The Collaborative Project: The First Two Years

Submitted to the Public School Forum
and
The NC Science, Mathematics, and Technology Center

June 2009

THE UNIVERSITY
of NORTH CAROLINA
at CHAPEL HILL

Carolina Institute
for Public Policy

The Collaborative Project: The First Two Years

Submitted to the Public School Forum

and

The NC Science, Mathematics, and Technology Education Center

June 2009

by

Charles L. Thompson, East Carolina University

Elizabeth K. Cunningham, Independent Consultant

Adrienne Smith, UNC–Chapel Hill

Joy C. Phillips, East Carolina University

Rebecca A. Zulli, UNC-Chapel Hill

Acknowledgements

We wish to thank the local educators in the five district partners in The Collaborative Project for their generous and candid participation in the interviews and survey that served as the primary basis for this report. In every district and school we met administrators whose dedication, energy, skill, and insights were extremely impressive. We also wish to thank Collaborative Project leaders Jean Murphy and Alfred Mays, as well as John Dornan, Sam Houston, and Jo Ann Norris, who worked with key members of the General Assembly to initiate the project and who were unfailingly helpful and candid in providing information for this report. Collaborative Project Administrative Assistant Kristen Dibble was also a great resource in providing essential information for the report. Finally, we wish to acknowledge the meticulous editing and formatting work done by Elizabeth D'Amico, who is responsible for the overall look and polish of the report. The lead author is solely responsible for any remaining errors in the report.

Table of Contents

Tables:

Appendix:

Appendix B: Teacher Characteristics

Appendix C: Student Performance

Appendix D: Professional Development

Appendix E: Performance Incentive Criteria

Appendix F: Monetary Compensation by Collaborative Project

Appendix G: After School Program

Appendix H: Teacher Survey

Executive Summary

Administered jointly by the NC Public School Forum and the NC Science, Mathematics, and Technology Education Center, The Collaborative Project is a three-year pilot program serving five small, rural school systems distributed across the state. From west to east, the districts include Mitchell, Caswell, Warren, Greene, and Washington County Schools.

Over its first two years of operation, The Collaborative Project has developed and implemented three major systems designed to improve the performance of elementary and middle school students in the pilot districts, make the schools places that can attract and retain talented teachers and administrators, and lay the foundation for students' success in high school and beyond. In themselves, these systems of professional development, performance incentives, and after school programs represent important products of the Collaborative as a pilot project. All three are thoroughly designed, increasingly well implemented, and fully functional. They go well beyond what any district of modest size could develop and implement on its own, and within certain limitations of scale, the Project now has the capacity to apply them individually or in any combination in rural districts all across the state. Further, the Project has demonstrated an ability to continue adapting and refining the systems, based on experience, feedback from participating districts, and external evaluation. This type of "adaptive management" is a key component of successful projects and learning organizations.

But there is clearly an additional year of pilot work to be done. Based on data from several sources – administrative data from participating districts and the NCDPI, three rounds of interviews that we conducted in participating districts, and our online survey of teachers – in this report we have suggested potential adjustments to improve all three systems. Furthermore, as the designers of the Project in the General Assembly, the Public School Forum, and the Science, Mathematics, and Technology Education Center foresaw, two years are insufficient to make and to document a substantial impact. For that, the third year of the pilot and an additional year of more outcome-focused evaluation are required.

Yet student performance data from the first, partial year of the pilot (2007-08) are modestly encouraging. Across the five districts, the percentage of students proficient in mathematics increased over 2006-07 by an average of 4 points, from 52% to 56%. Between the two years, the State Board of Education raised standards for proficiency ("cut scores") in reading. So reading proficiency levels are not comparable across the two years, and no assessment of progress in reading proficiency is possible. (Reading proficiency levels fell statewide, including those in Project districts.)

For school growth and performance designations, the picture is confused by the different ways in which growth and performance were handled. Because of the change in reading standards, the 2007-08 Growth designations excluded reading achievement and were based solely on mathematics scores. So a strict comparison of Growth designations across the two years is not possible. But just considered by themselves, the Growth designations at the end of the first year of the Project (2007-08) are impressive. Ten schools made High Growth, 12 made Expected Growth, and only 2 failed to achieve expected growth.

In addition to improving student achievement, a second goal of the Project is to improve teacher quality by attracting and retaining talented teachers and administrators as well as strengthening their skills through intensive professional development. Here again, no final assessment of impact can yet be made, but data on such indicators as teacher turnover are encouraging: teacher turnover in Project elementary and middle schools fell in all five districts, from an average of 19% in the year before the project was initiated (2006-07) to 15% in the first year of the Project.

Based on administrative and interview data, there appears to have been an enormous increase in the quantity and a sharp improvement in the quality of professional development provided to teachers in Project districts. As one superintendent put it, the Project "has brought us into the major leagues from the minor leagues" in professional development quality. Our survey and interview data from principals as well as teachers generally support this contention. Principals also report observing significant and widespread impact on classroom teaching, including greater emphasis on hands-on methods, differentiated instruction, project and inquiry-based instruction, and teaching that is adapted to different student learning styles and needs. Candidates for certification by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards were vocal in their appreciation for the Project-sponsored support they received, and the figures on NBCTs and candidates bear out their enthusiasm. From the first, partial year of the Project (2007-08) until the second year (2008-09), applications for Board certification in Project districts increased from 13 to 40.

The third goal of The Collaborative Project is to lay the foundation for students' success in high school. Attracting, retaining, developing, and motivating teachers and administrators are all strategies designed to improve the skills and attitudes that students carry forward into high school. The Project's system of after school programs represents a different and more direct approach to this goal. The programs bring a combination of enrichment activities and remedial interventions to hundreds of elementary and middle school students across the pilot districts. According to local educators' reports, the programs have not only improved students' skills, but have also greatly strengthened teacher-student relationships in participating schools. If "relationships" are just as crucial as "rigor and relevance" to keep students in high school and on track to graduation, establishing patterns of positive relationships during the elementary and middle years may prove just as foundational as building skills and knowledge. The after school programs also provide a way to extend instructional time – not a negligible effect if global competition is to be more than a popular slogan. In many European nations, a typical school year runs to 220 days. In Japan, the rule is 240 days. If we cannot extend the academic year beyond 180 days, extending the school day may represent a down payment on what it will take to compete globally.

In summary, then, the evidence we have assembled from administrative, survey, and interview data indicate that The Collaborative Project has created systems of professional development, performance incentives, and after school programs that could be scaled up to serve similar districts all across the state. Initial evidence and potential "leading indicators" of student achievement and teacher quality in pilot districts seem promising. But another year of pilot work will be required to make the refinements suggested in this report and – even more importantly – to make a valid assessment of Project outcomes.

Introduction

Administered jointly by the NC Public School Forum and the NC Science, Mathematics, and Technology Education Center, The Collaborative Project is a three-year pilot program serving five small, rural school systems distributed across the state. From west to east, the districts include Mitchell, Caswell, Warren, Greene, and Washington County Schools. Targeted primarily to elementary and middle schools in these districts, the Project comprises three major components:

1) professional development for teachers, principals, and central office administrators;
2) performance incentives for individual teachers, principals, and administrators; and
3) enrichment-oriented after school programs for promising, but underachieving students in at least two schools per district.

The Project was funded by the General Assembly in the summer of 2007 at approximately $4.4 million in 2007-08 and $7.2 million in 2008-09.

In August of 2008, the Forum and Center contracted with a team based at East Carolina University and UNC-Chapel Hill to carry out an evaluation of the Project. In our initial report, we approached The Collaborative Project as just that – a project designed to improve elementary and middle schools in the five pilot districts. We described the districts themselves and the design, development, administration, implementation, and ongoing process of adjusting activities in the three components from its inception in the summer of 2007 through the summer of 2008.

By this spring (2009), however, the Project had developed well-defined *systems* of professional development, performance incentives, and after school programs. We base this finding on an extensive array of administrative data, three rounds of interviews with local educators at all levels of the districts, an online survey of teachers' views concerning the professional development and performance incentive components of the Project, and one round of observations in the after school programs. The administrative data came from the NC Department of Public Instruction and the Project's own records. Interviewees included superintendents, the associate or assistant superintendents who served as the Project's primary central office contacts, principals, after school coordinators, and elementary and middle school teachers. Six hundred seventeen (617) teachers responded to our Spring, 2009 online survey -- approximately eighty percent of the elementary and middle school teachers in participating districts. Finally, we conducted brief observations in the after school programs funded by the Project.

The systems of professional development, performance incentives, and after school programs can be viewed as important products or "outcomes" in their own right. That is, in each area the Project has developed approaches and functioning capacities that could be applied in a broad variety of similar districts – relatively small, rural districts which themselves lack the financial resources to design, develop, and operate sophisticated systems of these sorts. In a given district, the Forum and Center could deploy one, two, or all three components, with some tailoring to fit the circumstances of the particular district. Thus, the Project has created a new capacity for the

improvement of education in rural areas across the state – a capacity that did not exist before the Project was initiated.

In the next three sections of this report, we provide more background on the Project, on the districts it serves, and on the administration of the Project by the Forum and Center. Then in subsequent sections, we review the data we have gathered in order to assess the completeness, strengths, and weaknesses of the three systems. We ask, essentially, how well-developed and how functional are these systems? What else should Project leaders do to complete development of the systems and refine them to maximize their effectiveness? We conclude the report with some overall observations on the Project to date and the final year of the pilot.

Background on The Collaborative Project

According to a description prepared by Collaborative Project leaders, the Project has three overall goals:

- To make student performance in the pilot counties equal to, or better than, performance of students around the state – especially in the area of mathematics and science.
- To make schools in the pilot project counties places that talented teachers and administrators will want to come to and continue working in, places that parents will place their confidence in, and places in which students thrive, learn, and grow.
- To give students a solid educational foundation that will dramatically increase their ability to succeed in high school and beyond.

In brief, the Project seeks to improve student performance in the districts it serves; make the schools more attractive and productive places for local educators, parents, and students; and sharply improve students' preparation for high school and beyond. Achieving these goals will require sustained, focused efforts.

Continuing to quote from a description prepared by The Collaborative Project's initiators, Project activities were designed on the basis of the following premises:

- If educators are given the chance to sharpen their skills or to acquire new skills through high-quality professional development, dramatic student gains are possible. To make that possible, however, educators must be given time beyond the typical school day.
- If educators participate in high-quality professional development during optimum times (Saturdays and during the summer), incentives and rewards must be available for their extra effort.
- If educators participate in high-quality professional development with incentives and rewards, it will be possible to accomplish two goals: show measurable student performance growth and create a more positive learning and teaching environment for young people and for the educators who work with them.
- If students are given opportunities to extend their school days and calendars with after school programs, the additional time will lead to measurable benefits among promising students such as better test scores, attendance, etc.

Project leaders add that "… as teachers work together and come together around professional development experiences, a learning community should be created that could be a major factor in retaining teachers over the long haul."

For the past six years or more, reform of high schools has been a major statewide focus. High schools in the districts served by the Project have come in for their share of attention, and a variety of reform activities are under way in many of them. So legislative leaders, the Public School Forum, and the Science, Mathematics, and Technology Education Center elected to focus The Collaborative Project on elementary and middle schools. Recent research by our team at the Carolina Institute for Public Policy indicates that middle school mathematics and reading scores are the best predictors of student achievement in North Carolina high schools (Henry, Thompson, with others, 2008[1]). So over the longer term, improvements in elementary and middle school achievement in the five collaborating districts should contribute to improved outcomes at the high school level, as well.

Background on the Districts Served by The Collaborative Project

The five counties served by The Collaborative Project are all small and rural. The counties are also poorer and less well educated than the rest of the state. Statewide, the county average for persons living in poverty is 14.3%. In the five Project districts, the percent in poverty ranges from 15.8% to 24.5%.

In the state as a whole, about 28% of the parents of children in the public schools have at least a 4-year college degree. In the five Project districts, the percent of parents with at least a college degree ranges from 9% to 15%. The counties' school systems also reflect the small overall populations, with student populations averaging 2,735 and ranging in size from 2,072 to 3,303. The average for NC districts is 12,223.

Table 1: Profile of Collaborative Counties

	Caswell	Greene	Mitchell	Warren	Washington	State
Population[1]	23,248	20,677	15,784	19,388	12,946	9,222,414
Persons/Square Mile[1]	55.3	71.6	71	46.6	39.4	165.2
Persons Living in Poverty[1]	15.8%	21.7%	15.8%	24.5%	23.6%	14.3%
Parents at Least Four Year College graduate[2]	15% (225)	14% (205)	15% (162)	9% (110)	12% (120)	28%
Total Number of Students[3]	3,303	3,272	2,213	2,817	2,072	Total=1,405,694 District=12,223 Range=614-29,009

[1]*U.S. Census Bureau: State and County Quick Facts. Data derived from Population Estimates, Census of Population and Housing, Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates, State and County Housing Unit Estimates, County Business Patterns, Non-employer Statistics, Economic Census, Survey of Business Owners, Building Permits, Consolidated Federal Funds Report*
[2]*Data retrieved from Reports of Disaggregated State, School System (LEA) and School Performance Data in 2005-06*
[3]*Data retrieved from NC Public Schools Statistical Profile 2007*

[1] Henry, Gary T., Thompson, Charles, L. Brown, Kathleen, Cunningham, Elizabeth, Kainz, Kirsten, Montrosse, Bianca, Sgammato, Adrienne, Yi, Pan (2008). *North Carolina High School Resource Allocation Study,* Carolina Institute for Public Policy, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

As noted above, the Collaborative Project focuses on elementary and middle schools. As would be expected, Project districts have small numbers of schools at the K-8 grade levels. Most have from 3 to 5 elementary and middle schools, but the geography of Mitchell County dictates 7 smaller elementary and middle schools (Appendix A, Table 1). The elementary schools are generally smaller than the state average of 510 students, but in three counties the middle schools are larger than the 666-student average for middle schools across the state. (Appendix A, Table 3). District-wide class size averages are not sharply different from state averages, although there is substantial variation in class size from school to school within districts (Appendix A, Table 4).

Perhaps the most striking differences across the five counties served by The Collaborative Project are in student ethnicity. In North Carolina as a whole, 31% of public school students are African-American. In the five Project counties, the percentage of students who are African-American ranges from less than 1% to 74%. In four of the districts, Hispanic students make up only 3 to 4% of the student population, but in one, the Hispanic percentage is 18% – twice the statewide Hispanic average of 9%. Across all five counties, however, the percentages of American Indian and Asian students are consistently small – less than 1%, slightly lower than the statewide percentages. (Appendix A, Table 5).

Looking now at teachers, in 2006-07, the number of teachers at the elementary and middle school levels in the five Project districts ranged from 117 to 165. In terms of experience, at the elementary and middle school levels, two of the five counties had a higher percentage of inexperienced teachers (0-3 years of experience) than the state average of 24%. In one of the two, 30% of elementary school teachers and 36% of middle school teachers were inexperienced (Appendix B, Table 4). The higher than average proportion of inexperienced teachers may be in part due to some pilot districts reliance on substantial numbers of Teach for America and Visiting International Faculty, two groups of teachers who turn over more rapidly than others. At the elementary school level, all five districts had higher percentages of teachers with more than 10 years of experience than did the average NC district. With one exception, the same was true at the middle school level.

As Table 2 below indicates, teacher turnover across the five districts was quite variable. At the elementary school level, two districts had lower turnover rates than did districts statewide, while three had higher than average turnover rates. At the middle school level, three districts' turnover rate was higher than the state average, while two had lower than average turnover rates. The single combined middle/high school in one district had slightly higher turnover than the average for such schools statewide.

Table 2: Teacher Turnover[1]

	Caswell	Greene	Mitchell	Warren	Washington	State
Elementary	7%	14%	7%	22%	14%	12%
Middle	13%	17%	8%	16%	23%	15%
Elementary/Middle	NA	NA	15%	NA	NA	11%
Middle/High	NA	NA	NA	NA	33%	15%

Data retrieved from NC School Report Cards in 2006-07

[1]The percentage of classroom teachers who left their school district between March of the 2006-07 academic year and March of the 2007-08 academic year.

In light of teacher compensation in Collaborative Project districts relative to the rest of the state, it seems surprising that the districts do not have even higher turnover rates and percentages of teachers with 0-3 years of experience. The local salary supplements paid by the five Collaborative Project districts are substantially lower than the average local supplement for districts statewide. In 2008, local supplements for the five districts ranged from $434 to $1,663. The average supplement for the five Collaborative districts was $901, compared to a statewide average of $3,327. Even the largest supplement paid by Collaborative Project districts was about half the average supplement for the state. (For more information on teachers and teacher salary supplements in the five Project districts see Appendices B and F.)

Turning to student performance, in 2006-07, the year before The Collaborative Project was initiated, the percent proficient in reading in two of the five counties was slightly above the state's average of 86%, and the percent proficient in the other three counties was 10 points or less below the state average. In mathematics, however, the percent proficient in three of the five districts was 19 to 22 points below the state average of 66%, while in the other two districts the percent proficient in mathematics was 4 to 9 points below the state average. So while three districts were struggling in reading, it was in mathematics where the severest problems were experienced.

Table 3: Percent Proficient in Reading and Math by Grade Level in 2006-07 and 2007-08

	Caswell		Greene		Mitchell		Warren		Washington		State	
	06-07	07-08	06-07	07-08	06-07	07-08	06-07	07-08	06-07	07-08	06-07	07-08
Reading	87.5	53.7	75.7	37.2	89.0	57.0	78.6	39.1	75.7	33.3	85.5	55.6
Math	62.5	66.1	44.1	48.1	61.2	67.4	49.6	53.2	44.1	46.8	66.4	69.9
Reading & Math	61	48	42	30	60	51	47	33	41	27	64	51

Data retrieved from NC School Report Cards in 2006-07and Reports of Disaggregated State, School System (LEA) and School Performance Data in 2007-08

A final set of points about The Collaborative Project districts comes from our initial round of interviews, conducted in August, 2008. To open the interviews, we asked district administrators to set aside The Collaborative Project for a few minutes and to reflect on the biggest challenges they faced and their overall goals for the next year or two.

- Virtually all of them named the urgent need to raise End-of-Grade (EOG) and End-of-Course (EOC) test scores, especially in mathematics. At that time, the EOG scores in reading were not yet public, but presumably local educators were aware of both the reading scores within their own districts and of the newly-raised cut scores for proficiency in mathematics.

- Most also mentioned the difficulty of making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) under the federal No Child Left Behind Act. In four of the five districts, administrators pointed to making AYP with the subgroup of special education students as an almost impossibly difficult challenge.

