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ABSTRACT

The role of the 21st Century teacher is one that continues to challenge all those who embrace the title. The diverse needs of students in and outside of the classroom are direct contributors to what and how teachers facilitate the learning process. Consequently, the type and frequency of professional development are pivotal to the teachers’ capacity to provide appropriate instruction. The researcher used a case study design to investigate the self-efficacy of five middle school English Language Arts & Reading (ELAR) Pre-Advanced Placement (Pre-AP) teachers in an urban school district. This record of study was designed to examine the factors that influence high teacher self-efficacy and advanced performance of both teachers and students in these 7th grade Pre-AP ELAR classrooms.

The findings of this study suggest that high teacher self-efficacy in advanced academics can be fostered through intentional professional development, focusing on advanced instruction of their content. Additionally, administrators who support and encourage risk taking as well as collaboration among peers with similar instructional goals are vital to high teacher self-efficacy in advanced academics. Recommendations for future implementation and research include the development of a district wide Advanced Academics department to provide on-going professional development of this targeted group (Gifted and Talented, pre-Advanced Placement and Advanced Placement teachers).
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Preparing students for college and career readiness is an initiative that 21st century schools are pursuing in creative ways. Early and increased exposure to advance coursework is a growing strategy that is being embraced by educational organizations to assist in this initiative. Lifvendahl (2007) stated, “The best predictor of success or failure in postsecondary education is the intensity and quality of secondary school curriculum”. Attempts to challenge students and provide opportunities for them to show advanced application of content knowledge must be carefully planned from every angle to yield the success schools seek in student achievement and ultimately, college readiness. Schools want to see students rise to the challenge and perform at advanced levels on assessments. However, the emphases on student growth and progress toward college readiness have caused stakeholders to examine their pedagogical practices more closely so that all students will be successful.

Current accountability systems aim to review the teaching and learning processes for all students. The inclusion of and focus on all students concept requires that educators examine their practices much closer than before. Educators must look at how they impact learners who are below grade level, on grade level, and above. Much of the work that has been completed in the past has been designed for learners who are below grade level. The instruction rarely focuses on the other learners through financial resources or daily, instructional resources; however, that is changing.
Seventh grade Pre-AP (pre-advanced placement) ELAR (English Language Arts and Reading) students at three middle schools in a target district are passing the advanced academics coursework, but not performing at advanced levels on the state assessment to indicate progress toward college readiness. One approach to help better prepare students for global competition is to ensure rigor within coursework. The Pre-Advanced Placement (Pre-AP) and Advanced Placement (AP) courses are supposed to provide academic rigor that will allow for students to score at high levels on academic assessments; however, these high scores are not always the case. There appears to be a misalignment of the instruction provided throughout the year at the campus level and the assessment used to evaluate student learning based on that instruction.

One of the most neglected populations in some educational settings is the advanced instruction population. These are the students who generally perform well on teacher assessments, as well as state assessments. However, as the Texas Education Agency (TEA) focuses more closely on the learning at various levels, for all students, District N has been forced to examine its practices for students who are enrolled in and expecting advanced instruction. District data show a decline in the performance of students participating in advance instruction programs. This research will focus on advanced instruction at the three middle schools in the target district. While one middle school experienced an increase of advanced students performing at advanced levels from 19 percent to 25 percent, another experienced a decline of 73 percent to 71 percent and the third middle school’s decline was from 48 percent to 41 percent of students who participated in advanced instruction programs and performed at advanced levels. All campuses had an increase in the percentage of students who participated in advanced instruction programs, but did not perform at advanced levels. The data follow: 19 to 25 percent, 42 to 50 percent and 34 to 55 percent. There is a need to review the advanced instruction
programs in the middle schools to determine areas of need that contribute to decline in advanced performance.

The Problem Space

A National Perspective

The importance of an educated citizenry was a desire for the early fathers of the United States (Finkelstien, 1991). In 1983, A Nation at Risk was published and warned of failing public schools and increased global competition (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983). The report indicated that America’s unchallenged superiority in commerce, industry, science, and technological innovations was being taken over by world competitors (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983). United States schools face additional challenges in the 21st Century as they strive to prepare a more diverse population of students for more rigorous college and career paths. The National Math and Science Initiative (2017), shares that “the nation’s greatest economic and intellectual threats are the declining number of students who are prepared to take rigorous college courses . . . and are equipped for careers in those fields”. “At a time when the knowledge-based, global economy requires more Americans with education and training beyond high school, the nation confronts the prospect of a sustained drop in the average educational levels of the U.S. workforce” (Callan et al, 2006, p. 1; Kelly, 2005). The United States’ next steps to address the needs of its educational system are critical to all students and the global economy. Creating an equitable system that supports teachers and students is essential to addressing these problems. Future policy must include funding and time to prepare teachers for the rigorous demands that students will face in 21st Century colleges and careers. Recent accountability focuses on college and career readiness aspects of schools
however; teacher training is a key component to closing the gaps that exist from the K-12 setting to college and career settings.

A State Perspective

Texas school districts are required to assess students for accountability purposes each year via standardized tests: State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR) and End of Course (EOC) exams. These exams measure student proficiency on the state curriculum standards, widely known as Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) by the Texas State Board of Education (SBOE). Additionally, these assessments measure postsecondary readiness standards that were developed by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) and incorporated into the TEKS curriculum. According to the Texas Education Agency (TEA) (2014), TEC §39.024(a), postsecondary readiness is the level of preparation a student must attain in English language arts and mathematics courses to enroll and succeed, without remediation, in an entry-level general education course for credit in that same content area for a baccalaureate degree or associate degree program or for certificates or credentials other than baccalaureate or advanced degrees (moakcasey.com). The incorporation of the post secondary readiness standards provides data regarding the instructional strengths and needs of Texas schools as it relates to preparing students for college and careers.

Student performance was categorized as: (1) unsatisfactory academic performance, (2) satisfactory academic performance, and (3) advanced academic performance. Unsatisfactory academic performance indicated a student was not prepared for the next grade level or an entry-level college course. The operational definition for satisfactory academic performance meant that a student was “reasonably likely (with at least a 60 percent probability) to succeed (with a grade of C or higher) in an entry-level, credit bearing course in that content area for a
baccalaureate degree or associate degree program at a general academic teaching institution or a postsecondary institution that primarily offers associate degrees, certificates, or other credentials” (Morath, n.d., p. 14). Similarly, advanced academic performance meant that a student was “highly likely (with at least a 75 percent probability) to succeed (with a grade of C or higher) in an entry-level, credit bearing course in that content area for a baccalaureate degree or associate degree program at a general academic teaching institution or a postsecondary institution that primarily offers associate degrees, certificates, or other credentials” (Morath, n.d., p. 14). The assessment data provide valuable insight that must be analyzed and addressed at every level of administration to improve the preparation of students for post-secondary readiness.

**The Problem of Practice**

**Context**

The case study took place at three middle schools in an urban school district in the Dallas-Fort Worth metroplex. The school district is located in the southern sector of the Dallas area. Almost 13,000 students are served on 9 elementary campuses, 3 intermediate campuses, 3 middle school campuses, and 1 comprehensive high school campus. The district has seen a change in demographics of both students and teachers over the past 10 years. Some of the participants have seen the district’s transition from a suburban district to an urban district. Their reflections provide valuable insight into the misalignment of Pre-AP instruction and advanced performance.

**Stakeholder Groups and Values**

The stakeholders who participated in the study were five 7th grade Pre-AP ELAR teachers, three middle school principals, and three middle school teacher specialists. The experience levels of the teachers ranged from 4 to 15 years; however, their years of experience as
an advanced academics teacher ranged from two to five years. The task of facilitating, monitoring, and accessing the learning of 7th grade Pre-AP ELAR students at high levels was the primary responsibility of the aforementioned teachers. Findings from this case study reveal a fractured system that does not provide the resources and support for teachers and students at various administrative levels. Several factors were determined to inhibit their ability to perform at high levels. The lack of priority and focus from the district perspective left campuses to determine if and how they would prioritize and support advanced academics at the campus level. Some campus administrators saw the value in supporting advanced academics, while others did not. Consequently, the campus whose principal made it a priority has seen more success in advanced academics. Additionally, the district has experienced administrative turnover at various levels. Changes in philosophy and priority were seen with the introduction of teacher specialists. They were introduced to work one-on-one with teachers at the campus level, building capacity that would ultimately enhance instructional practices and student achievement. Only one of the middle school teacher specialists has been trained in advanced academics. The other specialists lack the skillset to coach advanced academics teachers as needed. In essence, the middle school Pre-AP teachers may not have received the resources they needed to excel in the instructional facilitation of advanced academics students. While numerous themes emerged, the most striking were:

1. Consideration of the lack of district focus/value on advanced academics to provide direction for campus administrators and teachers.
2. Consideration of the absence of a consistent, ongoing and intentional professional development model for all advanced academics teachers.
3. Consideration of the absence of time to collaborate with peers to improve teaching and learning in advanced academics.

