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## Hillington High School's Evaluation Plan for Evaluating Advisory Periods

### Introduction

This proposed evaluation plan describes the evaluation questions, study design, analysis plan, and timeline for the evaluation of Hillington High School’s Academic & Career Planning program, specific to the creation and implementation of the “Advisory Period” dedicated for the completion of a number of ACP in-school student activities and learning.

### Program Background

Based on planning undertaken by the Hillington ACP committee in 2015-16 and 2016-17, Hillington High School (HHS) began implementation in school year 2017-18 of a daily, 20-minute Advisory Period for all students in grades 9-12. Advisory periods were organized as single-grade level, with each classroom to remain with the same teacher for all 4 years of high school. Advisory periods were created in order to deliver instruction around Academic & Career Planning, to allow time for certain ACP-related student activities, and to build safe student-staff relationships for mentoring and advising purposes.

The present evaluation will gather feedback from students, teachers, administrators, and families on their perceptions of the effectiveness of Advisory Period for these purposes, with an eye towards refining this important component of HHS’s Academic & Career Planning program if findings suggest that changes are needed.

### Evaluation Questions

The over-arching evaluation questions is: ***How well does the current 20-minute, daily advisory period support HHS’s ACP program?***

The evaluation will be guided by the following sub-questions:

1. *Does the amount of time allotted (frequency and duration) adequately serve the needs of immediate stakeholders (students, staff and administrators)?*
	1. Is there sufficient time for activities designated for Advisory Period, across all grades?
	2. How much out-of-school time is required for students to finish these activities, by grade?
2. *Does the portion of the overall ACP scope and sequence that is carried out during Advisory period well matched to this delivery system?*
	1. Do stakeholders see value in the activities designated for Advisory Period, across grades?
	2. Has access to technology been adequate for the completion of activities designated for Advisory Period?
	3. Do teachers feel adequately prepared to deliver the scope and sequence designated for Advisory Period, by grade?
3. *What are stakeholder (administrators, school counselors, teachers, students, families) perceptions about the organization of Advisory Period in terms of serving the goals of the ACP program?*
	1. What are attendance rates for Advisory Periods? Do they differ from overall attendance rates? If they are lower, what are the reasons that students are missing Advisory?
	2. What are the advantages and disadvantages of the current system of same-grade cohorts that stay together for all four years?
	3. In what ways does this delivery system impact core content courses, electives, scheduling or other factors?
4. *Does Advisory Period support the development of safe student-staff relationships for mentoring and advising purposes?*
	1. What percentage of students are benefiting from safe student-staff relationships arising from Advisory? What other safe student-staff relationships are being developed at HHS?
	2. What, if any, advantages do stakeholders report that these relationships confer?
	3. Do staff feel adequately prepared to undertake these mentoring and advising roles?

### Evaluation Design

This evaluation will use a mixed-methods design with quantitative measures (attendance data) and qualitative measures (descriptions of Advisory Periods, activities and relationship-building, and perceptions about them).

In 2018-19, the study team will gather data related to the four evaluation questions to further describe what variety exists in the implementation of Advisory Periods, and what stakeholder perceptions exist about the quality and utility of Advisory.

### Data Collection

Methods of data collection will include analysis of existing attendance data, surveys, and follow-up focus groups.

School-wide **surveys** of administrators and department leaders, teachers, and students will be administered via electronically and will include both quantitative survey items and qualitative (open-ended) questions. Additional survey questions will be included on the annual family survey to gather the perceptions of family members. Survey data will also be used to identify themes for deeper investigation in the form of focus groups among students and teachers, to be conducted by former principal Abby Smith (retired).

### Analysis Plan

Surveys will be analyzed within the survey program for quantitative items, and the study team will examine open-ended responses for common themes, patterns, and outlier responses. Survey findings will be used to inform the creation of protocols for follow-up interviews and focus groups among students and teachers.

### Timeline

| **Task** | **Lead** | **Timeline/Due Date** | **Notes** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Evaluation plan drafted | Sarah | September 2018 |  |
| Evaluation plan reviewed by study committee and revised, finalized | Sarah | End of September 2018 | Eval plan will be revised/ evolved as needed |
| Survey questions selected,  | Sarah | October 15, 2018 | Use DPI’s ACP evaluation toolkit for questions and guidance |
| Survey questions reviewed by study committee, revised, finalized | Sarah | October 30, 2018 |  |
| Student, teacher and admin surveys developed, programmed and tested; family survey questions sent to Family survey team. | Miguel | November 2018 |  |
| Student, teacher and admin surveys administered | Miguel and Sarah | December 3-7, 2018 | Follow-up reminders to go out December 6 |
| Student, teacher and admin survey data analyzed | Miguel – quant; Sarah – qual | January 2019 |  |
| Family survey questions included in annual Family outreach survey | Sarah and family survey team | February 11-15, 2019 |  |
| First semester attendance data collected and analyzed | Miguel | February 2019 |  |
| Family survey questions re Advisory analyzed | Sarah | Late February 2019 |  |
| Survey and attendance findings reviewed by study team | Sarah & team | March 2019 |  |
| Follow-up topic areas and questions identified for Focus Groups | Study Team | Late March 2019 |  |
| Teacher and student focus group protocols developed  | Sarah | By April 15, 2019 | Use DPI’s ACP evaluation toolkit for questions and guidance |
| Focus groups scheduled, participants identified and scheduled | Sarah | Late April 2019 | 1 FG of approx. 10 students per grade, 2 FGs of teachers |
| Focus Groups conducted | Abby S. | May 2019 | Audio recorded, transcribed |
| Focus group data analyzed | Sarah  | May-June 2019 |  |
| Report drafted | Sarah | July 15, 2018 |  |
| Report reviewed  | Study team | August 1, 2018 |  |
| Report reviewed and finalized | Sarah | August 15, 2018 |  |
| Report shared with staff, Board and posted on website, available at back-to-school | Study team | August  |  |
| Recommendations for system improvements made to admin and district  | Study team | September 30, 2019 |  |
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