- In four of the five districts, both district and school administrators emphasized the problems they had in recruiting high quality teachers, particularly in mathematics and special education. One principal returned to the problem of attracting a high quality applicant pool almost a dozen times in a one hour interview. District and school administrators who cited teacher recruitment problems attributed them in part to their county's isolation and lack of quality housing and of social and cultural amenities. These were said to represent particular barriers to recruiting and retaining younger teachers. The other factor to which district and school leaders attributed their recruitment difficulties was teacher compensation. As noted above, the local salary supplements paid by the five Collaborative Project districts are indeed substantially lower than the average local supplement for districts across the state. Administrators also pointed out that in areas such as mathematics, where they have particular difficulty hiring high quality teachers; their problem is compounded by the large signing bonuses paid by some urban districts.

- Administrators in all five districts cited low levels of parent literacy and of support for education as barriers to the improvement of student achievement. The most recent literacy figures available by county date back to 1997, but they do provide a rough sense of where the state stands nationally and where The Collaborative Project counties may stand within the state. In 1997, North Carolina ranked 41st in the nation in adult literacy. Based on an assessment of a sample of North Carolina adults in that year, about 51% of adults (residents above the age of 16) scored at one of the two lowest levels of literacy – out of a total of five levels. So the state as a whole appeared to suffer from a low rate of adult literacy. But the percentages of adults scoring at one of the two lowest levels were even higher for the five Collaborative Project counties: Caswell (71%), Greene (69%), Mitchell (60%), Warren (81%), and Washington (70%). Even if adult literacy rates have improved significantly over the past decade, the five school districts served by The Collaborative Project do appear to have a serious literacy challenge to overcome. Of course, low levels of adult literacy do not necessarily equate to low levels of parental support for education, but some less educated parents in these districts may not fully understand the importance of education in today's economy, and even if they do, they may have more difficulty in helping their children with homework.

- A final challenge cited by many teachers and some administrators across the districts was the limited horizon of experience within which many of their students live. According to local educators, many students have never been outside of their home counties and have little acquaintance with urban areas and the contemporary economy and cultural amenities represented there. As a result, they often lack the background knowledge necessary to make ready sense of what they read, and they do not appreciate the level of education required for well-paying jobs in today's economy.

The Collaborative Project includes responses to nearly all of the main challenges cited by administrators in the five districts it serves: improving student achievement and making Adequate Yearly Progress under NCLB, recruiting and retaining high quality teachers, and increasing parent support for education. All three components of the project – professional development, performance incentives, and after school programs – speak to the student

achievement challenge. Professional development: by addressing the skills and knowledge of teachers and administrators. Performance incentives: by attempting to stimulate motivation. And after school programs: by attempting to promote stronger bonds between teachers and students, higher levels of student engagement with learning, and improved skills through remediation. The performance incentive component is also designed to make the districts more competitive in attracting and retaining high quality teachers, and it includes incentives to increase teacher-parent communication and thus to enlist stronger parental support for their children's education. The after school component includes travel and exposure to cultural amenities that many students are reported to lack. The only two challenges cited by administrators in participating districts that are not addressed directly by the Project are recruiting special education teachers and overcoming low parent literacy levels. Thus, overall, the Project's systems of professional development, performance incentives, and after school programs are appropriately targeted to address the main problems confronting the five districts.

In the next section, we briefly describe the administration of the Project, and then follow that with sections discussing the implementation of the professional development, performance incentive, and after school systems in pilot districts.

Administration of the Project

As noted earlier, The Collaborative Project is administered by the Public School Forum of NC and the NC Science, Mathematics, and Technology Education Center. The Forum was established in 1986 as a partnership of North Carolina business, education, and government leaders. Long the state's leading education policy think tank, the Forum also oversees several action programs in communities across the state. The Science, Mathematics, and Technology Education Center's website traces the impetus for the organization back to a 1995 Forum report that highlighted North Carolina's shortcomings in science and mathematics education, but it was not until 2002 that the Burroughs Wellcome Fund established the Center to improve pre-K through high school student performance in science, mathematics, and technology.

Forum Executive Director John Dornan and Center President Sam Houston worked closely with legislative leaders to design the Project, and they continue to play active roles in shaping its operation. The Project is directed by Jean Murphy, former Director of the NC Model Teacher Education Consortium, based at the UNC system's Center for School Leadership Development.

Our interviews and observations indicate that Dornan, Houston, Murphy and their colleagues have integrated the "Collaborative" principle into the administration of the Project. To set policy for the Project and guide its operation, they organized an Advisory Committee with two representatives from each of the five participating districts: the superintendent and the central office contact. The Advisory Committee meets during the Project's Leadership Institutes, quarterly two-day professional development retreats for the teams of superintendents, central office contacts, and elementary and middle school principals from each district.

The clearest example of real collaboration with district leaders to set Project policy is the process of designing the criteria for the Performance Incentive component described above and discussed

in more detail below. The criteria were primarily worked out during three Leadership Institutes held between September of 2007 and March of 2008. In confidential interviews we conducted in the participating districts, administrators in all five districts assured us that they had been fully involved in developing the criteria and other Project policies. District leaders acknowledged that Collaborative administrators were negotiating a balance between the individual needs of each district and the needs of the Project as a whole. While some District leaders expressed frustration with the extended timeline for the development of the criteria and disagreed with some specific features of them, most understood that the inclusive process required a bit more time. District and school administrators characterized Project managers as highly competent, open to ongoing communication, and responsive to questions and requests. In several cases, administrators described their own work in ways that suggested that they had been influenced by Project managers' management practices and/or components of the Project's design.

Assistant Director Alfred Mays has created an unusually well-designed Project data system that includes a user-friendly, web-based facility that teachers can use to enroll in professional development and view the history of all Project sessions they have taken to date; a graphical, password-protected webpage on which teachers can check their progress toward performance incentives; a facility for accumulating aggregate data on students' participation in after school programs as well as teachers' participation; and a variety of other features that enable the Project to accumulate and report on its operations.

Professional Development System

The Collaborative Project provides professional development for superintendents, the associate or assistant superintendents who serve as central office contacts, and principals, as well as teachers.

Professional Development for Administrators

The main professional development for administrators has been provided through a series of two-day Leadership Institute retreats. In addition, near the beginning of the project, each superintendent was the focus of a 360° feedback exercise and has since been supported by leadership coaching from a well-regarded retired superintendent.

Since the project was initiated in August of 2007, eight quarterly two-day Leadership Institutes have been held. The Institutes have had four main foci: (1) orientation to the Project and ongoing operational updates, (2) development of the performance criteria for incentives, (3) team building and communication within and across districts, and (4) formal presentations or seminars. After the initial organizational meeting, the time devoted to orientation and operation has been minimized. Development of the performance criteria was largely completed during the first three Institutes, but sticky issues and details have been revisited during the Advisory Group sessions held in conjunction with all subsequent retreats. About a third of each of the first four sessions was devoted to explicit team building and communication, mainly within district teams, but with some discussion of common problems across role-like groups along with informal cross-district networking.

Leadership Institute Presentations and Seminars

Leadership Concepts and Skills

- Management and Workplace Motivators (George Alwon, Raleigh Consulting Group)
- Using the Myers-Briggs in Understanding the Self and Others (Dan Bruffey, Bruffey Training, Facilitation, and Consultation)
- The Need for Great Leadership (Dudley Flood and Gene Causby)
- What Matters Most: Principle-Centered Leadership (Gary McGuey, Franklin Covey Institute)
- Great Leaders, Great Teams, Great Results, Imperative One: Inspiring Trust (Gary McGuey, Franklin Covey Institute)
- Great Leaders, Great Teams, Great Results, Imperative Two: Clarifying Purpose (Gary McGuey, Franklin Covey Institute)
- Great Leaders, Great Teams, Great Results, Imperative Three: Aligning Systems (Gary McGuey, Franklin Covey Institute)
- Great Leaders, Great Teams, Great Results, Imperative Four: Unleashing Talent (Gary McGuey, Franklin Covey Institute)
- Developing Leaders One Child at a Time (Muriel Summers, AB Combs Elementary School, Raleigh, NC)

Use of Data for Instructional Improvement

- Working Smart with Test Results (Gongshu Zhang, Guilford County Schools)
- EVAAS: A Tool for Supporting Your Decisions (June Rivers, SAS Institute, Inc.)
- Using the Results of the Teacher Working Conditions Survey (Eric Hirsch, University of California at Santa Cruz)
- Linking Assessment to Instruction (Carl Swartz, MetaMetrics, Inc.)

Professional Development for Teachers

- Lenses on Learning: Instructional Leadership in Mathematics (Helen Compton, NC School of Science and Mathematics; Carol Midgett, Columbus County Schools; and Retha Rusk, Brunswick County Schools)
- Lenses on Learning Supervision: Focusing on Mathematical Thinking (Carol Midgett, UNC-Wilmington; and Retha Rusk, Brunswick County Schools)
- Take One: a Professional Development Activity for Teachers (Joyce Loveless and Karen Garr, National Board for Professional Teaching Standards; Sheila Evans, DF Walker Elementary School, Edenton, NC; Shannon Fluornoy, Stonewall Tell Elementary School, Atlanta, GA; and Vickie Carson, NBCT)

After School Programs

- Z. Smith Reynolds After School Programs (John Dornan; Tom Williams, former Granville County Schools Superintendent; and Anne Crabbe, Scotland County Schools)
- How Can Futures 4 Kids Fit into Your Young Scholars Program? (Susan Milliken, Futures 4 Kids)
- Best After School Practices: What We've Learned (John Dornan, Public School Forum)

Economic, Social, Cultural, and Historical Challenges for Education

- Future Jobs and the Importance of an Educated Workforce (Ted Abernathy, Research Triangle Regional Partnership)
- People and Jobs on the Move: Implications for Education (James H. Johnson, UNC-Chapel Hill)
- *The Paradox of North Carolina Politics: The Personalities, Elections, and Events That Shaped Modern North Carolina* (Rob Christensen, *The News and Observer*)
- McCrory-Perdue Gubernatorial Debate (Moderated by John Dornan, Public School Forum)
- Ten to Watch: Coming Developments in NC Education Politics (John Dornan, Public School Forum)
- Review and Discussion of *Three Cups of Tea: One Man's Mission to Promote Peace One School at a Time*, by Greg Mortenson and David Oliver Relin (Ken Jenkins, Appalachian State University)
- Review and Discussion of *Crossing Over: A Mexican Family on the Migrant Trail*, by Ruben Martinez (Ken Jenkins, Appalachian State University)
- Review and Discussion of *Outliers,* by Malcolm Gladwell (Ken Jenkins, Appalachian State University)

Participants' assessments of the Institutes offered in the Project's own surveys and our interviews were very positive, with most participants indicating that the sessions were well-designed, well-run, and helpful to them in their regular administrative work.

The presentations mentioned most frequently in our Fall interviews were the two sessions of Lenses on Learning, a "leadership development course that teaches participants to make observations in standards-based mathematics classrooms." Designed to help school leaders understand and supervise the use of new approaches to mathematics instruction, the program was developed by Education Development Center, a widely respected non-profit R&D firm located in Newton, MA and delivered by North Carolina-based trainers certified by EDC. Collaborative Project leaders report that after the Lenses on Learning sessions, a principal volunteered that, previously, he had never been confident that he really knew what to look for when observing math classes in his school, or how to evaluate the instruction he saw. He said that for him the sessions had opened up a whole new way of understanding teaching and learning in mathematics and had equipped him with the knowledge he needed to approach classroom observation with much greater insight and confidence. Other principals agreed.

In addition to the Lenses on Learning sessions for administrators, the Project also organized a set of week-long summer workshops for teachers. After the Leadership Institute sessions, the participating administrators asked Project leaders to arrange for follow-up sessions for their teachers, to make sure that teachers really knew how to apply the new approaches in the classroom. The Project did so. One principal followed up by adopting the *Lenses* approach, recruiting several teachers to attend the summer and follow-up sessions, using local funds to purchase materials keyed to the approach as well as to bring the *Lenses* facilitators in as consultants, and continuing to give sustained support to the implementation of the approach.

Principals from four districts reported that they found Dr. Gongshu Zhang's session on how to use test score data both enlightening and helpful. A few principals across the districts reported being overwhelmed by the sheer volume of data discussed in the session. But one principal of a small elementary school with a challenging student population recounted that Dr. Zhang had advised him that the only way his school was likely to make Adequate Yearly Progress was via the "safe harbor" provision of No Child Left Behind, which Zhang explained clearly. The safe harbor provision allows a school to make AYP by reducing the percentage of its students who do not score proficient by 10% from one year to the next while also maintaining an acceptable student attendance rate. On returning to his school, the principal displayed the prior year's performance data to his teachers, explained the safe harbor provision as Zhang had explained it to him, and persuaded his faculty that safe harbor was indeed an attainable goal. With a new level of commitment from his teachers, he reported, last year the school made High Growth as well as AYP in mathematics. During our Spring interviews, principals often reported increasing attention to data to guide school improvement, mentioning the other data-use presentations in addition to Zhang's.

More than half of the available time in the last four Leadership Institutes was devoted to the four main components of the Franklin Covey leadership model for public sector organizations. So it is not surprising that the Covey sessions were mentioned often during our Spring round of

interviews. The Covey model emphasizes the development of a vision and set of goals that are shared by all members of an organization, so that each employee pursues those goals with independent initiative within an atmosphere of mutual trust and accountability rather than simply complying in the performance of specified tasks under close supervision. This emphasis on commitment to common goals as the basis of coordinated action contrasts with the proposition that because leaders are the ones who are held accountable for an organization's performance, they must make the key decisions and coordinate action through close supervision, sanctions, and rewards.

One principal's interest was so strongly sparked by the sessions that she did substantial additional reading about the model and, via telephone and email, sought extensive assistance from Covey trainer Gary McGuey to figure out how to apply the model in her school, with results that were clearly observable during our site visits. Several other principals told us that the Covey training helped them reflect on their own leadership styles, and some reported using components of the training in areas such as the development of a new mission and vision for their school. But our interviews indicate that so far, no other principal or superintendent has been able to use the model as a comprehensive guide to the improvement of organizational climate and performance.

While most Leadership Institute participants told us that the Covey sessions were illuminating and valuable, some complained that the sessions were still too theoretical, too unconnected from the realities of daily practice in schools for them to be able to put the Covey ideas, skills, and tools to real use. They argued for briefer treatment of the fundamental ideas followed immediately by more extended opportunities to try putting them into practice with guidance from the facilitator. Although only a few participants expressed this view, the fact that only one principal and no district administrator has applied the Covey ideas and techniques comprehensively suggests that they may make a valid point. Whether the Project continues with the Covey training or moves on other foci and facilitators, a shift to a more interactive approach featuring a stronger focus on application and practice will probably be required to assure broad implementation of the ideas and techniques advocated in these PD sessions.

Several additional points about the Leadership Institutes and other PD for administrators deserve mention:

- Participants from four of the five districts said that the opportunities for team building and communication, both within the district and across districts, were useful. The assessments from one district were somewhat more mixed regarding the cross-district exchanges, with interviewees indicating that they believed their schools and district to be a little ahead of other schools and districts in many areas.
- Principals from three districts cited the opportunity to evaluate case descriptions of teachers and to compare their evaluations of the cases as especially valuable, helping them to "calibrate" their standards for teacher performance with greater objectivity and assurance.
- Several administrators reported that the Institutes were instrumental in giving them opportunities to get outside their daily round of activities, gain perspective on themselves

as leaders as well as on the challenges they face, and exchange experiences and ideas with other administrators across their own and other districts.

- Some superintendents and principals are concerned about the inconvenience and risks of holding the institutes in settings far from their districts and schools for most of three days, four times a year. Collaborative Project managers surveyed participants, and the majority preferred to continue Institute sessions in settings away from the intrusions of day-to-day operations, but a minority remain dissatisfied with the decision.
- A few participants expressed impatience with the heavily presentational approach to the books assigned for common reading. They have found the books stimulating but would prefer opportunities to discuss them with their colleagues in small informal groups near the end of the day.
- Two superintendents did not consider the 360° feedback accurate or helpful. They complained that some of those surveyed had personal axes to grind. One suggested using an instrument developed by the UNCG School of Business instead of the 360° technique.
- Most superintendents found their leadership coaches helpful, but four generally did not see the coaches as a major component of the Project. One felt that as an experienced administrator, he really did not need the coach. Another stressed that the close match between his coach's skill and personality with his own level of development made the assistance useful even though not decisive for him. In contrast, one superintendent expressed great enthusiasm for his coach and actually initiated a major district initiative based on advice from him.

The overall pattern of actions taken and views expressed in response to the Leadership Institutes suggests a possible refocusing of the professional development for administrators for the third year of the pilot. Thus far, the major changes in leadership behavior seem to have come when Institute sessions triggered individual principals to take the initiative to seek further guidance and support for concrete actions in their schools. Zhang's session on data use did prove adequate to prompt action without further guidance, but he gave the initiative-taking principal data on his own school and specific advice about the action he should take. After Lenses on Learning and the Covey Institute sessions, the two principals solicited further guidance and support to implement the ideas presented in Institute settings. Some central administrators and other principals offered examples of ways they had gain new perspective and used techniques in limited ways, but there were few indications that the ideas and approaches presented in the Leadership Institutes have achieved broad implementation. To promote greater impact, the PD for administrators will probably have to push well beyond acquainting them with new ideas, ideas, techniques, and tools to provide them with opportunities for guided practice, feedback, reflection, and problem solving that begin during Institute sessions themselves but extend to on-site follow-up sessions and consultation. This observation is consistent with a great deal of research on professional development and the diffusion of innovations.

The difficulty, of course, is that more extended, practice-oriented training and support are expensive. So to pursue this course, Project leaders would have to narrow the range of PD offered, making a deliberate choice of depth over breadth. One way to focus the PD more sharply would be to choose a small number of themes, each supported by only one or two sources of training and consultation over the year. For example, the Project might choose to

focus on (a) the use of benchmark assessments and other data for school improvement, provided by a data use expert such as Zhang, (b) supervision of curriculum, instruction, and assessment in mathematics and science, provided respectively by the Lenses on Learning and the Center for Inquiry-Based Learning facilitators, and (c) promoting professional community through teacher leadership, emphasizing leadership roles for the National Board Certified Teachers whose candidacy has been promoted by the Project. This set of themes would focus the Institutes more sharply on the improvement of math and science education within the framework of commitment-based and data-based leadership as well as professional community. The narrowed focus and reduced number of providers could make support for sustained, practice-oriented training and consultation feasible in these areas, resulting in broader implementation of new curricular, instructional, and assessment approaches across the Project districts.

