

The CEEDAR Center

Innovation Configuration Guidelines





Office of Special Education Programs
U.S. Department of Education

Disclaimer:

This content was produced under U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs, Award No. H325A120003. Bonnie Jones and David Guardino serve as the project officers. The views expressed herein do not necessarily represent the positions or policies of the U.S. Department of Education. No official endorsement by the U.S. Department of Education of any product, commodity, service, or enterprise mentioned in this website is intended or should be inferred.

The following material adapted from the National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality (NCCTQ) *Innovation Configurations: Guidelines for Use in Institutions of Higher Education and Professional Development Evaluation*. Retrieved from http://ceedar.education.ufl.edu/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/IC_Guidelines.pdf/. Adapted with permission.



Innovation Configurations

Purpose of this Document

Teacher effectiveness, equitable distribution, and teacher preparation are inextricably linked. Recognizing that evidence-based practices (EBPs) account for at least part of the effects of teachers on achievement and the critical role of teacher preparation, the CEEDAR Center professionals offer innovation configurations (ICs) to promote the implementation of evidence-based instructional practices in teacher preparation activities. ICs are designed to evaluate current teacher preparation and professional development (PD) by determining the extent to which EBPs are taught, observed, and applied within teacher preparation and PD programs. The use of ICs advances collaborative practices and encourages an examination of the similarities, differences, and gaps among programs by answering the following two questions:

- What types of instruction and experiences do teachers receive throughout their preparation and/or PD programs that promote the use of evidence-based instructional practices?
- To what extent are teachers and teacher candidates provided opportunities to apply strategies with explicit feedback and sustained implementation and support to ensure fidelity?

ICs are designed to improve teacher education, which, in turn, can lead to improved student achievement. The use of ICs to evaluate teacher education programs and PD activities provides an overview of the practices and competencies taught within general and special education teacher preparation programs. IC results provide credible information about current practices and can be used as the basis or rationale for policy and program changes in teacher preparation and PD programs at the district, state, and university levels.

This document describes the content and purpose of ICs, outlines their intended use as syllabus evaluation tools, and provides scoring guidelines and examples for clarification.



Innovation Configuration Dimensions

ICs have been used in the development and implementation of educational innovations and methodologies for at least 30 years (Hall & Hord, 1987; Roy & Hord, 2004). They most often have been used as PD tools to guide implementation of an innovation within a school and facilitate the change process. ICs have also provided a form of self-assessment and reflection. They can be used in program evaluation as a means to determine the extent to which educational policies are implemented within course work and supervised field experiences.

ICs are typically established through tables that have two dimensions, one specifying the essential components and one specifying the degree of implementation (Hall & Hord, 1987; Roy & Hord, 2004). The essential components of the innovation or program are listed in the table's far column, along with descriptors and examples to guide application of the criteria to program course work, standards, and classroom practice. The essential components of EBPs are drawn from a variety of sources and are determined by the use of the CEEDAR Center's evidence standards. The second dimension is the degree of implementation. In the top row of the table, several implementation variations, or levels, are defined. For example, no mention of the essential component is the lowest level of implementation and should receive a score of zero. Increasing levels of implementation receive progressively higher scores.

Table 1 details each variation and scoring code. Table 2 features a sample of a completed IC.



Scoring Syllabi With Innovation Configurations

Table 1

Innovations Configuration Variations and Scoring Codes

| | |
|--------|--|
| Code 0 | <p>There is no evidence that the component is included in the syllabus, or the syllabus <i>only</i> mentions the component.</p> <p>If no evidence of a component can be found in a course syllabus or a component is listed as a topic item for lecture and discussion (e.g., progress monitoring) or an outcome or course objective (e.g., “Students will use a progress monitoring measure such as Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills [DIBELS].”), then an X may be placed under this variation, and an X should be marked under zero next to the component.</p> |
| Code 1 | <p>Syllabus mentions the component <i>and</i> requires readings, tests, or quizzes on the topic.</p> <p>In order to score a 2, a course syllabus must mention the component as part of the lectures, discussions, or course objectives and require readings, tests, or quizzes about the topic. Evidence of readings includes textbooks (e.g., “Read Chapter 2, Vocabulary Instruction, in Adams’ <i>Beginning to Read: Thinking and Learning About Print</i>.”). Evidence of tests may include, “Test 2 will cover Lectures 15-25.” Note, however, that vocabulary instruction must be mentioned under Lectures 15-25.</p> |
| Code 2 | <p>Syllabus mentions the component <i>and</i> requires readings, tests, or quizzes <i>and</i> assignments or projects for application.</p> <p>In order to score a 3, a course syllabus must mention the component and require readings, tests, or quizzes and an assignment (e.g., “Write a one-page reaction paper explaining why it is important to provide vocabulary instruction.”) or project (e.g., “Create a lesson addressing vocabulary instruction.”).</p> |
| Code 3 | <p>Syllabus mentions the component <i>and</i> requires readings, tests, or quizzes; assignments or projects; <i>and</i> teaching with application and feedback.</p> <p>A course syllabus may list application with feedback or student teaching as a general requirement. However, in order to earn a score under this variation, the syllabus must link the application with feedback experience with the particular concept (e.g., “Students will be required to practice skills related to developing and instructing vocabulary. Direct observations with feedback by the instructor will be applied toward the total course grade.”).</p> |



