

**Strengthening Quality Mathematics and Science Learning for All:
Measuring What Matters**

**2001 Southwest Regional Conference
National Science Foundation
Division of Educational System Reform**

12/13/01

Susana M. Navarro - El Paso Urban Systemic Program

Dr. Susana Navarro graduated from The University of Texas in El Paso with a major in political science in 1968. After working at the United States Commission on Civil Rights in Washington on a landmark study of Mexican-American education, she began her graduate studies at Stanford University, where she received her Ph.D. in educational psychology. Since that time, she worked with the Mexican-American Legal Defense Education Fund for five years as national director of research and policy analysis. From 1985 until early 1991, she worked with the Achievement Council, a statewide non-profit organization in California, where she helped to create as associate first and then executive director. Susana returned to El Paso where, with regional education business and civic leaders, she founded the El Paso Collaborative for Academic Excellence, an organization which she has headed since its inception. The Collaborative, a city-wide effort to improve academic achievement among all students, is now completing its 10th year of operation and has become a national model of urban school reform. Dr. Navarro's work has been featured in numerous national publications, including Education Week, Chronicle of Higher Education, and Phi Delta Kappan. In addition to Urban Systemic Initiative and Urban Systemic Program, grants from the National Science Foundation, the Collaborative has received support for its systemic reform work from the Pugh Charitable Trust, the United States Department of Education, the Rockefeller foundation, and the Coca-Cola Foundation.

It's a pleasure to be with you this morning. I'd like to tell you a little bit about the El Paso Collaborative for Academic Excellence and about the long history of work that we've done in conjunction with the National Science Foundation, the Urban Systemic Initiative, and the Urban Systemic Program. Our work undoubtedly shares many similarities with your own work. I'm not up here pretending that what I'm saying is radical, different, or wildly different from what you all have done. There may be some differences in your own efforts, but I'd like to share our story in the hopes that some elements of this will be useful to you.

Our story is really one about equity, in so many ways a primary feature and driver of our work. It's about partnerships, particularly K-16 partnerships. It's about systemic education reform that's gone on for now over 10 years. And if anyone had told me 10 years ago that I would still be doing this, I might have screamed and said "no way!" and yet here we are. It's also a story of deep commitments and understanding about what all children deserve. And so much of our work from the very beginning, as I often tell people, has been driven by what we would want for our own children. As Alicia, one of my colleagues, and I often say, it would have to be good enough for Anna Elisa, my daughter, and Bobby, her son. And that's what we would want for every single child in El Paso. And that's what has really driven our work in the Collaborative. It's about creating professional learning communities. And, finally, it's about how we know that we're creating the changes that we're working so very hard to ensure. Part of what you'll hear in the story that I'll share with you this morning is how the three strands that are the focus of this conference have come together in our work. And how they're interconnected. This is also about how resources have made much of this story, and indeed this work, possible.

Let me start with a brief portrait of El Paso. Some of you know it reasonably well. For many of you, it's new. We're a bi-national community on the border between the United States and Mexico. We're a city of 700,000 and along with Ciudad Juarez, Chihuahua, Mexico, we comprise a metropolitan area of about two million people. We're a very poor community with the fifth poorest congressional district in the country. Over 70 percent Hispanic. With over one-half of the homes reporting Spanish as the language of preference. Our three school districts enroll over 135,000 students, of which well over 85 percent are Latino and about two-thirds

are eligible for free or reduced cost lunch. We started the El Paso Collaborative for Academic Excellence, as Julio told you, just about 10 years ago now—in fact, over 10 years ago—motivated by three key concerns. The first was that academic achievement, no matter how you measured it, was absolutely unacceptably low. And we looked at many indicators as the conversations for the Collaborative took place. We looked at academic achievement. We looked at drop-out rates. We looked at the numbers of students who were repeating first grade. Anyway you looked at it, the numbers of students going on to college or being retained the first year, we simply were not cutting it.

The second factor was the realization that the many special education programs that we had counted on for so very long and had thought would bridge the achievement gap—no matter how wonderful they were for individual students— simply weren't enough to turn around the schooling experience for all minority and poor students. When I worked with the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights study of Mexican-American education. I think we had fond hopes that certain kinds of programs could, in fact, ensure high achievement on the part of all of our students. The reality was that as we looked 20 years after that work, when many of the recommendations that we had made during that study had in fact been implemented, the reality was that the gap was still enormous between Latino and white students.