Professional Development for Teachers

The Collaborative Project has developed a system for providing professional development (PD) to four distinct groups of teachers in the target districts: candidates for certification by the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards; beginning (1st and 2nd year) teachers, teachers of mathematics and science; and all other K-8 teachers. High school teachers are eligible for the PD that supports teachers seeking Board certification, but all other professional development sponsored by the Project is focused on K-8 (elementary and middle school) teachers.

The first key decision in designing the system was to broker PD from organizations that already had well-developed and tested PD designs, materials, and facilitators (trainers). This permitted the Project to mobilize quickly, avoid design and materials development costs, and provide PD of recognized quality. A second decision was to open the window of time available for professional development, by offering PD sessions on weekends and during the summer vacation and by paying teachers a $150/day stipend for participation. A third feature of the system is a software tool that enables (a) teachers to enroll online; (b) teachers, district and school administrators as well as Project administrators to track enrollment; (c) district and Project administrators manage participation; (d) Project administrators to make appropriate stipend payments for participating teachers, and (e) Project administrators to collect and report participation data accurately and quickly. Project administrators have also arranged for the appointment of local coordinators to ensure that all logistics are handled effectively and for snags to be cleared up promptly. A final feature of the system is ongoing communication with central office contacts which permits Project administrators to add or adjust offerings over time.

A list of the PD sessions and the associated PD provider organizations for the first two years of the Project is displayed in Table 2, Appendix D. More detailed information on the PD providers as well as schedules for all teacher PD activities from the inception of the Project through Summer, 2009 may be found in Appendix D, Table 1.

The scale of the professional development program for teachers is substantial. As Table 4 on the following page indicates, from the inception of the Project through May 16th, 2009, the Project provided a total of over 5,700 person days of PD, ranging across the five districts from 804 to

1642 days. This included approximately 615 K-8 teachers who participated in at least one day of Project PD. In addition, 33 high school teachers participated in the PD designed to support NBCT candidates, but the main focus of the Project is on grades K-8. Setting aside the high school teachers for the moment, we can get a rough sense of how broadly Project PD impacted K-8 grades in a district by dividing the number of K-8 teachers participating in Project PD by the number of K-8 teachers in the district. On average across the districts, roughly 80% or about 615/766 of the K-8 teachers in the five districts have participated in at least one day of Project professional development. As the numbers indicate, The Collaborative Project's PD has pervaded participating districts extensively. Not only did the Project touch many teachers, but teachers who did participate in PD participated in multiple days of professional development. For those who did participate, the average number of days of PD was 8.9. (See Appendix D for more information on Professional Development in the participating districts.)

Table 4: Participation in Professional Development Across the Five Collaborative Project Districts 2007-2009[1]

	Caswell	Greene	Mitchell	Warren	Washington	Project Overall
Unduplicated Count of K-8 Teachers Participating in Project PD	157	149	115	97	97	615
Number of eligible K-8 Teachers	179	188	127	140	132	766
K-8 Teachers Participating in Project PD as a Percentage of K-8 Teachers	88%	79%	91%	69%	73%	80%
Unduplicated Count of High School Teachers Participating in Project PD (NBCT Candidates)	4	9	13	2	5	33
Total Number of Professional Development days[2,3]	1642	1392	1127	831	804	5796
Average Number of Days per Participant (with Ranges in Parentheses)[3]	10.2 (1-30)	8.8 (1-24)	8.8 (1-30)	8.4 (1-35)	7.9 (1-29)	8.9 (1-35)

Data retrieved from The Public School Forum 2009

[1]*Numbers are from PD from project inception to May 16, 2009.*

[2]*Please note that class sizes varied and teachers could (and were encouraged) to take more than one professional development day.*

[3]*Includes data from all teachers who participated in Professional Development (K-12)*

Another way to convey the scale of the PD provided by the district is to compare the *Project's* expenditures for PD in its first year (2007-08) with the *districts' own* expenditures for PD in the year before the Project began (2006-07). In 2006-07, from their own funds the five districts together spent a total of approximately $724,000 on professional development. In 2007-08, The Collaborative Project spent a total of approximately $1,286,000. The amounts spent by the individual districts in 2006-07 and the amounts spent by the Project in different districts in 2007-08 vary significantly, but across the five districts, in 2007-08 the Project spent almost twice as

much on PD in the five districts as the districts themselves had spent in the previous year. In other words, the Project brought about a large increase in PD activity in the five districts it serves. (For more detail, see Appendix D, Tables 3 and 4.)

Spending on PD has continued to increase as the pilot program continues into the second year of implementation. In 2007-08, without including stipends for teacher participation in PD, The Collaborative Project provided 160 days of PD at an expense of approximately $476,000. For 2008-09, the total cost for 289 days of Collaborative Project professional development (again, not including stipends) is $860,000 (approximately $172,000 per district). The projected amount to be spent on teacher training (including stipends) for 2009-10 is $2,097,354 (CP Budget Overview, March 2009).

Turning from the overall scale of the professional development to a breakdown of participation by teachers in different categories of PD, in different districts, and at the elementary school versus the middle school level, Table 5 shows significant variation in all of these respects. The data in Table 5 represent a useful point of departure for discussions among Project leaders themselves and between Project leaders and key people in each of the participating districts. But the data are not all simple to interpret. They do not necessarily "speak for themselves." Rather, one has to think about them carefully in light of a complex array of considerations, including the following:

There are substantially more elementary and middle school teachers in some districts than in others, ranging from a low of 127 to a high of 188 teachers. So one would not expect the same level of participation across districts. However, as displayed in Table 4, The Collaborative Project PD has reached a greater percentage of K-8 teachers in Mitchell County as compared to Warren County.

There are more elementary school teachers than middle school teachers in each of these districts. So one would not expect the same level of participation across in middle schools as in elementary schools. Yet it is interesting to note that some counties are experiencing higher rates of participation with middle school teachers. For example, Greene, Mitchell, and Warren County have had higher rates of participation by middle school teachers in math PD than Caswell and Washington Counties. Whether this is related to the location of PD sessions or the interest of teachers is an interesting issue that was explored further in follow-up teacher interviews and surveys conducted in all five of the CP districts.

There is some specialization by subject in elementary schools, but many elementary school teachers teach all core subjects, including math. So there are many more elementary school teachers who teach math than middle school teachers who teach math. On this basis alone, one might expect to see more person-days of math PD at the elementary school level than at the middle school level. The same is true for science.

Four districts have only 1 middle school, and the fifth has 2 very small middle schools. Even the larger middle schools have only about 5-6 teachers of mathematics. So providing PD to "only" 4 or 5 middle school mathematics teachers in a district may represent quite good coverage.

Project leaders elected to offer fewer, more intensive sessions in mathematics than in other areas. Those teachers who did participate got an experience that may have enabled them to make deep changes in their instructional practice, but the decision to emphasize longer-term sessions may have reduced the number of teachers who were selected to participate. We do not quarrel with the choice, because real improvement in mathematics instruction probably requires in-depth PD. But a series of shorter sessions might have enticed more teachers to participate. More recently, Project leaders have added a series of two-day sessions on mathematics in each district.

At the middle school level, there are many more teachers of subjects other than math than teachers of math. Similarly for science. Further, a larger number of different PD sessions were offered for beginning and "other" teachers than in mathematics or science. So it is not surprising that the levels of participation are higher in the sessions for beginning and "other" teachers than in the sessions for mathematics and science teachers.

Taking all of this into account, we recommend that Project leaders ask themselves, for example, whether in terms of actual numbers of PD person-days provided, the Project is giving as much emphasis to mathematics and science as they intended, in every district and at every grade level. In two districts, during the first year of the Project very few middle school teachers participated in math PD at all. On this basis alone, one would not expect much Project-based improvement in 2007-08 middle school math performance in these districts. Recognizing this, Project leaders encouraged broader participation in mathematics, and participation has increased in the current year, but to maximize the likelihood of improvements in math, Project and district leaders should check to assure themselves that the level of PD person days in mathematics is now adequate. Is the relative emphasis on mathematics and science versus other topics the right one for future years of the Project? As a basis for these discussions, we include considerably more detail on professional development in Appendix D.

Another emphasis of the Project was to encourage teachers in K-12 to pursue National Board Certification (NBC). The PD for teachers interested in pursuing National Board Certification was well received by teachers, who commented in interviews and survey responses that the support they received from The Collaborative Project was invaluable. The barriers to achieving National Board Certification in North Carolina are not monetary. The NC Department of Public Instruction provides the funds to apply for a full submission for NBC ($2,500). However, the full submission has multiple requirements and may seem daunting to interested teachers. Another way to begin the NBC process is to complete a *Take One!* where teachers complete and submit only one of the NBC requirements. This allows teachers not only to finish one component of the NBC requirements, but also to get their feet wet with the type of tasks and standards required for National Board Certification. However, Take One requires a $300 fee that is not funded the NC Department of Public Instruction. Instead, The Collaborative Project has joined with the National Board to cover the $300 fee for teachers in the Project districts. County leaders were informed about the Take One option and several counties jumped on board to form three Take One cohorts in Greene (17 participants), Mitchell (15 participants), and Warren (9 participants) Counties. The Project provides not only NBC focused PD, but also hired an NBC coach to work with these teachers.

Table 5: Number of Person-Days of PD Received, by Category of PD, Grade Level of Teachers, and District in 2007-2009[1]

		Caswell	Greene	Mitchell	Warren	Washington	Total
Professional Development days in mathematics	Elem. grades teacher days	104	94	124	100	17	439
	Middle grades teacher days	7	54	50	39	10	160
	Total teacher days in math	111	148	174	139	27	599
Professional Development days in science	Elem. grades teacher days	78	33	36	23	65	235
	Middle grades teacher days	12	21	11	8	31	83
	Total teacher days in science	90	54	47	31	96	318
Professional Development days for National Board Certification	Elem. grades teacher days	190	167	89	98	23	567
	Middle grades teacher days	35	110	44	27	71	287
	High school grades teacher days	6	20	51	2	10	89
	Total teacher days for National Board Certification	231	297	184	127	104	943
Professional Development days for beginning teachers and all others	Elem. grades teacher days	842	638	556	384	377	2797
	Middle grades teacher days	368	253	165	152	196	1134
	Total teacher days for beginning teachers and all others	1210	891	721	536	573	3931
Total Professional Days		1642	1390	1126	833	800	5791

Data retrieved from The Public School Forum 2009

[1]*Note that these are roster totals for each day of PD, aggregated by session category. Teachers who attended multiple sessions in the same PD category or in sessions lasting multiple days were counted for each day of participation.*

Having described the professional development provided by the project and having discussed the scale and levels of participation in Project PD, we turn now to our findings from interviews conducted in the five districts during the fall of 2008 as well as the online survey and interviews conducted this spring (2009). The interviews and survey brought some snags and drawbacks to light, but superintendents, central office contacts, principals, and teachers were overwhelmingly positive about the PD that the Project had provided to their districts. As one principal put it, "The Collaborative brings us *good stuff*. You couldn't ask for them to be better organized, and to host programs like they host programs. They are just top notch." An Associate Superintendent serving as the Central Office Contact for one district praised the "intensity and conceptual depth" of the professional development offered by the Project. In one county, district administrators actually seemed a bit shocked by the quality and intensity of the Project PD. The superintendent said, "It has brought us into the major leagues from the minor leagues –

especially in math and brain research." The Central Office Contact person reported that district administrators had decided to rethink the district's own PD plans completely. The sessions offered by The Collaborative Project had set a new standard for PD, and district administrators concluded that teachers would no longer be satisfied with PD at the level of the sessions the district had often offered in the past.

Concerning the effects of the stipend for participation, one principal summed up the consensus view, "They may come for the stipend, but they stay for the quality." He explained that even with the stipends, teachers would not continue to sign up for PD if the sessions were not stimulating and if what teachers learned in them were not useful in the classroom. Teachers generally confirmed this perception. As we shall describe below, teachers in a few situations criticized certain aspects of the PD programs, but across the five districts, experience in the PD sessions appears to have made the great majority of teachers more rather than less enthusiastic about participating.

Table 6 below, based on our online survey, reflects teachers' sense of the value, quality, and utility of the professional development provided by the Project. (For more details on teachers' survey responses, see Tables 7-9 in Appendix D.)

Table 6: Teachers' Responses to Collaborative Project PD

Survey Item	**% Agreement**
The PD in which I participated was well matched to my needs.	85%
The PD in which I participated was of high quality.	91%
I have been able to apply things I learned from the PD in my classroom.	86%
My students have benefited from my participation in the Collaborative PD.	85%
The PD made me feel like a valued professional	83%
I plan to attend more PD sponsored by the Collaborative Project.	90%

The level of enthusiasm for Project PD was illustrated by an exchange between teachers in one of our small group interviews. When one teacher reported that she had signed up for a workshop which had just been opened for online enrollment, another teacher asked, "How did you get into that? I tried to sign up this morning, and it was already totally full." The first teacher replied, "I set my alarm clock and got up at three in the morning." "Why didn't you call me?" the other demanded. In addition to the stipends and quality of the sessions, administrators and teachers also agreed that the fact that teachers get to choose among a variety of sessions offered onsite within the districts and makes participation much more attractive: "Having the sessions in the county is just wonderful. There is real excitement about teaching, learning, and using this information in the classroom. We see more excitement about these sessions than anything we can remember."

One Central Office Contact person recounted her initial resistance to offering a particular workshop because she had already sponsored a set of sessions on the same theme, herself. "I

was argumentative at first," she recalled, but after talking with Collaborative Project Director Jean Murphy, "we opened it up anyway." To her surprise, "We had great participation, and I was totally wrong. When I looked at the evaluations, I don't have an exact number, but several of them said, 'I got it now.'" By "it," the teachers were referring to ideas about the ways that students' backgrounds affect their learning, ideas which had not come through clearly from earlier exposure. During school improvement planning meetings, the Central Office Contact reported, these teachers often bring up and apply ideas from the Collaborative PD session. "I was wrong in my assessment, and I'm glad that I was," she said. She attributed teachers' active utilization of what they had learned from the PD in part to the fact that several teachers from each school participate in the sessions together, which gives them a common basis for discussion and planning. For example, she said, three teachers who had attended a science session together approached her with a proposal: "We've got some wonderful ideas. We want you to give us this science department in this middle school and let us make a difference for children." Principals across all five districts confirmed that in planning sessions, their teachers use vocabulary and initiate discussions of ways to use ideas picked up from Project PD.

Selected Comments on the Quality and Impact of Collaborative Project PD

- "The summer math institute has made a big difference in the way we think about teaching math, and we told everyone in the school. We ordered math kits for all of our teachers. We adopted a new math book. We participated in their follow-up. We coordinated with our K-2 feeder school. We are sending a new group of teachers this summer. Now we need to do the same thing in science."
- "The session on inquiry-based science was the most powerful science staff development I have ever attended. I don't even use the book any more. [The facilitator] sent us a CD with the new science goals and objectives with hand-on experiments to do. We are building rockets. We've done experiments with cars and balls. We need follow-ups to continue."
- "We instituted teacher walk-throughs for the first time as a result of the Collaborative. They report out in teacher-led sessions on positive things they saw in one another's classrooms. As a result, the teachers asked to work together on class assignments for the upcoming year. They have never done so previously. They want more heterogeneous grouping among classes for the coming year. As one teacher commented, 'Who knows the students better than we do?'" Activities of this sort suggest progress toward the Project's goal of promoting greater professional community in project schools.
- "Had it not been for the Collaborative [support for National Board candidates] I would never have done it. I was not even considering it until I went to that first Collaborative meeting about National Boards and found out that we were going to have that support. Because it was *not* doable before."
- "The Culture of Poverty was also enlightening, because now I can see things in my students, especially my male students. I had one in particular that I could never figure out why we clashed. But he just had a problem with white females. After that I approached him in a different fashion, and now he comes to see me every day even though I don't teach him anymore. He knows that Miss L loves him. I wrote that up for one of my National Board portfolio entries."
- "Minds Attuned was wonderful! Kids meet a roadblock, and sometimes you can't get around that roadblock. I had a student who was home schooled, and they never made him choose a dominant hand. So his handwriting was just illegible. So I let him use the computer to write, and I was able to help him understand that is okay because that works better for him. Before Minds Attuned I might have given him the choice, but I really wouldn't have worked so hard to help him understand." Another teacher described working with the parent of a child with attention problems: "I'm able to pull that book and sit down and show her these strategies she can do at home – the same ones I use at school. And the kid has gone from first grade to almost fourth grade just by using the All Kinds of Minds tools to get organized."

In addition to the specific knowledge gained from Collaborative Project PD, the sessions appear to have improved many teachers' morale and motivation, their sense of being valued and competent. The sessions gave teachers the sense, as one district administrator put it, that "someone outside of this district really thinks that we are pretty decent, to get this opportunity." She said that she uses the Project PD opportunities to communicate the message that. "We want to keep you. You are great teachers. We need you." To explain why high quality PD may pick up teachers' morale and sense of being valued, she pointed to the strong accountability pressures and many separate interventions that teachers have experienced in recent years. "It is easy to get beaten down by this sort of thing, to get to feel pretty worthless." Teachers in rural districts may be especially vulnerable to such discouragement. The headline on the cover of a recent issue of *Ed.*, the magazine of the Harvard Graduate School of Education, was "Living in the Shadows: Rural Schools in America."

As indicated earlier, despite the positive overall response, some teachers pointed out snags in PD implementation or what they saw as weaknesses in particular aspects of the program. For example, some teachers expressed irritation that taxes had been withheld from the PD stipends, so that the checks they received were for less than the $150 per day that they felt they had been promised. In one school, teachers complained that cumulatively, the stipends had bumped them into a higher tax bracket, effectively reducing their after-tax regular monthly checks. Some even indicated that for this reason, they would not participate in future Project PD sessions. Project leaders have expressed regret about these issues, but note that all such income is subject to taxation, a fact beyond their control. Some teachers also complained that the stipend checks arrived two weeks or more after the PD events. The Finance Officer in one district responded by arranging for the stipends to be paid the day after a session ends, and other districts report working to speed payments, as well.

