Program Evaluation: Staff Development

I. Program Information

Name of Program
Staff Development: Academy I Teacher Induction Program

Personnel Responsible for Evaluation
Special Education:
Kris Weingaertner-Hartke, Learning and Assessment Area Coordinator
Ros VanHecke, Learning and Assessment Director
Carolyn Owen, Rockwood Parent
Chialin Hseih, Program Evaluation Administrator
Susan Welde, Diagnostic Effective Practice Specialist
Lori Rehme, Clayton Area Coordinator
Wendi Pendergrass, Ritenour Area Coordinator
Linda Hofeditz, Hazelwood Area Coordinator
Pat Harkins, Valley Park Area Coordinator
Lynda Leavitt, Brentwood Area Coordinator
Peggy Lockhart, Rockwood Area Coordinator

Technical Education:
Shane Trafton, Technical Education Curriculum and Instruction Administrator
Mary Braun, Technical Education Instructional Facilitator

Date of Evaluation
September 2004 – January 2005

Goal/Objective of Program
Special Education:
The Academy I strand is sequential staff development that supports the Academy I Skill Sets and the SSD Performance Based Teacher Evaluation. All teacher level staff in their first two year with the district are expected to:
1. Attend professional development training,
2 Participate in peer coaching as a job-embedded support,
3. Reflect on their teaching by video taping their instruction and then discussing the activity with a facilitator, and
4. Provide student data to show the impact of the participant's professional growth not only on their own learning, but on student learning, as well.

Technical Education:
Staff development is provided to support the teacher-level staff's acquisition of the Level I Skill Sets and is prescribed in their individual professional

development plans. Technical education teachers are also required to attend a two week New Teacher Institute in order to gain technical education teacher certification.

The Technical Education Instructional Facilitator meets bi-weekly with the new hires and and also with the teacher's mentors. The Educational Technology Facilitator provides staff development, also. Cohort sessions are held quarterly. New hires participate in staff development during school meetings and are part of the *High Schools That Work Committee*. Technical education new hires also meet with their principals monthly.

Brief description of relationship between program goals, CSIP and MSIP Standards

Special Education:
For the last five years, the Learning and Assessment Department has coordinated the SSD Professional Development plan around its CSIP, the MSIP Standards and the National Staff Development Standards. Since the 2002-03 school year, the district has used the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education's (DESE) High Quality Professional Development Standards (based on the National Staff Development Council Standards) to evaluate each of its staff development programs.

The Learning and Assessment Department Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (CSIP)
- Goal 1. Improve Student Performance Levels
  - Strategy 2. Develop a staff development plan for all staff within the district to include: measurable goals for student outcomes and participant implementation, activities related to assessed skills, follow-up training and evaluation.
  - Strategy 6. Develop district-wide training to increase teacher retention rate from 93% to 95% and maintain new staff in high needs districts.

Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP)
- Standard 6.7: Professional development is an integral part of the educational program and all school improvement initiatives.
  - Indicator 6.7.1: The district provides intensive, on-going professional development activities that address curriculum and the instructional practices related to student achievement issues identified in the CSIP (plan).

- Indicator 6.7.2: For all staff members, professional development is an integral part of their job responsibilities and expectations.
- Indicator 6.7.3: The district has identified a set of instructional strategies designed to meet the assessed needs of students, and has made a long-term commitment to focus its professional development activities on implementing and reinforcing these strategies.
- Indicator 6.7.4: The district collects and utilizes information regarding the effectiveness of its professional development program in improving instruction and student achievement.
- Indicator 6.7.5: The district has a written plan for professional development.
- Indicator 6.7.6: The district provides substantial time and resources for the professional development of all staff members.

National Staff Development Council Standards (NSDC): Process
(The Process standards describe how staff development is provided.)

Staff development that improves the learning of all students:
- uses disaggregated student data to determine adult learning priorities, monitor progress, and help sustain continuous improvement. (Data driven)
- uses multiple sources of information to guide improvement and demonstrate its impact. (Evaluation)
- prepares educators to apply research to decision making. (Research-based)
- uses learning strategies appropriate to the intended goal. (Design)
- applies knowledge about human learning and change. (Learning)
- provides educators with the knowledge and skill to collaborate. (Collaboration)

Demographic Description of Program
Special Education Location: SSD Learning Center

Technical Education Location: North Technical School and South Technical School

Number of Staff: 13 Facilitators, 2 Area Coordinators, 1 Director, the additional support of instructional administrators within Regions and input from the Professional Development Committee

Program Evaluation: Staff Development

Number of Technical Education Staff: 2 Facilitators, 1 Director, Principals and Assistant Principals and input from the Professional Development Committee

Special Education Participants: Approximately 300 (Beginning Teachers, New Hires with Experience, and teachers attending the Mentor professional development program.)

