



**The Impact of the  
Standards-Aligned Classroom Initiative  
on the Implementation of the  
Illinois Learning Standards  
During 2005–2006**

**Revised Report**

**September 2006**

**Lizanne DeStefano  
Principal Investigator**

**Victoria Hammer  
Project Coordinator**

**Elisa Fiedler  
Data Analyst**

**Holly Downs  
Visiting Research Specialist**

**University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign  
College of Education**

**THE IMPACT OF THE  
STANDARDS-ALIGNED CLASSROOM INITIATIVE  
ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE  
ILLINOIS LEARNING STANDARDS  
DURING 2005–2006**

**REVISED REPORT**

**September 2006**

**Lizanne DeStefano  
Principal Investigator**

**Victoria Hammer  
Project Coordinator**

**Elisa Fiedler  
Data Analyst**

**Holly Downs  
Visiting Research Specialist**

**University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign  
College of Education**



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Executive Summary .....</b>	<b>i</b>
Findings.....	ii
Recommendations.....	iii
<b>Program Description .....</b>	<b>1</b>
Description of Program Activities .....	2
Learning Teams .....	2
SAC Coaches .....	4
<b>Overview of the Evaluation.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Evaluation Methods.....</b>	<b>6</b>
Evaluation Activities.....	6
Data Sources .....	7
Qualitative.....	7
Interviews.....	8
Observations of Initial SAC Training and Ongoing Local Learning Team Meetings.....	9
Classroom Observations and Walkthroughs.....	9
SAC Site Sample.....	9
Quantitative.....	10
ILS Teacher Survey. ....	10
ILS Teacher Survey Sample. ....	11
<b>Evaluation Findings .....</b>	<b>14</b>
Findings from the Interview and Observation Data.....	14
Key Implementation Factors.....	14
Administrative Support.....	14
Program Fidelity .....	15
Coach Quality .....	17
Positive Impacts of the SAC Initiative.....	18
Student Involvement in Goal Setting and Assessment Creation .....	18
Teacher Collaboration.....	19
Resource Use .....	19

Barriers to the SAC Initiative Impacting the ILS Implementation .....	20
Lack of Time.....	21
Uncertainty of Teachers Toward the Training.....	21
Summary of the Findings from the Interview and Observation Data.....	22
Findings from the Study of SAC Participation and ILS Implementation.....	23
Summary of Findings from the Study of SAC participation and ILS Implementation .....	29
<b>Overall Implications of the Findings .....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Recommendations .....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>References.....</b>	<b>33</b>

**Appendices**

**Appendix A: Unit Plan Organizer Example**

**Appendix B: SAC Contracts for Level I and Level II Learning Teams**

**Appendix C: Contracts for ROE/ISCs**

**Appendix D: Contracts for SAC Coaches**

**Appendix E: SAC Educator Interview Protocols for Fall 2005**

**Appendix F: SAC Educator Interview Protocols for Spring 2006**

**Appendix G: SAC Coach Interview Protocols for Spring 2006**

**Appendix H: Observation Guide for the Statewide SAC Training and Local Learning Team Meetings**

**Appendix I: Classroom Observation and Walkthrough Observation Guide**

**Appendix J: ILS Teacher Survey**

## **FIGURES AND TABLES**

Table 1. Descriptions of Level I and Level II Activities and Outcomes.....	3
Figure 1. Level I Statewide Training Agenda.....	4
Figure 2. Local Meeting Sample Agenda .....	4
Figure 3. Statewide SAC Coach Training Agenda .....	5
Table 2. Timeline of Data Collection.....	7
Figure 4. Typical Site Visit Agenda.....	8
Table 3. Number of Teachers, Administrators and Coaches Interviewed at Each Site .....	8
Table 4. Demographic Data of the Three SAC Schools in the Sample .....	10
Table 5: SAC Survey Questions Added to the ILS Teacher Survey (2006).....	11
Table 6. Demographic Characteristics of Sampled Schools, 2005 .....	13
Table 7. Characteristics of SAC and Non-SAC Schools, 2005 .....	13
Table 8. Correlations Among Overall ILS Implementation Dimensions and School and Teacher Differences with SAC .....	24
Table 9. Prediction of Overall ILS Implementation using School Level, School Size, SAC School, and Percentage of Teachers Receiving SAC Training, 2005 .....	26
Table 10. Regression on the Affective Response Dimension of ILS Implementation, 2005 .....	27
Table 11. Regression on the Community & Stakeholder Involvement Dimension of ILS Implementation, 2005 .....	27
Table 12. Regression on the Curriculum Dimension of ILS Implementation, 2005 .....	27
Table 13. Regression on the District/School Infrastructure Dimension of ILS Implementation, 2005 ...	28
Table 14. Regression on the Instruction Dimension of ILS Implementation, 2005 .....	28
Table 15. Regression on the Professional Development Dimension of ILS Implementation, 2005 ..	28
Table 16. Regression on the Student Learning & Assessment Dimension of ILS Implementation, 2005 .....	29



# THE IMPACT OF THE STANDARDS-ALIGNED CLASSROOM INITIATIVE ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ILLINOIS LEARNING STANDARDS

## Executive Summary

The Evaluation of the Implementation of the Illinois Learning Standards (ILS) is a four-year study funded by the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE). The study, which will run from February 2005 through June 2008, builds on the 1999–2002 ILS implementation study and serves the following purposes:

- To assess the extent to which local districts are implementing ILS,
- To identify factors which enhance or inhibit implementation, and
- To investigate the relationship between ILS implementation and student achievement.

To satisfy these purposes, the external evaluation team designed the evaluation to produce information about standards implementation and the impact at the state level, as well as provide insight into how the ILS have influenced classroom practice, professional development, and other dimensions of schooling. Both qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods were used: the qualitative portion, designed to provide insight into which implementation strategies are used, relied on intensive interviews and observations; the quantitative component, intended to determine the nature and extent of ILS implementation across the state, employed a statewide survey. Both components were guided by 1) the conceptual framework utilizing the ISBE-developed Rubrics for a Standards Implementation System (DeStefano & Prestine, 2002) and 2) the collaborative feedback from ISBE staff and the ILS Implementation Advisory Committee.

In July 2005, the external evaluation team presented several possible topics and sampling options for the focus of Year 1 to ISBE staff and the ILS Implementation Advisory Committee. The group decided that the Standards-Aligned Classroom (SAC) Initiative would be the focus during the 2005–2006 school year due to its publicized availability and wide use. Thus, the evaluation was designed to answer the question: *What is the impact of the Standards-Aligned Classroom (SAC) Initiative on implementation of the Illinois Learning Standards (ILS)?*

The SAC program coordinators purposively selected and recruited three schools to participate in this portion of the evaluation. These sites were selected based on the SAC program coordinators' assessment of the schools' high level of SAC adherence. Moreover, the coordinators selected schools which represented different SAC training levels, district types, and schools levels (i.e., elementary, middle, and high school).

## Findings

Using multiple methods and sources, the evaluation activities produced the following findings:

- **As a result of SAC training, teachers report a greater understanding of 1) how to involve students in their learning; 2) how to work collaboratively with peers; and 3) how to use resources related to standards implementation (i.e., performance descriptors).** Nearly 80% of teachers noted student involvement in goal setting and assessment creation as being the result of SAC. Increased teacher collaboration within the Learning Team was referenced by fourteen teachers (73% of those interviewed) at least once. Half of the teachers interviewed reported an increase in use of ISBE created resources on standards.
- **Teachers and SAC coaches reported that SAC participants increased their use of standards materials created by the Illinois State Board of Education.** Citations of increased use of standards materials from ISBE occurred when teachers were creating Unit Plan Organizers (UPOs), as standard identification is a required field on the form and emphasized by the SAC coaches.
- **The administration's involvement in the program was noted as a key implementation factor in both the interview and observation data.** Teachers (79%) and all of the SAC coaches most often attributed administrative support as a key factor. Observation data also suggested that teacher engagement in the program also seemed to be related to the involvement of an administrator.
- **Teachers and administrators noted the importance of a supportive and knowledgeable SAC coach.** About half of the teachers and administrators interviewed reported that one key implementation factor was a SAC coach who was reassuring and supportive of teachers' efforts and who was knowledgeable about the ILS and the standards resources (e.g., the coach could explain how that different standards resources, like performance descriptors, could be used with SAC).
- **The extent to which teachers were implementing the Standards-Aligned Classroom training and felt that SAC was worthwhile varied across the sites.** Evident from the interview and observation data, it seems that both adherence to the SAC training and opinions about the program were at the individual teacher level and not necessarily shared within the Learning Team or at the site as a whole.
- **Schools with a higher percentage of teachers who had received the SAC training had higher levels of overall ILS implementation.** The percentage of teachers who had received SAC training was always positively (and always significantly) correlated with ILS implementation, indicating that the greater the percentage, the better the implementation of every one of the seven ILS dimensions, including Affective Response, Community & Stakeholder Involvement, Curriculum, District/School Infrastructure, Instruction, Professional Development, and Student Learning and Assessment.

- **The best predictor of overall ILS implementation and the seven ILS dimensions was the percentage of teachers who had received SAC training.** Analysis done on the data collected from the ILS Teacher Survey (2006) items related to SAC revealed that the percentage of teachers in a school who had received SAC training was a significant predictor of overall ILS implementation and the seven ILS dimensions.
- **Being a teacher at a SAC school correlated with the overall ILS implementation and three of the dimensions but not with the percentage of a school's teaching population that participated in the SAC training.** This may indicate that non-SAC teachers may not acquire the same level of satisfaction with 1) the ILS (Affective Response), 2) the community involvement with ILS (Community & Stakeholder Involvement), 3) the effects of the ILS on district goals (District Infrastructure), and 4) the professional development alignment with ILS (Professional Development) than teachers who participate in the actual SAC training. The findings may suggest that the vicarious experience of the SAC program from the dissemination strategies of SAC Level II Learning Teams may not be able to adequately substitute for actual participation in SAC.

### **Recommendations**

Based on the site visits and ILS Teacher Survey (2006) findings summarized above, the evaluation team recommends the following:

- 1. Build on the strengths of the program.** The following strengths of the SAC program need to be maintained:
  - The SAC coach needs to continue to have a presence in the schools and at the Learning Team meetings.
  - The SAC program needs to continue to specifically incorporate the ISBE created resources.
- 2. SAC contracts and resources for administrators may be useful.** Due to the fact that teachers and SAC coaches emphasized the administrators, it may be appropriate to incorporate an administrator component into the SAC program.
- 3. More explanation and emphasis could be given to the spring SAC celebration (formerly the SAC fair).** Information about these fairs needs to be better distributed and shared among the SAC and non-SAC teachers and schools.
- 4. More onsite trainings of the SAC program.** Because teachers tended to collaborate primarily within their Learning Team and dissemination throughout the school did not appear to have as great an impact as intended, SAC program coordinators and SAC coaches may want to sponsor more onsite work with teachers and administrators.

The following report details the background of the program, evaluation overview, methods, sample, analysis, and findings.



# THE IMPACT OF THE STANDARDS-ALIGNED CLASSROOM INITIATIVE ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ILLINOIS LEARNING STANDARDS

## Program Description

The SAC Initiative<sup>1</sup> was developed by the Regional Offices of Education (ROEs) and Intermediate Service Centers (ISCs) in Illinois, in collaboration with and funded by the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE). The initiative was created as a vehicle to provide teachers with ongoing professional development with the goal of positively impacting the work of teachers on a daily basis through teaching them how to align lessons and assessments.

The SAC Initiative focuses on the following:

- **Utility for Teachers:** The training is “job-embedded,” meaning a participant studies, learns, and practices SAC concepts in the context of his or her real classroom setting.
- **Collaboration Among School Staff:** Participants work and study together in school-based “Learning Teams.”
- **Evidence-Based Models:** Participants study evidence-based curricular models, resources (such as texts and workbooks from Dr. Richard Stiggins and associates of the Assessment Training Institute), assessment, and instructional methods throughout the year.
- **Ongoing Professional Development and Support:** Teachers participating in the SAC initiative attend Alignment and Assessment Conferences held throughout the state, in addition to attending presentations in assessment and standards.
- **Tangible Products from Participants:** Participants are required to participate in a statewide SAC fair held in May and to display their work and to submit standards-aligned lesson plans (called Unit Plan Organizers or UPOs) and assessments to a review team. Approved lesson plans and assessments are posted on a searchable website linked from ISBE. Any teacher in the state can attend the SAC fair and then access and download the UPOs and assessments. Moreover, participants are encouraged to periodically share their work with other members of their teaching staff at round-table sharing sessions, poster sessions, and presentations.

The SAC Initiative development team reports that all 48 ROEs/ISCs in Illinois are actively involved in this initiative. ROEs/ISCs are responsible for selecting the schools to participate in SAC training, selecting SAC coaches, and housing support materials used in local meetings. Additionally, the SAC development team reports that over the past three years, more than 6,000 teachers and administrators from 22% of the school districts in the state have participated. More than 75 trained coaches from ROEs/ISCs currently support participating schools.

Providing opportunities to discuss and integrate the ILS explicitly into daily classroom instruction is part of the initiative. To assess the effectiveness of the SAC Initiative at meeting these objectives, Dr. Ed Wolfe of Michigan State University and MetriTech, Inc. conducted an

---

<sup>1</sup> All the SAC program information was current as of July 2006 per the SAC website at [www.sac-success.org](http://www.sac-success.org).

## 2 Evaluation of the Implementation of ILS

independent study beginning in 2001 through 2003. The findings, based on a survey designed to measure attitudes related to the implementation of standards-aligned instruction and assessment in classrooms, indicated that teachers who adopted the SAC Initiative principles felt more positive toward standards-aligned instruction and the ILS.<sup>2</sup>

### Description of Program Activities

There are two main components that comprised the SAC program activities for this study; these components include: 1) the Learning Teams and 2) the SAC coaches.

**Learning Teams.** There are two categories (Level I and Level II) of Learning Teams identified by the SAC initiative. Learning Teams are a group of four to six teachers who attend the initial training together and then agree to meet as a group with a SAC coach throughout the school year to study and discuss classroom implementation of SAC resources. The overall objective of team meetings is to use the SAC resources, including *Classroom Assessment for Student Learning* by Richard Stiggins and associates (2004) and lesson plan organization templates known as Unit Plan Organizers (UPOs), to deconstruct the Illinois Learning Standards (ILS) by breaking them down into four domains including: knowledge, reasoning, skills, and products (referred to as “KRSP” [pronounced “crisp”]). SAC training helps teachers to: 1) identify the four KRSP domains in a lesson addressing a particular ILS, 2) determine learning targets based upon the state educational standards using conversational language that students can understand (referred to as “I-Can” statements), 3) develop and use assessments to ascertain if students have met the learning target presented in the “I-Can” statement, and 4) organize all of these previously described components into a Unit Plan Organizer (see Appendix A for examples of UPOs for sixth grade and special education).

Teachers are expected to participate in Level I training before they proceed to Level II. Level I teachers participate in a statewide Level I SAC training and approximately sixteen local, ongoing support meetings with their Learning Team and a SAC coach over the school year. Level I training explores topics such as completing formal lesson plans with UPOs and setting learning targets with students by using the I-Can statements (Figures 1 and 2 below are sample agendas for a statewide SAC training and a local Learning Team meeting). Level II teachers also participate in a statewide Level II SAC training and then meet at least four times per year locally with their Learning Team and a SAC coach. Level II training also uses UPOs and I-Can statements, but it also explores topics like developing and using assessments and creating dissemination plans aimed at non-SAC teachers on the SAC teachers’ immediate staff.

At the conclusion of the school year, “SAC Celebrations” (formerly Spring SAC Fairs) are held as a reporting and promotional vehicle allowing Learning Teams to share their work with other teachers from throughout the state. The celebrations have been held in various locations in the past, including Springfield, Naperville, Pekin, Galesburg, and Loves Park. Teachers who participate in the Level I, Level II, or both programs are eligible to receive Continuing Professional Development Units (CPDUs) and may choose to earn graduate-level credits and Administrators’ Academy Credit. More detailed descriptions of the levels are described in Table 1, which follows (SAC contracts for Level I and Level II are in Appendix B).

---

<sup>2</sup> Information on this study can be found at <http://www.sac-success.org/program/1090.html>.

