

IBNA – The Primary Years Programme Field Study

February 2009

Overview and Findings

**Under a Contract with:
Education Policy and Evaluation Center
College of Education
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia**

UGA Project Evaluation Team:

- **Dr. Jori Hall, PI, Assistant Professor, Department of Lifelong Education, Administration, and Policy**
- **Ms. Tracy Elder, Project Coordinator, Education Policy and Evaluation Center**
- **Ms. Jana Thompson, Research Professional, Education Policy and Evaluation Center**
- **Mr. Scott Pollack, Research Professional, Education Policy and Evaluation Center**

Table of Contents

Overall Summary Report	3
Methods	3
Procedures	4
Findings	8
Survey Results Report	17
Appendices	24
Appendix I: Evaluation Plan Proposal	25
Appendix II: Evaluation Instruments	31
Appendix III: School Survey and Results	43

INTERNATIONAL BACCALAUREATE PRIMARY YEARS PROGRAMME FIELD STUDY OVERALL SUMMARY REPORT

In response to a request for proposals issued by the International Baccalaureate Organization (IBO) in August of 2008, an investigation of the IB Primary Years Programme (PYP) was conducted by the Education Policy and Evaluation Center (EPEC) in the College of Education at the University of Georgia from September to December 2008. The project investigated the authorization and implementation process of the PYP in Georgia schools. Information from multiple sources was collected to provide a comprehensive, diverse and balanced view of the authorization process and implementation of IB-PYP schools. The findings are intended primarily as information useful to the IBO for improving the organization's work and guiding the efforts of schools seeking to offer PYP.

Questions to be addressed by the study include the following:

1. How does a school move from interested to candidate to authorized status?
 - a. How do schools learn about and follow IB regulations related to becoming authorized? What steps do they take to meet IB standards?
 - b. How do schools encourage teacher support for IB? Who in the school is pursuing the IB programme? Who in the school organizes the tasks necessary for authorization?
 - c. How do schools advertise IB to the community? How are parents involved as stakeholders? Does the school partner with any outside organizations?
 - d. How does the school meet IB and state/local standards?
2. How is the programme implemented?
 - a. What are successful strategies?
 - b. What are the challenges?
 - c. How does IB provide support to the school?
 - d. What other systems/actions did the school(s) put in place?

Methods

To address the research questions, a mixed methods approach was used. Online survey data were collected from sixteen schools authorized in Georgia to implement the PYP. Of those sixteen schools, three schools were targeted for case studies.

To ensure breadth and diversity of feedback, an online survey for certified school personnel, including principals and teachers, was developed and administered to collect information about respondents' perceptions and experiences related to the IB-PYP authorization and implementation process. The survey was administered in December 2008.

Data collection for the three case studies were conducted by a two-person team of field researchers through focus groups and individual interviews, direct observations of PYP activities, and review of documents and data related to PYP to understand school practices and the ways in which they align with IB guidelines. Interview data from various stakeholder groups (district level administrators, school level administrators, teachers, parents) allowed for an investigation of areas pre-identified by the project

team as well as issues that emerged that were not previously known. A case study report for each school is included in a separate section of this report.

Individual interviews. A district level administrator and school level administrators from each school were interviewed. These interviews specifically targeted information related to IB implementation, support, and stakeholder involvement.

Focus group interviews. To obtain in-depth information about the perceptions and experiences of teachers and parents, the field research team conducted focus group interviews with teachers and parents.

Classroom observations and document review. Classroom observations and the review of relevant documents were also part of the data collection process. These data collection activities provided rich supplemental data that informed understanding of the IB-PYP implementation process.

Procedures for Data Collection and Analysis

Project team members developed the protocol for the onsite visits, which included a common set of data collection procedures and instruments to be used during the three onsite school visits to Georgia IB-PYP schools. Following is a description of the data collection process for the onsite visits.

Project Team Members

A College of Education faculty member with research expertise in qualitative data collection and analysis as well as knowledge in IB-PYP, Dr. Jori Hall, served as the Principal Investigator for this project. Professional staff from the EPEC included the Project Director, Tracy Elder, and two research professionals, Scott Pollack and Jana Thompson. Each project team member was assigned roles in this project to design data collection instruments, conduct survey research, coordinate the onsite school visits, develop site visit protocols and data collection processes, and coordinate field data analysis, and reporting. All four members of the project team participated in site visits and contributed to the development of a case study report for each school. The Project Director served as the lead researcher for all three site visits and was accompanied by one of the other project team members.

Instrument Development

Development of the survey and case study instruments was done by the project team members. Each instrument was divided into two main sections: the current implementation of the PYP and the authorization process. The current implementation section of each instrument was formed based on *programme standards and practice* with subsections including philosophy, organization, curriculum, students and their families, and overall implementation. The authorization process section addressed the three phases, including the feasibility study, trial implementation, and the IB team visit, as well as authorization process challenges.

Survey items related to the authorization and implementation process were answered on a 4-point scale from *strongly agree* to *strongly disagree*. A *don't know* option was provided for authorization process items. Respondents were asked if they were at the school during each phase of the authorization process; if they were not, then they were not asked the questions about that particular phase. Another question listed challenges a PYP school might face when seeking IB authorization with response options

none/a little/some/very/don't know. The survey also included an open-ended question that asked respondents to share any successful strategies used by their school to implement the PYP.

The survey was based on another instrument that had been validated by extensive field research. In addition, a review of the survey was conducted by other educational researchers to assess the clarity of the instructions and the basic intelligibility of the items. Based on input from the other educational researchers, the questionnaire was refined by the research team. The research team deleted items and some items were reworded for further clarification to ensure that the measurement tool was consistent and that the respondents would share the same understanding of the questions. Cronbach's alpha was used to measure the internal consistency for subsections. The overall Cronbach alpha correlation for the survey is .91.

Preliminary survey data analysis informed the development of the individual interview and focus group interview instruments. Based on the analysis, interview instruments were adapted according to stakeholder group, as necessary. Interview instruments were also reviewed by other educational researchers and then revised by project team members. All field researchers involved in collecting qualitative data were trained to maximize inter-rater reliability.

Case Study School Selection

Three schools were selected from the sixteen authorized PYP schools in Georgia for a two-day, in-depth visit to collect case study data. Selection was based on the following criteria: type and size of school system – small, medium, and large with two county and one city school system; demographics – one school predominantly African American, one school predominantly Hispanic, and one school predominantly white; and size of the community served by the school – metropolitan/urban, suburban/rural.

Given the fact that there are no rural schools authorized as IB World Schools in Georgia, one school was selected from the smallest school system (only 7 schools). This school is largely made up of Spanish speaking students (69% Hispanic) with 10 other languages represented by the student population.

The metropolitan/urban school selected was from the largest school system represented in the authorized schools (147 schools), located in the Atlanta area. The population at this school is very diverse with students from all over the world due to the influx of immigrants and refugees who come to this area of the state. The demographics of this school include 11% Asian, 53% Black, 2% Hispanic, 8% Multi-Racial, and 26% White. The faculty also reflects the diversity of the student population.

The medium size school system selected was from a school system in middle Georgia with 56 schools. The demographics of this school include 61% White, 25% Black, 8% Multi-Racial, and 3% Hispanic. The community where this school is located is the home of a US military installation and many of the students are children from military families stationed in this Georgia community. Many of the teachers (90%) are white and are long time residents of the community.

Data Collection

The survey was administered online to sixteen Georgia PYP schools. These schools were notified about the survey by email. The email was sent out in November with an original cutoff set for survey completion by mid-November. In mid-November, project team observed that the participation rate was

relatively low. Project team members followed up with school personnel via email and telephone to encourage more participation and the survey remained active. Survey data collection ended in December. A total of 561 surveys were collected (See Appendix X for a complete list of participants by school). Results from the survey are provided in a separate section of this report.

In preparation for the onsite visits, schools were asked to identify and arrange times and places for individual and focus group interviews, classroom observations and to compile relevant documents for review during the visit dates. The team project manager served as the primary contact for coordination of the onsite school visits. A proposed schedule was provided to the project team; the scheduling of data collection activities during the two-day visit was based on mutually convenient dates for researchers and the school. Two-day site visits for the three Georgia PYP schools were conducted in December. A total of 6 school-level administrator interviews, 2 PYP coordinator interviews, 3 media specialist interviews, 2 district-level administrators, 9 teacher focus groups, 3 parent focus groups, and 16 classroom observations were conducted. The following table list the activities conducted during the two-day school visits with an estimate of the amount of time for each activity.

Activity	Estimated Amt. of Time	Person(s) involved
School-level administrator interview(s)	1.5 hr	Head of School/ Principal
	1.0 hr	Asst. Principal(s), if applicable
PYP coordinator interview	1.5 hr	PYP coordinator
Media specialist interview	15 to 20 mins.	Media specialist
District-level administrator interview	45 mins.	One district personnel who is knowledgeable about the school's IB authorization
Parents focus group	30 mins.	6-8 parents representative of the school
Teachers focus group(s)	1 hr per focus group	8 to 10 teachers representing a cross section of grade levels and subject areas
Documentation review	30 mins. to 1 hour	PYP Coordinator to collect for field researchers
School walk-through	15 mins.	To view school facilities including media center, labs, halls, etc.
Classroom observations	15-20 mins. per observation	Classrooms representing a cross section of grade levels and subject areas

Below are examples of documents that were reviewed during the visits.

- Documentation of feasibility study (work products, meeting agendas and minutes, participants)
- Sample communications with parents and community
- Professional development plan, including records of attendance
- Written goals, strategies, timelines
- Student/parent handbooks
- Student work samples, projects
- Records of student's learning (report card)
- Products of professional development (strategic plans, lesson plans, rubrics)
- Meeting minutes, memos, emails, journals, logs
- Newsletters, announcements, memos, communications with parents
- Community support documentation (communications, services, publicity)
- Web-site, newspaper articles

Data Analysis

Data collected from the survey and onsite school visits were analyzed across the subsections of the authorization process (the feasibility study, trial implementation, the IB team visit, authorization challenges) and current implementation (philosophy, organization, curriculum, students and their families, overall implementation). Frequencies and means were calculated for each survey item in an effort to make comparisons across items, as appropriate. Items in each subsection were averaged to create overall ratings. Individual case and a cross-case analysis were conducted using data collected from the onsite school visits. Data triangulation was used to analyze case study data from individual schools to support the consistency of the data sources, comparing observational data to interview data and comparing the interview information from each person to that of another interviewee. The project team examined cases with the pre-identified subsections in mind while remaining open to discovering new insights for the individual case and cross-case analysis. This procedure was conducted multiple times to allow for the development of narrative description.

Narrative descriptions were organized by subsections and included in the individual case study reports, as relevant. Individual case study reports are provided in a separate section of this report. Based on the survey and case study reports, recommendations for schools considering the PYP have been compiled into a report brief, which is also included in a separate section of this report.

The remainder of this report presents summaries of key findings utilizing the research questions as a framework for synthesizing the survey and case study data collected. Survey data and exemplar respondent quotes are utilized to illustrate key findings related to the research questions.

Findings

1. How does a school move from interested to candidate to authorized status?

IB related activities

Case study data indicate that issues related to district-mandated school reorganization, changes in the surrounding neighborhood and wanting to improve the reputation of the school as primary reasons for a school's decision to implement the IB-PYP. Schools wanted a program that would attract and develop a diverse high-achieving student body. Schools learned about the PYP primarily through IB literature and word of mouth:

So we [principal and district-level administrator] were discussing it [the PYP] and she said she had read an article, 'IB for Peewees,' and she sent it to us. And from that, that was my first knowledge of the Primary Years Programme.

