

Evaluation of TNTP and Solution Tree in Washoe County School District

Prepared for: Laura Davidson Washoe County School District

Prepared by: Jennifer Hogg, Marian Negoita, Emily McCaffrey, and Victoria Rodriguez Social Policy Research Associates



September 30, 2020

This page intentionally left blank.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	3
Introduction	4
Section I: TNTP And Solution Tree Supports	7
Section II: Commitment & Buy-In	13
Section III: Vendor Effectiveness	15
Section III A: Perceptions of Effectiveness	15
Section III B: Impact on School Climate and SEL Skills	20
Section IV: Implementation & Sustainability Considerations	29
Conclusion	33
Technical Appendices	34
Appendix A: Interview & Focus Group Samples	34
Appendix B: TNTP & Solution Tree Principal and Teacher Survey Response Rates	35
Appendix C: CITS Methodology and Detailed Results	38
Appendix D: Quantile Regression Methodology and Results	42
Appendix E: Description of School Climate Survey Measures	44

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The New Teacher Project (TNTP) and Solution Tree are two research-based education vendors hired by Washoe County School District (WCSD) to support schools that have been designated in need of improvement. Over the course of the 2019-2020 school year, these vendors worked with 25 schools to improve school leadership practices, instruction, and student achievement. In fall 2019, WCSD commissioned a study to better understand the implementation (pre-COVID-19) and impact of these vendors.

Key Findings

FIDELITY, COMMITMENT, & BUY-IN

- Both vendors implemented the activities they proposed with fidelity.
- Principals and leadership teams think highly of their coaches, and especially appreciate that they empower school leaders to own the work.
- Awareness of the two vendors among non-leadership team teachers varied, with awareness somewhat higher among Solution Tree teachers.

VENDOR EFFECTIVENESS

- School leaders overwhelmingly reported that vendors positively impacted their own instructional leadership skills.
- Principals and teachers reported increased effectiveness of collaborative team meeting time, greater teacher buy-in for using student data to drive instruction, and strengthened beliefs in the ability of all students to meet high standards, particularly among staff working with TNTP.
- Impact analyses reveal that working with TNTP significantly increased staff perceptions of school climate, whereas working with Solution Tree did not. Additional statistical analysis suggests that TNTP participation yielded the greatest impacts in schools with relatively lower school climate scores.
- The evidence on the overall impact of the intervention on student SEL skills or perceptions of school climate is inconclusive.

IMPLEMENTATION & SUSTAINABILITY CONSIDERATIONS

- Consistency in school leadership is essential for sustainability.
- School staff are committed to continuing the work they started this year and agree it will take time for results to materialize.
- New principals described a challenging start to their work with the vendor and suggested more communication from the district prior to implementation would have been helpful.
- Messaging should be as cohesive as possible (across state, district, schools, and vendors) to reduce confusion for teachers.
- School structures that provide the time and support for teachers to meaningfully collaborate are important contributors to progress.

INTRODUCTION

Washoe County School District (WCSD) is committed to investing in evidence-backed strategies to support its highest-need schools and students. As such, it has invested federal Title I 1003(a) School Performance Support and state-funded Turnaround grant funding in two evidence-based providers for its Acceleration Zone, Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI), and Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI/ATSI) schools: The New Teacher Project (TNTP) and Solution Tree. WCSD hired Social Policy Research Associates (SPR) to lead an evaluation of these two vendors' supports on key outcomes of interest including school leadership practices, instruction, and student achievement in the district.

Building upon the knowledge gained in a previous study of Solution Tree support for WCSD schools, SPR conducted an **implementation study** that provides essential information on how these services were delivered, what influence they had on key outcomes of interest, and formative considerations for future school support activities, and an **impact study** that endeavors to estimate the impact, quantitatively, of these vendors on school climate and student academic and social-emotional learning (SEL) outcomes.

The implementation study primarily drew from two data collection strategies: interviews with key staff from a representative sample of schools, and surveys of principals and teachers at all TNTP and Solution Tree-supported schools in the district. SPR planned to conduct site visits to WCSD schools in the spring of 2020, but due to school closures resulting from COVID-19, opted for virtual interviews instead.

Key research questions, developed with thought partnership from WCSD's Research and Evaluation department, Title I District Coordinators, and TNTP and Solution Tree trainers, guided the implementation evaluation (Exhibit 1).

Research Questions	Data Sources
#1: What supports are TNTP/Solution Tree coaches providing to schools?	Document review, interviews, focus groups
#2: What is the level of buy-in and commitment among school leaders and staff to implementing the essential activities in the TNTP/Solution Tree models?	
#3: How and to what extent has TNTP/Solution Tree's support affected school leaders' capacity to serve as strong instructional leaders?	Interviews, focus groups,
#4: How and to what extent has TNTP/Solution Tree's support affected teachers' skills and capacity to implement strong, data-	principal and teacher surveys
driven instruction?	
#5: What challenges do WCSD schools face in adopting the essential activities in the TNTP/Solution Tree models?	-
#6: What are the enabling conditions for high fidelity, successful	
implementation, and sustainability of the TNTP/Solution Tree models?	

Exhibit 1: Implementation Evaluation Research Questions

SPR's initial plan for the impact study was to conduct a quasi-experimental analysis of the impact of supports provided by TNTP and Solution Tree on student achievement, attendance rates, and disciplinary outcomes. However, due to the closure of schools in WCSD between March and June 2020, students did not complete end-of-year assessments, which would have provided the data necessary for this analysis. Instead, SPR leveraged existing School Climate Survey data to conduct a **quasi-experimental analysis** of the impact of working with a vendor on school climate indicators and student SEL skills. Key research questions guided this analysis (Exhibit 2).

Research Questions	Data Sources
#7: Have TNTP/Solution Tree's services contributed to changes in staff attitudes and school climate?	School Climate Surveys
#8: Have TNTP/Solution Tree's services contributed to changes in	School Climate Surveys (for
student academic learning, engagement, attendance, and/or	student SEL skills only)
disciplinary outcomes?	
#9: To what extent have TNTP/Solution Tree's schools met their	N/A
goals for students' growth and achievement?	

Exhibit 2. Quasi-experimental Analysis Research Questions

Overview of Data and Methodology

As described above, this evaluation draws on both qualitative and quantitative data to understand the implementation of TNTP and Solution Tree supports, as well as assess progress toward WCSD's intended outcomes. These data provide information about the individual schools as well as progress overall and are described in more detail in Exhibit 3.

Exhibit 3: Data Sources and Methodology

Data Source	Description
Document Review	SPR reviewed documentation on TNTP and Solution Tree models of support for school improvement, as well as WCSD documentation on each vendors' proposed scope of work for the 2019-2020 school year. SPR reviewed progress updates from the district on which activities and supports had been implemented between September 2019 and December 2020.
Interviews and Focus Groups (n=48)	SPR conducted interviews with Title I District Coordinators (3), TNTP coaches (2), and Solution Tree coaches (6) ¹ in January 2020 to gain a deeper understanding of the ways in which trainers work with WCSD districts, to learn about the enabling conditions and key challenges schools face when working to improve, and to develop familiarity with the context and progress of the schools receiving support. Then, in May and June 2020, SPR conducted interviews with principals (8) and school staff (29), selected from a sample of four TNTP schools and four Solution Tree schools as approximate

¹ There were 11 total vendor coaches working with WCSD schools in SY2019-2020 (two TNTP coaches and nine Solution Tree coaches).

	representatives of the schools working with the vendors, based on the				
	following characteristics:				
	• Level of supports (enhanced or regular)				
	• Time working with vendor (one year or multiple)				
	Level (elementary or secondary)				
	 School type (traditional public alternative or charter) 				
	 Baseline performance and progress (as determined by start-up) 				
	interviews with vendor coaches and district staff)				
	Interviews with vehicle coaches and district starry				
	Location & student demographics Consideration was also made for school staff conscitute participate				
	narticularly in light of the constraints introduced by distance learning. See				
	Appendix A for a full list of schools selected and interviewees				
	Appendix A for a full list of schools selected and interviewees.				
	SPR summarized findings from this data collection activity in a brief memo,				
	which can be found <u>here</u> .				
TNTP and Solution	SPR administered surveys to principals and teachers at WCSD schools that				
Tree Principal and	worked with TNTP or Solution Tree during the 2019-20 school year. Surveys				
Teacher Survey	were tailored to the specific supports and practices used by each vendor but				
(n=301)	were aligned to enable analysis across vendors. Four unique surveys were				
	administered to the following groups:				
	Principals at TNTP-supported schools				
	• Teachers at TNTP-supported schools				
	Principals at Solution Tree-supported schools				
	 Teachers at Solution Tree-supported schools 				
	Surveys were administered via email in late May through early June 2020, prior				
	to the conclusion of the school year. The surveys instructed school staff to				
	reflect on activities that occurred during the school year prior to distance				
	learning, and as such, the findings reflect activities and experiences up until				
	March 2020 A total of 727 teachers and principals were invited to participate				
	in the survey of which 41% responded. See Annendix B for a full description of				
	survey response rates				
	survey response rates.				
	SPR summarized findings from this data collection activity in a brief memo				
	which can be found here.				
Student and Staff	WCSD provided SPR with aggregate results from the annual School Climate				
School Climate	Survey that the district has administered since 2011. The survey intends to				
Survey	provide schools with data that reflect components of school climate that				
Survey	support a positive learning and working environment and that promote				
	academic success among all students. The survey battery consists of three				
	nrimary instruments: (1) Student Climate and Safety Survey: (2) Teacher and				
	Staff Climate and Safety Survey: and (3) Family Climate and Safety Survey. For				
	this study, we analyzed a subset of pre-selected domains from the Student and				
	Staff Surveys aligned to the vendors' supports. Personases to the surveys are				
	anonymous and aggregated at the school level				
	מוסוואוווסטג מווע מצבו בצמובע מג גווב גרווסטו ובעפו.				

