

8(g) STATEWIDE PROGRAMS
State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education
Project Summary Evaluation Form
FY 2011-2012

Administering Agency: Louisiana Department of Education **Log Number:** S060

Program Title: The System for Teacher and Student Advancement (TAP)

Program Administrator: Mary Ann Harmon

Amount Funded: \$500,000

Constitutional Category:

Impact: TAP is a research-based school reform initiative intended to recruit, motivate, develop, and retain high-quality teachers to increase student achievement. TAP is unique in that it is comprehensive in nature, combining four key elements (Multiple Career Paths, Ongoing Professional Growth, Instructionally-Focused Accountability, and Performance-Based Compensation). When implemented at the same time, the four elements provide a balanced system of high expectations, opportunity for growth, accountability, and support for schools to do what is necessary to improve. The program had two objectives:

Objective 1: From fall 2010 to fall 2011, 70% or more of eligible TAP schools will receive a value added growth score of 3 or more. This objective was assessed using SAS/EVASS Value-Added reports. Although based on 2010-2011 data, it was determined that 42 of the 54 schools or 78% received value-added growth scores of 3 or more.

Objective 2: Within the 2011-2012 school year, teachers in TAP Schools will demonstrate skillfulness in effective classroom instruction, as demonstrated by 80% of the teachers scoring at or above proficient on the research-based TAP Instructional Rubric at the end of the school year. Across the total population of teachers, 77% of the teachers achieved the stated standard. However, when data for continuing TAP schools (Year 2 and beyond) is used, the percent of teachers scoring at or above proficiency on the TAP Instructional Rubrics was 80%.

RATING SUMMARY		
Section	Points Possible	Program Score
I. Participants	12	12
II. Personnel	18	18
III. Activities	21	21
IV. Constitutional Category	18	18
V. Objectives and Evaluation	45	45
VI. Results	36	33
Overall Rating	150	147
	September 1, 2012	
Evaluator	Date	

Identify the key personnel responsible for program implementation and indicate those interviewed (X) during site visits.

X	Local-Level Personnel (Name)	Program Position	School/District
x	Lizabeth Frischhertz	Chief Officer for Accountability, Assessment, and Evaluation	East Baton Rouge Parish School System
x	Ruth Bennett	Coordinator of District Assessment	East Baton Rouge Parish School System
x	Stephanie Tate	Principal	East Baton Rouge Parish School System Claiborne Elementary School
x	Candace Maiden	Teacher (Grades 4&5)	East Baton Rouge Parish School System Claiborne Elementary School
x	Jude A Harris	Mentor Teacher (Grade 4)	East Baton Rouge Parish School System Claiborne Elementary School
x	Josephine Batiste	Principal	East Baton Rouge Parish School System Cedarcrest-Southmoor Elementary School
x	Jan Evans	Master Teacher	East Baton Rouge Parish School System Cedarcrest-Southmoor Elementary School
x	Ebony Montgomery	Assistant Principal	East Baton Rouge Parish School System Cedarcrest-Southmoor Elementary School
x	Cheryl Brown	Master Teacher	East Baton Rouge Parish School System Cedarcrest-Southmoor Elementary School
x	Laura Desedare	Teacher	East Baton Rouge Parish School System Cedarcrest-Southmoor Elementary School
x	Erica Adams	Teacher	East Baton Rouge Parish School System Cedarcrest-Southmoor Elementary School
x	Emilie Whitley	Teacher	East Baton Rouge Parish School System Cedarcrest-Southmoor Elementary School
x	Amy Dunbar	Teacher	East Baton Rouge Parish School System Cedarcrest-Southmoor Elementary School
x	Dr. Charles Raviotta	Supervisor of Staff Development	St. Bernard Parish School System
x	Doris Larason	Assistant Superintendent	St. Bernard Parish School System
x	Doris Voitier	Superintendent	St. Bernard Parish School System
x	Denise Pritchard	Principal	Trist Middle School St. Bernard Parish School System
x	Kara Colburn	Master Teacher	Trish Middle School St. Bernard Parish School System