More substantively, in most districts a few teachers faulted one or two PD trainers for failing to model the style of active teaching and learning that they were advocating in their sessions, or for insufficiently energetic and lively presentations. Even these teachers noted, however, that the great majority of presenters in sessions they had attended employed more active, energetic, and effective instructional styles. Project Director Jean Murphy reports that when teachers' feedback forms suggest problems with a particular presenter, she takes the matter up with the provider organization. In one case, elementary school teachers attending a mathematics workshop found that the session was keyed more to material taught in middle school. In response, Murphy reviewed the posted descriptions of sessions to avoid duplicating this mismatch between participants' expectations and the session's content. As a result of a few reported logistical slip-ups in the facility and meal arrangements for PD sessions and the burden that these arrangements placed on the central office contacts, the Project supplied funds to each district to support a PD site coordinator to make sure that the arrangements for each session all communicate a high standard of professionalism. Project Director Jean Murphy puts a premium on "treating teachers like professionals" in these details as well as in the substance of the PD sessions, and in our interviews both administrators and teachers frequently expressed appreciation for the message that this conveys.

One other set of snags illustrates the difficulties of implementing such a complex program across five districts with over 700 K-8 teachers. In response to a request from district and school administrators, Project leaders arranged for two days of follow-up PD on the summer Lenses on Learning mathematics sessions. Because the follow-up sessions were specifically designed to help teachers implement what they had learned in the week-long summer retreat, enrollment in the follow-ups was restricted to teachers who had participated during the summer. Yet some teachers with a particular interest in mathematics had been unable to attend during the summer. One, for example, had been caring for an aging parent. Other teachers had other legitimate family responsibilities. Several teachers have second jobs or their own businesses to supplement salaries they find inadequate to support their families or put their children through college. These teachers were genuinely disappointed that they could not enroll in the two-day follow-up. One said that she felt "locked out." Even though Project administrators make a good-faith effort to respond to the expressed needs of participating districts, dilemmas such as these remain.

We also heard requests for a broader array of opportunities for teachers of subjects other than mathematics and science, for notification of new PD opportunities as they become available, opportunities for mentors to attend the sessions for beginning teachers, and online lists of sessions that teachers have registered for and were waitlisted for.

Despite these difficulties, both principals and teachers reported substantial utilization of the ideas, practices, and materials communicated through Project PD. Across all five counties, principals reported observing more use of hands-on, inquiry-based, differentiated instruction, use of thinking maps to help students organize their thoughts, and instructional strategies based on an understanding of students' family backgrounds and learning styles. Several principals also reported significant increases in professional community among teachers – more collaboration on lesson plans, more mutual observation and feedback, more joint use of assessment data to re-shape instruction. The box on the page sums up the features of Project PD that are reported to have promoted actual changes in classroom instruction. These features suggest directions for focusing and refining the Project's PD system over time.

Collaborative Project PD That Works

- Teachers in Project districts want facilitators who practice the lively, active learning approaches that they preach.
- They find the *combination* of research-based ideas about teaching and learning with specific, directly usable practices more useful than either alone.
- They prefer sessions in which facilitators provide materials and techniques they can try out during the PD sessions themselves and can take into their classrooms for immediate use.
- They want substantial, fresh information, but preferably in one or two-day chunks that are distributed over time, so that they have a chance to assimilate and try out the ideas and practices they are learning, then come back to get help with questions and puzzles based on actual classroom tryouts.
- Participation by a critical mass of teachers within a school and opportunities for exchange among the participants promotes ongoing discussion, mutual support, and broader use of PD content.
- Experienced teachers often expressed a preference for sessions that focus on the teaching and learning of specific subject matter, although generalizable but well-specified techniques for diagnosing students' learning difficulties and responding to them also found considerable support.
- Offering sessions right in the districts is not mere convenience, but allows teachers with multiple demands from extracurricular activities, after school programs, outside employment, and children or aging parents to participate much more fully than sessions in remote locations.

Performance Incentive System

The Project's performance incentive component was designed to spur greater commitment to the improvement of student performance and to reduce turnover by opening opportunities for educators in participating districts to earn extra compensation for extra effort and high performance. When the Project was originally conceived by Forum and Center leaders in consultation with legislators, this component was envisioned as a set of retention bonuses for teachers and administrators, but during discussions with pilot district administrators, Project leaders were persuaded that a system of performance incentives could boost motivation as well as improve retention. Through a design process carried out in collaboration with key district and school administrators, implementation in the five pilot districts, and ongoing refinements to address snags and anomalies that arose during implementation, Project leaders have created a workable system of performance incentives that could be applied in other districts across the state. Our interviews and surveys have turned up some issues that Project leaders should address as they go forward, but on the whole, response to the system and the incentive awards distributed in the fall of 2008 has been positive, and there are indications that the system is beginning to exert its intended effects in the pilot districts.

The system includes (a) the criteria for incentive awards, (b) procedures for collecting thedata necessary to calculate appropriate awards, (c) an online system that permits teachers to track their progress toward earning awards at different levels, (d) procedures for actually making the payments, and (e) a process for refining the criteria and procedures via the Project's Advisory Committee. Drawing on data from our survey and interviews, we comment on these elements of the system below.

The criteria for the performance incentives were worked out jointly over the fall of 2007 and early winter of 2008 by the Project's management team in collaboration with superintendents, central office contacts, and principals from participating districts. Teachers may earn annual incentive bonuses of up to $2,000 for meeting specified criteria: participation in professional development (days of participation), student performance (percent of students at or above proficiency), communication with parents and the community (number of documented contacts), and a combination of their principal's evaluation and a decision to return to teach in the district for another year (performance plus continuation in the district). Principals are eligible for deferred compensation of up to $22,500 plus interest, based on criteria for student performance, building a professional learning community among teachers in their schools, evaluation by their immediate superior (superintendent or principal), and creating a positive workforce environment as measured by the Teacher Working Conditions Survey. Like teachers, assistant principals may earn an annual bonus of up to $2,000; the criteria for AP's are similar to those for principals. The criteria for central office contacts' annual bonus of up to $2,000 focus on their contribution to building a learning community in the district plus evaluation by Collaborative Project leaders and their superintendents. Superintendents may earn deferred compensation of up to $30,000 plus interest accumulated by the end of the three-year pilot. Awards for superintendents are based on specific criteria in five areas: student performance, building a learning community, leadership of and support to principals, leadership in The Collaborative Project, and teacher and

principal retention. For more detailed information on the precise criteria for incentive awards for all participants, see Appendix E.

Across the five districts, superintendents, central office contacts, and principals confirmed that they had been fully involved in developing the criteria for the full set of performance incentives. "This isn't something that John (Dornan) and Sam (Houston) developed and we just rubber-stamped," one Central Office contact said. "We argued and cut it up one way and cut it up another and put it back together as a group." In fact, debates about and revisions of some criteria continued right through the Advisory Committee meeting held in late April (2009). Most members of the Committee appear satisfied with the process and resulting criteria, but two participants complained on the one hand that Project leaders had already made up their minds about the contested issues and on the other that discussions went on too long without conclusive decisions. Another superintendent also expressed impatience with the extended discussions, preferring to leave the design details to his central office contact.

The initial payments from the incentive award system were made in late November, 2008. As reflected in Table 1 in Appendix F, the payments totaled $993,000. Further, as indicated in Table 7 below, across the five counties, the average award per K-8 teacher was $1,336, ranging from $1,067 to $1,489. Combining the districts' local supplements with the average incentive payments and the average stipends paid for professional development, we see that across the five districts, the totals averaged $3,007 only about $300 less than the average local supplement statewide. In two counties, the totals actually exceeded the average local supplement statewide. In two of the three other counties, the totals fell about $800 below the state average local supplement and in one county about $150 below the state average. Comparisons between Project districts' local supplements in 2006-07 and in 2007-08 offer no suggestion that the districts used Project funds to supplant local supplements. Thus, from a financial standpoint, The Collaborative Project made the five districts substantially more competitive places to teach – one of the purposes of the incentive system. For more details on compensation distributed by The Collaborative Project, see Appendix F.

Table 7: Local Supplements, Incentive Awards, and PD Stipends in CP Districts

	Caswell	Greene	Mitchell	Warren	Washington	Average Across Districts[1]	State
Average District Local supplement for 2006-07	$794	$1,300	$100	$1,663	$448	$885	$3,200
Average District Local Supplement for 2007-08	$738	$1,300	$100	$1,663	$434	$901	$3,327
Average CP annual award received in 2007-08[2]	$1,408	$1,327	$1,489	$1,067	$1,383	$1,336	
Average PD stipend total received in 2007-08[2]	$1,028	$745	$931	$695	$729	$831	
Average District + CP Supplemental fund total per teacher for 2007-08	$3,174	$3,372	$2,520	$3,425	$2,546	$3,068	$3,327

Data retrieved from North Carolina Department of Public Instruction, Information Analysis and Reporting Section And from The Public School Forum 2008.

[1]*Average weighted by the number of teachers in each district.*

[2] *Average calculations include all eligible K-8 teachers in denominator.*

Turning to the motivational purpose of the incentive system, on balance, results from our survey and interviews indicate that teachers responded positively both to the system itself and to the payments disbursed. Table 8 below displays teachers' responses to selected items. During our interviews, a few teachers seemed unclear about the incentive criteria and procedures, but eighty percent of the teachers who responded to our survey indicated that they were well informed about the incentive system and how to earn a bonus. Almost three quarters (72%) also said that the system was well designed and that the criteria made sense. Not surprisingly, teachers who did receive payments expressed more positive views of the system than those who did not (percentages for the latter group are in parentheses), but even among teachers who did not receive an award, over 80% would like to see the incentive payments continue.

Table 8: Teachers' Responses to the Incentive System and Awards

Survey Item	**Percent Who Agreed[1]***
I was well informed and knew that there was a bonus available and how to earn it.	79% (50%)
The Collaborative incentive payments are well designed and linked to criteria that make sense.	72% (54%)
Earning an incentive payment made me (or would make me) feel better about teaching.	70% (61%)
The Collaborative incentive payments helped boost school morale.	69% (52%)
I am making changes to ensure that I receive the full bonus next year.	68% (54%)
The Collaborative incentive payments show that the program values my efforts as a teacher.	78% (67%)
I would like the incentive payments to continue in the future.	91% (83%)
The Collaborative incentive payments are a source of irritation for teachers at my school.	13% (15%)
The Collaborative incentive payment is key in my decision to return to teach in this district next year.	19% (17%)

[1] **Percentages in parentheses reflect the views of teachers who did not receive an incentive.*

What may surprise some opponents of incentive systems focusing on individual teachers is that whether they received a payment or did not, relatively few teachers found the incentives an irritant. In our interviews, several teachers were critical of specific features or unanticipated consequences of the system, but very few teachers objected in principle to awards based on individual teacher performance. Many teachers smiled and brightened noticeably when asked about the incentives. Several said that the Project bonuses put them more on a par with their friends in private industry, where individual bonuses for high performance are more common. The bonuses made them feel "more professional" and more appreciated, they said. Several were particularly pleased by the Project's online data system, which allows them to see in a bar graph format exactly where they stand in relation to each of the criteria at any given time.

Less than a fifth of the teachers reported that the payments were "key" to their decision to continue teaching in their district. Yet the percentage of teachers who leave these districts is itself small. So if the incentives really are key to the decisions of about 19% of the teachers to return, that should result in a substantial reduction in turnover in future years. From 2006-07 to

2007-08 – around the time that The Collaborative Project was launched but before the incentive system was instituted – the average teacher turnover rate across the five districts fell from 20% to 16%. The only district where turnover did not fall was Mitchell County, where turnover rates were already low (12%). We cannot attribute this reduction to the initiation of the Project, but in future years, turnover rates that fall significantly faster than those in comparable districts would suggest that the Project may be exerting an impact on turnover.

Having reported the size of the incentives disbursed, assessed their effects on Project districts' financial competitiveness with other North Carolina districts, and summarized teachers' overall reactions to the incentive system and payments, we now examine the reactions of teachers and administrators to specific aspects of the system, beginning with the component based on student achievement. The main dilemmas in designing the student achievement component were (a) whether to base incentives on the level of student performance (the percent of students who meet state standards for proficiency) or growth (the amount learned by students during a given year as indexed by change in their End-of-Grade test scores), and (b) how to deal with the fact that some teachers teach tested subjects and others do not.

In the ABCs program, schools are held responsible for both student performance and growth. Under the No Child Left Behind law, however, schools are held responsible solely for making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) toward 100% proficiency, with the proviso that they may also make AYP by reducing the number of students below the proficiency cutoff score by 10 percent from one year to the next (the so-called "safe harbor" provision). Enabling more schools to make Adequate Yearly Progress under NCLB was an explicit objective of Collaborative Project initiators. So after much discussion, Project leaders and district participants agreed to set performance rather than growth targets, but with a type of safe harbor provision (improvements of 3%, 5%, or 10% required for different levels of rewards). During our interviews, several teachers objected strongly to using improvement in the level of performance from one year to the next as the basis for awards. They pointed out, as many research studies have emphasized, that classes of students differ sharply from year to year. Some noted that in any given year, two or three difficult students can make a class a nightmare. Others noted that current student assignment practices often give some teachers much more difficult classes than others, an issue that takes on extra importance in a system based partly on individual teachers' results rather than schoolwide results. A special education teacher expressed relief that for her, incentives are tied to the performance of the whole school rather than just those students with whom she works directly: "Growth I could probably do. They grow. But they are not gonna be proficient. Kids with a 64 IQ? They have disabilities. That's why I serve 'em." While achievement by these disabled students does not affect the special education teacher's incentive award via a link to her individual performance, it does affect the school's overall level of performance, and thus the incentives for most teachers in the school.

The student achievement component of the incentive system addresses the dilemma posed by teachers of tested versus untested subjects by basing incentives for teachers of tested subjects on their own students' performance and incentives for other teacher on student performance schoolwide. This has created anomalies that rankle many teachers. For example, because of her reputation as an excellent teacher, one mathematics teacher had been assigned a high proportion

of especially challenging students. Because many students had entered her class with low skills, and even the substantial growth she was able to produce did not bring her class up to the school's overall level of performance. So the student achievement component of her award came out lower than that for many teachers who do not teach tested subjects at all. Unfortunately, this was not an isolated case. Teachers reported similar anomalies across many schools.

The performance incentive system as currently designed is clearly workable, and it draws positive overall evaluations from teachers, but to improve its technical soundness and motivational power, Project leaders may want to consider revising it to address these anomalies. A shift to growth rather than performance-based criteria would improve its technical soundness, particularly if growth were calculated as a three-year rolling average. There are signs from the Obama administration that NCLB may move toward this type of approach in the coming years.

As our colleague Gary Henry has pointed out in another context, the tested versus untested subjects dilemma could be addressed by using a breakdown into four subparts rather than an either-or breakdown: ¼ for growth achieved by a teacher's own students (if tested), ¼ for growth achieved by students taught by the team of teachers and students with whom she works, ¼ for growth achieved by students in her grade level, and ¼ for growth in the school overall. Because teachers of tested and untested subjects would receive the same amounts for up to ¾ of the subparts, such a scheme would smooth out discrepancies between the two groups. It could also strengthen solidarity and commitment to bring about higher achievement by overlapping circles of work groups within the school. It would retain an individual merit pay component but would also encourage greater contributions by teachers of untested subjects. In schools that do not have clear team structures that engage teachers of non-tested subjects in the enterprise of improving growth, the approach we suggest would provide incentives to create them. Many variations on this approach would be possible, and we are prepared to explore and explain the possibilities if Project leaders wish to consider revisions along these lines. Of course, the approach outlined here is complex to explain and would require a clear description, posted online, in addition to the oral explanations that teachers have been passed down through the "chain of command."

Teachers were generally enthusiastic about the incentive to participate in Project professional development, which comes on top of the basic stipend to compensate them for their time. Our interviews surfaced only one issue with the PD component of the incentive system. Some teachers, eager to maximize their incentive awards, seem to sign up for as many sessions as possible on the theory that they may not get into all for which they sign up (some have limited enrollments). Then, once they have reached the number required for the maximum reward, some fail to show up for subsequent sessions without informing the Project of the change in their plans. In some cases, this may have caused "slots" to go unused. At a minimum, it results in unused meals and materials. The online registration system provides a ready way to withdraw from sessions, but as it is not always utilized appropriately, it may be necessary to add a penalty for failure to withdraw in a timely way.

Teachers and administrators raised a handful of implementation issues concerning the parent contact component. First, they continue to call for the Project to issue a standard form for recording contacts, and more clarification regarding what kinds of contacts do and do not count

toward incentive awards. There appear to be school-to-school and teacher-to-teacher differences in counting normal teacher-parent conferences, notes sent home via children, email messages, telephone calls, and other forms of contact. It would be relatively simple for the Project to circulate a draft form for comment, revise it, and post a link to it on the Project website on the same page with the bar graphs that track teachers' progress toward awards. A short written statement of which types of contacts do and do not count might accompany the form. A second issue is whether 50 hours of parent contacts is a reasonable target. One special education teacher said, "I have Individual Education Plan meetings with parents all the time, but even with those, I will never meet the 50 hour target. I can't see how other teachers can possibly meet it." Despite these issues, both teachers and administrators agreed that the incentive had clearly increased teacher-parent communication.

During our Fall, 2008 interviews, both district administrators and principals anticipated that teachers might object to the principal evaluation component of the incentive system, but we heard virtually no complaints from teachers about it during either the Fall, 2008 or Spring, 2009 round of interviews. This may be because in fact, low ratings by principals are extremely rare. In Spring of 2008, across the five districts only three teachers were rated unsatisfactory, all by a single principal. Forum Executive Director John Dornan raised this point very sharply during one of the Leadership Institutes, using a striking graph produced with EVAAS software to make his point. The EVAAS graph showed that many schools in Project districts continued to perform below par. Yet even in these schools, teachers' performance routinely received high ratings. Early in the series of Leadership Institutes, the Project had included a session designed to help principals "calibrate" their evaluations by scoring and discussing videotapes of classroom instruction. Several principals reported finding the exercise helpful, but it appears to have had little effect on their teacher evaluations the following spring. One principal pointed out that the DPI-issued teacher evaluation form in use for many years did not include student test scores as an element, and that a teacher could easily demonstrate all of the practices specified on the form, yet fall short on actual student outcomes. The new teacher evaluation form now in force appears to correct this omission, but it remains to be seen whether the change will affect the distribution of evaluation ratings.

A final issue raised by several teachers across the districts concerned the effect of taxes on the incentive awards. Because taxes were withheld, the amounts that teachers actually received in incentive payments were significantly lower than they had anticipated. Even some impressively articulate and accomplished teachers expressed bitter disappointment in the post-tax size of the awards. For example, one Board certified teacher who was also a certified trainer for three different nationally-recognized mathematics programs said that as a result of the tax deductions, the incentive awards actually left her deflated rather than more highly motivated. As taxes are famously inevitable, it is difficult to know what the Project might do to address this problem.

