

**SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED  
SCHOOL DISTRICT**

---

Program Evaluation &  
Research Unit

Evaluation  
Report

**National  
Urban  
Alliance**

2009-2010

*Aimée Tabor, Program Evaluator*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>3</b>
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS .....	3
<b>PROGRAM DESIGN .....</b>	<b>5</b>
PROGRAM DESCRIPTION .....	5
PROGRAM OBJECTIVES .....	5
PROGRAM STRATEGIES, RESOURCES AND ACTIVITIES .....	6
<b>EVALUATION DESIGN .....</b>	<b>7</b>
EVALUATION METHODOLOGY .....	7
EVALUATION OBJECTIVES .....	7
DATA COLLECTION METHODS .....	8
DATA ANALYSIS .....	9
<b>EVALUATION FINDINGS .....</b>	<b>9</b>
LIMITATIONS OF THE DATA .....	25
<b>SUGGESTIONS TO CONSIDER FOR CONTINUAL IMPROVEMENT .....</b>	<b>26</b>
HOW CAN THE PROGRAM BE IMPROVED? .....	26
<b>REFERENCES .....</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>APPENDIX .....</b>	<b>28</b>

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

---

In this *National Urban Alliance* evaluation report, there are three guiding questions: to what extent has teacher professional development had an impact teacher behavior and practice, what has been the impact of NUA professional development on outcomes for targeted student populations and what structures and systems have been incorporated by the district to transfer program skills or to build district capacity on NUA strategies. These guiding questions were used to frame the evaluation design and make sense of the evaluation findings.

### SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

- Attendance at professional development sessions and observations revealed that NUA consistently modeled positive, culturally relevant, research-based pedagogical techniques and strategies, which aimed to teach teachers how to help students facilitate their own learning and instill higher-order/critical thinking skills.
- Self-reported interview data suggests that teachers at the elementary level were quite consistent with strategy use. They self-reported using NUA strategies almost daily. Teachers at the high school level were not consistent. They self-reported using an NUA strategy about once a week.
- SFUSD Teachers used the following NUA strategies most frequently: phonics hopscotch, synonym triplets, dancing definitions, essential summaries, taxonomies, graphic organizers, and key word notes
- Workshop surveys and interviews revealed that principals and teachers were positive about NUA. Teachers felt that their work with NUA made them more thoughtful teachers. Many said they were reminded to keep all students in mind when planning lessons. Some teachers felt that NUA allowed them to make connections within their building outside of their department.
- Based on analysis of student participation by teacher, students impacted by the achievement gap were not impacted by NUA as outlined in the LEA plan.
- CST scores revealed that NUA students under-performed district students by 2.6% in English Language Arts and by 4.33% in Mathematics on the California Standards Test. This was true for targeted student populations as well.
- Qualitative analysis revealed that NUA had no impact on student GPA outcomes. The district experienced an increase in GPA of .032 while NUA students experienced an increase of .042. The difference of .01 is not significant enough to show program impact. Individual school outcomes were mixed and no better than chance. NUA professional development had no impact on student GPA outcomes.

## KEY RECOMMENDATIONS

- *Structured Common Planning Time:* Best practice schools used common planning time or created shared time to plan NUA strategy usage. This practice should apply to all NUA Schools.
- *NUA needs to help some teachers with scaffolds:* SFUSD teachers are in different places professionally. Some need more help to implement practices in their classrooms. In the coming year NUA may want to address this issue.
- *The use of Subs should be reconsidered:* SFUSD teachers do not like to be pulled out of their classrooms. They are dedicated and loyal to the point of not wanting professional development. This issue arose repeatedly from 8 out of 10 schools.
- *District Plan:* Currently, there is no district plan for implementation of NUA strategies at schools district-wide. Additionally there is not plan for continued support of NUA schools once NUA leaves the district.

## **PROGRAM DESIGN**

---

### **PROGRAM DESCRIPTION**

San Francisco Unified School District (district) is in Program Improvement Year 3+ because of the disparity between the highest performing students and targeted populations of underperforming students. As set out in the LEA plan, specific actions must be taken to close the achievement gap in the district. One area identified in the plan is the need to better prepare teachers and administrators for the needs of students not meeting AYP in an urban school district. Target district populations include African Americans, Latinos, Samoans, English Language Learners, and Special Education Students.

Interviews with staff at Academics & Professional Development stated that they felt NUA was needed and the best option for the district because of their belief that effective professional development for urban students could not be delivered centrally. APD staff felt that quality professional development was needed at the teacher level first because teachers have the greatest impact on student outcomes. The district chose to use some Title 1 funds to address this issue of urban education professional development. The National Urban Alliance was selected to address urban education professional development because of their focus on the whole school and their experience with districts in urban areas.

The mission of the National Urban Alliance, NUA, is to foster cultural change in urban public schools, instilling the belief in the capacity of all children to reach the highest levels of learning & critical thinking. NUA staff plan with school districts to provide ongoing professional development activities for teachers and administrators to improve classroom instruction, and to improve how school communities are organized for sustained achievement.

### **PROGRAM OBJECTIVES**

The *National Urban Alliance* was brought into the San Francisco Unified School District:

1. To provide professional development for teachers and administrators in order to better address the needs of targeted student populations in an urban school setting.
2. To provide literacy and mathematics coaching and support.
3. To provide services and support to Program Improvement Schools.

### **PROGRAM STRATEGIES, RESOURCES AND ACTIVITIES**

The theory that underlies the NUA model specifies that the primary unit of change or most important relationship within the school is between the teacher and the student. The teacher's personal and professional values and practices have the greatest impact on a student's sense of personal efficacy, engagement, and success in school (Midgley Et. al., 1989 & Fang 1996). The value system/cultural climate predict expectations for student

achievement (Fang, 1996 & Crosnoe Et al., 2004). This theory is heavily impacted by the work of critical theorists and critical pedagogues such as Paulo Freire (1970), Antonia Darder (1991), and Bell Hooks (1994). In this spirit, NUA works primarily with teachers, through professional development, to give them research based tools and practices that will help them improve the outcomes for targeted student populations. Strategies include: providing teachers specific time to focus on and talk about instruction, a habit of high functioning learning communities (McLaughlin & Talbert, 2006); aiding teachers to develop stronger learning communities through relationships (McLaughlin & Talbert, 2006); and focusing teacher attention on specific tools that impact target populations such as reciprocal teaching, metacognition, neuroscience, background knowledge, etc (City Et. al., 2009). *Please See Appendix for a Fuller List of Strategies & Tools.*

The program strategies of the *National Urban Alliance (NUA)* for teachers and administrators in the San Francisco Unified School District serve to address and support:

*Needs of Target Student Populations.* The first focus is to provide professional development that will give teachers tools to address the needs of African Americans, Latinos, Samoans, English Language Learners, and students receiving Special Education.

*Professional Development, Mentoring, & Coaching.* To provide high quality professional development, mentoring, and coaching for teachers as they attempt new strategies. And, to provide research-based, proven strategies and tools that will address the needs of district teachers and students.

*Teacher-Student Relationship.* In the NUA model, the most important relationship is between student and teacher. NUA believes that, “No significant learning can occur without a significant relationship of mutual respect, teacher to student.” James Comer

The National Urban Alliance, NUA, offers the following services and activities to support the aforementioned areas. At the beginning of the contract, NUA meets with district officials to determine what issues the target schools are facing and what types of professional development is needed. NUA then sends a team to conduct interviews with each school site principal and does classroom observations at each proposed site. At least one-third of a school’s teachers must be willing to participate in the NUA process before a school will be accepted. Based on interviews and walk-throughs, each school receives an instructional assessment. The instructional assessment addresses the following: instruction, school climate, and data use. After the Instructional Assessment, an NUA team creates a unique plan for each school site. They also create a district plan based on what they have seen at all school sites. Based on school instructional assessments, school mentors may demonstrate lessons, provide workshops, and coach instructional staff to accelerate student learning based on school site needs. Based on the district instructional assessment, large group workshops are held with all participating staff to address wider district level issues.

# EVALUATION DESIGN

---

## EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

At SFUSD, the Program Evaluation and Research Office employs an approach to evaluation that is participatory (Cousins & Earl, 1992), utilization-focused (Patton, 1986, 1994), and integrated with processes of continuous improvement and program planning (Fetterman, Kaftarian & Wandersman, 1996). Our approach is based on the idea that participation of program directors and coordinators in the evaluation process is key to insuring that program planners and managers use evaluation data to support decision-making. The involvement of program directors and coordinators has the potential to encourage program staff to think more systematically about the relationship between program activities and objectives. Such systematic reflection would be aimed at building a “culture of learning” (Patton, 1997, p. 147) to lead to continuous program improvement.