Guide to this Report

The purpose of this report is to describe our findings from both the implementation study and impact study conducted over the course of the 2019-2020 school year. Sections I, II, IIIA, and IV present themes from our interviews, focus groups, and TNTP and Solution Tree Principal and Teacher Survey (implementation data), while Section IIIB presents findings from our impact analysis.

- *Section I* describes the **models of support** provided by TNTP and Solution Tree to selected schools during the 2019-2020 school year.
- Section II explores the level of **commitment and buy-in** among school staff for the TNTP and Solution Tree models of school improvement.
- Section III presents findings from our comprehensive analysis of **vendor effectiveness** at influencing intended outcomes.
 - *Part A* focuses on **perceptions** of vendor effectiveness as assessed through our implementation study.
 - *Part B* describes **findings of vendor impact** on school climate and student SEL skills.
- Section IV describes common challenges, enabling conditions for successful implementation, and considerations for sustainability.

Across our data sources, many of our findings were consistent across the two vendors. Unless otherwise noted, the findings we present apply to both TNTP and Solution Tree. Where findings diverge, we highlight these differences using a green checkered text box.

SECTION I: TNTP AND SOLUTION TREE SUPPORTS

TNTP and Solution Tree are education vendors dedicated to school improvement at the school and classroom level. Both vendors provide school leaders with tailored supports to promote progress toward high-quality instruction and high student achievement. In this section, we provide an overview of TNTP and Solution Tree's models and the specific supports they provided to schools in WCSD during the 2019-2020 school year prior to distance learning (March 2020), and conclude with observations of differences in vendors' approaches to school improvement.

TNTP

TNTP is a national technical assistance and professional development provider that works at multiple levels of school systems to "advance policies and practices that ensure effective teaching in every classroom."² TNTP's model focuses on providing school-level support in the following key areas:³

- 1. Rigorous Academics. TNTP coaches help school staff examine if students are studying relevant, challenging, and engaging content.
- 2. Talented People. TNTP works with school leaders to uncover if educators have the right skills in the appropriate role to help students succeed.
- **3. Supportive Environments**. TNTP coaches help schools assess whether schools have the supportive environments—defined as policies, systems, and communities—to support all students.

TNTP's approach is grounded in solving problems that get in the way of equity, and tailors its model of support to the unique needs and goals of districts and schools. WCSD hired TNTP in 2019 to begin working with nine of its CSI elementary schools. Based on the results of **school-level needs assessments**, and through conversations with district and school leaders, TNTP designed a set of supports that focused on "improving teachers' instructional practices and developing and supporting leaders to be strong instructional leaders who are equipped to **develop their teachers and sustain instructional improvements on their campus**."⁴

TNTP SUPPORTS IN WCSD

Consistent with the district-wide focus on developing strong professional learning communities (PLCs), TNTP's support for WCSD schools included a particular focus on school-based collaborative teams as a vehicle toward school improvement. The work began with leadership teams from each of the nine schools, comprised of administrator(s), instructional coaches, specialists, and teacher leaders, participating in a **Summer Academy** which served as the "launching off point" for the partnership. Over the course of the eight-day Academy, leadership teams prepared for the new school year while also building instructional expertise. Teams identified goals and priorities for the year that aligned with their School Performance Plans (SPP) around the following topics: (1) adopting the new ELA curriculum, (2) understanding demands, (3)

TNTP-Supported Elementary Schools (SY2019-2020)

Anderson Booth Canaan Desert Heights Duncan Echo Loder Mariposa Charter Matthews Natchez

² TNTP's mission statement (<u>https://tntp.org/about-tntp</u>).

³ As described on their website (<u>https://tntp.org/what-we-do</u>).

⁴ TNTP Scope of Support & Proposed Calendar (2019-2020), internal document provided by WCSD.

using data, (4) developing foundational skills, (5) aligning questions and tasks, and (6) mapping instructional plans.⁵ School leaders were also provided with professional development to better support teachers around instructional priorities during the school year.

During the school year, principals participated in **virtual and onsite coaching**. In addition, TNTP provided group learning experiences for school leadership teams as a follow up to their Summer Academy. The school-year support focused on "building principal and site-based leadership team's ability to be the instructionally-focused leaders needed for their school improvement efforts," including developing leaders' ability to: (1) observe classrooms to identify actionable feedback and norm instructional practices, (2) use data to make instructional decisions and analyze student work, and (3) develop an instructional vision.⁶

TNTP coaches also **supported on-site data coaches** at eight schools, focusing on building understanding of using English

TNTP Key Priority Areas for WCSD Schools

- High-quality Tier 1 instruction, with particular focus on accessibility for English Learners
- Professional learning opportunities for teachers
- Implementing collaborative teams

Language Arts (ELA) curriculum materials in service of "a strong vision of standards aligned literacy instruction."⁷

Survey and interview data confirm that TNTP provided the full range of their supports to each of their participating school sites with few exceptions.⁸

Solution Tree

Solution Tree is a global education publisher and professional development provider that aims to "transform education worldwide to ensure learning for all."⁹ For the past several years, WCSD has adopted Solution Tree's trademarked PLC at Work[®] model as a guide for teacher collaboration districtwide, and partnered with Solution Tree to provide school-specific coaching and support in a subset of its CSI and TSI/ATSI schools.

Solution Tree's model of transforming a school into a professional learning community (PLC) requires a **shift in adult mindsets and capabilities**, and the **structures to facilitate continuous improvement**. Solution Tree coaches provide support to selected school leaders in facilitating shifts in mindsets regarding student potential – that all students can learn at high levels – and towards collective responsibility for all students – from a focus on "my students" to "our students." Coaches also provide support on using student data to adapt and improve educator practice, which is the vehicle for shifts in student outcomes.

To work toward these goals, Solution Tree coaches help organize schools into collaborative teams which hold regular, structured meetings organized around the following four questions:¹⁰

⁵ TNTP Scope of Support & Proposed Calendar (2019-2020), internal document provided by WCSD.

⁶ TNTP Scope of Support & Proposed Calendar (2019-2020), internal document provided by WCSD.

⁷ TNTP Update 121819, internal document provided by WCSD.

⁸ One principal indicated their school did not participate in group learning experiences on the TNTP Principal Survey.

⁹ Solution Tree's Vision (<u>https://www.solutiontree.com/about/overview</u>).

¹⁰ DuFour, R., DuFour, R., Eaker, R., Many, T. W., & Mattos, M. (2016). Learning by Doing: A Handbook for Professional Learning Communities at Work[™].

- 1. What do students need to know and be able to do? After considering this question, collaborative teams agree on what standards their students should know at the end of the school year.
- 2. How will we know when they have learned it? For this question, collaborative teams create and implement common assessments for each standard and analyze the data together during professional development time.
- 3. What will we do when they haven't learned it? After assessments, if the data shows that some students haven't mastered a standard, collaborative teams create a plan for how to intervene and extend lessons for those students.
- 4. What will we do when they already know it? For students who have already mastered the core content, collaborative teams create an enrichment plan to extend their learning.

WCSD selected Solution Tree to implement its PLC at Work[®] model at six schools during the 2017-18 school year (Cohort 1). In the following school year (2018-19), six more schools were added (Cohort 2), and now in its third year (2019-20), Cohort 3 includes 10 elementary, four middle, one middle/high, and one high school.¹¹

SOLUTION TREE SUPPORTS IN WCSD

Solution Tree coaches supported implementation of the PLC at Work[®] model at 16 total schools in the 2019-2020 school year. Solution Tree began the year with a **three-day summer symposium for district and school leaders** and facilitated **school-level needs assessments** with school leadership. These "kick-off" activities set the foundation for PLC implementation supports during the school year, which included onsite training and professional development for building leadership teams, observation and coaching for collaborative teams, and virtual coaching for principals. With their coaches, principals focused on getting the systems and culture in place to facilitate strong PLC teams.

While adhering to the components of their PLC at Work[®] model, Solution Tree **tailored support to schools' needs and context**, and additionally provided **enhanced supports** to the three

Solution Tree-Supported Schools (SY2019-2020)

Elementary Schools Allen Bennett Drake Lemelson STEM Academy Lincoln Park Palmer Stead Sun Valley Veterans Warner Middle Schools Dilworth O'Brien Sparks Traner **High Schools** Turning Point (MS & HS) Washoe Inspire

Solution Tree's WCSD Cohort 3 Goals

- Increase school leaders' level of knowledge around instructional leadership through onsite training.
- Build shared knowledge about formative assessment, student data, and instructional strategies among collaborative teams.
- Train collaborative teams in the process of reviewing data, adjusting instructional practices, and the importance of continuous improvement processes.

¹¹ Three elementary schools that were part of Cohort 1 or 2 continued receiving Solution Tree supports in Cohort 3: Lemelson STEM Academy and Palmer Elementary were members of Cohorts 1 and 2, and Stead Elementary was a member of Cohort 2.

Turnaround-designated schools.¹² Title I-funded schools received more light-touch support, primarily directed at the principal, whereas the Turnaround schools received more intensive support, with Solution Tree coaches providing additional **direct support to teachers in collaborative teams** to use the four "big" questions to guide collaborative work, with a focus on priority, or "essential" standards.

Survey and interview data confirm that Solution Tree provided the full range of their proposed services to each of their participating school sites.

Comparison of Models and Supports

School leaders agreed that both TNTP and Solution Tree consider schools' unique contexts and tailored supports to individual needs and constraints – the vendors are not implementing a "program," but instead are meeting schools and leaders where they are and helping them achieve their own goals and priorities. Though TNTP and Solution Tree provided similar supports to WCSD schools, key differences in their respective models and approaches to implementation include:

- Solution Tree's approach is grounded in their **trademarked PLC at Work® model**, while TNTP's approach is grounded in solving **problems that get in the way of equity** and are aligned to individual **school performance plans**.
- Solution Tree focuses on prioritizing standards (each grade level selects 10 "essential standards") and getting the systems in place to facilitate strong PLC work. TNTP does not narrow down the number of standards, and based on interview data, "jumped into the nuts and bolts" faster, including backwards planning and how to implement the new ELA curriculum.
- Solution Tree provides **district-level trainings**, whereas TNTP provides district-level updates. District liaisons believe district trainings are an important asset of Solution Tree because it encourages consistent priorities and messaging across the entire district.
- TNTP schools were allocated a **full-time data coach** by the district, which Solution Tree schools were not.
- Solution Tree coaches provided some **direct support to collaborative teams**. TNTP coaches provided direct support to data coaches, but not systematically to teachers (apart from those on the leadership team) or collaborative teams.

