiding, planning, and modeling support for PLCs (91%). The most common service that EDs assigned to their Science ILCs included developing instructional practices (46%).

When describing two strengths of the 2020-21 ILC model (11 responses), EDs most frequently mentioned the content knowledge of the ILCs ($n = 5$, 46%), coaching support ($n = 3$; 27%), and the data/need informed ILC assignment ($n = 2$; 18%). Regarding the supports that would be beneficial for the ILC model for the 2021-22 school year (11 responses), EDs most often mentioned technology support (ILCs; $n = 3$; 27%) and adding more ILCs in certain content areas (e.g., Social Studies and Science; $n = 2$; 18%).

Instructional Lead Coach Survey

Fifty-one (75%) of the 68 invited ILCs completed at least part of the survey. Per ILCs, the three most common services frequently or very frequently requested by EDs included reviewing and interpreting campus data (96%); guiding, planning, and modeling support for PLCs (94%); and developing instructional practices (94%).

The frequency with which ILCs reported providing services to CICs and APs was generally high, but somewhat varied depending on the support recipient.

- Guiding, planning, and modeling support for PLCs (CICs: 92%; APs: 86%) and training campus administrators on instructional practices (CICs: 86%; APs: 82%) were two services that ILCs frequently or very frequently provided to both CICs and APs.
- While 84 percent of ILCs reported frequently or very frequently leading PD sessions for CICs, a smaller percentage (67%) frequently or very frequently led PD sessions for APs. In contrast, 75 percent of ILCs reported they frequently or very frequently helped implement curriculum for APs, compared to 96 percent of ILCs for CICs.

ILC respondents highly rated the helpfulness of the services that they received from program. Sixty-five percent of ILCs rated the PD collaboration with the T&L department as moderately or extremely helpful. Eighty-two percent agreed the collaboration between T&L and ILCs provided content resources that effectively provided instructional support to campuses. In addition, most ILC survey respondents agreed or strongly agreed that 1) APs (96%), CICs (100%), and principals (98%) were receptive to the service(s) that they provided, and 2) the ILC model was effective at providing instructional support to campuses (94%).

Network Coordinator Survey

Of the 9 NCs invited to complete the survey, 7 (78%) completed at least part of the survey. NCs reported that the three most common services frequently or very frequently

requested by ILCs reviewing campus data (86%); leading PD sessions (57%); and develop action plans (50%).

The frequency with which NCs reported providing services to CICs and APs was generally high, but somewhat varied depending on the support recipient.

- Reviewing campus data (CICs: 71%; APs: 86%), guiding, planning and modeling PLCs (CICs: 43%; APs: 57%) and developing instructional practices (APs: 72%) were three services that NCs frequently or very frequently provided to CICs and APs.
- NCs reported frequently or very frequently developing instructional practices for APs (72%) and led PD sessions for APs (57%). Similarly, 14 percent of NCs reported that they frequently or very frequently provided technology/blended learning support for CICs, compared to 29 percent of NCs for APs.

All NCs reported that the weekly NC meetings were either moderately helpful (29%) or extremely helpful (71%). NC respondents also reported that they experienced some improvement or a lot of improvement in the following skills: autonomy (14%), collaboration (57%), flexibility (29%), and PD (57%). NC respondents also reported that they need more support in the following areas: developing knowledge and competency (57%), collaboration (29%), and coaching skills (14%). All NC survey respondents agreed to strongly agreed that the ILC model was effective at providing instructional support to campuses and almost all NCs agreed to strongly agreed that Principals (100%), APs (100%) and CICs (86%) were receptive to the services they provided.

Campus Instructional Coach Survey

Of the 347 CICs invited to complete the survey, 119 (34%) completed at least part of the survey. During 2020-21, 92 percent of CIC respondents reported that an ILC had provided services to them or their campuses, and 59 percent reported that their ILCs provided support often.