Contrasting sharply with this National Board Certified Teacher's dissatisfaction was the response of the Project's central office contact in the same district. She recounted her earlier experience in trying to design and implement a program of performance incentives with the use of a grant from another state-funded program. The system that the district had developed proved too complex. "We just had multiple goals and criteria. That made it a monster to monitor," she said.

In contrast, the system developed by The Collaborative Project seemed much more manageable. So with minor adaptations and using funds from another source, she adopted the Project's system for use in the district's one high school.

As indicated earlier, the incentive awards for superintendents and principals take the form of lump sum compensation for a three-year period. So they have not yet received awards. Two superintendents and several principals expressed doubt that they could meet the student performance criteria, particularly since the State Board of Education has recently raised the bar for proficiency in reading. But in virtually the same breath, they said that this did not concern them greatly. Many administrators seemed a bit diffident about the rewards. Some version of, "We really should be doing all of this anyway, for the sake of the kids," was a common response. A few principals were a bit cloudy about the exact workings of the incentive system. Some believed, for example, that poor student performance in a single year would rule out any reward for the full three year period of the pilot. Project leaders have attempted to clear up such confusions, but until the initial awards to superintendents and principals, some unclarity will probably persist. Meanwhile, the Advisory Committee continues to adjust details of the criteria for teachers as well as for administrators. The current version of the criteria for all participants may be found in Appendix E.

A final feature of the incentive system is the $15,000 that each district was allocated to use for signing bonuses of up to $5,000 for teachers of mathematics or science. Districts' use of the funds varied greatly. Three districts used the entire amount, and of these, two supplemented the Project's funds with funds of their own. Mitchell County has so little difficulty in attracting and retaining teachers that many certified teachers serve as teacher aides while they wait for openings. So the fact that Mitchell used only $5,000 of its signing bonus funds is not surprising. But Washington County principals complain of severe difficulties in recruiting good mathematics and science teachers. One principal said, "The pool of high quality applicants is so shallow that you could walk through it without getting your feet wet." So the fact that Washington reported no use at all of the bonus funds is puzzling. (For exact figures on districts' expenditures on signing bonuses, see Appendix F, Table 1.) Surprisingly, both principals and recipients of the bonuses reported that while teachers appreciated them, the bonuses were not a decisive factor in the recipients' decisions to take jobs in the districts. They said the bonuses would have to be much larger to be decisive. One district indicated that it would have been helpful to have the flexibility to use the funds to retain especially able teachers rather than to attract new ones, and some administrators argued for greater flexibility to use the bonuses for people who teach subjects other than math and science for the majority of their time.

After School Programs

As is true in the professional development and performance incentive components, The Collaborative Project has developed a system of after school programs for promising, but underachieving students, a system that could also be applied in other rural districts across the state. In developing the system, Project leaders faced certain design, development, and implementation challenges: (a) to define the purposes of the programs, (b) to define the target population of students for the programs, (c) to specify the relative emphasis on enrichment

versus remediation, (d) to provide a balance of guidance versus autonomy that promotes ownership and commitment on the one hand, but assures consistency on the other, (e) to decide on an appropriate and feasible level of financial assistance, (f) to define the types of training and follow-up assistance necessary to assure adequately functioning programs, and (g) to create channels of communication and feedback to permit adjustment. Below we describe the system that has evolved as these challenges have been addressed and review the administrative and interview data we have gathered in order to assess the system of after school programs. Next year, we will turn our focus to the question of impact — how have these systems affected student learning as well as other aspects of the districts' functioning?

The design of the system was based on the Forum's experience during five years of crafting and directing the Young Scholars Program. The Young Scholars Program was organized by the Public School Forum in 1999 in 19 schools across the state with funding from the Z. Smith Reynolds Foundation. Although schools in the Young Scholars initiative had discretion in choosing students to participate, the programs primarily served students who were scoring below grade level on the state's End-of-Grade tests. The programs relied heavily on fully certified teachers working with students in small group settings. Participation in Young Scholars was a special opportunity for invited students to participate in enrichment activities. The programs were never to be seen as remedial.

Each of the five pilot districts participating in The Collaborative Project received $150,000 annually to support after school programs in two or more of their elementary and/or middle schools. Collaborative Project designers initially expected districts to divide the funds equally across two schools but have permitted them to distribute funding to more sites in situations where individual schools are isolated and very small and where transporting students from multiple schools to only two sites would be costly. Project leaders urged districts to serve underachieving students through these programs – students with strong academic potential but scoring just below or marginally above proficiency cutoffs on the state's End-of-Grade tests, but schools had discretion in choosing students to participate. Some districts restricted participation rigorously to the intended target group, but others first targeted students scoring just below or just above the proficiency cutoffs and then opened participation to lower-scoring students. "We just couldn't leave out students who needed the help and really wanted to participate," one Central Office Contact explained. As the tables below illustrates, program size varied by district and school grade levels.

Table 9: Number of Students Who Participated in Collaborative Project After School Programs by District and School Grade Levels in Fall 2008

	Caswell	Greene	Mitchell	Warren	Washington
Elementary	43	137	68	60	164
Middle	42	0	0	35	240
Elementary/Middle	NA	NA	30	NA	NA
Total Students	**85**	**137**	**98**	**95**	**404**

Data retrieved from school-reported Collaborative Project questionnaire, Fall 2008

Table 10: Students Served in Young Scholars Program as a Percentage of All Students in Grades 3-8 in Fall 2008

	Caswell	Greene	Mitchell	Warren	Washington
Students in Grades 3-5	6%	16%	10%[1]	10%	18%
Students in Grades 6-8	6%	0%		5%	49%

Data retrieved from school reported Young Scholars questionnaire, Fall 2008 and Carolina Institute of Public Policy ADM database 2008-09
[1]*Unable to identify YS participants' grade level in elementary/middle combined schools*

Most schools selected students annually on the basis of their prior year End-of-Grade (EOG) test scores and focused on students scoring at levels II or III, just at or below proficiency, on the state's EOG test. However, several schools choose to focus on students scoring at lower proficiency levels, levels I and II, or to use EVAAS performance prediction software to select students for participation. One school selected students as they entered the school in the 2nd grade and asked them to remain in the after school program through their 5th grade graduation. As the program director explained, "With other interventions we have tried, students were constantly starting and stopping. We believe that working with the students over three years will produce the best long-term results." Students were explicitly invited to participate in the after school program at each school. Project leaders emphasized that participation was an opportunity for enrichment, not a punishment or a way of compensating for poor achievement.

After school programs were encouraged to maintain low student-to-staff ratios. As a result, while ratios in the programs varied, they remained between 1:5 and 1:11. The programs were encouraged to rely on teachers who were fully certified, but some programs also utilized non-certified staff, staff with flex-time schedules, paraprofessionals, non-staff volunteers, and staff volunteers.

Table 11: Staff Participation and Staffing Ratios for After School Programs in Fall 2008

	Caswell	Greene	Mitchell	Warren	Washington
Number of certified staff who participated in After School Programs	18	13	23	21	54
Staffing Ratios for each school[2]	1:5[1]	1:10, 1:10	1:9, 1:8, 1:8, 1:5	1:7	2:10, 1:11

Data retrieved from school reported Young Scholars questionnaire, Fall 2008
[1]*Data unavailable from one program*

District and school interview participants generally reported that with some addition of local funds, the $150,000 provided by The Collaborative Project to support the after school programs were adequate. As the table below indicates, each district supplemented the Collaborative funds

with some local resources. District leaders reported some concerns about the costs of transportation and related expenditures. Three districts provide funds to supplement the cost of transportation for students; two districts reported that they do not provide transportation.

Table 12: Funds or In-Kind Resources other than Collaborative Project Funding which Supported the Young Scholars Program from January 2008-August 2008

	Source(s) (Amount contributed)
Caswell	No direct monetary contributions, on occasion items were donated or sold to the program for a reduced rate.
Greene[1]	Salaries for bus drivers ($20,000) Fuel for buses ($52,000)
Mitchell[2]	4H provided an assistant and the materials for nutrition unit ($1,750)
Warren	Central Office-Transportation and Snacks (amount unknown) Warren County Middle School-Supplies, Copies, Volunteers, Presenters ($500.00)
Washington	WOW-e Community Development Corporation ($25,000) At Risk Student Fund (amount unknown) Title 1 Funds (amount unknown) Title 1 School Improvement Funds (amount unknown)

Data retrieved from school reported Young Scholars questionnaire, End of Academic Year 2007-08
[1]*Data unavailable for one school*
[2]*Data unavailable for two schools*

At the outset of The Collaborative Project, administrators brought in representatives from successful Young Scholars Programs along with staff from the NC Center on After School Programs (NC CAP) to provide an orientation on the Young Scholars model to district administrators and principals from participating schools. Project administrators later followed up with a combination of in-person and telephone meetings to address questions and needs from the districts. Project districts were also eligible to participate in the annual conference hosted by NC CAP, to receive NC CAP forms and written materials, and to call on NC CAP as well as Collaborative Project staff, for advice on an ongoing basis.

Collaborative Project administrators provided district leaders and After School Program Directors broad latitude to shape their programs to meet the needs of their individual students and schools. District and school leaders may determine: (1) the number of programs to be established in their district; (2) the location of each program; (3) the criteria by which students would be selected to participate; (4) the number of students in each program; (5) the activities in which students participated; (6) the number of hours that students would spend in the program; (7) the criteria by which staff would be selected to participate in the program; (8) the staff to student ratios; and (9) the level of staff participation in Young Scholars and NC CAP training activities.

According to our Fall, 2008 interviews, the Project's non-prescriptive approach worked well for many schools and districts. There were examples of programs that have energized administrators, teachers, and students. Participants were particularly pleased to be given the latitude to meet the needs of their students without having to fit those needs into a tightly-designed program model. Here are some illustrative examples of positive program activities and features:

- Several teachers reported that the opportunity to choose activities based on their own interest often sparked great excitement among students. In at least one case, it was the students' excitement that persuaded teachers to participate. One teacher told us that she came to the first organizational session of the program intending to leave after helping a few students during the remedial period. But a group of students persuaded her to stay to work with them on a cooking activity. "They really just came up with all of the ideas themselves," she recalled. "They wanted to learn how to cook food from all these different countries and cultures, and they wanted to learn about formal table settings, and bring their parents and other kids in for the meals. They laid out the whole plan for me. They said that without me, they couldn't do it. So I said to myself, 'If these kids can stay late and do all of this, *so can I*.'"
- Students in one elementary program participated in a two-state regional science competition in which they were required to design the lightest possible container to protect an egg from a three-story fall. These Project students won 12 of the 16 possible awards in the competition and drafted papers outlining the principles required to complete the task so successfully. The after school students assigned to this site also participated in activities such as culinary arts, model making, technology, music appreciation, and newspaper writing. Students were allowed to propose the list of activities from which they could choose based on their interests.
- Programs in another county are making a major effort to involve parents and community members in after school initiatives. "These efforts are changing many students' views of whether they really do fit in their school and community," the central office contact told us. Parents were actively volunteering at school, and students were participating in apprenticeship programs and interacting with community volunteers.
- Teachers in one school enthusiastically described taking their students on a trip "around the world" during a recent Saturday extension of their after school enrichment. As one teacher explained, "Most of our students have never even been to Raleigh, the beach, or the mountains. We gave them a passport that was stamped as they entered each room. Taught them to cook an exotic dish. Dressed them up. Played exciting music from a beautiful place. We even built a little plane that carried them from room to room throughout the school. We gave them a piece of the world to show them what is possible – maybe something to work toward."
- In two of the five districts, the central office contact clearly gave strong and detailed guidance to the after school program coordinators and participating faculty. In one of them, the central office contact prescribed a set of components that should be a part of every activity, including such features as required background research, hands-on inquiry, and reporting on the activity orally to parents and other students as well as in writing. The central office contact explained that she was using the after school program

as a low-risk context in which participating teachers could get some experience with problem-based inquiry as an instructional approach. Accountability pressures might discourage them from experimenting with such methods in their regular classrooms, but her plan was to persuade them to try the methods in the after school context, have some success with them, and subsequently import them into their regular instructional repertoire. The other very active central office contact prescribed the use of an instructional cycle involving a common set of steps or elements, a cycle advocated by some leaders in the middle school movement nationally. Over the spring and summer, the programs tried some variants on this approach, but found the originally-prescribed method the most effective and decided to hew more closely to it in the future. In both districts, students had broad latitude to choose the topics and activities they wanted to pursue, but the instructional guidance provided by the central office contacts seems to have given the activities enough structure to support successful implementation.

- Teachers in another school remarked that the enrichment component allows teachers and students to interact in a relaxed way that is different from the regular classroom. "No set textbook, worksheets, things like that. Discovering and developing that drama or that piece of art together as it evolves. Children take great pride in that – especially kids who do not excel academically. It makes the teachers more approachable. That type of camaraderie does transfer into other parts of the school day. They can approach the teacher for help. That development of the relationship is as important as anything academic." The enrichment component can be a source of motivation of students who struggle academically and can level the playing field for students who feel out of place in school.
- Several programs also offered students opportunities to travel to plays, science fairs, concerts, larger cities, theme parks, beaches, the mountains, and other events and settings with which they had little or no prior experience. Many programs also included service project field trips to area retirement homes and hospitals. Teachers and administrators remarked that these trips were some of the most rewarding experiences offered by the after school programs.
- A number of after school coordinators and teachers remarked that the additional time with students, low student-to-staff ratios, and the opportunity to integrate new or different teaching methods were key to the success of their after school programs. "It gives teachers a chance to do things they wouldn't normally do in the classroom. Also I get to collaborate with them, learn their teaching styles, and I've picked up tips that I can use when I go back to the classroom. Because of the high accountability testing system, teachers don't get the opportunity to get to know their students on that level. Now you're walking down the hallway and it's like "Hey Ms. H." It feels good, it really does."

As we noted in our January, 2009 preliminary report on the Collaborative Project, the broad discretion combined with limited interaction with NC CAP resulted in programs with differing capacity serving different types and numbers of students. Districts had been provided the opportunity to consult with the Forum's NC Center for After School Programs (NC CAP), to get written material from NC CAP, and to attend the annual conference organized by the Center, but our interviews suggested that they had seldom taken advantage of these resources, preferring to draw upon their own prior experience with after school programs as well as upon local

knowledge and skills. As the foregoing bullets illustrate, in most cases, local educators did organize exciting activities that were working well for their students and teachers. Some participants expressed particular appreciation for the opportunity to shape their own programs in a creative way. For example, one teacher told us that she initially thought that too little guidance had been provided, but as she worked with colleagues, they developed a well-structured program, and she came away grateful for the opportunity to exercise her creativity. But we pointed out in the Preliminary Report that the local discretion and the low rate of interaction with NC CAP also appear to have resulted in some programs that were less thoroughly designed and implemented. We recommended that Project leaders visit all programs with an eye toward identifying strengths and providing additional support to programs in need of extra help.

During Spring, 2009, Project leaders responded to our recommendation by taking a number of steps. They conducted a day-long training and exchange session at the Forum for after school program coordinators. They organized a separate session for principals to assure that they understand how to support solid programs. Forum Executive Director John Dornan drew on his earlier Young Scholars experience as well as the experience of The Collaborative Project to prepare a paper describing Best Practices in After School Programs. Dornan discussed the paper at the spring Leadership Institute. Based on the success one district had with a district-wide coordinator for after school programs, the Project encouraged and supported other districts to create a similar role. They also encouraged districts to send representatives to the Synergy Conference organized by NC CAP. And finally, they commissioned their own on-the-ground review of programs.

In general, participating districts responded well to these steps. Some districts had already begun to shore up weaknesses on their own. But our spring interviews and observations indicate that they also sharply increased participation in the NC CAP conference, appreciated and paid close attention to the additional guidance provided by the Best Practices paper, and increased district-wide coordination. Several after school coordinators particularly valued the opportunity to learn about other districts' programs afforded by the day-long session at the Forum. The prospect of a program review did raise some fears that Project leaders would be "grading" programs on criteria that had not been announced in advance, but Project leaders explained that the review was designed solely to pinpoint places where additional assistance was needed, not to single out any program for negative attention or sanctions. By coincidence, during the same Leadership Institute where the review was broached, the Covey facilitator made the point that real leadership avoids both "abandonment" and "micro-management" in favor of interventions designed to unleash and support the expression of talent in an organization.

Our overall sense is that weak points in the After School System are gradually being shored up through the steps outlined above. Project leaders have treated the variation across districts as a resource to draw on in defining "best practices" and sharing them across programs. They now have a stronger sense of the level of guidance and support required to place a floor under quality across the varied programs but to avoid putting a ceiling on local creativity and commitment. Continued follow-through on this more proactive approach will be necessary to strengthen some struggling programs and to support further progress in the programs that have already begun to improve.

Conclusion

Over its first two years of operation, The Collaborative Project has developed and implemented three major systems designed to improve the performance of elementary and middle school students in the five pilot districts, make the schools places that can attract and retain talented teachers and administrators, and lay the foundation for students' success in high school and beyond. In themselves, these systems of professional development, performance incentives, and after school programs represent important products of the Collaborative as a pilot project. All three are thoroughly designed, well implemented, and fully functional. They go well beyond what any district of modest size could develop and implement on its own, and within certain limitations of scale, the Project now has the capacity to apply them individually or in any combination in rural districts all across the state. Further, the Project has demonstrated an ability to continue adapting and refining the systems, based on experience, feedback from participating districts, and external evaluation. This type of "adaptive management" is a key component of successful projects and learning organizations.

But there is clearly an additional year of pilot work to be done. Based on data from several sources – administrative data from participating districts and the NCDPI, three rounds of interviews that we conducted in participating districts, and an online survey of teachers – in this report we have suggested potential adjustments to improve all three systems. Furthermore, as the designers of the Project in the General Assembly, the Public School Forum, and the Science, Mathematics, and Technology Education Center foresaw, two years are insufficient to make and to document a substantial impact. For that, the third year of the pilot and an additional year of more outcome-focused evaluation are required.

Yet student performance data from the first, partial year of the pilot (2007-08) are modestly encouraging. Across the five districts, the percentage of students proficient in mathematics increased over 2006-07 by an average of 4 points, from 52% to 56%. Between the two years, the State Board of Education raised standards for proficiency ("cut scores") in reading. So reading proficiency levels are not comparable across the two years, and no assessment of progress in reading proficiency is possible. (Reading proficiency levels fell statewide, including those in Project districts.)