Characteristics of Schools Supported

The schools who worked with TNTP and Solution Tree this school year were selected because of their designations as underperforming on various metrics.¹³ In order to situate the findings in the sections that follow, Exhibit 4 (below) summarizes the characteristics of TNTP and Solution Tree-supported schools during the 2019-2020 school year compared to other schools in WCSD..

¹² TNTP and Solution Tree supports are funded through multiple mechanisms, including Title I School Performance Support (SPS), Title I 1003a, and Turnaround funding.

¹³ TNTP and Solution Tree Schools are all CSI, TSI/ATSI, and/or Acceleration Zone schools. CSI schools were identified by the state of Nevada for being among the lowest-performing schools according to Nevada School Performance Framework (NSPF). TSI/ATSI schools receive this designation from the state of Nevada for consistently underperforming subgroups. Acceleration Zone schools receive this designation from WCSD through (1) selection by the superintendent, (2) identification as CSI or TSI by the state of Nevada, and (3) low performance on the designated accountability framework.

Exhibit 4: Characteristics of Schools Served by Vendors Compared to Other WCSD Schools Source: Nevada Accountability Portal



SECTION II: COMMITMENT & BUY-IN

While TNTP and Solution Tree coaches equip school leaders with frameworks, tools, and encouragement to improve instruction, changes in practice require buy-in and commitment to the model. In this section, we describe principal and school staff commitment and buy-in to the TNTP and Solution Tree models based on data collected through interviews, focus groups, and surveys. In the following section on Vendor Effectiveness, we describe how this buy-in translated into changes in staff behavior and mindsets.

PRINCIPAL COMMITMENT & BUY-IN

Surveys and interviews revealed that principals think very highly of their TNTP and Solution Tree coaches, which underlies their commitment to the process. Principals reported high levels of trust in

and respect for their coaches and described them as a critical thought partner and friend in an otherwise "lonely role." This respect for their coaches, who quickly proved themselves to be useful and trustworthy mentors, is what seems to have driven principals to buy-in to these respective models. In particular, coaches' experiences as principals at similar schools added to their credibility.

During interviews, principals praised vendors for their authenticity and **customized approach to providing support.** Survey results confirm that almost all principals (88%) agreed that their vendor personalized supports for their school's unique context. Rather than coming in and prescribing, "Here's the fix," as some vendors have in the past, both TNTP and Solution Tree coaches made principals feel empowered to "In my 20 years of being in education, this is probably one of the top two professional development opportunities that I've ever had personally...TNTP really ranks up there. I'll say the reason why is that they've done an amazing job totally differentiating for our school."

-TNTP Principal

make progress towards their existing visions. Principals believe the tailored support and feedback increased their sense of ownership over school improvement work.

SCHOOL STAFF COMMITMENT & BUY-IN

In addition to their close collaboration with principals, the vendors provide training and support to school leadership teams (or "guiding coalitions" as they are known in Solution Tree schools) made up of deans, instructional coaches, specialists, and teacher leaders (typically department chairs or grade level leads). Like principals, **leadership team members appreciated the vendors for empowering them to lead school improvement work**, rather than "coming in and telling us what to do." Leadership team members found vendors' trainings to be useful and directly applicable to their work.

In particular, **TNTP** leadership teams explained that the Summer Academy greatly strengthened their understanding of school performance plans. Almost all attendees described the Institute as an important component of their site's progress to establish school goals. Many staff members reported feeling "energized" after the multiday conference, despite it taking place at the beginning of summer. The leadership team specifically mentioned the importance of breaking larger goals into smaller benchmarks. One principal shared that the Summer Academy was helpful to "speed up" the process of collaboration and set the pace for the school year ahead. **Non-leadership staff interacted with vendors to varying degrees.** In most TNTP and Solution Treesupported schools, teachers had little direct interaction with vendor coaches, and instead received direction and support from school leadership teams. Most principals, and TNTP principals in particular, preferred this model of support, which further empowered school leaders to "own" the school improvement process. Principals explained that while teachers may not be interacting with the provider directly, they are very aware of the shifts the school is making, and the majority are bought-in to this process. Because both vendors operate in the "background," principals believe the onus of developing teacher buy-in to the PLC process and/or associated instructional improvement approaches is on school leaders rather than on the vendors themselves.

Solution Tree provided higher-intensity supports to three of its schools designated as Turnaround schools, including direct support to teachers through staff-wide trainings and coaching sessions with collaborative teams. One Turnaround School principal appreciated this direct support, and believed it was very effective at increasing teacher investment in the PLC process:

"The Collaborative Team Day was very purposeful in allowing the teachers the time to work together, rather than the top-down [approach] where I'm just lecturing to them and giving them all the stuff and not having them say much."

Due to the relatively lower levels of teacher interaction with **TNTP**, some teachers felt uncomfortable during coaches' classroom walk-throughs. One teacher on her school's leadership team shared that her colleagues felt worried about a stranger coming into their classroom to point out perceived missteps. She explained, *"some teachers [worry] that its 'oh, it's another person in here to try to fix us up'...there's some anxiety because people are coming in your room."*

SECTION III: VENDOR EFFECTIVENESS

As mentioned previously, both TNTP and Solution Tree aim to (1) enhance school leaders' capacity to serve as strong instructional leaders, (2) equip teachers with the tools to continuously improve their instruction, and ultimately (3) improve student outcomes. This section explores the extent to which vendors are meeting these goals in their work with WCSD schools. We begin by describing school staff perceptions of vendor effectiveness in these three key areas, before moving into the results of our impact study.

Section III A: Perceptions of Effectiveness

SPR asked principals, teachers, and other staff about their perceptions of the vendors' effectiveness through interviews, focus groups, and participant surveys. The key findings below summarize key findings from across these data sources.

EFFECT ON SCHOOL LEADERSHIP

Overall, school leaders reported the vendors positively impacted their own instructional leadership skills. In fact, *all* principal survey respondents reported that working with a vendor had impacted their capacity as an instructional leader to some extent, and nearly three-fourths (71%) felt that working with their vendor had *greatly impacted* their capacity. Notably, principals with fewer years of experience as an administrator reported greater levels of impact on their capacity as a result of working with their vendor.¹⁴ As described in the previous section, high levels of interpersonal trust and respect established between the principals and coaches were key drivers of impact at the principal level. As a trusted partner, vendor coaches were able to provide critical thought partnership that principals took to heart, which translated into changes in principal practices.

Principals reported greater capacity to implement key practices like empowering a strong instructional

team, setting measurable goals for their school, and implementing action steps to achieve school performance goals. Exhibit 5 summarizes principals' perception of impact on key practices.

As this Exhibit 5 shows, principals working with **TNTP** were more likely to receive support in these areas and more likely to report that this support influenced their capacity to implement these practices.

"We focused everything, all our decisions, around those three goals that we set. I really felt like that was the strongest positive thing that changed is [being] very laser focused toward those goals."

– TNTP Principal

¹⁴ Chi square test for independence demonstrates a statistically significant relationship between principal tenure and level of impact of supports provided by vendor (p=0.03).

Exhibit 5: Vendor Effect on Principal Capacity to Implement Key Practices

Source: TNTP and Solution Tree Principal Surveys



While the study team did not ask teachers and other school staff about vendor impacts on school leadership, several offered their thoughts on how vendor supports had developed their principals' leadership skills in interviews and focus groups, unprompted. For example, staff at one TNTP school praised the vendor for helping their principal stay focused, organized, and communicating expectations clearly to staff. This principal corroborated that these were skills they had worked on with their TNTP coach.

EFFECT ON TEACHER INSTRUCTION

Principals also believe that vendors have had an impact on teachers' instructional beliefs, mindsets, and capacity to effect student outcomes. Nearly all principals who responded to the survey (90%) believe that their vendor had a moderate to strong impact on the teacher *beliefs and mindsets* that are key drivers of instructional improvement, including their belief in the benefit of collaborative team meetings, the importance of student data, and their own ability to improve outcomes for *all* students (see more detail in Exhibits 6 - 8). Furthermore, most respondent principals believe their teachers' *capacity to improve student outcomes* had moderately or greatly improved as a result of their work with TNTP or Solution Tree.

Exhibit 6: Vendor Effect on Teacher Beliefs and Mindsets

Source: TNTP and Solution Tree Principal Surveys¹⁵



Working with a TNTP or Solution Tree coach helped make collaboration time more structured, focused, data-driven, and effective. This finding was pronounced across all data sources. Several interviewed principals also explained that working with the coaches helped them communicate the "why" behind the work they were doing to their staff. This finding is consistent with the results from the principal survey which show that nearly all respondent principals (94%) feel the vendor had a moderate

to strong impact on teachers' beliefs that "collaborative team meetings are beneficial to day-to-day instructional practices." Specific outcomes reported include an increase in the frequency of teams implementing common assessments for each standard, making instructional decisions based on student data, reviewing formative student assessment, and other important collaborative team practices (see Exhibit 7). These improvements in specific practices may be why the time felt more effective for teachers.

"The work we have done with PLCs this year and making the outcomes and focus academically-centered has had a large impact on productive PLC culture."

⁻ Solution Tree Principal

¹⁵ Starred (*) practice was only asked to principals of Solution Tree-supported schools (n=10).

Exhibit 7: Vendor Effect on Collaborative Team Practices

Source: TNTP and Solution Tree Principal Surveys



who have already mastered a standard.

6% 12% 6% 13% 18% 12% 6 12% 12% 24% 18% 18% 24% 35% 12% 24%

6% 12%

Percentage of Principals

■ Large increase ■ Moderate increase ■ Small increase ■ No change ■ Not sure/ Too early to tell

Relatedly, principals and teachers reported greater teacher buy-in for using student data to drive instruction. Some school staff shared in interviews that before working with their vendor, they spent a lot of time measuring and summarizing student data without actionable next steps to drive instruction. However, Solution Tree and TNTP helped create a mindset shift from data as an accountability tool, to data as a tool for continuous improvement.