The most frequent service that ILCs provided CICs was to help implement district curriculum (42%). In addition, most CICs expressed favorable views about their experiences with the Differentiated Instructional and Technology Support program. Regarding the quality of services provided by ILCs, the majority of CICs (67%) rated the technology support they received from ILCs as either helpful or very helpful. Additionally, Most CICs agreed or strongly agreed that ILCs provided services met the needs of their campuses (83%) and responded to their campus needs in a timely manner (83%). Finally, the majority of CICs (79%) agreed or strongly agreed that the ILC structure was effective.

- Eighty-one percent of CICs reported they improved in knowledge from this year's ILC support.
- Seventy-nine percent of CICs improved in providing feedback as a result of the ILC support they received this year.

- Seventy-seven percent of CICs reported that they improved in data and coaching skills as a result of this year's ILC support.

CICs considered the most successful support (119 responses) to be PD sessions that ILCs provided ($n = 44$; 37%), followed by frequent and timely communication with ILCs ($n = 22$; 19%) and curriculum and lesson support that the ILCs provided ($n = 20$; 17%). In addition, CICs reported that the two most important ways that ILCs can continue to support CICs (119 responses) included continuing to provide PD session for their growth ($n = 64$; 54%) and more frequent and timely communication between ILCs and CICs ($n = 28$; 24%).

Assistant Principal Survey

Of the 467 APs invited to complete the survey, 170 (36%) completed at least part of the survey. Eighty-eight percent reported that their ILCs provided services to their campuses, with the three most common services provided to APs being: help to implement curriculum (47%), developing instructional practices (44%), and providing feedback on action plans (40%).

The majority of APs (71%) agreed or strongly agreed that ILC structure was effective at providing instructional support to their campuses. When describing the skills that improved from the ILC model, AP respondents reported that they experienced at least some to a lot of improvement in their knowledge (63%), providing feedback (58%), coaching (57%), and analyzing data (56%).

When APs described the two most important ways that ILCs can continue to support APs (170 responses), APs most frequently mentioned that ILCs can continue to develop and lead PD sessions ($n = 45$; 27%), followed by coaching teachers and CICs ($n = 42$; 25%), and review and interpret campus data ($n = 26$; 15%). In addition, regarding the two most successful supports APs received from ILCs, APs most frequently mentioned providing PD session ($n = 43$; 25%), followed by data support ($n = 36$; 21%), and lesson planning and instructional support ($n = 30$; 18%).

What percentage of campuses have created a structured campus technology plan for staff during the 2020-21 school year?

In 2020-21, the Differentiated Instructional and Technology Support program supported the development of a structured

campus technology plan for Dallas ISD campus staff and program staff members provided end-of-year data to the program evaluator. A frequency analysis was conducted and showed that a total of 230 (100%) Dallas ISD campuses created a structured campus technology plan for campus staff.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Improve the tracking of ED spot observation data. Missing or incomplete data prevented the ED spot observations from being used in the 2020-21 evaluation of the program. Differentiated Instructional and Technology Support program staff members should determine how the Campus Coaching Tracker file can be used more effectively to track ED spot observations during the school year. These data could be invaluable for monitoring the impact of these supports over time.

Continue using ILCs in their current roles. In 2020-21, most EDs, ILCs, NCs, CICs, and APs had positive views of the ILC model and reported that the ILC model was effective at providing instructional support to campuses. Thus, ILCs should continue to focus on providing direct campus instructional support that empowers and builds capacity within CICs and APs.

Further support ILCs by continuing to build their knowledge and skills. In 2020-21, most ILCs reported that the ILC Summit Sessions were helpful but also reported that they needed additional support to further develop their knowledge and competency (e.g., using technology). Differentiated Instructional and Technology Support program staff members should determine how to fine tune PD sessions and provide more resources for ILCs, as needed.

REFERENCES

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

EA21-526-4

Erica Landrau, Ph.D., Evaluation Analyst I

©2021 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 [and full 2020-21 report] can be found at www.dallasisd.org/Page/888.

For more information, please contact Program Evaluation at evaluation@dallasisd.org.