And the third motivator was the belief that new approaches to improvement had to bring the entire community together to focus on the essential components of schooling. Not just K-12, but K-16. It was a very different notion at the time, that not only would K-12 be coming together, but that K-16 would be coming together. Universities would come join school districts in a very different kind of partnership.

It wasn't about the university saying "listen to us, we'll tell you how to fix yourselves." It was about saying we're all in this together, there's lots that we can do to improve and if we don't band together to do it, it's not going to happen in the way that it must. Those partners came together to form the El Paso Collaborative and the partners that did come together, in fact, are still with us to this day. We just had a board meeting two days ago and all of these people were there. The superintendents of the three large school districts—El Paso, Ysleta, and Socorro—the presidents of the El Paso Community College and The University of Texas at El Paso. And, in fact, the chair of our board, Diana Natalissio (?), the president of The University of Texas at El Paso, has been the chair for this 10-year period as well. The executive director of our education service center, Region XIX, the lead organizer of the El Paso Interreligious Sponsoring Organization, a grassroots inter-faith organization affiliated with the industrial areas foundation. And when we made clear that we were going to have to have a strong community voice on this board, there were a number of people who were somewhat concerned and yet EPISO, this interreligious organization, has been a critical partner of ours and has come to be seen by the rest of the board members as being terribly important in this partnership. As well, we've had the presidents of the Greater El Paso and the El Paso Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, and the mayor of the city of El Paso, and the county judge who heads the board of supervisors.

Our goals are straightforward and clear. They remain the same today as they were 10 years ago. The first is to ensure academic success among all students in our schools, K-16. The second is to ensure that all students graduate from area high schools prepared to enter and be successful in a four-year college or university. And I will tell you that when we talked about this 10 years ago, it was a source of great

debate and discussion. There were lots of people who felt that you couldn't prepare all students for college and that you had to, in fact, continue the fundamentally sorting approach that public American education has been so very good at. We have come to the point now where we have broad consensus about the fact that we must prepare every single youngster for post-secondary education. And our third goal is to close the achievement gap between groups of students—those who have traditionally gotten the best and those we absolutely must ensure get the best.

How have we worked to achieve our goals? First, our efforts, undoubtedly like yours, are standards-based. In El Paso we set our own content standards in seven key subject matter areas as a way to begin the process of systemically aligning the curriculum. Our standards are uniformly high for all students and are based on the best national and state standards. In the development of our local standards, we engaged many in what may be the most important step in setting high academic goals short of implementing them, and that is discussing them, debating them, getting into intense conversations about them. I am one of those that believes that however wonderful standards may be, unless people understand them and embrace them and make them meaningful to themselves, set them as their own personal mission and goal, standards are not going to make much of a difference. When, in fact, people talk about standards and whether they really believe that all students can achieve at those high levels, that's when the most important work begins. The discussion that we began in setting our own local standards was community-wide. And it began with teams of faculty members, elementary through university, who worked for over a year to draft standards. That was a very useful process. They were trying to go from huge tomes—national standards and state standards—and at that time we had the EEs (the Essential Elements) here in Texas. And go from those

to a rather discrete, small set of the very biggest ideas that we were trying to achieve in these seven subject matter areas led, of course, by mathematics and science. But, in addition, after we developed these drafts, the process grew to include principals, deans, parents, and civic leaders, and gave everyone in the community a clear sense of what K-16 and community-wide engagement looks like and what it feels like. We brought them together on many successive Saturdays and we would have principals at some tables, and we would have parents—many of whom spoke only Spanish—and we would ask them questions like, “Are these standards understandable? Do you know what these mean? Are they too low? Are they too high? Would you understand? Would you know if your children came home with work that met these standards?” And it was only after going through that exhaustive process that, in fact, we approved and embraced those standards. And, in fact, when we released the standards, it was a great big community activity. The governor, now president, came to El Paso to release the standards and it was an exciting day if for no reason other than that two years of work had finally been completed.

Second, our work focuses on whole schools and on the systems within which they operate. It’s not a special program focused only on a few students, a few classrooms, on one approach or a couple of subject matter areas. It is focused instead on what the core of schooling is all about, the relationship between teachers and students, the way knowledge is constructed, the ways in which teachers and students interact with one another around knowledge, problem solving, and learning. And the expectations that teachers and students have for themselves and one another. It is trying to reshape that in ways that make sure that we really believe in our heart of hearts that those children, in fact all children, can meet these high

standards. And that we not only have high expectations for students, but we have high expectations for what teachers can do and for what principals can do.