Teacher focus groups from schools working with Solution Tree explained that the vendor helped them feel more comfortable sharing and talking about their data with team members. Rather than feeling embarrassed or defensive, teachers at these schools have started to embrace the usefulness of openly examining and comparing their data to identify which practices are meeting the needs of individual students, and which are not.

In our principal survey, over 90% of principals felt the vendors had a strong or moderate impact on teachers' belief that "analyzing student data is an important tool for planning future instruction," and nearly all (97%) respondent teachers agreed with this statement after having worked with a vendor.

"The first time we did that data meeting people [were] kind of taking it personally. [It shifted from] "My kids are failing" to "What did you do? Okay, let's try it...Okay what are we going to do? What's the next step? How did you get there?" and having those conversations. I think it's starting to really build into a community of "our" kids, [and] what can we do to help each other?"

-Solution Tree Teacher

School staff reported a strengthened belief in the ability of all students to meet high standards. An important goal of both vendors is to inspire teachers to keep high expectations for all students, and to believe in their ability to master grade-level standards.

For **Solution Tree**, the first step of the PLC at Work[®] process is building consensus that the purpose of a PLC is to help all students learn at high levels, while **TNTP** emphasizes the urgent need to increase instructional rigor in its report "The Opportunity Myth" and associated trainings.

During interviews and focus groups, staff at TNTP schools, especially those who attended the Summer Academy or participated in a TNTP-led reading group, emphasized the profound effect reading this report had on them. TNTP teachers described their growing comfort with "letting the kids do the heavy lifting" and "productive struggle" since learning more about how to implement the key lessons of The Opportunity Myth in practice, and now regularly interrogate whether their instructional materials are rigorous and on grade level. Survey evidence corroborates the enthusiasm we heard from TNTP staff related to this outcome. While the vast majority of principals working with both vendors felt their support had an impact on teacher beliefs in student ability, this conviction was somewhat stronger among TNTP principals.



Exhibit 8: Vendor Effect on Teachers' Belief in Student Abilities Source: TNTP and Solution Tree Principal Surveys

EFFECT ON STUDENT PROGRESS

Due to the lack of summative test data, we only have information about the vendors' effects on student outcomes through school staff interviews and focus groups. When asked about student progress, staff across several of the schools felt optimistic that if state testing had taken place this year, there would have been measurable student progress. Principals and

teachers working with both vendors expressed disappointment that they did not have the chance to demonstrate the progress their students had made. One school that has worked with Solution Tree for multiple years pointed to the growth they made through the PLC at Work[®] process in the past and felt confident the same or greater would have occurred this year. In addition to academic growth, staff at one TNTP school emphasized that students

"Honestly, there's so much more pride at our school. Kids are proud to be learning. They are excited, they know they're being supported, and it just shows in their attitudes."

-TNTP Teacher

have been more engaged and excited to come to school this year. Staff at another TNTP school felt the more engaging and rigorous instruction had led to behavior improvements as well.

Section III B: Impact on School Climate and SEL Skills

The following section of the report presents findings from our impact study of vendor supports on school climate and student SEL skills. It begins with the methodology used to measure impact on these outcomes, describes the data and measures used, and finally presents impact findings overall and separately by vendor.

METHODOLOGY

In our original Evaluation Plan for this study, we planned to utilize a difference-in-differences (DiD) quasi-experimental design, which has the potential to meet ESSA Tier 2 evidence requirements, to estimate the impact of programs developed by TNTP and Solution Tree on a large number of outcomes including school climate, student SEL skills, student achievement, attendance rates, and disciplinary outcomes. The DiD design assumes that for treated schools, a change in the outcome after the intervention would suggest that the intervention may have had an impact. To help ensure that the estimated effect reflects the impact of the intervention alone, and is not biased by any unrelated (i.e. confounding) event, DiD models add a comparison group (in our case, schools that were not affected by the intervention) to control for potentially confounding events. The underlying assumption of a DiD model is that any confounding event would affect the treatment and comparison groups similarly. Under that assumption, subtracting the pre-post comparison group difference in outcomes from the pre-post treatment group difference removes the effect of the confounding event, isolating the unique contribution of the intervention to any changes in outcome for the treatment schools.

However, events that occurred after developing the initial research plan led to several changes in the initial QED design. The advent of COVID-19 and subsequent school closures in March 2020 led to significant disturbances in district operations, affecting how classes were taught and the kinds of data available for analysis. Because Smarter Balanced achievement tests for English Language Arts and Math are typically conducted in the Spring, the pandemic-induced disruptions led to the unavailability of these data for analysis. Student-level attendance rates and disciplinary outcomes were unavailable as well. As a result, the impact analysis could only focus on outcomes collected through school climate surveys.

Subsequently, we also learned that the results of school climate surveys were available for a longer period than initially anticipated. This additional data allowed us to update our methodological approach from DiD to a Comparative Interrupted Time Series (CITS) design (a more generalized case of DiD), which tends to be more statistically valid than DiD alone. Instead of one pre-intervention measurement point, CITS includes multiple pre- and post-intervention measurement points to estimate the impact of the intervention. CITS calculates the estimated intervention effect by subtracting the comparison group's deviation from its pre-intervention *trend* from the treatment group's deviation from its trend (as opposed to simply subtracting the change from a single point in time). The main advantage of CITS over DiD is that for DiD impact estimates to be valid, the pre-intervention trends in the two groups must be parallel; finding comparison groups with this property, however, is often difficult. CITS' advantage is that it does not require the pre-intervention trends for the two groups to be parallel, as long as the trends can be precisely estimated. Additional details about the CITS methodology are included in Appendix C.

Our design also proposed to estimate the average treatment effect of working with Solution Tree at 12 schools (only three of which were part of the current intervention, known as Cohort 3) beginning in SY2017-2018. In a previous project, we estimated the impact of Solution Tree programs for those schools at one year after participation (for all 12 schools) and two years after participation (for the earlier cohort of six schools). Our design would have taken advantage of the availability of an additional year of school data (SY2019-2020) to estimate the longer-term impact of that intervention. However, the unavailability of end-of-year data for SY2019-2020 meant that we would no longer have an additional year of follow-up. We then also considered including an analysis of Winter MAP test score data for earlier Solution Tree cohorts, but given the limited amount of time between the latest SBAC data point (Spring 2019) and winter MAP data point (Winter 2019), and the potential confusion caused by trying to compare results across these two tests, we elected not to analyze Winter MAP data as part of this report. ¹⁶ However, SPR staff are currently conducting an analysis of Solution Tree's impact on grades 1 and 2 ELA MAP scores, given the lack of early grades data from the SBAC to complement our 2019 analysis. The results of that analysis will be provided in an addendum to this report.

DATA AND MEASURES

SPR accessed the results of school climate surveys conducted by WCSD annually and merged these data with school-level characteristics. These data fields were used to measure changes in staff and student attitudes on school climate and student SEL skills over time. After examining the survey domains, we selected those domains that we believed could be feasibly impacted by vendor activities given the features of their improvement models. The survey domains and school-level covariates included in our impact analysis are summarized in Exhibit 9.

Data Type	Data Fields	Years Available	
Staff Climate Survey	Expectations of success	2014, 2016-2019	
Outcomes	Fairness and respect	2014, 2016-2019	
	Staff collaboration	2014, 2016-2019	
	Staff-student relationships	2016-2019	
	Work stress	2016-2019	
Student Climate Survey	School Climate Outcomes		
Outcomes	Adult Support	2014-2019	
	Engagement	2014-2019	
	SEL Skill Outcomes		
	Relationship skills	2015-2019	
	Responsible decision making	2015-2019	

Exhibit 9: WCSD School Climate Survey Data Fields Included in Analysis

¹⁶ Another way of thinking about this limitation is that analyzing Winter MAP data for Solution Tree Cohorts 1 & 2 would not provide any additional years of post-intervention data. For example, the first Solution Tree cohort began working with the vendor in fall 2017. In our previous analysis, because we had access to end-of-year SBAC scores, we considered SY2017-2018 to be the first year of "post" data (since almost a year of implementation had passed by then). But this logic does not apply to MAP winter scores (the only ones available to us for this analysis) because, in winter 2017, the initiative had just begun. Therefore, the first year of "post" MAP winter scores data for the SY2017-2018 cohort is SY2018-2019. However, this means that we only have two years of "post" data for this cohort: SY2018-2019 and SY2019-2020. Given that available data did not offer the opportunity to have an additional year of follow-up, we decided against conducting this analysis.

	Self-awareness of emotions	2015-2019
	Self-Awareness of Self Concept	2015-2019
	Self-Management of Emotions	2015-2019
	Self-Management of Goals	2015-2019
	Self-Management of Schoolwork	2015-2019
	Social Awareness	2015-2019
School-level covariates	Percentage of students eligible for Free and Reduced-Price Lunch	2015-2019
	Percentage of students with Individualized Education Plan	2015-2019
	Percentage of students who are limited English proficient	2015-2019
	Percentage of students who are female	2015-2019
	Percentage of students by racial group	2015-2019

School-level averages for each of the domains above were provided by WCSD. WCSD created these averages by calculating the percentage of respondents at each school who selected "3" or "4" (agree and strongly agree) for each survey item, and then by averaging the percentage for survey items that make up each domain. WCSD developed this methodology and shared aggregate data with SPR.¹⁷ Appendix E provides a more detailed description of these domains (i.e. the individual items that comprise each domain) and how they were calculated.