x	Walter Lee	Superintendent	DeSoto Parish School System
x	Lillie P. Giles	Principal	DeSoto Parish School System Logansport High School
x	Sissy Bagley	Teacher	DeSoto Parish School System Logansport High School
x	Dr. Alvin Brossette	Principal	Natchitoches Parish School System Park Elementary School
x	Brooke Williams	Assistant Principal	Natchitoches Parish School System Park Elementary School
x	Leanie Fitzgerald	Master Teacher	Natchitoches Parish School System Park Elementary School
x	Zenda Sawyer	Teacher	Natchitoches Parish School System Park Elementary School
x	Nicole Rudolph	Teacher	Natchitoches Parish School System Park Elementary School
x	Catherine McClinton	Teacher	Natchitoches Parish School System Park Elementary School
x	Nan Hargett	Teacher	Natchitoches Parish School System Park Elementary School
x	Larry Minor	Master Teacher	East Baton Rouge Parish School System Lanier Charter School
x	Charlotte G. Olivier	Supervisor of Curriculum	Iberia Parish School System
x	Carey Laviolette	Assistant Superintendent	Iberia Parish School System
x	Heath Hulin	Principal	Iberia Parish School System Jeanerette Senior High School
x	Julia Ferguson	Mentor Teacher	Iberia Parish School System Jeanerette Senior High School
x	Brett Ferguson	Mentor Teacher	Iberia Parish School System Jeanerette Senior High School
x	Lynette Hawk-Hill	Mentor Teacher	Iberia Parish School System Jeanerette Elementary School
x	Racquelle Roberts	Teacher	Iberia Parish School System Jeanerette High School
x	Jennifer Foster	Master Teacher	Jeanerette Elementary School
x	Stella Johnson	Mentor Teacher	Iberia Parish School System Jeanerette Elementary School
x	Chris M. Kimbell	Principal	Lafourche Parish School System Raceland Middle School
x	Pamela Folse	Curriculum Supervisor	Lafourche Parish School System
x	Lisa O. Boudreaux	Master Teacher	Lafourche Parish School System Raceland Middle School
x	Lisa A. Boudin	Master Teacher	Lafourche Parish School System Raceland Middle School

School Sites Visited	District or Geographical Location
Claiborne Elementary School	East Baton Rouge Parish School System
Cedarcrest-Southmoor Elementary School	East Baton Rouge Parish School System
Lanier Charter School	East Baton Rouge Parish School System
Logansport High School	DeSoto Parish School System
Jeanerette Elementary School	Iberia Parish School System
Jeanerette High School	Iberia Parish School System
Raceland Middle School	Lafourche Parish School System

X	State-Level Personnel (Name)	Program Position
x	Sheila Talamo	State TAP Director
x	Mary Ann Harmon	Education Program Consultant: 8(g) Program Administrator

EVALUATION RATINGS

Using all evidence gathered in the evaluation process, rate the following sections according to the specified criteria. (Please put the number assigned for each indicator in the spaces provided.)

I. Participants	0= Absent	1= Unsatisfactory	2= Satisfactory	3= Excellent
Indicator				
1 The grade level (or experience level) of participants served was appropriate, given the objectives of the program.				3
2 The number of participants served was appropriate, given the objectives of the program.				3
3 The number of participants served was appropriate, given the resources of this program.				3
4 The criteria for selecting participants were appropriate.				3
Section I Overall Rating <u> 12 </u> of 12				
Section I Rationale:				
Indicator 1				
Indicator 2				
Indicator 3				
Indicator 4				

II. Personnel		0= Absent	1= Unsatisfactory	2= Satisfactory	3= Excellent
Indicator					
1	Key administrative personnel had sufficient background to provide leadership or service to the program.				3
2	Designated program administrator filed all required reports in a timely manner— x 2.				6
3	Personnel responsible for local implementation of program services were qualified to perform those services				3
4	Local program personnel had adequate training to perform their assigned duties.				3
5	Both state and local program personnel were sufficiently committed to the program to generate enthusiasm.				3
Section II Overall Rating <u>18</u> of 18					
Section II Rationale:					
Indicator 1					
Indicator 2					
Indicator 3					
Indicator 4					
Indicator 5					

III. Activities		0= Absent	1= Unsatisfactory	2= Satisfactory	3= Excellent
Indicator					
1	The activities of the program were consistent with program objectives.				3
2	The activities were appropriate for the needs of the participants.				3
3	Ample time was allotted for completion of program activities at each level of implementation.				3
4	State and local program activities were monitored by the program administrator— x 2.				6
5	All program activities began and were maintained according to schedule—x 2.				6
Section III Overall Rating <u> 21 </u> of 21					
Section III Rationale:					
Indicator 1					
Indicator 2					
Indicator 3					
Indicator 4					
Indicator 5					

IV. Constitutional Category		0= Absent	1= Unsatisfactory	2= Satisfactory	3= Excellent
Indicator					
1	The program conforms to the stated constitutional category under which it is funded.				3
2	Program personnel have a clear understanding of the intent of the program.				3
3	There is sufficient data to document compliance with the constitutional category.				3
Section IV Overall Rating		<u>9</u>	of 9 x 2 =	<u>18</u>	of 18

Section IV Rationale:

Indicator 1	
Indicator 2	
Indicator 3	

V. Objectives and Evaluation		0= Absent	1= Unsatisfactory	2= Satisfactory	3= Excellent
	Indicator				
1	The proposed objectives were stated in measurable terms.				3
2	Data were collected for each objective.				3
3	Appropriate data were collected through an established feedback system to determine program success.				3
4	All data collected from participants (including any tests administered) were valid and reliable for their intended use.				3
5	All collected data were appropriately analyzed and submitted in accordance with final reporting guidelines.				3
Section V Overall Rating <u> 15 </u> of 15 x 3 = <u> 45 </u> of 45					

Section V Rationale:

Indicator 1	
Indicator 2	
Indicator 3	
Indicator 4	
Indicator 5	

VI. Results		0= Absent	1= Unsatisfactory	2= Satisfactory	3= Excellent
	Indicator				
1	Sufficient documentation was provided to determine whether program objectives were met.				3
2	Sufficient documentation was provided to determine compliance with the constitutional category.				3
3	The proposed gains in academic achievement or technical skills of participants were obtained.			2	
4	Proposed objectives related to educational improvements were fulfilled.				3
Section VI Overall Rating		<u>11</u>	of 12 x 3 =	<u>33</u>	of 36
Section VI Rationale:					
Indicator 1					
Indicator 2					
Indicator 3	Objective #2 stated, "Within the 2011-2012 school year, teachers in TAP Schools will demonstrate skillfulness in effective classroom instruction, as demonstrated by 80% of the teachers scoring at or above proficient on the research-based TAP Instructional Rubric at the end of the school year." Consistent with the application, valid, reliable SKR data was collected and analyzed. The analysis concluded that 77% of all teachers achieved the performance standard. Although below the forecasted performance level the percentage was still impressively high. Also, when data was further analyzed, the subgroup of more experienced teachers (Year 2 and beyond TAP schools) met the forecasted 80% standard.				
Indicator 4					

Program observations based on site visits:	
I. Participants	Given the number, grade and experience level of the participants, the objectives of the program were appropriate. The number of participants served and their selection criteria were appropriate and consistent with stated objectives.
II. Personnel	Key administrative personnel had sufficient background to provide leadership or service to the program. The designated program administrator filed all required reports in a timely manner. Personnel responsible for local implementation of program services were qualified to perform those services. Local program personnel had adequate training to perform their assigned duties. Both state and local program personnel were sufficiently committed to the program to generate enthusiasm.
III. Activities	The activities of the program were consistent with program objectives and were appropriate for the needs of the participants. Ample time was allotted for completion of program activities at each level of implementation. State and local program activities were monitored by the program administrator. All program activities began and were maintained according to schedule.
IV. Constitutional Category	The program conformed to the stated constitutional category under which it is funded. Program personnel had a clear understanding of the intent of the program and provided sufficient data to document compliance with the constitutional category.
V. Objectives and Evaluation	Proposed program objectives were stated in measurable terms. Data were collected for each objective through an established feedback system to determine program success. Data collected from participants were valid and reliable for their intended use and were appropriately analyzed and submitted in accordance with final reporting guidelines.
VI. Results	Sufficient documentation was provided to determine whether program objectives were met and sufficiently documented compliance with the constitutional category. The proposed gains in academic achievement or technical skills of participants were obtained, The proposed objectives related to educational improvements were fulfilled.
Program recommendations based on overall evaluation:	
I. Participants	Site visits to TAP schools consistently generated highly favorable comments concerning their commitment to and satisfaction with the TAP program. Local staff were deeply and enthusiastically committed to TAP and that commitment was clearly observable during the site visits.
II. Personnel	A frequent comment during site visits was the excellent, supportive, quality of LDoE program leadership. Key LDoE program administrative personnel had excellent academic and professional backgrounds to provide leadership for their program. The designated program administrator was courteous and cooperative in scheduling initial meetings, responding to questions and data requests and offering site visit recommendations. The administrator was diligent in filing required, responsive reports in a timely manner. Personnel responsible for local implementation of program services were also well-qualified to perform services and conduct activities required by the program. Local program personnel had adequate training and professional development to perform their assigned duties and responsibilities. LDoE and LEA program personnel were genuinely sincere in their commitment to the program and conducted the program with enthusiasm. However, during several site visits some concerns were expressed about not being able to fund TAP leadership and teaching positions because of LEA and state funding issues.

III. Activities	The program should continue to give careful attention to current and emerging priority education policy initiatives and trends in professional practices to ensure that the program is articulated and coordinated with these policies and initiatives. In particular, the program should consider its alignment with such priority initiatives and trends as the evolving School and District Accountability System, implementation of the COMPASS evaluation system, the charter school movement, transition to the Common Core State Standards and PARCC assessments, utilization of various instructional technologies and expansion of virtual learning programs.
IV. Constitutional Category	The program conformed to the stated constitutional category under which it is funded. Program personnel had a clear understanding of the intent of the program and provided sufficient data to document compliance with the constitutional category.
V. Objectives and Evaluation	Proposed program objectives were stated in ambitious, measurable terms. Data were collected for each objective through an established feedback system to determine program success. Value-added school data collection on were valid and reliable for their intended use. However, there is a one-year “lag” time before the time the data is generated and it is reported for BESE 8(g) purposes. When the data is gathered, it is appropriately analyzed and submitted in accordance with final reporting guidelines.
VI. Results	Sufficient, high quality testimony, observational information, documentation and data were provided to determine that the program’s objectives were addressed. The documentation satisfactorily addressed compliance with the constitutional category. Although below forecasts and outside of stated timeframes, impressive gains in school academic achievement and technical skills of teacher participants were obtained, The proposed objectives related to educational improvements were addressed and generated impressive results.