**Table 1. Descriptions of Level I and Level II Activities and Outcomes**

Level	Activities	Outcomes
Level I	<p>Level I Teams begin with a two-day training session. Following the initial two-day session, Level I Learning Teams continue to meet with a trained SAC coach for two hours every 2–3 weeks throughout the school year. The SAC coach guides each team through 1) the SAC resources (specifically <i>Classroom Assessment for Student Learning</i> by Richard Stiggins and associates) and 2) the process of deconstructing the Illinois Learning Standards into teachable targets by breaking them down into four domains: knowledge, reasoning, skills, and products (KRSP).</p> <p>Using the identified targets, the Learning Team selects one or more appropriate assessments and then develops a standards-aligned unit or lesson plan. The teachers practice the components of the Initiative through applied action research in the classroom.</p> <p>Following a three-step review process with the SAC coach, the Learning Teams submit their aligned UPOs to SAC program coordinators for possible posting on the SAC website. Finally, at the end of Level I, all Illinois Learning Teams are invited to share their experiences at the spring SAC Fair.</p>	<p>At the conclusion of the first year of SAC training and implementation, teachers from a school’s Level I Learning Team are expected to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Unpack Illinois Learning Standards into clear achievement targets that can be assessed.</li> <li>2. Select aligned assessments for their classrooms.</li> <li>3. Develop a standards aligned unit plan using the UPO.</li> <li>4. Involve and motivate students by setting student-friendly learning targets.</li> </ol>
Level II	<p>Level II Teams are given the freedom to choose from various areas related to standards alignment (for instance, teams may choose to focus on evaluating student work, developing rubrics, or constructing effective assessments) as they continue to implement the Standards-Aligned Classroom Project. As part of that focus, Level II participants are allowed to monitor their own progress throughout the year, but they are still required to meet with their Learning Team and coach at least four times a year.</p> <p>Additionally, Level II teams continue their study of <i>Classroom Assessment for Student Learning</i>. Each team member writes and submits a lesson plan aligned with the Illinois Learning Standards. The teams also focus on implementing student-involved assessment and learning in their standards-aligned classrooms.</p> <p>Finally, Level II teams they are encouraged to update their schools, school boards, and ISBE of their participation and progress in the SAC initiative through events like all school meetings and the spring SAC fair.</p>	<p>At the conclusion of the second year of SAC training and implementation, teachers from a school’s Level II Learning Team are expected to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Develop and implement an area of assessment (i.e., rubrics, teacher-made tests, standardized test review, etc.) linked with the ILS.</li> <li>2. Develop a standards-aligned lesson plan.</li> <li>3. Update their entire faculty at least once during the school year on their learning activities and update the Board of Education as appropriate.</li> <li>4. Maintain a Learning Team Log.</li> </ol>

**Figure 1. Level I Statewide Training Agenda**

<b>The Standards-Aligned Classroom                      Level I Training 2005–2006 (Day 1 of 2)                      8:30 a.m. – 3:30 p.m.</b>	
8:30 a.m. – 9:00 a.m.	Team Building Activity/Pre-assessment (prior knowledge of ILS, SAC)
9:00 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.	Differentiation using ILS, Training Agenda, SAC introduction video
10:05 a.m. – 10:10 a.m.	Break
10:10 a.m. – 10:40 a.m.	Standards Alignment, Keys to Quality Assessment, Assessment Analysis
11:00 p.m. – 11:45 p.m.	Types of Achievement Targets: Knowledge, Reasoning, Skills, Products
11:45 p.m. – 12:30 p.m.	Lunch break
12:30 p.m. – 1:00 p.m.	Identifying the KRSPs. Assessments “Of & For” Learning (video).
1:00 p.m. – 1:30 p.m.	Matching Assessments to Learning Targets (video). Assessment Matching.
1:30 p.m. – 1:40 p.m.	Break
1:40 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.	Aligning Unit/Lesson Plans. Unit Plan Organizer (modeling and application). Student-friendly Learning Targets: “I CAN” statements
3:00 p.m. – 3:15 p.m.	“Snacking Standards” (Review Activity)
3:15 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.	Evaluation of Day 1 Training:

**Figure 2. Local Meeting Sample Agenda**

<b>The Standards-Aligned Classroom                      Local Meeting (School A)</b>	
8:00 a.m. – 8:05 a.m.	Greetings; review agenda
8:10 a.m. – 8:30 a.m.	Review chapter four from <i>Classroom Assessment for Student Learning</i>
8:30 a.m. – 9:00 a.m.	Review and rate UPO example one provided by the SAC coach
9:00 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.	Review and rate UPO example two provided by the SAC coach
10:00 a.m. – 10:10 a.m.	Break; retrieve laptops for individual UPO work
10:10 a.m. – 11:25 a.m.	Use laptops for UPO; individual meetings with SAC coach
11:25 a.m. – 11:40 a.m.	Reflect by completing a journal entry. Complete an assessment of the SAC coach and return to her.

**SAC Coaches.** Another program component in the SAC initiative is the SAC coach. SAC coaches are educational consultants selected and contracted by local offices of education to meet with the Learning Teams on an ongoing basis to provide support and guidance at the local sites. After the ROE/ISCs agree to designate a contact person for the SAC program coordinators, select participant schools, and assign SAC coaches to participating schools within their particular region, the Illinois State Board of Education gives them funds to support the SAC coaches and program through their offices (see Appendix C for The ROE/ISC contract). There is no formal

**Figure 3. Statewide SAC Coach Training Agenda**

<b>Coaching for the Standards-Aligned Classroom 2005–2006 8:30 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.</b>	
8:30 a.m. – 8:45 a.m.	Introductions and “Human Graph” Icebreaker
8:45 a.m. – 9:00 a.m.	Review of SAC Coach Contract (Sign and Return); Discussion of Block funds and Responsibilities of ROE
9:00 a.m. – 9:30 a.m.	Level I and Level II Expectations
9:30 a.m. – 9:50 a.m.	Knowledge, Reasoning, Skills, and Products (KRSP) Example; Differentiation using the ILS Discussion
9:50 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.	Keys to Quality Assessments
10:00 a.m. – 10:10 a.m.	Break
10:10 a.m. – 10:50 a.m.	Group Activity: Seven Strategies of Assessment for Learning (from Stiggins text)
10:50 a.m. – 11:20 a.m.	Group Presentations
11:20 a.m. – 11:35 a.m.	SAC Video about Students Setting Goals (Visual Targets for I-Can statements)
11:35 a.m. – 11:55 a.m.	Group Work: Review Unit Plan Organizers and use Checklist to Evaluate
12:00 p.m. – 1:00 p.m.	Lunch Break
1:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.	Group Work: Learning Team Scenarios and How You Would Deal with Them as a SAC coach
2:00 p.m. – 2:25 p.m.	Self Assessment and Communication Techniques as a SAC Coach; Building Trust with Learning Teams
2:25 p.m. – 2:35 p.m.	Break
2:35 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.	Closing Remarks. How to Facilitate Reflection for Teachers. Individual SAC Coach Journal Reflections.

application process to become a SAC coach, and it is left up to the discretion of the ROE/ISCs to appoint and oversee the SAC coaches.

SAC program coordinators report that currently there are 100 SAC coaches dispersed throughout the state of Illinois housed within the ROE/ISCs in six different regions. We found that SAC coaches had varied backgrounds in education ranging from retired classroom teachers and principals to retired district office personnel. While the backgrounds of the SAC coach vary, all of the SAC coaches must participate in the statewide SAC coach training conducted by the SAC program coordinators (Figure 3, which follows, shows the agenda from the 2005 summer training) and they must sign a contract agreeing to the responsibilities outlined below (see Appendix D for a copy of the SAC coach contract). SAC coaches work with one to three schools during the school year depending on the ROE/ISCs. SAC coaches are expected to:

## 6 Evaluation of the Implementation of ILS

- Provide support, assignments, and resources (i.e., lesson plan examples, Illinois Performance Descriptors, UPO graphic organizers, etc.) at onsite, local meetings of Level I Learning Teams every 2–3 weeks (equaling roughly sixteen meetings per site) and help the team work toward independence and Level II;
- Supply support and resources to Level II Learning Teams and attend at least four local Level II meetings;
- Help Learning Teams to prepare for the Spring SAC fairs;
- Attend the one-day training of coaches, the two-day Level I training, the one-day Level II training, the Spring SAC fairs, and the area-wide SAC coaches network meetings and other professional development opportunities for SAC coaches;
- Evaluate how well teachers connected the standards, assessments, instructional activities, and I-Can statements in the Unit Plan Organizers for Level I teams; and
- Review and rate how well the Level II teachers link their assessments with the ILS.

Using the knowledge that we had of the SAC program and the activities that comprise the program at both the state and local school levels, we developed a study that employs both qualitative and quantitative methods in order to probe the relationship of the SAC initiative on ILS implementation.

### Overview of the Evaluation

We conducted a management-oriented, external evaluation designed to summatively evaluate ILS implementation and determine the degree to which supplemental resources, in this case SAC, have assisted school districts in increasing standards implementation. It is important to note that this was not meant to be a systematic evaluation of SAC itself, but of the degree to which SAC participation did or did not impact implementation of the overall ILS standards. The evaluation utilized multiple methods to assess the ways in which each SAC initiative contributed to the following overarching question:

*What is the impact of the Standards-Aligned Classroom (SAC) Initiative on implementation of the Illinois Learning Standards (ILS)?*

### Evaluation Methods

The evaluation made use of both qualitative and quantitative data sources collected via multiple methods. Data collected by external evaluators pertained to SAC and its impact on teachers' implementation of the ILS at the three purposively selected sites. Evaluation activities, data sources, and sampling procedures are outlined below.

### Evaluation Activities

The activities conducted during the 2005–2006 school year included generating qualitative data from 1) interviews conducted with school-level administrators, teachers, and SAC coaches from each of the three selected schools, 2) observations of initial statewide SAC training and ongoing

local Learning Team meetings, and 3) classroom observations and walkthroughs, as well as quantitative data from the ILS Teacher Survey (DeStefano, Hammer, Fiedler, & Downs, 2006). Table 2 below outlines the logistics of the data collection dates, locations, and data sources.

## Data Sources

### Qualitative

Instruments used to generate qualitative data included interviews, observations of initial statewide SAC training and ongoing local Learning Team meetings, and classroom observations and walkthroughs. Descriptions of each instrument are below, followed by a typical site visit agenda (see Figure 4). From August 2005 to May 2006, members of the external evaluation team conducted a total of seven visits at the three sites (see Table 2). Evaluators spent between five to seven hours on site for each visit.

Following each site visit, the evaluators produced site summaries of the interviews and observations. Site summaries, which contained logistical overviews of the school, interview summaries on questions related to SAC and ILS, observation summaries, and objectives for future visits, were then used to glean major themes and conclusions. From the site summaries, data were aggregated in several ways as a means of discerning trends and searching for commonalities and shared themes (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982; Miles & Huberman, 1994). The individual site summaries underwent cross-site analysis to 1) identify commonalities across sites, and 2) identify those instances in which differences in local context resulted in differential

**Table 2. Timeline of Data Collection**

Dates	Locations	Data Sources
August 8-9, 2005	Joliet, Illinois	Statewide SAC Level 1 Training
August 23, 2005	Springfield, Illinois	Statewide SAC Coaches Training for both Level I and Level II
September 13, 2005	School A	Interviews; School Walkthrough
October 2005 (collected through March 2006)	Throughout Illinois	ILS Teacher Implementation Survey
October 12, 2005	School B	Interviews; School Walkthrough
October 14, 2005	School C	Interviews; Classroom Observations; School Walkthrough
October 17, 2005	School A	Interviews; Classroom Observations
February 8, 2006	School B	Interviews; SAC Meeting Observation
February 9, 2006	School A	Interviews; SAC Meeting Observation
May 22, 2006	School C	Interviews; SAC Meeting Observation

**Figure 4. Typical Site Visit Agenda**

<b>The Evaluation of the Implementation of the Illinois Learning Standards Site Visit Agenda School C</b>	
7:20 a.m. – 7:50 a.m.	Evaluator interviews teachers from Level II
8:00 a.m. – 9:00 a.m.	Evaluator interviews Assistant Principal and Principal
9:10 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.	Evaluator interviews teachers from Level I during their prep times. Begin to walk through classrooms to observe setting/context.
12:30 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.	Continue to walk through classrooms to observe setting and context and interview teachers not available in the morning.

implementation and impact. A thematic approach was used in the cross-site analysis that emphasized the clustering and presentation of material by key themes found across the various cases. Data were analyzed in searching for regularities and patterns within each of the emergent major themes using grounded theory methodology for each site (Strauss & Corbin, 1994). Potential problems of construct validity were addressed through triangulation of data, as multiple sources of evidence essentially provide multiple measures of the same phenomenon (Rist, 1982).

**Interviews.** Evaluators conducted semi-structured interviews with teachers (including department and grade-level chairs and lead teachers), building administrators, and SAC coaches was conducted to document use of the SAC program and the Illinois Learning Standards and to assess the effects of the SAC training on implementation of state standards at the classroom level. Interview protocols for fall and spring (see Appendix E and F) were developed to prompt interviewees and ensure that the study questions were covered during the interviews. The number of interviews at each site varied from between five to eight people (depending on the size and availability of the Learning Team). Table 3 below reveals the number of teachers, in-school administrators, and SAC coaches interviewed at each school site. Fall interviews involved the initial reactions of the teachers and administrators toward the SAC training and their perceptions of how SAC was or perhaps would influence the ILS implementation. Spring interviews revisited the teachers and involved the SAC coach perceptions (SAC coach interview protocols are in Appendix G) of the implementation of SAC and the ILS at the site itself.

**Table 3. Number of Teachers, Administrators and Coaches Interviewed at Each Site**

<b>Site</b>	<b>Teachers</b>	<b>Administrators</b>	<b>SAC Coaches</b>
School A	8	1	1
School B	6	2	1
School C	5	1	1

**Observations of Initial Statewide SAC Training and Ongoing Local Learning Team meetings.** Another component of the site visits included observations of the Level I statewide SAC training and the ongoing local Learning Team meetings at the three school sites. The objectives of doing these observations were to 1) document the content and process at the Level I statewide initial training and 2) describe the content and process of the ongoing local Learning Team meetings.

For observations, evaluation team members followed an observation guide (see Appendix H) and were instructed to take notes on the following categories during these observations:

- **Physical setting**—a rich description of the time and place of the ongoing trainings and meetings, including where participants were situated.
- **Social or interpersonal setting**—who was sitting or clustered with whom and how groups and individuals were arrayed in this context.
- **Activities**—a systematic description of the activities with timeframes.
- **Content**—a description of the SAC resources and ILS used and discussed during the trainings and meetings.
- **Interactions**—a description of verbal and nonverbal interactions between the various stakeholders involved with the meetings (i.e., the SAC coach and teachers, the administrators and teachers, etc.).

**Classroom Observations and Walkthroughs.** The final piece of qualitative data gathered was the classroom observations. While the written or official SAC curriculum was of some importance, the specific use of the resources was of even greater importance on these walkthroughs (i.e., verbiage used, explicit posting of I-Can statements, etc.). These data were collected following the observation guide (see Appendix I) in order to generate field records of school-day observations; these records were recorded at least once at all three sites. Teachers and other sources were interviewed after each observation instance.

**SAC Site Sample.** The SAC program coordinators purposively selected and recruited three schools to participate in this portion of the evaluation. These sites were selected based on the SAC program coordinators' assessment of the schools' high level of SAC adherence. The three school sites purposively selected for this study represented various: 1) SAC participation levels and experience (Level I and Level II); 2) district types (two schools were in relatively small suburban settings; one school was in a larger urban setting); and 3) school levels (elementary, middle, and high schools). Additionally, three different ROE/ISCs and SAC coaches served the three sites. Table 4 which follows represents demographic data of the three sites.

**Table 4. Demographic Data of the Three SAC Schools<sup>3</sup> in the Sample<sup>4</sup>**

Site	School Level	SAC Levels	District Type	Enrollment	Percentage				
					White	Black	Hispanic	LEP <sup>5</sup>	Low Income <sup>6</sup>
School A	Elementary (K–5)	I; II	Suburban	803	80.0	4.6	13.2	0.6	6.1
School B	Middle (6–8)	I; II	Suburban	647	75.7	14.7	4.3	0.0	43.1
School C	High School (9–12)	I; II	Urban	996	28.0	68.7	1.8	0.7	52.7

### Quantitative

**ILS Teacher Survey.** The *ILS Teacher Survey* (2006) was used to generate the quantitative data to explore participation in and knowledge about SAC training. The 763 schools within the stratified random sample drawn for the ILS implementation study (see the next section on the ILS Teacher Survey sample for a complete description) started receiving the mailed surveys during the first week of October 2005. Each mailing contained ILS Teacher Surveys for all teaching staff in the school, a ILS Principal Survey for the principal, and a self-addressed stamped envelope for each respondent. We followed up once via mail and once via phone to increase our teacher return rate and additionally via mail once to increase our principal return rate. Data collection continued through March 2006.

The ILS Teacher Survey contains forced-choice and open-ended items developed, piloted, and field-tested during the previous evaluation of ILS implementation (DeStefano & Prestine, 2002). The forced-choice items are designed on a five-point Likert scale, with each point corresponding to one of the response possibilities listed below in Table 5. The open-ended items allow respondents to elaborate on issues related to ILS implementation. For example, one item asks about barriers to ILS implementation, and another asks about supports for ILS implementation.

In July 2005, an advisory panel of both ISBE staff and practitioners from around the state validated the survey for use in the current study. Although core items which are used to determine levels of ILS implementation remained the same to allow for longitudinal comparisons, several items were added to gauge the effectiveness of resources developed as a result of the findings from the previous evaluation. The current survey first collects information

<sup>3</sup> A school was considered a SAC school if it had at least one team of teachers participate in the SAC training any time between 2001 and 2005. It does not indicate that at the present time, all or even any teachers in a SAC school have been trained in SAC.