IMPACT ON STAFF PERCEPTIONS OF SCHOOL CLIMATE

Exhibit 10 shows the trends in staff perceptions of school climate before and after schools began working with their respective vendors, for both the treatment group (schools that worked with TNTP and Solution Tree, shown in green) and the comparison group (other schools in the district, shown in gray). Key takeaways the exhibit include:

- On average, treatment schools had less positive staff perceptions of school climate than comparison schools across all years studied (and therefore lower average scores on the graphs below), which is to be expected given the factors influencing selection for the intervention.
- For several of the outcomes tested, including Staff Collaboration, Staff-Student Relationships, and Work Stress, post-intervention year averages for both the treatment and comparison groups followed their pre-period trend. Therefore, we might not expect to find a statistically significant impact of the intervention on these outcomes when we run the analysis.
- Average scores for Expectations of Success and Fairness and Respect are higher in SY2019-2020 for treatment schools compared to what would have been expected if the treatment group stayed true to its pre-intervention trend. On the other hand, the average in the comparison group stayed close to its pre-intervention trend, suggesting that the intervention might have had a positive impact on these outcomes.

¹⁷ SPR did not have access to individual-level responses.

Exhibit 10: Trends in Staff Survey Outcomes Over Time (by select domains)

Green = Treatment (TNTP and Solution Tree) schools; Grey = Comparison schools Source: WCSD





As expected, the estimated overall impacts of the intervention on Expectations of Success and Fairness and Respect are positive; however, they are not statistically significant. Therefore, **the evidence about the** *overall* **impact of the intervention on staff perceptions of school climate is inconclusive**.

However, estimating impacts separately for schools that worked with TNTP and those that worked with Solution Tree reveals differential underlying patterns (Exhibit 11). Working with TNTP appears to have significantly increased average scores on *all* tested outcomes, ranging from an impact of about four percentage points on Staff-Student Relationships to 17 percentage points on perceived Fairness and Respect. By contrast, none of the estimated impacts of working with Solution Tree was statistically significant.

	Percent Point Change: Average Impact on Staff Outcomes among Treatment Group Relative to Comparison Group				
Outcome	Expectations of success	Fairness and respect	Staff collaboration	Staff-student relationships	Work stress
Estimated impact, overall	3.2	3.9	-4.1	-0.4	-1.9
Estimated impact, TNTP	12.7**	17.2**	12.2*	3.6*	11.1*
Estimated impact, Solution Tree	-1.7	-3.5	-13.0	-2.5	-8.3

Exhibit 11: Intervention Effects on Staff Beliefs and Mindsets

Source: WCSD

*Significantly different from zero at the .10 level, sharpened two-stage q-values.

**Significantly different from zero at the .05 level, sharpened two-stage q-values.

***Significantly different from zero at the .01 level, sharpened two-stage q-values¹⁸.

¹⁸ See Appendix C for explanation.

The findings presented above suggest that in the short term (about halfway through the school year), working with TNTP was associated with increases in these selected instructional beliefs and perceptions of school climate among staff. This is consistent with findings from principal surveys and qualitative interviews discussed earlier in the report, which suggested that participating in TNTP was associated with a high level of satisfaction among principals and staff.

However, our analysis of existing data suggests that this **difference between the two vendors may be influenced by differences in their implementation timelines**. Based on interview data and a review of the vendors' training schedules, TNTP appeared to provide more supports earlier in the school year, whereas Solution Tree's approach begins more incrementally. Since WCSD conducted the staff climate surveys only a few months after the interventions began, these findings may reflect different styles in implementation and not necessarily a difference in the medium- to longterm impact of each initiative. In addition, the schools served by TNTP had on average lower preintervention climate scores compared to schools served by Solution Tree. Given the lower starting point, it was conceivably easier for TNTP schools to increase their climate scores than it was for Solution Tree schools to achieve the same result.

To provide a more nuanced look at impacts, we employed an additional technique known as quantile regression. This technique allowed us to examine whether these positive results from working with TNTP might be larger for schools with relatively lower staff perceptions of school climate than for schools with higher staff perceptions of school climate. Our results from this analysis suggest that **TNTP participation produces its impact mostly by affecting schools at the lower end of the outcome scale.** For more information on this method and the results, please refer to Appendix D.

IMPACT ON STUDENT SEL SKILLS AND PERCEPTIONS OF SCHOOL CLIMATE

Exhibit 12 displays trends in a randomly selected sample of student survey outcomes before and after the adoption of school interventions, for both the treatment group (schools that worked with TNTP and Solution Tree, shown in green) and the comparison group (the other schools in the district, shown in gray)¹⁹. Similar to trends in staff outcomes, we notice that intervention schools have lower average scores compared to the rest of the schools, which is to be expected given the factors influencing selection for the intervention. In addition, in all cases, the average outcomes from SY2019-2020 do not appear to diverge markedly from their trends, suggesting that the intervention may not have had a statistically significant impact.

Exhibit 12: Trends in Student Survey Outcomes Over Time (by sampled outcomes)

Green = Treatment (TNTP and Solution Tree) schools; Grey = Comparison schools Source: WCSD



¹⁹ To limit the space occupied by this exhibit, we excluded six outcome variables; their trends over time were very similar to the ones shown in the exhibit.

As suggested by a visual examination of graphs above, impact estimates in Exhibit 13 show that none of the estimated overall impacts of the intervention on student survey outcomes were statistically significant. Therefore, the evidence on the overall impact of the intervention on student SEL skills or perceptions of school climate is inconclusive.

In contrast to the analysis of staff-level survey outcomes, estimating impacts separately for schools that worked with TNTP and those that worked with Solution Tree **does not reveal differential underlying patterns**. Impact estimates for TNTP schools are mostly negative and a few are positive for ST schools; however, none are statistically significant.

Outcome	Estimated impact, overall	Estimated impact, TNTP	Estimated impact, ST
SEL Skills-Relationship Skills	0.8	-4.6	3.5
SEL Skills-Responsible Decision Making	-3.2	-4.9	-2.1
SEL Skills Self-Awareness of Emotions	-2.3	-2.1	-2.5
SEL Skills-Self Awareness of Self Concept	-2.5	-0.6	-3.5
SEL Skills-Self Management of Emotions	-0.9	-3.6	0.8
SEL Skills-Self-Management of Goals	-3.1	-3.9	-2.7
SEL Skills-Self Management of Schoolwork	-1.1	-3.1	0.4
SEL Skills-Social Awareness	-0.9	-4.2	0.7
Adult Support	1.3	-3.6	3.9
Student Engagement	-3.3	-9.1	-0.8

Exhibit 13: Intervention Effects on Student SEL Skills and Perceptions of School Climate

Source: WCSD

*Significantly different from zero at the .10 level, sharpened two-stage q-values.

**Significantly different from zero at the .05 level, sharpened two-stage q-values.

***Significantly different from zero at the .01 level, sharpened two-stage q-values.

These findings suggest that given the very short time frame in which outcomes could be observed, participating in the initiative may not have had time to be felt at the student level. Although ultimately the outcomes are meant to be felt at the student level, the findings suggest this may take more than a few months to occur.

LIMITATIONS

The validity and reliability of our analysis could have been affected by several limitations. As explained above, given the disruptions induced by the pandemic, our quasi-experimental study could not include many of its initially planned outcomes, including student academic performance, attendance, and disciplinary outcomes. Although WCSD made available student winter test score data from SY2016-2017 to SY2019-2020, the duration of exposure to vendor activities was so limited in SY2019-2020 compared to the amount of time expected before school-level interventions impact academic outcomes that we decided against conducting an analysis for these outcomes for Cohort 3.

In addition, since we did not have access to the original school climate survey data and methodology, we could not independently verify the validity and reliability of school climate constructs. For example, our understanding is that no adjustment is typically performed to account for survey nonresponse, which could bias the measurement of constructs. In addition, it was uncertain whether any testing was conducted to ensure that survey-derived constructs are reliable and valid—for example, by conducting an item response analysis or internal consistency testing such as Cronbach's alpha. If the survey measures used were affected by measurement error, this could bias our findings.

Lastly, the underlying assumption of a CITS model is that confounding events (which occurred when the intervention began) affected the treatment and comparison groups similarly. However, if that were not the case—for example, because the schools served by the vendors, but not comparison schools, started other initiatives that could affect the school climate independently—then the CITS-derived impacts would be biased. Although we were not aware of any such initiatives when we conducted the analysis, they might still be possible.

SECTION IV: IMPLEMENTATION & SUSTAINABILITY CONSIDERATIONS

SPR collected feedback from stakeholders in an effort to inform the district's future approach to partnering with vendors and supporting the schools that work with them for greater effectiveness and sustainability of school improvement initiatives. In this section, we describe common challenges, enabling conditions, and considerations for the district as it continues to support collaborative teams and partnerships with vendors.

Common Challenges

Interview and participant survey responses provide insight on common challenges WCSD school leaders and staff experienced while implementing TNTP and Solution Tree's models of school improvement. First, we summarize common challenges that relate specifically to the work of vendors, and then describe broader challenges to implementation of collaborative teams and progress towards school performance goals.

CHALLENGES WORKING WITH VENDORS

Survey respondents and interviewees had generally very positive experiences working with their vendors, but some found the **lack of interaction between the vendors and most teachers to be challenging**. While several TNTP principals felt it was unnecessary for teachers to be in direct contact with the TNTP coach, others felt that it would be helpful in order to make TNTP classroom walk-throughs less disruptive and more effective. Similarly, instructional leaders at Solution Tree schools explained they would have liked for Solution Tree coaches to be able to work directly with all collaborative teams, rather than a subset of grade levels. This could reduce confusion among staff about why coaches were not meeting with all collaborative teams.

New principals described a challenging start to their work with the vendor. Principals who were new to their schools felt they did not have time to build rapport and trust with their staff before asking them to change their practices, and similarly, had not been leading the school long enough to have established their own vision and instructional approach. One new principal described initial confusion around the role of their Solution Tree coach at the start of the school year that likely could have been mitigated by clearer communication from the district on expectations and roles. Another principal, who started at a school that was entering its third year of partnering with Solution Tree but was also transitioning to a new coach, had a difficult time gaining buy-in from staff at the start of the year. Staff expressed frustration with what they felt was too much time spent getting the new coach up to speed and revisiting activities the school had done in previous years.