For school growth and performance designations, the picture is confused by the different ways in which growth and performance were handled. Because of the change in reading standards, the 2007-08 Growth designations excluded reading achievement and were based solely on mathematics scores. So a strict comparison of Growth designations across the two years is not possible. But just considered by themselves, the Growth designations at the end of the first year of the Project (2007-08) are impressive, see Table 13 on the next page. In contrast to the growth designations, proficiency in reading was used in making the 2007-08 school performance designations. Despite the new cut scores for reading, two more Project schools were designated Schools of Progress one additional school made AYP, but there were also increases in Priority and Low Performing Schools. In light of the confusion introduced by the new reading standards and the Project's emphasis on mathematics, it seems sensible to focus on the growth scores as a

potential "leading indicator" for performance improvement. The figures on turnover and NBCTs presented earlier may also predict future improvements in growth and performance.

Table 13: ABCs and NCLB Designations of Collaborative Project Elementary and Middle Grades Schools in 2006-07 and 2007-08

ABCs & NCLB Designations	**2006-07**	**2007-08**
High Growth	1	10
Expected Growth	9	12
Expected Growth Not Achieved	14	2
Schools of Excellence	0	0
Schools of Distinction	1	1
Schools of Progress	8	10
No Recognition	9	0
Priority Schools	6	12
Low Performing Schools	0	1
Made AYP	6	7
Did Not Make AYP	18	17

Data retrieved from NC School Report Cards

In addition to improving student achievement, a second goal of the Project is improve teacher quality by attracting and retaining talented teachers and administrators as well as strengthening their skills through intensive professional development. Here again, no final assessment of impact can yet be made, but data on such indicators as teacher turnover are encouraging. As Table 14 below shows, teacher turnover in Project elementary and middle schools fell in all five districts, from an average of 19% in the year before the project was initiated (2006-07) to 15% in the first year of the Project.

Table 14: Classroom Teacher Turnover[1] in Collaborative Project Elementary and Middle Grades Schools in 2006-07 and 2007-08

District	**2006-07**	**2007-08**
Caswell	13%	9%
Greene	21%	12%
Mitchell	12%	11%
Warren	24%	20%
Washington[2]	27%	22%
Average for CP Districts	19%	15%

Data retrieved from NC School Report Cards
[1]Teacher turnover percentages are weighted by the number of teachers in each school
[2]Some 9-12 grade teachers are included in this total

We have documented large increase in the quantity and the sharp improvement in the quality of professional development provided to teachers in Project districts. As one superintendent put it, the Project "has brought us into the major leagues from the minor leagues" in PD quality. Our survey and interview data from principals as well as teachers generally support this contention. Principals also report observing significant and widespread impact on classroom teaching, including greater emphasis on hands-on methods, differentiated instruction, project and inquiry-based instruction, and teaching that is adapted to different student learning styles and needs. Candidates for certification by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards were vocal in their appreciation for the Project-sponsored support they received, and the figures on NBCTs and candidates bear out their enthusiasm. From the first, partial year of the Project (2007-08) until the second year (2008-09), applications for Board certification in Project districts increased from 13 to 40.

The third goal of The Collaborative project is to lay the foundation for students' success in high school. Attracting, retaining, developing, and motivating teachers and administrators are all strategies designed to improve the skills and attitudes that students carry forward into high school. The Project's system of after school programs represents a different and more direct approach to the goal. As we have shown, the programs bring a combination of enrichment activities and remedial interventions to hundreds of elementary and middle school students across the pilot districts. According to local educators' reports, the programs have not only strengthened students' skills, but have also greatly strengthened teacher-student relationships in participating schools. If "relationships" are just as crucial as "rigor and relevance" to keep students in high school and on track to graduation, establishing patterns of positive relationships during the elementary and middle years may prove just as foundational as building skills and knowledge. The after school programs also provide a way to extend instructional time – not a negligible effect if global competition is to be more than a popular slogan. In many European nations, a typical school year runs to 220 days. In Japan, the rule is 240 days. If we cannot extend the academic year beyond 180 days, extending the school day may represent a down payment on what it will take to compete globally.

In summary, then, the evidence we have assembled from administrative, survey, and interview data indicate that The Collaborative Project has created systems of professional development, performance incentives, and after school programs that could be scaled up to serve similar districts all across the state. Initial evidence and potential "leading indicators" of student achievement and teacher quality in pilot districts seem promising. But another year of pilot work will be required to make the refinements suggested in this report and – even more importantly – to make a valid assessment of Project outcomes.

Appendix A: Student Composition

Table A.1: Number of Schools per School Type in 2006-07

	Caswell	Greene[1]	Mitchell[2]	Warren	Washington[3]	North Carolina District Average (Total number in NC)[4]
Elementary	4	2	3	4	2	11(1256)
Middle	1	1	2	1	1	4(422)
High	1	2	1	1	1	4(438)
Elementary/Middle/High	0	0	0	0	0	<1(34)
Elementary/Middle	0	0	2	0	0	1(133)
Middle/High	0	0	0	0	1	<1(88)

Data retrieved from NC School Report Cards in 2006-07and ABCs performance of all schools 2006-07

[1]*Greene includes elementary schools with grades PreK-2 and another serves grades 3-5.*

[2]*Mitchell elementary schools include grade ranges K-1, 3-5, and K-2. Middle school includes grades 5-8.*

[3]*Washington elementary schools include grade ranges PreK-6 and PreK-4. Middle school serves grades 5-8.*

[4]*When school grade ranges overlapped by more than 2 grades into another subset (subsets: elementary K-5, middle 6-8, high school 9-12), a combination school type was assigned. To create averages, category totals were divided by 115, representing the 115 school districts in NC in 2006-07.*

Table A.2: Total Number of Students in 2006-07

	Caswell	Greene	Mitchell	Warren	Washington	State
Total number of students	3,303	3,272	2,213	2,817	2,072	Total=1,405,694 District Average=12,223 Range= 614 - 129,009

Data retrieved from NC Public Schools Statistical Profile 2007

Table A.3: Average School Size per School Type in 2006-07

	Caswell	Greene	Mitchell	Warren	Washington	State
Elementary	370	810	274	293	416	510
Middle	766	724	257	684	551	666
Elementary/Middle	NA	NA	95	NA	NA	413
Middle/High	NA	NA	NA	NA	150	196

Data retrieved from NC School Report Cards in 2006-07

Table A.4: Average Class Size within Schools by Grade in 2006-07

Note: Average class size ranges across all school types indicated in parentheses.

	Caswell	Greene	Mitchell	Warren	Washington	State
Kindergarten	21 (19-22)	20	17 (13-22)	19 (16-22)	16 (13-18)	19
Grade 1	18 (16-19)	18	16 (15-17)	18 (16-22)	17 (16-17)	19
Grade 2	19 (16-23)	19	14 (11-17)	20 (15-22)	19	19
Grade 3	19 (16-22)	22	13 (11-15)	20 (18-21)	16(15-16)	19
Grade 4	16 (11-20)	25	18 (14-21)	19 (13-25)	16 (14-16)	20
Grade 5	17 (12-19)	28	19 (16-22)	18 (15-22)	23 (22-24)	21
Grade 6	20	22	15 (13-17)	20	25 (21-28)	21
Grade 7	21	22	19 (16-21)	20	21 (19-22)	21
Grade 8	19	24	16 (14-18)	19	20 (19-21)	20

Data retrieved from NC School Report Cards in 2006-07

Table A.5: Total Number and Percentage of Students by Ethnicity in 2006-07

	Caswell	Greene	Mitchell	Warren	Washington	State
American Indian	6 (<1%)	0	3 (<1%)	134 (5%)	1 (<1%)	20,143 (1%)
Asian	11(<1%)	4 (<1%)	11 (<1%)	1 (<1%)	3 (<1%)	31,077 (2%)
Hispanic	146 (4%)	589 (18%)	98 (4%)	100 (4%)	67 (3%)	130,690 (9%)
Black	1382 (42%)	1569 (48%)	18 (<1%)	2088 (74%)	1530 (74%)	439,725 (31%)
White	1758 (53%)	1110 (34%)	2083 (94%)	494 (18%)	471 (23%)	784,059 (56%)

Data retrieved from NC Public Schools Statistical Profile 2007

Table A.6: Percent of Students by Economic Condition in 2006-07

Note: Economic disadvantage is defined as students applying for free or reduced lunch price school meals.

	Caswell	Greene	Mitchell	Warren	Washington	State
Economically disadvantaged	56%	73%	54%	76%	80%	48%
Not economically disadvantaged	44%	27%	46%	24%	20%	52%

Data retrieved from NC DPI Child Nutrition Services Free and Reduced Lunch Applications in 2006-07.

Table A.7: Percentage of Test Takers in Grades 3-8 by Parent Educational Attainment in 2005-06

Note: Number of test takers in grades 3-8 indicated in parentheses.

	Caswell	Greene	Mitchell	Warren	Washington	State
Parents not high school graduate	12% (181)	16% (230)	12% (120)	8% (107)	7% (70)	9%
Parents at least high school graduate	64% (993)	59% (860)	57% (590)	73% (964)	66% (666)	50%
Parents community/junior college graduate	9% (145)	11% (160)	16% (165)	10% (136)	15% (155)	12%
Parents at least four year college graduate	15% (225)	14% (205)	15% (162)	9% (110)	12% (120)	28%

Data retrieved from Reports of Disaggregated State, School System (LEA) and School Performance Data in 2005-06

Appendix B: Teacher Characteristics

Table B.1: Average Number of Classroom Teacher by School Type in 2006-07
Note: Total number of classroom teachers indicated in parentheses

	Caswell	Greene	Mitchell	Warren	Washington	State
Elementary	28 (111)	55 (109)	20 (59)	24 (94)	36 (72)	37
Middle	54 (54)	47 (47)	19 (38)	45 (45)	39 (39)	46
High	67 (67)	34 (68)	48 (48)	65 (65)	41 (41)	63
Elementary/Middle	NA	NA	10 (20)	NA	NA	30
Middle/High	NA	NA	NA	NA	18 (18)	20
K-8 Teacher total	165	156	117	139	129*	Data Unavailable
Overall Teacher Total	232	224	165	204	170	District Average=831

Data retrieved from NC School Report Cards in 2006-07
** Some 9-12 grade teachers are included in this total*

Table B.2: Average Number of Teachers with National Board Certification in 2006-07
Note: Total number of teachers is indicated in parentheses

	Caswell		Greene		Mitchell		Warren		Washington		State	
	06-07	**07-08**	**06-07**	**07-08**	**06-07**	**07-08**	**06-7**	**07-08**	**06-07**	**07-08**	**06-07**	**07-08**
Elementary	3 (13)	4 (14)	8 (16)	7 (14)	2 (3)	4[1] (7)	2 (9)	2 (9)	4 (7)	5 (10)	4	5
Middle	3 (3)	4 (4)	1 (1)	3 (3)	2 (3)	2 (4)	2 (2)	2 (2)	0[1]	0[1]	5	5
Elementary/ Middle	NA	NA	NA	NA	0[1]	1 (1)	NA	NA	NA	NA	4	4
Middle/High	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0[1]	0[1]	3	3
High	5 (5)	6 (6)	4[1] (4)	4[1] (4)	9 (9)	11 (11)	1 (1)	1 (1)[1]	0[1]	0[1]	8	8

Data retrieved from NC School Report Cards in 2006-07
[1]N/A reported for at least one school

Table B.3: National Board Applications by Year and District[1]

	Caswell	Greene	Mitchell	Warren	Washington
2006-2007	1	7	11	6	1
2007-2008	1	5	4	2	1
2008-2009[2]	10	11	7	6	6

Data retrieved from NC Department of Public Instruction 2009
[1]Applicants with full submissions are funded through the NC Department of Public Instruction. Take 1 applicants are funded through the Collaborative Project. Take 1 applicants are only included in this table if they have applied for full submission. Figure includes teachers who have received NBC status and those retaking components.
[2]Applicants are waiting for scores, expected in November 2009.

Table B.4. Percentage of Teachers by Years of Experience in 2006-07

		Caswell	Greene	Mitchell	Warren	Washington	State
0-3 years	Elementary	8%	30%	3%	26%	14%	24%
	Middle	15%	36%	13%	29%	15%	24%
	Elementary/Middle	NA	NA	15%	NA	NA	18%
	Middle/High	NA	NA	NA	NA	33%	33%
4-10 years	Elementary	20%	20%	32%	23%	33%	29%
	Middle	13%	28%	26%	16%	23%	30%
	Elementary/Middle	NA	NA	40%	NA	NA	27%
	Middle/High	NA	NA	NA	NA	17%	17%
10+ years	Elementary	72%	50%	64%	51%	53%	48%
	Middle	72%	36%	61%	56%	62%	46%
	Elementary/Middle	NA	NA	45%	NA	NA	51%
	Middle/High	NA	NA	NA	NA	50 %	47%

Data retrieved from NC School Report Cards in 2006-07

Appendix C: Student Performance

Table C.1: Percent Proficient in Both Reading and Math by Subgroups for 2006-07 and 2007-08

Note: NA is used if the number of students in a subgroup is 5 or fewer, if the percentage is greater than 95%, or less than 5%

	Caswell		Greene		Mitchell		Warren		Washington		State	
	06-07	**07-08**	**06-07**	**07-08**	**06-07**	**07-08**	**06-07**	**07-08**	**06-07**	**07-08**	**06-07**	**07-08**
All Students	61%	48%	42%	30%	60%	51%	47%	33%	41%	27%	64%	51%
Male	51%	46%	41%	28%	61%	51%	43%	29%	41%	23%	67%	47%
Female	52%	50%	43%	33%	58%	50%	51%	38%	43%	32%	66%	53%
White	62%	54%	61%	51%	61%	52%	70%	53%	63%	50%	77%	64%
Black	39%	39%	29%	19%	NA	NA	40%	28%	34%	19%	46%	30%
Hispanic	40%	47%	38%	23%	31%	16%	44%	28%	43%	38%	55%	35%
American Indian	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	49%	34%	NA	NA	55%	35%
Asian/Pacific Islander	NA	NA	NA	NA	57 %	50 %	NA	NA	NA	NA	78 %	66 %
Multiracial	69%	63%	56%	28%	67%	50%	74%	34%	44%	33%	70%	52%
Economically disadvantaged students	51%	38%	34%	23%	50%	41%	42%	28%	36%	21%	51%	33%
Not economically disadvantaged students	73%	63%	63%	49%	71%	64%	59%	52%	61%	44%	74%	67%
Limited English proficient students	36%	12%	27%	13%	18%	6%	32%	17%	38%	24%	39%	20%
Students with disabilities	24%	15%	15%	11%	30%	18%	23%	12%	34%	7%	38%	21%
Parents not high school graduate*	34%	**	20%	**	35%	**	34%	**	20%	**	34%	**

Table C.1: Percent Proficient in Both Reading and Math by Subgroups for 2006-07 and 2007-08 Continued

	Caswell		Greene		Mitchell		Warren		Washington		State	
	06-07	07-08	06-07	07-08	06-07	07-08	06-07	07-08	06-07	07-08	06-07	07-08
Parents trade/business school graduate*	70%	**	NA	**	57%	**	21%	**	29%	**	68%	**
Parents community/ junior college graduate*	66%	**	51%	**	75%	**	68%	**	54%	**	67%	**
Parents four year college graduate*	76%	**	70%	**	85%	**	66%	**	63%	**	83%	**
Parents graduate degree*	82%	**	85%	**	86%	**	86%	**	92%	**	90%	NA

Data retrieved from NC School Report Cards in 2006-07and Reports of Disaggregated State, School System (LEA) and School Performance Data in 2007-08
**Data retrieved from Reports of Disaggregated State, School System (LEA) and School Performance Data in 2005-06*
***No data available*

Table C.2: Percentage of Students Scoring at Level I, II, III, or IV in Reading and Math in 2006-07

Note: NA is used if the percentage of students is <5%

		Caswell	Greene	Mitchell	Warren	Washington	State
Level I	Reading	NA	NA	NA	5%	NA	NA
	Math	10%	17%	9%	17%	18%	9%
Level II	Reading	10%	19%	9%	16%	20%	11%
	Math	27%	39%	28%	34%	38%	25%
Level III	Reading	46%	50%	44%	50%	51%	43%
	Math	47%	37%	48%	41%	36%	45%
Level IV	Reading	42%	26%	45%	29%	24%	43%
	Math	16%	7%	13%	9%	8%	21%

Data retrieved from NC School Report Cards in 2006-07

Table C.3: Proportion of Schools Receiving Each School Performance Designation in 2006-07 and 2007-08

		Caswell		Greene		Mitchell		Warren		Washington		State	
		06-07	07-08	06-07	07-08	06-07	07-08	06-07	07-08	06-07	07-08	06-07	07-08
Schools of Excellence	Elementary	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1%	1%
	Middle	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1%	1%
	Elementary /Middle	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	<1%	3%
	Middle /High	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	0	<1%	<1%
Schools of Distinction	Elementary	1/4	0/4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24%	9%
	Middle	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20%	7%
	Elementary /Middle	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	1/2	NA	NA	NA	NA	26%	10%
	Middle /High	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	0	6%	<1%
Schools of Progress	Elementary	1/4	2/4	0	0	2/3	2/3	1/4	1/4	0	1/2	37%	51%
	Middle	1/1	1/1	0	0	0	2/2	1/1	0	0	0	45%	54%
	Elementary /Middle	NA	NA	NA	NA	1/2	1/2	NA	NA	NA	NA	38%	51%
	Middle /High	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1/1	0	38%	33%
No recognition	Elementary	2/4	0	0	0	1/3	0	2/4	0	1/2	0	22%	1%
	Middle	0	0	0	0	2/2	0	0	0	0	0	16%	2%
	Elementary /Middle	NA	NA	NA	NA	1/2	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	16%	4%
	Middle /High	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	0	44%	56%
Priority school	Elementary	0	2/4	2/2	2/2	0	1/3	1/4	3/4	1/2	1/2	11%	35%
	Middle	0	0	1/1	1/1	0	0	0	1/1	1/1	1/1	12%	31%
	Elementary /Middle	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	13%	28%
	Middle /High	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	0	6%	4%
Low Performing	Elementary	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1%	3%
	Middle	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2%	5%
	Elementary /Middle	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	3%	4%
	Middle /High	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	1/1	6%	7%

Data retrieved from NC School Report Cards in 2006-07 and ABCs performance of all schools 2007-08 (NC Report Card data unavailable for 2007-08). Calculations used only schools which received a school performance designation

Appendix D: Professional Development

Table D.1: Professional Development Offered by The Collaborative Project, 2007-2009

