

**Wyoming Department of Education
INSTRUCTIONAL FACILITATORS (IF's)**

**Joint Education Interim Committee Report
December 16, 2011**

Presented by: Sean Moore, Director – Standards and Learning Division

Authority

House Bill 139, 2006

W.S. 21-13-335, Senate File 70, Reauthorized 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011

History / Perspective / Process

During the 2006 legislative session, the Wyoming Legislature established House Bill 139 to assist schools with providing ongoing instructional coaching and mentoring creating the Instructional Facilitators program. This bill was based off of extensive research that included a study from Picus and Odden (2005). The research team identified Instructional Facilitators as catalysts for the most effective professional development by providing a systematic, ongoing, and school-wide approach to improvement.

W.S. 21-13-335, Senate File 70 (2008) reauthorized financial assistance for Instructional Facilitators and instructional coaches as a supplemental resource for school district professional development programs which required districts to provide documentation of the following program components:

- Evidence of a research-based approach to instructional facilitator program implementation.
- A plan for evaluation of the instructional facilitator program over time.
- Since the inception of the Instructional Facilitator program, much has been learned about the roles and responsibilities of Instructional Facilitators. Of note, Instructional Facilitators:
 - Can have profound impacts on the professional practice of teachers and overall improvement of instruction.
 - Have evolved into the role of data analyst.
 - Have a different role in elementary schools versus secondary schools.

Early on in the program, the Instructional Facilitator Task Force, composed of administrators from Wyoming school districts and WDE staff members, provides direction, leadership, and information to support the implementation of the Instructional Facilitator program. Activities of the task force include coordinating professional development for Instructional Facilitators and sharing evidence-based practices throughout the state.

Actions: Data / Participation / Professional Development

In the spring of 2011, Wyoming school districts completed the 2011-2012 Grant Application and Report for Instructional Facilitators. As part of the application and report, districts completed a survey about district Instructional Facilitator's programs. A total of forty five (45) participants completed the survey. As a result of a very successful 2011 spring survey, District-level survey data collected regarding Instructional Facilitator's roles and responsibilities was sufficient. Therefore, the WDE did not require an additional survey in the fall of 2011.

Districts indicated challenges centered around eight areas of concerns for both elementary and secondary level implementation (see Figure 1 for elementary / see Figure 2 for secondary):

- Funding an adequate number of IFs in the district
- Workload is too large for the IFs
- Consistent implementation of expected IFs activities and responsibilities
- Tracking the time and efforts of IFs in the district
- Providing professional development for IFs
- Evaluation of Ifs
- Recruitment and retaining high-quality IFs
- Utilizing IFs funding

Figure 1: Biggest challenges the district has faced in the implementation of an IF program at the **ELEMENTARY level**

	1	2	3	4	5
Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.					
Funding an adequate number of IFs in the district	7 16%	5 11%	15 33%	8 18%	10 22%
Workload is too large for the IFs	6 13%	10 22%	14 31%	12 27%	3 7%
Consistent implementation of expected IF activities and responsibilities	12 27%	11 24%	15 33%	7 16%	0 0%
Tracking the time and efforts of IFs in the district	17 38%	11 24%	8 18%	7 16%	2 4%
Providing professional development for IFs	17 38%	9 20%	12 27%	7 16%	0 0%
Evaluation of IFs	27 60%	6 13%	9 20%	2 4%	1 2%
Recruitment and retainment of high-quality IFs	17 38%	9 20%	11 24%	4 9%	4 9%
Utilizing IF funding	29 64%	7 16%	6 13%	1 2%	2 4%

Note: Top number indicates # of respondents / 1 = not a challenge, 2 = infrequent or slight challenge, 3 = a challenge the district overcomes, 4 = a challenge, 5 = a challenge that is an impairment to the effectiveness of the district IF program

Sixty percent (60%) of Instructional Facilitators reported that they received professional development in the subject area of math, eighty-nine percent (89%) in reading, seventy-six percent (76%) in writing, and seventy-one percent (71%) in technology. All respondents added that they would like to see the WDE provide professional development around adult learning, district resources, strategic planning, assessment data, teacher engagement and collaboration amongst others.