Evaluations are designed to address both program implementation (formative evaluation) and outcomes (summative evaluation) and are question-driven. Evaluators and program staff collaborate to develop evaluation questions that are linked to the program objectives and activities, and to the interests of all program stakeholders. In addition, research on the best practices in the project’s domain of activity informs the evaluation framework. The evaluation design involves a mix of qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis methods, such as surveys, open-ended response questions and one-on-one interviews. Each evaluation design involves the triangulation of multiple sources of data brought to bear on crucial evaluation questions.

## EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

The design of this evaluation examines the program objectives, which are: to provide professional development that will give teachers tools to address the needs of target SFUSD populations, to provide mentoring, and coaching for teachers as they attempt new strategies, and to provide teachers with ways to build stronger relationships with students and one another.

Using these objectives as the guide, the evaluation is designed to address the following sets of questions:

1. What has been the impact of NUA professional development on teacher behavior and practice?
2. To what extent has teacher professional development had an impact on outcomes for targeted student populations?
3. What structures and systems have been incorporated by the district to transfer program skills or build district capacity on NUA strategies?

## DATA COLLECTION METHODS

To assess the success of the implementation and impact of the *National Urban Alliance*, the following data collection methods were used: (1) Classroom Observations (2) Workshop Observations (3) Interviews (4) Surveys (5) document review (6) Quantitative Student Data including: GPA and CST.

- *Classroom Observations*

Classroom Observations were conducted March through May of the 2009-2010 school year. Observations were used to determine if teachers were using NUA strategies, the fidelity to which they were using NUA strategies, and student receptiveness to NUA strategies.

- *Workshop Observations*

The program evaluator attended all five large group workshops, principal workshops, and 1 coaches workshop. The goal of attendance was to understand what teachers were learning in the workshops, and, to determine ease of applicability and receptiveness based on teacher participation.

- *Interviews with Administrators & Teachers*

Interviews were conducted with school principals at the beginning of the year to get an understanding of their goals for the year and how NUA would impact those goals. Follow-up interviews were conducted at the end of the year to see how well the year went based on previously stated goals. Interviews were conducted with teachers at the end of the year. The questions focused on self report of usage, supports needed for usage, and suggestions for best practices and changes.

- *Surveys*

Several surveys were used during the course of the year to address formative and summative elements. Mid-year surveys were distributed to principals in December to collect on-going feedback from them. Teacher workshop surveys were reviewed after the large group workshops to determine teacher on-going feedback. School Satisfaction Surveys developed by the district were used to determine changes in student perceptions.

- *Review of Program Documents*

Program documents were reviewed to gain a more detailed understanding of the preparation and continued professional development of teachers. Documents included agendas, articles, teaching strategies, rubrics, charts, hand-outs and sign-in sheets. In addition, the program evaluator read all the books in the suggested reading bags for all teachers in the program.

- *Student Qualitative Data*

Students who were rostered to teachers in NUA Teachers were identified by student ID/HO Number. Based on these numbers, the program evaluator can link to district databases to review student GPA, CST scores, attendance, suspension, and formative assessments (if available).

## DATA ANALYSIS

Each aspect of the evaluation design provides information for triangulation. The data from the survey statements were analyzed using descriptive analyses. Survey questions with the Likert scale were analyzed based on means of responses with 1= strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3= agree, and 4=strongly agree. With the gathered qualitative data, the open-ended questions and interviews provide information applied to informing the reliability and validity of the National Urban Alliance program evaluation. All quantitative analyses were performed on SPSS 18.0.

## EVALUATION FINDINGS

---

This section of the report is organized around the findings of the *National Urban Alliance* evaluation. Guided by the following questions: 1) What has been the impact of NUA professional development on teacher behavior and practice? 2) To what extent has teacher professional development had an impact on outcomes for targeted student populations? 3) What structures and systems have been incorporated by the district to transfer program skills or build district capacity on NUA strategies?

### NUA IMPACT ON TEACHER PRACTICE

#### Teacher Participation

One hundred and thirty-eight SFUSD school site teaching staff participated in at least one NUA workshop. These teachers were at ten schools within the district: Glen Park ES, Jose Ortega ES, Sheridan ES, Willie Brown Alt, Visitacion Valley MS, Independence HS, International Studies Academy HS, Raoul Wallenberg HS, George Washington HS, and Ida B Wells Cont. The majority of teachers participating were from Washington High School and Visitacion Valley Middle School.

The NUA model works to train 1/3<sup>rd</sup> of a school's teachers each year of participation with the goal that all school staff will participate in the third year. The schools with the largest number of students, Washington and Wallenberg, did not have 1/3<sup>rd</sup> of their teachers participate. The district choice to continue with these schools did not match NUA strategy.

Based on reviews of sign-in sheets, attendance was over 90% at all NUA workshops and sessions. Based on lists provided by APD, twenty teachers dropped out of the program however, most did so early in the school year. Because of the use of subs, one school decided to limit teacher participation in order to maintain school functioning.

### TEACHER PARTICIPATION IN NUA BY SCHOOL 2009-10

SCHOOL	TEACHERS PARTICIPATING	TOTAL TEACHERS	PERCENTAGE PARTICIPATION	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	ETHNIC SUMMARY	SOCIO-ECONOMIC
GLEN PARK	12	20	60.0%	329	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Latino 48.3%</li> <li>• African American 16.7%</li> <li>• Asian 9.74%</li> </ul>	75.9%
IDA B. WELLS	9	17	52.9%	233	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• African American 37.8%</li> <li>• Latino 32.6%</li> <li>• Asian 19.74%</li> </ul>	48.0%
INDEPENDENCE	6	14	42.8%	368	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Latino 38.0%</li> <li>• African American 20.9%</li> <li>• Asian 14.7%</li> </ul>	22.0%
ISA	16	41	39.0%	477	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• African American 34.4%</li> <li>• Latino 32.9%</li> <li>• Asian 10.9%</li> </ul>	56.4%
JOSE ORTEGA	12	20	60.0%	267	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Asian 35.2%</li> <li>• African American 19.9%</li> <li>• Latino 14.9%</li> </ul>	58.8%
SHERIDAN	12	15	80.0%	215	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Latino 32.0%</li> <li>• African American 25.6%</li> <li>• Asian 14.9%</li> </ul>	70.2%
VISITACION VALLEY MS	24	26	92.3%	283	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Asian 34.3%</li> <li>• African American 23.7%</li> <li>• Filipino 13.4%</li> </ul>	67.5%
WALLENBERG	7	31	22.6%	613	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Asian 45.3%</li> <li>• Latino 20.7%</li> <li>• African American 17.3%</li> </ul>	59.0%
WASHINGTON	27	120	22.5%	2283	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Asian 66.9%</li> <li>• Latino 10.4%</li> <li>• White 8.41%</li> </ul>	51.5%
WILLIE L. BROWN	11	20	55.0%	184	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• African American 73.4%</li> <li>• Pacific Islander 10.9%</li> <li>• Asian 4.9%</li> </ul>	76.6%

## Teacher Practice & Strategy Use

In order to determine teacher receptiveness and use of NUA strategies and techniques, several data collection methods were used. Interviews were conducted with principals to determine if they noticed any changes in their staff or students. Interviews were also conducted with teachers to allow them to self-reflect on their use of the strategies and what worked well (best practices and lessons learned will be discussed in a later section). In addition, the evaluator conducted site visits, site observations, and workshop evaluations to establish a baseline for what schools would be expected to know, to determine what strategies and tools were in use, and to determine overall teacher receptiveness to the professional development.

A random sample of 20% of NUA teachers was selected for interview. There were approximately 138 teachers and school professionals involved with NUA during the 2009-10 school year. Twenty-six teachers were selected for interview. Of the 26, 14 agreed to be interviewed and the rest declined to be interviewed. The protocol for teacher interviews can be found in the appendix. Teachers were asked to self-report how often they used an NUA strategy and what strategies they used. Based on interview data, teachers at the elementary level were quite consistent with strategy use. They self-reported using NUA strategies almost daily. Teachers at the high school level were not consistent. Most reported using an NUA strategy about once a week.

