

# Implementation by Site

Project STAIR

Technical Report 22

Stacy Hirt | Samantha Bos | Erica Mason | Sarah R. Powell

Southern Methodist University | University of Missouri | University of Texas at Austin

---

The research reported here is supported by the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP award H326M170006). The opinions expressed are those of the authors and do not represent views of the Institute or the U.S. Department of Education.

Copyright © 2022. Southern Methodist University. All rights reserved. This publication, or parts thereof, may not be used or reproduced in any manner without written permission.

This document is available in alternative formats upon request.

## **Implementation by Site**

### **Purpose**

The purpose of this technical report is to describe the professional learning (Core PL) trainings, administration of assessments, and coaching sessions throughout Year 2 (2019-2020) implementation of Project STAIR (Supporting Teaching of Algebra: Individual Readiness).

### **Method**

#### **Site 1**

In Year 2 (2019-2020), the Site 1 team worked with general education mathematics teachers and special education teachers at three sites, School E, School F and School G. The UT team delivered Core PL with their participating teachers on two separate days. Day One Core PL training occurred at each respective site following the start of the school year and included content from Core PL Days 1 and 2. Day 3 Core PL training was conducted at each respective site at the convenience of the teacher during coaching sessions.

The UT team pretested students during the school year at the teachers' convenience. Students at School E and School F pre-tested during the months of October and November, and students at site G pre-tested during January. Each class of teachers' participating students tested individually. This process took several weeks to complete due to scheduling conflicts, technology issues on the campus, and a delayed recruitment of School G.

Following Day 3 training, the UT team began a cycle in which teachers, with coach support, collected and graphed progress-monitoring data, implemented an instructional strategy (i.e., explicit instruction or multiple representations), and made decisions based on student data. Coaches met with teachers every other week, alternating in-person visits and virtual visits, between October and March, depending on the school. Students were assessed weekly using the

*Algebra Readiness Progress Monitoring (ARPM)* measure. At School E, School F, and School G, ARPM measures was administered by teacher participants. Teacher participants and coaches reviewed graphed data for decision making in bi-weekly coaching meetings. The number of data-points at which decision making occurred varied by teacher due to difficulties administering the ARPM measures.

Due to the variability of pre-test dates, the Site 1 team did not administer a midtesting DOMA measure. In March, the team administered posttesting to two students at School F. Students at School E and School G did not complete posttesting due to school closures related to the COVID-19 global pandemic. The data collected was double entered and discrepancies resolved. Teachers received posttest measures via Qualtrics in April. In May and June, each teacher participated in a virtual exit interview session with their respective coach.

The coach visited each teacher biweekly through virtual and in person sessions. Teachers completed a brief pre-observation survey, followed by the observation, and post-observation coaching session on the same day. The coaching sessions comprised of observation, assessment progress, DBI, and instructional practices. The coach discussed data and how the teachers could implement the use of STAIR Tailored videos.

Due to the variability in the start times for the teachers, the number of coaching sessions varied by teacher. The teachers received a window within which the coach could observe them, and the observation was set up according to their availability within that window. Teachers completed a pre-conference survey a week prior to the observation. Observations took 45-50 minutes. STAIR teachers and coaches met in person for post-observation coaching sessions. STAIR coaches trained teachers based on observations, student data, and teacher feedback.

## **Site 2**

In Year 2 (2019-2020), Site 2, team worked with general education mathematics teachers at two sites, School C and School D. The MU team provided Day 1 Core professional learning training at each respective site before the start of the school year. Day 2 Core PL training was conducted at each respective site following the start of school. Day 3 Core PL training was conducted at each respective site one month following the start of school. On Day 1, treatment teacher participants received an overview of the study, project goals, and an overview of Data-Based Individualization (DBI) components. Teachers also completed a pretest at the beginning of Day 1. On Day 2, treatment teacher participants received a review of Day 1 training and given an overview of Project STAIR assessments, universal screening, progress monitoring, graphing and decision making, and diagnostic assessment. On Day 3, STAIR teacher participants received directives for a second screening of student participants using the *Screening Decision Making Form*, an overview of multiple representations and explicit instruction, and continuing with the instructional platform. STAIR teachers received coaching assignments at the initial Day 1 training. STAIR coaches gathered caregiver and student consent from assigned STAIR teachers at these trainings.

After assent, student participants pretested over two days, taking the *Iowa Algebra Aptitude Test* (IAAT) in one session and the *Diagnostic Online Math Assessment* (DOMA) in another. The order of assessments was randomized to mitigate order effects. Coaches double coded the data and was then entered by coaches, and discrepancies resolved by a third coach.

Following Day 3 training, the Site 2 team began a cycle in which teachers, with coach support, collected and graphed progress-monitoring data, implemented an instructional strategy (i.e., explicit instruction or multiple representations), and made decisions based on student data. Coaches met with teachers every other week, alternating in-person visits and virtual visits,

between October and March. Students were assessed weekly using the *Algebra Readiness Progress Monitoring* (ARPM) measure. At School C and School D, teacher participants administered ARPM measures. Graphed data was reviewed for decision making in bi-weekly coaching meetings. The number of data-points at which decision making occurred varied by teacher due to difficulties administering the ARPM measures.

School C and School D administered mid-testing DOMA measures in December of 2019. The data was double entered by coaches and discrepancies resolved by a third coach.

Posttesting occurred in March of 2020. Students at School C completed post-testing in two sessions, one for the IAAT and one for the DOMA. Students at School D did not post-test due to school closures related to the COVID-19 global pandemic. The data collected was double entered by coaches and discrepancies resolved by a third coach. Teachers received post-test measures via Qualtrics in April. In May, each teacher participated in a virtual exit interview session with their respective coach.

Each teacher was coached twelve times, six times following an observation, and six times without being observed. STAIR teachers received a window within which the coach could observe them, and the observation was set up according to their availability within that window. Teachers completed a pre-conference survey a week prior to the observation. Observations lasted 45-50 min. STAIR coaches trained teachers based on observations, student data, and teacher feedback.