<sup>4</sup> Demographic information and categories were drawn from the 2005 School Report cards at [webprod1.isbe.net/ereportcard/publicsite/getSearchCriteria.aspx](http://webprod1.isbe.net/ereportcard/publicsite/getSearchCriteria.aspx).

<sup>5</sup> Limited English Proficient students are defined as those students eligible for transitional bilingual programs.

<sup>6</sup> Low-income students are defined as students who come from families receiving public aid, live in institutions for neglected or delinquent children, are supported in foster homes with public funds, or are eligible to receive free or reduced-price lunches.

on teacher/administrator demographics and then is divided into the following four sections (see Appendix J for a complete copy of the survey):

- 1) Teaching Method, Curriculum, Assessment, and Teacher Response to ILS;
- 2) School Environment;
- 3) School/District Environment and Community Awareness; and
- 4) Professional Development and Support Resources.

During the advisory meeting, the group also approved and made suggestions on specific SAC-related items. The forced-choice items that focus on SAC are listed in Table 5 below.

**ILS Teacher Survey Sample.** A stratified random sample of 763 schools was drawn from the 3884 eligible schools in Illinois in spring/fall 2005. Had a simple random sample been drawn (i.e., without stratification), although all schools would have had an equal probability of selection, the sample might, by chance, not have been representative in terms of three variables we deemed very important, namely, the distribution of schools across geographic location, enrollment size, and level (elementary, middle/junior high, and high school). To guard against this, the sample drawn was stratified by the three school levels, by six broad geographic regions, and by three enrollment categories (small, medium, and large). The six regions are: 1) Northeast; 2) Northwest; 3) West Central; 4) East Central; 5) Southwest; and 6) Southeast. These categories are the same as those used in ISBE's annual teacher salary study. We also used ISBE's categories of school enrollment (small, medium, and large schools) to define those whose enrollment, respectively, was in the bottom, middle, and top third of the state at the time the sample was drawn.

**Table 5: SAC Survey Questions Added to the ILS Teacher Survey (2006)**

Closed Ended SAC-related Survey Questions	Response Possibilities
TD5. Have you participated in the Standards-Aligned Classroom Training?	Yes; No
If yes, when did you attend the training (mo. & yr.)?	Month; Year
90. ILS in-services/professional development activities are available in my area through: o. Standards-Aligned Classroom (SAC) training	Yes; No; Do not know
91. I have participated in ILS in-services/professional development activities through: o. Standards-Aligned Classroom (SAC) training	Yes; No; Do not know
97. To what extent have you used the following resources: h. Standards-Aligned Classroom Training	1–5 Scale: Not at all; To some extent; A great deal; Do not know

## 12 Evaluation of the Implementation of ILS

The sampling process entailed drawing a random sample of schools from each stratum (e.g., small elementary schools in northeastern Illinois). Thus, all schools within a stratum had an equal chance of being selected. We over-sampled schools in particularly small strata from which we might have more difficulty retaining schools over time. For example, not only does the state have far fewer middle and high schools (particularly in certain regions) relative to elementary schools, past experience suggests that we are likely to encounter higher dropout rates over time for middle and high schools. Consequently, we over-sampled them, thus decreasing the number of school substitutions that will need to be made over time and saving future recruitment costs.

Data for schools were weighted to adjust for certain strata being over- or under-represented due to our deliberate over-sampling or to different rates of return. Post stratification weighting by the six regions and three school levels (for a total of  $6 \times 3 = 18$  strata) statistically adjusted the sample so that the proportion of schools within each stratum in the sample matched the proportion of schools in that stratum in the state. For example, if the percentage of high schools in the southwest were twice as high in the sample as in the state, each of those high schools would be given a case weight of  $\frac{1}{2}$ . That would make the percentage representation of those high schools the same in both the sample and the state, while retaining the benefits of having all of them participate in the study. The weighting procedure does not change the total sample size, but it does make our sample a better reflection of the state population of schools, enabling us to describe the state population more accurately.

The number of Illinois schools eligible to participate in this study (i.e., the population) was 3884. The mean school enrollment across all 3884 schools is 531.08 (SD = 473.12; range = 29 – 4589). The mean school enrollment in our weighted sample (N = 177) is almost identical, though the standard deviation and range are smaller: the sample mean is 539.62 (SD = 355.716; range = 54 – 3016). In both the weighted sample and in the state, the percentage of schools in each of the geographic regions is: 1) 54% in the Northeast; 2) 11% in the Northwest; 3) 10% in the West Central; 4) 9% in the East Central; 5) 9% in the Southwest; and 6) 7% in the Southeast. In both the weighted sample and the state, 67% of schools are elementary schools; 16% are middle or junior high schools; and 17% are high schools.

Table 6, which follows, describes the schools in our sample in terms of characteristics of their students, teachers, and principals. Table 7 explores the characteristics of the two categories of 1) Non-SAC Schools and the 2) SAC Schools. A school was considered a SAC school if it had one team of teachers participate in the SAC training any time between 2001 and 2005, according to information provided to us by Dr. Jay Linksman, the Design Team Chair for SAC. Moreover, Table 7 reveals that the profiles of the SAC and non-SAC schools in our study were very similar. T- tests revealed only two significant differences. The percentage of low income students was, on average, 12.4% lower in SAC schools (sig = .011), and teachers in SAC schools tended to be slightly less educated (sig = .002). In both groups of schools, teachers' mean level of education fell between a "Bachelor's degree, plus" and a Master's degree, but the mean in non-SAC schools was closer to a Master's degree.

**Table 6. Demographic Characteristics of Sampled Schools, 2005 (N = 177)**

Demographics	Mean	SD
Percentage of Low Income Students	47.1%	32.02
Mobility Rate (percentage)	19.3%	20.44
Teachers' Years of Experience	13.2%	04.13
Teachers' Level of Education*	2.7	.54
Percentage of Teachers Certified in Primary Teaching Area	97.1%	06.99
Percentage of Teachers Who Received SAC Training	33.0%	26.56
Principals' Years of Experience	11.0%	07.84
Principals' Level of Education*	3.9	.51
Percentage of Principals Who Received SAC Training	41.8%	49.53

\* Levels of Education: 1 = Bachelor's degree; 2 = Bachelor's degree, plus; 3 = Master's degree; 4 = Master's degree, plus; 5 = Ed.D. or Ph.D.

**Table 7. Characteristics of SAC and Non-SAC Schools<sup>7</sup>, 2005 (N = 177)**

Characteristic	Non-SAC Schools (n = 145)		SAC Schools (n = 32)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
School Size Category*	2.2	.715	2.0%	.763
Enrollment	541.0	355.153	533.1	364.042
Percentage of Low Income Students	49.3	33.493	36.9%	21.716
Mobility Rate (percentage)	19.4	22.069	18.7	10.145
Teachers' Years of Experience	13.2	3.869	13.3%	5.260
Teachers' Level of Education**	2.8	.522	2.5	.570
Percentage of Teachers Certified in Primary Teaching Area	96.9%	7.38%	97.6%	4.89%
Percentage of Teachers Who Rec'd SAC Training	31.9%	26.38%	37.8%	27.30%
Principals' Years of Experience	11.5	8.049	8.8%	6.692
Principals' Level of Education**	3.9	.522	3.9	.510
Percentage of Principals Who Rec'd SAC Training	38.5%	48.91%	55.0%	50.81%

\*1 = Small; 2 = Medium; 3 = Large

\*\* Levels of Education: 1 = Bachelor's degree; 2 = Bachelor's degree, plus; 3 = Master's degree; 4 = Master's degree, plus; 5 = Ed.D. or Ph.D.

<sup>7</sup> A school was considered a SAC school if it had at least one team of teachers participate in the SAC training any time between 2001 and 2005. It does not indicate that at the present time, all or even any teachers in a SAC school have been trained in SAC.

### Evaluation Findings

This section presents the findings on the impact of the SAC initiative on ILS implementation based on interview, observation, and survey data.

#### Findings from the Interview and Observation Data

This section looked across the sites involved in this study to determine the key factors which may have facilitated or hindered the impact of SAC training on the ILS implementation at these particular schools. Across the data sources from the schools, three major themes emerged through the content analysis of the case study: 1) key implementation factors, 2) positive impacts of the SAC Initiative on curriculum and student awareness of the ILS, and 3) barriers to the SAC initiative impacting ILS implementation. Issues within each theme emerged as well. This section of the report includes a description of these issues, as well as examples and quotes gleaned from the interview and observation data that illustrate these findings. While most issues transcended the individual nuances of each school level and site, some were more prevalent in certain contexts (e.g., an issue only relevant in the upper grades). In these cases, they are noted in a way to inform the client while maintaining the anonymity of the site.

#### Key Implementation Factors

First and foremost, key implementation factors emerged which were deemed important by nearly all of the interview participants (including teachers, administrators, and SAC coaches). These were seen as both facilitators and barriers to the overall SAC implementation and impact. Respondents cited three major issues: administrative support, program fidelity, and coach quality.

**Administrative Support.** Administrative support was most often cited by interviewees as vital to the effect SAC had on implementation at these schools. Of the nineteen teachers interviewed, twelve individuals from the three sites mentioned the administrator as the reason for participating in the SAC initiative. Similarly, all three SAC coaches noted this at least once in their interviews. Coaches emphasized administrators being involved in the initial training as well as the ongoing local Learning Team meetings. Not only was the physical presence of the administrator noted, but the support of the ongoing Learning Team work (through supplying funds for substitutes and time for team meetings) were mentioned in the teacher and SAC coach interviews. Teacher and SAC coach interview comments which referenced the importance of the supportive administration included:

- “[My principal] invited me to do SAC. It’s just part of the culture at our school.”
- “The best SAC schools are those who have a strong leader; [the principal and assistant principal] come to the meetings and make the teachers feel like they have an equal voice.”
- “[My principal] is so enthusiastic about SAC that I want to do well for him.”
- “People want to do well for [our administrator].”

- “[Our principal] has tried to get everyone involved so we can see how we can all implement it in our classrooms.”
- “The key is when the administrator is there; that person is able to link the whole school picture.”

Moreover, the evaluators observed meetings with and without administrators in attendance. Some teachers tended to be more attentive in the meetings when the administrator was in attendance and then shift their focus when the administrator left the meeting. One observation illustrates this shifting dynamic:

The coach distributed the UPO examples. Space was becoming tight at the table with the shuffling of books, papers, binders, and laptops. Few side conversations were occurring and the participants were focused on the task at hand. A secretary interrupted the meeting to inform the principal of a call. He left the room.

“I think this is ideal and not very realistic,” one teacher whispered to another teacher. Two teachers affirmatively nodded at her.

“Well, look at the assessment piece,” the coach said quickly, “it doesn’t have to be very long but it uses different things to help to see if the student is getting it.”

The principal came back into the room.

“Look back at the knowledge part, what do they already come with, and how similar are they when they come in? So we need to know where they’re at to determine if this is appropriate or not. It makes sense,” one teacher concluded.

“I’m getting goose bumps!” the coach exclaimed. “That is exactly what we’re talking about.”

Everyone at the table nodded in agreement. The principal grimaced as his cell phone ringer blared a rock song from the 1980’s. He apologized and left the room again.

“Do we have to do all this writing for ours?” one teacher asked.

“Do what you need to for you,” the coach answered.

In conclusion, administration support emerged as a key implementation factor in the interviews and observations done across the sites. It was not only seen as important by the majority of teachers and coaches involved with SAC, but the evaluators noted the shifts in engagement by the teachers with and without the administrator in attendance.

**Program Fidelity.** Varying degrees of program fidelity were noted across sites. According to our interview data, the SAC initiative was implemented differently in the three sites we visited and was at times meshed with other initiatives like Professional Learning Communities (PLC) and Essential Skills. In addition to interview data, evaluators observed varying implementation levels of SAC at the three sites, which ranged from high (i.e., the Learning Team met regularly; the teacher was preparing a UPO to submit to the SAC Coach; the teacher used and displayed the

## 16 Evaluation of the Implementation of ILS

I-Can statements in his or her classroom) to low (i.e., the Learning Team did not meet regularly during the school year; the teacher was not preparing a UPO to submit to the SAC Coach; the teacher did not use or display the I-Can statements in his or her classroom). References to program fidelity were made by eight teachers and two administrators and included the following quotes:

- “SAC implementation is maturing at different levels, but the English department has really taken the ball and run with it.”
- “The district has been moving away from SAC; they fund an initiative for so long then they move away from it and fund something new. So they have moved on to PLC.”
- “My concern is that every year a team was trained, but they never did anything. No meetings or anything.”
- “What happened to other SAC teams? They just fell apart and never have any meetings.”
- “[Our administrator] said that SAC teams could determine what their practice was going to be for the next year, so at that point we were the only team that moved on.”
- “It’s so hard with our students [from diverse backgrounds and socioeconomic situations] to even get them to ‘meet’ the standard, let alone exceed them, so I just use the stuff (from SAC) that fits what I’m already doing.”
- “I do not use the I-Can statements [or] UPOs, or KRSP out my lesson. I just took a different direction with SAC and just pick and choose what elements suit my style.”

Additionally, it may be that implementation of the SAC program is dependent on the teacher himself or herself and not the school. Observation notes at one school revealed a high degree of SAC program implementation by one teacher and lower adherence by another. The former observation (referenced in the excerpt below) was of a teacher who had been singled out as “one of the best teachers who was implementing the training and standards” by her superiors and by the SAC Project Manager.

The teacher handed me an eight page UPO for the nonfiction unit. It was textbook perfect in structure according to the SAC training and extremely thorough and beautifully organized. It included all four sections of knowledge, reasoning, skills, and products (KRSP); I-Can statements from her students; references to all covered Illinois Learning Standards; and assessment rubrics. She said, “As you can see, I spent a lot of time with this. There is no way that I could do this for every lesson, but I wanted to show you an example of one that I did.” Targets and I-Can statements were prominently displayed in her room and referenced throughout her lesson.

The teacher who had a lower level of implementation of the SAC program (meaning that his Learning Team did not meet regularly during the school year, and the teacher was not preparing a UPO to submit to the SAC Coach) reported that he had “rarely” written lesson plans in his teaching career and said that he would “never” use the UPO touted by the SAC program. However, he did report that he had posted a target and used an I-Can statement for his class (although the evaluator did not see targets or I-Can statements posted in his room, and the teacher reported that he “could not really remember” what the I-Can statement was that he created with his students in class). Further, he stated that he had rewritten a test because of the

initial training. His Learning Team had not met (with or without a SAC coach) at the time of the interview in late fall. At a follow-up site visit, this teacher revealed that he had, in fact, started a UPO to fulfill the requirements for college credit, and reported that he was “still occasionally posting targets.” He expressed doubt of ever doing the UPO again, but said he was, “glad that I did it.”

Interview and observation data revealed varying implementation of the SAC initiative among and within the sites that we visited. Fellow staff members, administrators, SAC coaches, and program coordinators recognized and praised the efforts of high implementing Learning Teams and teachers at the various sites. However, it seemed that even the teachers who were implementing the SAC program at a lower level reported finding value in some activities that were associated with the program, as some of the teachers who were reticent about the program complied with the SAC program requirements for tangible incentives like college credit. The SAC Fair was not mentioned as a focus or program activity by any of the teachers, administrators, or SAC coaches interviewed or during the local Learning Team observations at the sites.

**Coach Quality.** Personal characteristics of a coach (i.e., organization, personality, etc.) varied across the sites and were deemed important by participants. It was noted by five teachers and three administrators that a key implementation factor was a coach who was reassuring and supportive of teachers’ efforts and who was knowledgeable about the SAC program and the ILS resources (e.g., the coach could explain how different standards resources, like performance descriptors, could be used with SAC). Interview statements included:

- “An energetic and dynamic coach is important.”
- “[Our coach] has been helpful...they keep me looking at the standards and performance descriptors that I find the most handy so I don’t have to hunt for materials.”
- “The administration and [our coach] have been really supportive.”
- “Some of the other teams didn’t even have meetings after the first training, but we are going to because we have a coach who is going to come in September for our first meeting.”
- “Our coach shows us UPO examples and where to find the standards I need. It has been very helpful.”

All of the personnel interviewed at the sites were positive about their current coach. However, one SAC team had had two coaches over a two year period. The variability of the coach quality over the two years was especially noted at this site as an important factor in improving implementation and feelings about the SAC initiative. The following is a quote from a teacher from this site:

“We had a negative coach before. Our current coach is great and tells you what to do. She is a knowledge giver. [The former coach] was feeding us a lot of ISAT knowledge. She was more negative and not too positive. [The former coach] was deflating. When [the former coach] would leave, she’d just tell me all that I was doing wrong.”

## 18 Evaluation of the Implementation of ILS

Evident from the interview data, sites valued a coach who was reassuring and supportive of teachers' efforts. Moreover, teachers appreciated a coach who was knowledgeable about the SAC program requirements and how to use the ILS resources to fulfill these requirements.