Instructions for Scoring

Refer to the following steps when scoring syllabi with ICs.

| | |
|--------|---|
| Step 1 | One IC can be used for scoring each institution of higher education (IHE) syllabi. After reviewing a course syllabus, an X should be placed under the appropriate variations of implementation code for each item for any course contained in IHE syllabi that meets the variation criteria. Bulleted items describe the broad category in greater detail and provide examples or descriptors of each component. Refer to the examples outlined in Table 1 for details and examples regarding the variation of implementation criteria. |
| Step 2 | Each item should be given an overall rating based on the highest variation of implementation score that received an X. Overall ratings are marked in the last column on the right under <i>Rating</i> . For example, if under <i>Phonics</i> , the highest variation that received an X was for mentioning the concept, then a rating of 1 is appropriate for that rated course syllabus under that concept. |
| Step 3 | If more than one syllabus was rated on the IC, then the number of Xs for each variation can be totaled in each column under Codes 0-3 (see Table 2). If computing a comprehensive university score, record the highest variation of implementation score across the submitted syllabi. The scores created to represent different levels of implementation are on an ordinal scale; a higher number indicates more thorough implementation of an IC. These scale points cannot, however, be interpreted as if the intervals between the scores are equal. The difference between 0 and 1 cannot be assumed to be the same amount as the difference between 2 and 3. Furthermore, a score of 3 indicates more thorough implementation than a score of 2, but it cannot be interpreted as twice as much of some quality as a score of 2. Users are urged to consider these limitations in the score scale. |
| Step 4 | Use results to identify the similarities, differences, and gaps in content covered and skills acquired within teacher training programs. Results may promote changes in course content and assignments or identify a need to eliminate, restructure, or add classes or PD. |



Table 2

Sample Innovation Configuration for Culturally Responsive Learning

| Essential Components | Implementation Levels | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|--|
| Instructions: Place an X under the appropriate variation implementation score for each course syllabus that meets the criteria level from 0 to 3. Score and rate each item separately. | Level 0 | Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 3 | Rating |
| | There is no evidence that the component is included in the syllabus, or the syllabus only mentions the component. | Must contain at least one of the following: reading, test, lecture/presentation, discussion, modeling/demonstration, or quiz. | Must contain at least one item from Level 1, plus at least one of the following: observation, project/activity, case study, or lesson plan study. | Must contain at least one item from Level 1 as well as at least one item from Level 2, plus at least one of the following: tutoring, small group student teaching, or whole group internship. | Rate each item as the number of the highest variation receiving an X under it. |
| 1.0 Multicultural Awareness | | | | | |
| 1.1 - Educate students regarding the culture of others while emphasizing sensitivity and respect. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commonalities • Differences | XX | X | XX | | 2 |
| 2.0 Critical Thinking | | | | | |
| 2.1 - Teach explicit strategies. 2.2 - Apply logic to new or unfamiliar ideas and concepts. | X | | XX | X | 3 |
| 3.0 Social Justice | | | | | |
| 3.1 - Assist students to become socially and politically conscious. | XX | XX | | X | 3 |



| Essential Components | Implementation Levels | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| | Level 0 | Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 3 | Rating |
| Instructions: Place an X under the appropriate variation implementation score for each course syllabus that meets the criteria level from 0 to 3. Score and rate each item separately. | There is no evidence that the component is included in the syllabus, or the syllabus only mentions the component. | Must contain at least one of the following: reading, test, lecture/presentation, discussion, modeling/demonstration, or quiz. | Must contain at least one item from Level 1, plus at least one of the following: observation, project/activity, case study, or lesson plan study. | Must contain at least one item from Level 1 as well as at least one item from Level 2, plus at least one of the following: tutoring, small group student teaching, or whole group internship. | Rate each item as the number of the highest variation receiving an X under it. |
| 4.0 Problem-Solving Approach | | | | | |
| 4.1 - Create opportunities for students to investigate. | X | | | | 0 |
| 4.2 - Allow students to formulate questions and develop solutions. | | | | | |
| 5.0 Culture, Language, and Racial Identity | | | | | |
| 5.1 - Implement educational practices that connect to and reflect the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Culture • Language • Race • Values • Customs • Daily lives • Beliefs | | XX | | | 1 |