Figure 2: Biggest challenges the district has faced in the implementation of an IF program at the **SECONDARY level**

	1	2	3	4	5
Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.					
Funding an adequate number of IFs in the district	6 13%	4 9%	12 27%	10 22%	13 29%
Workload is too large for the IFs	8 18%	8 18%	17 38%	9 20%	3 7%
Consistent implementation of expected IF activities and responsibilities	10 22%	15 33%	11 24%	7 16%	2 4%
Tracking the time and efforts of IFs in the district	18 40%	11 24%	7 16%	6 13%	3 7%
Providing professional development for IFs	16 36%	8 18%	11 24%	7 16%	3 7%
Evaluation of IFs	25 56%	5 11%	9 20%	5 11%	1 2%
Recruitment and retainment of high-quality IFs	14 31%	10 22%	9 20%	6 13%	6 13%
Utilizing IF funding	28 62%	6 13%	4 9%	3 7%	4 9%

Note: Top number indicates # of respondents / 1 = not a challenge, 2 = infrequent or slight challenge, 3 = a challenge the district overcomes, 4 = a challenge, 5 = a challenge that is an impairment to the effectiveness of the district IF program

Additional challenges indicated by districts are stiff educational requirements and finding quality teachers with the knowledge, skills and abilities, combined with the leadership skills needed to understand and facilitate data workshops and demonstrate instructional best practices.

In the Spring 2011 Instructional Facilitator Application and Report Survey, school district representatives responded to the question, “What type(s) of training would be helpful to improving the IF program in the district?” Although there were a variety of responses, many of them requested training for improving coaching skills that would be provided on at least an annual basis.

University of Wyoming GEAR UP (Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs) and the Wyoming Department of Education, partnered to sponsor a professional development workshop for Instructional Facilitators, “Coaching for Student Success,” presented by national trainer, Diane Sweeney, in Casper on June 21 & 22, 2011. The participating IF’s

gave high praise for the strategies that they took away to use in their coaching interactions with classroom teachers to improve student performance.

IF Expected Activities

IF Activity	Examples
Work with data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guide and assist teachers to use and/or create assessments that match and reflect planned objectives • Organize, compile, and interpret data from multiple sources for teacher and school use • Guide and assist teachers to learn, utilize, analyze, and interpret data from multiple sources • Guide and assist teachers to determine changes needed during instructional delivery, based on data • Communicate student performance expectations to staff and other stakeholders • Guide and assist teachers to document student learning using appropriate assessment instruments • Facilitate the analysis of data to determine impacts on student achievement, teacher practice, and school culture
Model Lesson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports the implementation of lessons, curriculum, and instructional practices by modeling for teacher(s)
Coach-Lead: Professional Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design professional learning that improves student achievement based on assessment results • Provide professional development to individual teachers that supports increased student achievement • Provide classroom-based professional development in the implementation of new and refined instructional practices • Provide professional development to groups of teachers that supports student achievement
Work with Professional Learning Communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lead or participate in professional learning communities that support teacher and student learning • Support structures for professional learning communities
Training for Coach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participate in coach training • Participate in training to support implementation of curriculum or effective teaching strategies • Participate in professional growth activities including conferences, workshops, professional organization meetings • Collaboration with other coaches
Teacher Observation/Feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engage in planning for teacher observation • Observe teacher • Provide feedback
Teacher Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guide and assist teachers in planning, organizing, and preparing for effective instruction • Guide and assist teachers in planning, organizing, and preparing for assessment • Guide and assist teachers in planning, organizing, and preparing to embed technology in the classroom for instructional enhancement
Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • E.G. Administer assessments as part of an assessment team

Financial

In July and November 2010, the Department of Education delivered a School-Based Instructional Facilitators/Instructional Coaches Grant presentation and report to the Select Committee on School Finance Recalibration. The presentation and report both recommended a technical correction to the funding method. Instead of funding based on a specified dollar amount and to provide consistency to districts in hiring and retaining IF's, funding for the IF categorical grant program be adjusted so that it funds positions at 60 percent of the cost-basis rather than a fixed dollar amount, thus ensuring the number of facilitators does not shrink as salaries increase. That same recommendation was contained in the 2010 Cost of Education Study prepared by Lawrence O. Picus and Associates and forwarded to the 2011 Wyoming Legislature by the Select Committee on School Finance Recalibration Committee in their 2010 final recalibration report.