Technical Education Participants: 16 New Hires and 16 Mentors or Peer Consultants (Peer Consultants are assigned to those staff who are not required by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education to have a Mentor for teacher certification, but benefit from the professional support of a veteran teacher-level staff member.)

Special Education Length of program: Academy I professional development describes a two year process that includes Beginning Teachers (0-1 years of experience) and New Hires with Experience.

Technical Education Length of program: Two year program

II. Description of Stakeholders Engagement in Program Evaluation
Special Education:
Learning & Assessment Director
Learning & Assessment Area Coordinator
Area Coordinators (West, Central, and North Region Representation)
Diagnostic Effective Practice Specialist (West Representation)
Facilitators
Parent
Program Evaluation Administrator

Technical Education:
Curriculum and Instruction Administrator
Instructional Facilitator

III. Evaluation Criteria for Programs Offered
The following questions guided the standard program evaluation:
1.   How does the professional development program for New Teachers (Academy I) compare to the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) Standards for High Quality Professional Development?
2.   To what extent are the expressed participant and student outcomes for each component of the New Teacher Professional Development (Academy I) being met?

Program Evaluation: Staff Development

IV. Data Collection Methodology

Special Education:

The Missouri Commissioner's Award of Excellence for Professional Development Evaluation Rubric (Process Standards Section) was used by the committee to evaluate the three components of the Academy I staff development program – Mentors, Effective Teaching (Academy I, Year One) and Thoughtful Teaching (Academy I, Year Two). Each standard is based on the National Staff Development Council and DESE standards. Each standards also has criteria, descriptors and indicators that can be scored 1 (No evidence) to 4 (Exemplary evidence).

The committee looked for evidence of the MSIP Process standard criteria, descriptors and indicators by reading the December 2004 Midyear Reports of three components of Academy I (Mentors, Effective Teaching and Thoughtful Teaching). The Midyear reports for each of the components of the Academy I program compare the professional development design of the courses to each Exemplary (A rating of "4") standard in the in the rubric. (A copy of the entire rubric is attached to this report. It can also be found at http://69.0.163.232/published_sites/gen/msdc_generated_bin/documents/basi c_module/rubric05.pdf). The committee then discussed their individual rating of each standard's criteria and agreed on a collective, consensual score.

Technical Education:
- Checklists (eMints, Forget 23 Strategies, Universal Checklist)
- Technical Education Instructional facilitator meets with Mentors

V. Results

A. Strengths of program

Special Education:

The collective strengths of the two year New Teacher professional development program can be rated as near or at exemplary (Scores ranging from 3.0 to 4 on the four point scale.) in its ability to teach the SSD new hires skills through 1.) modeling learning methods that consistently mirror the methods teachers are expected to use with their students, 2.) providing consistent evidence of focused collaboration on student achievement, 3.) consistently using staff development results to implement change, 4.) accepting responsibility for collecting, analyzing and using data to increase student achievement, and 5.) selecting learning strategies based on the intended outcomes.

The Missouri Commissioner's Award of Excellence for Professional Development Rubric self-evaluation scores relative to two of the three components (The third

component, Mentors, score will be addressed in the "Concerns regarding program" section.) of the Academy I professional development program are as follows:

Effective Teaching (Academy I, Year One)
Staff development that improves the learning of all students:
- applies knowledge about human learning and change. (Learning) = **3.8**
- provides educators with the knowledge and skill to collaborate. (Collaboration) = **3.8**
- uses multiple sources of information to guide improvement and demonstrate its impact. (Evaluation) = **3.8**
- uses learning strategies appropriate to the intended goal. (Design) = **4.0**

Thoughtful Teaching (Academy I, Year Two)
Staff development that improves the learning of all students:
- applies knowledge about human learning and change. (Learning) = **3.4**
- provides educators with the knowledge and skill to collaborate. (Collaboration) = **3.0**
- uses multiple sources of information to guide improvement and demonstrate its impact. (Evaluation) = **3.4**
- uses disaggregated student data to determine adult learning priorities, monitor progress, and help sustain continuous improvement. (Data driven) = **3.0**
- learning strategies appropriate to the intended goal. (Design) = **4.0**

Technical Education:
(The Technical Education program was not compared to the Missouri Commissioner's Award of Excellence for Professional Development Rubric.)