"I told [my coach], 'With all due respect, I appreciate that you're here, but this was imposed on me. I have no idea what you do. Am I reporting to you? Are you reporting back to me? I don't understand what you're doing here.' So, I will tell you that it wasn't until about September that I really felt more comfortable with his presence."

--Solution Tree Principal

CHALLENGES TO IMPLEMENTING COLLABORATIVE TEAMS AND ACHIEVING SCHOOL PERFORMANCE GOALS

Both vendors are working with schools to help them implement collaborative teams and, directly or indirectly, to achieve their school performance goals. However, school staff reported challenges below that continue to impede this progress.

School and district staff report that **competing priorities and scheduling conflicts are significant challenges for implementing collaborative teams**.

In their survey responses, almost all teachers across vendors (88%) reported that competing priorities (e.g., grading, lesson planning/prepping, etc.) and scheduling conflicts (64%) (e.g., IEP meetings, parent meetings, covering other classrooms, etc.) are the most challenging barriers, as they often displace dedicated collaboration time during the week.²⁰ Teachers felt there was not enough time to dig into the types of collaboration that they thought would be most useful. Principals and district staff agreed, noting that Title I schools are often implementing multiple initiatives and grants, and serve student populations with complex needs, which can make it hard for teachers to focus on their instructional practice.

"In the elementary setting it is imperative that we have the necessary time built into our contract day to allow for our preparation and planning (for multiple subjects), and also include time for PLC once a week. Expecting us to use our before and after school contract time as planning time is unfair. If you really want the model to work, and for teachers to dig in and do the hard work that needs to be done, we need the time.

--TNTP Teacher

Many teachers also reported feeling that collaboration time was not used as effectively as it could be. Several teachers felt that the topics were not relevant to their needs, and some reported feeling as though collaboration was stifled by the presence of teachers' supervisors or other administrators. Teachers shared that they would like greater control over the agenda for collaborative team meetings, and for the time to be used consistently for discussion and collaboration with their colleagues. Interviewees described varying levels of readiness and collaboration among grade-level and subjectmatter teams, primarily due to teacher and principal tenure and mindsets.

While staff buy-in to the collaborative team process was strong across schools, principals and teachers also shared that **collaborative teams lacking cohesion struggled to make progress** towards their shared goals. Some interviewed teachers shared that some of their colleagues did not adhere to the norms of collaboration or did not engage in meaningful discussions during team meetings. In survey responses, 59% of principals also reported that teacher mindsets and morale are a significant barrier to achieving school performance goals.²¹ Several principals described dealing with veteran staff members who were outspoken or refused to contribute to collaborative work.

Lack of cohesion across the state, district, schools, and vendors also left teachers fielding mixed messages about their work. Teachers reported feeling as though competing agendas from different levels of the education system created confusion. In particular, staff working with TNTP reported feeling

²⁰ n=260

²¹ n=17

bought-in to their philosophy of "going slow," but then were faced with district pacing directives that seemed in conflict with the vendor's philosophy. Additionally, staff reported that the multitude of everchanging policies and initiatives, particularly for Title I-funded schools, meant that they had to regularly adapt to changes in curricular priorities and supports available, which can distract from their own school improvement priorities supported by the vendors. And, while some schools were able to use the collaborative team model to support the rollout of the new ELA curriculum, some teachers were "overwhelmed" by the new content and felt that with a limited amount of time for collaboration during the day, they needed to focus on learning content as opposed to iterating on instructional strategies.

Most understandably, the transition to distance learning during the COVID-19 pandemic disrupted schools' progress towards fully implementing collaborative teams and achieving school performance goals. The urgent need to adjust plans to engage and serve students and families during distance learning meant that collaborative teams did not continue working towards their stated goals, and instead worked to triage needs and plan for the new reality. Because schools were no longer teaching new content, collaborative teams' focus shifted to supporting each other with strategies for distance learning. Principals and school staff felt as though the end of the school year would have been the time when they would begin to see the impact of the work they began at the start of the year.

Enabling Conditions for Successful Implementation

In addition to common challenges, there were several clear patterns in the interview and survey data that suggest there are common conditions that support a successful partnership with school improvement vendors. The following factors appear to be associated with faster progress when working with TNTP and Solution Tree:

 Vendors and coaches that are well matched to the needs of principals and schools. Principals and instructional leaders spoke highly of their TNTP and Solution Tree coaches, and most felt their coach provided them with valuable, differentiated support. The relationships that appeared especially successful paired WCSD principals with vendor coaches who had been principals at schools with similar characteristics and challenges.

"I'm assuming TNTP was strategic about assigning [coach name] to us. Because she has an ELL background, that's really a specialty of hers, and it has really been advantageous for us as a school."

--TNTP Principal

 School leaders that hold and communicate consistent expectations for all school staff and cultivate a supportive environment that promotes trust and

vulnerability. TNTP and Solution Tree's models require more open classrooms and critical conversations between teachers, principals, and coaches, meaning that a culture of trust and vulnerability is foundational to successful collaborative teams. Principal and teacher tenure, as well as staff experience with prior school improvement initiatives, impacts the readiness of staff to adopt and implement new mindsets and instructional practices. New principals (to the position and/or building) must spend time setting their tone, expectations, and building relationships and rapport with teachers and the community, as well as building trust in their vision for school improvement (supported by their vendor), which takes time. Additionally, there exists a continuum of openness to new approaches across schools and staff, as some have

witnessed successful initiatives, while others have been disappointed in the lack of progress of past initiatives.

• School structures—including schedules, resources, and staff capacity—that provide the time and support for teachers to meaningfully collaborate. Schools varied in the amount of time they were able to dedicate to collaborative team meetings. Teachers and instructional coaches frequently described the need for consistent and sufficient time in their daily and weekly schedules to actually do the work of a collaborative team, while also having the time to address other student and planning needs. Additional staff capacity, such as through substitute teachers, specials teachers (such as art, music, or P.E.), and instructional assistants, is necessary to provide time for teachers away from their classrooms for team meetings, and allows teachers to work without being interrupted to help students move between classrooms or address behavioral needs. Additionally, when staff hold multiple roles within the school building, it can be difficult to find time for collaborative planning.

Furthermore, schools with more resources to support the social-emotional, behavioral, and basic needs of its students (a sufficient number of school counselors or social workers, for example) enable teachers to focus on high quality instruction in the classroom without also having to tend to Tier 2 or 3 student behavioral and social-emotional needs. Without these supports, teachers have less capacity to focus on iterative instructional improvements.

Considerations for Sustainability

Respondents expressed an overall positive experience with the supports provided by TNTP and Solution Tree, and SPR's analysis has surfaced several important considerations and recommendations for the continuation of the work with these vendors and more broadly.

- Principals would like to see the district-wide focus on and support for PLCs continue, especially as professional development for staff, even when the vendor coaching supports end. Principals indicated receiving the most direct support from TNTP and Solution Tree coaches and believed that the supports have had an influence on improving school leadership practices as well as teacher instruction. They felt that there is still work to do to fully implement strong collaborative teams and make progress toward their school performance goals, and hoped that the district would continue to support schools in their unique approaches to implementation. Coaches from both vendors believe it takes about three years for the average school to "transform," and agree that having multiple years of focused support for each school is important.
- School staff are committed to continuing the essential activities and agree it will take time for results to materialize. Principals, teachers, and other school staff all agree that collaborative teams are a strong model for "We just need time to professional development that they hope to continue using in implement. We are their schools, and that they will continue to incorporate other already seeing progress lessons learned from working with their vendor in future and just need to keep the years. While many schools saw progress in teacher mindsets, course." instructional practices, and student behavior and outcomes, there was consensus that it will take more time for the model - TNTP Principal to be fully implemented and successful. This was particularly

true for staff that began work with their vendor more recently, and because of the loss of the spring quarter due to the pandemic.

- The amount of dedicated collaboration time and competing priorities have a large influence on teacher perceptions of the effectiveness of collaborative teams. Teachers believe more uninterrupted time for collaborative meetings is necessary for progress of essential activities, and while many felt that they needed more time for meetings, almost as many felt that the time they do have needs to be more focused. District policies and resources play a role in supporting schools to redesign schedules that prioritize this collaboration time, and provide the needed supports (e.g., additional staff, aligned initiatives and training).
- **Consistency in school leadership is important** to carry the vision for the work forward and make necessary changes to support school improvement. While new principals often bring with them the opportunity to make changes to school culture and structures, it takes time to cultivate the supportive environment that promotes trust and vulnerability that is the foundation for successful implementation of collaborative teams and other positive changes. The data suggests that in this respect, principal tenure is more important than teacher and other staff tenure, as school leaders are the conduit for developing effective instruction in their staff, as opposed to training that comes directly from vendors or the district.
- Interviewees suggest streamlining school improvement efforts could increase the effectiveness of vendor-supported efforts. The structure of employing two vendors and three district liaisons caused some confusion, and interviewees suggest that streamlining by selecting one vendor and one district liaison would ensure consistency across schools and provide a more coordinated and sustainable effort. Several school staff noted that in district meetings with their colleagues, it was challenging to collaborate because the focus of the work varied across schools, limiting their ability to discuss or share relevant best practices. Consistent districtwide efforts would also ease transitions for school staff between different sites; for example, collaborative team norms and structures and frameworks for thinking about high-quality instruction would be consistent across schools.

CONCLUSION

The findings from this evaluation point to strong implementation and early benefits of working with TNTP and Solution Tree. School leaders (including both principals and school leadership teams) overwhelmingly reported that vendors positively impacted their own instructional leadership skills, and that their work together had benefits at the teacher level as well. These teacher-level benefits include increased effectiveness of collaborative team meeting time, greater teacher buy-in for using student data to drive instruction, and strengthened beliefs in the ability of all students to meet high standards. Among TNTP schools, work with the vendor translated into statistically significant positive impacts on school climate as measured by the Staff Climate Survey.

While the evaluation did not include student-level academic indicators of progress for schools served in SY2019-2020 due to COVID-19, the quantitative and qualitative results reinforce the quality of these vendors and their potential to positively influence school, classroom, and student outcomes. Our hope is that this report equips district leaders with the data and considerations needed to continuously improve its approach and support of these vendor-school partnerships, including how to help schools sustain the work they began this school year into the future.