Important initial steps taken by schools to meet IB standards include seeking additional funds, applying for charter school status, meeting with various stakeholder groups, networking with other IB schools and sending teachers to IB workshops. Responses from one principal illustrate how schools learned about the IB and steps taken to start the process:

This is an old established neighborhood...when we saw things changing and people leaving...we need something to make us unique...I didn't want to be the magnet school that gets all the students coming to escape problems in their other schools... so in 2002, we started talking in faculty meetings about the PYP...we invited another IB coordinator to talk to us about it with us...then we were in transit.

Internally/school related activities

Schools encouraged teacher buy-in mainly by networking with other schools that offer an IB programme and attending IB workshops. Schools typically sent teachers to the workshops in order to report skills and strategies back to the rest of the faculty. A majority of the survey respondents indicated that teacher buy-in initially presented at least some challenge (59.5%) to the authorization process. Hiring teachers committed to the PYP philosophy and communicating words of support were other important ways schools established buy-in for the PYP. The following is a response that demonstrates words of encouragement described by teachers: "We can do this together, we're a team."

School building leaders (administrators, IB-PYP coordinator) were largely responsible for pursuing and organizing the PYP authorization process. The majority of respondents (92.4%) agreed or strongly agreed that the school building leaders worked with teachers to deliver the trial implementation of PYP and worked with teachers to make sure the school ran effectively at the time of the IB team visit (95.2%). These school leaders were highly instrumental in spearheading a school vision, developing a plan of action and articulating these goals and plans to the school. This resulted in an understanding of the PYP, a commitment on the part of teachers, the use of new teaching strategies and increased collaboration among teachers. The following quotation denotes a common observation made by school building leaders about changes in teachers' behavior during the authorization process: "teachers were walking together, supporting each other."

Community related activities

Slightly fewer than half of the survey respondents (46%) reported that parent buy-in was challenging to at least some extent. Schools have worked with stakeholder groups, namely parents and community business partners, from the beginning of the authorization process. Handing out flyers, offering informative IB sessions at the school, and involving parents in the preparation of IB reports and events were some of the ways in which schools have helped to establish the presence and legitimacy of the PYP among families and local community institutions during the authorization process. Anecdotally, providing food, transportation, and childcare as needed also fostered parental involvement.

Local churches, hospitals, not-for profit organizations, parent groups and other concerned community members were reported as examples of community partners. One school partnered with a Catholic church to offer a workshop titled, “Your Role as a Parent.” As a result of the workshop opportunities, parents began to have confidence and became more actively involved in their children’s education. Some schools used their charter status to attract families to the school. The following is a direct quotation from a parent describing how she learned about the PYP offered at the school:

Sister Mary¹ was standing on the corner down the street and gave me a flyer about the school that was about to open down the street. She told me that it was going to be a charter school and invited me to an open house.

State/district school system requirements

It was commonly reported that teachers had some “confusion” about how to integrate the Georgia Performance Standards (GPS) with the IB-PYP curriculum units. A majority of respondents rated the alignment of the primary years programme curriculum with the Georgia Performance Standards during the authorization process as challenging to some extent (65.2%). The state curriculum is not optional; therefore schools must continue to work toward integration of the GPS and the PYP curriculum. While this was an initial challenge for schools, case study data reveal that schools are making progress in this area, particularly those schools that have been integrating state standards longer. Collaborative time tends to focus on unit planners and the “meshing” of the GPS and the IB-PYP curriculum units. Schools reported that there are still some standards in the state curriculum that do not fit with the IB units and are taught as stand-alone lessons.

In terms of district requirements for the schools visited, two case study schools reported that every attempt is made to integrate district initiatives. However, their autonomy as a charter schools gives them some latitude for implementing district requirements. For example, one school requested a waiver for the district requirement that student assessment data be posted in the school building. This waiver was based on the fact that posting students’ test scores was not consistent with the IB philosophy. As a result, the waiver was granted and the school was exempt from the requirement. Because of its status as a new-start charter school, the third case study school functioned outside of the school district and was not required to adhere to district requirements during the authorization period. However, the school was not exempt from the state requirement of implementing GPS and administering state assessments. It should be noted that this school is progressively moving toward oversight by the district and may be required to adhere to district requirements in the future.

¹This name is a pseudonym.

Support during the Authorization Process

In general, moving through the authorization process was reported as a relatively positive experience for schools. The majority of survey respondents agreed or strongly agreed that IBNA provided support during the feasibility study (87.5%), the trial implementation (80.5%), and the IB team visit (74.5%). Schools found the report provided by the IB team particularly helpful and supportive. The majority of survey respondents (90.4%) agreed or strongly agreed that the report provided useful information to the school. Case study data support this finding. For example, one district-level administrator noted that the feedback about their PYP implementation was “clear and specific.” A PYP coordinator from another school stated that the feedback was “very affirming.”

In addition, two case study schools reported the importance of district-level support during the authorization process. Reported areas of support include granting charter school status, allowing increased autonomy, providing full-time faculty positions (PYP coordinators, special area teachers), and funding both workshops and substitute teachers to support workshop attendance.

Challenges to the Authorization Process

Personnel at all three case study schools cited the lack of IB workshops for special area teachers (e.g. media specialists, counselors, physical education teachers) as a challenge. Schools cited workshops for special area teachers as critical to help them effectively deliver the transdisciplinary nature of the PYP. Other challenges expressed by case study schools include the need for better communication with the IBNA and additional assistance from the organization, particularly in terms of additional time with an IB consultant.

Case study data indicate that every school was assigned an IB consultant soon after submitting Application A for candidacy. Because schools can engage in professional learning about IB and can attend IB workshops prior to Application A, becoming an IB candidacy school, each school may be developmentally at a different point on the continuum of understanding and readiness for IB-PYP at the time of submission. According to teachers and administrators, this factor influenced how schools experienced the process of working with the IB assigned consultant. Two of the case study schools noted that if they were provided help prior to making Application A, they could have avoided some hurdles. A response from one principal illustrates this point when he reported that the school would have “done better” during the feasibility study phase with “more outside [IBNA] help.”

Schools that attempt to write IB units and proceed with trial implementation prior to submitting Application A, do so without the assistance of a consultant, potentially making the trial implementation more challenging. However, if the school submits Application A early in the process of learning about IB, a consultant comes into the picture earlier and can provide support while the trial implementation is occurring. One school reported that they were able to utilize feedback provided by its IB consultant to prepare for the trial implementation, which helped to make their authorization process less challenging. Another school expressed that more support with interpreting the feedback from IBNA on Application B would have been appreciated to meet expectations for documentation during the IB team visit. At the very least, more detailed or specific feedback on Application B from IBNA would better prepare the school for the IB team visit.

2. How is the Primary Years Programme (PYP) implemented?

Successful Strategies for Programme Implementation

Analysis of the findings across site visits and the survey data indicates six different categories of successful strategies reported by PYP schools in Georgia. The strategies cited are:

- whole school program immersion
- collaborative, transdisciplinary planning
- continuous training (e.g., IB workshops, faculty meetings, visits)
- resource development to support IB units
- increasing family and community involvement
- leadership to support implementation

Whole School Immersion

Whole school immersion implies that the school makes every attempt to surround the students and teachers with IB-PYP. Evidence of the programme can be found everywhere. In each of the schools visited, the hallways and classroom walls provided evidence of this approach toward implementation. Visual displays of student work, student profile words, the IB units, and school-wide projects promote the IB philosophy. During a parent focus group, one parent said that it was difficult to explain IB to others but added, “You see it.” On the survey one teacher highlighted the importance of making IB visible in the school and promoting the IB philosophy throughout the school day. In addition to visual displays, this teacher described the approach they use at their school, which is called “I see IB.” The staff records examples of IB qualities exhibited by students and the principal randomly draws a student to be recognized as well as the student’s teacher. The teacher stated that this strategy has “united us as an IB school.” A similar approach was noted at one of the site visit schools. At one school during morning announcements the principal talks about the profile word of the day and recognizes students who have demonstrated that trait. For example, a student who demonstrated “empathy” by helping the custodian clean hard to reach areas under the bleachers was recognized.

Another common whole school strategy for ensuring integration of IB throughout the school is the expectation that the special areas teachers (art, music, PE, second language, ELL teachers, etc.) integrate the IB units into their instructional plans. Students encounter the current IB unit in all of their classes. The Spanish teacher at one school has established a microcosm of a community with its economic system to teach many of the IB principles and incorporates vocabulary and concepts from the current IB unit. The special area teachers typically have received the same training as the grade level teachers and meet with the PYP coordinator to plan how they will support the IB unit. Strategies for finding the time to meet for collaborative planning vary across schools and can be a challenge, but schools consistently saw involving all teachers as instrumental in implementing the IB-PYP.

Collaborative Planning

All stakeholder groups interviewed at the site visits and 42.7% of survey respondents who provided strategies cited collaborative planning and having the time to plan as one of the most successful strategies for implementing IB-PYP. Strategies for collaborative planning time typically included weekly grade level meetings during the school day facilitated by the PYP coordinator and periodic meetings across grade levels or the whole faculty. Each six weeks teachers at some schools come together for

half-day work sessions to reflect on the unit they are just finishing and to plan for the next unit. Substitutes are hired or paraprofessionals are used to cover classes to provide this release time. It was very important to teachers that this time to meet and plan occurred during the school day and was not added on at the end of the day. One teacher stated that time spent collaborating and working with the PYP coordinator is “the most important time aside from being in front of the kids.”

Continuous Training

Continuous training comes in various forms, ranging from visits to other schools to onsite weekly professional development with the entire faculty. Stakeholders from one school stated that it has been critical to the success of their programme implementation to communicate up front when hiring teachers that, in addition to grade level meetings, teachers would be expected to attend weekly meetings dedicated to professional development related to IB-PYP. Teachers in this school are also expected to observe in other classrooms three to four times during the year. All stakeholder groups mentioned IB workshops and ongoing training as critical to the success of IB-PYP. Visits to other schools were cited as a key component during the authorization process. Visiting is also mentioned as a beneficial strategy to stay current, get new ideas, and network with other teachers; however, it was not something that routinely occurred after authorization. One administrator’s comment demonstrated an acknowledgement of its importance: “It’s something we really should be doing.”

Resources

To facilitate sharing among teachers, many schools use a shared computer drive to store the IB units and other resources. In many schools the media center is instrumental in supporting the IB units. At one school, the media specialist has devoted one wall in the media center to shelving materials to support each unit currently being implemented. Each section of the bookshelves is lined with a different color paper to make it easy for students to find their grade level. This media center also has tagged the collection by IB unit in the card catalog, making searches by unit easy for teachers.

Providing resources to support the IB units is acknowledged by all as one of the biggest challenges. The media specialists interviewed during site visits all stated that decisions about purchases for the media collection are always guided by the IB units. One school has gone beyond the regular district funds provided for media center resources to use funds provided by the state for textbook purchases creatively. The media center purchases level readers and other resources to support the units using these funds.

Family and Community Involvement

Strategies to promote family and community involvement were very similar across schools. Many of the traditional methods (newsletters, communication sent home, website, etc.) schools use for this purpose were evident. However, the case study schools all had a welcoming climate and outwardly demonstrated the IB philosophy that everyone is valued. One of the schools visited does not have PTA officers because they do not want to send the message that an elite group of parent leaders is making decisions. Instead, they invite everyone to all School Council and PTA meetings. Two of the three schools visited are open to the community beyond the regular school day.