### Positive Impacts of the SAC Initiative

In the various sites, it was reported that the SAC initiative had positive impacts on the students, on teacher collaboration, and on resource use.

**Student Involvement in Goal Setting and Assessment Creation.** Fifteen of the nineteen teachers interviewed noted at least once during the interviews that increases in student involvement in the goal setting (i.e., when formulating I-Can statements) and assessment creation (i.e., students forming their own quiz and test questions) as a positive impact of the SAC initiative. Teachers reported that by using I-Can statements, students may have a better understanding of the skills that they will learn and which will be assessed from the beginning of the unit. Furthermore, some teachers surmised that having students more involved in the creation of their assessments may help them feel more accountable for their learning (i.e., student-centered classrooms). Comments gleaned from the interviews include:

- “The biggest impact [of SAC] has been helping me in implementing student portfolios and student-led conferences in my classroom. It shifted a lot of the accountability onto the students rather than just coming straight from me.”
- “I have more awareness of the student-centered approach to teaching.
- “Students are making their quizzes on materials.”
- “Students have picked problems to put on tests.”
- “Students need more self reflection, and the teacher wants a way to make [instruction] meaningful to all. This helps across the board.”
- “This will have a lasting impact on my teaching because it has helped students become involved and interested in learning.”
- “It has helped me to understand the importance of student involvement.”
- “At the beginning, it was a lot of work and hard to focus that way, but I found that it was easier for the kids when they knew ahead of time in kid friendly terms (I-Can statements) what was expected of them.”

In addition to interview data on the involvement of students, observation data was also collected which noted student involvement. One specific instance of this is illustrated from the quote generated from a site summary:

During the observation, the teacher and her students discussed the objectives (with I-Can statements) for the lesson and group work. Before the end of the hour, one student recorded the discussed objectives for the current lesson on a clipboard at the back of the room. “The students track their own as well as the rest of the group’s learning...we monitor each other,” the teacher stated in the debriefing interview.

In sum, most teachers reported that the process of increased student involvement prompted by the SAC program helped them in shifting to a student-centered classroom and was one of the most positive aspects of the initiative. Increased student involvement in goal setting (through student generation of I-Can statements) and assessment creation (through student design of quizzes and tests) were the two activities teachers most often referenced.

**Teacher Collaboration.** Interviewees also cited the increased meetings and discussions among teachers on a staff which were fostered by Learning Team meetings as a positive effect SAC had on their school. Twenty of the twenty-six teachers, administrators, and SAC coaches interviewed from the three sites mentioned the increased collaboration among staff as a positive outcome of participating in the SAC initiative. While a few administrators referenced sharing information about SAC outside of the Learning Team, SAC coaches and teachers mainly talked about sharing ideas within their immediate Learning Team. This may indicate that the shared experience of the training among the teachers with the coach may contribute to the positive attitudes regarding teacher collaboration. Statements gleaned from various interviews related to this theme include:

- “It is expected of the teachers to share ideas—things they found when they [went] to the SAC training—and to involve the entire grade level. Collaboration is very important.”
- “I’ve used the ideas from my group and the other SAC groups and have applied [them] to my own classroom.”
- “We now sit down and brainstorm about what to do as a SAC team. We go to conferences, and everyone will share their ideas and portfolios. We come up with ways to make it better for the kids. It’s really nice, and it starts working very well once everyone is on the same boat.”
- “It’s a nice structured vision for everyone to work together. We do it by SAC team, and then it just trickles down.”
- “These teachers are the best that I have ever coached, because they are really embracing the training and trusting each other more as a team.”
- “The teachers have to self-discover and work with the team. They come up with their goals and their targets. It gives them authority.”

Teacher collaboration was most often referenced by all of the interviewees from the teacher, administrator, and SAC coach categories. While administrators made references regarding dissemination of SAC information to other teachers, teachers and SAC coaches noted the requirement of ongoing Learning Team meetings as helping to generate ongoing discussions among members of the immediate group. In other words, the core of the teacher collaboration emphasis for teachers and coaches seems to be within the actual Learning Team more so than the entire school.

**Resource Use.** After attending the SAC training, half of the teachers we interviewed reported an increased use of standards materials from ISBE (like performance descriptors and frameworks) because of SAC. Specifically, teachers cited an increased use of standards materials from ISBE when creating UPOs, as this was a requirement of the form (see the UPO example in Appendix A) and emphasized by the SAC coaches.

## 20 Evaluation of the Implementation of ILS

Interview and observation data supported this. For instance, in an observation of Level I Learning Team training, conversations regarding performance descriptors and standards from ISBE took place as the team critiqued UPO examples and then began to create their own UPOs. In this observation, the teachers cited the actual standards outlined by ISBE and not the “District Curriculum Binder” shown to the evaluator by an administrator. In fact, in the two districts that had similar binders, which housed the district’s written curriculum aligned with the Illinois Learning Standards, the binders were shown to the evaluators by the administration, but rarely mentioned in the other interviews with the teachers. However, the other interviewees, teachers and SAC coaches at these sites, noted specific resources (i.e., Illinois Assessment Frameworks and Performance Descriptors) available from ISBE that they used in conjunction with SAC. Thus, teachers and SAC coaches that we interviewed and observed used the actual statewide standards and related resources more than the “in-house” created resources like district binders. Remarks related to the positive increase in the use of these resources use included:

- “The performance descriptors that we used with SAC have helped me to know how to go down the steps and to make sure that I am covering what I need to for assessments.”
- “SAC ties it all together for me; it makes sense because SAC connects with the ILS, which in turn creates a better environment for your students and makes it easier for the teacher to become a better teacher. It helps me use the standards and the resources for them.”
- “You can’t just open your manual and teach from it, because now you think in a whole different format. It takes a lot of time, but I match my instruction with assessments and Illinois’ standards now.”
- “We go over math frameworks with our SAC meetings.”
- “I didn’t use the numbers before, but [now] I actually put the standard numbers right on my UPO.”
- “We used the Illinois Assessment Frameworks, and I think that SAC has perhaps taken teaching back to more depth.”

Teachers participating in the SAC initiative at the sites we interviewed and observed indicated that they had increased their use of ISBE resources related to standards implementation (i.e., performance descriptors). Most often this increased use was attributed to the fact that the resources were necessary in helping the teacher complete the UPO. While these districts did have binders available, which contained documents created by local committees and teachers that aligned the district’s curriculum with the standards, teachers and SAC coaches most often reported using specific materials provided by ISBE rather than the locally created resources.

### Barriers to the SAC Initiative Impacting ILS Implementation

In addition to the positive impacts, there were barriers related to the SAC initiative as well. Most educational initiatives face the daunting challenges of the lack of time and funding, and SAC faces these as well. However, looking beyond these generalized categories, we found that two key issues emerged as obstacles to SAC impact on ILS implementation related to these general categories: 1) the lack of time for teachers to balance the demands of SAC and/or the ILS and 2) the uncertainty of teachers toward the training and the impact that it could make.

**Lack of Time.** While most teams were meeting on a regular basis, one site did not have coordinated meetings with a coach in the fall semester because of scheduling conflicts. Further strains had prevented them from establishing a planning time for curricular meetings. Of the barriers discussed by interviewees, time emerged as the one referenced the most often, as all but one of the teachers and administrators referred to it. Statements like the following were made that illustrated this challenge:

- “Lack of common planning time can be an added challenge when trying to do SAC.”
- “[Our Learning Team] didn’t meet at all the first semester because of board conflicts and scheduling challenges. We are going to have to cram it all in to get credit for it.”
- “[The SAC requirements] just seem like a lot at first by yourself; we need time together.”
- “Well, SAC takes a lot of time. Like it takes more time to think it through and actually take the time to talk to the kids and have them figure out the I-Can statements. It all takes time when we don’t have enough time in the day to even implement all our subjects all the time, so it seems like we have to rush through certain sections and subjects; you have to teach them the important parts; you would rather go more in depth with it, but you have to take more time to come up with the I-Can statements.”
- “The first training seems so overwhelming. I don’t know how I’ll be able to do it.”
- “We have no common prep time to talk with others in and out of the building, so we are just scraping by and doing the minimum with SAC.”
- “We aren’t shown any examples at our level in our area. I don’t have time to do the training and make up all of my own stuff with SAC.”

Feelings of being overwhelmed resulting from the perceived lack of time required to implement the SAC program were most often noted as barriers (this was especially prevalent in the fall meetings immediately following the initial SAC training). While the feelings of some teachers seemed to be assuaged over time, perhaps because they became better acquainted with the SAC program and the requirements, the lack of Learning Team meetings coupled with the lack of a common planning time seemed to especially exacerbate this barrier with some of the teachers at one site.

**Uncertainty of Teachers Toward the Training.** The final barrier theme included the ambivalence of teachers toward the initial training or ongoing meetings and the difference that they could make with their students. This category also seemed to be dependent on the teacher himself or herself and not a collective feeling shared at the school or within the Learning Team. Seven of the nineteen teachers noted this as a barrier. These feelings may or may not be related to the other barrier of time listed above, but we did find evidence of this throughout the three sites. Some related statements include:

- “I was forced by my principal to attend the SAC training; I wanted to go to something else). I’m confused and not sure how SAC is all supposed to come together with the new math and reading series. I don’t know what I’m supposed to do. I know I’m supposed to read the Stiggins book, but what else? It’s a waste of time.”

## 22 Evaluation of the Implementation of ILS

- “I guess I’m still doing the same thing I was doing. I learned about the ILS in undergrad so [SAC] was [a] repeat for me. As long as you are a rational person, you can figure out how what you are doing fits in, pretty much anything fits in the ILS. “
- “I will be reading the Stiggins book and going to the meetings. We have a half-day release time every month. Honestly, for a lot of the things we assess, the district makes up the assessments for us, so in that case SAC will not change that.”
- “Sometimes when you try something different like this with SAC, you get off track with what you need to do in the classroom. Is it really worth it?”
- “It’s so hard with our students [from diverse backgrounds and socioeconomic situations] to even get them to meet the standards let alone exceed them. So I don’t know how useful that SAC can be for this.”

Teacher perception of the worth of the program was variable among the three sites and did not seem to be related to the school level (i.e., various teachers at the elementary, middle, and high school expressed concern about this). However, to our knowledge, all but one teacher that we interviewed at the beginning of the year were still participating as of our spring visit. This indicates to us that most teachers seem to continue to participate in the SAC program regardless of the degree of satisfaction that they have with the program.

### Summary of the Findings from the Interview and Observation Data

Qualitative findings from the interview and observation data indicate that the teachers and administrators from these three sites view the major impacts of SAC training on teachers who participated were a greater understanding of 1) how to involve students in their learning; 2) how to work collaboratively with peers; and 3) how to use resources related to standards implementation (i.e., performance descriptors).

Increased student involvement was reported to be most likely occur during the beginning stages of the unit, referenced as goal setting activities (i.e., developing I-Can statements), and during the latter stages of the unit, specifically during assessment creation (i.e., students forming their own quiz and test questions). This heightened involvement by the students signaled to some of these teachers an evolution to a “student-centered” classroom and was referenced by nearly 80% of the teachers interviewed.

Additionally, increased teacher collaboration through meetings stimulated by the Learning Team meetings was also cited by over 76% of the teachers, administrators, and SAC coaches interviewed. SAC coaches and teachers emphasized collaboration between members of the immediate Learning Team group more so than fellow Learning Teams or non-SAC teachers. This may mean that the simultaneous shared professional development and program experience (i.e., learning about the program and striving to complete the program at the same time together) of the SAC program may contribute to the positive responses regarding teacher collaboration.

Lastly, half of the teachers we interviewed reported increased use of standards materials from ISBE (like performance descriptors and frameworks) because of SAC. Moreover, more teachers and SAC coaches that we interviewed and observed referenced and used the actual statewide standards and related resources rather than the “in-house” created resources like district binders.

Teachers cited that increased use of standards materials from ISBE occurred when they were creating UPOs, as standard identification is a required field on the form and emphasized by the SAC coaches.

Teachers (79%) and all of the SAC coaches most often attributed administrative support as a key factor in SAC being implemented successfully at the school. Moreover, about half of the teachers and administrators interviewed reported a SAC coach who was reassuring and supportive of teachers' efforts and who was knowledgeable about the ILS and the standards resources (e.g., the coach could explain how different standards resources, like performance descriptors, could be used with SAC) was a key implementation factor.

More variable findings were 1) the extent to which teachers were implementing the Standards-Aligned Classroom training, and 2) the extent to which the teachers felt SAC was worthwhile. It seems that both adherence to the SAC training and opinions about the program were at the individual teacher level and not within the Learning Team or at the site as a whole. The SAC initiative's ongoing professional development structure (i.e., requiring ongoing Learning Team meetings at the local level with a SAC coach; having schools schedule shared planning time for the Learning Teams to discuss material outside of the regular meetings; etc.) and incentives may have contributed to the continued participation of some teachers at these sites.

### **Findings from the Study of SAC Participation and ILS Implementation**

In order to generate quantitative findings, we used data collected from the ILS Teacher Survey (2006). Before conducting regression analyses, which would ascertain how well SAC-related variables predicted ILS implementation, we examined correlations among potential predictors and between predictors and the ILS implementation variables (overall implementation and its seven dimensions). Potential predictors included variables dealing with 1) school level, 2) school size, 3) being a SAC school (characterized by having at least one group of teachers participate in the training since the SAC initiative's inception in 2001), 4) percentage of teachers who had received the SAC training, and 5) teachers' years of experience with the ILS implementation dimensions. The ILS implementation dimensions, used with the *Evaluation of the Implementation of the Illinois Learning Standards 2006 Report*, represent:

1. **Affective Response:** attitudes and beliefs about the ILS, motivation to implement the ILS, and confidence related to implementing the ILS;
2. **Community and Stakeholder Awareness:** community involvement in the ILS implementation system, articulation and dissemination of the ILS performance descriptors and other information about the ILS-led system, and community resources to facilitate ILS implementation;
3. **Curriculum Development:** alignment of curriculum to the ILS and selection and use of resources;
4. **District Infrastructure:** the effects of ILS implementation on district goals, policies, and practices; resources to implement ILS; and leadership facilitating implementation of ILS;

## 24 Evaluation of the Implementation of ILS

5. **Instruction:** classroom context, selection of teaching strategies and instructional practices, and teaching philosophy and beliefs;
6. **Professional Development:** alignment to ILS, sufficiency and quality;
7. **Student Learning and Assessment:** achievement expectations, classroom assessment, student involvement, use of assessment information to inform instruction, standardized tests, and reporting of assessment information.

Correlations are measures of association between two variables and can range from zero (no association) to one. Positive correlations indicate that both variables tend to increase or decrease at the same time; negative correlations indicate that one variable tends to decrease as the other increases. Anything that did not correlate significantly with an ILS implementation variable could not play a role in predicting it and was omitted from the relevant regression analysis.

Table 8, which follows, reports correlations between the ILS implementation variables and all the SAC variables we measured except the percentage of principals who received SAC training (this was omitted from the table because it was not a significant correlate of any of the implementation variables and would not be a significant predictor of any of them). The table also includes correlations between the ILS implementation variables and school level and school size, which were chosen as control variables due to significant correlations.

As previously discussed in the sample section, a school was considered a SAC school according to information provided to us by the Design Team Chair for SAC. Unlike the percentage of

**Table 8. Correlations Among Overall ILS Implementation Dimensions and School and Teacher Differences with SAC (N = 177)**

	School Level (Elementary, Middle, or High School)	School Size (Small, Medium, or Large)	Being a SAC school <sup>8</sup>	% of Teachers Who Rec'd SAC Training	Teachers' Years of Experience
Affective Responses	-.356(**)	.171(*)	-.134	.317(**)	.018
Community & Stakeholder Involvement	-.276(**)	.222(**)	-.130	.375(**)	.052
Curriculum	-.219(**)	.207(**)	-.149(*)	.331(**)	.158(*)
District/School Infrastructure	-.188(*)	.290(**)	-.103	.320(**)	.149(*)
Instruction	-.332(**)	.178(*)	-.200(**)	.318(**)	-.016
Professional Development	-.186(*)	.161(*)	-.069	.469(**)	.134
Student Learning & Assessment	-.363(**)	.143	-.185(*)	.416(**)	.005
Overall ILS Implementation	-.320(**)	.236(**)	-.162(*)	.414(**)	.092

\* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

<sup>8</sup> A school was considered a SAC school if it had at least one team of teachers participate in the SAC training any time between 2001 and 2005. It does not indicate that at the present time, all or even any teachers in a SAC school have been trained in SAC.

teachers who had received SAC training, which correlated with overall ILS implementation and all of its dimensions ( $p$  always  $< .001$ ), being a SAC school correlated only with overall ILS implementation ( $p = .013$ ) and three of the seven dimensions: Curriculum ( $r = -.149$ ;  $p = .048$ ), Instruction ( $r = -.200$ ;  $p = .008$ ), and Student Learning and Assessment ( $r = -.185$ ;  $p = .014$ ). Consequently, it was included only in those regressions.