- New hires are showing progress as reported by the checklist observations.

- The process of providing individual support from the Technical Education Instructional Facilitator is reported as a strength. New hires indicate that they appreciate the support. Administrators point out that they appreciate the support the Instructional Facilitator provides to the new hires as well as the mentors/peer consultants.

B. Concerns regarding program

Program Evaluation: Staff Development

Special Education:

The results, ranging from 1.0 to 2.2 on the rubric, serve as a guide for improving the quality and results of each of the three components of the program. Review of the Midyear reports indicated; 1.) some student data are used in Academy I program planning, 2.) some participants accept responsibility for seeking out information or conducting research for planning and/or decision making, 3.) all areas of the process standards need improvement in regards to the Mentor program.

The Missouri Commissioner's Award of Excellence for Professional Development Rubric self-evaluation scores relative to the three components of the Academy I professional development program are as follows:

Effective Teaching (Academy I, Year One)
Staff development that improves the learning of all students:
- uses disaggregated student data to determine adult learning priorities, monitor progress, and help sustain continuous improvement. (Data driven) = **2.2**
- prepares educators to apply research to decision making. (Research-based) = **2.2**

Thoughtful Teaching (Academy I, Year Two)
- Staff development that improves the learning of all students prepares educators to apply research to decision making. (Research-based) = **1.7**

Mentor
Staff development that improves the learning of all students:
- uses disaggregated student data to determine adult learning priorities, monitor progress, and help sustain continuous improvement. (Data driven) = **1.0**
- uses multiple sources of information to guide improvement and demonstrate its impact. (Evaluation) = **1.0**
- prepares educators to apply research to decision making. (Research-based) = **1.0**
- learning strategies appropriate to the intended goal. (Design) = **1.0**
- applies knowledge about human learning and change. (Learning) = **1.0**
- students provides educators with the knowledge and skill to collaborate. (Collaboration) = **1.0**

The second question, "To what extent are the expressed participant and student outcomes for each component of the New Teacher Professional Development (Academy I) being met?" was the second focus area for this Staff Development program evaluation. Structures such as data collection methods and criteria for student and participant learning have been identified. The Midyear Report shows evidence of these structures, however, given the time of the year, the staff developers are currently working with participants to collect and analyze outcome data. The 2004-05 Annual Report will provide detailed student and participant outcome data.

Technical Education:
(The Technical Education program was not compared to the Missouri Commissioner's Award of Excellence for Professional Development Rubric.)
The quantity of information presented at new teacher orientation and the complicated nature of the professional development process are concerns. Technical Education instructors must also complete eighteen hours of college coursework in two years to move beyond the Temporary Authorization Certificate.

C. Recommendations regarding program
Special Education:
- Restructure the Mentor Program align the Missouri Commissioner's Award Rubric standards, criteria, descriptors.
- Prepare educators to seek out information and/or research to guide their instructional decision-making.
- Create observable and measurable goals from student data for the Academy I Professional Development program. Determine if those goals should focus on special education teacher retention, developing effective teachers, or both.

Technical Education:
- Provide financial and Instructional Facilitator support for the Mentors/Peer Consultants program to develop as a two year program.

VI. Action Plan for Recommendations as a Result of Program Evaluation
Special Education:
1. Explore resources to improve the Mentoring Program February 2005 through June 2006.
2. Modify the Mentoring program by August 2006.
3. Continue to research the development of a special education teacher induction program by June 2005.

4. Incorporate research results into Academy I staff development program by August 2005.
5. Report final student and participant outcomes for the 2004-05 Academy I staff development program in the Learning & Assessment Annual Report. Share report with the Board of Education, Superintendent, Associate Superintendent, Staff Development Program Evaluation Committee Members, Executive Directors and Directors in August 2005.

Technical Education:
1. Revisit the New Teacher Orientation structure by August 2006.
2. Survey the new hires for recommendations by August 2006.

Person responsible to champion action plan
Kris Weingaertner-Hartke, Learning and Assessment Area Coordinator
Ros VanHecke, Learning and Assessment Director

Timeframe for reporting updates to Board of Education
(See Action Plan Section VI above.)

_____ Date:_____
Signature of Administrator Responsible for Chairing Evaluation