Third, we very much believe that this work must be undertaken K-16. Both K-12 and post-secondary, as John Goodlad said, must engage in renewal simultaneously. Reforming K-12 will only work for the long term if our teacher preparation programs in colleges and universities have themselves improved. And if they, too, are focused on the best national standards. If they, too, are aggressively working toward fully engaging students in the learning process. And on moving away from teacher-centered, frontal teaching which all of us remember from our own college days. And if we don't think that that shapes the way teachers teach once they get back to K-12, just ask them. Trying to transform that has been a major element in this Collaborative's work. And given that teacher preparation encompasses the entire university, not just colleges of education but colleges of science and liberal arts, the entire university must work toward improving teacher quality.

We found ourselves in the California work always playing catch-up. We were trying to work intensively on professional development in K-12, realizing that almost as quickly as the new teachers came out of teacher preparation institutions, they were going to need intensive work to prepare them for the challenges of today's classrooms. And that's the gap that we're trying to address. We also believe that K-16 partnerships must address the issue of systemic alignment. That is, what to teach when and how to assess it across the educational continuum. Our K-16 mathematics alignment project is a vivid example of K-16 partnerships look like and of what thinking and working K-16 can accomplish. Our K-16 math alignment work has brought together K-12 teachers from the three USP school districts, our USP

mentors as well as mathematics faculty from the El Paso Community College and faculty from UTEP's colleges of education, engineering, and science. Included in this group, in this overall effort, are the university provost, the deans of the college of engineering, science, and education, the chair of the mathematics department, the head of the mathematics department at the community college, and key faculty members across the board.

A major goal of this initiative was to develop an Algebra II course outline along with the curriculum framework that would be implemented by high school teachers across the three districts. And, frankly, we know how many curriculum frameworks are out there that sit on the shelves. And so we brought high school teachers together and said what do you really need. We had worked very hard to implement the SIMS mathematics initiative in high school, but there were some schools that simply did not want to move toward SIMS. We knew we were going to have to have them get closer to standards-based work. And what we ended up doing was bringing them together to talk about what are the most important topics that have to be taught in algebra II. And we tried to make them reasonably discrete and clear and in a simple statement. We also set a statement about what it was that students going into algebra II needed to know in order that the course could proceed effectively. That group of faculty members has sat together now for about two years and we're just about ready to release our algebra II course outline, which I was just talking to Norm Webb about. It includes the cognitive demands students must meet. So what we've done is we've laid out the topics that are most important. We've mapped it back to the textbooks that the schools are using now and said rather than teach in the way that we've found out from doing surveys we knew they were teaching—some teachers were getting through two or three chapters in the year.

Some were getting through 12 chapters in the year. And they were just, in some cases, marching through. So what we needed to do was tell them don't march through the book. These are the key things you need to do and if you're using this book, go to this chapter. But, in addition, we knew that we would have to include the cognitive demands work and Norm certainly let us know during our most recent review that he endorsed that and encouraged us to hurry up and do it and we have done it now. But essentially what the cognitive demands stuff says is don't just say what topics they need to know—at what level should they know them? Is it just at the memorization or undertaking procedures level? Or should they be able to make inferences and know the concepts well enough to generalize them and to hypothesize about them? And then we tell teachers how they should know that students are, in fact, achieving that level of knowledge and skill within each of those cognitive demands. We're very excited by the work and we're at the point where we've completed the algebra II course outline. It's a very brief document. It's about, I think it's about 10 or 15 pages at the most. There's great excitement on the part of faculty members, even department chairs, K-12, principals. And we are now working on developing the algebra I outline. And as we implement those two, we will work on the geometry and KA outlines.

A fourth component of our work is the full, robust set of support and assistance mechanisms aimed at building school capacity, including most importantly the focus on improving teacher quality. In addition to teachers, our professional development work is focused on principals and other site administrators and district leaders, parents, and others. We have, however, prioritized teachers. From the beginning, we knew that all of our work—our standards-based strategy in its entirety—rested on the ability of teachers in

classrooms across our community to really transform teaching and learning in each and every classroom. We knew, too, that the ability of many teachers to do just that was limited. In the work in California and early in the work in El Paso, we undertook data collection at the extent of experience in education on the part of teachers in our schools. And we found, not very surprisingly, that in those schools that had the lowest levels of academic achievement, we often, too, had teachers with the lowest level of skills and knowledge. They were teachers who, in many cases, wanted to do the very best for their students but because, in some cases, they lacked the latest and best information about how to do that, they themselves knew that they weren't delivering the quality of education that they felt was necessary.