Other examples of how schools promote family and community involvement include inviting family members to participate in classroom activities, making whole school activities family oriented, and overcoming language barriers to facilitate communication. A Kindergarten teacher invited families to demonstrate culturally related dance steps and had 21 out of 23 families participate. One school surveys families two to three times a year; based on the survey data, the school revamped their PTA meetings to

be more family-oriented, with food served at all meetings and child care provided. The media center at One school uses a software program entitled Babble to facilitate communication with parents and the community.

One of the site visit schools has developed the most extensive system for involving families and communities in the school programme. Multiple programs in the school are supported by nonprofit organizations, local colleges and universities, and volunteers and parents provide countless hours of volunteer time. A variety of strategies are used to provide translators to facilitate communication with families. Staff members, other parents, college students, and volunteers all help with communication. When calling a student's family, the school always tries to communicate in the caregiver's native tongue.

Leadership

The final category of successful strategies used by schools to implement the IB-PYP is necessary on the front end. Support for IB by the school leadership, including the PYP Coordinator, was cited by every stakeholder group and by the respondents to the survey as one of the key strategies for successful implementation. At all three site visits, it was clear that the building level administrators were instrumental in the success of the programme. In two of the three schools visited, the PYP coordinator had been full-time since early on in the authorization process and these schools had made much progress toward integration of the state curriculum, the Georgia Performance Standards (GPS), and in addressing the transdisciplinary nature of the IB-PYP. The other school had a part time PYP coordinator who also had administrator duties for most of its PYP implementation. This school showed a marked difference in the progress made toward transdisciplinary teaching and use of the inquiry method of instruction, lagging behind the other two schools.

The PYP coordinator was the most important person in the building for maintaining the focus on IB-PYP. One school described this person as the "taskmaster" who keeps the teachers on task and focused. Others described the PYP coordinator as the person in the building who facilitates communication across grade levels and the special area teachers, including the media specialist; gathers resources to support units; finds answers to questions; observes in classrooms and meets with teachers to troubleshoot what she is seeing; is the keeper of the unit planners; and generally keeps the model going. Stakeholders communicated that someone has to keep an eye on the big picture of IB-PYP implementation, and this is the primary role of the PYP coordinator.

Challenges to Programme Implementation

While there were not that many challenges to implementation of IB-PYP mentioned during the on-site visits, those that were consistently clustered in four areas:

- limited resources (i.e. time, materials and space)
- integration of GPS and the PYP curriculum
- the transdisciplinary nature of the programme
- district and state expectations

Limited Resources

Issues related to time and other resources to support the IB units were mentioned most often by all stakeholder groups. Time issues included having enough planning time for special area teachers to meet with grade level teachers; limited whole class instruction due to students being pulled out for services; and instructional time for the media center and the counselor.

Because the IB-PYP curriculum relies on the inquiry method of instruction, a wealth of support materials is necessary to properly implement the programme. Schools consistently report that acquiring and maintaining adequate instructional materials to support the IB units, which constantly change, is an ongoing challenge. One school has the additional challenge of meeting the diverse needs of a population made up of students from over 30 different countries.

Adequate space was a tremendous problem for one of the schools visited. A teacher pointed out that project-based work required workspace to complete, storage space for project supplies, and display space once the product is complete. This school did not have adequate wall space in the classrooms and hallways to display student work. One teacher shared her frustration that, with the combination of state's expectation that curriculum objects are posted and IB's expectation that profile words and themes are posted, no room was left for student work.

Integration of GPS

Integration of the state curriculum with IB units was a challenge shared by all teachers and administrators based on data collected during school visits and from survey responses. However, 90.4 percent of the survey respondents agreed or strongly agreed that their schools have developed strategies to integrate PYP and GPS. The GPS is content-specific with facts, names, and dates that students are expected to remember when tested on the state-mandated assessments. The international perspective of the IB curriculum is not content-specific but rather concept-focused, with connections made to context. Teachers find it a challenge to meet the state expectations of teaching the GPS facts and dates while honoring the global focus of IB. Teachers shared many examples of this challenge, but also gave examples of how certain GPS have been well integrated with IB. Those schools that have been at this longer seem to be adjusting, but still see this as an ongoing challenge, particularly in certain content areas such as math. One teacher admitted that she strays from the unit planner to teach specific information and skills because of the pressure to prepare students for the state assessment. Schools occasionally include stand-alone units to insure coverage of GPS.

Another distinction between GPS and IB-PYP pointed out by both teachers and administrators at one school is the "rigidity of GPS and the fluid, process-oriented approach of IB." They see these as philosophical opposites and have had trouble reconciling the two. Survey respondents rated aligning PYP and GPS as the most challenging aspect of the authorization process. As noted above, GPS is more content-oriented, focusing on facts and skills that students are measured in the required state tests. IB, on the other hand, tends to focus more on the process of learning and acquiring higher-order thinking skills. IB schools must serve two masters. While these concerns are specific to Georgia, all schools have national, state and/or local requirements they must meet. The challenge is meeting the requirements of both at the same time without doing twice as much work.

Transdisciplinary Nature of IB Curriculum

On top of the challenge to integrate IB and GPS, teachers also are faced with IB's expectation that instruction be transdisciplinary. Most school reported starting with social studies and science integration in unit development and moving to reading and language arts. Math consistently was reported as the most challenging to integrate. Again, schools with more experience with IB were doing a better job with achieving transdisciplinary teaching. School personnel shared that achieving transdisciplinary teaching is a step-by-step process and one that does not happen overnight.

District and State Expectations

Each of the schools visited has charter status, so many of the district and state requirements are relaxed to allow the school complete autonomy to implement IB-PYP. This may not always be the case and schools acknowledged that, so far, district and state expectations have not been a huge challenge, but this could become a problem in the future. Some examples of district issues shared by schools included the use of a district report card, district software used to record lesson plans, and district initiatives for school improvement. Schools have managed to “get around” or been excused from some requirements; or the issues were not a problem because they were consistent with the IB-PYP.

Support from IBNA

Administrators and PYP coordinators typically were the school personnel who could speak specifically to the level of support provided by IBNA. They reported that they knew where to get answers from IBNA. One felt that answers were sometime slow in coming because many of the questions she had related to state curriculum issues and the IBNA person answering the phone was not readily able to answer her questions. Teachers generally have not had any contact with IB support staff and rely on the PYP coordinator to seek answers to questions. Teachers saw IB workshops and training opportunities as the primary form of support from IB that directly impacts them. One group of teachers did see the website as another source of support provided to teachers. However, the opinions varied from positive to very negative about the usability and value of this resource. Issues surrounding the website fell into two areas – communicating with other schools and meeting curriculum needs. One group of teachers saw the curriculum resources as adequate. Another group of teachers said the curriculum resources found online were not useful because they did not provide enough depth and there were not enough lesson samples. One described it as “a little slim.” Several voiced the desire to have a blog or bulletin board for classroom ideas.

One group of teachers did point to the IB visit team’s report as quality feedback which continues to guide their implementation. Several teachers from one school had attended the IB national conference in California and found that to be a great opportunity to learn more about IB and network with other schools. The feedback received by one school as a result of their participation in an IB World initiated study was described as extremely useful, but this level of support was not available to all IB schools.

Recommendations from Schools to Improve IBNA Support

Through the course of interviews with the various stakeholder groups during the site visits and from the additional comments added by respondents to the online survey, the following suggestions were gathered on how IBNA might improve the authorization process and ongoing support for implementation. Most teachers and administrators acknowledged that learning about IB is a process. One PYP coordinator stated that they had “learned more by not having it [answers] handed to us.” Despite awareness that it is best not to have information spoon-fed to them, schools consistently would like more support during the authorization process. The following details some of the ideas shared by schools.

Networking with Authorized Schools

A systematic way for pre-candidate and candidate schools to connect with authorized schools for support would be beneficial. More than one person interviewed suggested that IBNA facilitate matching up schools with a mentor school. One person went one step further to suggest mentors for the various roles, i.e. PYP coordinator, media specialist, counselor, administrator, etc. Technology to support this

process was also suggested by some. IB could post a list of schools or persons interested in mentoring and a bulletin board or place on the website for schools looking for a mentor to post their needs.

Consultative Support

Some schools do have additional funds for hiring consultants during the authorization process. The PYP coordinator at one school stated she would like to see IBNA produce a list of consultants/experts who could be hired by schools to provide onsite training in specific areas. Another administrator stated that having the names of consultants who are geographically located near the school would be helpful. This has multiple advantages, including familiarity with state curriculum and requirements, decreased travel cost, and ease of access.

Numerous interviewees requested more time with the IB consultant and more feedback along the way. As one PYP coordinator pointed out, “the amount of time between Application A and Application B can be a long time and just making a progress report with limited feedback doesn’t help advance your efforts.” She was looking for more specific, corrective feedback. Another school leader felt that the official period of time the school works with an IB consultant should start earlier in the process and the amount of time should be increased. The school that participated in the IB World study highly recommended that all schools receive this level of feedback periodically, both during trial implementation and after authorization.

Training

Several types of training were suggested by those interviewed. Special area teachers (e.g. counselors, media specialists and language teachers) stated that they had attended the workshops offered by IB but found them to be not specific to their roles in the school. Specialized training, or at a minimum mentoring with a person in a like role at an authorized school, would help these professionals to implement the IB-PYP and increase their buy-in to the programme. One district level administrator expressed the desire for IB to provide specific training for district level personnel who are responsible for supporting IB.

Communication with IBNA

Several school leaders interviewed recommended that IBNA improve communication with schools during the authorization process. Specific and detailed feedback in response to Application B, particularly about the documentation necessary to support the application, would better prepare schools for the authorization visit. Additionally, in larger school systems where multiple schools may be going through the process simultaneously, IB should be sensitive to the timing of the notification of the outcome of the IB authorization visit. It can be awkward for schools in the same district to be notified at different times; it implies differences in effort and implementation that may not actually exist.

School Survey Report

IB-PYP School Survey Results

Introduction

These results are based on 561 surveys received by December 11, 2008. The survey was administered online; schools were notified about it by email. The email was sent out on November 5 with an original cutoff date of November 14; however, UGA personnel followed up with school personnel via email and telephone to encourage more participation and the survey remained active for several more weeks. Personnel from all sixteen PYP schools in Georgia completed the survey. The number of respondents at each school ranged from two to 66, and 53 did not identify the school at which they worked.

The survey was divided into sections addressing current implementation of the Primary Years Programme and each of the parts of the authorization process. The first section dealt with current implementation. Within this section the items were based on IB standards, including philosophy (2 items), organization (6 items), curriculum (3 items), students and their families (3 items), and overall implementation (2 items). The authorization process sections covered the feasibility study (4 items), trial implementation (4 items), and the IB Team visit (5 items). All the items were answered on a scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree. A response option of don't know was included for the authorization items. Respondents were asked if they were at the school during each of the authorization periods; if they were not, then they were not asked the questions about that period of time. Another question listed challenges a school might face when seeking IB authorization and asked respondents to rate how much of a challenge each one was for their school. The end of the survey contained demographic questions.

Frequencies and means (where appropriate) for each item can be found in the appendix to this report.

Demographics

Respondents were mostly female (79.7%) and white (63.3%). About one in six (15.7%) of respondents was African-American and 3.7 percent were Hispanic; many did not identify their race or ethnicity. There was a fairly even spread of ages ranging from 20 to 60 years of age. The largest group (25.1%) was between the ages of 31 and 40, while only 3.6 percent were over the age of sixty. Most have been at their school either 4-8 years (33.2%) or 2-3 years (25.3%); only 2.9 percent had been there over 20 years. Both age and time at school had ranges as answer categories.

