**A Tale of Two Schools**

**Logic Model/No Logic Model**

The following tale of two schools shows the different outcomes when a school or team decides to use a *Logic Model* as a roadmap for change and improvements. *School A* is grounded with a roadmap and clear vision for what they want their students to know and be able to do. *School B* is focused on professional development activities and events for teachers. *School A* started on the last column of the *Logic Model* and went left, beginning with the outcomes for students, then considered what changes in teachers’ practices needs to occur, proceeded to what teachers had to know to be able to change their practice, then identified the professional learning activities that were needed so teachers could learn. Finally, they considered who, where, and when those events would happen. *School B* began with first column on the *Logic Model* and asked, “What are we going to do? What professional learning needs to happen? Look at the difference in the outcomes for *School A* and *School B*. Using a *Logic Model* makes a difference focusing efforts for increasing student performance.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **School A**  **Used a Logic Model to Guide Change** | **School B**  **Used Activities without a Logic Model to Guide Change** |
| State and interim data showed that the middle school students’ lowest performance was in the expressions and equations domain.  The principal and math teachers just learned how to use a *Logic Model* at MC2 MathLab and decided to try it to increase student achievement in the expressions and equations domain.  On Friday, the last day of MathLab, the principal and teachers created a *Logic Model* to guide their improvement efforts. They began by identifying the intended outcome for students, what teachers would do differently, what teachers needed to know, what support is needed, and then who would do what when.  The team created a timeline for MC2 site support to ensure successful implementation if new practices. The principal monitored implementation through walkthrough and quick checks along the year.  When the state scores came back, students’ scores in the expressions and equations domain increased. The principal and teachers were thrilled, especially since everyone worked so hard, and were guided by their *Logic Model*.  **Outcome: 72% of students were proficient in the Expressions and Equations domain.** | State and interim data showed that the middle school students’ lowest performance was in the expressions and equations domain.  The principal and teachers contacted the district math specialist for advice on what professional development was needed for the teachers.  They scheduled a consultant to come and work with the staff for three days during the year to increase teachers’ content knowledge about how to teach expressions and equations.  Teachers learned new strategies and were asked to try them out in the classroom. The school didn’t have a math coach or any peer learning structure, so they were left on their own to implement new practices.  When the state scores came back, students’ scores either remained the same or decreased. The principal and teachers were disappointed, especially since everyone worked so hard, and money was invested for professional development.  **Outcome: 34% of students were proficient in the Expressions and Equations domain**. |

Source: Morrision, J. D. & Rudt, M. (2008/2009). A tale of two schools. *Educational Leadership, 66* (4). Alexandria, VA: ASCD.