The Academic Facilitators (AF) program, as well as the Campus Instructional Coaches (CIC) received Title I and general operation funding during this school year.

The Academic Facilitators program budget consisted of Title I and general operation funds designated as payroll costs. Budget information is found in Table 1.

**Table 1. Budget for Instructional Coaches Program, 2012-2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Source and Code</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>2012-13</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Facilitators (6100)</td>
<td>8,070,216</td>
<td>5,271,665</td>
<td>4,658,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CICs Stipend (6100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>824,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>8,070,216</td>
<td>5,271,665</td>
<td>5,483,099</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**At-a-Glance**

The Academic Facilitators (AF) program, as well as the Campus Instructional Coaches (CIC) received Title I and general operation funding during this school year.

**Development**: Professional development included co-planning professional development and co-facilitating professional development with CICs. **Support Planning**: This aspect referred to helping CICs and teachers in lesson planning and included support planning, monitoring support plan, and helping access additional resources for instruction. **Data Driven Instruction**: The FAs provided support to CICs in assessment development, data conversations and analysis, instructional technology support, identifying target areas based on data analysis, and other content specific support. **Other Duties**: these refer to any other duties necessary to support instruction.

AFs and CICs kept records of their activities during the year. Records reflected the number of hours spent in each component. AFs summary of the days they spent at schools by six-week periods were presented in Figures 1 and 2. The number of days AFs devoted to schools varied according to division and school needs. Divisions 1 and 2 AFs seemed to work more intensely during the first two six-week periods and recorded lower number of days during the rest of the year. Divisions 3, 4, and 5 appeared to have a more even spread of days during the school year.

**Figure 1**: Summary of Days at Schools of AFs by Six Weeks Period Division 1.

**Figure 2**: Summary of Days at Schools of AFs by Six Weeks Period Division 3.

In the current school year, 2013-14, the program has the following main aspects: **Coaching**: refers to the process in which the AFs participated in the instruction by performing classroom observations with the CICs to advise teachers about instructional techniques. This aspect of the program also included observing the coach coaching. The Coaching aspect also required observing the coach providing professional development. **Teacher Teams**: AFs worked with CICs who in turn worked with teachers to form teams. Sometimes, depending on the characteristics of the teachers and the student population in a school, teachers participated in co-teaching. AFs also supported CICs in meeting facilitation, team planning and monitoring team effectiveness when they interacted with teachers in their schools. **Professional Development**: Professional development included co-planning professional development and co-facilitating professional development with CICs. **Support Planning**: This aspect referred to helping CICs and teachers in lesson planning and included support planning, monitoring support plan, and helping access additional resources for instruction. **Data Driven Instruction**: The FAs provided support to CICs in assessment development, data conversations and analysis, instructional technology support, identifying target areas based on data analysis, and other content specific support. **Other Duties**: these refer to any other duties necessary to support instruction.
When Academics Facilitators (AFs) efforts were observed by component of the program it was clear the largest number of hours in all five divisions was Professional Development.

![Figure 3. Summary of Yearly Days by Program Component](image)

This evaluation attempted to tease out the effects of various components of the Academic Facilitators program on student achievement. The difficulty with this approach was in determining the effect that Academic Facilitators had on Campus Instructional Coaches, who in turn coached the classroom teachers and who then had an effect on the students’ performance. Standardized coefficients were used to allow for the direct comparison of effect size for each component of the program on the student scores in the different content areas for STAAR and STAAR EOC testing. The five major components of the program included Coaching, Data Driven Instruction, Instructional Technology, Professional Development, and Teacher Teams. Comparisons were made to determine the contribution of each component to the students 2013-14 STAAR performance, based on the size of the coefficient. It is important to highlight that statistically significant standardized coefficients were due in part to large sample sizes, and that all coefficients presented were significant. Also, the adjusted $R^2$ which indicates the amount of variance in the STAAR test scores attributed to that component of the program was very small. Due to these factors conclusions about the effects of the various program components on student achievement could not be made.

It was found that different components of the Academic Facilitators program can have both positive and negative effects. This was apparent when comparisons were made across divisions. Since the same component had greater or lesser effects on student achievement by division, one is led to conclude that the program varied greatly by division and in some cases by grade level.

For STAAR EOC results indicated that Coaching had positive effects on English I, English II and US History, but had negative effects on Algebra I. Data Driven Instruction had negative effects on English I and English II but positive effects on Algebra I. Instructional Technology appears to affect Algebra I only.

The overall Title I report presents results for STAAR and STAAR EOC. It is clear that, in general, the percentage of students in grades 3-8 meeting Satisfactory level on the reading portion of STAAR decreased in 2013-14, while mathematics increased.

The program goal of increasing scores in reading, mathematics and writing by a minimum of 5% was not met. In all fairness, the district mirrored the State performance on STAAR with a few exceptions. This could explain why the AFs program appeared to have very little impact on students’ achievement.

**Summary**

The program was implemented following new guidelines during 2013-14. A new structure and reporting line was created to serve teachers. The CICs were added to the process and the AFs were removed from the direct contact with the teachers. The campus leadership was in charge of overseeing and coordinating the work of AFs and CICs. Academic Facilitators performed more of a support role to the coaches than to teachers, as opposed to what had been done in previous years. Multiple regression analysis showed the effects of the different program aspects on student achievement. In most cases, for STAAR grades 3 through 8, the effects were small and varied by division. The size of the Adjusted $R^2$ makes it difficult to discern a clear pattern of effects.

**Recommendations**

Better supervision should be applied to the record keeping process. It is recommended to maintain accurate records of all activities and record relevant information for a proper program evaluation.

There is a disconnection between AFs and CICs in information record keeping. Furthermore, according to AFs, it is expected that in 2014-15 each division will put into practice a different version of the program. This situation will create even more disarray in its implementation eliminating standardization and comparability.

Uniformity and fidelity of implementation are keystones for the success of any program. This case is not an exception and it is important that the guidelines of the program design are followed. The district should consider defining standard guidelines to maintain uniformity of the role of AFs and CICs as well as the goals of the program.

Additional information may be obtained by consulting the Instructional Coaching Program report, EA14-526-2, which can be found at [http://www.dallasisd.org/Page/888](http://www.dallasisd.org/Page/888).