Over half (51.3%) of respondents were grade level teachers; other teachers included specials (i.e. art, music and physical education; 8.4%), special education (6.1%), foreign language (4.3%) and ELL (2.0%). Twenty-three administrators (4.1%) and 17 (3.0%) IB coordinators answered the survey.

Most of the respondents hold either a masters (45.8%) or bachelors (31.9%) degree. They have a number of additional certifications, including gifted (13.2%), reading specialist (9.4%), leadership (8.6%), and ELL (7.1%). A handful of respondents hold master teacher (3.2%) or national board (1.2%) certification.

Current Implementation

The responses to the items addressing current implementation were mainly positive. Over eighty percent of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with all of the statements in this section except two.

About two-thirds of respondents (68.1%) agreed or strongly agreed that support for PYP is provided by outside organizations such as businesses and universities. Similarly, about three-quarters (76.8%) agreed or strongly agreed that parents understand student expectations regarding the IB-PYP. Taken as a group, these results indicate that respondents believe their schools are following the key principles of PYP.

Means were calculated for each item in an effort to make comparisons across items. Items in each of the five subsections were averaged to create overall ratings. Each subsection had an adequate reliability rating to be considered as a coherent scale. All the categories had similar means, ranging from 3.17 for overall implementation to 3.30 for curriculum. In terms of the rating scale, the averages were slightly higher than the agree response, which would equate to a 3.00 average.

Current Implementation Sections	Mean	Cronbach's Alpha
Philosophy	3.28	.82
Organization	3.23	.87
Curriculum	3.30	.82
Students and Their Families	3.21	.79
Overall Implementation	3.17	.86

Authorization Process Phases

Slightly fewer than half (48.9%) of respondents were employed by their schools during the feasibility study, 60.1 percent during their school's trial implementation, and 84.3 percent at the time of the IB Team visit. As with the previous section, the large majority of responses were positive, indicating that each of these processes was accomplished in the proper fashion. The only area with even a slight concern was school district support; 60.8 percent agreed or strongly agreed with this item in the feasibility study section and 58.2 percent in the IB Team visit section.

The overall mean for items in the feasibility section was 3.21, similar to the averages in the current implementation section. The means for the trial implementation (3.42) and IB Team visit (3.44) items were higher, placing them nearly halfway between agree and strongly agree on the rating scale.

Authorization Process	Mean	Cronbach's Alpha
Feasibility Study	3.21	.84
Trial Implementation	3.42	.91
IB Team Visit	3.44	.88
Challenges	1.79	.94

Authorization Process Challenges

Respondents were asked to rate how challenging the authorization process was in a number of areas. A plurality said that support from school building leaders (33.4%) and student buy-in (26.0%) were not a challenge at all. On the other hand, a plurality also said that collaborative planning time (34.2%) and

meeting both PYP and state accountability requirements (28.1%) were very challenging. Additionally, alignment of PYP and GPS (2.17) had the highest mean of all the items, indicating that this was the most challenging area. The average rating of all challenges was 1.79, which fell between very little (1.00) and some (2.00) challenge.

Successful Strategies for Implementation

The survey included an opportunity for respondents to share any successful strategies used by their schools to implement the PYP. A total of 131 (24.3%) respondents completing the survey entered a response to this item. The most frequently identified strategy was collaborative time with other teachers to plan and reflect on instruction (42.7%). The comments reflected that schools have used different ways to schedule the time together for teachers, but that it usually occurs during regular working hours and is often facilitated by the PYP coordinator. The following comments are representative of this category of answers:

Collaboration is key. It is also important to have support from an IBO coordinator and from the district.

Collaborative planning time is extremely helpful and an absolute necessity for successful implementation and ongoing success of the program.

The collaborative planning times are probably the key to the success of implementing the PYP.

Almost one in five (19.1%) of the comments about successful strategies referenced the support provided for IB by school administrators, including the PYP coordinator.

Having a good full time PYP coordinator is key to a successful program.

...We have administration that support the teacher - parent cooperation and are always being considerate of all teachers and staff reflecting the PYP attitudes and profiles.

...Our PYP coordinator works closely with teachers and helps provide many of the tangible signs, posters, etc., that are on display throughout the building.

The same number of respondents (19.1%) highlighted the opportunities provided for professional development including attending formal IB training, conferences, visiting other IB schools, doing book studies and other learning opportunities offered to their staff members as a key strategy.

Training, training, training! With experience comes knowledge and comfort.

1. teachers visit other PYP schools 2. staff meetings in which teachers learn how to implement certain ideas while participating in the same type of activity during the meeting 3. teachers attend IB Level 1,2,3 training 4. book studies by faculty members 5. "walk-throughs" in which teachers visit classrooms that exemplify "best practices"

All teachers are encouraged to attend training across the U.S. All faculty meetings center around PYP training

Commitment from stakeholder groups and involvement of all school staff members, as well as parents, were described by 12.2 percent of the respondents as a component for success at their schools. Being able to choose to teach in the IB school was a concept also mentioned in this category.

Our best strategy is the fact that we have such a strong "buy in" with staff, students, parents and district...

All of the personnel here is involved with the PYP program: art, Spanish, music and P.E. They are included in the planning process.

A few respondents (9.9%) highlighted the importance of making IB visible in the school and promoting the IB philosophy throughout the school day.

There are several; but the one, in particular that seems to have teachers as well as students excited is the "I see IB"...whenever a staff member observes a [student] exhibiting IB qualities it is written on a card and placed in a box, which [name] our principal randomly pulls from and acknowledges the student, their deed as well as the teacher who wrote the observation. This strategy seems to unite us as an IB school.

Learner Profile/Attitudes are promoted through announcements, assemblies, and throughout the day by teachers.

Six comments described the importance of having the needed resources to implement IB. Resources mentioned included funding for supplies and materials, a well-equipped media center and supportive media specialist, professional development funding provided by a parent-teacher organization, and having access to grant funds to supplement IB implementation. Two respondents identified aligning the GPS to their units of inquiry as a strong strategy for their schools.

Some respondents (19.1%) entered comments that really did not identify successful strategies, but rather were general observations about the PYP and IB philosophy. The comments often described outcomes seen in the schools and exhibited by students. Ten comments (7.6%) noted that a school has not been very successful or were negative about some component of IB.

Comments: Successful Strategies	*Percent N=131
Collaborative Planning Time	42.7
Supportive administration/ PYP Coordinator	19.1
Opportunities for Professional Learning	19.1
Stakeholder buy-in/ involvement	12.2
IB visible/promoted across school day	9.9
Resources	4.6
Alignment of GPS to PYP	1.5
General comments about IB	19.1
Negative comments	7.6

** Some comments were included in more than one category, so the total will not equal 100%.*

Differences by Stakeholder Group

For the analyses below, respondents were arranged in three groups: administrators and IB coordinators, grade level teachers and other personnel. Stakeholder groups often have different opinions about how a school is operating, so it is instructive to compare them.

In general, grade level teachers did not answer as positively as either administrators and IB coordinators or other types of school personnel. Grade level teachers did not have an average rating higher than the other two groups on any of the individual items in the current implementation sections. Their average scores on all of the sections were statistically significantly lower than other personnel. Also, they were significantly lower than the average scores of administrators/IB coordinators on curriculum and overall implementation. On the individual item which asks if students' academic achievement has improved, the average rating by grade level teachers (2.94) was lower than the "agree" option (3.00) and significantly lower than both administrators/IB coordinators (3.22) and other personnel (3.11). Administrators and IB coordinators and other personnel did not differ significantly on any of the section means.

Current Implementation Sections	Administrators/ IB Coordinators (n=39)	Grade Level Teachers (n=289)	Other Personnel (n=167)
Philosophy	3.44	3.26	3.40
Organization	3.26	3.15	3.35
Curriculum	3.53	3.23	3.37
Students and Their Families	3.33	3.15	3.27
Overall Implementation	3.42	3.07	3.26

The groups had more similar opinions on the authorization process, although the same overall pattern was observed. Grade level teachers did not have a rating higher than the other two groups on any of the individual items in these sections. Grade level teachers had significantly lower scores than other personnel on the average of the feasibility study items; there was also a significant difference with administrators/IB coordinators on the average of the trial implementation items. Administrators/IB coordinators and other personnel did not differ significantly on any of the authorization process means.

Authorization Process	Administrators/ IB Coordinators (n=39)	Grade Level Teachers (n=289)	Other Personnel (n=167)
Feasibility Study	3.36	3.11	3.30
Trial Implementation	3.66	3.36	3.46
IB Team Visit	3.53	3.41	3.47
Challenges	1.32	1.80	1.83

It should be noted again that, despite the significant differences among groups, the average ratings on these variables indicate that all groups perceived that their schools were implementing IB-PYP well and had what they needed to get through the authorization process. The average scores for the feasibility

study, trial implementation and IB Team visit were all above 3.00, which equates with “agree” on the four-point scale used on the items.

The pattern was slightly different when respondents were asked about the challenges of IB authorization. Overall, administrators and IB coordinators (1.32) saw the possible hurdles as significantly less challenging than both grade level (1.80) or other (1.83) teachers. On the four-point scale used on these items, 1 represented a little challenge and 2 represented some challenge. The differences were particularly noticeable on the items concerning student buy-in, IB regional office support and school building leader support. Administrators and IB coordinators had average scores below 1.00 on each of these (0.65, 0.86 and 0.51, respectively), signifying that they were not much of a challenge to authorization. Grade level teachers (1.39, 1.37, and 1.24, respectively) and other personnel (1.51, 1.64 and 1.43, respectively) judged them to be significantly more challenging.

APPENDICES

Appendix I: Evaluation Plan Proposal

Appendix II: Evaluation Instruments

Appendix III: Online School Survey and Results

Appendix I: Evaluation Plan Proposal

International Baccalaureate – Primary Years Programme Case Study Proposal

Overview

The University of Georgia is pleased to submit the following proposal for investigating the implementation of the International Baccalaureate Organization (IBO) Primary Years Programme. This study is designed to provide IBO with case study and survey data on the authorization process and implementation of the Primary Years Programme in authorized Georgia schools. The aim of the project will be twofold: to gather information which can be used internally by IBO to inform the development of the authorization process and to learn about how schools have successfully proceeded through the authorization process which can then be shared externally with interested schools.

The proposed overall research questions are:

1. How does a school move from interested to candidate to authorized status?
 - a. IB related –
 - i. How do schools learn about and follow IB regulations related to becoming authorized?
 - ii. What steps do they take to meet IB standards?
 - b. School related –
 - i. How do schools encourage teacher support for IB?
 - ii. Who in the school is pursuing the IB programme?
 - iii. Who in the school organizes the tasks necessary for authorization?
 - c. Community related –
 - i. How do schools advertise IB to the community?
 - ii. How are parents involved as stakeholders?
 - iii. Does the school partner with any outside organizations (e.g. universities, local businesses, etc.)?
 - d. State/district school system related –
 - i. How does the school meet IB and state/local standards?
2. How is the programme implemented?
 - a. What are successful strategies?
 - b. What are the challenges?
 - c. What is the impact of state/district requirements?
 - d. What are recommendations to future schools?
 - e. How does IB provide support to the school?
 - f. What other system/actions did the school put in place?

There are sixteen (16) schools in Georgia authorized by IBO to implement the Primary Years Programme (PYP). Data will be collected from all Georgia Schools through online surveys and phone interviews. Three schools will be selected to receive a two-day site visit for a more in depth examination of implementation resulting in a case study report for each site. The schools selected will represent the various geographical regions of the state and will include a school from three different community sizes – small, medium and large. If possible, schools in the

sample will include a site recently authorized as well as one school that is several years into the implementation process to examine fidelity issues over time.