**Problem Statement**

**Audience**

This proposal is directed to the local school district in which the case study was completed, specifically the Senior Leadership Team (SLT) that consists of executive administrators from all departments in the school district. Using the results of this study, the Chief Academic Officer will schedule a time for me to present the proposed solutions to SLT. Decisions to implement the proposal as presented or with changes will be made by the SLT. Curriculum, personnel or policy changes will be presented to the school board and implemented as approved.

**Ideal Scenario**

Ideally, the school district would have an established Advanced Academics department in place with the resources to support campuses at all levels. In the absence of the ideal structure, the district’s Senior Leadership Team (SLT) will need to make provisions for initial and ongoing training of teachers, administrators and support staff in advanced academics. The district focus and commitment to time, finances, and human capital for this department are vital to the changes needed at the campus and district level so that all stakeholders will see improvements in student achievement at more balanced levels among all campuses. A commitment to the proposed plan will yield the gains the district wishes to see in the future.

**The Real**

One of the district’s goals is to increase student performance at advanced levels. The district’s advanced performance on state assessments is lower than the state and many of its
neighboring districts. A close look at the data revealed that the district is not capitalizing on its advanced instruction opportunities. In fact, advanced instruction has not been a focal point in the district.

The district received accountability results for 2016. Six of the 17 eligible campuses received distinctions for student performance at advanced levels and in progress (growth) measure. Many of the neighboring districts received more distinctions for advanced level and progress level performance. A review of the data show that the progress and advance level performance numbers are declining. When reviewing the middle school data, one campus is leading advanced performance and growth with a significantly higher margin. Conversations with the principals and teachers at all three middle school campuses revealed a need for instructional support for teachers and students in advanced instruction and on-level coursework.

Many of the high performing teachers who appear to be stronger and more consistent in moving students to advanced performance on district and state assessments exhibit very similar characteristics and use similar instructional strategies. Those teachers all came from one campus and participated in College Board training. Further investigation would address underlying factors that contributed to the more successful teachers and school as it related to advanced students performing at advanced levels on local and state assessments.

Most advanced academics teachers at the middle schools were left to support themselves however they could and with whatever resources they could find. Consequently, the support of the campus principal was a major factor in the success of advanced academics students performing at advanced levels on local and state assessments. Initial interviews with the teachers and principals, revealed that most of the teachers lack the skills they need to provide advanced instruction because they have not had training. Budgeting constraints at the campus level often
pushed GT and pre-AP training to the bottom of the priority list, leaving little funding to provide systematic and ongoing professional development for this population of teachers. Additionally, the initial interviews with principals revealed a gap in the understanding of and capacity to lead and support advanced instruction of students and teachers. Like many of the teachers, campus administrators have not participated in College Board or any other training to prepare them for leading an advanced instruction program. It is difficult to lead what one does not know or fully understand. The lack of an advanced academic system in the district is reflected in the lack of direction and progress on the middle school campuses in the pre-AP classes.

**History of the Problem**

The district has had a series of leadership and philosophical changes implemented over the course of 5-8 years. For multiple years, an advanced academics department was present at the district level. That department was charged with the compliance, training and procedural management of teaching and learning for this population of students and teachers. Conversations with teachers who were present during that time recalled the training and collaboration that they experienced during that time. However, the department was eliminated with the entry of a new superintendent in 2007. For the next eight years, the district experienced instructional shifts that impacted that advanced academics program for k-12 students. In the wake of new district leadership, the district has seen a renewal of various programs and new initiatives. However, advanced academics teachers changed significantly during the previous leadership’s time. The years of experience, training and teaching practices of those who participated in the systematic advanced academics program of the past administration were weakened over the years with no structure in place. Currently, the district does not have a system in place to ensure appropriate training, collaboration and monitoring of students and teachers in advanced academics.
Each interviewee mentioned the district’s role in supporting and focusing on advanced instruction. There are concerns that the district has not valued or supported this effort. Teachers and principals do not feel valued in the conversation about advanced instruction and that the professional development be thorough. Significant feedback regarding the district’s lack of focus/direction and support for the advanced instruction program was received from teachers, campus administrators, as well as district level personnel who have been in the district from eight years to 28 years. This concern is significant as it has the potential to frame the importance of improving this area of instruction at the campus level. Campus personnel want to know that the district sees this as an important initiative and that it will be supported at multiple levels.

My Role

As a district director in the curriculum and instruction department, I work very closely with the Superintendent, Chief Academic Officer, other department directors, building principals and teachers to educate them on areas that impact teaching and learning, accountability and advanced instruction. Additionally, a close working relationship existed with the Director of Professional Development to establish supports based on the data revealed through assessments, campus walkthroughs, surveys and more. My field advisor, the Chief Academic Officer, provides numerous growth opportunities for me in my current capacity.

As a building principal and advanced academics teacher in my former district, there was a structured advanced academics department and I learned the value of a system that prioritized these learners just as much as they did those who struggled to meet minimum grade level requirements. Consequently, I know the significance and impact of providing direction and support from the district level. It is through that lens that I research and make recommendations for the district.
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

As we continue to frame the 21st century school and economy, many stakeholders in education agree that there is a need to increase efforts to better equip students for success in life. Students are exposed to instruction to ensure mastery of basic math and reading skills; however, most are not equipped with the skill-set to experience success in a competitive, global market.

According to Laguardia and Pearl (2009), the preservation of democracy is one rooted in a well-prepared citizenry. Referring back to a report developed by the United States Department of Education in 1983, entitled a Nation at Risk, it was determined the United States prowess in commerce, industry, science, and technological innovation was being taken over by other competitive nations (Wagner, 2008). In current times, evidence indicates American schools fail to properly prepare students for success in the 21st century. According to Wagner (2008), only about a third of U.S. high school students are ready for college, with the rates being much lower for minorities and those that live in poverty. American schools must confront this issue for all students. Truly addressing and preparing educators to provide rigorous instruction for improved college and career readiness is a top agenda for educational reform. Advanced academics programs should be a frontrunner for providing rigorous college and career preparation for students. However, participation and performance data for these programs do not align in the Texas urban school district used for this research.

Variations in student performance at advanced levels are largely influenced by the teachers’ self-efficacy and capacity to facilitate instruction at the appropriate levels for advanced academics. Jamil (2012) asserts that “teacher self-efficacy is a teacher’s belief in his or her ability to complete the steps required to accomplish a particular teaching task in a given context
(Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk, Hoy & Hoy, 1998), or more broadly as a teacher’s belief in their ability to influence important student outcomes (Wheatley, 2005). Appropriate and ongoing professional development provides the skills needed to facilitate advanced instruction. District N’s absence of an advanced academics department or focus has led to a gap in support and capacity of the pre-advanced instruction at all levels. As a result, the self-efficacy and performance of middle school English Language Arts and Reading teachers varies.

This case study explored the relationship between middle school Pre-Advanced Placement English teacher self-efficacy and student performance at advanced levels on district and state assessments. Additionally, the researcher developed a model professional development format to support 7th grade middle school Pre-AP English teachers.

**Pre-AP Courses**

Pre-AP classes are designed to challenge and prepare students for College Board’s Advanced Placement (AP) course and exam. The level of rigor, as outlined by College Board, is aligned from sixth grade through high school and these courses are “designed to give students a foundation to develop the skills they need for success in high school and beyond” (collegeboard.com). Like most Texas school districts, Pre-AP classes also provide the required services for gifted and talented students because of the rigor and differentiation that is included in the curriculum and instruction. It is important to note that not all students in a Pre-AP class are gifted and talented.

A cornerstone of College Board’s program is the training it provides to implement their curriculum (collegeboard.com). It teaches advanced instruction how to identify student-learning needs, align curriculum and assessment, and differentiate instruction, among other vital skills needed for Pre-AP courses. In 2009, College Board created an evaluation to determine the
impact and needs of the current AP Summer Institute (APSI) in Florida. Godfrey (2009) reports that the results of the evaluation showed that “75.8 percent of the participants would “strongly recommend the training to new AP teachers” (p.3). “Teachers were asked the extent to which they changed various aspects of their AP and non-AP (if applicable) courses due to the APSI. At least 585 teachers rated the items regarding the extent of change in the AP classroom, and 243 left optional comments regarding their changes” (Godfrey, 2009, p. 3). “Many less-experienced teachers reported having a better understanding of the AP Program expectations, as measured by the exams, as well as how the tests are scored. As a result, they have made changes to their curricula in order to better prepare their students for the exam” (Godfrey, 2009, p. 4). While Pre-AP students do not take the College Board exam at the end of the course, the rigor and challenging curriculum prepare them for the higher-level AP coursework and advanced thinking skills for college level work. College Board offers summer courses in the APSI for Pre-AP students. One of the seventh-grade Pre-AP ELAR teachers who participated in this case study has attended an APSI for middle school ELAR. The other participants have not attended an APSI for any grade level or content.