In one-on-one interviews, teachers were asked what strategies they used most frequently. At the elementary school level, teachers reported using many of the strategies taught by Dr. Augusta Mann: phonics hopscotch, synonym triplets, dancing definitions, essential summaries, and taxonomies. At the high school level, teachers primarily used graphic organizers, taxonomies, and key word notes. Although individual teachers mentioned using other strategies, the aforementioned came up repeatedly in interviews.

The previous information was consistent with site observations and workshop observation data. The program evaluator attended all five large group workshops and visited all NUA school sites to determine use. Evidence of graphic organizers was present in the faculty lounge or teacher classrooms at six out of ten schools. Teachers were observed going through synonym triplets and phonics hopscotch at several professional development sessions and at 2 school sites. During shared time at workshops, teachers would bring their best practices and examples of student work for feedback and affirmation.

End of year interviews were conducted with nine out of ten principals. In interviews, principals were asked if they had noticed changes in teacher use, understanding, and discussion of NUA strategies. Overall six out of ten principals were happy with how teachers had integrated NUA strategies into the school and classrooms. Based on interviews, elementary and middle school principals felt that their teachers incorporated techniques more than high school principals. Of the five high schools/continuation school, only one principal was satisfied with how teachers incorporated NUA strategies.

Teacher Satisfaction

Surveys from the NUA large group workshops revealed that teachers were mostly satisfied with NUA workshops. The median score suggests that they agreed with most of the statements. A copy of the survey questions can be found in the appendix. The five questions are on a 5 to 1 scale where 5 is strongly agree, 4 is agree, 3 is neutral, 2 is disagree, and 1 is strongly disagree. Below are the mean responses to the five questions from the surveys collected during the 2009-10 school year. There were approximately 112 surveys, on average, from each session. The median scores for questions were as follows:

The information presented today will help me move students toward HIP (High Intellectual Performance) and improve learning.	The sessions provided opportunities for me to interact with my colleagues and to discuss the presented information.	I have gained more ideas related to reversing student underachievement.	I will be better able to use a variety of learning strategies to make sure students comprehend information in my class(es).	I had time during the sessions to think about what was presented and how I might use it in my work with students.
<b>4.375</b>	<b>4.607</b>	<b>4.258</b>	<b>4.357</b>	<b>4.330</b>

Teachers found the Pedagogical Flow Map, time to share ideas with colleagues, NUA coaches modeling techniques and strategies most helpful. Teachers asked for more help to understand how to use the Pedagogical Flow Map. They wanted to know how to link it to California State Content Standards. Teachers wanted more time to process material and plan how to use what they had learned. Teachers also asked for more “real world” examples of the techniques being demonstrated in an urban classroom.

Each school year SFUSD also administers a school satisfaction survey to all teachers. In general, the teacher satisfaction surveys contain questions that relate to how school site staff work together, expectations of students and administration, student-staff relationships, and overall school satisfaction. Several questions on the school satisfaction survey relate to key areas of interest for APD and NUA goals. In particular, questions about student-teacher relationships align with NUA beliefs that successful learning cannot occur without quality student-teacher relationships. Questions about teacher professional development, teacher beliefs about impacting their students, teachers problem-solving together, and teachers overall job satisfaction. The questions on the following page have been selected to shed light on the issue of professional development, support for teachers, and their perceptions of their impact on their students. Any teacher, NUA participant or not can respond to the survey.

NUA was a large professional development program that worked with teachers and schools all year. Based on cost analysis, the district spent about \$11,600 per teacher for each teacher who participated in NUA during the 2009-10 school year. NUA teachers had five large group workshops and ten school site visits from NUA staff to work on strategies specific to school needs. The results of the school satisfaction survey do not match district input. Although there is some missing data, whole school staffs did not necessarily feel they had access to more resources to close the achievement gap,

that their school worked together more to improve practice, that professional development was ongoing, or that they received support from the administration to improve practice.

NUA emphasizes community builders as part of their goal to better teacher relationships with their students and each other. School teaching staff did not necessarily feel their efforts impacted their students or that their peers valued students experiences more. Teachers also did not show more satisfaction based on NUA being present in their schools.

Overall the teacher satisfaction survey showed very little difference in teacher opinions from last year. Only two schools showed clear directionality with survey scores and Jose Ortega only joined the NUA partnership in January so it is not likely that gains can be completely contributed to NUA. All NUA schools had fluctuations in their scores and there was no consistency across NUA schools.

Schools can choose to opt in or out of the survey, it is not mandatory, thus some schools do not have data. If a school returns too few surveys, data is not included about the school so that particular teachers or school staff is not identifiable. Finally, look with caution on the results. Schools cannot be compared to each other. Each school has its own climate, student population, teacher population, mission and goals. Thus, each school will have a different baseline. The goals are for each school to move along on the indicators that the principal or school feels are important.

**TEACHER SATISFACTION SURVEY RESULTS FOR NUA SCHOOLS (Select Questions)**

School	Year	The school provides access to resources that close the achievement gap.	Teachers at my school believe that their efforts make a difference in their students' learning.	Teachers in my school work together to improve their instructional practice.	School staff values and builds on our students' languages, cultures, and lived experiences.	Professional development for staff is ongoing, research based, and clearly related to the school's Balanced Scorecard.	The administration provides me with the support I need to improve my professional practice.	My school is heading in the right direction.	Overall, I am satisfied with my job at SFUSD.
Glen Park	2009	3.09	3.48	3.46	3.32	3.35	3.12	3.08	3.12
Elementary	2010	3.08	3.43	3.54	3.21	3.26	3.13	3.24	3.14
Jose Ortega	2009	3.48	3.61	3.74	3.78	3.67	3.70	3.57	3.52
Elementary	2010	3.65	3.94	3.88	3.94	3.88	3.76	3.38	3.20
Sheridan	2009	3.87	3.96	3.91	3.74	3.86	3.70	4.00	3.22
Elementary	2010	3.78	3.94	4.00	3.94	4.00	3.72	3.89	3.24
Willie Brown	2009	2.96	3.04	2.84	3.35	2.88	2.83	2.68	3.13
Middle School	2010								
Visitacion Valley	2009	3.33	3.02	3.57	3.43	3.39	3.42	3.50	3.33
Middle School	2010	3.25	3.44	3.34	3.25	3.23	3.35	3.48	3.29
Independence	2009	3.00	3.20	3.11	3.20	3.10	3.00	3.11	3.20
High School	2010	3.33	3.55	3.08	3.67	3.67	3.36	3.50	3.50
Intl Stud Acad	2009								
High School	2010	3.09	3.00	3.03	3.00	2.91	2.92	3.03	2.74
Wallenberg	2009	2.89	3.22	2.58	2.89	2.38	2.64	2.32	2.88
High School	2010	2.87	3.00	2.48	2.63	2.70	2.70	2.87	2.74
Washington	2009								
High School	2010	3.17	3.33	3.19	2.99	2.96	2.95	3.03	3.17
Ida B Wells	2009	3.39	3.56	3.37	3.53	3.28	3.33	3.42	3.21
High School	2010	3.35	3.22	2.96	3.04	2.95	3.17	3.16	3.00

## Lessons Learned & Best Practices

### *Best Practices*

Teachers interviewed were asked what worked well for them and what did not work well for them. The point of the question was to refine district practices for year two. The following were considered best practices that came from the NUA work of the 2009-10 school year. Teachers felt that their work with NUA made them a more thoughtful teacher. Many said they were reminded to keep all students in mind when planning lessons. Elementary and middle schools, in particular, liked that they were provided with quick easy strategies to supplement what they were already doing. Some high school teachers, who felt isolated in their departments, felt that NUA brought their staff together around common issues or strategies. They felt they were able to develop peers across the school.

During site observations and interviews, best practices at high functioning school were clear. Schools that had high levels of implementation showed evidence of that implementation in the school. Two schools used 3 to 5 strategies school-wide and all teachers used the strategies whether or not they participated in NUA. High functioning schools used common planning time or professional learning communities to focus on strategies and talk among themselves. One school had a cross-classroom project in the hall. Even at schools where implementation was not optimal. Interviews revealed pockets of collaboration among two or three teachers who would not have met each other except through NUA.

