

Core Principle 5: Professional Development

Dr. Sandee Crowther

The fifth of the core principles on which the State Board of Education bases its consideration of redesign of the system is: *Professional growth and development that increases the capacity of those who work in the system to help all children learn well must be ongoing and continuous.* The following principle and indicators will be addressed in this paper:

Professional growth and development that increases the capacity of those who work in the system to help all children learn well must be ongoing and continuous.

- (a) Time is scheduled on a regular basis for teachers to plan and collaborate together on student progress.
- (b) Sufficient and effective opportunities for professional development are provided.
- (c) Higher education institutions will ensure that research is linked to effective practices that help all students learn the curriculum.
- (d) Teacher quality in both preservice programs and ongoing professional development provide prospective and practicing educators with deep content knowledge, the associated pedagogy, and related clinical experiences to ensure their ability to help all students learn the essential curriculum.
- (e) Leadership preparation and practices are characterized by a primary focus on student learning and the development of staff, school, and community capacity to help all students learn the essential curriculum.
- (f) The success of professional development activities is measured through school and classroom implementation and student progress.

Introduction

During the past twenty years staff development has gone by many names including inservice education, staff development, professional development, or human resource development. No matter what it was called, it was too often the same thing; educators (usually teachers) listening passively while an “expert” “exposed” them to new ideas or “trained” them in new practices. The success was usually measured by a “happiness quotient” that measured participants’ satisfaction. Fortunately much of this is changing.

Every year, many research studies, reports, articles, and books are published with the good intention of improving the quality of professional learning within schools. Unfortunately, even with all this information available, only marginal improvements are occurring in changing the practices of educators. The lack of high-quality professional development for teachers explains much of the failure of past school reforms. In the absence of substantial professional development, many teachers gravitate to the methods they remember from their own years as students. There are exceptions of course, but in the majority of cases, professional development is pretty much like it has been in the past: unfocused, insufficient, not tied to student performance needs, and lacking in follow-up. States cannot improve schools through mandating high standards and high stakes tests unless they provide teachers the tools, support, and training

to help them change their practice. There is more knowledge about quality professional development than is regularly practiced in our schools.

Quality teaching in all classrooms and skillful leadership in all schools will not occur by accident. Tinkering around the edges of improvement is insufficient. The National Staff Development Council has set the goal, “All teachers in all schools will experience high-quality professional learning as part of their daily work by 2007.” How can this goal be achieved in Kansas? What do we need to know and do?

Research

Current research is redefining our notion of professional development. A growing body of research supports the link between students’ achievement and the quality of teaching. A Tennessee study conducted by Sanders and Horn using 6 million test profiles, found that teacher effectiveness influenced student behavior more than any other factor. It revealed a 39 percentage-point difference in student achievement between students with “most effective” and “least effective” teachers. In classrooms headed by teachers characterized as “most effective,” students posted achievement gains of 53 percentage points over the course of one academic year, whereas in classrooms led by “least effective” teachers, student achievement gains averaged 14 percentage points. A Texas study of 900 districts found that teacher expertise explained 40 percent of the difference in student achievement and most of the performance gap between African-American and white students. Effective teaching begins with effective teacher preparation. The efforts in states should be on ensuring graduates have strong content expertise and are equipped to use research-based instructional strategies. This is why it is so important that Kansas has implemented a performance-based teacher licensure system.

Recent national reports have emphasized the importance of professional development for teachers and administrators. One longitudinal study entitled, *Does Professional Development Change Teaching Practice: Results from a Three-Year Study* (USDE, 2000), looked at the federal Eisenhower professional development program. The study found that when professional development was of the “reform type”, that is, it promoted active teacher learning, collective participation, and coherence, teachers increased their use of desired strategies in their science and mathematics classrooms. These activities included teacher study groups; teacher collaboratives, networks, or committees; mentoring; internships; and resource centers. The National Education Goals Panel’s report, *Bringing All Students to High Standards* (NEGP Monthly, 2000) also linked professional development to improved student achievement. Finally, the Learning First Alliance’s publication, *Every Child Reading: A Professional Development Guide* (2000) pointed out that for the teaching of literacy to succeed with almost all students, schools must use the most effective forms of professional development.

Teachers Who Learn, Kids Who Achieve: A Look at School with Model Professional Development, a WestEd report (2000) identified a number of shared characteristics among schools that distinguished themselves in the U.S. Department of Education’s (USDE) National Awards Program for Model Professional Development. These schools demonstrated the link between staff development and student learning because they had: clear student achievement

goals, provided an array of professional development opportunities, embedded ongoing learning in the school culture, built a highly collaborative school environment, found and used time for teacher learning and used a broad range of student performance data. (Four of the award winners were from Kansas: Lawrence, Olathe, Wichita, and Manhattan.) The USDE goals are listed in the Appendices: Part 1C.