Name of Professional Development Provider	Affiliation	Participators Served	Sample of Session Titles	Mission
North Carolina Association of Educators	National Education Association	National Board Certification K-12 teachers, Beginning K-8 teachers, All K-8 teachers	"Getting Started on NBC", "How to Teach for Rigor and Relevance: Using the International Center for Leadership in Education Framework"	"Advocate for students and members, enhance the education profession, and advance public education" Retrieved from www.ncae.org
North Carolina Center for the Advancement of Teaching	Funded by the State	National Board Certification K-12 teachers, Beginning K-8 teachers,	"National Board Certification Information Session", "Connect to your Future: Celebrating Success in the Classroom"	"From the mountains to the sea, advancing teaching as an art and as a profession" Retrieved from www.nccat.org
Franklin Covey Institute	Private Company	National Board Certification K-12 teachers, Beginning K-8 teachers, All K-8 teachers	"7 Habits of Highly Effective Teachers", "Leadership Foundations for NBC teachers"	"…dedicated to helping Education Organizations build the culture that will provide great results." Retrieved from www.franklincovey.com
NC Teacher Academy	Funded by the North Carolina General Assembly	Beginning K-8 teachers, All K-8 teachers	"Differentiated Instruction", "Classroom Management"	"The mission of the academy is to support continuous learning to the growth of a career teacher by providing quality professional development in the areas of school leadership, instructional methodology, core content, and use of modern technology in order to enrich instruction and enhance student achievement." Retrieved from www.teacheracademy.org

Table D.1: Professional Development Offered by The Collaborative Project, 2007-2009 Continued

Name of Professional Development Provider	Affiliation	Participators Served	Sample of Session Titles	Mission
Thinking Maps Inc.	Private Company	Beginning K-8 teachers, All K-8 teachers	"Thinking Maps II: A Focus on Differentiation and the North Carolina Standard Course Of Study"	"Building a common language for learning through visual tools to achieve lifelong student success!" Retrieved from www.thinkingmaps.com
Statewide Institute for Teaching Excellence	Part of the North Carolina Mathematics Science and Education Network	Math and science K-8 teachers	"Summer Math Institute, K-5", "Summer Math Institute, 6-8"	"It is the mission of the NC-MSEN to improve the quality of mathematics and science teaching and learning in the schools of North Carolina by providing statewide leadership in mathematics and science professional development in an effort to strengthen the quality and increase the size of the teaching base in mathematics and science education; and increase the pool of students who graduate from North Carolina high schools prepared to pursue careers requiring mathematics and science." Retrieved from http://education.uncc.edu/cmste/SITE/
North Carolina Science Fair Foundation	Public School Forum- NC Science Fair Foundation	Math and science K-8 teachers	"Using Student Research in Science 3-5", "Using Student Research in Science 6-8"	

Table D.1: Professional Development Offered by The Collaborative Project, 2007-2009 Continued

Name of Professional Development Provider	Affiliation	Participators Served	Sample of Session Titles	Mission
The Science House	A learning outreach project of NC State University	Math and science K-8 teachers	"K-5 Safety Sense in Science", "K-8 Inquiry in the Science Classroom"	"Our mission is to work in partnership with K-12 teachers to increase the use and impact of hands-on learning technologies in mathematics and science." Retrieved from www.science-house.org
Center for Inquiry Based Learning	Funded by the National Science Foundation and supported by GlaxoSmithKline, Progress Energy, and the Pratt School of Engineering, Duke University	Math and science K-8 teachers	"K-2 Inquiry Motivator", "3-5 Using Science Notebooking for Inquiry"	"CIBL's purpose is to provide North Carolina K-8 students with opportunities to learn to think as scientists: critically, creatively, and independently." Retrieved from www.ciblearning.org
All Kinds of Minds	All Kinds of Minds is a non-profit institute	Beginning K-8 teachers, All K-8 teachers	"All Kinds of Minds: School Attuned"	"The institute's mission is to help students who struggle with learning measurably improve their success in school and life by providing programs that integrate educational, scientific, and clinical expertise." Retrieved from www.allkindsofminds.org

Data retrieved from the Public School Forum 2007-08 and 2008-09 Schedules of Professional Development

Table D.2: List of PD Sessions November 2007-August 2009

	Title of Session *Professional Development Provider*
PD in Mathematics	• "Summer Math Institute, Elementary K-5 Teachers " *NC Science, Mathematics, and Technology Education Center (NCSMTEC)* • "Summer Math Institute, Middle Grades 6-8 Teachers " *NCSMTEC* • "Summer Math I Follow Up K-5" *NCSMTEC* • "Summer Math I Follow Up 6-8" *NCSMTEC* • "Using the NC Math Manipulative Kit to Teach the NCSCOC" *NCSMTEC* • "K-5 Summer Math Institute II" *NCSMTEC* • "6-8 Summer Math Institute II" *NCSMTEC*
PD in Science	• "K-5 Safety Sense in Science" *Science House* • "K-8 Inquiry in the Science Classroom" *Science House* • "SITE: K-2 Science Follow Up" *North Carolina Math Science Education Network (NCMSEN)* • "SITE: 3-5 Science Follow Up" *NCMSEN* • "SITE: 6-8 Science Follow Up" *NCMSEN* • "Using Student Research In Science 3-5" *North Carolina Science Fair Foundation (NCSFF)* • "Using Student Research In Science 6-8" *NCSFF* • "3-5 Orientation to NC Science Olympiad" *Science House* • "6-8 Orientation to NC Science Olympiad" *Science House* • "SITE: K-2 Science" *NCMSEN* • "SITE: 3-5 Science" *NCMSEN* • "SITE: 6-8 Science" *NCMSEN* • "K-2 Using Science Notebooking for Inquiry" *Center for Inquiry Based* • *Learning (CIBL)* • "3-5 Using Science Notebooking for Inquiry" *CIBL* • "6-8 Using Science Notebooking for Inquiry" *CIBL* • *"*K-2 Inquiry Motivator" *CIBL* • "3-5 Inquiry Motivator" *CIBL* • "6-8 Inquiry Motivator" *CIBL*

Table D.2: List of PD Sessions November 2007-August 2009 Continued

	Title of Sessions *Professional Development Provider*
PD in National Board Certification Support	• "Nationals Board Certification Information Session" *North Carolina Center for the Advancement of Teaching (NCCAT)* • "Getting Started on National Board Certification" *North Carolina Association of Educators (NCAE)* • "Getting & Staying Organized: The Architecture of Accomplished Teaching and Thinking about Writing" *NCAE* • "Documented Accomplishments" *NCAE* • "National Board Support Seminars" *NCCAT* • "Aligning Your Candidacy to the School Year & Using the Rubrics and Scoring Guides for Success" *NCAE* • "Understanding Standards; Videotaping Tips" *NCAE* • "Getting Started on Take One" *NCAE* • "All Kinds of Writing" *NCAE* • "NBC Support Drive-In Clinic" *NCAE* • "Winter Writing Workshop" *NCAE* • "Writing About Student Work Samples" *NCAE* • "Let's Get to Work" *NCAE* • "Reading, Writing, and Working" *NCAE* • "Packing the NBC Box" *NCAE* • "Preparing for the Assessment Center" *NCAE* • "National Board Support Seminar" *NCCAT* • "Leadership Foundations for NBC Teachers" *Franklin Covey Institute*
PD for Beginning Teachers and All Others	• "Culture of Poverty" *NC Teacher Academy* • "Classroom Management" *NC Teacher Academy* • "CARE: Culture, Abilities, Resilience, and Effort" *NCAE* • "Differentiated Instruction" *NC Teacher Academy* • "How to Teach for Rigor and Relevance: Using the International Center for Leadership in Education Framework" *NCAE* • "Creating Strong Family-School-Community Partnerships" *NCAE* • "Connect to your Future: Celebrating Success in the Classroom" *NCCAT* • "All Kinds of Minds: Schools Attuned" *All Kinds of Minds* • "All Kinds of Minds: Schools Attuned Follow Up" *All Kinds of Minds* • "Integration of Technology Into the Curriculum" *NC Teacher Academy* • "Cognitive Conditioning" *NC Teacher Academy* • "Thinking Maps I: A Language for Learning" *Thinking Maps Inc.* • "Thinking Maps II: A Focus on Differentiation and the NCSCOS" *Thinking Maps Inc.* • "I Can Do It" *NCAE* • "Using Multiple Intelligences to Individualize Instruction" *NC Teacher Academy* • "All Kinds of Minds: Schools Attuned" *All Kinds of Minds* • "Latinos: NC's new neighbors" *NCCAT* • "7 Habits of Highly Effective Teachers" *Franklin Covey Institute* • "Using Data for School Improvement" *NC Teacher Academy* • "Integrating Art, Music and Physical Education into Math and Science K-8 Curriculum" *NCSMTEC*

Data retrieved from the Public School Forum 2007-08 and 2008-09 Schedules of Professional Development

Table D.3: District Expenditures for Professional Development* in 2006-07

	Caswell	Greene	Mitchell	Warren	Washington
Total Amount Spent Across all Schools	$118,334	$195,877	$97,955	$156,563	$155,229
Total Amount Spent Across Elementary, Middle, Elementary/Middle, and Middle/High schools	$66,269	$131,592	$69,969	$91,325	$142,250
Average Amount on Professional Development Spent per K-8 Teacher	$402	$844	$598	$657	$1,103**

Data retrieved from NC expenditure database from Carolina Institute of Public Policy
** Expenditures related to staff development and new teacher orientation. These include expenditures for workshops and mentor salaries and benefits.*
*** Some 9-12 grade teachers are included in this total*

Table D.4: Amount Spent on Professional Development by The Collaborative Project from November 2007-September 2008

	Caswell	Greene	Mitchell	Warren	Washington	Total
Total Amount Spent on Professional Development Stipends Payments	$223,059	$172,721	$163,498	$116,167	$134,349	$809,794
Estimated Amount Spent on Professional Development Costs other than Stipend Payments (includes payment to trainers, materials, site fees)	$137,292	$108,751	$90,569	$70,430	$69,279	$476,321
Total Amount Spent on Professional Development including Stipends and other Expenditures	$360,351	$281,472	$254,067	$186,597	$203,628	$1,286,115

Data retrieved from The Public School Forum 2008

Table D.5: Amount of Professional Development Experienced by Teachers 2007-2009[1]
Note: Range indicated in parentheses

		Caswell	Greene	Mitchell	Warren	Washington
Total Number of Days for PD	Elementary Teacher	1214	934	743	604	482
	Middle Grades Teacher	422	438	333	225	307
	High School Teacher	6	20	51	2	15
	Total for K-8 Teachers	1642	1392	1127	831	804
Average Number of PD Days per Participating Teacher	Elementary Teacher	11.0 (1-30)	9.2 (1-21)	10.3 (1-30)	8.8 (1-35)	8.5 (1-23)
	Middle Grades Teacher	9.0 (1-24)	9.3 (1-24)	7.7 (1-19)	8.0 (1-24)	7.7 (1-29)
	High School Teacher	1.5 (1-2)	2.2 (1-8)	3.9 (1-6)	1.0(1-1)	3.0 (1-7)
	Total K-8 Teachers	10.4 (1-30)	9.2 (1-24)	9.4 (1-30)	8.5 (1-35)	8.1 (1-29)

Data retrieved from The Public School Forum 2009
[1]Numbers are from PD from project inception to May 16, 2009

Table D.6: Number of Professional Development Days Provided[1] to a County Broken Down by Subject Type 2007-2009[2]

	Caswell	Greene	Mitchell	Warren	Washington
Math Professional Development Days	20	21	13	21	12
Science Professional Development Days	14	13	5	6	13
National Board Certification PD Days	22	28	23	25	17
All Other Professional Development Days	28	28	23	23	28

Data retrieved from The Public School Forum 2009
[1]The number of PD days the Collaborative Project provided does not translate to the number of days of PD offered. Some PD was offered to multiple counties on the same day
[2]Numbers are from PD from project inception to May 16, 2009

Table D.7: Survey Responses on Attendance of Collaborative Project (CP) Sessions Since Inception by District, Years of Teaching Experience, and Role

Note: Table reads such that percentages per column segment add to 100%, plus or minus 1 percentage point due to rounding error. For example, "One hundred and twenty-three people said they did not attend any PD sessions. Of the 123 people, 12% were teachers in Caswell County, while 34 % were from Greene County."

		Did Not Attend Any Sessions (n=123)	**Attended Between 1-2 Sessions (n=122)**	**Attended Between 3-5 Sessions (n=165)**	**Attended Between 6-8 Sessions (n=115)**	**Attended more than 9 Sessions (n=92)**
District Employed	Caswell	12%	20%	19%	28%	28%
	Greene	34%	30%	25%	30%	25%
	Mitchell	7%	13%	26%	16%	13%
	Warren	27%	21%	16%	11%	16%
	Washington	20%	16%	15%	15%	17%
Years of Teaching Experience	First Year	15%	2%	2%	1%	1%
	1 - 3 years	13%	13%	12%	11%	9%
	4 - 8 years	15%	16%	21%	23%	22%
	9 -12 years	16%	10%	10%	9%	15%
	More than 12 Years	42%	59%	55%	56%	53%
Role	Elementary School Classroom Teacher	43%	48%	50%	56%	57%
	Middle School Classroom Teacher	30%	25%	31%	30%	27%
	Other	26%	28%	19%	14%	17%

Table D.8: Survey Respondents' Reactions to Professional Development (PD) by the Number of Sessions Attended

Note: Percentage indicates those who answered "strongly agree" or "somewhat agree" to statement

	Respondents Who Attended 1-2 Sessions (n=120)	**Respondents Who Attended Between 3-5 Sessions (n=163)**	**Respondents Who Attended Between 6-8 Sessions (n=115)**	**Respondents Who Attended More than 9 Sessions (n=90)**
The PD in which I participated was well matched to my needs.	75%	83%	91%	96%
I have been able to apply things I learned from the PD in my classroom activities	69%	90%	93%	96%

Table D.8: Survey Respondents' Reactions to Professional Development (PD) by the Number of Sessions Attended Continued

	Respondents Who Attended 1-2 Sessions (n=120)	Respondents Who Attended Between 3-5 Sessions (n=163)	Respondents Who Attended Between 6-8 Sessions (n=115)	Respondents Who Attended More than 9 Sessions (n=90)
The PD that was offered made me feel like a valued professional	73%	81%	90%	91%
My students have benefitted from my participation in the Collaborative PD	66%	86%	97%	96%
I plan to attend more PD sponsored by the Collaborative Project	79%	89%	97%	97%

Table D.9: Survey Respondents' Reasons for Non-Participation in CP Professional Development

I have not participated because…	Respondents who did not participate in CP Professional Development (n=121)
I was not aware of the PD offerings	7%
The PD offered did not match my needs	17%
I am not eligible to participate in these PD sessions	5%
The workshops were offered at inconvenient times	41%
The workshops were offered in inconvenient locations	2%
Other	29%

Appendix E: Performance Incentive Criteria

Criteria to Use When Determining Teacher Performance Incentive Rewards

The following performance incentive model establishes four criteria to use when determining eligibility for annual performance incentives of up to $2,000. Each of the four criteria to determine eligibility for 25%, or up to $500, of the performance incentive. Within each of the four criteria there are levels of attainment ranging from the full 25%, or $500, to nothing, depending on performance.

Value	Professional Development (25%)	Student Performance (25%)	Parent and Community Contact (25%)	Principal's Assessment (25%)
$500	Attended 9 or more CP PD days or 85% of days available to you	85% of students met composite performance proficiency or 10% more than the previous year	50 hours of direct parent contact (defined below in # 3). 25% of that contact may be superintendent designated community activity. *Must log.*	Above Standard performance (8 out of 8) and returning to the system
$400	Attended 7 or more CP PD days or 70% of days available to you	75% of students met composite performance proficiency or 5% more than the previous year	40 hours of direct parent contact (defined below in # 3). 25% of that contact may be superintendent designated community activity. *Must log.*	At Standard performance (6 out of 8) and returning to the system
$300 *Note Below Standard for Principal's Assessment receives no reward towards this category	Attended 6 or more CP PD days or 55% of days available to you	65% of students met composite performance proficiency or 3% more than the previous year	30 hours of direct parent contact (defined below in # 3). 25% of that contact may be superintendent designated community activity. *Must log.*	Below Standard performance does not merit financial reward
$0	If attended less than five CP PD days, not eligible for financial reward	If less than 65% of students met proficiency or less than 3% increase from previous year, not eligible for financial reward.	If less than 30 hours of parent contact (defined below in # 3), not eligible for financial reward. *Must log.*	Unsatisfactory performance does not merit financial reward * See note #2

Explanatory Notes: 1) Teachers whose students take ABC tests will be rated based on the performance outcomes of their students. Teachers who are in areas not tested for ABC accountability purposes will be rated based on the student performance outcomes of all of the children in their school; for instance, if a middle school meets its ABC growth target, all teachers in non-tested areas would be eligible for a $500 incentive. 2) Changes may be required due to a new teacher evaluation instrument. 3) Parent contact is defined as, but not limited to, face-to-face parent-teacher conferences, parent-teacher phone conferences offered as a face-to-face alternative, home visitations, PEP and IEP meetings or other activities to be determined by the principal.

Criteria to Use When Determining Superintendents' Eligibility for Deferred Compensation Rewards

Superintendents' eligibility for receiving a one-time deferred compensation reward at the end of the three-year Collaborative Project will depend upon meeting five criteria.

Point Value	Student Performance (20%)	Building a Learning Community (20%)	Leadership/Support of School Principals (20%)	Leadership in Collaborative Project (20%)	Teacher and Principal Retention (20%)
4	Majority of elementary and middle schools met ABC and AYP targets	90% of eligible teachers participated in 90% of available CP professional development; 10% increase in teachers working toward NBCT. 90% of principals attended 26 or more CLI days (out of 30).	360 evaluation rating by evaluators found superintendent "excellent"	Attended 26 or more CLI days (out of 30); responsive to info requests; personally encourages teacher/principal project support	Retention rate of teachers has improved 5% since baseline year (2006-07). 90% of principals remained in the system since baseline year. (Excluding terminated and retiring teachers and principals.)
3	Majority of elementary and middle schools met ABC targets Either ABC or AYP targets	85% of eligible teachers participated in 85% of available CP professional development. 8% increase in teachers working toward NBC. 85% of principals attended 25 or more CLI days (out of 30).	360 evaluation rating by evaluators found superintendent "above average"	Attended 25 or more CLI days (out of 30); responsive to info requests; personally encourages teacher/principal project support	Retention rate of teachers has improved 3% since base line year (2006-07). 85% of principals remained in the system since baseline Year (Excluding terminated and retiring teachers and principals.)
2	Majority of elementary and middle schools registered measurable growth gains from baseline year	75% of eligible teachers participated in 75% of available CP professional development. 5% increase in teachers working toward NBC. 75% of principals attended 24 or more CLI days (out of 30).	360 evaluation rating by evaluators found superintendent "average"	Attended 24 or more CLI days (out of 30); responsive to info requests; personally encourages teacher/principal project support	Retention rate of teachers has not decreased since baseline year (2006-07). 75% of principals remained in the system since baseline year (Excluding terminated and retiring teachers and principals.)
0	If majority of elementary and middle schools did not meet AYP or ABC targets or registered measurable growth from baseline year, no points are earned	Less than 75% of eligible teachers participated in less than 75% of available CP professional development. Less than 5% increase in teachers working toward NBC. Less than 75% of principals attended 24 or more CLI days (out of 30).	360 evaluation rating by evaluators found superintendent "below average" no points are earned	Attended less than 24 CLI days (out of 30)	Retention rate of teachers has decreased since baseline year. Less than 75% of principals remained in the system since baseline year (2006-07).