TECHNICAL APPENDICES

Appendix A: Interview & Focus Group Samples

Vendor	School	Count of Interviewees
TNTP	Anderson Elementary	5
	Echo Loder Elementary School	4
	Mariposa Academy	5
	Natchez Elementary	4
Solution Tree	Dilworth STEM Academy	6
	Palmer Elementary	4
	Veterans Elementary	5
	Washoe Inspire	4

Exhibit A-1: Schools Selected for Qualitative Data Collection

Exhibit A-2: Roles of Interview & Focus Group Participants



*Other staff include 4 deans, 6 coaches and specialists, and one social worker.

Appendix B: TNTP & Solution Tree Principal and Teacher Survey Response Rates

Vendor	School/Role	Number of Staff Invited	Number of Staff Responded	Response Rate
Solution	ALLEN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	27	15	56%
Tree	Principal	1	0	0%
	Teacher	26	15	58%
	BENNETT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	31	13	42%
	Principal	1	0	0%
	Teacher	30	13	43%
	DILWORTH MIDDLE SCHOOL	43	13	30%
	Principal	1	1	100%
	Teacher	42	12	29%
	DRAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	21	10	48%
	Principal	1	0	0%
	Teacher	20	10	50%
	LEMELSON K-8 S.T.E.M ACADEMY	22	5	23%
	Principal	1	1	100%
	Teacher	21	4	19%
	LINCOLN PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	28	9	32%
	Principal	1	1	100%
	Teacher	27	8	30%
	O'BRIEN S.T.E.M. ACADEMY	43	18	42%
	Principal	1	1	100%
	Teacher	42	17	40%
	PALMER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	32	17	53%
	Principal	1	1	100%

Exhibit B-2: Survey Response Rates

	Teacher	31	16	52%
	SPARKS MIDDLE SCHOOL	43	15	35%
	Principal	1	0	0%
	Teacher	42	15	36%
	STEAD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	43	23	53%
	Principal	1	1	100%
	Teacher	42	22	52%
	SUN VALLEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	32	15	47%
	Principal	1	0	0%
	Teacher	31	15	48%
	TRANER MIDDLE SCHOOL	40	17	43%
	Principal	1	1	100%
	Teacher	39	16	41%
	TURNING POINT/PASS	11	7	64%
	Principal	1	1	100%
	Teacher	10	6	60%
	VETERANS S.T.E.M. ACADEMY	28	9	32%
	Principal	1	1	100%
	Teacher	27	8	30%
	WARNER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	22	9	41%
	Principal	1	0	0%
	Teacher	21	9	43%
	WASHOE INSPIRE ACADEMY	15	8	53%
	Principal	1	1	100%
	Teacher	14	7	50%
ΤΝΤΡ	ANDERSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	32	13	41%
	Principal	1	1	100%
	Teacher	31	12	39%

	BOOTH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	26	8	31%
	Principal	1	0	0%
	Teacher	25	8	32%
	CANNAN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	31	13	42%
	Principal	1	1	100%
	Teacher	30	12	40%
	DESERT HEIGHTS ES	31	18	58%
	Principal	1	1	100%
	Teacher	30	17	57%
	DUNCAN S.T.E.M. ACADEMY	31	14	45%
	Principal	1	0	0%
	Teacher	30	14	47%
	ECHO LODER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	33	13	39%
	Principal	1	1	100%
	Teacher	32	12	38%
	MARIPOSA	9	1	11%
	Principal	1	1	100%
	Teacher	8	0	0%
	MATHEWS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	40	12	30%
	Principal	1	1	100%
	Teacher	39	11	28%
	NATCHEZ ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	13	6	46%
	Principal	1	1	100%
	Teacher	12	5	42%
Total		727	301	41%

Appendix C: CITS Methodology and Detailed Results

To help ensure that the effect estimates reflect the effect of the intervention alone, CITS models have a comparison group to control for potentially confounding events. The model calculates how the observed outcome deviates from the predicted outcome (based on the pre-period trend), but it does this separately for the group affected by the intervention (the treatment group) and for the group not affected by the intervention group). The model then calculates the effect estimate by subtracting the comparison group deviation from the treatment group deviation. The underlying assumption of a CITS model is that the confounding event (which occurred when the intervention began) affected the treatment and comparison group similarly. Under that assumption, subtracting the confounding event.

The CITS regression model is:

(2)
$$Y_{at} = \alpha + \beta t + \lambda T_{at} + \gamma (t * T_{at}) + \Sigma \delta POST_k + \Sigma \Theta (T_{at} * POST) + \pi X_{at} + \Sigma \zeta_n S_n + \varepsilon_{at}$$

where Y_{at} is the outcome for group a (treatment or comparison group) at time t; t is the time period centered at the last pre-period month; T_{at} is a binary variable that equals 1 for the treatment group and 0 for the comparison group; POST is a binary variable that equals 1 for the SY2019-2020 and 0 otherwise; α and β equal the intercept and slope of the pre-intervention trend for the comparison group; ($\alpha + \lambda$) and ($\beta + \gamma$) equal the intercept and slope of the pre-intervention trend for the treatment group; δ represents the deviation from the trend for the comparison group in the post-period; and θ represents the estimated effect in the post-period—that is, the deviation from the trend for the treatment group minus the deviation from the trend for the comparison group. X_{at} is a vector of other time-varying school-level characteristics (school size, the percentage of students eligible for Free and Reduced-Price Lunch, the percentage of students with Individualized Education Plan, the percentage of students who are limited English proficient, the percentage of students who are female, and the percentage of students by racial group); Σ Sn is a vector of school fixed effects (that is, a set of 0/1 dummy variables indicating which school the observation came from, where n is the number of schools included in the model; and ε_{at} is an error term.

All the CITS models were estimated with clustered robust standard errors, which take into account the nested structure of the data.²²

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS ADJUSTMENT

Our CITS approach involved the estimation of 45 different models (for each survey domain, separate models were estimated for overall impact, TNTP impact, and Solution Tree impact). This raises the likelihood of estimates appearing as statistically significant only by chance, even if there is in fact no significant relationship. This is known in the literature as a Type I error (by contrast, a Type II error is not rejecting the null hypothesis of no association even if, in fact, an association exists). A common way to deal with Type I errors is to adjust the p-values associated with each estimate. We opted for a

²² Clustered robust standard errors are calculated in a way that takes into account that measurements for individual schools over time are highly correlated, which tends to artificially lower standard errors. Clustered standard errors are less biased than regular standard errors.

methodology that replaces the original p-values with sharpened False Discovery Rate (FDR) q-values.²³ The reason to opt for this methodology was its flexibility—it allows a small number of type I errors to still occur in exchange for greater statistical power compared to familywise error rate (FWER) methods (such as Bonferroni adjustments) which prioritize the rejection of Type I errors at the expense of Type II errors.

COMPLETE CITS RESULTS

Below we present the full model results from the CITS regressions. The coefficients and associated adjusted p-values were already presented in the body of the report. The full model results include additional information that allows readers and researchers to examine the strength of the evidence and include the findings in other research (for example, meta-analyses).

	(1) Expectations of	(2) Fairness and	(3) Staff	(4) Staff-Student	(5)
VARIABLES	Success	Respect	Collaboration	Relationships	Work Stress
Impact estimate (sharpened q	3.214	3.939	-4.063	-0.387	-1.911
value) School-level	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
covariates included	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	368	368	368	368	368
R-squared	0.064	0.049	0.031	0.064	0.121
Number of schools	92	92	92	92	92

Exhibit C-1: Staff Outcomes, Overall

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Exhibit C-2: Staff Outcomes, TNTP Schools

VARIABLES	(1) Expectations of Success	(2) Fairness and Respect	(3) Staff Collaboration	(4) Staff-Student Relationships	(5) Work Stress
Impact estimate (sharpened q	12.74**	17.23**	12.15*	3.583*	11.10*
value) School-level	0.026	0.026	0.051	0.087	0.051
covariates included	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	308	308	308	308	308
R-squared	0.155	0.164	0.084	0.091	0.172
Number of schools	77	77	77	77	77

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

²³ Anderson (2008), "Multiple Inference and Gender Differences in the Effects of Early Intervention: A Reevaluation of the Abecedarian, Perry Preschool, and Early Training Projects", *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 103(484), 1481-1495

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
VARIABLES	Success	Respect	Collaboration	Relationships	Work Stress
Impact estimate (sharpened g	-1.710	-3.465	-12.95	-2.511	-8.315
value) School-level	0.641	0.503	0.243	0.503	0.243
covariates included	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	336	336	336	336	336
R-squared	0.082	0.033	0.057	0.060	0.144
Number of schools	84	84	84	84	84

Exhibit C-3: Staff Outcomes, Solution Tree Schools

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Exhibit C-4: Student Outcomes, Overall

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7) Self	(8)	(9)	(10)
			Self-	Self	Self	Self-	Manage-			
		Responsible	Awareness	Awareness	Manage-	Manage	ment of	Social		Student
	Relationship	Decision	of	of Self	ment of	ment of	Schoolwo	Aware-	Adult	Engage-
VARIABLES	Skills	Making	Emotions	Concept	Emotions	Goals	rk	ness	Support	ment
Impact estimate (sharpened g	0.820	-3.204	-2.338	-2.547	-0.880	-3.143	-1.056	-0.900	1.340	-3.294
value) School-level	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
covariates included	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	459	459	459	459	459	459	459	459	460	460
R-squared Number of	0.060	0.138	0.170	0.120	0.077	0.176	0.112	0.108	0.257	0.059
schools	94	94	94	94	94	94	94	94	94	94

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Exhibit C-5: Student Outcomes, TNTP Schools