Program Implementation

Research on the implementation of IB-PYP will use a case study approach to data collection, analysis, and reporting.

The proposed design for IB-PYP implementation case studies will examine the following key elements which have been shown through research to be important for successful school reforms:

- Leadership at the building/school level
- Support from the district (technical assistance, support, and funding for effective implementation of the IB-PYP)
- Selection of the IB programme by school(s) given the school's context (i.e. geographical location, size of community, size of school, student demographics, etc.)
- Fidelity of implementing the program model (methods, strategies of the model)
- Quality and extent of parental and community involvement
- Quality and effect of external (provider) support and technical assistance
- Continuing commitment and involvement of teachers, staff, and administrators in the reforms

Specific questions for each of the above key elements will be identified, and will be used in development of the data collection instruments and processes described below.

Data on each of the above key elements will be collected, analyzed, and reported using qualitative field study and survey methods. The following data collection methods will be used to gather information related to each of the research questions.

At all IB-PYP authorized Georgia schools:

- Online or paper **survey questionnaires** for (a) school principals, (b) teachers, and (c) parents will be developed and administered to collect information about perceptions and experiences of key participants in the implementation of PYP. The surveys will ask questions related to the key elements list above.

At three IB-PYP authorized Georgia schools:

- **Onsite visits** consisting of two days will be conducted by a two-person team of field researchers to collect information through group and individual interviews, direct observation of PYP activities, and review of documents and data related to PYP. Data collected during these onsite visits will provide an in-depth understanding of school practices and the ways in which they align with IB guidelines.
- **Individual interviews** will be conducted during the onsite visits with a district level administrator and a school administrator. These interviews will specifically target information related to IB implementation, support, and involvement by key leadership.

- **Focus group sessions** will be conducted by the field research team during the two-day onsite visits with samples of teachers and parents to obtain more in-depth information about the perceptions and experiences of school and community participants. In order to understand how the IB programme is experienced by those for whom it is primarily intended, it is desirable to interview students (with parent permission) in a focus group setting as well. Use of this data collection strategy will depend on approval by UGA’s Institutional Review Board and any other required approval process, i.e. IBO’s approval process, local approval required by the school or district.

The use of mixed methods of data collection will ensure both depth and breadth of information from multiple perspectives and stakeholder groups. Surveys will be distributed to all participants to ensure breadth and diversity of feedback. The focus groups will sample a small number of teachers and parents (and students, if possible) representing diverse grade levels at each site to allow in-depth discussion both of areas pre-identified by the researchers as well as those issues emerging from the PYP participants that might not otherwise be known. Direct observation of activities on-site will validate self-report information provided by school personnel. In this way, information from a wide range of stakeholder groups will be collected, analyzed, and reported in the case studies to ensure a comprehensive, diverse and balanced view of the implementation at three PYP sites in Georgia. Table 1 illustrates the different data collection methods and sources of information that will be used to address each of the key elements of the study.

Table 1
Research Categories

	Initial Interest Continued Commitment	Implementation Strategies (Fidelity)	Support – School, District, IB	Leadership – School, District	School and Community Experiences
School Survey		X	X	X	X
District School Admin. Interviews	X	X	X	X	
Teacher Parent Focus Groups	X				X
Document Review	X	X	X	X	X
Observations	X	X			X

To assure content and construct validity, specific survey questions and observation, interview, and focus group protocols will be developed and reviewed by IBO personnel, as well as several administrators and teachers from an IB school in Georgia that will not be receiving a field visit in this study. All field researchers involved in collecting qualitative data at the sites will be fully trained to maximize inter-rater reliability. Also, one of the evaluators will be the same for all three schools. This will also allow for comparisons across schools.

Information from each of these sources will be analyzed across common sets of questions related to each of the key elements listed above. Narrative description of information will be presented in a case study report for each site. Theme-related resulting from analysis of data will organize the presentation and discussion of findings in each case study site. Field researchers also will conduct a cross-case analysis of diverse perceptions of implementation by participating stakeholders from across three sites. An assessment instrument and rubric for summary ratings of the program implementation based on IBO requirements for PYP will provide information about the extent to which the site visit schools are implementing the programme as designed and will guide the examination of how the program is being implemented in diverse settings over time. Survey results will be summarized across all schools by the key element categories listed above.

Evaluation Timeline

Details about activities to be completed as part of the evaluation are provided on the table below.

Timeline for IB Case Study

	<u>August</u>	<u>Sept</u>	<u>Oct</u>	<u>Nov</u>	<u>Dec</u>	<u>Jan</u>	<u>Feb</u>
Proposal submitted	✓						
Notification of proposal approval	✓						
Initial meeting with IB		✓					
Identification of school sites		✓					
Contact with sites to discuss participation		✓					
Scheduling of site visits		✓					
Development of protocol for visits			✓				
- procedures for onsite activities			✓				
- interview questions/participants			✓				
- focus group questions/participants			✓				
- document review process			✓				
- field data collection procedures/forms			✓				
- data compilation/analysis process			✓				
- outline of case study report			✓				
Conduct site visits to schools				✓			
Analyze field data notes				✓			
Write draft case study reports				✓			
Review/revise case study reports					✓		
Submit final case study reports to IB						✓	
Ongoing discussions/status reports to IB		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Development of online survey questions/format		✓					
Identification of survey participants		✓					

Posting of online survey questions	✓			
Communicate with schools on survey administration	✓			
Collect/compile/analyze survey responses		✓		
Prepare report on survey findings			✓	✓

Deliverables

Completion of data collection activities described in the timetable will result in the following deliverables for IBO:

- On-site visits to three IB-PYP Schools in Georgia: Case Study Report for each school
- Survey Questionnaire Results: Statewide Report
- Overall summary report focused on answering the research questions.
- Brief on recommendations for interested schools.

Resources Required

A College of Education faculty member with research expertise in qualitative data collection and analysis as well as knowledge in IB-PYP, Dr. Jori Hall, will serve as the Principal Investigator for this project. Professional staff from the EPEC will include the Project Director, Tracy Elder, and two research professionals, Scott Pollack and Jana Thompson. Each project team member will be assigned for a part of their time to this project to design data collection instruments, conduct survey research, coordinate the field study visits, develop site visit protocol and data collection processes, design and conduct training of field researchers, and coordinate field data collection, analysis, and reporting. All four members of the project team will participate in site visits and contribute to the development of a case study report for each school. The Project Director will serve as the lead researcher for all three site visits and will be accompanied by one of the other project team members. Travel costs for team visits will include round-trip mileage to sites, meals and overnight stay for two field researchers for each two-day visit. The budget for this project focuses resources on personnel time to plan, prepare, and conduct the study, and then to report findings to IB. Operational costs, including copies, surveys, and materials needed to complete activities and reports will be covered through the Indirect cost amount included in this proposal.

Appendix II: Evaluation Instruments

INTERVIEW FORM
School Building Administrator
IB Coordinator

School:

Position:

I. Current PYP Implementation

I would like to begin with some questions about your school's **current implementation** of the PYP.

- A. In your opinion, what are some successful strategies used at this school to implement the PYP?
- B. As you know, the Georgia Performance Standards (GPS) are intended to increase the academic achievement of students. Talk about your experiences with the integration of the GPS and the PYP curriculum framework at this school?
- C. Could you please talk about your experience with the PYP curriculum and district level requirements?
- D. The IB organization is designed to be supportive as schools implement the PYP. How does the IBO support the school's PYP implementation?
- E. How might the IB organization improve their efforts to support the school?
- F. What resources (supplies, materials, money, time) are most important to implement the PYP at your school?
- G. What is the most important type of support provided to teachers (professional learning, collaboration time, guidance, problem solving, etc.) to implement the PYP?
- H. Tell me about any strategies or practices that the school has put in place to meet the **trans disciplinary** nature of the PYP.
- I. What is the most challenging issue concerning the **trans disciplinary** nature of the programme? How have you worked through this challenge as a school?
- J. How do you orient new staff or teachers to the PYP at your school?
- K. Overall, how would you describe the level of commitment the school has for the PYP?

II. Community Support

Sometimes schools form partnerships with outside organizations to support their efforts.

- A. Please describe any partnerships between the school and outside organizations designed to support implementation of the PYP. How is that working?
- B. How does the school communicate with the local community about IB-PYP?
- C. What are the ways in which the local community is involved in the PYP? Parents?

III. Authorization Process

The following questions ask your experiences with respect to how the school moved from being interested to the final phase of authorization. To begin, I would like to discuss **how the school decided to become an IB school.**

[Probes]

- A. Who was involved in the decision making process?
- B. How did the school encourage teacher buy-in?
- C. What were the main reasons for applying to become an authorized IB-PYP school?
- D. Who at the school was primarily responsible for organizing the tasks necessary for authorization?

Another aspect of the consideration requires schools to make an in-depth analysis of the philosophy and curriculum, and to identify the resources needed to deliver the PYP. I would now like to discuss your school's process of studying the **feasibility of implementing IB.**

[Probes]

- A. Who was involved?
- B. What was your role?
- C. What type of support did the school receive from _____ during this phase?
The IBO regional office
The district
- D. What additional steps could have been taken to improve the feasibility study phase of the authorization process?

As you recall, during the second phase of the process, the school participates in a **trial implementation period**. Now, I will ask some questions about your experience with the trial implementation phase?

- A. What steps were taken to orient the school staff to the IB standards during this stage?
- B. What worked? What didn't work and why?
- C. In your opinion, were the teachers to implement the curriculum during the trial implementation?
- D. What type of support was provided from _____ during the trial implementation? Was the support adequate from each of these?
 - a. The IBO regional office?
 - b. By the district?
- E. What additional steps could have been taken to improve the trial implementation phase of the authorization process?

As you know, the school visit by an IB visiting team is the final stage of authorization. Now I would like to ask a few questions about the **IB team visit**.

[Probes]

- A. The IB school visit is primarily intended to be supportive. What are the ways in which you thought the school was supported?
- B. Tell me about the school's level of preparedness when the IB team came to the school? Describe any problems or challenges associated with the authorization visit?
- C. In what ways were the subsequent authorization visit report findings helpful? How could the feedback provided been improved?
- D. Overall, what were some practical steps the school took to become authorized?
- E. What recommendations would you make to future IB schools?

Lastly, is there anything about the PYP that you would like to share that I didn't ask?

INTERVIEW FORM
IBO Regional Office/Director
School District Representative

School: _____ **Position:** _____

Thank you for sharing time with me to participate in this interview. In an effort to clarify my understanding of the International Baccalaureate (IB) Primary Years Programme (PYP), I am interested in your reflections. Specifically, I am interested in your experiences related how the IB works with those in the school to implement the PYP and the ways in which the school was assisted during the authorization process.

Through the questionnaire and conversations with the educators at this school, I am somewhat familiar with the PYP. However, in order to better understand your involvement, I would like to get your perspective.

Ice Breaker

So tell me, how long have you been working with this particular school to become an authorized IB World School? Describe your relationship with the school thus far.

I. Current PYP Implementation

I-A. From your perspective, please describe how the PYP is being implemented at this school? How is it working?

[Probes]

I-B. What are some successful strategies used to help this school implement the PYP?

I-C. How does the IB regional office support the PYP?

I-D. How does the IB school district support the PYP?

I-E. Describe the level of support for the PYP from:

- School building administrators?
- PYP school coordinator?
- Teachers
- Family members

I-F. What has been the most challenging issue?

I-G. Overall, do you think the school is committed to the PYP?

II. Community Support

Sometimes schools form partnerships with outside organizations to support their efforts.

II.A Does the school partner with any outside organization to implement the PYP?