* Over the course of the three-year Project, $10,000 will be deposited annually for each superintendent. The amount rewarded at the end of the Project will be dependent upon the growth in the incentive criteria plus the interest accrued. This year (2007-08) will be the benchmark year.

Criteria for Principals' Performance Incentive Rewards

Principals' eligibility for receiving a one-time deferred compensation reward at the end of the three-year Collaborative Project will depend upon meeting four criteria.

Point Value	Student Performance (25%)	Building a Learning Community (25%)	Superintendent's Evaluation (25%)	Creating a Positive Workforce Environment (25%)
4	School met ABC and AYP targets	90% of eligible teachers participated in 90% of available CP-sponsored professional development; 10% increase in teachers working toward NBC. Principal attended 26 or more CLI days (out of 30).	Superintendent rates principal as well above-average performer	Teacher Working Conditions Survey results (average of 5 domains) improved 10% or maintained high level (above state 3.444 average) since baseline year (2007-08) *Must have 85% response.*
3	School met ABC or AYP targets	85% of eligible teachers participated in 85% of available CP-sponsored professional development; 8% increase in teachers working toward NBC. Principal attended 25 or more CLI days (out of 30).	Superintendent rates principal as above-average performer	Teacher Working Conditions Survey results (average of 5 domains) improved 5% since baseline year (2007-08) *Must have 80% response.*
2	School missed both ABC and AYP targets, but made measurable growth from baseline year	75% of eligible teachers participated in 75% of available CP-sponsored professional development; 5% increase in teachers working toward NBC. Principal attended 24 or More CLI days (out of 30).	Superintendent rates principal as average performer	Teacher Working Conditions Survey results (average of 5 domains) have not declined since baseline year (2007-08)
0	School did not reach ABC or AYP targets and did not register measurable growth from baseline year	Less than 75% of teachers Participated in less than 75% of available CP-sponsored professional development or less than 5% increase in teachers working toward NBC.	Superintendent rates principal as below-average performer	Teacher Working Conditions Survey results (average of 5 domains) declined since baseline year (2007-08)

*Over the course of the three-year project, $7,500 will be deposited annually for each principal. The amount rewarded at the end of the Project will be dependent upon the growth in the incentive criteria plus the interest accrued. This year (2007-08) will be the benchmark year.

Criteria for Assistant Principals' Performance Incentive Rewards

The Assistant Principal supports the Principal in Collaborative Project initiatives.

Value	Student Performance (25%)	Building a Learning Community (25%)	Value	Principals' Evaluation (50%)
$500	School met ABC and AYP targets	90% of teachers participated In 90% of available Project-sponsored professional development; 10% increase in teachers working toward NBC.	$1,000	Principal rates assistant principal as well above-average performer
$400	School met ABC or AYP targets	85% of teachers participated in 85% of available Project-sponsored professional development; 8% increase in teachers working toward NBC.	$800	Principal rates assistant principal as above-average performer; AP attended 5 CP teacher PD days (beginning 2009-10).
$300	School missed both ABC and AYP targets, but made measurable growth from baseline year	75% of teachers participated in 75% of available Project-sponsored professional development; 5% increase in teachers working toward NBC.	$600	Principal rates assistant principal as average performer; AP attended 4 CP teacher PD days (beginning 2009-10).
$0	School did not reach ABC or AYP targets and did not register measurable growth from baseline year	Teachers participated in less than 75% of available Project-sponsored professional development or less than 5% increase in teachers working toward NBC.	$0	Principal rates assistant principal as below-average performer; AP attended less than 3 CP teacher PD days (beginning 2009-10).

Criteria to Use when Determining Central Office Contact

The following performance incentive model establishes three criteria to use when determining eligibility for annual performance incentives of up to $2,000. Within each of the three criteria there are levels of attainment ranging from 50% or $1,000, to nothing, depending on performance.

Value	Building a Learning Community (25%)	Forum Staff's Evaluation (25%)	Value	Superintendent's Evaluation (50%)
$500	90% of eligible teachers participated in 90% of available CP professional development. 10% increase in teachers working toward NBCT. Central office contact attended 11 or more CLI days (out of 12).	Excellent support for CP including disseminating information regarding CP sponsored events; responding in a timely manner to all CP requests; providing accurate data; attending planning and ad hoc meetings related to CP; and providing logistical support for CP sponsored events held in the LEA	$1,000	Excellent communication, coordination and facilitation of all CP professional development for the LEA; Central office contact (or his/her designee) attends 100% day-long professional development held in LEA; Encourages teacher/principal support for CP initiatives.
$400	85% of eligible teachers participated in 85% of available CP professional development. 8% increase in teachers working toward NBC. Central office contact attended 10 or more CLI days (out of 12).	Effective support for CP including disseminating information regarding CP sponsored events; responding in a timely manner to all CP requests; providing accurate data; attending planning and ad hoc meetings related to CP; and providing logistical support for CP sponsored events held in the LEA	$800	Effective communication, coordination and facilitation of CP professional development for the LEA; Central office contact (or his/her designee) attends 90% day-long professional development held in LEA; Encourages teacher/principal support for CP initiatives.
$300	75% of eligible teachers participated in 75% of available CP professional development. 5% increase in teachers working toward NBC. Central office contact attended 9 or more CLI days (out of 12).	Average support for CP including disseminating information regarding CP sponsored events; responding in a timely manner to all CP requests; providing accurate data; attending planning and ad hoc meetings related to CP; and providing logistical support for CP sponsored events held in the LEA	$600	Average communication, coordination and facilitation of CP professional development for the LEA; Central office contact (or his/her designee) attends 80% day-long professional development held in LEA; Encourages teacher/principal support for CP initiatives.
$0	Less than 75% of eligible teachers participated in less than 75% of available CP professional development. Less than 5% increase in teachers working toward NBC. Central office contact attended less than 9 CLI days (out of 30).	Ineffective support for CP including disseminating information regarding CP sponsored events; responding in a timely manner to all CP requests; providing accurate data; attending planning and ad hoc meetings related to CP; and providing logistical support for CP sponsored events held in the LEA	$0	Ineffective communication, coordination and facilitation of CP professional development for the LEA; Central office contact (or his/her designee) attends less than 80% day-long professional development held in LEA; Does not encourage teacher/principal support for CP initiatives

Appendix F: Monetary Compensation by Collaborative Project

Table F.1: Amount of Monetary Compensation for Teachers for Nov. 2007-Sept. 2008

	Caswell	Greene	Mitchell	Warren	Washington
Total Amount Spent on Sign-On Bonuses	$15,000	$25,000	$5,000	$34,800	$0
Total Amount Spent on Annual Awards	$245,000	$249,400	$184,600	$139,800	$174,200

Data retrieved from The Public School Forum 2008

Table F.2: Number of Teachers Who Received Annual Awards for 2007-08

	Caswell	Greene	Mitchell	Warren	Washington
Percentage of Teachers Receiving an Annual Award	90 % (157/174)	90 % (169/188)	95 % (118/124)	91 % (119/131)	95 % (120/126)
Number of Teachers Receiving the Maximum Award Amount ($2000)	18	33	15	11	6

Data retrieved from The Public School Forum 2008

Table F.3: Average Annual Award for a Participating Teacher by Criteria for 2007-08

	Caswell	Greene	Mitchell	Warren	Washington
Average Annual Award for PD Participation	$374.84	$300.59	$415.83	$257.14	$278.33
Average Annual Award for Student Performance	$283.65	$346.75	$263.33	$191.60	$307.50
Average Annual Award for Principal Evaluation	$487.42	$437.28	$477.50	$445.38	$460.83
Average Annual Award for Parent Contact Log	$409.43	$414.79	$444.17	$280.67	$405.00

Data retrieved from The Public School Forum 2008

Table F.4: Average Annual Award for Central Office Contact Personnel and Assistant Principals for 2007-08

Note: Range indicated in parentheses

	Average Amount of All Participating Districts
Central Office Contact	$1,500 ($1,400 - $1,700)
Assistant Principal	$1,378 ($1,200 - $1,500)

Table F.5: Survey Respondents' Reactions to Incentive Payments by District

Note: Percentage indicates those who answered "strongly agree" or "somewhat agree" to statement

	Respondents Who Indicated They **Had** Received Incentive (n=549[1])						Respondents Who Indicated They Had **Not** Received Incentive (n=46[1])
District:	**Caswell (n=118)**	**Greene (n=157)**	**Mitchell (n=89)**	**Warren (n=92)**	**Washington (n=93)**	**Total (n=549[1])**	**Total (n=46[1])**
Earning an incentive payment made me/would make me feel better about teaching	75%	71%	67%	63%	71%	71%	61%
The Collaborative incentive payments helped boost school morale.	75%	77%	65%	61%	65%	70%	52%
I am making changes to ensure that I earn the full bonus for next year.	72%	73%	57%	60%	71%	68%	54%
I would like the incentive payments to continue in the future.	92%	94%	91%	85%	91%	91%	83%
The Collaborative incentive payment is key in my decision to return to teach in this district next year.	21%	23%	10%	21%	15%	19%	17%
The Collaborative incentive payments show that the program values my efforts as a teacher.	82%	80%	76%	72%	75%	78%	67%
The Collaborative incentive payments are a source of irritation for teachers at my school.	13%	8%	21%	15%	15%	13%	15%

[1]Actual number of respondents varies slightly by question due to missing data

Table F.6: Survey Respondents' Reactions to Incentive Payments by Years of Experience
Note: Percentage indicates those who answered "strongly agree" or "somewhat agree" to statement

	Respondents Who Indicated They **Had** Received Incentive (n=542[1])					Respondents Who Indicated They Had **Not** Received Incentive (n=46[1])
Teaching experience[2]:	**1-3 yrs (n=64)**	**4-8 yrs (n=109)**	**9-12 yrs (n=63)**	**13+ yrs (n= 306)**	**Total**	**Total**
Earning an incentive payment made me/would make me feel better about teaching	70%	72%	62%	71%	70%	61%
The Collaborative incentive payments helped boost school morale.	69%	72%	70%	69%	69%	52%
I am making changes to ensure that I earn the full bonus for next year.	72%	75%	63%	65%	68%	54%
I would like the incentive payments to continue in the future.	88%	95%	87%	91%	91%	83%
The Collaborative incentive payment is key in my decision to return to teach in this district next year.	23%	19%	13%	19%	19%	17%
The Collaborative incentive payments show that the program values my efforts as a teacher.	77%	79%	78%	78%	78%	67%
The Collaborative incentive payments are a source of irritation for teachers at my school.	6%	17%	16%	14%	13%	15%

[1]Actual number of respondents varies slightly by question due to missing data
[2]Results for first year teachers (n=27) are not reported

Table F.7: Survey Respondents' Reactions to Incentive Payments by Teaching Role

Note: Percentage indicates those who answered "strongly agree" or "somewhat agree" to statement

	Respondents Who Indicated They **Had** Received Incentive (n=544[1])				Respondents Who Indicated They Had **Not** Received Incentive (n=46[1])
Role:	**Elementary School Classroom Teacher (n=278)**	**Middle School Classroom Teacher (n=154)**	**Other (n=112)**	**Total**	**Total**
Earning an incentive payment made me/would make me feel better about teaching	71%	66%	71%	70%	61%
The Collaborative incentive payments helped boost school morale.	66%	71%	77%	69%	52%
I am making changes to ensure that I earn the full bonus for next year.	65%	68%	73%	68%	54%
I would like the incentive payments to continue in the future.	90%	89%	96%	91%	83%
The Collaborative incentive payment is key in my decision to return to teach in this district next year.	19%	16%	21%	19%	17%
The Collaborative incentive payments show that the program values my efforts as a teacher.	80%	71%	82%	78%	67%
The Collaborative incentive payments are a source of irritation for teachers at my school.	15%	13%	10%	13%	15%

[1]Actual number of respondents varies slightly by question due to missing data

Table F.8: Survey Respondents' Reactions to Incentive Payments by Amount of Incentive Payment Received

Note: Percentage indicates those who answered "strongly agree" or "somewhat agree" to statement

	Respondents Who Indicated They **Had** Received Incentive (n=547[1])			
Incentive Amount Received:	**Less Than $500 (n=45)**	**Between $500 and $999 (n=123)**	**Between $1,000 and $1,500 (n=214)**	**More Than $1,500 (n=165)**
Earning an incentive payment made me feel better about teaching	60%	65%	67%	80%
The Collaborative incentive payments helped boost school morale.	58%	69%	66%	78%
I am making changes to ensure that I earn the full bonus for next year.	49%	73%	64%	74%
I would like the incentive payments to continue in the future.	76%	90%	90%	98%
The Collaborative incentive payment is key in my decision to return to teach in this district next year.	16%	14%	19%	23%
The Collaborative incentive payments show that the program values my efforts as a teacher.	56%	77%	74%	89%
The Collaborative incentive payments are a source of irritation for teachers at my school.	16%	11%	16%	12%

[1]*Actual number of respondents varies slightly by question due to missing data*

Appendix G: After School Programs

Table G.1: Students Served in Young Scholars Program as a Percentage of all Students in Grades 3-8 from January 2008-August 2008

	Caswell	Greene	Mitchell	Warren	Washington
Students in Grades 3-5	8%	12%[1]	Unavailable[2]	7%	22%
Students in Grades 6-8	5%	0%	Unavailable[2]	6%	49%

Data retrieved from school reported Young Scholars questionnaire, End of Academic Year 2007-08 and Carolina Institute of Public Policy ADM database 2007-08
[1]Does not include the spring attendance for one school.
[2]Unable to discern grade level of participants at K-8 schools

Table G.2: Number of Collaborative Project Young Scholars Programs by District and School Grade Levels (January 2008-August 2008)

	Caswell	Greene	Mitchell	Warren	Washington
Elementary Schools	1	2	2	1	1
Middle Schools	1	0	0	1	1
Elementary/Middle Schools	NA	NA	2	NA	NA

Data retrieved from school-reported Collaborative Project questionnaire, End of Academic Year 2007-08

Table G.3: Number of Collaborative Project Young Scholars Programs by District and School Grade Levels in Fall 2008[1]

	Caswell	Greene	Mitchell	Warren	Washington
Elementary Schools	1	2	2	1	1
Middle Schools	1	0	0	1	1
Elementary/Middle Schools	NA	NA	2	NA	NA

Data retrieved from school-reported Collaborative Project questionnaire, Fall 2008
[1]These are Young Scholars funded by the Collaborative Project. Some other schools operate after school programs modeled after Young Scholars, but these programs are not funded through the Collaborative Project.

Table G.4: Number of Students Who Participated in Collaborative Project After School Programs by District and School Grade Levels (January 2008-August 2008)

	Caswell	Greene	Mitchell	Warren	Washington
Elementary	55	95[1]	145	40	95
Middle	38	0	0	36	234
Elementary/Middle	NA	NA	60	NA	NA
Total Students	**93**	**95[1]**	**205**	**76**	**329**

Data retrieved from school-reported Collaborative Project questionnaire, End of Academic Year 2007-08
[1]Does not include the spring attendance for one school.

Table G.5: Average Number of Program Hours Offered per Week and Average Total Number of Hours Each Student Participated (January 2008-August 2008)

	Caswell	Greene	Mitchell	Warren	Washington
Average number of program hours scheduled per week	6.5 hours	12 hours in spring/ 20 hours in summer	Unavailable[1]	18 hours	12 hours
Average total hours per student, January – August, 2008	67 hours	97 hours[2]	40 hours[3]	113 hours	42 hours

Data retrieved from school-reported Collaborative Project questionnaire, End of Academic Year 2007-08
[1]Data is unavailable for 3 schools
[2]Data unavailable for spring program at one school
[3]Data incomplete for one school

Table G.6: Average Number of Program Hours Offered per Week and Average Total Number of Hours Each Student Participated in Fall 2008[1]

	Caswell	Greene	Mitchell	Warren	Washington
Average number of program hours scheduled per week	7 hours	6 hours	8 hours	7 hours	8 hours
Average total hours per student, Fall 2008	31 hours	35 hours	40 hours	40 hours	17 hours

Data retrieved from school-reported Collaborative Project questionnaire, Fall 2008
[1]Programs varied in fall program start dates

Table G.7: Staff Participation and Staffing Ratios for After School Programs (January 2008-August 2008)

	Caswell	Greene	Mitchell	Warren	Washington
Number of certified staff who participated in After School Programs	45	18	16[1]	19	44
Staffing Ratios for each school	1:8, 1:8	1:10, 1:8	1:10[1]	1:7, 1:10	1:14, 2:10

Data retrieved from school reported Young Scholars questionnaire, End of Academic Year 2007-08
[1]Data is unavailable for 3 schools

Appendix H: Teacher Survey

Table H.1: Demographic Information for Survey Respondents

Survey Responses		**Number (Percent)**
Total number of survey respondents		617
District Employed	Caswell	128 (21%)
	Greene	178 (29%)
	Mitchell	97 (16%)
	Warren	113 (18%)
	Washington	101 (16%)
Years of Teaching Experience	First year	27 (4%)
	1 - 3 years	72 (12%)
	4 - 8 years	118 (19%)
	9 -12 years	72 (12%)
	More than 12 years	326 (53%)
Role	Elementary School Classroom Teacher	308 (50%)
	Middle School Classroom Teacher	176 (29%)
	Other	127 (21%)
Received Incentive	Yes	549 (89%)
	No	46 (7%)
	Not sure	22 (4%)
Participated in Collaborative Project sponsored Professional Development	Yes	494 (80%)
	No	123 (20%)