In order to respond to those challenges, we developed our first model of professional development. This first wave focused on many traditional ways of providing training and we can now admit that, including workshops and large groups sessions. But with a twist. Teachers had to come in teams accompanied by their principals, and they came sometimes kicking and screaming. In fact, I remember one session where the people came to the session and those that didn't come with their principals were not allowed in. And, boy, did I hear it from every corner of every district that day and the next day and for weeks to come. But it did reinforce the notion that this wasn't just about teachers getting developed; unless the person that should be the instructional leader was in that room for at least part of the time, it was not going to work. They had to come together, but they also had to commit to taking the training back to their schools and to sharing it with the full faculty. We began by bringing these teams together to commit to making change, to learn about the school improvement process, and to draft an action plan for change

that they would then take back to their full faculty for analysis, rethinking, redrafting.

Using this same approach, we also provided subject matter institutes, starting with mathematics, moving on to science and finally literacy. Then we identified our second wave because we were pretty clear that things could improve from that first wave of professional development. Our second wave consisted of change agents or mentors working with teacher teams and principals during institutes and at the school site as well. They helped bring grade level and vertical teams of teachers together to deal with problems of implementation, to model inquiry-based instructional practices, and to look at student work and achievement data to inform decision making about teaching and learning at that particular school in that particular classroom. A second element of this wave of professional development was a focus on selecting and implementing high quality standards-based math and science curriculum materials. And I know that many of you have done that. We did that in both mathematics and science and pushed those curricula, including Math Investigations and CMP and SIMS among others, very hard in the schools. Our institutes at the time were still large, but were now focused on professional development around specific curricula. And that, I must say, was a surprise to me. How much more professional development you had to provide directly in order to make sure that your standards-based curricula really had a chance of being done well in the classroom. And still we felt that things could improve beyond that.

Our third wave of professional development came about because of the recognition that we needed to deepen even further teachers' knowledge and understanding of mathematics and science. Not just any mathematics and science content. Teachers had, in fact, learned a great deal from the work that we had done

in professional development in earlier waves and through USI. But they still did not uniformly have a deep understanding of concepts to the point where they could use them to address problems at the high end of the cognitive demand spectrum. We not only focused on content, but also on pedagogical content. That is, implementation of instructional practices appropriate to specific math and science concepts. This deepening of knowledge and practice required a real organization of where and how we deliver professional development. And, frankly, it's been a radical change that I will admit to you at this point, not everyone is comfortable with despite the fact that we've been working hard to make this transition. The majority of the professional development is now provided in classrooms by USP mentors, thus bridging the teaching and practice gap. Through it all, we continue to raise issues of teacher and administrator beliefs and attitudes about who can learn and who cannot learn. And challenge educators' thinking in ways that make it possible for them to begin to come to terms with their beliefs and the impact of those beliefs on student achievement. I will tell you that that is something that we believe we have to continue to stress and bring up time and time again, irrespective of how long teachers have been teaching. And, frankly, irrespective of teacher ethnicity. We have to bring up the issues of what they believe about the poorest kids in the poorest neighborhoods who come in with the most serious problems and what they really believe that those children are capable of in the areas of mathematics, science, and literacy. It is a tough issue to keep bringing up and I think that they get very tired of us asking questions about those beliefs. But we continue to believe that they're fundamental to what children have a chance to learn and ultimately get taught on a daily basis.