While College Board provides a curriculum for their approved Pre-AP courses, districts are not required to purchase it. Teachers can be trained on research-based strategies that yield success in Pre-AP courses. At the time of this research, District N had not purchased the curriculum, nor has it provided a curriculum that addresses the Pre-AP classroom needs. Pre-AP teachers are expected to take the general curriculum and differentiate it to the appropriate level for their advanced course. Through conversations with seventh grade Pre-AP ELAR teachers, it was determined that one of the five teachers is comfortable taking the district’s general curriculum and differentiating it for Pre-AP ELAR instruction. The others admitted that they
need assistance in this area. The one teacher who is comfortable differentiating the instruction does not know how to differentiate the curriculum.

**Professional Development and Support**

The teachers, trained and untrained, bare the responsibility of planning and facilitating the content at differentiated levels that incorporate the rigorous college and career readiness standards. The principals are charged with the responsibility of supporting the teachers and students with the resources needed to participate in the learning cycle at rigorous levels. The teacher specialists are assigned to campuses and charged with supporting teachers through coaching. Most often, the most vital resource advanced academics teachers need is ongoing professional development and follow up. The teacher specialists support all teachers at the campus level; however, only one of the three middle school teacher specialists has been trained in advanced academics instruction via College Board or any other source. The lack of training for the teacher specialists weakens the support layer needed to build capacity in the Pre-AP ELAR teachers. Identifying existing professional development, creating professional development and supporting Pre-AP teachers will be critical to building the capacity of advanced academics teachers.

Interviews with the target stakeholders revealed some positive and negative experiences in the district that have impacted the beliefs of Pre-AP teachers regarding their practice, the need and role of professional development. The background information revealed through interviews provided valuable insight into the needs of the proposed professional development model. Perhaps, one of the most valuable revelations was the identification of the people/roles that need to participate and how they can serve as support layers for the Pre-AP teachers.
According to Loucks-Horsley, Stiles, Mundry, et al. (2010), “all professional development programs need to consider the knowledge base of learners and learning as a major input to their designs. This consideration is critical on at least two levels. First, when teachers experience and reflect on how students learn, they are better able to understand why certain instructional strategies are more effective than others, thus enabling them to provide powerful learning experiences for their students” (p. 53). Constructing an ongoing professional development model for advanced academics teachers, particularly those targeted in this case study, requires great care and consideration for the needs of adult learners and the desired outcomes. The teachers who participated in the case study were not very clear on how their students learn and this was a key factor in designing a proposed professional development plan that incorporates reflections and collaborative opportunities. Additionally, the support personnel, teacher specialists and campus administrators, are not skilled at helping Pre-AP teachers identify how their students learn or what strategies are needed to address learning needs. A structured, ongoing professional development model for Pre-AP teachers, campus administrators, and teacher specialists will better prepare the team for improved planning and delivery of advanced instruction.

Loucks-Horsley, Stiles, Mundry, et al. (2010) went on to share “second, we need professional development designs that reflect how people learn so that the teachers themselves are supported to learn in a sustained and in-depth way” (p. 53). Just as teachers must understand how their k-12 students learn, professional development designers must understand the complexities of how adults learn. There are critical components to be considered in the design model to make it an effective professional development with transferrable and applicable content. According to Bausmith and Barry (2011), there is mounting evidence that certain
features of professional development also can have an impact on student achievement. These features of effective professional development include training over an extended time period (Yoon, Duncan, Lee, Scarloos, & Shapley, 2007), a focus on the subject matter content and how students learn that content (Dopplet et al., 2009; Kennedy, 1998), and opportunities for teacher teams to work collaboratively on student learning (Saunders et al., 2009) (p. 176). These features will be included in the advanced academics proposal for the district and campuses. The incorporation of instructional technology is another component that must be present in the professional development model. The district’s Bright Bytes results from the last two years reveal a need to build teacher capacity in the area of instructional technology. Denton, Smith, Davis et. al (2002) addressed the need for building teacher capacity in pre-service teachers as a means to confront the growing gap in the use of instructional technology as a key resource for student support. “The need for colleges of education to prepare students and teachers for a technological world is clear. It is also apparent that teacher preparation faculty, who should be leaders and models of technology enhanced education, are not” (5). While this scenario addresses the need for building capacity in pre-service teachers at the collegiate level, the same concept is an issue at the K-12 levels. Students are digital natives who welcome opportunities to integrate technology into their instructional experiences; however, their teachers are often apprehensive. The levels of differentiation required for 21st Century classrooms is vast and provides various opportunities for teachers to include instructional technology as a resource to provide individual or group access to differentiated instruction.

The APSI will be instrumental to the learning and capacity building process; however, follow up and collaborations must be a consistent and intentional component of the teaching and
learning process for advanced academics teachers. Table 1 provides a view of the structure and content included in the proposed advanced academics professional development model.

Antoniou and Kyriakides’ (2011) research suggests that the Dynamic Integrated Approach (DIA) to teacher professional development was most impactful on teacher instruction (p. 291). The Dynamic Integrated Approach to teacher professional development “refers to eight factors which describe teachers’ instructional role and are associated with student outcomes: orientation, structuring, questioning, teaching-modeling, applications, management of time, teacher role in making classroom a learning environment, and classroom assessment. An integrated approach in defining quality of teaching is adopted” (Antoniou and Kyriakides, 2011, p. 294). This approach addresses the learning needs of both 7th grade Pre-AP English Language Arts and Reading teachers and students. The proposed design will include this model because of the components of this model and their alignment to the needs of advanced academics instructors. According to Antoniou and Kyriakides (2011), “the model is also based on the assumption that teacher factors are inter-related and the importance of grouping of factors has been demonstrated. A longitudinal study revealed that the teacher factors can be grouped into five levels which are situated in a developmental order. The first three levels are mainly related with the direct and active teaching approach by moving from the basic requirements concerning quantitative characteristics of teaching routines to the more advanced requirements concerning the appropriate use of these skills as these are measured by the qualitative characteristics of these factors. These skills gradually also move from the use of teacher-centered approaches to the active involvement of students in teaching and learning” (p. 294). According to Antoniou and Kyriakides (2011), “skills associated with direct teaching only were found to be situated at the easiest levels; whereas, more complicated levels refer to advanced skills concerned with
constructivist approaches to teaching and differentiation of learning” (p. 296). One of the most challenging instructional practices to overcome for the target teachers in this case study is providing direct instruction for most of their instructional time. Teachers understand the need to adjust their instructional practices to a more varied technique; however, they require support in planning and facilitating instruction that actually removes them as the sole source of content knowledge in the classroom.

**Table 1**

*Advanced Academics – Proposed Professional Development Activities*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Instructional Focus</th>
<th>Audience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring/Summer 2018</td>
<td>College Board Training for Advanced Placement Instructors, Social Emotional Learning (SEL) Training, Methodology for Academic &amp; Personal Services (M.A.P.S.)</td>
<td>Advanced Academics Teachers &amp; Campus Administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly (August – March)</td>
<td>Professional Development reflections, grade level and content planning</td>
<td>Advanced Academics Teachers, Specialists &amp; Campus Administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2019</td>
<td>Teacher &amp; Admin PLC- (Benchmark Data) Data Analysis</td>
<td>Advanced Academics Teachers, Specialists &amp; Campus Administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2019</td>
<td>EOV PLC – 2018-2019 instructional reflections and adjustments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interestingly, the newly implemented Texas Teacher Evaluation and Support System (T-TESS) consist of levels as well: 4 domains and 16 dimensions (txasteachers.org). The domains are planning, instruction, learning environment and professional practices and responsibilities (txasteachers.org). Performance in these domains is rated in levels: distinguished,
accomplished, proficient, developing and improvement needed (texasteachers.org). These levels are similar to the five levels of the Dynamic Integrated Approach in that performances for improvement needed, developing and proficient include elements of direct teaching and strong teacher led instruction. “The last two levels of the DIA “are more demanding since teachers are expected to differentiate their instruction (Level 4) and demonstrate their ability to use the new teaching approach by engaging students to orientation and modeling tasks (Level 5)” (Kyriakids & Tsangaridou, 2008). “Antoniou and Kyriakides (2011) posit, “when student outcomes are taken as criteria, teachers who demonstrate competencies in relation to higher levels were found to be more effective than those situated at the lower levels. The correlation between teachers who demonstrate competencies in levels four and five of the DIA to that of teachers who perform at the accomplished and distinguished level of the TTESS is an interesting one that adds value to the planning and design of the proposed professional development model. Antoniou and Kyriakides’ (2011) research found that “teachers employing the DIA managed to improve their teaching skills more than teachers employing the other professional development model. Moreover, 21 out of 65 teachers employing the DIA managed to improve their teaching skills to such an extent that it enabled them to move to the next stage of teaching competence. The use of the DIA had also a significant impact on student achievement” (p. 306). The success that those teachers experienced has to be celebrated and reflected upon so that they are empowered and encouraged to expand their reach to other teachers. That is the level of capacity building and collaboration intended for the proposed professional development plan for the target audience.