During the 2011 Legislative Session, the Wyoming Legislature approved funding for the IF Program at an amount equal to 60% for each full-time equivalent (FTE). This funding for the categorical grant is in effect, and the total grant amount is adjusted annually, based upon the updated FTE amount. Any unused funds during any school year are required to revert to the foundation program account.

Since the funding model for school-based Instructional Facilitators is capped at 60% for each FTE position, a major majority of districts reported the use of general funds to augment IF's salaries. The following chart summarizes, by district, the financial history of the IF grant program.

Instructional Facilitator Grant Awards, 2006-07 through 2011-12

District ID	District Name	2006-07			2007-08			2008-09			2009-10			2010-11 <i>Preliminary</i>			2011-12 Grant Award
		Grant Award	Expenditures	Difference	Grant Award	Expenditures	Difference	Grant Award	Expenditures	Difference	Grant Award	Expenditures	Difference	Grant Award	Expenditures	Difference	
0101000	Albany #1	622,402	534,873	(87,529)	636,523	634,003	(2,520)	830,548	836,672	6,125	743,944	743,944	-	599,643	598,247	(1,397)	760,439
0201000	Big Horn #1	121,721	121,721	-	112,293	112,293	-	148,910	148,911	-	131,978	131,978	-	107,790	107,790	-	136,649
0202000	Big Horn #2	120,120	117,708	(2,412)	123,393	122,315	(1,078)	162,756	171,563	8,807	142,767	107,654	(35,113)	117,886	114,186	(3,700)	154,035
0203000	Big Horn #3	97,770	97,770	-	97,833	97,833	-	128,167	128,167	-	113,925	113,925	-	92,004	90,220	(1,784)	113,573
0204000	Big Horn #4	59,796	60,061	264	62,665	68,619	5,954	81,870	80,175	(1,695)	68,766	68,794	28	52,448	52,242	(207)	62,713
0301000	Campbell #1	1,420,159	1,371,173	(48,985)	1,477,356	1,445,159	(32,197)	1,973,427	1,952,595	(20,832)	1,859,466	1,859,753	287	1,521,991	1,522,272	281	1,965,248
0401000	Carbon #1	297,794	199,478	(98,316)	304,023	287,429	(16,595)	416,901	423,518	6,616	381,020	392,381	11,361	306,818	317,021	10,203	392,026
0402000	Carbon #2	111,349	74,174	(37,174)	114,499	127,221	12,722	156,336	141,317	(15,019)	139,013	178,485	39,472	111,670	111,670	-	135,239
0501000	Converse #1	298,521	298,521	-	308,901	308,130	(771)	429,882	410,683	(19,199)	373,168	371,673	(1,495)	296,733	294,936	(1,797)	366,715
0502000	Converse #2	70,103	70,103	-	132,226	81,820	(50,406)	170,259	170,259	-	156,770	88,202	(68,568)	125,130	91,052	(34,078)	155,159
0601000	Crook #1	190,996	190,996	-	201,130	210,955	9,826	273,298	154,047	(119,252)	244,528	174,237	(70,291)	196,151	187,718	(8,433)	246,124
0701000	Fremont #1	330,760	330,760	-	330,581	448,204	117,622	440,334	570,940	130,606	380,673	484,509	103,836	302,820	430,668	127,848	379,024
0702000	Fremont #2	51,537	51,537	-	49,328	49,968	641	61,495	61,812	317	49,814	49,814	-	28,039	28,046	6	34,169
0706000	Fremont #6	64,546	64,546	-	67,008	67,008	-	90,853	90,853	-	84,168	84,186	18	66,992	66,992	-	86,541
0714000	Fremont #14	109,532	109,532	-	107,482	107,482	-	144,428	144,428	-	132,579	132,579	-	103,208	-	(103,208)	132,378
0721000	Fremont #21	60,895	60,895	-	63,653	61,044	(2,609)	97,931	87,680	(10,251)	95,745	83,559	(12,186)	82,975	74,206	(8,770)	109,794
0724000	Fremont #24	47,442	46,858	(584)	58,772	55,687	(3,086)	85,203	72,947	(12,256)	69,298	-	(69,298)	54,779	57,780	3,001	66,485
0725000	Fremont #25	462,263	462,263	-	474,932	474,932	-	614,120	614,120	-	556,603	556,603	-	444,166	444,166	-	561,591
0738000	Fremont #38	52,031	-	(52,031)	64,083	12,835	(51,248)	-	-	-	69,092	-	(69,092)	55,598	54,884	(713)	68,697
0801000	Goshen #1	351,896	351,893	(3)	350,790	350,265	(525)	458,207	480,132	21,925	403,439	493,342	89,903	322,963	518,255	195,292	395,072
0901000	Hot Springs #1	131,494	119,440	(12,053)	131,854	148,775	16,921	167,520	161,351	(6,170)	150,612	152,636	2,024	118,119	148,401	30,281	146,827