### *Lessons Learned*

NUA takes teachers away from the school for professional development because teachers at high functioning schools focus on, have a common language, and have ongoing conversations about practice and professional development. In order to do whole days of professional development, the district employed substitute teachers. Teachers in SFUSD did not like the use of subs and did not like being pulled away from their classrooms. The majority of teachers interviewed and seven principals felt that learning was not happening at their schools when subs were there for a whole day. Three principals stated that their schools dissolved into chaos on NUA large group days and had to find solutions to make the program run smoothly for them. Interviewed teachers felt that the district should split days so the majority of the teachers would not be out on a given day. One principal suggested that subs should be trained in NUA techniques. Another school used some extra funds to have trainings in the evenings so that teachers did not miss as much school. Although research suggests that whole day professional development is a good thing, this issue needs to be resolved in SFUSD.

Teachers also identified time to plan as issue. Although teachers were given time during the NUA days to talk with one another and plan, teachers still asked for more time. Based on workshop observations, not all teachers who chose to be a part of NUA were in the same place professionally. Some teachers could automatically see how to implement strategies in their classroom while others struggled to understand the need for strategies and how to implement them. Teachers continually asked for structures, lesson plans, and tapes to see how these strategies worked in a “real classroom”. The translation from demonstration, to practice, to use did not work smoothly in year one.

One set of teachers felt that NUA was too light or only scratching the surface. Interviews revealed that a handful of teachers felt that they were not hearing new information. Several teachers already used some of the NUA strategies because they had learned them while learning to teach or had received professional development on them. These teachers had expected NUA to delve more deeply into the race and politics of the district and help them reach their toughest students. They were disappointed with the workshops because they wanted more techniques that fit their needs.

## **NUA IMPACT ON STUDENT OUTCOMES**

### Population Served

The 138 NUA Teachers worked with 4148 students in SFUSD. The student population includes students who are taught by a teacher participating in NUA no matter whether the subject was primary or elective. The largest majority of students impacted by NUA teachers were Chinese at 1222 or 29.5%. The second and third largest groups were African Americans at 861 or 20.8% and Latinos at 827 or 19.9%. Seven hundred and thirty-one students or 17.6% were English Language Learners. Of the student population, 76.1% of them qualify for free or reduced lunch. This data verifies that the structure of how schools chose to opt in and district scrutiny of that choice were ineffective. The result was that students impacted by the achievement gap were not impacted by NUA as outlined in the LEA plan. Examples of schools with higher needs would be: Bret Hart, George Washington Carver, Bryant, Thurgood Marshall, and Mission High School.

### NUA STUDENT PARTICIPATION BY SCHOOL 2009-10

SCHOOL	NUA STUDENTS	TOTAL STUDENTS	PERCENTAGE PARTICIPATION	SOCIO-ECONOMIC	ETHNIC SUMMARY
GLEN PARK	186	329	56.5%	75.9%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Latino 48.3%</li> <li>• African American 16.7%</li> <li>• Asian 9.74%</li> </ul>
IDA B. WELLS	212	233	90.9%	48.0%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• African American 37.8%</li> <li>• Latino 32.6%</li> <li>• Asian 19.74%</li> </ul>
INDEPENDENCE	174	368	47.2%	22.0%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Latino 38.0%</li> <li>• African American 20.9%</li> <li>• Asian 14.7%</li> </ul>
ISA	448	477	93.9%	56.4%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• African American 34.4%</li> <li>• Latino 32.9%</li> <li>• Asian 10.9%</li> </ul>
JOSE ORTEGA	213	267	79.8%	58.8%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Asian 35.2%</li> <li>• African American 19.9%</li> <li>• Latino 14.9%</li> </ul>
SHERIDAN	179	215	83.2%	70.2%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Latino 32.0%</li> <li>• African American 25.6%</li> <li>• Asian 14.9%</li> </ul>
VISITACION VALLEY MS	260	283	92.3%	67.5%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Asian 34.3%</li> <li>• African American 23.7%</li> <li>• Filipino 13.4%</li> </ul>
WALLENBERG	541	613	91.9%	59.0%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Asian 45.3%</li> <li>• Latino 20.7%</li> <li>• African American 17.3%</li> </ul>
WASHINGTON	1560	2283	68.3%	51.5%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Asian 66.9%</li> <li>• Latino 10.4%</li> <li>• White 8.41%</li> </ul>
WILLIE L. BROWN	167	184	90.8%	76.6%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• African American 73.4%</li> <li>• Pacific Islander 10.9%</li> <li>• Asian 4.9%</li> </ul>

Student Academic Outcomes

NUA is specifically a professional development program and the benefits are most directly felt by teachers. The model used by NUA of training 1/3<sup>rd</sup> of teachers a year is not designed to show impact until years three through five. However, NUA was brought to SFUSD to assist teachers with students who are impacted by the achievement gap. Following is a table with the 1-year gains and losses of students at NUA schools. District data is also included.

**NUA STUDENT PERFORMANCE BY SCHOOL 2009-10**

SCHOOL NAME	ELA 1-Year Gain/Loss	ELA %Proficient	Scores Reported	Math 1-Year Gain/Loss	Math Combined %Proficient	Scores Reported
<b><i>DISTRICT</i></b>	<b><i>2.3%</i></b>	<b><i>56.3%</i></b>	<b><i>37,668</i></b>	<b><i>2.8%</i></b>	<b><i>55.4%</i></b>	<b><i>37,573</i></b>
<b>NUA STUDENTS</b>	<b>-0.3%</b>	<b>46.23%</b>	<b>2,771</b>	<b>-1.53%</b>	<b>31.98%</b>	<b>2717</b>
GLEN PARK	-5.15	39.29%	84	-19.97	39.29%	84
JOSE ORTEGA	9.34%	64.13%	92	6.8%	69.47%	95
SHERIDAN	-12.36%	53.96%	139	-8.15%	56.43%	140
WILLIE BROWN	3.97%	12.50%	144	13.60%	15.83%	139
VISITACION VALLEY MS	-.59%	37.02%	262	0%	32.82%	259
INDEPENDENCE	1.25%	24.14%	29	14.95%	16.67%	12
ISA	2.49%	26.91%	353	-4.78%	11.55%	355
WALLENBERG	.75%	53.10%	435	-.95%	30.31%	419
WASHINGTON	-1.28%	58.27%	1131	-4.73%	36.83	1124
IDA B. WELLS	2.91%	8.20%	122	1.29%	1.85%	108

Overall, NUA students under-performed district students by 2.6% in English Language Arts on the California Standards Test. In English Language Arts, six out of 10 schools did experience gains in the 2009-10 school year however, only 4 experienced gains that matched or exceeded district gains. Two of the four that experienced the greatest gains, Jose Ortega and Willie brown did not join the NUA partnership until January so impact cannot be fully attributed to NUA. In addition to NUA, Willie Brown also had access to Partners and AEMP for literacy and language arts programming.

Overall, NUA students under-performed district students by 4.33% in Mathematics on the California Standards Test. In Mathematics, four out of ten schools saw gains in their NUA students. Three schools experienced gains greater than district gains, Jose Ortega, Willie Brown, and Independence. As mentioned previously, Jose Ortega and Willie brown did not join the NUA partnership until January so impact cannot be fully attributed to NUA. Willie Brown also had Project SEED and EPGY for Mathematics supplemental programming.

Two schools showed consistent gains in both English Language Arts and Mathematics that exceeded district gains. These gains were in schools that received the least amount of NUA training time during the summer and the school year. Twenty percent is not a significant amount of schools to suggest that NUA professional development had any impact on student outcomes on the California Standards Test for English Language Arts or Mathematics.

Data on targeted student outcomes on the CST is similar to all students. NUA targeted students underperformed their peers in the district as a whole. In English Language Arts, six out of ten schools showed gains for their African American students. Four out of ten made gains for their Latino students. In Mathematics, three out of ten schools showed gains for African Americans and four out of ten schools showed gains for Latinos. If Willie Brown and Jose Ortega are removed, no school showed consistent gains in target populations that exceeded district gains.