**Interpretive Theoretical Perspective and Teacher Self Efficacy**

Erickson (1985) asserted, “the key questions asked in interpretative research are "What is happening here?" and "What do these events mean to the people engaged in them?" (p. 19). The
qualitative research case study for this record of study is grounded in the interpretive theoretical perspective, which guides the research process. According to Crotty (1998), Interpretivism seeks to develop an understanding of an action. Furthermore, Schwandt (2000) noted “to find meaning in action, or to say one understands what a particular action means, requires that one interpret in a particular way what the actors are doing” (p. 191).

McDonald, Metzler, Nilges, et al. (2002) note that key characteristics of interpretive research are “the premise that social organizations are constructed based on purposeful actions of individuals as they negotiate their social roles and define status within the collective social group” (p. 138). Schools and school districts must note and ensure that stakeholders, particularly teachers, are empowered as individuals and groups within the structures that impact the organization. McDonald, Metzler, Nilges, et al (2002) share the following:

People make use of learned meaning acquired and constructed through the symbol systems of a culture (e.g., language, politics, ethnic beliefs, negotiations of gender roles, distribution of power within a group). Another premise of the interpretive perspective is that meaning making is both an individual and collective action. Put another way, a person is viewed as both a unique individual and a part of a larger social organization (p. 138).

The qualitative research case study for this record of study is grounded in the interpretive theoretical perspective, which guides the research process. According to Crotty (1998), Interpretivism seeks to develop an understanding of an action. Furthermore, Schwandt (2000) noted “to find meaning in action, or to say one understands what a particular action means, requires that one interpret in a particular way what the actors are doing” (p. 191). “Teachers are the connection among a strong professional community, improved instructional capacity, and higher academic achievement” (Buell et al 2004). As Pre-AP English Language Arts teachers give their best efforts to provide the highest level of instruction to their students, they have to believe that they have the skills and resources to successfully accomplish this task. According to
Shahzad and Naureen (2017), “the more competent the teachers are, the more effective is the educational system” (p. 49).

“Self-efficacy can be understood as possessing three dimensions: magnitude, or perceptions about the level of task difficulty that can be performed; strength, the degree to which perceptions are applied to tasks within a specific domain or across a variety of domains, and generality, how perceptions are applied to tasks within a specific domain or across a variety of domains” (Stajkovic and Luthans, 2002). These dimensions must be monitored and used to coach teachers through their instructional practices on a regular basis. Additionally, Gavora highlight’s Bandura’s theory in stating the following:

Self-efficacy has two components: efficacy expectation and outcome expectancy. The former is the conviction that one has the ability, knowledge, and skills to successfully execute the behaviour or actions required to produce the desired outcome(s). The latter represents a person’s estimate of the likely consequences (impact) of performing a task at the self-expected level of performance. To be successful, the teacher must have both high efficacy expectations and high outcome expectancy (p. 2).
The teacher’s ability and belief about the impact of the work they do are critical to their performance and impact on student achievement. Bandura (1994;1997) also contends that contributing factors to self-efficacy are, most importantly, enactive mastery experiences (actual performance of a relevant task) and, successively, vicarious experiences (observations of others’ performances), social persuasion (verbal or other information used to influence perception), and physiological/affective states. Martin et al. (2005) share “a key component of a teacher’s beliefs and knowledge is self-efficacy. From a psychological perspective, self-efficacy theory shows promise in helping us to further understand how teachers think about curricular change as they move along the process” (p. 174). It is paramount that we understand the magnitude of the experiences and environment in which we place our teachers. They are direct contributors to the
level of self-efficacy of our classroom teachers.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

A qualitative research method was identified for this record of study for several reasons. Qualitative research methods are especially useful in discovering the meaning that people give to events they experience (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003; Denzim & Lincoln, 2000). Dresch et al. (2015), suggests (as presented in Romme, 2003; Van Aken, 2004) the main objectives of research carried out under this paradigm (case study) are to explore, describe, explain and, if possible, predict phenomena or existing systems. The qualitative method selected for this research was a case study approach because it allowed the researcher to explore systems in the district that impact the advanced academics courses: parents and students. This study sought to identify the factors that impact teacher self efficacy in advanced academics and the factors that influence the misalignment of advanced academics instruction and advanced performance of students who receive that instruction. The components and principles that guide qualitative research serve as the means to identify and understand the research questions in this study.

Research Questions

This case study was designed to answer the following questions:

1. What are seventh grade Pre-AP English language arts and reading (ELAR) teachers’ levels of self-efficacy as it relates to their ability to provide appropriate levels of instruction to their students?

2. What systems are in place at the district and campus levels to address the seventh grade Pre-AP English language arts and reading (ELAR) teachers’ instructional needs?
3. Are seventh grade Pre-AP English language arts and reading (ELAR) teachers receptive to a proposed professional development model as a means to improve and align instructional practices at all middle schools in District N?

4. What role do middle school principals play in influencing seventh grade Pre-AP English language arts and reading teachers’ self-efficacy?

**Ethical Considerations**

Texas A&M University’s Internal Review Board (IRB) determined that this study was to be a Quality Improvement project because it involved the collection of the school district’s internal data for the purpose of indicating the impact of teacher self-efficacy. Participants were invited to participate. Participant confidentiality and informed consent were emphasized early in the process. Interviewees were reminded of the scope of the work and their right to discontinue their participation prior to each action without negative consequences. While all efforts were made to uphold confidentiality, the risk of participant privacy was present. Coding was used to honor the privacy of all participants. This measure was explained to participants in an effort to encourage honesty regarding the systems and people associated with those systems in the district and schools. There are no identifying points that will link participants in the study at this point or in the future. While participants received a light appetizer and Target gift card, there were no costs encountered for participating in the case study.

**Data Collection**

Seidman (1991) stated, “I interview because I am interested in other people’s stories. Telling stories is essentially a meaning-making process. When people tell stories, they select details of their experience from their stream of consciousness”. I selected interviewing as a data
collection method for this study. The interview approach connected the making of meaning to the factors revealed regarding the work they do, the preparation and support they receive. Additionally, I used a survey to assist in identifying key areas to address during the interview process.

**Research Steps**

The research conducted for this study employed the following protocol to ensure that the interviews yielded data consistent with the study’s goals:

1. The proposal was presented to the Superintendent of the district.
2. Participants were invited to the study by the researcher, and were informed of their options for participation and confidentiality.
3. Teachers, teacher specialists and middle school administrators participated in a mock PLC to discuss a grade level need and the proposed professional development model.
4. The teachers completed the Ohio State University Teacher’s Sense of Efficacy Scale.
5. Teachers, principal and teacher specialists participated in a one-day College Board training on instructional strategies for advanced academics classes.
6. Teachers, principals and teacher specialists completed an Advanced Academics Support Survey.
7. Interviews were conducted and transcribed.
8. Follow up informal contact was initiated, and each participant was given his or her respective transcript for review and verification of accuracy.
9. The researcher reviewed district-level data.
10. The researcher coded the data for emergent themes.
Quantitative Instruments

Advanced Academics Instructional Support Survey. The five 7th grade Pre-AP teachers were asked to complete a short survey identifying the various layers of support available and desired for the teachers. The survey was developed by the researcher to examine strengths and needs at the campus and district levels based on responses from the teacher and administrator interviews. Influenced by Zheng, Wang Doll et al.’s Organisational Support Survey (2018), the Advanced Academics Instructional Support survey was made available and completed using an online format. Teachers indicated not at all, rarely or regularly to statements regarding instructional support regarding advanced academics instruction. Some questions required a yes or no response from teachers.

The questions were designed to examine the following factors: instructional strategies, professional development and collaboration opportunities, administrative feedback and support. Missing data (blank responses) were treated as meaningful, because a blank indicated that the associated item/s did not occur or needed further investigation. Feedback from the survey provided valuable insight to the researcher regarding the foundation, systems, and needs of the advanced academics teachers in the district, and more specifically, those in the middle school 7th grade Pre-AP ELAR classes.

Many of the responses revealed expectations for high performance and rigorous instruction without the preparation and support for teachers to meet those expectations. When asked about the district’s support and encouragement for the use of advanced academics, 43% of the respondents indicated the occurrence was rare, 43% noted regular and 14% noted not at all. The survey also asked about the positive impact of the training provided by the district. 29% of the respondents indicated the training (professional development) had no positive impact on their
instruction, while 43% indicated the training rarely had a positive impact on their instruction and 28% indicated the training regularly had a positive impact on their instruction. The other questions revealed similar responses regarding the support and preparation for teachers of advanced academics at the middle school level.