Being a SAC school did not correlate with the percentage of a school's teachers who participated in SAC training. In fact, none of the predictors in the regressions correlated significantly with one another. Of course, all of them had significant correlations with ILS implementation variables (or they would not have been included in the regressions). As seen in the table above, school size had positive correlations, meaning that the degree of ILS implementation tended to increase as enrollment increased. School level had negative, or inverse, correlations, meaning that ILS implementation and school level tended to move in opposite directions (i.e., elementary schools were most likely to implement ILS to a greater degree). Being a SAC school was always negatively correlated with ILS implementation variables, though correlations were significant only half the time. In contrast, the percentage of teachers who had received SAC training was always positively (and always significantly) correlated with ILS implementation, indicating that the greater the percentage, the better the implementation of every one of the ILS dimensions.

The results of the regression analyses on overall ILS implementation and on each of its dimensions are reported in Tables 9–16. Each regression assessed the extent to which the ILS implementation variable in question (overall ILS implementation or one of its dimensions) could be predicted from the SAC-related variables that correlated with it. The regressions controlled for the effects of school level and school size by entering them into each analysis as predictors before the SAC-related variables. Remember that the signs of the correlations discussed above give the direction of the relation between an ILS implementation variable and its predictors.

If all of the observed values of an ILS implementation variable (e.g., every school's overall ILS implementation) could be accurately predicted, it would mean that the predictors could account for all of the fluctuations in that ILS implementation variable. In other words, the predictors would account for 100% of its variance. The amount of variance in ILS implementation that was actually attributable to predictors is indicated in a regression analysis by the  $R^2$  statistic.  $R^2$  is the *proportion* of variance explained, so to convert it to a percentage, the decimal point needs to be moved two places to the right. The "Change in  $R^2$ " is the proportion of variance attributable to whatever predictor(s) were entered in that step.

For example, in the regression on overall ILS implementation (see Table 9), the  $R^2$  (proportion of variance) associated solely with school level was .102, meaning that school level explained 10.2% of the variance in overall ILS implementation (with elementary schools tending to implement ILS to a greater degree, and high schools to a lesser degree, as indicated by the negative correlation between school level and ILS implementation). School size, entered in Step 2 of the regression, explained an additional 4.2% of the variance (the degree of ILS implementation tended to increase as enrollment increased, as indicated by their positive correlation). Being a SAC school, despite its significant correlation with overall ILS implementation, accounted for an increment of just 1.3% of the variance in overall ILS

**Table 9. Prediction of Overall ILS Implementation Using School Level, School Size, SAC School<sup>9</sup>, and Percentage of Teachers Receiving SAC Training, 2005 (N = 177)**

Step	Predictors	Cumulative R <sup>2</sup>	Change		
			R <sup>2</sup>	F stat	Sig.
1	School Level (Elem, Middle, HS)	.102	.102	19.962	.000
2	School Size (small, medium, large)	.145	.042	8.593	.004
3	Being a SAC school <sup>9</sup>	.158	.013	2.704	.102
4	% of teachers who rec'd SAC training	.360	.202	54.376	.000

implementation, which was not a significant increment ( $p = .102$ , which is greater than the .05 cut-off for statistical significance). Yet the percentage of teachers who received SAC training was a highly significant predictor ( $p < .001$ ), accounting for 20.2% of the variance. The proportion of variance in overall ILS implementation accounted for by all four predictors together was 360 (cumulative R<sup>2</sup>), which is 36% of the variance.

Regression results show that the percentage of teachers who had received SAC training was a significant predictor of overall ILS implementation and of every one of its dimensions, even after controlling for both school level and school size. Regressions on the Curriculum and District Infrastructure dimensions initially controlled for teacher experience, as well, because both dimensions correlated with it. But because teacher experience did not prove to be a significant predictor, it was not included in the regressions reported for those dimensions.

Furthermore, the percentage of teachers who had participated in SAC training was always the best predictor among all those considered. The proportion of variance it accounted for ranged from .116, or 11.6% (for District Infrastructure, as seen in Table 13), to .235, or 23.5% (for Professional Development, as in Table 15). The significance level was always less than .001.

In contrast, being a SAC school accounted for only 2.4% of the variance in the Instruction dimension (see Table 14) and 1.9% of the variance in the Student Learning and Assessment dimension (see Table 16). It did not explain a significant portion of the variance in overall ILS implementation or the Curriculum dimension (i.e., significance levels were greater than .05), nor, as mentioned above, correlate significantly with the Affective Response, Community/Stakeholder Involvement, District Infrastructure, or Professional Development dimensions.

School level was always a significant predictor of ILS implementation. The percentage of variance it explained ranged from 3.5% in the case of both District/School Infrastructure ( $p = .012$ ) and Professional Development ( $p = .013$ ) to 13.2% for Student Learning and Assessment ( $p < .001$ ).

<sup>9</sup> A school was considered a SAC school if it had at least one team of teachers participate in the SAC training any time between 2001 and 2005. It does not indicate that at the present time, all or even any teachers in a SAC school have been trained in SAC.

**Table 10. Regression on the Affective Response Dimension of ILS Implementation, 2005 (N = 177)**

Step	Predictors	Cumulative R <sup>2</sup>	Change		
			R <sup>2</sup>	F stat	Sig.
1	School Level (Elem, Middle, HS)	.127	.127	25.464	.000
2	School Size (small, medium, large)	.146	.019	3.840	.052
3	% of teachers who rec'd SAC training	.263	.117	27.484	.000

\*Note: Being a SAC school did not correlate with implementation of this dimension and was therefore left out of the regression.

**Table 11. Regression on the Community & Stakeholder Involvement Dimension of ILS Implementation, 2005 (N = 177)**

Step	Predictors	Cumulative R <sup>2</sup>	Change		
			R <sup>2</sup>	F stat	Sig.
1	School Level (Elem, Middle, HS)	.076	.076	14.448	.000
2	School Size (small, medium, large)	.115	.039	7.602	.006
3	% of teachers who rec'd SAC training	.273	.158	37.642	.000

\*Note: Being a SAC school did not correlate with implementation of this dimension and was therefore left out of the regression.

**Table 12. Regression on the Curriculum Dimension of ILS Implementation, 2005 (N = 177)**

Step	Predictors	Cumulative R <sup>2</sup>	Change		
			R <sup>2</sup>	F stat	Sig.
1	School Level (Elem, Middle, HS)	.048	.048	8.846	.003
2	School Size (small, medium, large)	.083	.035	6.642	.011
3	Being a SAC school <sup>10</sup>	.096	.013	2.455	.119
4	% of teachers who rec'd SAC training	.225	.130	28.767	.000

<sup>10</sup> A school was considered a SAC school if it had at least one team of teachers participate in the SAC training any time between 2001 and 2005. It does not indicate that at the present time, all or even any teachers in a SAC school have been trained in SAC.

**Table 13. Regression on the District/School Infrastructure Dimension of ILS Implementation, 2005 (N = 177)**

Step	Predictors	Cumulative R <sup>2</sup>	Change		
			R <sup>2</sup>	F stat	Sig.
1	School Level (Elem, Middle, HS)	.035	.035	6.393	.012
2	School Size (small, medium, large)	.110	.074	14.542	.000
3	% of teachers who rec'd SAC training	.225	.116	25.850	.000

\*Note: Being a SAC school did not correlate with implementation of this dimension and was therefore left out of the regression.

**Table 14. Regression on the Instruction Dimension of ILS Implementation, 2005 (N = 177)**

Step	Predictors	Cumulative R <sup>2</sup>	Change		
			R <sup>2</sup>	F stat	Sig.
1	School Level (Elem, Middle, HS)	.110	.110	21.694	.000
2	School Size (small, medium, large)	.132	.022	4.313	.039
3	Being a SAC school <sup>11</sup>	.156	.024	4.951	.027
4	% of teachers who rec'd SAC training	.282	.126	30.119	.000

**Table 15. Regression on the Professional Development Dimension of ILS Implementation, 2005 (N = 177)**

Step	Predictors	Cumulative R <sup>2</sup>	Change		
			R <sup>2</sup>	F stat	Sig.
1	School Level (Elem, Middle, HS)	.035	.035	6.284	.013
2	School Size (small, medium, large)	.055	.021	3.785	.053
3	% of teachers who rec'd SAC training	.290	.235	57.286	.000

\*Note: Being a SAC school did not correlate with implementation of this dimension and was therefore left out of the regression.

<sup>11</sup> A school was considered a SAC school if it had at least one team of teachers participate in the SAC training any time between 2001 and 2005. It does not indicate that at the present time, all or even any teachers in a SAC school have been trained in SAC.

**Table 16. Regression on the Student Learning & Assessment Dimension of ILS Implementation, 2005 (N = 177)**

Step	Predictors	Cumulative R <sup>2</sup>	Change		
			R <sup>2</sup>	F stat	Sig.
1	School Level (Elem, Middle, HS)	.132	.132	26.624	.000
2	School Size (small, medium, large)	.144	.012	2.372	.125
3	Being a SAC school <sup>12</sup>	.163	.019	3.979	.048
4	% of teachers who rec'd SAC training	.368	.205	55.843	.000

School size did not account for a significant amount of the variance in Affective Response, Professional Development, or Student Learning and Assessment. The variance in the remaining dimensions and in overall ILS implementation attributable to school size ranged from 2.2% ( $p = .011$ ) for Instruction to 4.2% ( $p = .004$ ) for overall ILS implementation.

#### Summary of Findings from the Study of SAC Participation and ILS Implementation

The evaluation team examined correlations and conducted regression analysis on the ILS Teacher Survey (2006) data in order to determine how teachers perceived the degree that SAC predicted or influenced ILS implementation.

Correlations among predictor variables (like school level, school size, SAC school, and percentage of teachers who received the SAC training) and between seven ILS dimensions from the *Evaluation of the Implementation of the Illinois Learning Standards 2006 Report* were completed to generate these findings. Findings related to the correlations among and between these categories suggest that the percentage of teachers who had received SAC training was a significant predictor of overall ILS implementation and of every one of the seven ILS dimensions (even after controlling for variables of school level and school size). In other words, the findings indicate that the higher the percentage of teachers who participated in SAC training from a school, the greater the teacher perception on the ILS Teacher Survey of:

- The overall ILS implementation ( $r = .414$ ;  $p < .001$ )
- The attitudes and beliefs about the ILS (Affective Response dimension;  $r = .317$ ;  $p < .001$ );
- The community involvement and awareness of the ILS (Community and Stakeholder Awareness dimension;  $r = .375$ ;  $p < .001$ );
- The alignment of ILS and use of resources (Curriculum Development dimension;  $r = .331$ ;  $p < .001$ );

<sup>12</sup> A school was considered a SAC school if it had at least one team of teachers participate in the SAC training any time between 2001 and 2005. It does not indicate that at the present time, all or even any teachers in a SAC school have been trained in SAC.

### 30 Evaluation of the Implementation of ILS

- The effects of the ILS on district goals (District Infrastructure dimension;  $r = .320$ ;  $p < .001$ );
- The selection of teaching strategies and instructional context are to the ILS (Instruction dimension;  $r = .318$ ;  $p < .001$ );
- The alignment of professional development to ILS (Professional Development dimension;  $r = .469$ ;  $p < .001$ ); and
- The achievement expectations, classroom assessment, and student involvement (Student Learning and Assessment dimension;  $r = .416$ ;  $p < .001$ ).

However, being a teacher at a SAC school only correlated with the overall ILS implementation and three of the dimensions and not with the percentage of a school's teaching population who participated in the SAC training. This may indicate that non-SAC teachers may not acquire the same level of satisfaction with 1) the ILS (Affective Response), 2) the community involvement with ILS (Community & Stakeholder Involvement), 3) the effects of the ILS on district goals (District Infrastructure), and 4) the professional development alignment with ILS (Professional Development) as teachers who participate in the actual SAC training. The findings may suggest that vicariously experiencing the SAC program via the dissemination strategies of SAC Level II Learning Teams may not be able to adequately substitute for actual participation in SAC.

School level (i.e., elementary, middle, or high school) had significant negative correlations in overall ILS implementation and all seven dimension categories, meaning that the lower the school level, the higher the teacher ratings on the ILS survey (so elementary school teachers indicated higher implementation and satisfaction with ILS and the dimensions). Correlations also suggested that teachers from schools with higher enrollment numbers tended to report higher degrees of ILS implementation, with significant positive correlations in all dimensions but Student Learning and Assessment.

Regression findings also indicated that the percentage of teachers who received SAC training is a significant predictor of overall ILS implementation and all seven of the dimensions. In other words, if a school has a higher percentage of teachers trained, we can predict that the teacher perceptions about overall ILS implementation will be higher. Similarly, higher percentages of teacher participation in a school in SAC can predict that there will be higher ratings in all seven of the ILS implementation dimensions.

Conversely, being a SAC school was an ineffective predictor of overall ILS implementation (accounting for 1.3% of the variance;  $p = .102$ ). Moreover, being a SAC school did not explain a significant portion of the variance ( $p$  always  $< .001$ ) for any of the seven dimensions. Thus, we would be unable to predict that a teacher at a school designated as a SAC school would have higher levels of ILS implementation.

Regression revealed similar findings to the correlations on school levels. School level was always a significant predictor of perceptions of overall ILS implementation and all but one of the seven dimensions (with elementary tending to be higher). Therefore, we may be able to predict higher levels of perceptions of overall ILS implementation and most of the seven dimensions from a teacher at the elementary level.

## Overall Implications of the Findings

The evaluation activities produced the following findings:

- **As a result of SAC training, teachers report a greater understanding of 1) how to involve students in their learning; 2) how to work collaboratively with peers; and 3) how to use resources related to standards implementation (i.e., performance descriptors).** Nearly 80% of teachers noted student involvement in goal setting and assessment creation as being the result of SAC. Increased teacher collaboration within the Learning Team was referenced by fourteen teachers (73% of those interviewed) at least once. Half of the teachers interviewed reported an increase in the use of ISBE-created resources on standards.
- **Teachers and SAC coaches reported that SAC participants increase their use of standards materials created by the Illinois State Board of Education.** Citations of increased use of standards materials from ISBE occurred when teachers were creating UPOs, as standard identification is a required field on the form and emphasized by the SAC coaches.
- **The administration’s involvement in the program was noted as a key implementation factor in both the interview and observation data.** Teachers (79%) and all of the SAC coaches most often attributed administrative support as a key factor. Observation data also suggested that teacher engagement in the program also seemed to be related to the involvement of an administrator.
- **Teachers and administrators noted the importance of a supportive and knowledgeable SAC coach.** About half of the teachers and administrators interviewed reported that a SAC coach who was reassuring and supportive of teachers’ efforts and who was knowledgeable about the ILS and the standards resources (e.g., the coach could explain how different standards resources, like performance descriptors, could be used with SAC) was a key implementation factor.
- **The extent to which teachers were implementing the Standards-Aligned Classroom training and felt that SAC was worthwhile varied across the sites.** Evident from the interview and observation data, it seems that both adherence to the SAC training and opinions about the program were at the individual teacher level and not necessarily shared within the Learning Team or at the site as a whole.
- **Schools with a higher percentage of teachers who had received the SAC training had higher levels of overall ILS implementation.** The percentage of teachers who had received SAC training was always positively (and always significantly) correlated with ILS implementation, indicating that the greater the percentage, the better the implementation of every one of the seven ILS dimensions including Affective Response, Community & Stakeholder Involvement, Curriculum, District/School Infrastructure, Instruction, Professional Development, and Student Learning and Assessment..
- **The best predictor of overall ILS implementation and the seven ILS dimensions was the percentage of teachers who had received the SAC training.** Analysis done on the

data collected from the ILS Teacher Survey (2006) items related to SAC revealed that the percentage of teachers in a school who had received SAC training was a significant predictor of overall ILS implementation and the seven ILS dimensions.

- **Being a teacher at a SAC school correlated with the overall ILS implementation and three of the dimensions but not with the percentage of a school's teaching population who participated in the SAC training.** This may indicate that non-SAC teachers may not acquire the same level of satisfaction with 1) the ILS (Affective Response), 2) the community involvement with ILS (Community & Stakeholder Involvement), 3) the effects of the ILS on district goals (District Infrastructure), and 4) the professional development alignment with ILS (Professional Development) as teachers who participate in the actual SAC training. The findings may suggest that vicariously experiencing the SAC program via the dissemination strategies of SAC Level II Learning Teams may not be able to adequately substitute for actual participation in SAC.

### **Recommendations**

The evaluation team recommends the following based on the site visits and ILS Teacher Survey (2006) findings:

- 1. Build on the strengths of the program.** The following strengths of the SAC program need to be maintained:
  - The SAC coach needs to continue to have a presence in the schools and at the Learning Team meetings.
  - The SAC program needs to continue to specifically incorporate ISBE-created resources.
- 2. SAC contracts and resources for administrators may be useful.** Due to the fact that teachers and SAC coaches emphasized the administrators, it may be appropriate to incorporate an administrator component into the SAC program.
- 3. More explanation and emphasis could be given to the spring SAC fair.** Information about these fairs needs to be better distributed and shared among the SAC and non-SAC teachers and schools.
- 4. More onsite trainings of the SAC program.** Because teachers tended to collaborate primarily within their Learning Team and dissemination throughout the school did not appear to have as great of an impact as intended, SAC program coordinators and SAC coaches may want to sponsor more onsite work with teachers and administrators.