**NUA AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENT PERFORMANCE BY SCHOOL**

SCHOOL NAME	ELA 1-Year Gain/Loss	ELA %Proficient	Scores Reported	Math 1-Year Gain/Loss	Math Combined %Proficient	Scores Reported
<b><i>DISTRICT- African Americans</i></b>	<b>2.3%</b>	<b>28.9%</b>	<b>3,829</b>	<b>4.3%</b>	<b>25.2%</b>	<b>3,768</b>
<b>NUA- African Americans</b>	<b>2.00%</b>	<b>20.80%</b>	<b>553</b>	<b>1.75%</b>	<b>12.95%</b>	<b>533</b>
GLEN PARK	-10.00%	30.00 %	20	-55.00	25.00%	20
JOSE ORTEGA	-12.59%	48.28%	29	4.17%	50.00%	30
SHERIDAN	-24.62%	43.24%	37	-2.33%	45.95%	37
WILLIE BROWN	2.93%	11.93%	109	10.09%	15.09%	106
VISITACION VALLEY MS	0.81%	14.81%	54	1.32%	11.32%	53
INDEPENDENCE	-0.83%	20.00%	10	-5.56	0%	3
ISA	0.79%	17.95%	117	-3.36%	3.36%	119
WALLENBERG	0.97%	27.03%	74	-9.78%	4.35%	69
WASHINGTON	2.28%	14.52%	62	-1.96%	4.84%	62
IDA B. WELLS	11.23%	12.77%	122	0%	0%	39

**NUA LATINO STUDENT PERFORMANCE BY SCHOOL**

SCHOOL NAME	ELA 1-Year Gain/Loss	ELA %Proficient	Scores Reported	Math 1-Year Gain/Loss	Math Combined %Proficient	Scores Reported
<b><i>DISTRICT- Latino</i></b>	<b>3.2%</b>	<b>54.5%</b>	<b>8458</b>	<b>3.0%</b>	<b>30.7%</b>	<b>8,432</b>
<b>NUA- Latino</b>	<b>2.56%</b>	<b>29.82%</b>	<b>513</b>	<b>3.00%</b>	<b>14.94%</b>	<b>502</b>
GLEN PARK	8.03%	31.11%	45	2.56%	33.33%	45
JOSE ORTEGA	21.67%	75.00%	16	17.36%	61.11%	18
SHERIDAN	-19.85%	35.71	42	-7.67%	40.48	42
WILLIE BROWN	0%	33.33%	3	0%	0%	3
VISITACION VALLEY MS	9.67	21.21%	33	3.37%	18.75%	32
INDEPENDENCE	-19.23%	0%	7	0%	0%	4
ISA	5.15%	29.06%	117	-4.76	6.67%	120
WALLENBERG	-0.57%	37.76%	98	1.99%	7.87%	89
WASHINGTON	-1.25%	27.83%	115	-1.86%	9.57	115
IDA B. WELLS	-2.47%	4.88%	41	0%	0%	38

## Grade Point Average

Another important indicator for NUA students in middle and high school is grade point average or GPA. GPA should more accurately reflect what is happening in the classroom between teachers and students. NUA techniques and strategies are designed for use in the classroom along with the teacher standard curriculum. Therefore GPA is probably the best quantitative indicator of changes in teacher practice for year 1 of NUA.

Based on qualitative analysis, NUA had no impact on student GPA outcomes. The school district experienced an increase in GPA of .032 while NUA students experienced an increase of .042. The difference of .01 is not significant enough to show program impact.

### **GPA FOR DISTRICT & NUA STUDENTS SPRING 2009 TO SPRING 2010**

DISTRICT	All Students	17647	2.6346	17522	2.6674
	NUA Students	3053	2.4536	3364	2.4965
	District African-American	1916	1.8869	1843	1.8770
	NUA African-American	567	1.9929	656	2.0102
	District Latino	3660	2.0879	3681	2.0775
	NUA Latino	573	2.0647	624	2.1975

Ideally, GPAs of students in the target population should increase along with the whole school GPA. In order to close the achievement gap, target population GPA should increase faster than overall school GPA. Visitacion Valley Middle, ISA, Washington, and Wallenberg demonstrated gains in their school population but not across all target populations. Some schools made gains with their school target populations but not their NUA students within their targeted student populations. The results are mixed for all schools and outcomes no better than chance. NUA professional development had no impact on student GPA outcomes. The following table will look at GPA for the whole school as well as for students in target populations in more detail.

**CHANGE IN GPA BY SCHOOL SPRING 2009 TO SPRING 2010 (with PE)**

<b>SCHOOL</b>		<b>Count</b>	<b>GPA Spring 2009</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>GPA Spring 2010</b>
VIS VALLEY MIDDLE	School	309	2.7709	280	2.8217
	NUA Students	147	2.7727	239	2.7398
	School African-American	87	2.2017	58	2.2066
	NUA African-American	33	2.3100	51	2.3496
	School Latino	34	1.9506	34	2.26
	NUA Latino	18	2.6311	31	2.4919
WILLIE L. BROWN, JR	School	130	2.3209	346	2.0203
	NUA Students	82	2.2672	121	2.2250
	School African-American	110	2.2619	89	2.2536
	NUA African-American	60	2.2692	85	2.1766
	School Latino	6	2.1633	6	2.74
	NUA Latino	3	3.4233	5	2.6800
WASHINGTON	School	2348	2.6763	2226	2.7231
	NUA Students	1462	2.7002	1505	2.6727
	School African-American	128	1.8034	124	1.8751
	NUA African-American	98	2.0957	102	2.0495
	School Latino	226	1.8477	222	1.8895
	NUA Latino	139	2.1197	142	2.1336
IDA B WELLS	School	231	1.7472	228	1.6544
	NUA Students	182	1.2808	199	1.8114
	School African-American	85	1.8039	88	1.4343
	NUA African-American	67	1.0452	72	1.5731
	School Latino	73	1.8068	81	1.9074
	NUA Latino	65	1.2763	72	1.9151
INDEPENDENCE	School	351	2.0854	346	2.0203
	NUA Students	127	1.7353	152	1.9425
	School African-American	73	1.9781	91	1.9084
	NUA African-American	37	1.7657	46	2.0283
	School Latino	127	1.9124	134	1.8906
	NUA Latino	44	1.8061	54	1.9425
ISA	School	320	2.019	330	2.0775
	NUA Students	296	2.2723	388	2.3127
	School African-American	109	1.64	114	1.7287
	NUA African-American	105	2.0690	137	2.0388
	School Latino	105	1.9402	108	1.8721
	NUA Latino	100	2.2723	133	2.3127
WALLENBERG	School	613	2.5593	607	2.5732
	NUA Students	479	2.6453	503	2.5682
	School African-American	109	1.8568	98	1.7432
	NUA African-American	82	2.1266	86	1.9044
	School Latino	122	2.1412	126	1.9267
	NUA Latino	108	2.3294	114	2.2611

## Student-Teacher Relationships & School Climate

Each school year SFUSD administers a school satisfaction survey to students at all school sites. Schools can choose to opt in or out of surveys. In general, the school satisfaction surveys contain questions that relate to student and staff perceptions of school climate and safety, student-teacher relationships, student-staff relationships, student perceptions of school work and overall school satisfaction.

Several questions on the student satisfaction survey relate to key areas of interest for APD and NUA goals. In particular, questions about student-teacher relationships align with NUA beliefs that successful learning cannot occur without quality student-teacher relationships. Questions about home language and relevance of the classroom address student access to the classroom and school, particularly for English Language Learners. The questions on the following page have been selected to shed light on the issue of school climate and student-teacher relationships.

The following table shows no clear directionality in the mean scores of student respondents to the student satisfaction survey. In other words, some schools made gains while most schools seemed to maintain means close to the previous year. The schools that made clear gains: Independence, Washington, and Wallenberg did not necessarily have the largest number of teachers participating. In addition at least one school had additional programming going on at the same time to tackle climate issues at the school. At this point it is safe to say that none of the schools experienced a serious decline in school climate. Further years of data will need to be available to determine what part of climate is due to the school population and what part is due to the additional programming.

In the following table some schools do not have multiple years of data. Schools can choose to opt in or out of the survey, it is not mandatory, thus some schools do not have data. If a school returns too few surveys, data is not included about the school so that particular students are not identifiable. Finally look with caution on the results. Schools cannot be compared to each other. Each school has its own climate, student population, teacher population, mission and goals. Ergo, each school will have a different baseline. The goal is for each school to move along on the indicators that the principal or school feels are important.