Table 2

*Advanced Academics Instructional Support Survey*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Regularly</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My campus provides structured and ongoing support for advanced academics instruction.</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My campus provides content and pedagogy support in advanced instruction when I have difficulty.</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I have difficulty achieving advanced academic instructional goals, I can discuss the issues with a teacher specialist trained in advanced academics instructional strategies.</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am confident about my ability to use research based advanced academics instructional strategies (College Board, National Math &amp; Science Initiative, or another research based training).</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have mastered the skills necessary to deliver advanced instruction and yield advanced student performance on local and state assessments.</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>57.14%</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I received advanced academics instructional support in the 2016-2017 school year that enhanced my teaching effectiveness.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td>57.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have received instructional feedback regarding my use of advanced academics instructional practices from an administrator.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>71.43%</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Regularly</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I believe that more support in advanced academics instructional practices would enhance my teaching effectiveness.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The responses from this survey led the researcher to pay closer attention to the respondents during the interview portion of the process. The researcher became even more interested in the responses of the campus administrators after learning that 71.43% of the respondents noted receiving instructional feedback regarding the use of advanced academics instructional practices from an administrator. Most of the other responses were in line with the other information learned through the research process.

**Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale.** Seventh grade Pre-AP ELAR teachers responded to 16 items on a nine point Likert-like scale with the following anchors: nothing, very little, some influence, quite a bit, and a great deal. Each item represented two subscales: efficacy in student engagement and efficacy in instructional strategies. Each subscale was represented by eight questions. After completing the scale, teachers had an opportunity to discuss efficacy in student engagement and instruction through a middle school PLC setting. Most teachers who rated themselves high expressed concern that they may have rated themselves lower. The one teacher who participated in specific professional development for advanced academics scored themselves modestly, however spoke more reflectively about their practices and improving instructional for student achievement. Three of the four untrained Pre-AP ELAR teachers rated themselves highly and the other untrained Pre-AP ELAR submitted a moderate rating of themselves.
Table 3

*Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Engagement</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malcolm</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felicia</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briana</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanda</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualitative Instruments

Eight participants were interviewed for this research. The five seventh grade Pre-AP ELAR teachers and the three middle school principals allowed for identifying and soliciting knowledge regarding the needs of the program at the campus and district levels. Patton (1987) refers to these type of participants as “key informants”. They are people who possess significant knowledge about the inquiry setting and articulate that knowledge accurately. Additionally, their insights can be helpful in assisting an observer in understanding events and factors that influenced those events. As an initial step in the interview, I reiterated the purpose of the study, research procedures, benefits, their right to discontinue participation at any time and the protection of confidentiality. They were also reminded that they could and should ask questions at any point. Using a semi-structured interview approach (Merriam, 2002) and a uniform set of open-ended questions, I was able to gather demographic information, participants’ perceptions,
experiences, understandings and awareness of self-efficacy. The teacher interview consisted of the following questions:

- Do you plan with other Pre-AP ELAR teachers on your campus? In the district?
- If and when you plan with other Pre-AP ELAR teachers, how often do you plan with them and how long are your planning sessions?
- How do you differentiate instruction for your Pre-AP ELAR students?
- What training have you received in differentiating instruction for your Pre-AP ELAR students?
- What PD (district or campus provided) has been most impactful to your ability to plan and facilitate advanced instruction?
- Have you had Advanced Placement Summer Institute (APSI) training through College Board?
- If so, how long has it been since you attended the training?
- Have you used or explored College Board’s curriculum?

The administrator interview consisted of the following questions:

- Do your Pre-AP teachers plan together?
- Is there a support plan for your Pre-AP teachers?
- What PD is provided to your Pre-AP teachers?
- How does their instruction differ from non-Pre-AP teachers?
- What do you notice about these teachers and students that you do not notice with on level teachers and students?
- How do you coach your advanced academics teachers in the use of instructional practices that will improve their pedagogy and student achievement outcomes?
Setting

This research was conducted in a small, urban school district (District N) in north Texas. Per the district’s online profile, it serves more than 13,000 students at 18 campuses: nine elementary schools, three intermediate schools, three middle schools, one comprehensive high school and two alternative campuses. In addition to the students within the city of the District N, three surrounding cities are zoned for the target school district. A diverse school district, the student population is 51.01 percent Hispanic, 40.66 percent African American, and 4.9 percent White. The district employs approximately 1600 employees, including almost 800 classroom teachers.

Pre-AP courses are currently taught in grades 7-10 in the district. Middle school Pre-AP enrollment warrants one teacher for each course: math, science, social studies, and ELAR. Campus principals have opted to divide course loads among two to three teachers in some grades. Two of the three middle schools have multiple Pre-AP teachers for ELAR and math at each grade level (seventh and eight grades). This research focused on seventh grade Pre-AP ELAR teachers at the three middle schools in District N.

Participants

Key participants in the study were the five seventh grade Pre-AP ELAR teachers. The researcher received assistance and insight from the middle school principals, Director of Professional Development, Assistant Superintendent of Student Support (formerly a secondary principal in District N) and the Chief Academic Officer. A light lunch was provided during the mock PLC and gift cards were provided to the teachers. The names of the teachers and middle school principals have been changed for confidentiality purposes. The five teachers are all African American. One of the teachers is a male, while the others are female. The table below
displays the demographic and teacher experience data for the teacher participants in this case study. The average number of years teaching among the group of teachers is 8.4 years; however, the average number of years teaching Pre-AP coursework is 3.6 years and only one of the participants has received the recommended College Board training in an AP Summer Institute (APSI).

**Table 4**

*Participant Demographic Results*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Teaching Experience</th>
<th>Total Pre-AP Teaching Experience</th>
<th>AP Training</th>
<th>Race</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malcolm</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felicia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briana</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanda</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Janet.** Janet is an African American female with 15 years experience teaching in two states. She has taught Pre-AP ELAR 4 of those 15 years and has not attended College Board’s content specific training or any other advanced academics training since teaching Pre-AP curriculum. She is also seeking a counselor’s degree and expects to be a licensed school counselor by the summer of 2019.

**Malcolm.** Malcolm is an African American male with nine years experience teaching English Language Arts and Reading. He has taught Pre-AP ELAR for the last two years and has
not participated in College Board’s content specific training or any other advanced academics training.

**Felicia.** Felicia is a young, African American female teacher who has four years of experience teaching English Language Arts and Reading. She has taught Pre-AP ELAR all four of those years and has the highest student achievement scores of all teachers. Felicia has attended a College Board content specific training and communicates with other professionals she met during that training.

**Briana.** Briana is the youngest African American female teacher of the group. She has taught English Language Arts and Reading for five years and the last two years have been in the Pre-AP ELAR classroom. Like most other Pre-AP ELAR teachers, Briana has not attended a College Board content specific training.

**Wanda.** Wanda is an African American female seventh grade English Language Arts teacher. She has taught ELAR for nine years and Pre-AP ELAR for six of those nine years. Wanda joined District N’s teaching staff two years ago. Although she taught Pre-AP prior to joining the target district, she has not participated in College Board’s content specific training. She has, however, used College Board’s ELAR curriculum.

**Reliability and Validity**

Qualitative research involves the researcher taking an active role in the collection and interpretation of other people’s thoughts and experiences. Reliability and validity are essential to the integrity of a study. A sound case study is significant and complete, utilizes alternative perspectives and sufficient evidence and is reported in an engaging manner (Yin, 2009). To maintain credibility of the study’s findings, I utilized research-based strategies from Merriam (2002). I triangulated data and performed member checks (Merriam, 2002) by sharing a copy of
the interview transcript with interviewees for their review and approval. Golafshani (2003) posits triangulation is used to strengthen the impact of naturalistic inquiry by controlling for bias and increasing researcher’s truthfulness. Using quantitative and qualitative data collection and data analysis were two of the main triangulation steps used in the study.

Merriam (2002) also recommends that credible and trustworthy researchers follow additional guidelines such as reflexivity (engaging critical self-reflection by the researcher regarding assumptions, biases, and the relationship to the study, which may affect investigation.)
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The purpose of this qualitative study was to examine the factors that impact seventh grade ELAR teachers’ levels of self-efficacy as it relates to student achievement at advanced levels. The following research questions informed this study: (a) What are seventh grade Pre-AP English language arts and reading (ELAR) teachers’ levels of self-efficacy as it relates to their ability to provide appropriate levels of instruction to their students?; (b) What systems are in place at the district and campus levels to address the seventh grade Pre-AP English language arts and reading (ELAR) teachers’ instructional needs?; (c) Are seventh grade Pre-AP English language arts and reading (ELAR) teachers receptive to a proposed professional development model as a means to improve and align instructional practices at all middle schools in District N?; and (d) What role do middle school principals play in influencing seventh grade Pre-AP English language arts and reading teachers’ self-efficacy?

Through the interview process, teacher participants shared their experiences, perceptions and concerns with their instructional practices, opportunities to collaborate and grow as advanced academics teachers. The findings of this research are based on analysis of the interviews, observations, questionnaires and surveys.

