



Sample Client Services Overview

This overview represents the services for one client of the professional learning partner.

Services Overview

Curriculum or Content Area (adoption)	Science	
Type of Professional Learning (Adoption, Launch, Ongoing for Teachers, or System Design and Leadership Support)	Adoption	
Number of educators serviced	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 - 50 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 51 - 100 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 101 - 500 <input type="checkbox"/> 501 - 1000 <input type="checkbox"/> 1000+
Audience (select all that apply)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Teachers <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> School Leaders	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Instructional Coaches <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> District Leaders
District Type	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Traditional District <input type="checkbox"/> Charter <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Suburban <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Greater than 20% of English language learners <input type="checkbox"/> Greater than 20% students with disability	<input type="checkbox"/> Private <input type="checkbox"/> Parochial <input type="checkbox"/> Rural <input type="checkbox"/> Greater than 60% of economically disadvantaged students <input type="checkbox"/> Greater than 80% students of color



District Size	<input type="checkbox"/> Fewer than 2,500 students <input type="checkbox"/> 2,500 to 10,000 students <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 10,001 - 50,000 students	<input type="checkbox"/> 50,001 - 100,000 students <input type="checkbox"/> More than 100,001 students
Delivery Format	<input type="checkbox"/> Virtual <input type="checkbox"/> In-person <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hybrid	
Total Cost Range ¹	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than \$50,000 <input type="checkbox"/> \$50,000 - \$100,000 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> \$100,001 - \$500,000	<input type="checkbox"/> \$500,001 - \$1,000,000 <input type="checkbox"/> \$1,000,000+

Services narrative

What were the goals of the professional learning? How did you work with the school or system to determine the goals and progress monitor for them throughout the engagement? (Limit 200 words)

NextGen TIME (Toolkit for Instructional Materials Evaluation) was selected to support the adoption of the middle-school science curriculum for a mid-size suburban district. This suite of professional learning tools and processes is designed for educators in a collaborative, evidence-based evaluation of science instructional materials for the purposes of selection. NextGen TIME unfolds over five phases, each with particular goals and monitoring plans.

Prepare: leaders make plans to use NextGen TIME. This includes forming a team, determining readiness,

¹ Includes any travel related expenses, etc.

and gathering potential programs.

Prescreen: a team uses key criteria to reduce the number of programs under consideration to three to five programs. These programs will be evaluated through the Paperscreen Phase.

Paperscreen: a team collaboratively collects, represents, and analyzes evidence from programs under consideration. The team identifies one or two programs to pilot in classrooms.

Pilot: teachers collect evidence as they teach at least one unit from each program still under consideration. The additional evidence is analyzed to inform selection and implementation of the best program. Leaders use the body of evidence collected to communicate/advocate with decision-makers.

Plan: leaders develop and enact a plan to use information collected through NextGen TIME to support and monitor the implementation of the selected program.



How was this professional learning customized to meet the educators' needs? How were facilitators prepared to meet the needs of participants? (Limit 200 words)

NextGen TIME was adapted based on the client's needs in two main areas. First, a hybrid model was used blending both in-person and virtual environment sessions to maximize time in some phases while still maintaining the collaborative community in others. Second, the process was adjusted to align with State-specific adoption requirements and science standards. This required fine tuning the rubrics used during evidence collection and collaborative scoring protocols.

The ability of the PD staff to support the participants began with a review of the state science standards and adoption requirements as the tools and processes were modified to reflect the local context of the district. The PD team developed a deeper understanding of participants' needs during each phase of the work. For example, when teams apply the Paperscreen Tools and Process to candidate programs, they document evidence-based scores supported by documentation of strengths and limitations across programs. This body of evidence is used by the educators to make collaborative recommendations for programs to pilot in the classroom. The PL staff monitored the nature of team collaborations and the strengths and limitations of the selected program to understand their needs and inform the PL plans to support broad and effective implementation.

Describe the delivery structures employed and how often participants were able to participate in professional learning over the length of the engagement. (Limit 200)

NextGenTIME process was delivered via a combination of in-person and virtual sessions. District teams met for a series of 2-3 hour in-person and virtual sessions during the prepare phase to select the adoption team and identify potential programs. The paperscreen phase was conducted primarily in person over four days to learn the process and review three potential programs. Two programs were selected for piloting, which was completed by four teachers on the adoption team over a 6 week period in their classrooms (two teachers per program). Four, 2-3 hour virtual and in-person meetings were held to evaluate the evidence and make a recommendation for adoption. The plan phase was primarily

conducted via virtual team meetings, where the PL staff facilitated discussions around implementation plans for the selected materials. These include considerations for ongoing professional learning, resource allocation, and goals for Science teaching and learning, as well as plans for monitoring progress over the next 3-5 years.

How did the professional learning build on previous work or set the foundation for additional professional learning? (Limit 200 words)

In this case, the professional learning leveraged the district's work supporting teachers' understanding of the new science standards (NGSS) and the instructional shifts that the standards require of classroom teachers. This foundational work was utilized in the prepare and paperscreen phases.

The plan phase included the development of a program elements matrix, a three year plan for implementation that is based on the strength and limitations found in the selected materials.

This plan outlines multiple areas for future work and monitoring including professional learning.