### STUDENT SATISFACTION SURVEY RESULTS FOR 2 YEARS NUA SCHOOLS

School	Year	I believe school staff cares about the success of all students at my school.	My school values my home language and culture.	My teachers help me when I do not understand a lesson	My teachers make learning meaningful and joyful.	Teachers and school staff make clear what they expect from me at school.	My teachers treat me and all other students with respect.	The Principal treats me and all other students with respect.	I like this school and would recommend it to other students.
Glen Park Elementary	2009	3.07	3.44	3.36	2.89	3.45	2.79	3.03	2.71
Glen Park Elementary	2010	3.23	3.21	3.36	2.88	3.19	3.27	3.08	3.13
Jose Ortega Elementary	2009	3.46	3.18	3.52	3.07	3.38	3.11	3.53	3.25
Jose Ortega Elementary	2010	3.35	3.7	3.44	2.88	3.44	2.92	3.67	2.83
Sheridan Elementary	2009	3.61	3.38	3.6	3.41	3.58	3.72	3.75	3.27
Sheridan Elementary	2010	3.43	3.66	3.52	3.31	3.61	3.62	3.67	3.36
Willie Brown Middle School	2009	2.88	3.02	3.05	2.45	3.05	2.57	2.77	2.29
Willie Brown Middle School	2010	3.11	2.91	3.27	2.5	2.9	2.91	2.9	2.44
Visitacion Valley Middle School	2009	3.14	2.83	3.37	2.64	3.16	3.09	3.25	2.89
Visitacion Valley Middle School	2010								
Independence High School	2009	3.47	3.21	3.5	3.3	3.41	3.5	3.51	3.5
Independence High School	2010	3.51	3.65	3.58	3.09	3.55	3.63	3.64	3.51
Intl Stud Acad. High School	2009								
Intl Stud Acad. High School	2010	2.94	3.03	2.97	2.63	2.89	2.55	3.03	2.45
Wallenberg High School	2009	2.72	2.88	2.74	2.43	2.78	2.71	2.54	2.38
Wallenberg High School	2010	3.05	2.94	2.88	2.47	2.84	3.09	2.71	2.8
Washington High School	2009	2.7	2.82	2.85	2.35	2.84	2.81	2.82	2.85
Washington High School	2010	2.91	2.94	2.89	2.58	2.87	2.93	3.01	3.01
Ida B Wells High School	2009	3.08	3.21	3.1	3.03	3.09	3.03	3.03	3.16
Ida B Wells High School	2010	3.06	3.22	3.43	2.6	3.13	3.06	3.16	2.96

## **NUA IMPACT ON CAPACITY BUILDING**

The NUA model of training 1/3<sup>rd</sup> of a school's teachers a year does not allow for full transference on strategies and skills until at the earliest year four. In other NUA districts, such as New York and Minnesota, full transference of skills did not occur for five to seven years. In addition, the model of implementation chosen by the district to train teachers and not focus any of the NUA training centrally could pose problems for sustainability of NUA techniques and strategies. Given that SFUSD-NUA Partnership was a 1-year contract aimed at addressing LEA targeted student populations evidence of some type of sustainable model should have been evident by the end of the 2009-10 school year.

### *Teacher Leaders as Trainers*

If it is the district goal is to disseminate NUA practices to all program improvement schools and schools with significant target populations, the model proposed by APD would necessitate teacher leaders who would then become trainers. As teachers are needed most in the classroom with their students, this model has some flaws but could be a workable solution if central delivery is not an option. Based on evaluator interviews with APD and district staff, no teacher leaders have been identified and no plan for how to use their skills has been developed. A mid-year meeting was held in January of 2010 between RPA staff and APD to raise these issues.

In the absence of school site teacher leaders, NUA strategies training would need to be carried out by APD teachers and content specialists. NUA held five coach training session in addition to the five large group workshops. The program evaluator attended all five large group workshops and four out of five coach trainings. Based on attendance at these workshops and review of sign in sheets, no APD teachers or content specialists were in attendance at these workshops. Associate superintendants, department heads, and one staff member from Pupil Services were the only district credentialed staff in attendance besides school site teachers and principals.

Based on the lack of central systems to continue training in NUA strategies, the failure to identify teacher leaders, and the lack of a plan as to how to use the skills of current trained teachers, the current ability of the district to build capacity around NUA techniques and strategies is minimal.

### *Sustainability*

Consistently, teachers ask for more time to reflect on newly learned techniques and instructional practices so that they can use them in the classroom. In large groups, teachers expressed concerns about how to integrate NUA pedagogical techniques and instructional practices with California State Content Standards. Currently, there is no plan to support teachers as they implement practices in the classroom or provide models of a differentiated, grade-specific, lessons and curricula that incorporate NUA techniques/instructional practices with California grade and content standards. At the summer institute, teachers were given a book of all NUA strategies and how to use them, however at the end of the summer; each school became an island of NUA practice unto itself. RPA has not seen a plan to keep teachers engaged and using techniques in year 2 when the program is facing budget cuts.

### Limitations of the Data

NUA Programs are directed at teachers. The goal of the program is to use NUA coaching, lessons and techniques to teach California Content Standards. As stated earlier, implementation of the NUA varied by school and classroom within schools. The California Standards Test for ELA and MATH may not be the most appropriate measure of student progress. At most the data must be taken as a baseline for future NUA work in SFUSD schools. One year is generally not enough time to see student achievement results.

Twenty percent of teachers were randomly sampled for interviews. Almost half refused to be interviewed. Although there is a high degree of synergy between the comments on teachers' interview and other survey and observation data, teacher comments and views expressed above do not represent all teachers. Teachers and schools are different and chose to focus on different strategies and implementation timelines.

### **COST ANALYSIS**

The National Urban Alliance contract cost the district \$1,608,688. The following is the cost per student based on the number of students served:

Total Program Cost	\$1,608,688
Total Number of Students Served	4148
Total Cost Per Student	\$387.82
Total Number of Teachers Served	138
Total Cost Per Teacher	11657.16

## ISSUES TO CONSIDER FOR CONTINUAL IMPROVEMENT

---

### *Process Recommendations*

- *Structured Common Planning Time:* Best practice schools used common planning time or created shared time to plan NUA strategy usage. This practice should apply to all NUA Schools. Consistently, teachers ask for more time to reflect on newly learned techniques and practices so that they can incorporate them into their lessons. This could be done at school sites and does not have to happen during a workshop day.
- *NUA needs to help some teachers with scaffolds:* SFUSD teachers are in different places professionally. Some need more help to implement practices in their classrooms. In the coming year NUA may want to address this issue.
- *The use of Subs should be reconsidered:* SFUSD teachers do not like to be pulled out of their classrooms. They are dedicated and loyal to the point of not wanting professional development. Principals and teachers are concerned about the number of days teachers are out of the classroom. At smaller schools there is a worry that this is impacting the quality of student learning. This issue arose repeatedly from 8 out of 10 schools.
- *The District Needs Structures to Maintain NUA:* Title 1 funds have been invested in building capacity among teachers in the schools but there is no district trainer who has been identified to hold this knowledge. Additionally, there are no structures in place in the district to identify and provide further development for innovator and early adopter teachers and principals in order to attain a critical mass of change agents?

### *Evaluation Recommendations*

- *Instructional Assessment for cohort 2 schools should be begun earlier.* This allows for a fuller evaluation to take place.
- *Principals should set clear goals:* Best practice schools had principals who set clear goals for their teachers and held the accountable. Their outcomes were more measurable for the program evaluator and made end-of-year staff conversations more productive.

### *Outcome Recommendations*

- *SFUSD should examine use of Title I funds:* Title I funds are directed at all students impacted by the achievement gap. The district should find a way to incorporate more target students who need access to services. Do all Title 1 targeted students have equal access to these NUA resources?

## REFERENCES

---

City, E.A., Elmore, R.F., Fiarman, S.E., and Teitel, L. (2009). *Instructional Rounds in Education*. Cambridge: Harvard Education Press

Cousins, Bradley J. & Earl, Lorna N. (1992). *Evaluation in education: Studies in Evaluation use and organizational learning*. The Falmer Press Teachers' Library.

Cronsoe, R., Johnson, M. K., and Elder, G. (2004). Intergenerational Bonding in School: The Behavioral and Contextual Correlates of Student-Teacher Relationships. *Sociology of Education*. 77 (1) 60-80

Darder, A. (1991). *Culture and Power in the Classroom: A Critical Foundation for Bicultural Education*. Bergin and Garvey Publishers.

Delpit, Lisa. (1995). *Other People's Children: Cultural Conflict in the Classroom*. NY: New Press.

Fang, Z. (1996). A review of Research on Teacher Beliefs and Practices. *Educational Research*. 38. (1) 47-65

Fetterman, D.M.; Kaftarian, S.J. & Wandersman, A. (1996). *Empowerment evaluation: Knowledge and tools for self-assessment and accountability*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Freire, Paulo. *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. [New York]: Herder and Herder, 1970.