Data Analysis and Coding

The researcher used the same questions for the interview, questionnaire and survey processes. The transcriptions of the interviews were used to code individual responses. Trends and common occurrences were then identified to further investigate the experiences and perceptions of the participants. The larger, common themes that emerged from the coding were in line with concepts discussed in the content of the record of study: support, collaboration,
training/professional development and planning time. The data regarding the teacher’s sense of self-efficacy provided an opportunity to align key aspects of the theory such as mastery experiences and social persuasion with those of Interpretive theory, which hold that “people make use of learned meaning acquired and constructed through the symbol systems of a culture” (McDonald, Metzler, Nilges, et al (2002)). The researcher used the themes to draw conclusions regarding the systems and lack of systems in District N and the impact on the participants.

**Support.** The campus and district personnel provide little or no levels of support to seventh grade ELAR advanced academics teachers. When asked about the support provided to the teacher participants, each of the five teacher participants paused to consider if they had received support specifically for their Pre-AP (advanced academics) courses. All of the teachers have blended schedules: they teach Pre-AP courses and on level (regular) seventh grade ELAR. They all shared that they receive curriculum support and instructional strategy support for the on level (regular) classes on a regular basis, but none for the Pre-AP classes. Felicia shared that while she attended an APSI, “there was a lot of information and it is overwhelming when no one else has it or understands how to help me bring it to life in my classroom.” She went on to share that she “tried some things on my own and found some strategies that worked well, but there were some that just didn’t work with my kids.” Janet shared that she “has received a lot of curriculum support for her on level classes and her kids who perform below grade level, but nothing is available to help her with her Pre-AP instruction.” She added that the campus “double blocks on level classes, but only provides 50 minutes of instruction for the Pre-AP students.”

**Training/Professional Development.** Little to no training is provided to seventh grade ELAR advanced academics teachers by the campus and district. One of the five teacher participants has had specific training by College Board that focused on advanced instruction in
English Language Arts and Reading. In many districts, there is an established system to monitor first time and recurring training of advanced academics teachers. The principal of the one trained teacher believed in the training and created a culture of providing the training to all Pre-AP teachers. There was no support beyond that training. The other four campuses do not have that culture and expectation of training. In fact, two of the non-trained teachers had never heard of the College Board training. Wanda has had the most experience teaching Pre-AP ELAR and exclaimed, “I’ve never heard of the APSI.” “I’ve used the College Board curriculum Spring Board and there are some things I like, but also some things I did not like about the curriculum.” Felicia, the only teacher who has been trained through College Board APSI, spoke highly of the training “it was good and content specific. I only wish I had other 7th grade Pre-AP teachers there with me to help me make more sense of all of the information.”

**Collaboration.** Opportunities to collaborate with other seventh grade ELAR Pre-AP are limited or non-existent. When asked about the short, mock PLC the researcher established, each of the teachers spoke to the value of that opportunity even though it was short. They all stated that they wanted more opportunities to collaborate with other seventh grade Pre-AP ELAR teachers. Each of the teacher participants discussed the benefits of the newly implemented PLCs on their campus, but noted they only focus on the non Pre-AP courses during that collaboration time. Felicia is especially interested in the opportunity to collaborate with other teachers because she is the only teacher on her campus for seventh grade Pre-AP ELAR. The other two campuses split the courses between two teachers so they can plan and collaborate with one another, while she has no other teacher to plan and collaborate with for her grade level and content. According to Malcolm, “having an opportunity to share planning, assessment, instructional and overall resources would be so helpful. If we could all just have protected time to share what’s working
and what’s not working for our students, it would help us all grow. Our kids would grow.” The three principals observed their teachers and listened to their collaborations during the mock PLC. All principals realized the teachers needed more opportunities to collaborate. The principal of middle school B made several references to time. She said “we just don’t have enough time to pull them for planning. When would we be able to do this and how often?”

**Planning Time.** Protected planning time is not provided to seventh grade ELAR advanced academics teachers. The curriculum provided to and required for instruction in District N is an on level curriculum. It includes suggestions for when students do not master the content and that level and suggestions for instructional adjustments for when students show mastery of the content early. What the curriculum does not do is provide guidance for advanced students from the introduction to the conclusion of the content. This means that teachers have to take the on level curriculum and differentiate for the various levels within their Pre-AP classes. Most of the teachers admitted that they need help in being able to differentiate the content. They further discussed the lack of time provided to plan differentiated curriculum. All of the teachers spoke about the need for time to just get caught up and plan more effectively. Wanda spoke about her use of the Springboard curriculum in her previous district. “I did like that the curriculum was advanced, but also had layers for differentiation. We should have been trained a little more to really understand all that was available, but it was a good resource. Coming here and having to do more of the work to get the lessons where they need to be and having to find resources requires a lot more time.” The other teachers agreed that they put in a lot of time, separately trying to prepare for their Pre-AP students. Briana noted “we have this PLC now, but that time is spent focusing on the on level and below level instruction and students. We always have to
schedule time after school to try to work together. It’s harder for me to do that now because I just had a baby.”
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This chapter will discuss the findings of this case study, examine the research questions, discuss future implications and conclusions.

During this process, the researcher provided updates to the Chief Academic Officer of the district. Prior to the completion of the case study, the superintendent created an Advanced Academics department to begin laying the foundation for the work he agreed needed to be done. This department will be instrumental in addressing the concerns of the participants in this case study and others throughout the district.

Discussion

Research question 1: What are seventh grade Pre-AP English language arts and reading (ELAR) teachers’ levels of self-efficacy as it relates to their ability to provide appropriate levels of instruction to their students? The variance between the teachers’ levels of self-efficacy was not in line with what the researcher anticipated. It was interesting that the teacher with the most training and highest performance did not have the highest level of self-efficacy. The teacher and student performance data revealed the teacher with the most training did have the highest performance data, however that teacher’s sense of self-efficacy was one of the lowest based on the scale. The principals provided great insight into their teachers when the data were reviewed. The two newest middle school teachers both shared that early conversations and interactions with all teachers revealed that the previous principals did not follow up often. The one middle school principal who has been on their campus the longest shared that their campus teachers were accustomed to frequent feedback and opportunities to reflect. In table 3, a summary of the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy results reveal higher efficacy scores for three of the five teachers.
The responses and scale scores may be influenced by the feedback and reflective opportunities established by the campus culture. The other campus principals spoke to a need for a more reflective culture. When all principals received an overview of the middle school PLC comments of some teachers after responding to reflective questions regarding teacher self-efficacy, the principals made connections regarding the teachers and their scores.

**Research question 2:** What systems are in place at the district and campus levels to address the seventh grade Pre-AP English language arts and reading (ELAR) teachers’ instructional needs? At the time of this case study, there were no systems in place at the district level to address the instructional needs of seventh grade Pre-AP ELAR teachers. Any support or resources available for the advanced academics teachers came from the campus principal’s decision to designate funding for those teachers.

The middle school campuses had no system in place to address the needs of this population. It was a reflection of the lack of focus at the district level. While middle school B had more trained teachers (APSI trained) than the other campuses, it was an inherited culture. The newly named principal of middle school B struggled with how to maintain and grow teachers as it had been established in the past. Both of the other middle schools (A and C) had new principals as well. Those principals were very welcoming and innovative in their attempts to prepare teachers for improved instruction at advanced levels. There was not a plan when they were hired, but they have been open to developing plans for future school years to build the capacity of all advanced academics teachers on their campuses.

**Research question 3:** Are seventh grade Pre-AP English language arts and reading (ELAR) teachers receptive to a proposed professional development model as a means to improve and align instructional practices at all middle schools in District N? The four teacher participants
for this case study are extremely receptive to the proposed professional development model as a means to improve and align instructional practices for advanced academics in their classrooms. They realized the power of their combined knowledge and found the design encouraging. They all commented on the frequency of the PD and the campus support. Janet mentioned “the teacher specialist does a good job helping as much as possible, but it is always for the students who struggle the most. If we had someone who helped us to focus and plan for the advanced students more frequently, it would help us balance our efforts better.” They also like that the model provides opportunities for them to see what the others are doing.

**Research question 4:** What role do middle school principals play in influencing seventh grade Pre-AP English language arts and reading teachers’ self-efficacy? “The school principal is the creator or re-shaper of a school’s teacher culture and influences not only the actions of the school staff, but also their motivations and spirit” (Deal and Peterson, 1999). Conversations with middle school principals revealed their desire to be more knowledgeable and supportive of ways to help the advanced academics teachers and students. The principal of middle school B has been at her campus longer than the other two middle school principals. The principal of middle school B has paid for summer training for advanced academics; however, the principal admitted “the previous principal had a three year plan in place to provide training for all advanced academics teachers” (April 2017 interview). The newly identified principals revealed that are open to providing the funding for advanced academics teachers “with guidance.” All middle school principals indicated that they were “in favor” of their pre-AP teachers participating in a district wide PLC to grow, share, and challenge instructional practices for advanced academics teachers. “There’s no such thing as a high-performing school without a great principal… You simply can’t overstate their importance in driving student achievement, in attracting and
The principals understand the need to support the advanced academics teachers and students as a means of moving every student to higher levels of achievement. Principal of school A shared “so much of what I’ve seen or helped in focusing on has been on low performing students. I need guidance in finding ways to help the advanced academics teachers and students.” Principal of middle school C revealed she “knows of some ways to challenge and support advanced academics students, but appreciated guidance and district support in getting ground level professional development in place.” A large percentage of teachers indicated that they had received instructional feedback from a campus administrator on the support survey, however only one administrator indicated they have the knowledge of ways to challenge and support advanced academics students and teachers. Most of the principals want to learn how to coach and support this population on their campuses. In listening to and reviewing responses from teachers and administrators, it become more evident that there was a need to align expectations and understandings of instructional feedback. Teachers believed they were receiving instructional feedback regarding their advanced academics practices, while most principals are unaware of how to provide instructional feedback regarding advanced academics practices.