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7) Self	(8)	(9)	(10)
			Self-	Self	Self	Self-	Manage-			
		Responsible	Awareness	Awareness	Manage-	Manage	ment of	Social		Student
VARIABLES	Relationship Skills	Decision Making	of Emotions	of Self Concept	ment of Emotions	ment of Goals	Schoolwo rk	Aware- ness	Adult Support	Engage- ment
Impact estimate (sharpened q	-4.603	-4.874	-2.125	-0.560	-3.608	-3.886	-3.122	-4.154	-3.621	-9.064
value) School-level	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.441
covariates included	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	383	383	383	383	383	383	383	383	383	383

R-squared	0.088	0.123	0.172	0.086	0.077	0.176	0.092	0.107	0.297	0.085
schools	78	78	78	78	78	78	78	78	78	78

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Exhibit C-6: Student Outcomes, Solution Tree Schools

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7) Self	(8)	(9)	(10)
VARIABLES	Relationship Skills	Responsible Decision Making	Self- Awareness of Emotions	Self Awareness of Self Concept	Self Manage- ment of Emotions	Self- Manage ment of Goals	Manage- ment of Schoolwo rk	Social Aware- ness	Adult Support	Student Engage- ment
Impact estimate	3.471	-2.051	-2.515	-3.480	0.769	-2.739	0.374	0.651	3.851	-0.827
(sharpened q value) School-level	0.429	0.835	0.735	0.616	1.000	0.735	1.000	1.000	0.541	1.000
covariates included	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	419	419	419	419	419	419	419	419	420	420
R-squared Number of	0.110	0.184	0.232	0.165	0.083	0.218	0.167	0.139	0.277	0.100
schools	86	86	86	86	86	86	86	86	86	86

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Appendix D: Quantile Regression Methodology and Results

Unlike ordinary regression where the objective is to estimate the *mean* of the dependent variable, quantile regression estimates predict quantiles of the dependent variable (such as the median, which is also known as the 0.5 quantile) conditional on covariates. Simply said, quantile regression finds a line through the data that minimizes the sum of the absolute residuals rather than the sum of the squares of the residuals, as in ordinary regression.

There are two main reasons to employ this technique. First, average outcomes are often unduly influenced by outliers. Second, the average treatment effect can mask underlying patterns; for example, participating in TNTP and Solution Tree programs might have a larger effect on schools with relatively lower staff perceptions of school climate (lower quantiles) than on schools with higher staff perceptions of school climate (higher quantiles). We conducted this analysis for TNTP schools to determine whether these statistically significant results were driven more so by schools at certain points of the spectrum.

Because our estimates are based on data from the same school over several years, we needed a variant of quantile regression that can account for school fixed effects (i.e., school characteristics that do not vary over time). The user-written command qregpd²⁴ was specifically designed to account for fixed effects in panel data. Its estimator uses within-individual variation for identification purposes, and the resulting estimates can be interpreted in the same manner as cross-sectional quantile estimates (i.e., the impact of the explanatory variables on the nth quantile of the outcome distribution) while using the panel nature of the data to relax the typical assumptions required to estimate quantile treatment effects. The fixed effects are never estimated directly, and the coefficient estimates are consistent for a small number of yearly observations (which is the case for our data).

We plot the QTEs (as a solid red line) in Exhibit D-1. For comparison purposes, the mean treatment effect is plotted as a horizontal green line, and the 0-line is also provided for reference. Blue shaded areas around QTEs represent two-sided 90% confidence intervals. For one outcome—Expectations of Success—the QTEs exhibit a relatively narrow vertical range, suggesting that the impact of TNTP on this outcome is relatively constant throughout the distribution; therefore, the average treatment effect is probably a suitable representation of TNTP's impact. For most of the other outcomes, however, the range of QTEs is considerably wider, suggesting that the mean treatment effect is insufficient to characterize TNTP's impact. Generally, most of the positive and significant QTEs occurred between the second quantile and the median, suggesting that TNTP participation produces its impact mostly by affecting schools at the lower end of the outcome scale.

²⁴ Matthew Baker, 2016. "QREGPD: Stata module to perform Quantile Regression for Panel Data," Statistical Software Components S458157, Boston College Department of Economics.

Exhibit D-1: TNTP Quantile Treatment Effects on Staff Beliefs and Mindsets

Source: WCSD

Note: Quantile treatment effects represent the pre-post deviation in Quantile X (1, 2, 3, and so forth) for the treatment group minus the pre-post deviation in the same quantile for the comparison group.







Appendix E: Description of School Climate Survey Measures

Staff Measures

Expectations of Success: 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=agree, 4=strongly agree

Staff at my school set high expectations for students' achievement Staff at my schoolwork hard to motivate students who show low interest in schoolwork Staff at my schoolwork hard to make sure that students stay in school

Staff-Student Relationships: 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=agree, 4=strongly agree

Teachers and staff at my school care about every student

Teachers and staff at my school listen to students' ideas and opinions

Teachers and staff at my school talk openly to students about school issues

Every single student at our school knows at least one staff member who would help them with a personal problem

Every single student at our school knows at least one staff member who would care if they were not in school

Fairness and Respect: 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=agree, 4=strongly agree

Staff respect all students at my school

- Staff are professional when speaking of each other and/or administrators
- Students of different social backgrounds get along well at my school
- The rules and expectations about how students should behave at my school are fair

The rules and expectations about student behavior are enforced equally by staff

Staff Collaboration: 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=agree, 4=strongly agree

There is a sense of teamwork among all school staff

The school leadership make a sustained effort to address staff concerns

Staff at my school are recognized and appreciated for good work

The school leadership makes sure that staff are involved in making plans and decisions that affect this school

The school leadership makes sure that my administrative duties do not interfere with my essential role of educating students

I feel comfortable raising issues and concerns that are important to me at my school

I feel supported by my administrator

My school provides me with the materials and resources needed to provide support for students of all abilities

I feel school leadership is clear about what my job is at this school

Staff are proud to work at this school

I look forward to coming to this school everyday

Work Stress: 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=agree, 4=strongly agree

I feel tense, restless, or anxious at work.

I feel burnt out

With this work pace I don't think I'll make it to the retiring age

I'm disappointed in our staff's ways of handling our shared affairs I often feel like an outsider in my work community I often feel I have failed in my work with students Dealing with problem situations concerning students often upsets me

Student Measures

Self Awareness of Self Concept: 1=Very difficult, 2 = Difficult, 3 = Easy, 4 = Very easy Knowing what my strengths are. Knowing how to get better at things that are hard for me to do at school. Knowing when I am wrong about something. Knowing when I can't control something.

Self Awareness of Emotions: 1=Very difficult, 2 = Difficult, 3 = Easy, 4 = Very easy

Knowing when my feelings are making it hard for me to focus Knowing the emotions I feel Knowing ways to make myself feel better when I'm sad Noticing what my body does when I am nervous. Knowing when my mood affects how I treat others Knowing ways I calm myself down

Social Awareness: 1=Very difficult, 2 = Difficult, 3 = Easy, 4 = Very easy

Learning from people with different opinions than me Knowing what people may be feeling by the look on their face Knowing when someone needs help Knowing how to get help when I'm having trouble with a classmate Knowing how my actions impact my classmates

Self Management of Emotions: 1=Very difficult, 2 = Difficult, 3 = Easy, 4 = Very easy

Getting through something even when I feel frustrated Being patient even when I am really excited Staying calm when I feel stressed Working on things even when I don't like them

Self Management of Goals: 1=Very difficult, 2 = Difficult, 3 = Easy, 4 = Very easy

Finishing tasks even if they are hard for me Setting goals for myself Reaching goals that I set for myself Thinking through the steps it will take to reach my goal

Self Management of Schoolwork: 1=Very difficult, 2 = Difficult, 3 = Easy, 4 = Very easy

Doing my schoolwork even when I do not feel like it Being prepared for tests Working on assignments even when they are hard Planning ahead so I can turn a project in on time Finishing my schoolwork without reminders Staying focused in class even when there are distractions

Relationship Skills: 1=Very difficult, 2 = Difficult, 3 = Easy, 4 = Very easy

Respecting a classmate's opinions during a disagreement Getting along with my classmates Sharing what I am feeling with others Talking to an adult when I have problems at school Being welcoming to someone I don't usually eat lunch with Getting along with my teachers

Responsible Decision Making: 1=Very difficult, 2 = Difficult, 3 = Easy, 4 = Very easy

Thinking about what might happen before making a decision Knowing what is right or wrong Thinking of different ways to solve a problem Saying "no" to a friend who wants to break the rules Helping to make my school a better place

Social Awareness: 1=Not at all True, 2=A little True, 3=Pretty Much True, 4=Very Much True

I listen carefully to what other students say to me
I get along with students who are different from me
It is important for me to help others in my school
I can tell when someone is getting angry or upset before they say anything
I care about other people's feelings and points of view
I try to understand how other people feel and think

Relationship Skills: 1=Not at all True, 2=A little True, 3=Pretty Much True, 4=Very Much True

I am able to work well with others I know how to disagree without starting an argument I ask my teachers for help when I need it If I get upset with a friend, I can talk about it and make things better It is easy for me to join a conversation that other students have already started I enjoy being around people whose background and experiences are different from mine

Responsible Decision-Making: 1=Not at all True, 2=A little True, 3=Pretty Much True, 4=Very Much True

When I have problems at school, I am good at finding ways to solve them If I can't figure something out, I try different solutions until one works When I make a decision, I think about what might happen afterwards I take responsibility for my mistakes I can say "no" when my friends want me to do something that I don't want to do

Student Engagement: 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=agree, 4=strongly agree

Most of what I learn in school is interesting.

School keeps my mind really busy.

Time seems to pass very quickly in my classes.

I think a lot about what I learn in my classes even when I'm out of school.

I look forward to coming to school every day.

I am happy to be at this school.

I feel like I am part of this school.

Adult Support: 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=agree, 4=strongly agree

My teachers think I can get high grades in their classes if I try hard enough.

My teachers connect what I am doing in school to life outside of the classroom.

It is easy to talk with teachers at this school.

Teachers are available when I need to talk with them.

If I am absent, there is a teacher or some other adult at school that will notice my absence.

Teachers understand my problems.

My teachers care about me.

My teachers make me feel good about myself.

I can meet the expectations that my teachers have set for me.