## References

- Bogdan, R. E., & Biklen, S. K. (1982). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- DeStefano, L., & Prestine, N. (2002). *Evaluating the implementation of Illinois Learning Standards, year four report*. Illinois State Board of Education.
- DeStefano, L., Hammer, V., Fiedler, E., & Downs, H. (2006). *Evaluating the implementation of Illinois Learning Standards 2006 report*. Springfield, IL: Illinois State Board of Education.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis, 2nd ed.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Rist, R. C. (1982). On the application of ethnographic inquiry in education: Procedures and possibilities. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 19*, 439–450.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1994). Grounded theory methodology: An overview. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 273–285). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Stiggins, R., Arter, J., Chappuis, J., & Chappuis, S. (2004). *Classroom assessment for student learning*.
- Yin, R. K. (1994). *Case study research: Design and methods* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.



## **APPENDICES**

- Appendix A: Unit Plan Organizer Example**
- Appendix B: SAC Contracts for Level I and Level II Learning Teams**
- Appendix C: Contracts for ROE/ISCs**
- Appendix D: Contracts for SAC Coaches**
- Appendix E: SAC Educator Interview Protocols for Fall 2005**
- Appendix F: SAC Educator Interview Protocols for Spring 2006**
- Appendix G: SAC Coach Interview Protocols for Spring 2006**
- Appendix H: Observation Guide for the Statewide SAC Training and Local Learning Team Meetings**
- Appendix I: Classroom Observation and Walkthrough Observation Guide**
- Appendix J: ILS Teacher Survey**



## **APPENDIX A**

### **UNIT PLAN ORGANIZER EXAMPLES (GRADE SIX SCIENCE EXAMPLE AND SPECIAL EDUCATION EXAMPLE)**



**Unit Plan Organizer: Example from a Sixth-Grade Classroom\***

**Grade:** 6      **Unit Plan Title:** Animal Adaptation      **Learning Area:** Science

**Standards: Goal 12:** Understand the fundamental concepts, principles and interconnections of the life, physical and earth/space sciences.

Students who meet this standard can know and apply concepts that explain how living things function, adapt and change. (Std. A)

**12B:** Know and apply concepts that describe how living things interact with each other and with their environment.

**12.B3b:** Compare and assess features of organisms for their adaptive, competitive and survival potential (e.g., appendages, reproductive rates, camouflage, defensive structures).

**In this activity students will demonstrate the ability to:** observe how animal characteristics help organisms survive in their environments.

KRSP	"I CAN" Statements	Assessments	Instructional Activities
<p><b>K:</b> <b>Review</b> definitions for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• predator</li> <li>• organism</li> <li>• environment</li> <li>• protective adaptation</li> <li>• trait</li> <li>• camouflage</li> </ul> <p><b>Define:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• protective coloration</li> <li>• protective resemblance</li> <li>• mimicry</li> </ul>	<p><b>K:</b> <b>I can</b> tell what organisms, predators, environment, trait, protective adaptation, and camouflage mean.</p> <p><b>I can</b> tell what protective coloration, protective resemblance, and mimicry are.</p>	<p><b>K:</b> Personal Communication</p> <p>Selected Response/Short Answer</p>	<p><b>K:</b> Teacher reviews definitions for <i>predator, organism, environment, protective adaptation, trait, and camouflage</i></p> <p>Teacher questioning activity: students use <i>thumbs up/thumbs down</i> to demonstrate understanding of terms</p> <p>Teacher introduces and describes 3 types of protective adaptations displayed by a variety of organisms</p> <p>Students write definitions for the 3 types of protective adaptations in their science journals</p>
<p><b>K:</b> <b>Recognize</b> organisms that display protective coloration, protective resemblance, and mimicry</p>	<p><b>K:</b> <b>I can</b> recognize living things that display each of the 3 types of protective adaptation.</p>	<p><b>K:</b> Selected Response/Short Answer</p>	<p><b>K:</b> Teacher and students discuss various survival adaptations used by organisms and their purpose</p> <p>Teacher presents visual examples of organisms in their natural environments that change for protection from predators</p> <p>Students match organisms with the type of adaptation they display in a 3- column chart based on the visual examples</p>
<p><b>K:</b> <b>Explain</b> how organisms change and the need for protective adaptation for survival</p>	<p><b>K:</b> <b>I can</b> tell why living things need to change the way they look and how they do it.</p>	<p><b>K:</b> Essay/Extended Written Response</p>	<p><b>K:</b> Students explain in writing in their science journals how and why organisms change</p>

A-2 Evaluation of the Implementation of ILS

KRSP	“I CAN” Statements	Assessments	Instructional Activities
<p><b>R:</b> <b>Examine</b> the traits of each protective adaptation (protective coloration, protective resemblance, and mimicry)</p> <p><b>Classify</b> the traits of each protective adaptation</p>	<p><b>R:</b> <b>I can</b> look for the traits of each kind of protective adaptation when I see examples of animals that are using protective coloration, protective resemblance, and mimicry.</p> <p><b>I can</b> sort the traits for each kind of protective adaptation.</p>	<p><b>R:</b> Personal Communication</p>	<p><b>R:</b> Teacher provides examples of the 3 kinds of protective adaptations and leads a group discussion regarding the traits associated with each example</p> <p>Traits of each of the protective adaptations are arranged into a graphic organizer</p>
<p><b>S:</b> <b>Match</b> organisms to the 3 types of protective adaptations they use in their natural environments</p> <p><b>Defend</b> choices for matching organisms to the type of adaptation they display in their natural environments</p>	<p><b>S:</b> <b>I can</b> match the names of organisms to the kind of protective adaptations they use when I see them in nature.</p> <p><b>I can</b> defend the choices I made when I matched organisms I observed to the kind of adaptation they used.</p>	<p><b>S:</b> Performance Assessment</p>	<p><b>S:</b> Students observe protective adaptations of organisms in their natural environments through video clip series</p> <p>Using a checklist matrix, students match the form of protective adaptation to the organism displaying it as the organisms appear in the video clips</p> <p>In small group discussion, students defend their decisions regarding their choices</p>
<p><b>P:</b> <b>Poster</b></p> <p><b>Essay</b></p>	<p><b>P:</b> <b>I can</b> make a poster of a make-believe organism using one of the types of protective adaptation.</p> <p><b>I can</b> explain in writing the kind of protective adaptation my make-believe organism uses and why this keeps it safe from predators.</p>	<p><b>P:</b> Performance Assessment</p> <p>Essay/Extended Written Response</p>	<p><b>P:</b> Teacher identifies the required elements and scoring guide for the poster and provides students with examples of strong and weak work to critique</p> <p>Students independently create a poster of a fictional organism displaying one type of protective adaptation</p> <p>Students explain in writing what type of protective adaptation is being used by their fictional organism and why it protects the organism in its environment</p>

\*Example provided by a current SAC coach.

## Unit Plan Organizer: Example from a Classroom Serving Students with Special Needs\*

<b>Grade Level:</b> 3 <sup>rd</sup> (Special Ed)	<b>Unit Plan Title:</b> Money in Mathematics		
<b>Standard(s):</b> State Goal 7: Estimate, make and use measurements of objects, quantities and relationships and determine acceptable levels of accuracy. Standard 7A: Measure and compare quantities using appropriate units, instruments, and methods.			
<b>Benchmark(s)/Performance Descriptor(s)</b> Performance Descriptor 7A, Stage B: Count, compare, and order sets of unlike coins.			
<b>In the columns below, record the KRSPs based on the standard(s) which this unit addresses and indicate the specific assessments and instructional activities which relate to each KRSP.</b>			
<b>Knowledge, Reasoning, Skills, and Products (KRSP)</b>	<b>Student Friendly “I can” Statements</b>	<b>Assessment</b>	<b>Instructional Activities</b>
<b>Knowledge:</b> * Recognize a penny, nickel, dime, and quarter. * State the value of penny, nickel, dime, and quarter.	“I can recognize a penny, nickel, dime, and quarter.” “I can tell the teacher the value of a penny, nickel, dime, and quarter.	Student will correctly identify the name and values of the coin on their poster. Student can state value of penny, nickel, dime, and quarter orally and in written format to the teacher. Student can select the appropriate coin when told the name or value in a one-on-one assessment with the teacher.	Teacher presents and reviews the names for each coin (penny, nickel, dime, and quarter). The teacher presents visual and concrete examples of each coin for the students. Teacher presents and reviews the values for each coin (penny, nickel, dime, and quarter). The values are presented in various forms (words and numbers). Money symbols are reviewed. Each student is then provided with their own coin manipulatives to trace and feel. Each student produces a coin poster identifying the coin and value. Students are formally assessed one-on-one by the teacher bi-weekly over the course of the unit (teacher checklist used to track the progress).

A-4 Evaluation of the Implementation of ILS

Knowledge, Reasoning, Skills, and Products (KRSP)	Student Friendly “I can” Statements	Assessment	Instructional Activities
<p><b>Reasoning:</b> * Compare coin values</p>	<p>“I can compare the values of a penny, nickel, dime and quarter.”</p>	<p>Student can tell the teacher which coin has the greater value when compared side by side (with numerals and names) in one-on-one time with the teacher. Students can develop and submit at least one question and correct answer for an informal quiz. Students will take a formal test related to these questions.</p>	<p>Teacher reviews the values for each coin (penny, nickel, dime, and quarter). The values are presented in various forms (words and numbers). Students develop their own questions and answers for an informal quiz (i.e., “Which is greater: three pennies or one quarter?”). A formal test will also be drawn from these student generated questions. During the formal, one-on-one assessment, students can tell the teacher which coins have the greater value.</p>
<p><b>Skills:</b> * Match coins to their values * Add coin values up to \$1.00</p>	<p>“I can match a penny, nickel, dime, and quarter to its value.” “I can add coin values up to \$1.00.”</p>	<p>Students will physically and orally match the value with the coin in one-on-one time with the teacher. Students will be able to identify different ways that coin values can add up to equal \$.05, \$.25, \$.50, and \$1.00.</p>	<p>Teacher reviews the values for each coin (penny, nickel, dime, and quarter). Students will produce a graph depicting different ways to combine coins to equal \$.05, \$.25, \$.50, and \$1.00.</p>
<p><b>Products:</b> *A <b>poster</b> displaying the coin names and values. *A <b>quiz question</b> along with the correct answer related to comparing the coin values. *A <b>graph</b> depicting different ways to combine coins to equal \$.05, \$.25, \$.50, and \$1.00. *The <b>proper change</b> to purchase items in the classroom store.</p>	<p>“I can produce a poster showing the names and values of a penny, nickel, dime, and quarter.” “I can create a quiz question and answer related to comparing the coin values.” “I can produce a graph to show different ways to combine coins to equal \$.05, \$.25, \$.50, and \$1.00.” “I can use the right coins to purchase items worth \$.05, \$.25, \$.50, and \$1.00 in the class store.”</p>	<p>Students will produce a poster displaying the coin names and values. Students will produce a quiz question along with the correct answer related to comparing the coin values. Students will produce a graph depicting different ways to combine coins to equal \$.05, \$.25, \$.50, and \$1.00. Students will produce the proper change to purchase items (worth \$.05, \$.25, \$.50, and \$1.00) in the classroom store.</p>	<p>Teacher reviews the values for each coin (penny, nickel, dime, and quarter). Students produce graphs depicting different ways to combine coins to equal \$.05, \$.25, \$.50, and \$1.00. Students are given manipulative coins to “purchase” various items from the class store. Each student will meet in a one-on-one assessment situation with the teacher and be given the opportunity to purchase four items worth: \$.05, \$.25, \$.50, and \$1.00. Students will be given the chance to purchase more than one item for different combinations of coins (i.e., there is a two item possibility for \$.05 by using 5 pennies or 1 nickel).</p>

\*Adapted from a worksheet entitled *Example of KRSP Process for Writing IEPs* from the 2005 SAC Coach Training Manual.

**APPENDIX B**

**SAC CONTRACTS FOR LEVEL I AND LEVEL II  
LEARNING TEAMS**





## Responsibilities of SAC Level I Learning Teams

- Will use the Rick Stiggins book and videotapes as the focus of their work.
- Must have 2-5 teachers and one building-level administrator to serve on the team. It is recommended that there be 4 teachers and 1 building administrator, but we recognize that some very small schools may not have enough staff available.
- Attend one of the two-day trainings offered in each ROE/ Area
- Meet at least 18 hours, ideally once every two weeks for at 1 ½ to 2 hours. (Please note additional hours will be required for Aurora Credit – please see syllabus)
- Will work with a coach from the ROE who can provide resources and support to become self-directed learning teams.
- Each team member will complete a Unit Plan Organizer and maintain a reflective journal.
- Will update their entire school faculty at least once during the school year on their learning team activities. (What they do, what they have learned, benefits for learning team, benefits for students.)
- May attend a one-day SAC Fair to be held in the Spring of each year. Participation through poster, presentation or round table discussion is optional. **(Please note spring celebrations will vary per Region/Area as fairs may not be funded by the project.)**
- Be willing to help others (provide consulting, advice, etc.) in their school and district that wish to create new learning teams.
- Participate in program evaluation, if applicable.

Signatures:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Principal / Building-Level Administrator

\_\_\_\_\_  
School Name

\_\_\_\_\_  
Teacher

\_\_\_\_\_  
Teacher

\_\_\_\_\_  
Teacher

\_\_\_\_\_  
Teacher

\_\_\_\_\_  
Teacher

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date



## Responsibilities of SAC Level II Learning Teams

- The team must have at least two returning members and one building-level administrator. It is recommended that there be 2 to 5 teachers on the team.
- New team members (replacing a learning team member from year one) will be required to attend a two-day Level I learning team training.
- New administrators will be required to attend a two-day Level I learning team training and will sign a contract.
- All Level II learning team members must attend a one-day Level II learning team training.
- The team will meet at least 4 times a year with a coach provided by the ROE.
- It is recommended that Level II team members meet at least 9 hours during the school year to provide ongoing articulation and peer support. (These hours include time met with the team coach.)
- Identify a Learning Team course of study plan.. (Evaluating Student Work, Developing Rubrics from KRSPs, Constructing Effective Assessments, Implementing the Seven Strategies)
- The team will continue the study of alignment of Illinois Learning Standards for classroom use and continue the study of classroom-based assessments.
- The team may choose an area of assessment to develop and implement, i.e. rubric development, teacher-made tests, unit/standardized test review, or unit/lesson planning after completing the work of Richard Stiggins. Other resources might include the work of Wiggins, McTighe, or Burke, etc.
- Each team member will submit a lesson plan with aligned assessments and scoring criteria that highlights both assessment **of** and **for** learning and that extends beyond a single day.
- The team will update their entire faculty at least once during the school year on their learning team activities and update the Board of Education as appropriate.
- The team will present at the annual SAC Fair, if applicable.
- The team should be willing to offer support to other school or area Level I learning teams.
- The learning team responsibilities include: maintaining a Learning Team Log, completing and submitting a standards-aligned lesson plan, and beginning to plan for SAC dissemination.

Signatures:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Principal/Building-Level Administrator

\_\_\_\_\_  
School

\_\_\_\_\_  
Teacher

\_\_\_\_\_  
Teacher

\_\_\_\_\_  
Teacher

\_\_\_\_\_  
Teacher

\_\_\_\_\_  
Teacher

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

**APPENDIX C**

**CONTRACTS FOR ROE/ISCs**



## Responsibilities of Each ROE/ISCs

- Select one person from each office to serve as a “Contact” person for this year-long initiative.
- Select three schools to participate in this building-level initiative. Schools (participating teachers and administrators) should be highly motivated to create and support ongoing learning teams focused on alignment of classroom level assessment and instruction. Each ROE will receive funding to help cover the cost for a coach. (Funds may not be used to purchase equipment.)
- Select one primary coach and one backup coach to work with the learning teams. (It is recommended that either the primary or backup coach be an ROE staff person.) Each ROE/ISC will be given funds so they can pay the coaches for time worked as part of their contract with the ROE.
- House, check out and track the loaning and return of two sets of videotapes from Rick Stiggins’ Assessment Institute. Learning Teams should have priority for checking out the videotapes, but other schools should also be given access to check the videotapes out when the Learning Teams are not using them.
- Encourage the work of the learning teams and support the networking of the coaches and teams in ways you feel are appropriate in your region.
- Provide fiscal and program documentation as required by Fiscal Agent by identified due dates.
- Each ROE will receive funding to support the team’s ongoing learning. Funds may not be spent on equipment. The funds are intended to directly support the needs of the learning teams.
- Highlight this Standards Project during the school year in ROE/ISC Newsletters.

Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Name \_\_\_\_\_

ROE/ISC \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Phone, Fax \_\_\_\_\_

Email \_\_\_\_\_



**APPENDIX D**  
**CONTRACTS FOR SAC COACHES**



## Contract for Coaches

- Attend the one-day training of coaches, the two-day Level I training, and the one-day Level II training (if applicable)
- Provide support and resources for learning teams
- Help school-based learning teams become self-directed, motivated learners who continue their work after the first year
- Work with learning teams to ensure they complete and share products (aligned lessons/units and assessments)
- Assist the team members with the submission of the UPO or Lesson Plan on website
- Attend meetings of Level I learning teams which meet approximately once every two weeks
- Attend at least 4 meetings of Level II learning teams
- Help learning teams, as needed, prepare for the Spring 2006 SAC fairs (if applicable)
- Attend one-day SAC fair (if applicable)
- Attend Area wide coaches network meetings and other learning opportunities as offered
- Engage in ongoing personal learning about standards, alignment and assessment
- Maintain reflective journal
- Evaluate unit plan organizers using checklist for Level I teams
- Evaluate lesson plans using checklist

Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Name \_\_\_\_\_

ROE/ISC \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

Phone, Fax \_\_\_\_\_

Email \_\_\_\_\_



**APPENDIX E**

**SAC EDUCATOR INTERVIEW PROTOCOLS FOR FALL 2005**



## **Evaluation of the Illinois Learning Standards Implementation: Written Consent Information Sheet (Educator Version)**

Hello Educator(s):

We are conducting an evaluation of the implementation of the Illinois Learning Standards (ILS) for the Illinois State Board of Education. As part of the evaluation we are planning to track the percentage of schools that fall into various stages of implementation. We also plan to examine the relationship between implementation and changes in student achievement. The evaluation results will be used to give Illinois State Board of Education staff, technical assistance providers and practitioners a clear sense of the implementation process and assist them in planning activities and support to assist schools to move toward full implementation.

You have been selected to participate in a case study as part of the evaluation. We would like to collect information to describe your school and community, student learning experiences and outcomes, and your impressions of how the implementation of the ILS have affected you. We will do this by reviewing school documents and interviewing various people associated with the school. As part of this process, we would like to interview you to discuss the process of standards implementation in your district and to determine its impact on instruction and student achievement.

This interview will take approximately one to one and one-half hours. Your participation in this research is voluntary, and you may refuse to answer any questions or leave the interview at anytime after it has started. There are no negative consequences (no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled) if you do not participate, choose to not answer questions, or leave the study before it is over. All information collected will be private. Reports will contain only information that has been provided by many sources and will be stated in a way that an individual cannot be identified. Only the researchers will see all original information. However, if this interview takes place in a focus groups setting, we cannot guarantee that other participants in the focus group will not share what was discussed during the interview.

Since your participation is voluntary, you may choose to end your participation at any time, and your answers will be kept confidential, the risks or discomforts to you of your participation are minimal. You may encounter minimal discomfort allotting time in your schedule to participate in the interview.

The results of the study will be used at the state level to plan professional development activities and to guide the standards implementation effort. In your school, the results may be useful to you as you enhance programs and services to comply with Illinois Learning Standards.

If you have further questions about this study, please feel free to call collect Lizanne DeStefano or Victoria Hammer at 217-244-7348 or Holly Downs at 217-244-7502 or email us at [destefan@uiuc.edu](mailto:destefan@uiuc.edu), [vhammer@uiuc.edu](mailto:vhammer@uiuc.edu), or [hadowns@uiuc.edu](mailto:hadowns@uiuc.edu). If you have any questions about the rights of research subjects, you can contact the Institutional Review Board Office at 217-333-2670; if you live outside the local calling area, you may contact them collect. We are providing you with a copy of this form for your records.

E-2 Evaluation of the Implementation of ILS

Please sign below to show that you: (1) agree to participate in this interview, (2) understand that your participation is voluntary, (3) understand that you can stop the interview at any time, (4) understand that you do not have to answer questions you feel uncomfortable answering, and (5) understand that your identity will be kept confidential in the reporting of this research.

\_\_\_\_\_

Name

\_\_\_\_\_

Date

We will be taking notes on your answers. To help make sure we accurately summarize the interview, we would like your consent to use a tape recorder to record our discussions. Please check the appropriate statement below to show whether or not we may tape record the interview. If you do agree to have the interview tape recorded but would like us to turn off the tape recorder at any time, we will do so.

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes, the researchers may tape record this interview.

\_\_\_\_\_ No, the researchers may not tape record this interview.

### **Individual/Focus Group Protocol (First Visit – Fall 2005)**

Our goal for this first on-site visit is twofold: 1) further or begin to establish a working relationship with the staff at these case study schools, and 2) gather information on the school context /atmosphere, including but not limited to the extent to which the ILS are “visible” in the classrooms and school as a whole; general impressions of the students (if we can), staff, and school; and staff members’ awareness of and attitudes about both the ILS generally and the SAC initiative specifically. To meet these goals, we will conduct one day site visits that include interviews with the principal, any staff instrumental in facilitating ILS implementation in curricula and classrooms, and the staff most involved in implementing the SAC. The questions below can be used for all interviews.

#### **General Awareness/Implementation of the ILS**

1. How would you describe ILS implementation in your classroom(s)? in your school? Who in your school has considered (or has the responsibility for?) the alignment of the ILS to the curriculum? How do you and your staff work to align instruction to the ILS? (e.g., through all school meetings, school improvement days, etc.)
2. On a day-to-day basis, how do teachers implement the ILS? How do the ILS make their way into classroom instruction?
3. What do you perceive to have most greatly facilitated ILS implementation in your classrooms? school? What factors do you think are critical for implementing the ILS?
4. What are some of the barriers to implementing the ILS in your school/district? What additional resources would help strengthen ILS implementation in your school/district?
5. Is there any other information that would help us learn about ILS implementation in your school/district? Final thoughts on implementing the ILS?

#### **Implementation of the Standards-Aligned-Classroom (SAC) Training and Its Impact on ILS Implementation**

6. How and why did you get involved in SAC? How did you hear about it? How long have you been working with it?
7. Describe your experience implementing SAC (tailor—“since you attended the training a few weeks ago or over the past year or over the past few years”)?
8. Will (or has) SAC impacted your teaching? instruction in your school generally? If so, how?
9. What do you feel will be (or are) the strengths of implementing the SAC in your classrooms? school?
10. What do you feel will be (or are) obstacles or challenges to effectively implementing the SAC in your classrooms? school?



**APPENDIX F**

**SAC EDUCATOR INTERVIEW PROTOCOLS FOR SPRING 2006**



## **Individual/Focus Group Protocol (Spring 2006)**

Our goal for this on-site visit is to: 1) observe a local Learning Team meeting with the SAC coach, and 2) gather information on any changes to the school context /atmosphere, including but not limited to the extent to which the ILS are “visible” in the classrooms and school as a whole; general impressions of the students (if we can), staff, and school; and staff members’ awareness of and attitudes about both the ILS generally and the SAC initiative specifically. To meet these goals, we will conduct one day site visits that include interviews with any staff instrumental in facilitating ILS implementation in curricula and classrooms, the staff most involved in implementing the SAC, and the SAC coach. The questions below can be used for all interviews.

### **General Awareness/Implementation of the ILS**

1. How would you describe ILS implementation in your classroom(s)? in your school? Who in your school has considered (or has the responsibility for?) the alignment of the ILS to the curriculum? How do you and your staff work to align instruction to the ILS? (e.g., through all school meetings, school improvement days, etc.)
2. Have there been any changes with implementation at your site since our last meeting?
3. What do you perceive to have most greatly facilitated ILS implementation in your classrooms? school? What factors do you think are critical for implementing the ILS?
4. What are some of the barriers to implementing the ILS in your school/district? What additional resources would help strengthen ILS implementation in your school/district?
5. Is there any other information that would help us learn about ILS implementation in your school/district? Final thoughts on implementing the ILS?

### **Implementation of the Standards-Aligned-Classroom (SAC) Training and Its Impact on ILS Implementation**

6. Describe your experience implementing SAC since our last visit. Any changes?
7. Will (or has) SAC impacted your teaching? instruction in your school generally? If so, how?
8. What do you feel are the strengths of implementing the SAC in your classrooms? school?
9. What do you feel are obstacles or challenges to effectively implementing the SAC in your classrooms? school?



**APPENDIX G**

**SAC COACH INTERVIEW PROTOCOLS FOR SPRING 2006**



## **Evaluation of the Illinois Learning Standards Implementation: Written Consent Information Sheet (Coach Version)**

Hello!

We are conducting an evaluation of the implementation of the Illinois Learning Standards (ILS) for the Illinois State Board of Education. As part of the evaluation we are planning to track the percentage of schools that fall into various stages of implementation. We also plan to examine the relationship between implementation and changes in student achievement. The evaluation results will be used to give Illinois State Board of Education staff, technical assistance providers and practitioners a clear sense of the implementation process and assist them in planning activities and support to assist schools to move toward full implementation.

You have been selected to participate in a case study as part of the evaluation. We would like to collect information to describe your school and community, student learning experiences and outcomes, and your impressions of how the implementation of the ILS have affected you. We will do this by reviewing school documents and interviewing various people associated with the school. As part of this process, we would like to interview you to discuss the process of standards implementation in your district and to determine its impact on instruction and student achievement.

This interview will take approximately one to one and one-half hours. Your participation in this research is voluntary, and you may refuse to answer any questions or leave the interview at anytime after it has started. There are no negative consequences (no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled) if you do not participate, choose to not answer questions, or leave the study before it is over. All information collected will be private. Reports will contain only information that has been provided by many sources and will be stated in a way that an individual cannot be identified. Only the researchers will see all original information. However, if this interview takes place in a focus groups setting, we cannot guarantee that other participants in the focus group will not share what was discussed during the interview.

Since your participation is voluntary, you may choose to end your participation at any time, and your answers will be kept confidential, the risks or discomforts to you of your participation are minimal. You may encounter minimal discomfort allotting time in your schedule to participate in the interview.

The results of the study will be used at the state level to plan professional development activities and to guide the standards implementation effort. In your school, the results may be useful to you as you enhance programs and services to comply with Illinois Learning Standards.

If you have further questions about this study, please feel free to call collect Lizanne DeStefano or Victoria Hammer at 217-244-7348 or Holly Downs at 217-244-7502 or email us at [destefan@uiuc.edu](mailto:destefan@uiuc.edu), [yhammer@uiuc.edu](mailto:yhammer@uiuc.edu), or [hadowns@uiuc.edu](mailto:hadowns@uiuc.edu). If you have any questions about the rights of research subjects, you can contact the Institutional

**G-2 Evaluation of the Implementation of ILS**

Review Board Office at 217-333-2670; if you live outside the local calling area, you may contact them collect. We are providing you with a copy of this form for your records.

Please sign below to show that you: (1) agree to participate in this interview, (2) understand that your participation is voluntary, (3) understand that you can stop the interview at any time, (4) understand that you do not have to answer questions you feel uncomfortable answering, and (5) understand that your identity will be kept confidential in the reporting of this research.

\_\_\_\_\_

Name

\_\_\_\_\_

Date

**General Awareness/Implementation of the ILS**

1. How would you describe ILS implementation in the school(s) you coach? How do the SAC meetings include the ILS?
2. What do you perceive to have most greatly facilitated ILS implementation in the school(s) you coach? What factors do you think are critical for implementing the learning standards?
3. What are some of the barriers to implementing the ILS in the school(s) you coach? What additional resources would help strengthen ILS implementation in the school(s) you coach?
4. Is there any other information that would help us learn about ILS implementation in your school/district?

**Implementation of the Standards-Aligned-Classroom (SAC) Training and Its Impact on ILS Implementation**

5. How and why did you get involved in SAC? How did you hear about it? How long have you been working with it?
6. Describe your observations of how SAC implementation is going in the school(s) you coach. What are the successes and challenges?
7. To what degree and in what ways has SAC impacted the instruction here?
8. Anything that you would like to share about being a coach and your experiences with SAC?



## **APPENDIX H**

### **OBSERVATION GUIDE FOR THE STATEWIDE SAC TRAINING AND LOCAL LEARNING TEAM MEETINGS**



## SAC Training Observation Guide

### *Purpose of observations:*

These observations will 1) document what happened during training, meetings, and presentations; 2) record the content delivered and discussed; and 3) note modest data regarding participants' responses to and engagements with the project and each other.

### *What to observe – descriptive information:*

- Physical setting—a rich description of the time and place of the initial SAC training and ongoing trainings and meetings, including where participants were situated.
- Social or interpersonal setting—who was sitting or clustered with whom and how groups and individuals were arrayed in this context.
- Activities—a systematic description of the activities with timeframes.
- Content—a description of the SAC resources and ILS used and discussed during the trainings and meetings.
- Interactions—a description of verbal and nonverbal interactions between the various stakeholders involved with the observations (i.e., the SAC coach and teachers, the administrators and teachers, the teachers and the students, etc.).

### *Main theme to observe, as possible:*

- How are SAC concepts and materials being used in this context?
- Are the ILS being used in conjunction with SAC? In what way?

Documentation of the observation will include written notes and, in some cases, photographs of the general space. Produce a written summary of the observation and interview notes within two days to share with the evaluation team.



**APPENDIX I**

**CLASSROOM OBSERVATION AND WALKTHROUGH  
OBSERVATION GUIDE**



## Classroom and Observation Guide

### *Purpose of observations:*

These observations will 1) document what happened during class; 2) record the content delivered and discussed; and 3) note any displays related to the SAC training; 4) log any references to UPOs – related elements (i.e., “I Can” Statements, Assessments, Standards); 5) detail modest data regarding participants’ responses to and engagements with the project and each other.

### *What to observe – descriptive information:*

- Physical setting—a rich description of the time and place of the class, including where participants were situated and any displays of SAC or ILS related materials.
- Social or interpersonal setting—who was sitting or clustered with whom and how groups and individuals were arrayed in this context.
- Activities—a systematic description of the activities with timeframes.
- Content—a description of the SAC resources and ILS used and discussed during the trainings and meetings.
- Interactions—a description of verbal and nonverbal interactions between the various stakeholders involved with the observations (i.e., the teachers and the students, the students with their peers, etc.).

### *Main theme to observe, as possible:*

- How are SAC concepts and materials being used in this context?
- Are the ILS being used in conjunction with SAC? In what way?

Documentation of the observation will include written notes and, in some cases, photographs of the general space.



**APPENDIX J**  
**ILS TEACHER SURVEY**



**SURVEY FOR EVALUATING THE  
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ILLINOIS LEARNING STANDARDS  
TEACHER EDITION (v1.1)**

**DISTRICT****SCHOOL**

This survey explores the extent to which teachers and administrators are implementing the Illinois Learning Standards (ILS). The Standards were adopted and distributed by the Illinois State Board of Education during the 1997–98 school year. They include:

1. State Goals for Learning in seven learning areas (English & Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, Social Studies, Physical Development & Health, Fine Arts, and Foreign Languages).
2. Learning Standards for each of the State Goals.
3. Learning Benchmarks, which define progress at five developmental levels (early elementary, late elementary, middle or junior high, early high, and late high school) for each Standard.
4. Performance Descriptors ([www.isbe.net/ils/html/descriptors.htm](http://www.isbe.net/ils/html/descriptors.htm)). These resources are intended to help teachers align their curricula to the Standards and to help students meet performance expectations at ten stages of educational development.
5. Assessment Frameworks (<http://www.isbe.net/assessment/IAFIndex.htm>). These documents define the content that will be assessed on the Illinois Standards Achievement Test (ISAT) and Prairie State Achievement Exam (PSAE) beginning with the 2005–2006 school year.

This survey will be used to derive: 1) the extent to which the ILS are being implemented, 2) effective strategies for implementation, 3) factors that inhibit or facilitate implementation, and 4) the relation between implementation and student achievement as measured by ISAT and PSAE.

You have been randomly selected to participate in this survey, which should take approximately 25 minutes to complete. Your superintendent has given permission for your district to participate. Your participation in this project is completely voluntary, and you are free to withdraw at any time and for any reason without penalty. You are also free to decline to answer any questions. The results of the individual surveys will be kept strictly confidential, and your name will never be associated with the survey results. A general summary of the results will be sent to the Illinois State Board of Education for use at the state level. A summary of school results that strictly maintains teacher confidentiality will be sent to principals.

If you have questions or need forms, please contact Lizanne DeStefano ([destefan@uiuc.edu](mailto:destefan@uiuc.edu)), Victoria Hammer ([vhammer@uiuc.edu](mailto:vhammer@uiuc.edu)), or Holly Downs ([hadows@uiuc.edu](mailto:hadows@uiuc.edu)) at the University of Illinois (217-244-7348). Thank you for your cooperation.

**FOR SCHOOL ID PURPOSES, PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE THIS PAGE.**

**DO NOT XEROX**

**THANK YOU**



### Teacher Demographics

Your answers to the following questions will support our analysis of the ILS implementation process. Your responses are completely confidential. Please fill in the appropriate circle(s). Like this: ● NOT like this: ⊗ ⊙ ⊖ Using a pen works well (or dark pencil marks).