All principals expressed an understanding of the need to lead teachers through reflective exercises to improve instructional practices. Bowles and Pearman (2017) suggest (as cited in Bandura 1986; 1989) that “self-reflection as it positively contributes to altering a person’s thinking and actions. Fundamental to the concept of self-efficacy is the ability to self-reflect, evaluate the situation, and develop a plan for action using one’s skills and knowledge” (p. 25). When the self-efficacy theory was explained to principals, they all expressed a need to improve
their support at all levels. Principal A stated “I need to learn more about the instructional needs and strategies of my advanced students and teachers so that I can do a much better job in guiding them through a reflective process.”

Summary

Two solutions were considered to address the problem. Conversations with district teachers, principals, my field based mentor, district level administrators and classmates helped to shape the two solutions presented. “The leadership within the school and district plays a more prominent role than merely a contextual factor as school districts are the primary providers of professional development and ongoing support for teacher learning which can ultimately affect student achievement (Birman et al., 2007). Understanding the need for a district led focus on advanced academics is vital to setting the tone for improving the self efficacy and overall performance of teachers and students in the advanced academics program. Just as principals are charged with establishing and maintaining a culture that embraces and supports the district’s mission, vision and values, the district’s leadership team must work to establish the same culture from the top down. Throughout the process, the writer updated the superintendent on the progress. Prior to the conclusion of the study, the superintendent created an Advanced Academics department charged with developing a plan to build capacity and a support system for advanced academics teachers and students from grades k-12. With the development of the district’s Advanced Academics department in 2017-2018, plans have been created to provide tiered training for the two middle school campuses that have the least number of trained teachers in the summer of 2018. The district is also reviewing College Board’s reading and math curriculum (Spring Board) as a possible resource for middle school Pre-AP courses. The district plans to adopt some or all parts of one of the proposed solutions below for full implementation in
the 2018-2019 school year.

The proposed solutions take into account research based aspects that will lend themselves to building the capacity of those teachers and establishing a culture of moving all students to higher achievement levels. Blattner (2001) highlighted a Missouri initiative to improve advanced placement success among teachers and students. She stated, “the programs at Southeast Missouri State University have prepared hundreds of secondary teachers to teach college-level AP courses in more than two dozen subject areas and to prepare their students for the corresponding AP examinations.” The state used a small group to monitor the growth of teachers and students as they increased the numbers of students participating in AP courses. The professional development of teachers was a critical piece to their success. Both solutions presented as a result of this case study involve a thorough and intentional professional development model for the advanced academics teachers and support staff.

There are some common requirements of both proposed solutions to be considered by the district’s senior leadership team. The newly developed Advanced Academics department will facilitate the implementation of the selected solution. Each scenario requires the district and campus provide PLC training for teachers, coaches, and administrators to establish a consensus of what is expected in the campus and district PLC settings. Additionally, both solutions include the purchase and training of advanced academics teachers and administrators in Methodology for Academic and Personal Success (M.A.P. S.) curriculum and Social emotional learning (SEL) training. These common requirements will aid the district in establishing a system of capacity building for teachers and administrators. The M.A.P.S. curriculum is similar to the well known Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID) system in it’s ability to provide a foundation for building student confidence, academic stamina, resiliency, time management, and
study skills. Providing insight into the soft skills included in social emotional learning (SEL) will aid teachers in building stronger relationships with students. According to Denham & Brown (2010), “when a child can understand self and others, take in social information accurately to make good decisions, interact successfully, and regulate behavior, many classroom learning tasks are made easier” (p. 667).

**Solution 1.** Provide training to campus principals and designated teachers on the use of the eight factors included in the dynamic model of effective teaching: orientation, structuring, questioning, teaching modeling, application, management of time, teacher role in making classroom a learning environment, and classroom assessment (Creemers, Kyriakids, Creemers, Antoniou, 2009). Create a protected, ongoing PLC for teachers to plan, and reflect upon the use of the eight factors of the dynamic model as well as other instructional concerns. Provide College Board training to all teachers and principals through the summer academy (APSI) to better prepare them for the 2018-19 school year and beyond. Assign advanced instruction/GT coaches/specialists to support each grade span configuration in the district: elementary, intermediate, middle and high school. With the most recent development of the Advanced Academics department, GT Specialists were hired to support the elementary and intermediate levels only in 2017-18. This proposed solution suggests the same level of support be provided for middle and high school campuses in the next school year. Incorporate College Board’s curriculum for Pre-AP instruction in reading and math with the implementation professional development that supports the first two years of facilitation for teachers and administrators. These steps will address the factors and themes that were revealed in the research as distractors to the growth of teachers and negative contributors to their sense of self-efficacy.
**Favorable Outcomes**: Teachers will establish a community of learners that support and share in the planning of advanced instruction using the strategies that are modeled with and for them. Campus principals will develop a better understanding of the instructional needs their advanced instruction students and teachers need. The district will create a support system that addresses the needs of advanced instruction students and teachers district wide. Most importantly, student data will reveal an increase in advanced performance levels on the district and state assessments.

**Solution 2.** If the district does not move forward with hiring more Advanced Academics coaches/specialists to support secondary teachers and students, it is recommended that the district provide abbreviated College Board training to designated teachers, teacher specialists and principals during the 2018-19 school year. Utilize the current teacher specialists to support the teachers and principals in designing advanced instruction that includes differentiated instructional strategies and more rigorous opportunities for learning. Provide protected time for collaboration and planning with the assistance of the teacher specialists for advanced academics teachers at the campus and district level.

**Favorable Outcomes**: The College Board training for the identified stakeholders will provide hands on, content specific strategies that will yield an increase in student performance at advanced levels. Including the district’s current teacher specialists will provide another layer of support for the teachers as they assist with the design of classroom instruction. As teacher leaders, the teacher specialists would be empowered in their ability to coach and promote differentiation in more classrooms beyond the targeted group for this research. This would enhance the district’s impact and support of advanced instruction. This is the least favorable
proposal by the researcher. Both teachers and principals who participated in the study favored the first scenario over the second scenario.

**Figure 2. Proposed Solutions**

![PROPOSED SOLUTIONS](image)

**Solution 1**
- Provide focused & ongoing training to campus principals, Pre-AP/AP teachers & teacher specialists
- Create a protected, ongoing PLC for teachers to plan, and reflect.
- Provide College Board training to all teachers, teacher specialists and principals through the summer academy (APSI).
- Methodology for Academic & Personal Success (MAPS)
- Social Emotional Learning (SEL) training for teachers and administrators through Big Thought

**Solution 2**
- Provide focused & ongoing training to campus Pre-AP/AP teachers & teacher specialists
- Create a protected, ongoing PLC for teachers to plan, and reflect.
- Provide College Board training to all teachers and teacher specialists through the summer academy (APSI).
- Methodology for Academic & Personal Success (MAPS)
- Social Emotional Learning (SEL) training for teachers and administrators through Big Thought

**Implications and Future Research**

The case study findings suggest that creating a district professional development model to support campus teachers, students and principals through the newly developed Advanced Academics department would help to build capacity for teachers to align their advanced instruction with the level of rigor and application students need to perform at advanced levels.

Professional development projects are increasingly, specifically tailored to improve teachers’ efficacies in a wide range of educational outcomes (Martin, 2005, p. 175). Creating an
intentional system of ongoing professional development has the potential to significantly influence the culture of all advanced academics teachers in the district. Considerations for the proposed professional development include time factors, administrative support, training, and opportunities to collaborate and frequent monitoring. The researcher planned to implement a semester of the proposed model; however, finding consistent times to work with the teachers was difficult. Furthermore, campus administrators varied in their levels of support of requiring teachers to register for or attend tentatively scheduled sessions. Although the teachers and principals articulated an understanding of and need for the professional development, the district’s calendar and schedule did not provide reasonable options for the incorporation of the professional development.