If so, how is that working? Tell me what you know about this partnership.

III. Authorization Process

The following questions ask for your experiences with respect to how assistance was provided to help the school during the authorization process.

III-A1 In what ways, were you involved in the process of identifying if the school had the capacity to offer the PYP (**Self-Study**)?

III-A2. Describe the process the school used to determine their capacity to offer the PYP.

III-A3 Could you describe the support provided by IB, the school district, during the **Self Study**?

- IB National:
- School District:

III-A4. Are there ways this first step (Self Study) in the process of authorization could be improved to ensure success? Specific to this school and for all schools in general?

III-B1. During the second phase of the process the school participated in a **trial implementation** period. Could you please tell me about your experience with the trial implementation phase?

III-B2. Tell me, what type of support did the **IB regional office** provide during the trial implementation?

III-B3. Tell me, what type of support did the IB **school district** provide during the trial implementation?

III-B4. What support was provided?

- Online materials:
- curriculum guides/standards:
- Professional development:

III-B5. What worked during the trial implementation?

III-B5. What didn't work during the trial implementation? What were the issues associated with why it didn't work?

III-C1. Please tell me about your experience with the **IB visit** during the school's final stage of authorization.

III-C2. What were the ways in which the school was supported by the **regional office**?

III-C3. What were the ways in which the school was supported by the **school district**?

III-C4. Could you talk about the school's level of preparedness when the IB team came to visit the school?

III-C5. What, if any, challenges were associated with the authorization visit?

III-C6. What steps were taken to assist the school in obtaining authorization **after the visit**?

III-C7. How responsive was the school to the feedback from the visiting team?

Lastly, is there anything about the PYP you would like to share that I didn't ask?

INTERVIEW FORM Media Specialist

School: _____

Years at school

Implementation Phases—were they present?

*Thank you for sharing time with me to participate in this interview. In an effort to clarify my understanding of the International Baccalaureate (IB) Primary Years Programme (PYP), I am interested in your reflections. Specifically, I am interested in your experiences related to the ways in which the PYP is **currently implemented** at this school and the how the school proceeded through the **IB authorization process**.*

Through the questionnaire and conversations with the educators at this school, I am somewhat familiar with the PYP at this school. However, in order to better understand the context, I would like to get your perspective.

I. Current PYP Implementation

I would like to begin with some questions about your school's **current implementation** of the PYP. What is your role related to PYP Implementation?

In your opinion, what are some successful strategies used at this school to implement the PYP?

How does the IB organization support the school's PYP implementation?

How might the IBO improve their efforts to support the school?

What is the most important type of support (professional learning, collaborative planning time, guidance, problem solving, etc.) staff in supportive roles received from the school to implement the PYP? From the district?

Tell me about any strategies or practices that the school has put in place to meet the **trans disciplinary nature of the programme**?

What is the most challenging issue concerning the **trans disciplinary nature of the programme**? How have you worked through this challenge?

Overall, how would you describe the level of commitment school staff have for the PYP?

II. Community Support

Sometimes schools form partnerships with outside organizations to support their efforts.

A. Please describe any partnerships between the school and outside organizations designed to support implementation of the PYP. How is that working?

B. How does the school communicate with the local community about IB-PYP? Parents?

C. What are the ways in which the local community is involved in the PYP? Parents?

III. Authorization Process

The following questions ask your experiences with respect to how the school moved from being interested to the final phase of authorization. To begin, I would like to discuss **how the school decided to become an IB school**.

A. Were you involved in the decision making process? If so, How?

- B. How did the school encourage staff buy-in?
- C. What were the main reasons for applying to become an authorized IB-PYP school?

Another aspect of the consideration requires schools to make an in-depth analysis of the philosophy and curriculum, and to identify the resources needed to deliver the PYP. I would now like to discuss your school's process of studying the **feasibility of implementing IB.**

- A. What was your role as during the feasibility stage?
- B. What type of support was most helpful to you in your role during the feasibility stage?
- C. What additional steps could have been taken to improve the feasibility study phase of the authorization process?

As you recall, during the second phase of the process, the school participates in a **trial implementation period.** Now, I will ask some questions about your experience with the trial implementation phase?

- A. What steps were taken to orient the school staff to the IB standards?
- B. What worked during the trial implementation? What didn't work and why?
- C. How prepared was the school to implement the trans disciplinary focus of the programme?

What was your role during the implementation period and did your role in the school change? How?

- D. What additional steps could have been taken to improve the trial implementation phase of the authorization process?

As you know, the school visit by an IB visiting team is the final stage of authorization. Now I would like to ask a few questions about the **IB team visit.**

- A. Tell me about the school's level of preparedness when the IB team came to the school? Describe any problems or challenges associated with the authorization visit?
- B. In what ways were the subsequent authorization visit report findings helpful? How could the feedback provided been improved?
- C. Overall, what were some practical steps the school took to become authorized?
- D. What recommendations would you make to future IB schools?

Lastly, is there anything about the PYP that you would like to share that I didn't ask?

INTERVIEW FORM

Classroom Observation Guide

School: _____ **Class:** _____

The purposes of the IB class observations are to:

1. Document a descriptive record of the structure, content, and activities of the classes.
2. Capture the character of the learners' participation in the classes, paying particular attention to: (a) the level and character of the learners' engagement; (b) interactions with the teacher, each other, and materials; and (c) any evidence of IB curriculum standards that are enacted in the classroom.

Description of context, setting:

1. Describe the setting of the class: physical features, student learning displayed in multiple formats (displays, posters, public performances, etc.), and people arrangement.
2. Describe the general climate: evidence of a positive, safe and secure learning environment.

Descriptions should include the following information:

1. Activity start and end time, so the records indicate how long each one took.
2. Activity goal or objective (if available).
3. Overall instructional method (s): demonstrations, power point presentations, lectures, hands-on activities, discussion, games, and/or paper-pencil tasks, assessment, etc.

Descriptive account of classes could include evidence of any of the following:

4. Learners' engagement with instructor and materials (raising hands, collaborative group work, individual work, students' enthusiasm, as well as boredom, disinterest, frustration).
5. Students taking responsibility for their own learning (self-initiated, self-directed)
6. Students demonstrating components of the IB learner profile (evidence of students as inquires, knowledgeable, thinkers, communicators, principled, open-minded, caring, risk-takers, balanced, reflective).
7. Teacher's engagement with learners (encouragement and formative-type feedback, etc.).
8. Instructional strategies to meet the needs of different learning styles (special equipment, technology, building on students' previous knowledge, grouping strategies, etc.).
9. Trans disciplinary teaching (how different subjects are tied together in a meaningful way).
10. Multi cultural experiences (displays, themes, student actions). (Standard A)
11. Individual, local, national and global awareness.
12. Show of respect and value of diversity.
13. Adequate resources to promote learning for diverse learners. (Standard B-1)
14. Multi-language usage.
15. Time available for inquiry learning.

Family Member Focus Group Interview Guide

Participants by grade level of child(ren) and how long they have had children at the school:

Thank you for sharing time with me to participate in this interview. In an effort to clarify my understanding of the International Baccalaureate (IB) Primary Years Program (PYP), I am interested in your thoughts. Specifically, I am interested in your experiences with how the PYP is currently implemented at the school and how the school proceeded through the IB implementation process.

Through the questionnaire and conversations with the educators at this school, I am somewhat familiar with the PYP at this school. However, in order to better understand the context, I would like to get your perspective.

Ice Breaker

So tell me, what do you enjoy most about being a parent of a child in an IB World School?

I. Current PYP Implementation

I-A. From your perspective, please describe how the IB-PYP is being implemented at this school? How is it working?

[Probes]

I-B. Do you think the PYP is a good match for the students at this school? Why or why not?

I-C. Please give some examples of how the PYP positively impacts the school.

I-D. What is different because of the PYP?

I-E. In your opinion, who in the school actively supports the PYP?

- School building administrators?
- PYP school coordinator?
- Teachers?
- Family members?

I-F. What has been the most challenging issue for the school in terms of offering the PYP?

I-G. What has the school done to meet this challenge?

I-H. Overall, do you think the school is committed to deliver the PYP?

I-I. In general, do you think the benefits of the PYP are worth the investment?

II. Community Support

Sometimes schools partner with outside organizations to support their efforts.

II-A. Do you know if the school partners with any outside organization to implement the PYP? If so, tell me what you know about it.

II-B. How are the partnerships working?

II-C. Are you aware of the ways in which the school communicates with the local community about the IB-PYP, including the status of their authorization to be an IB World School?

II-D. How does the school encourage family support of the PYP?

II-E. What are the ways in which you as a family member are involved in the PYP at this school?

III. Authorization Process

The following questions ask your experiences with respect to how the school moved from being interested in the PYP to the final phase of IB authorization.

III-A1. To begin, could you explain how you as a family member became aware of the decision by the school to become an IB World School?

III-A2. Share what you think might be the main reasons for the school deciding to offer PYP

III-A3. Before the school was authorized to implement the program, the IB required the school to make an in-depth analysis of the philosophy and curriculum, and identify the resources needed to deliver the PYP. Basically, to find out if the school had the resources to deliver the PYP.

As a family member, can you share any information you might have about this process?

- Did you know it occurred?
- Who was involved?
- How was the decision made?

III-A4. In what ways, if any, were you involved in the process of identifying if the school had the capacity or the resources to offer the PYP?

III-B1. During the second phase of the process, the candidate phase, the school participated in a **trial implementation period**. This was when the school implemented the program on a trial basis for a year. You may have noticed changes in the curriculum or the selection of a PYP coordinator.

As a family member, could you please tell me about your experience with the trial implementation phase?

III-B2. What worked?

III-B3. What didn't work?

III-C1. As you may know, the **school visit** by an IB visiting team was the final stage of authorization. Tell me about your experience with the school visit.

III-C2. Could you talk about the school's level of preparedness when the IB team came to the school?

III-C3. Describe any problems or challenges associated with the authorization visit?

Lastly, is there anything about the PYP you would like to share that I didn't ask?

INTERVIEW FORM Teacher Focus Group

School: _____ **Position:** _____

Thank you for sharing time with me to participate in this interview. In an effort to clarify my understanding of the International Baccalaureate (IB) Primary Years Programme (PYP), I am interested in your reflections. Specifically, I am interested in your experiences related to the ways in which the PYP is **currently implemented** at this school and the how the school proceeded through the IB **authorization process**.

Through the questionnaire and conversations with the educators at this school, I am somewhat familiar with the PYP at this school. However, in order to better understand the context, I would like to get your perspective.

I. Current PYP Implementation

I would like to begin with some questions about your school's **current implementation** of the PYP.

- A. In your opinion, what are some successful strategies used at this school to implement the PYP?
- B. Talk about your experiences with the integration of the PYP curriculum framework at this school with Georgia Performance Standards (GPS)?
- C. Could you please talk about your experience with the PYP curriculum and district level requirements?
- D. How does the IB organization support the school's PYP implementation?
- E. How might the IBO improve their efforts to support the school?
- F. What is the most important type of support (professional learning, collaborative planning time, guidance, problem solving, etc.) teachers receive from the school to implement the PYP? From the district?
- G. Tell me about any strategies or practices that the school has put in place to meet the **trans disciplinary nature of the programme**?
- H. What is the most challenging issue concerning the **trans disciplinary nature of the programme**? How have you worked through this challenge?
- I. Overall, how would you describe the level of commitment teachers have for the PYP?

II. Community Support

Sometimes schools form partnerships with outside organizations to support their efforts.