1001000	Johnson #1	232,474	232,474	-	240,428	-	(240,428)	317,816	317,816	-	275,987	276,415	428	222,042	222,042	-	287,697
1101000	Laramie #1	2,561,087	2,544,786	(16,301)	2,547,425	3,594,351	1,046,926	3,390,867	4,383,003	992,136	3,035,835	3,999,530	963,695	2,455,928	3,151,326	695,398	3,084,780
1102000	Laramie #2	167,376	147,375	(20,001)	166,441	186,443	20,001	220,340	220,340	-	182,494	208,337	25,843	157,313	157,791	478	203,953
1201000	Lincoln #1	117,552	-	(117,552)	119,158	366,538	247,380	156,817	137,074	(19,743)	130,754	144,316	13,562	102,178	106,620	4,443	128,250
1202000	Lincoln #2	473,958	473,680	(278)	473,129	483,926	10,797	642,965	483,705	(159,260)	592,369	529,840	(62,529)	468,209	468,947	738	592,464
1301000	Natrona #1	2,289,908	2,289,908	-	2,326,367	2,742,226	415,860	3,041,765	3,430,706	388,941	2,715,422	3,206,735	491,313	2,170,136	3,109,342	939,206	2,781,484
1401000	Niobrara #1	45,525	39,896	(5,629)	68,465	14,804	(53,661)	92,405	55,573	(36,832)	83,341	51,034	(32,307)	96,647	52,945	(43,702)	117,028
1501000	Park #1	317,987	317,987	-	321,024	451,414	130,390	437,978	483,809	45,830	393,695	526,865	133,170	313,516	544,881	231,364	392,677
1506000	Park #6	434,759	374,608	(60,151)	432,584	550,101	117,516	558,194	719,760	161,565	506,007	699,220	193,213	402,006	661,973	259,967	513,602
1516000	Park #16	22,294	22,294	-	21,895	21,895	-	28,115	24,171	(3,944)	25,613	24,304	(1,309)	19,017	24,271	5,254	23,254
1601000	Platte #1	194,726	194,601	(126)	201,184	201,212	29	263,703	263,793	90	226,909	226,827	(82)	177,502	177,502	-	220,295
1602000	Platte #2	47,606	47,606	-	39,667	39,667	-	49,984	49,984	-	43,919	43,919	-	35,557	35,558	1	43,731
1701000	Sheridan #1	180,546	178,056	(2,489)	184,870	188,490	3,620	247,665	262,705	15,040	218,546	218,546	-	177,638	173,991	(3,647)	221,337
1702000	Sheridan #2	580,803	580,803	-	603,282	612,745	9,463	809,543	809,543	-	720,294	720,294	-	589,562	596,106	6,544	742,869
1703000	Sheridan #3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1801000	Sublette #1	149,791	211,070	61,279	179,136	369,477	190,341	254,605	371,026	116,422	245,963	360,022	114,059	195,557	346,573	151,016	248,233
1809000	Sublette #9	-	-	-	-	-	-	192,711	-	(192,711)	173,772	135,666	(38,106)	135,488	98,898	(36,590)	166,319
1901000	Sweetwater #1	812,893	760,423	(52,470)	859,332	866,724	7,392	1,190,993	1,024,488	(166,505)	1,140,540	1,119,875	(20,665)	942,998	1,033,136	90,138	1,176,578
1902000	Sweetwater #2	513,227	513,227	-	502,880	550,511	47,632	665,999	738,395	72,397	621,209	658,199	36,990	495,466	527,211	31,745	609,852
2001000	Teton #1	525,216	525,216	-	525,950	467,058	(58,892)	691,719	711,715	19,996	610,122	579,004	(31,118)	502,317	438,216	(64,100)	650,844
2101000	Uinta #1	546,562	516,658	(29,904)	557,454	587,358	29,904	725,669	713,563	(12,106)	648,304	635,300	(13,004)	518,258	543,368	25,110	643,631
2104000	Uinta #4	130,876	80,323	(50,552)	131,811	131,811	-	181,009	181,009	-	157,035	158,110	1,075	125,381	127,338	1,957	166,974
2106000	Uinta #6	130,646	131,725	1,079	128,395	128,395	-	163,563	166,824	3,261	152,834	153,256	422	125,126	125,498	371	166,660
2201000	Washakie #1	256,755	254,558	(2,197)	257,780	259,977	2,197	342,768	342,768	-	309,257	300,339	(8,918)	249,314	230,443	(18,871)	317,428
2202000	Washakie #2	-	-	-	-	-	-	21,389	-	(21,389)	19,693	24,352	4,659	17,223	-	(17,223)	20,671
2301000	Weston #1	145,934	131,909	(14,025)	155,830	148,519	(7,311)	202,116	202,116	-	181,251	182,289	1,038	145,847	145,847	-	182,928
2307000	Weston #7	48,369	48,369	-	36,424	36,425	1	71,164	71,164	-	66,947	66,947	-	51,848	51,848	-	64,219
Grand Total	STATE	16,000,000	15,351,856	(648,144)	16,350,237	18,272,045	1,921,808	21,894,306	22,896,959	1,002,653	19,825,480	21,517,796	1,692,316	16,000,000	18,462,422	2,462,422	20,236,256
Appropriation		16,000,000			16,000,000			21,894,306			19,756,000			16,000,000			20,236,252