**Conclusion**

This study may provide district and campus instructional leaders with a foundation to use with advanced academics teachers of all grade levels and content. Using the components of the teacher self-efficacy theory, leaders can examine systems’ needs more closely. Additionally, the incorporation of an intentional and structured support system has the potential to build instructional capacity and positive teacher self-efficacy; both of which have strong ties to improving student achievement. The components suggested in the solutions are research based and suggested for building instructional capacity of all teachers. The key focus areas of the proposed professional development model are drawn from Kyriakides, Creemers, Antoniou (2009). Kyriakides presents (as cited in Campbell et al., 2003) these factors may have stronger impact for the learning of specific groups of students but should be treated as generic in nature since they were found to be related with achievement of each group of students. The study may provide a model to be used to support students in various categories of the school setting as
suggested in the research. While the target focused on advanced academics instruction, achievement and teacher efficacy, the research continues to suggest that a more structured approach to teacher and student support will yield improvements in student achievement.
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APPENDIX A

RECRUITMENT EMAIL

Dear Pre-AP ELAR Teachers:

As a doctoral candidate at Texas A&M University, I am inviting you to participate in my doctoral research project. This case study will examine the levels of 7th grade Pre-AP ELAR teacher self-efficacy and factors that positively impact those levels. An initial meeting will be held, giving you an opportunity to ask questions and review an outline of research activities.

Study participants will participate in a mock PLC, complete an interview, survey and questionnaire.

If you have any questions, please contact me by e-mail at doctor-neek16@tamu.edu. Thank you in advance for your time and support.

Sincerely,

Nneka S. Bernard
### APPENDIX B

**TEACHER SENSE OF EFFICACY SCALE (short form)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Beliefs</th>
<th>How much can you do?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. How much can you do to control disruptive behavior in the classroom?</strong></td>
<td>(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. How much can you do to motivate students who show low interest in school work?</strong></td>
<td>(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. How much can you do to get students to believe they can do well in school work?</strong></td>
<td>(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. How much can you do to help your students value learning?</strong></td>
<td>(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. To what extent can you craft good questions for your students?</strong></td>
<td>(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. How much can you do to get children to follow classroom rules?</strong></td>
<td>(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. How much can you do to calm a student who is disruptive or noisy?</strong></td>
<td>(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. How well can you establish a classroom management system with each group of students?</strong></td>
<td>(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9. How much can you use a variety of assessment strategies?</strong></td>
<td>(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10. To what extent can you provide an alternative explanation or example when students are confused?</strong></td>
<td>(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11. How much can you assist families in helping their children do well in school?</strong></td>
<td>(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12. How well can you implement alternative strategies in your classroom?</strong></td>
<td>(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

TEACHER INTERVIEW SCRIPT AND QUESTIONS

For interview:
“Thank you for agreeing to meet with me to answer questions regarding your experience as a 7th grade Pre-AP English Language Arts Teacher on your campus and in District N”. The focus of my research is to determine the factors that positively impact Teacher Self-Efficacy. Teacher self-efficacy is Teacher efficacy—“teachers’ confidence in their ability to promote students’ learning” (Hoy, 2000). Your beliefs about your impact on student learning may be impacted by school and district factors. Your responses will help me identify potential factors that positively impact your self-efficacy.

Teacher Interview Questions:
- Do you plan with other Pre-AP ELAR teachers on your campus? In the district?
- If and when you plan with other Pre-AP ELAR teachers, how often do you plan with them and how long are your planning sessions?
- How do you differentiate instruction for your Pre-AP ELAR students?
- What training have you received in differentiating instruction for your Pre-AP ELAR students?
- What PD (district or campus provided) has been most impactful to your ability to plan and facilitate advanced instruction?
- Have you had Advanced Placement Summer Institute (APSI) training through College Board?
- If so, how long has it been since you attended the training?
- Have you used or explored College Board’s curriculum?

Administrator Interview Questions:
- Do your Pre-AP teachers plan together?
- Is there a support plan for your Pre-AP teachers?
- What PD is provided to your Pre-AP teachers?
- How does their instruction differ from non-Pre-AP teachers?
- What do you notice about these teachers and students that you do not notice with on level teachers and students?
- How do you coach your advanced academics teachers in the use of instructional practices that will improve their pedagogy and student achievement outcomes?
APPENDIX D

ADVANCED ACADEMICS INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT SURVEY

1. I am supported and encouraged by my district to use advanced academics instructional strategies.
   Not at all   Rarely   Regularly

2. The training provided by my district has helped me become a stronger advanced academics teacher.
   Not at all   Rarely   Regularly

3. My campus provides structured and ongoing support for advanced academics instruction.
   Not at all   Rarely   Regularly

4. My campus provides content and pedagogy support in advanced instruction when I have difficulty.
   Not at all   Rarely   Regularly

5. When I have difficulty achieving advanced academic instructional goals, I can discuss the issues with a teacher specialist trained in advanced academics instructional strategies.
   Not at all   Rarely   Regularly

6. I am confident about my ability to use research based advanced academics instructional strategies (College Board, National Math & Science Initiative, or another research based training).
   Not at all   Rarely   Regularly

7. I have mastered the skills necessary to deliver advanced instruction and yield advanced student performance on local and state assessments.
   Not at all   Rarely   Regularly

8. I received advanced academics instructional support in the 2016-2017 school year that enhanced my teaching effectiveness.
   Yes   No

9. I have received instructional feedback regarding my use of advanced academics instructional practices from an administrator.
   Yes   No

10. I believe that more support in advanced academics instructional practices would enhance my teaching effectiveness.
    Yes   No

11. What is your home campus?
    Reed Middle School   Kennemer Middle School   Byrd Middle School
# APPENDIX E

## 2018-2019 ADVANCED ACADEMICS-PROPOSED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Instructional Focus</th>
<th>Solution 1</th>
<th>Solution 2</th>
<th>Support Personnel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apr-May 2018</td>
<td>Identify participants to enroll in a College Board AP Summer Institute, M.A.P.S., &amp; SEL Training</td>
<td>Advanced Instruction/Content Specific Skills</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun – Jul 2018</td>
<td>Advanced Academics Teachers, Teacher Specialists, &amp; Administrator/s participate in APSI workshops</td>
<td>Advanced Instruction/ Pedagogical Skills Tech Tip</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Director of Advanced Academics Instructional Technology Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 2018</td>
<td>APSI participants present their top 5 learning experiences from the APSI workshop.</td>
<td>Advanced Instruction/ Pedagogical &amp; Content Specific Skills Tech Tip</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Director of Advanced Academics &amp; Secondary Advanced Academics Specialist Instructional Technology Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Instructional Focus</td>
<td>Solution 1</td>
<td>Solution 2</td>
<td>Support Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 2018</td>
<td>Professional Development Model 2: Dynamic Model &amp; APSI PLC session, PSAT overview and Classroom observations</td>
<td>Factors of the Dynamic Model &amp; APSI Strategies 1-3 Tech Tip</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Teacher Specialists, Campus Administrator, Secondary Advanced Academic Specialist Instructional Technology Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 2018</td>
<td>Professional Development Model 3: Dynamic Model &amp; APSI, PLC session and classroom observations, M.A.P.S., &amp; SEL Training</td>
<td>Factors of the Dynamic Model &amp; APSI Strategies 4-6 Tech Tip</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Teacher Specialists, Campus Administrator, Secondary Advanced Academic Specialist Instructional Technology Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2019</td>
<td>Admin PLC- Identify teacher’s percentages for students performing at advanced levels Summary of scores in the targeted areas Walkthrough analysis of teacher performance in the targeted areas</td>
<td>Factors of the Dynamic Model &amp; APSI Strategies 1-3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Teacher Specialists, Secondary Advanced Academic Specialist Instructional Technology Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Instructional Focus</td>
<td>Solution 1</td>
<td>Solution 2</td>
<td>Support Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2019</td>
<td>Professional Development Model 4: Dynamic Model &amp; APSI, PLC session, PSAT and classroom observation</td>
<td>Factors of the Dynamic Model &amp; APSI Strategies 4-6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Teacher Specialists, Campus Administrator, Secondary Advanced Academic Specialist Instructional Technology Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 2019</td>
<td>Review of PD models 1-4 addressing journal notes</td>
<td>Factors of the Dynamic Model &amp; APSI Strategies Tech Tip</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Teacher Specialists, Campus Administrator, Secondary Advanced Academic Specialist Instructional Technology Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 2019</td>
<td>PLC session – data review, PD needs, M.A.P.S. &amp; SEL review</td>
<td>Factors of the Dynamic Model &amp; APSI Strategies Tech Tip</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Teacher Specialists, Campus Administrator, Secondary Advanced Academic Specialist Instructional Technology Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Instructional Focus</td>
<td>Solution 1</td>
<td>Solution 2</td>
<td>Support Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun 2019</td>
<td>Admin PLC- Identify teacher’s percentages for students performing at advanced levels</td>
<td>Summary of scores in the targeted areas Walkthrough analysis of teacher performance in the targeted areas</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Teacher Specialists, Secondary Advanced Academic Specialist, Director of Advanced Academics Instructional Technology Specialist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>