- A. Please describe any partnerships between the school and outside organizations designed to support implementation of the PYP. How is that working?
- B. How does the school communicate with the local community about IB-PYP? Parents?
- C. What are the ways in which the local community is involved in the PYP? Parents?

III. Authorization Process

The following questions ask your experiences with respect to how the school moved from being interested to the final phase of authorization. To begin, I would like to discuss **how the school decided to become an IB school**.

[Probes]

- A. How were teachers involved in the decision making process?
- B. How did the school encourage teacher buy-in?
- C. What were the main reasons for applying to become an authorized IB-PYP school?

- D. Who at the school was primarily responsible for organizing the tasks necessary for authorization?

Another aspect of the consideration requires schools to make an in-depth analysis of the philosophy and curriculum, and to identify the resources needed to deliver the PYP. I would now like to discuss your school's process of studying the **feasibility of implementing IB.**

[Probes]

- A. What was your role as teachers during the feasibility stage?
- B. What type of support was most helpful to you during the feasibility stage?
- C. What additional steps could have been taken to improve the feasibility study phase of the authorization process?

As you recall, during the second phase of the process, the school participates in a **trial implementation period.** Now, I will ask some questions about your experience with the trial implementation phase?

- A. What steps were taken to orient the school staff to the IB standards?
- B. What worked? What didn't work and why?
- C. Tell me about your level of preparedness to implement the PYP curriculum during the trial implementation, especially given the trans disciplinary focus of the programme?
- D. What type of support (professional learning, collaborative planning time, etc.) was most helpful to you to implement the curriculum during the trial implementation stage?
- E. What additional steps could have been taken to improve the trial implementation phase of the authorization process?

As you know, the school visit by an IB visiting team is the final stage of authorization. Now I would like to ask a few questions about the **IB team visit.**

[Probes]

- A. Tell me about the school's level of preparedness when the IB team came to the school? Describe any problems or challenges associated with the authorization visit?
- B. In what ways were the subsequent authorization visit report findings helpful? How could the feedback provided been improved?
- C. Overall, what were some practical steps the school took to become authorized?
- D. What recommendations would you make to future IB school teachers?

Lastly, is there anything about the PYP that you would like to share that I didn't ask?

Appendix III: School Survey and Results

WEBPAGE TO SURVEY



International Baccalaureate (IB) Primary Years Programme (PYP)

Teacher and Administrator Survey

This survey is being conducted by the Educational Policy and Evaluation Center (EPEC) at the University of Georgia for the International Baccalaureate Organization (IBO).

The survey is designed to learn about how schools experience the IB authorization process and to understand how schools implement the Primary Years Programme (PYP). As an educator in a school implementing PYP, your experience provides a valuable perspective on the implementation of your school's PYP model. Your answers to the survey will be anonymous and the results will only be reported in the aggregate.

Please take a few moments to complete the survey by clicking on the survey link below.

Thank you for your input.

[Click Here to take survey](#)

For questions about completing this survey online, please e-mail [XXXXXX](#) in the College of Education at the University of Georgia.

IBO Online Survey

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with each of the following statements related to how the International Baccalaureate Organization (IBO) - Primary Years Programme (PYP) standards and practices are currently being implemented at your school.

(Response options: Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Agree, Strongly Agree)

PHILOSOPHY

1. This school is committed to the principles of the PYP.
2. The school takes advantage of the international network of IB schools (e.g., personal exchanges, conferences, workshops).

ORGANIZATION

3. This school has a system to monitor the implementation of the PYP.
4. Support for the PYP is provided at this school from outside organizations (e.g., universities, businesses).
5. Teachers are prepared to implement the PYP.
6. School building leaders (e.g., administrators, IB coordinator) support the implementation of the PYP at this school.
7. Teachers are provided with ongoing professional development related to IB principles.
8. The district supports the implementation of the PYP at this school.

CURRICULUM

9. At this school, there is a system of review for refinement of the PYP curriculum framework (e.g., interdisciplinary themes, pedagogy of inquiry).
10. Teachers have time for collaborative, trans-disciplinary planning.
11. This school has developed strategies to integrate the PYP curriculum framework and the Georgia Performance Standards (GPS).

STUDENTS & THEIR FAMILIES

12. The PYP curriculum supports the academic needs of the students at this school.
13. The school provides opportunities for students to take ownership of their learning experiences.
14. Parents understand student expectations regarding the IB-PYP.

OVERALL IMPLEMENTATION

15. The academic achievement of students has improved since the implementation of the PYP.
16. Overall, the benefits of the PYP are worth the investment.
17. **Please share any successful strategies used by the school to implement the PYP.**

FEASIBILITY STUDY

Were you employed at the school during the IB-PYP Feasibility Study? Yes No

Only respondents answering "yes" could access questions 18A-18D.

18A. The IB organization provided support to assist the school in evaluating its capacity to deliver the PYP.

18B. Teachers helped to identify the resources needed to deliver the PYP.

18C. The PYP curriculum was examined to determine whether it would meet the needs of students at the school.

18D. The district provided support to assist the school in evaluating its capacity to deliver the PYP.

TRIAL IMPLEMENTATION

Were you employed at the school during the Trial Implementation Phase? Yes No

Only respondents answering “yes” could access t questions 19A-19D.

19A. Opportunities were provided for teachers to attend PYP training workshops to support the trial implementation.

19B. The IB regional office collaborated with the school to support the trial implementation.

19C. The school building leaders (e.g., administrators, IB coordinator) worked with teachers to deliver the trial implementation of PYP.

19D. Collaborative planning time was provided during the trial implementation.

IB TEAM VISIT

Were you employed at the school during the IB Team visit? Yes No

Only respondents answering “yes” could access questions 20A-20E.

20A. The school was prepared to deliver the PYP in accordance with IB requirements at the time of the authorization visit.

20B. The school district worked with the school to support the IB team visit.

20C. The IB regional office collaborated with the school to support the visit.

20D. The school building leaders (e.g., administrators, IB coordinator) worked with teachers to make sure the school ran effectively at the time of the visit.

20E. The report provided by the IB team provided useful information to the school.

CHALLENGES

The following is a list of challenges schools may face when seeking IB authorization.

How challenging was the authorization process in the following areas?

(Response options: None, A Little, Some, Very, Don't Know)

21A. Alignment of the Primary Years Program curriculum with the Georgia Performance Standards

21B. Teacher buy-in

21C. Parent buy-in

21D. Student buy-in

21E. Collaborative planning time

21F. Financial resources

21G. Professional development

21H. IB regional office support

21I. District level support

21J. School building leaders (e.g., administrators, IB coordinator) support

21K. Meeting both PYP and state accountability requirements

21L. Implementing PYP standards and principles

22. If you would like to offer any additional comments about the IB authorization process, please write them in the space provided.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Please select your school name

Names of schools have been deleted for this report.

How many years have you been employed at this school, including this year?

- 1
- 2-3
- 4 – 8
- 9 – 12
- 13 – 20
- Over 20

What is the highest level degree you hold?

- Bachelors
- Masters
- Specialist
- Doctoral

If you have add-on certificates or endorsements, please mark ALL that apply.

- Leadership
- Reading Specialist
- English Language Learners
- Gifted
- Special Education
- Master Teacher
- National Board certification (NBPTS)
- Other: _____

What is your position in the school? Please mark ALL that apply.

- Administrator
- IB Coordinator
- Grade-level Teacher
- Special Education Teacher
- ELL Teacher
- Special Area Teacher (e.g., Music, Art, PE)
- Foreign Language Teacher
- Other: _____

(Teachers only) What grade level(s) do you currently teach? Please mark ALL that apply.

- Pre-K
- Kindergarten
- 1st
- 2nd
- 3rd
- 4th
- 5th
- Other

What is your gender?

- Female
- Male

Please mark the appropriate range for your age.

- 20 – 30
- 31 – 40
- 41 – 50
- 51 – 60
- 61+

Mark ALL of the following categories that best describe you.

African American
Asian
Pacific Islander
American Indian or Alaskan Native
White
Hispanic
Other

Thank you for your cooperation with this study.

School Survey Results

N=561

	n	Strongly Disagree %	Disagree %	Agree %	Strongly Agree %
PHILOSOPHY					
1. This school is committed to the principles of the PYP.	558	7.2	3	32.6	57.2
2. The school takes advantage of the international network of IB schools (e.g., personal exchanges, conferences, workshops).	553	5.4	10.8	45.6	38.2
ORGANIZATION					
3. This school has a system to monitor the implementation of the PYP.	531	3.2	3.8	45.4	47.6
4. Support for the PYP is provided at this school from outside organizations (e.g., universities, businesses).	521	2.5	29.4	49.5	18.6
5. Teachers are prepared to implement the PYP.	529	2.1	7.9	54.3	35.7
6. School building leaders (e.g., administrators, IB coordinator) support the implementation of the PYP at this school.	529	2.3	2.8	32.1	62.8
7. Teachers are provided with ongoing professional development related to IB principles.	524	2.5	10.5	42.0	45.0
8. The district supports the implementation of the PYP at this school.	513	4.9	12.9	53.4	28.8
CURRICULUM					
9. At this school, there is a system of review for refinement of the PYP curriculum framework (e.g., interdisciplinary themes, pedagogy of inquiry).	523	2.1	6.1	42.8	48.9
10. Teachers have time for collaborative, trans-disciplinary planning.	525	5.1	11.2	42.1	41.5
11. This school has developed strategies to integrate the PYP curriculum framework and the Georgia Performance Standards (GPS).	522	3.1	6.5	46.7	43.7

	n	Strongly Disagree %	Disagree %	Agree %	Strongly Agree %
STUDENTS & THEIR FAMILIES					
12. The PYP curriculum supports the academic needs of the students at this school.	522	2.5	4.6	47.7	45.2
13. The school provides opportunities for students to take ownership of their learning experiences.	517	1.9	3.7	50.5	43.9
14. Parents understand student expectations regarding the IB-PYP.	518	2.7	20.5	60.4	16.4
OVERALL IMPLEMENTATION					
15. The academic achievement of students has improved since the implementation of the PYP.	488	3.3	13.9	59.0	23.8
16. Overall, the benefits of the PYP are worth the investment.	510	3.1	7.5	46.5	42.9

(Question 17 solicited open-ended responses and those results are not included in this section.)

FEASIBILITY STUDY

Were you employed at the school during the IB-PYP Feasibility Study? **Yes**
48.9%

Only respondents answering “yes” could access the following questions	n	Strongly Disagree %	Disagree %	Agree %	Strongly Agree %	Don't Know %
18A. The IB organization provided support to assist the school in evaluating its capacity to deliver the PYP.	257	2.3	1.9	52.9	34.6	8.2
18B. Teachers helped to identify the resources needed to deliver the PYP.	255	2.7	3.9	50.2	38.8	4.3
18C. The PYP curriculum was examined to determine whether it would meet the needs of students at the school.	256	2.7	4.7	46.9	39.8	5.9
18D. The district provided support to assist the school in evaluating its capacity to deliver the PYP.	253	6.7	17.4	39.5	21.3	15.0

TRIAL IMPLEMENTATION

Were you employed at the school during the Trial Implementation Phase?

Yes
60.1%

<i>Only respondents answering “yes” could access the following questions</i>	n	Strongly Disagree %	Disagree %	Agree %	Strongly Agree %	Don't Know %
19A. Opportunities were provided for teachers to attend PYP training workshops to support the trial implementation.	312	2.2	2.2	39.1	54.5	1.9
19B. The IB regional office collaborated with the school to support the trial implementation.	313	1.3	1.3	46.3	34.2	16.9
19C. The school building leaders (e.g., administrators, IB coordinator) worked with teachers to deliver the trial implementation of PYP.	313	2.2	2.9	42.2	50.2	2.6
19D. Collaborative planning time was provided during the trial implementation.	314	2.2	3.8	45.2	46.8	1.9

IB TEAM VISIT

Were you employed at the school during the IB Team visit?