Hooks, B. (1994). *Outlaw culture: resisting representations* . New York: Routledge

McLaughlin, M. & Talbert, J.E. (2006) *Building School-Based Teacher Learning Communities*. New York: Teachers College Press

Midgley, C., Feldlaufer, H., and Eccles, J. (1989). Student/Teacher Relations and Attitudes toward Mathematics Before and After the Transition to Junior High School. *Child Development*. 60: 981-992

Oakes, J. (2005). *Keeping track: How schools structure inequality*. New Haven, CT. Yale University Press.

Patton, M.Q. (1986). *Utilization-Focused Evaluation*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc., p. 688.

Patton, M.Q. (1994). Developmental evaluation. *Evaluation Practice* 15(3), 311 - 319.

Patton, M.Q. (1997). *Utilization-focused evaluation: The new century text*. Edition 3. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

**Strategies & Techniques  
Learned by  
NUA Teachers**

NUA brings to the partnership a set of research based techniques that teachers can use in their classroom. Many of these techniques are not new; some have been around since the 1970s. Some of the techniques and pedagogical tools are developed by NUA and some are not. Here is a brief list of some of the techniques and tools the program evaluator has seen used at NUA Large Group-Cross School meetings; this list is not inclusive:

- **Pedagogical Flow Map:** Students frequently learn a subject using rote memory and then are unable to transfer knowledge to other contexts or to solve problems. One way to visually mediate the learning process for students is through the pedagogical flow map. This idea is based on the research of David Ausubel, 1963 (meaningful learning), Joseph Novak, 1977 (concept maps), and Reuven Feuerstein, 1979 (mediated learning experience).
- **Key Word Notes:** A guide for decoding and mediating student understanding of a new text. (Robinson, 1993; Marzano, et al., 2001, Nessel and Graham, 2007).
- **Key Word Prediction:** Allows students to make predictions about a text while activating prior knowledge. Based on a few key words. This was first referenced by Dorsey Hammond (Stauffer, 1975; Hammond, 1984; Nessel, Jones, and Dixon, 1989).
- **A to Z Taxonomy:** A priming tool and vocabulary builder that helps students organize key ideas and vocabulary around a theme or text (Rothstein and Lauber, 2000).
- **Carousel Brainstorming:** A cooperative group activity to engage an entire class in generating ideas (Kagan, 1994).
- **Touching the Spirit:** A tool to incorporate African American culture into the classroom. Ideas are ritual, rhythm, recitation, repetition, and relationships (Augusta Mann, 1998).
- **Metacognition Frame:** A structured technique to allow students to articulate what they already know or have learned from new texts. Used to remove certain kinds of stress from the under-achieving students in a classroom setting (Rothstein and Lauber, 2000).
- **NUA Notebooks/Notetaking Technique:** A way for students to organize and reference information that they learn. The notebook can also give teachers an understanding of how students are processing their own learning. (Pauk, 1974; Robinson, 1993; Bakunas and Holley, 2001).
- **READ, TALK, WRITE:** Allows student to reflect on what they read, share understanding and write (Nessel & Baltas, 2000).

- **Thinking Maps:** Thinking Maps are a way for students to visually organize information that they are learning. There are eight maps that are designed to correspond with eight different fundamental thinking processes. The Circle Map is used for defining in context; the Bubble Map, describing with adjectives; the Flow Map, sequencing and ordering; the Brace Map, identifying part/whole relationships; the Tree Map, classifying/grouping; the Double Bubble Map, comparing and contrasting; the Multi-Flow Map, analyzing causes and effects; and the Bridge Map, seeing analogies. They potentially provide a common visual language to information structure accessible to all students. Thinking Maps were developed by David Hyerle (1993).
- **Flip Camera Reflections/Sweet Reflections:** A technique to quickly collect students' reflections on a text or concept. Can be done with a camera or on paper.
- **Compound Partners:** Students make compound words through the movement and feedback.
- **Password:** A vocabulary review game that develops vocabulary and understanding. Based on the game password.
- **From Portrait to Print:** A structured technique to moves students beyond the thinking maps into writing structured texts of their own.
- **Reciprocal Teaching:** An instructional activity that takes place in the form of a dialogue between teachers and students regarding segments of text. (Palincsar et al, 1984, 1986; Rosenshine & Meister, 1994; Alverman and Phelps, 1998)
- **Essential Summaries:** An intensified teaching strategy for increasing successful reading comprehension of content area texts. (Augusta Mann, 1998)
- **Dancing Definitions:** A pre-reading strategy that can be used with students, to accelerate students' mastery of the meanings of hundreds of words and concepts in a short period of time. It includes recitation, memorization, and makes connections to students' lives. (Augusta Mann, 1998)
- **Sentence Frames/Writing Frames:** Sentence frames are used to scaffold verbal and written response and encourage students to use academic language verbally and in writing (Nichols, 1980; McCracken & McCracken, 1986; Rothstein and Lauber, 2000).
- **4 Square Writing:** Graphic organizer to help students develop ideas for writing in a subject area (Gould & Gould, 1999; Zolman, 2005).
- **Think-Pair-Share:** Strategy to get students to respond more frequently in class and stay engaged with one another (Frank Lyman, 1981; Stahl, 1990).



**Surveys  
&  
Interview Protocols**

National Urban Alliance-San Francisco Unified School District Partnership  
Principal Pre- Interview

Principal:

School:

Date:

---

1. You were recently interviewed by NUA and they will come through next week for their walk-through. How are things going so far? On a scale of 1 to 10 how hopeful are you about the outcomes?
2. What are your expectations for the partnership with NUA this year? Do you have specific goals you are working on? What are the needs of your school?
3. The partnership with NUA was voluntary. You as a leader and the school had to opt in. What were your motivations?
4. So far, do you feel supported by NUA to meet the needs of your school including your teachers, your students, and your leadership team? Do you think it is feasible?

National Urban Alliance-San Francisco Unified School District Partnership  
Principal Post- Interview

Principal: Marion Grady

School: Glen Park

Date: April 22, 2010

---

1. It is coming to the end of the year. How are things going so far? On a scale of 1 to 10 how do you feel about the outcomes?
2. (Principals were recited their expectations stated at the beginning of the year) Have you seen evidence of these changes since NUA began working with your school?
3. Are your teachers using a wide range of effective, research-based strategies and practices? Have you seen any changes in student empowerment and capacity to be self-directed learners? Do students understand their own process of learning better? Are students challenged every day? Are students thinking more critically? Do teachers have high expectations of all students? Do students see connections between what they learn and their own lives and cultural perspectives. Are you doing any cross school and within school collaboration?
4. What worked well and what did not work well for your school? What would you like to see changed if anything?
5. Did you feel supported by NUA to meet the needs of your school including your teachers, your students, and your leadership team? Do you think it was easy or burdensome?

## 2009-10 SFUSD-NUA Principal Mid-Year Feedback Survey

Please answer the following questions. We greatly appreciate your candid feedback. This survey is voluntary and results will be kept confidential. Responses will be reported in aggregate form.

1. Now that you have seen your school's Instructional Assessment, does your Instructional Assessment match your understanding of what you think your school needs?

**If No, please explain what is missing (be specific):**

2. As the principal, do you feel confident about what your next steps are to achieve the outcomes stated in your Instructional Assessment?

**Please explain what your outcomes are:**

3. Is there anything that you need to be able to make this partnership more effective for you or your school?

**Please be specific:**

4. Please take a moment to tell the district about your experience with NUA so far. Share with us what you have seen, heard, are pleased to see or concerned about? (Feel free to use the section below or opposite side of the page to write a paragraph, draw a picture, or jot down a few words that come to mind.)

**NUA Teacher Survey – Cohort 1**  
**End of Year 2009-10**

1. Have you used or do you use any of the NUA techniques that you have learned or seen in large group, from the school's coach, or the books?
  
2. If so, which techniques have you/do you use the most frequently or are most helpful to you?
  
3. About how often do you use the NUA pedagogical techniques in your class? Has this amount changed through the year?
  
4. Have you noticed any changes since you began using the NUA strategies? In your students or your school? Engagement or self direction? Self?
  
5. Have you notice any changes in your relationships with other faculty? Working together more? Student's families?
  
6. Do you feel/think that NUA was helpful to you as a teacher why or why not? What worked well and what did not work well? Was it easy to implement? Best practices and lessons learned?