Let me move to our final point—assessment and tracking of student performance. We collect a full range of data that goes well beyond the data collected for the state’s accountability system. As you can see, for the state’s accountability system, data are collected on standardized test performance as well as performance on algebra and biology end-of-course exams, enrollments in advanced placement courses, and proportion of high school seniors taking the SAT, ACT, and their mean scores among other things. Beyond that, we look at student progression through the grades, starting in middle school, to get a much more accurate picture of movement of students through the schooling system up to high school graduation. We really believe that we obtain a much more accurate picture of student drop-out rates. And in those kind of wacky days of one percent drop-out—how many of us remember those high school figures that were just, well, they were unbelievable because they simply were not the case. We were collecting data from eighth grade and tracking it. And we, in fact, produced what we called our mountains and we found that we had a certain number of students enrolled in grade eight—let’s say 10,000 eighth graders. And, lo and behold, then we found out we had 12,000 ninth graders. Why was that? Because lots of students were getting stuck at ninth grade, not earning the credits that they needed to move on. Then we had the plunge again at 10th and on down it went. And as we looked at the data, we found that when we first started this process about eight years ago, we had about a 31 percent drop-out rate. Those numbers have now been improved to about 25 percent. That means we’re retaining about 75 percent of our students. But as I always say, if among the 25 percent were Anna Elisa or Bobby, it would not be much source of comfort about the improvement we’ve made in holding more of the students. In addition to that, we look closely at high school college prep course enrollments and completions. We examine them by

high school, each district, and across all three districts. And we also assess student performance using various standards-based assessments including TEIMS and exemplars. In addition to student achievement data, we collect information that answers the questions how do we know that standards-based curriculum are being implemented? How do we know that teacher practice in the classroom is changing? How do we know their schools are getting closer to providing high quality mathematics and science teaching and learning to all students? And this, by the way, we've got a real expert in Norm Webb. Norm and Andy Porter have worked on some of the things that we're going to talk about. We've made some changes in some of the instruments, but you've got a terrific person to talk to that's right with us today.

First of all, we use the school curriculum implementation profile—the SKIP. An observational instrument that assesses program implementation on three dimensions—curriculum, instruction, and assessment. This is complemented by the opportunity-to-learn instrument. Those are questionnaires for teachers and students that focus on availability and use of materials, fidelity to curriculum, use of varied instructional practices, and inquiry learning approaches. This is really if you want to get to the core of whether the change that you really want to make is occurring in classrooms. And the SKIP and OTL measures do give us a sense—for example, if a teacher says oh yeah, I'm doing all this inquiry-based and constructivist teaching, and then you ask the students, and they tell you well, no, that happens once a month if that. Or we don't ever talk to one another. Or we'll still seated in rows. It's a very nice check-and-balance to make sure that you know what's actually going on, not just in a single classroom but across classrooms. In addition, we rate each school on degree of classroom implementation of standards-based curriculum, instruction, and

assessment. Finally, we share data with all the stakeholders. We use them to make clear the need for change. And I cannot tell you how many times I've walked into a superintendent's office with just a little bit of data. Foolishly, I started off taking reams of data. I've now learned my lesson. I take maybe two little pages of data and I say did you know that in your district, in this particular high school, you've got this percentage of students that are not completing algebra I the first time they take it? Do you know why that's happening? Do you know that in your district you're still having this small percentage of students take physics? Or this number pass algebra II? It really makes a difference. And I know, again, that districts collect reams and reams of data, but unless you talk to them about it and make it clear to them in ways that focus their attention, either through one-on-one meetings with the superintendents or in cabinet meetings, I think that you can really lose the value of getting them to focus on where the problems lie and on the kinds of solutions that they might bring to the problems.

In addition to sharing the data with school people, both at the site level and at the district level, we review data regularly to assess progress toward a goal so that we can report regularly to the broad community about the status of education for local young people. We've held sessions in most of our 170 schools, helping teachers, parents, and administrators understand many different types of student achievement data. To look closely at the disaggregated data, to identify areas in which students are doing poorly, and to really try and understand what the data mean so that they can inform decision making. One of the things that we've tried to avoid, and haven't always been successful, but we've really tried hard to avoid it and done pretty well, is the knee-jerk reaction that can come about when data get out and somebody's pushing for a change. You know what happens. When the

newspaper prints information about what's happening in a school district or achievement data that are either good or bad, and then the district goes right to work to try and figure out how are we going to fix this one quick so that when the newspaper comes back in a week or a month, we've already fixed it without really trying to figure out what's going on here. What's the source of the problem that we can then devise better solutions?

I've alluded to something throughout this morning's talk that's an important thing to note about our Collaborative. Our Collaborative is comprised of districts but it is also a free-standing organization based at The University of Texas at El Paso. Able to play a role that is at the same time internal and external to the districts. Thus we're able to support, encourage, provide a range of alternative professional development opportunities, and propose alternate solutions or actions toward reaching the same ends. For us, it has been a very important element of our work. Again, that working very closely with all the key players while at the same time, maintaining our ability to look at issues in a very different way.