Yes
84.3%

<i>Only respondents answering “yes” could access the following questions</i>	n	Strongly Disagree %	Disagree %	Agree %	Strongly Agree %	Don't Know %
20A. The school was prepared to deliver the PYP in accordance with IB requirements at the time of the authorization visit.	393	1.3	2.8	38.2	57.0	0.8
20B. The school district worked with the school to support the IB team visit.	390	4.9	14.1	32.6	25.6	22.8
20C. The IB regional office collaborated with the school to support the visit.	396	1.3	1.0	40.4	34.1	23.2
20D. The school building leaders (e.g., administrators, IB coordinator) worked with teachers to make sure the school ran effectively at the time of the visit.	394	1.8	1.8	30.5	64.7	1.3
20E. The report provided by the IB team provided useful information to the school.	396	1.5	2.5	36.1	54.3	5.6

CHALLENGES

The following is a list of challenges schools may face when seeking IB authorization.

How challenging was the authorization process in the following areas?	n	None %	A Little %	Some %	Very %	Don't Know %
21A. Alignment of the Primary Years Program curriculum with the Georgia Performance Standards	514	3.9	10.3	33.7	31.5	20.6
21B. Teacher buy-in	514	5.3	17.3	35.2	24.3	17.9
21C. Parent buy-in	513	10.5	17.5	30.0	16.0	25.9
21D. Student buy-in	515	26.0	13.8	21.0	18.3	21.0
21E. Collaborative planning time	514	8.9	16.5	27.0	34.2	13.2
21F. Financial resources	514	7.0	14.8	28.2	22.2	27.8
21G. Professional development	510	8.2	17.3	32.9	25.7	15.9
21H. IB regional office support	511	13.1	7.2	13.7	9.2	56.9
21I. District level support	504	13.3	10.7	15.5	14.9	45.8
21J. School building leaders (e.g., administrators, IB coordinator) support	509	33.4	11.6	11.8	22.0	21.4
21K. Meeting both PYP and state accountability requirements	505	6.3	16.4	24.2	28.1	25.1
21L. Implementing PYP standards and principles	508	10.2	22.2	25.4	24.4	17.9

Years Employed at the School (including this year)

Years	Number Respondents	Response %
1	70	12.5
2 – 3	142	25.3
4 – 8	186	33.2
9 – 12	49	8.7
13 – 20	49	8.7
Over 20	16	2.9
No Response	49	8.7
Total	561	100.0

Highest level Degree	Number Respondents	Response %
Bachelors	179	31.9
Masters	257	45.8
Specialist	53	9.4
Doctoral	12	2.1
No Response	60	10.7
Total	561	100.0

Add-on Certificate or Endorsement	Number Respondents	* Response %
	N=561	
Leadership	48	8.6
Reading Specialist	53	9.4
English Language Learners	40	7.1
Gifted	74	13.2
Special Education	45	8.0
Master Teacher	18	3.2
National Board certification (NBPTS)	7	1.2
Other	50	8.9
No Response	319	56.9

** Percentages will not equal 100% because participants could choose more than one response.*

Position in the School	Number Respondents	Response %
Administrator	23	4.1
IB Coordinator	17	3.0
Grade-level Teacher	288	51.3
Special Education Teacher	34	6.1
ELL Teacher	11	2.0
Special Area Teacher (e.g., Music, Art, PE)	47	8.4
Foreign Language Teacher	24	4.3
Other	70	12.5
No Response	47	8.4
Total	561	100.0

Teachers' Grade Level(s)	Number Respondents	Response %
	N=561	
Pre-K	26	4.6
Kindergarten	126	22.5
1st	144	25.7
2nd	135	24.1
3rd	132	23.5
4th	131	23.4
5th	123	21.9
Other	23	4.1

** Percentages will not equal 100% because participants could choose more than one response.*

Gender	Number Respondents	Response %
Female	447	79.7
Male	38	6.8
No Response	76	13.5
Total	561	100.0

Age	Number Respondents	Response %
20 – 30	95	16.9
31 – 40	141	25.1
41 – 50	108	19.3
51 – 60	112	20.0
61+	20	3.6
No Response	85	15.2
Total	561	100.0

Ethnicity	Number Respondents	Response %
N=561		
African American	88	15.7
Asian	9	1.6
Pacific Islander	1	0.2
American Indian or Alaskan Native	3	0.5
White	355	63.3
Hispanic	21	3.7
Other	10	1.8
No Response	87	15.5

** Percentages will not equal 100% because participants could choose more than one response.*

Survey Items: Mean and Standard Deviation

	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
<i>Q1-21A Response options: Strongly Disagree (1), Disagree (2), Agree (3) Strongly Agree (4)</i>			
1.	559	3.40	0.86
2.	554	3.17	0.83
3.	532	3.38	0.71
4.	522	2.84	0.75
5.	530	3.24	0.68
6.	530	3.55	0.66
7.	525	3.30	0.75
8.	514	3.06	0.78
9.	524	3.39	0.70
10.	526	3.20	0.83
11.	523	3.31	0.73
12.	523	3.36	0.69
13.	518	3.36	0.65
14.	519	2.91	0.68
15.	489	3.03	0.71
16.	511	3.29	0.74
18A.	236	3.31	0.64
18B.	244	3.31	0.68
18C.	241	3.32	0.70
18D.	215	2.89	0.87
19A.	307	3.49	0.66

		Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
19B.	The IB regional office collaborated with the school to support the trial implementation.	261	3.37	0.60
19C.	The school building leaders (e.g., administrators, IB coordinator) worked with teachers to deliver the trial implementation of PYP.	306	3.44	0.67
19D.	Collaborative planning time was provided during the trial implementation.	309	3.39	0.67
20A.	The school was prepared to deliver the PYP in accordance with IB requirements at the time of the authorization visit.	391	3.52	0.62
20B.	The school district worked with the school to support the IB team visit.	302	3.02	0.88
20C.	The IB regional office collaborated with the school to support the visit.	305	3.40	0.60
20D.	The school building leaders (e.g., administrators, IB coordinator) worked with teachers to make sure the school ran effectively at the time of the visit.	390	3.60	0.62
20E.	The report provided by the IB team provided useful information to the school.	375	3.52	0.63

CHALLENGES

4 point scale where 1 represents a little challenge and 4 represents very challenging

21A.	Alignment of the Primary Years Program curriculum with the Georgia Performance Standards	409	2.17	0.84
21B.	Teacher buy-in	423	1.96	0.87
21C.	Parent buy-in	381	1.70	0.96
21D.	Student buy-in	408	1.39	1.17
21E.	Collaborative planning time	447	2.00	1.00
21F.	Financial resources	372	1.90	0.95
21G.	Professional development	430	1.90	0.95
21H.	IB regional office support	222	1.43	1.13
21I.	District level support	275	1.58	1.13
21J.	School building leaders (e.g., administrators, IB coordinator) support	402	1.28	1.27
21K.	Meeting both PYP and state accountability requirements	379	1.98	0.97
21L.	Implementing PYP standards and principles	418	1.77	1.01

Survey Items: Mean by School Position

	Administrators/ IB Coordinators	Grade Level Teachers	Other Personnel	
<i>Q1-21A Response options: Strongly Disagree (1), Disagree (2), Agree (3) Strongly Agree (4)</i>				
1.	This school is committed to the principles of the PYP.	3.56	3.39	3.52
2.	The school takes advantage of the international network of IB schools (e.g., personal exchanges, conferences, workshops).	3.31	3.13	3.28
3.	This school has a system to monitor the implementation of the PYP.	3.46	3.32	3.43
4.	Support for the PYP is provided at this school from outside organizations (e.g., universities, businesses).	2.77	2.77	2.97
5.	Teachers are prepared to implement the PYP.	3.21	3.19	3.33
6.	School building leaders (e.g., administrators, IB coordinator) support the implementation of the PYP at this school.	3.59	3.53	3.63
7.	Teachers are provided with ongoing professional development related to IB principles.	3.49	3.19	3.45
8.	The district supports the implementation of the PYP at this school.	3.03	2.89	3.30
9.	At this school, there is a system of review for refinement of the PYP curriculum framework (e.g., interdisciplinary themes, pedagogy of inquiry).	3.54	3.32	3.48
10.	Teachers have time for collaborative, transdisciplinary planning.	3.54	3.14	3.26
11.	This school has developed strategies to integrate the PYP curriculum framework and the Georgia Performance Standards (GPS).	3.50	3.26	3.37
12.	The PYP curriculum supports the academic needs of the students at this school.	3.54	3.29	3.44
13.	The school provides opportunities for students to take ownership of their learning experiences.	3.36	3.35	3.38
14.	Parents understand student expectations regarding the IB-PYP.	3.10	2.82	2.98
15.	The academic achievement of students has improved since the implementation of the PYP.	3.22	2.94	3.11
16.	Overall, the benefits of the PYP are worth the investment.	3.61	3.19	3.40
18A.	The IB organization provided support to assist the school in evaluating its capacity to deliver the PYP.	3.43	3.25	3.34
18B.	Teachers helped to identify the resources needed to deliver the PYP.	3.40	3.27	3.34

		Administrators/ IB Coordinators	Grade Level Teachers	Other Personnel
18C.	The PYP curriculum was examined to determine whether it would meet the needs of students at the school.	3.56	3.22	3.36
18D.	The district provided support to assist the school in evaluating its capacity to deliver the PYP.	3.09	2.67	3.15
19A.	Opportunities were provided for teachers to attend PYP training workshops to support the trial implementation.	3.78	3.42	3.53
19B.	The IB regional office collaborated with the school to support the trial implementation.	3.54	3.30	3.41
19C.	The school building leaders (e.g., administrators, IB coordinator) worked with teachers to deliver the trial implementation of PYP.	3.70	3.38	3.49
19D.	Collaborative planning time was provided during the trial implementation.	3.63	3.33	3.44
20A.	The school was prepared to deliver the PYP in accordance with IB requirements at the time of the authorization visit.	3.55	3.50	3.57
20B.	The school district worked with the school to support the IB team visit.	3.04	2.90	3.16
20C.	The IB regional office collaborated with the school to support the visit.	3.53	3.38	3.38
20D.	The school building leaders (e.g., administrators, IB coordinator) worked with teachers to make sure the school ran effectively at the time of the visit.	3.79	3.58	3.61
20E.	The report provided by the IB team provided useful information to the school.	3.70	3.47	3.55

CHALLENGES

4 point scale where 1 represents a little challenge and 4 represents very challenging

21A.	Alignment of the Primary Years Program curriculum with the Georgia Performance Standards	1.94	2.15	2.21
21B.	Teacher buy-in	1.58	1.98	1.99
21C.	Parent buy-in	1.37	1.70	1.72
21D.	Student buy-in	0.65	1.39	1.51
21E.	Collaborative planning time	1.56	1.96	2.11
21F.	Financial resources	1.70	1.96	1.86
21G.	Professional development	1.49	1.93	1.94
21H.	IB regional office support	0.86	1.37	1.64
21I.	District level support	1.24	1.61	1.58

		Administrators/ IB Coordinators	Grade Level Teachers	Other Personnel
21J.	School building leaders (e.g., administrators, IB coordinator) support	0.51	1.24	1.43
21K.	Meeting both PYP and state accountability requirements	1.55	2.06	1.91
21L	Implementing PYP standards and principles	1.20	1.82	1.76