TD0. How many years of teaching experience do you have? ⓪

	①	①
<u>Examples</u>	②	②
For 10 yrs, fill in '1' in the left-hand column & '0' in the right-hand column	③	③
For 2 yrs, fill in '2' in the right-hand column	④	④
	⑤	⑤
		⑥
		⑦
		⑧
		⑨

TD1. What is the highest level of education you have attained? Please fill in only one circle.

Bachelor's Degree		⓪
Bachelor's Degree, plus		⓪
Master's Degree		⓪
Master's Degree, plus		⓪
Ed.D. or Ph.D.		⓪

TD2. What grade level(s) do you presently teach?

Pre-K	⓪	1	⓪	4	⓪	7	⓪	10	⓪
K	⓪	2	⓪	5	⓪	8	⓪	11	⓪
		3	⓪	6	⓪	9	⓪	12	⓪



TD3. My primary teaching assignment(s) for this year is (are):

- |                                 |                       |                                    |                       |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| General Elementary School class | <input type="radio"/> | Special Education                  | <input type="radio"/> |
| English/Language Arts           | <input type="radio"/> | Early Childhood                    | <input type="radio"/> |
| Mathematics                     | <input type="radio"/> | English Language Learner/Bilingual | <input type="radio"/> |
| Science                         | <input type="radio"/> | Title I                            | <input type="radio"/> |
| Social Studies                  | <input type="radio"/> | Other                              | <input type="radio"/> |

If your teaching assignment is "Other," please specify.

**NOTE: Please make sure your responses are inside the box so the scanner can read them.**

TD4. Is (are) your primary teaching assignment(s) in an area where you hold certification? yes   
no

TD5. Have you participated in the Standards-Aligned Classroom Training? yes   
no

If yes, when did you attend the training (mo. & yr.)?

- |     |                       |      |                       |     |                       |      |                       |      |                       |
|-----|-----------------------|------|-----------------------|-----|-----------------------|------|-----------------------|------|-----------------------|
| Jan | <input type="radio"/> | May  | <input type="radio"/> | Sep | <input type="radio"/> | 2000 | <input type="radio"/> | 2004 | <input type="radio"/> |
| Feb | <input type="radio"/> | June | <input type="radio"/> | Oct | <input type="radio"/> | 2001 | <input type="radio"/> | 2005 | <input type="radio"/> |
| Mar | <input type="radio"/> | July | <input type="radio"/> | Nov | <input type="radio"/> | 2002 | <input type="radio"/> | 2006 | <input type="radio"/> |
| Apr | <input type="radio"/> | Aug  | <input type="radio"/> | Dec | <input type="radio"/> | 2003 | <input type="radio"/> |      |                       |

TD6. If it were available, would you complete this survey online? yes   
no



**Part I: Teaching Method, Curriculum, Assessment, and Teacher Responses to ILS**

For each of the following statements, please fill in the circle that best represents your answer.

	Not at all		To some extent		A great deal
1. I have heard of the Illinois Learning Standards (ILS).	①	②	③	④	⑤
2. I have read the ILS subject content for my primary teaching assignment(s).	①	②	③	④	⑤
3. I am involved in our curriculum alignment efforts.	①	②	③	④	⑤
4. I consider the ILS when selecting curriculum materials for my classroom.	①	②	③	④	⑤
5. I have made changes in the way I teach as a result of implementing the ILS.	①	②	③	④	⑤
6. I have made changes in the way I test students as a result of implementing the ILS.	①	②	③	④	⑤
7. I have made changes in the way I evaluate students' overall performance as a result of implementing the ILS.	①	②	③	④	⑤
8. I have made changes in the materials I use as a result of implementing the ILS.	①	②	③	④	⑤
9. I have made changes in the way I give feedback to students as a result of implementing the ILS.	①	②	③	④	⑤
10. I have made changes in the way I give feedback to parents as a result of implementing the ILS.	①	②	③	④	⑤
11. I have eliminated activities and units previously taught in the classroom because they are not aligned with the ILS.	①	②	③	④	⑤
12. All grade-level/content area curriculums are aligned with ILS.	①	②	③	④	⑤
13. I have materials that help me implement the ILS in the classroom.	①	②	③	④	⑤
14. Aligning the curriculum to the ILS has changed the instructional materials I use in the classroom.	①	②	③	④	⑤
15. My students are aware of the expectations of the ILS for the subjects and classes I teach.	①	②	③	④	⑤
16. I have reduced the redundancy within the curriculum as a result of implementing the ILS.	①	②	③	④	⑤
17. I consider the ILS when grading the students.	①	②	③	④	⑤
18. I consider the ILS when developing classroom assessments.	①	②	③	④	⑤
19. The ILS have caused me to change teaching methods.	①	②	③	④	⑤



<b>Part I: continued</b>	Not at all		To some extent		A great deal
20. I believe the ILS promote a higher level of student learning than previous State Goals for Learning.	①	②	③	④	⑤
21. I consider the ILS when choosing teaching methods.	①	②	③	④	⑤
22. I use a greater variety of teaching methods as a result of implementing the ILS.	①	②	③	④	⑤
23. I align my class lessons with the ILS.	①	②	③	④	⑤
24. I am in agreement with the content of the ILS for my primary teaching assignment(s).	①	②	③	④	⑤
25. I discuss the ILS at parent-teacher meetings and conferences.	①	②	③	④	⑤
26. I am more confident in teaching as a result of implementing the ILS.	①	②	③	④	⑤
27. I am eager to implement the ILS in my classroom.	①	②	③	④	⑤
28. I take every advantage to learn more about the use of the ILS.	①	②	③	④	⑤
29. I have personal goals for implementing the ILS in my school/district.	①	②	③	④	⑤
30. I have been involved in implementing the ILS in my school/district.	①	②	③	④	⑤
31. I believe that implementing the ILS has had a positive effect on the teaching and learning at my school.	①	②	③	④	⑤
32. I am satisfied with the content of the ILS for the grade levels and subjects I teach.	①	②	③	④	⑤
33. I use data from the following sources to make instructional decisions in my classroom.					
a. Classroom work	①	②	③	④	⑤
b. Classroom tests	①	②	③	④	⑤
c. District-developed tests	①	②	③	④	⑤
d. Standardized tests (not including state testing)	①	②	③	④	⑤
e. ISAT tests	①	②	③	④	⑤
f. PSAE tests	①	②	③	④	⑤
g. Illinois Alternate Assessment (IAA) tests	①	②	③	④	⑤
h. Illinois Measure of Annual Growth in English (IMAGE) tests	①	②	③	④	⑤



<b>Part I: continued</b>	Not at all		To some extent		A great deal
i. Student input	①	②	③	④	⑤
j. Parental input	①	②	③	④	⑤
k. Other:	①	②	③	④	⑤
34. I use the ILS to develop IEPs for students in Special Education.	①	②	③	④	⑤
35. The ILS are relevant for instructors of students who are in Special Education.	①	②	③	④	⑤
36. The ILS are relevant for instructors of students who are English language learners (ELL).	①	②	③	④	⑤
37. I use available technology to help me integrate the ILS into my classroom (e.g., Internet, PowerPoint, etc.).	①	②	③	④	⑤
38. I use available technology to help me monitor and manage the ILS in my classroom (i.e., performance reporting and data management).	①	②	③	④	⑤
39. I am aware of the Illinois Assessment Frameworks.	①	②	③	④	⑤
40. I use the Illinois Assessment Frameworks to inform instructional planning.	①	②	③	④	⑤

**Part II: School Environment**

	Not at all		To some extent		A great deal	Do not know
41. At my school, the ILS influence decision making about how we teach.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
42. Our school improvement plan is aligned with the ILS.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
43. ILS are discussed at faculty meetings.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
44. My school is making progress in its efforts to implement the ILS.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
45. ILS are used as one dimension of our teacher evaluation plan.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
46. Our district curriculum is aligned to the ILS.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
47. Data from the ISAT/PSAE/IMAGE/IAA testing and the School Report Card are used to make school improvement decisions at my school.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○



<b>Part II: continued</b>	Not at all		To some extent		A great deal	Do not know
48. My school is stalled in efforts to implement the ILS.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
49. The teachers at my school have been directed to align their curriculum content area to the ILS.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
50. My students are more prepared for the ISAT/PSAE as a result of implementing the ILS.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
51. <b>If you teach students who participate in the IAA:</b> My students are more prepared for the IAA as a result of implementing the ILS.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
52. <b>If you teach students who participate in the IMAGE:</b> My students are more prepared for the IMAGE as a result of implementing the ILS.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
53. Our school uses a standards-based report card.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
54. Student report cards reference the ILS when reporting performance information to parents.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
55. My school has seen increases in student achievement as a result of implementing the ILS.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
56. Parents are aware of the expectations of the ILS for their child's performance.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
57. There are in-service opportunities on the content and use of the ILS at my school.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
58. Faculty meetings are used to discuss implementation of the ILS.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
59. My school concentrates on creating a vision and defining goals for student learning.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
60. My school uses measurable feedback to track student progress toward learning outcomes.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
61. My school reflects on where we are now compared to our vision and student learning goals.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
62. My school has determined what actions are needed to reach our vision and student learning goals.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
63. My school is implementing the actions needed to reach our vision and student learning goals.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
64. My school continuously scans the environment for change (community, legislation, educational trends).	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
65. Our principal considers the use of the ILS in personnel evaluations.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
66. My school/district has a timeline for implementing the ILS.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○



**Part III: School/District Environment and Community Awareness**

	Not at all		To some extent		A great deal	Do not know
67. Faculty at my school/district know the timeline for implementing the ILS.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
68. My school/district has a committee for implementing the ILS.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
69. My district is making progress in its efforts to implement the ILS.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
70. Results from ISAT/PSAE/IMAGE/IAA testing and the School Report Card are used at the district level to plan and make policy and administrative decisions.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
71. The implementation of the ILS affects funding for instructional materials in my school.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
72. Our locally selected standardized testing instruments are consistent with the ILS.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
73. Our district has seen increases in student achievement as a result of implementing the ILS.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
74. My school/district requires all teachers to receive training in the use of the ILS.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
75. Parents have been involved in aligning the curriculum to the ILS.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
76. Information sessions on the ILS have been offered to parents and community members at the school/district level.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
77. Training sessions about the ILS are provided for parents and community members in my school.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
78. Our school/district newsletter to parents contains details about the ILS.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
79. Our school/district website contains details about the ILS.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
80. Information sessions on the ILS have been offered to parents and community members at the district level.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
81. The ILS have changed parents' expectations of classroom activities.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
82. The ILS have changed parents' expectations of student learning.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
83. Our school board is involved in implementing the ILS.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
84. Our school board makes decisions for educational policy based on the ILS.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○



<b>Part III: continued</b>	Not at all		To some extent		A great deal	Do not know
85. Our school board has allocated resources to implement the ILS.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
86. Members of the business community are involved in implementing the ILS.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
87. Implementation of the ILS has changed the community's expectations of student performance.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
88. Our district is stalled in its efforts to implement the ILS.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
89. Our school has developed a plan to disseminate the ILS, Performance Descriptors, and the Illinois Assessment Frameworks materials to parents.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○

**Part IV: Professional Development and Support Resources**

	Yes	No	Do not know
90. ILS in-services/professional development activities are available in my area through:			
a. State-sponsored workshops	Ⓨ	Ⓝ	○
b. The Regional Office of Education (ROE)/Intermediate Service Center (ISC)/Educational Service Center (ESC)	Ⓨ	Ⓝ	○
c. District-sponsored in-services	Ⓨ	Ⓝ	○
d. School-sponsored in-services	Ⓨ	Ⓝ	○
e. Outside consultants	Ⓨ	Ⓝ	○
f. College or University Coursework	Ⓨ	Ⓝ	○
g. Other in-house staff/faculty presentations (during staff meetings, planning time, etc.)	Ⓨ	Ⓝ	○
h. Online courses and resources	Ⓨ	Ⓝ	○
i. Ongoing Learning Teams (e.g., grade-level teams, professional book discussion groups, etc.)	Ⓨ	Ⓝ	○
j. District mentoring programs	Ⓨ	Ⓝ	○
k. One-day workshops	Ⓨ	Ⓝ	○
l. Professional conferences (e.g., Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, National Middle School Association, etc.)	Ⓨ	Ⓝ	○



<b>Part IV: continued</b>	Yes	No	Do not know
m. Content area professional organizations (e.g., National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, National Council of Teachers of English, Illinois Reading Council, etc.)	Y	N	O
n. School Improvement (SIP) days	Y	N	O
o. Standards-Aligned Classroom (SAC) training	Y	N	O
91. I have participated in ILS in-services/professional development activities through:			
a. State-sponsored workshops	Y	N	O
b. My Regional Office of Education (ROE)/Intermediate Service Center (ISC)/Educational Service Center (ESC)	Y	N	O
c. District-sponsored in-services	Y	N	O
d. School-sponsored in-services	Y	N	O
e. Outside consultants	Y	N	O
f. College or university coursework	Y	N	O
g. Other in-house staff/faculty presentations (during staff meetings, planning time, etc.)	Y	N	O
h. Online courses and resources	Y	N	O
i. Ongoing Learning Teams (e.g., grade-level teams, professional book discussion groups, etc.)	Y	N	O
j. District mentoring programs	Y	N	O
k. One-day workshops	Y	N	O
l. Professional conferences (e.g., Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, National Middle School Association, etc.)	Y	N	O
m. Content area professional organizations (e.g., National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, National Council of Teachers of English, Illinois Reading Council, etc.)	Y	N	O
n. School Improvement (SIP) days	Y	N	O
o. Standards-Aligned Classroom (SAC) training	Y	N	O



Part IV: continued	Not at all		To some extent		A great deal	Do not know
92. In general, the above professional development includes information on using the Illinois Assessment Frameworks and assessment data to improve curriculum and instruction.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○

93. List any other sources of available in-service/professional development activities relevant to ILS implementation. **NOTE: Please make sure your responses stay inside the box so the scanner can read them.**

--

94. Please indicate the degree to which these activities are occurring in your school and district <b>as a result of ILS implementation:</b>	Not considering this change	Considering this change	Currently making this change	Already made this change	Do not know
a. Increasing teacher planning time	①	②	③	④	○
b. Adopting block scheduling	①	②	③	④	○
c. Aligning the curriculum with the ILS	①	②	③	④	○
d. Increasing summer school options	①	②	③	④	○
e. Adopting/expanding after-school tutoring	①	②	③	④	○
f. Adding transition grades	①	②	③	④	○
g. Changing to a balanced calendar (year round)	①	②	③	④	○
h. Reducing class sizes	①	②	③	④	○
i. Lengthening the school day	①	②	③	④	○
j. Lengthening the school year	①	②	③	④	○
k. Changing the way we report school performance	①	②	③	④	○
l. Increasing standardized testing	①	②	③	④	○



<b>Part IV: continued</b>	Not considering this change	Considering this change	Currently making this change	Already made this change	Do not know
m. Revising personnel responsibilities	①	②	③	④	○
n. Multi-age classrooms	①	②	③	④	○
o. Grade-level looping	①	②	③	④	○
p. Professional book discussion/lesson study groups	①	②	③	④	○
q. Teacher mentoring programs	①	②	③	④	○
r. Peer coaching	①	②	③	④	○
s. Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) meetings	①	②	③	④	○

95. List any other changes that you have made in response to implementation of ILS.

	Not at all		To some extent		A great deal	Do not know
96. The professional development provided by my district addressed my needs and questions regarding the ILS.	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
97. To what extent have you used the following resources:	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
a. Rubrics for a Standards Implementation System	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
b. Performance Descriptors, Classroom Assessments, and Student Exemplars	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
c. The Illinois Assessment Frameworks	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
d. World-class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) English Language Proficiency Standards for English Language Learners	①	②	③	④	⑤	○



<b>Part IV: continued</b>	Not at all		To some extent		A great deal	Do not know
e. Social and Emotional Learning Standards	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
f. Illinois Early Learning Standards	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
g. Illinois Birth-to-3 Program Standards	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
h. Standards-Aligned Classroom Training	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
i. Distributed Occupational Skills Standards	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
98. I have accessed the above resources by the following means: (Fill in all that apply)						
a. Hard copies provided by my school administration						○
b. Hard copies from an in-service/professional development activity						○
c. Hard copies from the Illinois State Board of Education						○
d. CDs from the Illinois State Board of Education						○
e. Electronically via the Illinois State Board of Education website						○
99. In-services/professional development activities related to ILS were offered to:						
	Not at all		To some extent		A great deal	Do not know
a. Teachers	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
b. Aides	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
c. Personnel for special services	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
d. Title I personnel	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
e. Special Education teachers	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
f. Bilingual teachers	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
g. Administrators	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
h. Other	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
i. Parents and families	①	②	③	④	⑤	○
j. Community businesses	①	②	③	④	⑤	○



**NOTE: Please make sure your responses stay inside the box so the scanner can read them.**

100. What are considered best practices at your school regarding the implementation of the ILS?

101. What are some of the barriers to implementing the ILS in your school/district?



102. What are some of the supports for implementing the ILS in your school/district?

103. Please use the space below to discuss other issues and additional information about the ILS within your school or your district

**Thank you for completing this survey.**