Woven throughout this brief picture of our work, I trust you've been able to see those critical drivers that have always been key for us—equity, partnerships, systemic reform, systemic alignment, and deep commitments and understanding about what every single child deserves. This work is very much still in progress. We've had our share of things that have worked well and things that have worked not so well, and some that have failed pretty badly. And through it all, we remain absolutely committed that we can do much better in our community. We believe that the data, in fact, show that huge improvements have been made. Are they enough for us? Not by a long shot. There's still too many kids that give up on the system, too many teachers, administrators, and all of us that give up on kids. And

that's what we're hoping to turn around. We're still working very hard to do it.
Thank you very much.

Question-and-Answer Session Following

Stephen Marble: We have a little time. I'll give you a second to think about questions you might want to ask Susana. We have a few minutes here. So I don't know—she's one of the participants in the meeting, so she'll be here and working in one of the strands, so there will be other opportunities to ask. But, yes. We need to get a mike back there or, David, you need to speak really loudly and I'll repeat your question.

So David asked if she could expand on the TEIMS and exemplar items.

Suzanne Navarro: Essentially we've used the exemplars in a way that's been somewhat different. We have used them as an additional source of information about what our students are learning and we've done it—as opposed to trying to do across-the-board testing of all students using TEIMS, we've really tried to test at some key points and across a variety of different schools. As I think I indicated, we do overall ratings of schools, so we have schools that are intensive, moderate, and minimal in their implementation of standards-based curricula in math and science. And so we will look at how students are performing in high implementation classrooms and in lower implementation classrooms, using exemplars and TEIMS. So because we work closely with the districts and because one of the agreements that we have with them is that we can, in fact, do this testing, we've been able to

gain access to continued testing of certain groups of students over time. So that's pretty much the way that we use TEIMS and exemplars.

I appreciate the challenge of the K-16 and I know that —. Could you talk a little bit about the relationship with the community college and how that plays in, both with the K-12 and then feeding into the xxx?

I will tell you that as I've talked to colleagues around the country, we agree, and I would imagine that some of you may agree, that in some cases the most difficult piece to engage has been the community college. We've been very fortunate because we have some key staff members, and you'll meet them today. One of them, Lucy Michael, who runs our K-16 mathematics alignment, is on loan from the community college. That has made a huge difference. So we've been able to tap into a connection with the community college at a deeper level with the department chairs, with the deans, and with the faculty. I will tell you that one of the key elements that has made it hard, Joe, is that—and I don't know how much this is true of your community college. There's been a lot of stability in leadership in our school districts and at the university. At the university we still have the same president that we had from the beginning. At the community college, I think we're going on our maybe seventh president during these 10 years, so it has been very difficult for us to go in there and try and develop relationships. And we've said well, maybe we need to develop relationships with deans or department chairs, but then a new president comes in, a reorganization occurs, we have new deans, and so it really has caused, I think, real difficulty in developing relationships that can be sustained for the long term. We believe that we're in better shape in part because of the relationships that

have been made possible through this K-16 mathematics alignment work and through having Lucy on staff, so we're continuing to work on it but, for example, we've just got a new president of the community college that just started this month. So it's time to go back out there with a dog-and-pony show and get ready to build relationships again. But it's a challenge.

You talked a little bit about the relationships and the quality of the teachers xxx. I was curious about xxx.

A lot of it is self-reporting. But we also do, not only interviews in addition. We go into classrooms and do observations of the teachers to try and determine that. And increasingly in the districts, for a variety of reasons, principals are having to get into classrooms much more frequently now and really determine the quality of instruction and content that that teacher is able to deliver. So we try and do it in a variety of ways where we're trying to identify a variety of strengths that the teacher has and where the limitations continue to exist. Then I think that the work in the classroom is critically important. I think with professional development occurring in the classroom, with the teachers' own students, it's possible to look closely at where the difficulties lie. Is it largely in classroom management? Is it issues of not understanding what instructional strategies are most appropriate, given a particular content focus or concept that you're trying to address? And so I think moving the professional development to the classroom level has made for a very big difference. But in terms of actually determining who is in need of most help, we really are trying to address that through a variety of different measures, some of which are

self-report but also that are where we get kind of triangulated information from different sources, some of it quite independent of the teacher.