- Notes:
- Expenditures are self-reported by districts via the WDE601. 2010-11 expenditure amounts are preliminary.
 - Prior to 2011-12, grant award amounts that exceed the appropriation are due to reallocating unspent/returned district funds from the previous year.
 - Beginning in 2011-12, grant funding is equal to 60% for each full-time equivalent position, and all unspent/returned funds revert back to the foundation account.
 - Many districts supplement their IF program with general fund monies. One reason is because IF salaries tend to be more expensive than the average salaries in the model. (IFs are typically more experienced and/or educated than the average teacher).
 - Other supplemental expenses include professional development and supplies/materials.

Recommendations

As part of the continued commitment to fulfill statutory requirements and improve the Instructional Facilitator program in Wyoming, the WDE will consult districts on specific aspects of instructional coaching and provide a forum to collaborate and post best practices. The WDE will continue to work and assist Instructional Facilitators and provide quality professional development around numeracy, literacy and critical thinking in an effort to work toward overall program improvement. It is unsure how Instructional Facilitators fit into EA90 and school accountability. However, the WDE will continue to monitor the legislation, collaborate with districts and provide possible solutions regarding an Instructional Facilitator's role in teacher of record. It is the WDE's recommendation that the Wyoming Legislature:

- a. Continue to fund the IF Program using the formula outlined in W.S. 21-13-335
- b. Continue to implement IF Program requirements as outlined in W.S. 21-13-335