**Redacted  
Teacher  
Comments**

## REDACTED TEACHER COMMENTS FROM ALL NUA PARTICIPATING SCHOOL TEACHERS

- I've always had confidence in my underachieving students. This has enabled them to succeed at a higher level.
- My perceptions haven't changed. I have known all along that it is a matter of me finding the skills to help them achieve.
- I have always perceived that my students with special needs could be successful however; the NUA trainings have demonstrated that I can use some effective teaching strategies and work to build a positive rapport with the students.
- I have found NUA strategies and pedagogy amazing to work with. I see far more ways to engage students, but equally important, more ways to let students show me what they know.
- My perceptions have changed. I have found ways to use NUA strategies in my class that has had a positive effect on the enthusiasm level of my students, their learning, and the sense of community in my class.
- My perceptions have not changed. I have always recognized and worked to develop the academic potential of underachieving students!
- No I have known for a long time that underachieving students have academic potential that others may not see. I have as many times before seen my colleagues who are teaching NUA strategies change their perceptions and thank you for that.
- I have always believed in the academic potential of my underachieving students.
- Not Much-I have always believed all students can succeed if you find the key in, interest and challenge them.
- I have tried many of the maps in my classroom. This helped me present much of the same information in the same ways. These different approaches kept my class interested and motivated. The students especially liked the taxonomy, bridge map, and the tree map.  
Thank You!
- I have employed the notebooks, various warm-up activities/community builders, various maps and other strategies to aide my instruction. I have noticed improvements across the board, especially from my underperforming students.
- I have used some maps in class. I plan on implementing more strategies while unit planning this summer.
- I use a NUA cognitive/instructional strategy nearly every day. Perhaps the most important idea I have learned is the importance of building the students vocabulary. I use the 2 page vocabulary format as well as keyword notes on a very regular basis. I use the circle map, bubble map, double bubble map as well as the sequencing map the most.
- Frankly, this is where I have not done enough. NUA strategies require time to use with curriculum and I have not had sufficient time to fully integrate my curriculum with NUA strategies. That is my summer plan!
- I have adapted strategies like taxonomy, circle map, bubble map, etc... It all has had a positive impact on my students engagement, participation, and learning.
- Yes. I have used key word notes and some of the information-organizing primitives. All have been beneficial.

- I have learned some great new strategies. I (\*) use taxonomies, key word notes, circle maps, multiflow maps, define something I can't remember the name. I think NUA is the best thing I have experienced for Washington High School at this point in time. NUA provided the framework for all of the subject specific quality work that teachers in their departments are already doing. We desperately need a whole school framework and NUA is the best thing going. Our first group has been doing great work-this should work.
- I have used engagement activities
- Due to my subject area-not much incorporated but did keep some strategies in mind when planning lessons.
- It would be great if we didn't have to miss so much class time. It really sucks to have substitutes so often.
- Sample lessons and units!!!
- I want to learn how to more effectively motivate my students. Even with the NUA relationship builders I still find the special needs students very resistant to participating and being motivated to learn. I think some of that has to do with my understanding of how to implement the strategies and letting go of old ideas about teaching. I.E. my need for control. It's the students' responsibility to motivate. How to more effectively respond to behavior issues rather than judging it as inappropriate. I need more insight.
- More opportunities to work in content areas with other teachers on using NUA with our curriculum.
- During large group, I would like to see more videos of strategies in action.
- Having to be out of the classroom so much is not good. I think the overemphasis on underachieving African Americans needs to be dialed down. In our urban environment in San Francisco we have under achieving students of all origins and circumstances. Consultants must adjust their materials to the population which they are consulting.
- We need to continue in any way we can. I think teachers here value small group work better than large group work (although that's not me) so I think we could get by with less large group work.
- Show us real lesson plans and units based on real students. Give us more time to co-plan.
- NUA strategies are worthwhile and great to learn - but I already as a teacher, did all the things listed on this survey. That's why I put disagree for most! More sharing from teachers of how they use strategies in particular lessons for particular subjects.
- I do not feel that they have given us anything new. I feel that they have repackaged things from the past with their label on them.
- Yes I realize now that some of my students who were not performing at their potential level was because the strategies that I used were not as engaging and relevant to them. I got some really great tools and strategies that I've tried and some I will try next year. The NUA big group workshop is one of the most practical PDs that I've been to. I got so much out of it.
- NUA did not help with changing my perceptions.
- Yes, I am much more interested in teaching to strengths.
- No; much of what I was taught at NUA coincided with my teaching credential program.
- I'm learning to teach to and recognize students' assets.
- I use thinking maps a lot. They work great with a "smartboard."

- Thinking Maps
- I have used some of the practices of NUA. I have not seen any significant impact.
- I've used strategies such as taxonomy, tree map, dancing definitions, circle maps, double bubble maps, and flow maps. These are effective strategies that engage the students. I find that they participate more and understand the new topic/concepts more.
- It has interrupted our schedule continuously and decreased student learning because of substitutions
- The graphic organizers/thinking maps help students understand and process information. Community builders build relationships.
- I have used NUA practices to introduce and/or reinforce concepts for my students. Specifically, the thinking maps-bubble maps, double bubble map, and defining format were helpful. The impact of NUA on my teaching has been to make me more aware and reflective of my practice.
- I've used the flow map to plan lessons as well as the bubble maps and community builders.
- I do not see the impact of NUA being worth the cost.
- Get rid of NUA and have our successful district teach us professionally develop our district.
- More time to plan how to implement strategies in my classes.
- More time to share strategies with teachers.
- Yes; understanding students whom I thought were not listening actually were during NUA strategies because of rhythm and recitation.
- No, because I always believed that my underachieving students could and would up. Yet, NUA did lend itself to pushing my underachieving students to higher confidence in their academic achievement.
- I have always believed that all students have the ability and potential to learn, in their own manner.
- I have always believed in the potential of my underachieving students.
- No. I have known for many years that my underachieving students have high academic potential and are highly intelligent.
- Culturally responsive pedagogy is extremely important for reaching the needs of culturally diverse students
- Not part of NUA
- Yes, many were able to participate even if they could not read.
- No, my sense of potential has not changed; I have always believed all children can learn. However, I feel I am better prepared to reach underserved students.
- Yes, my perceptions have changed to the positive because I have seen some of my underachieving students perform at a higher level. I was pleased to see how quickly my students responded. It makes me more optimistic about my students potential.
- I've used just about everything I've learned. I am more energized and so are my students. NUA "Big Picture" has carried over into every part of my thinking and planning. I especially like Ms Mann's "teaching for mastery"
- Yes, it's a noticeable difference in vocabulary, phonics, and reading comprehension. Students are engaged and take their roles as participants seriously. Plus they love the rhythm of the dancing definitions, the synonym triplets and the effectiveness of reciprocal teaching

- I believe school employing NUA techniques develop an enhanced belief in the capabilities (potential) of underachieving students, especially those of backgrounds who are often not expected to progress steadily in their grade level. (As I have noticed especially at this school.)
- thinking maps, taxonomies, good and better, synonym triplets, dancing definitions
- I have used thinking maps and essential summaries. I think the impact on my teaching is to (\*) me with effective strategies. School culture is more sensitive to culturally different methods
- I've used thinking maps. I see that NUA has impacted our school culture - more recognition of student potential - more strategies to engage students.
- Not consistently because I was doing my own research in my classroom.
- The Charts, Seminar strategies
- Yes, I have used many strategies.
- Specifically I bring more oral language, recitation, and rhythm to my work.
- Yes, I have used what I learned in NUA in my classroom. I have used Mann's accelerate learning strategies with commonly occurring phonics elements. It has positively impacted several of my underachieving students.
- I would like to visit other school to see NUA practices.
- Keep it up.
- I would like more time w/ the coordinator, i.e. co-teaching etc.
- I want to see research based assessment if this program helps (i.e. 3 students out of every class is helped...)
- More time to make posters.
- Please reconsider having so many of us off-site on the same day.
- I am pleased that the partnership is continuing. I value the mentor site visits and hope that they will continue because these made the biggest difference in my teaching.
- Already Familiar with Techniques
- Participation was Mandatory
- Pressure to not opt out from the district and the school
- Developed alternative training schedule Wednesdays 18pm
- More math strategies
- Less emphasis on graphic organizers
- More reflection time at the school level
- Sub release to watch another teacher in action
- Guided book sessions or book groups
- Uses techniques for priming
- Not new but helped him to be more reflective of practices
- Need more explanation of the PFM
- Valuable to spend time with colleagues
- I do not always feel comfortable with the way they do things
- I don't dance and sing and will not incorporate that into my classroom
- Important to understand the cultural discomfort