Many writers have addressed the importance of a systems approach and the importance of leadership. Inherent in these concepts is the importance of creating sustained professional learning and collaboration in schools for the benefit of all students; these are often manifested as “professional learning communities.” In these teams, staff members provide meaningful and sustained assistance to one another to improve teaching and student learning. *Breaking Ranks: Changing an American Institution* (National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1996) recommended that principals lead efforts to turn high schools into learning communities and provide adequate time, money and other resources to ensure professional development is ongoing and continuous. Additionally, principals are asked to model their own growth for others by pursuing professional opportunities. Shirley Hord and her colleagues in their recently published book *Learning Together, Leading Together, Changing Schools through Professional Learning Communities*, concluded that professional learning communities display distributed leadership, a shared vision, collective learning, supportive conditions and shared practice.

To promote this type of collaboration requires building time into teachers’ daily schedules. Carolann Wade (2001) noted that teachers in the United States have about an hour each week for such activities compared to teachers in other industrialized nations who have 10-20 hours per week. The constant lament among educators today, especially about professional development, is “We don’t have enough time” (Goodson, 1992). Many schools allocate one percent or less of their budgets to professional development, offering little time for adult learning and collaboration. Funding should support released time for teachers, external assistance with designing and evaluating programs, and provide in-school instructional coaches. But just as allocating more time in school for students does not guarantee better learning (Denham & Lieberman, 1980), simply providing more time for professional development does not guarantee greater effectiveness on the part of educators.

Many writers cite the importance of the principal in ensuring high-quality professional learning takes place in establishing the appropriate culture (Lambert, Elmore, Guskey, and Schlechty). The National Association for Elementary School Principals’ (2001) report, *Leading Learning Communities: Standards for What Principals Should Know and Be Able to Do*, advocated the need for principals to: provide teacher reflection time regarding their own practice; invest in teacher learning; connect professional development to school learning goals; provide opportunities for teachers to work, plan and think together; and recognize the need to continually improve their own professional practice. The development of principals cannot continue to be the neglected stepchild of professional development efforts. It must be standards-based, sustained, intellectually rigorous, and embedded in the principal’s workday.

At the same time teachers must be at the core of the leadership communities for schools to be a place in which students and educators are successful in their respective roles. Teacher leadership

can take many forms. Both Ann Lieberman and Roland Barth point out that serving in leadership roles enable teachers to reduce isolation and gain a sense of professional satisfaction, investment and new learning about change and themselves. Leadership development for both administrators and teacher leaders requires high-quality professional learning that includes time to practice new skills and opportunities for coaching feedback.

Some forms of staff development are far more effective than others in changing teaching practice to improve student learning. It is clear that large groups of teachers who are talked at in the name of “exposing” them to new ideas is ineffective as are remedial teacher “pull out programs” for designated teacher groups. “One size fits all” does not address teachers differentiated needs. Staff members needs reflect a continuum in terms of the skills and/or knowledge needed. Teachers have insufficient time and skills to be able to develop new teaching strategies based solely on what they have learned from workshops or conferences. Dynamic speakers and interesting speakers may have some value, but schools must help educators translate their learning into instructional practice and student learning.

High-quality staff development that impacts teaching must address student learning needs, align with school improvement goals, address students’ and teachers’ areas needing improvement, deepen content knowledge, and expand the repertoire of teaching strategies. Data must be used to determine staff development goals, guide and motivate teacher learning, monitor and impact staff development on achievement, make appropriate mid-course corrections, and provide evidence to teachers that their changes in instructional practices are improving student learning. Closely tied to the use of student data is teachers’ regular study of student work. Rick Stiggins stated that the frequent monitoring of student progress is a powerful motivator for teachers. Unfortunately, many teachers have had little training on how to use formative classroom assessment to monitor progress and improve instruction.

The most powerful forms of professional development must also match adult learning processes with intended learning outcomes for students and the desired instructional practices for teachers. Staff development leaders must plan backwards from student learning outcomes to the types of curriculum, instruction, and assessment that will achieve those ends and backwards again to the content and processes for adult learning that will produce those results. The concepts in the above two paragraphs are specifically articulated in the current 12 National Staff Development Council Standards. (See appendices Part 1A.)

The California Department of Education commissioned *Designs for Learning*, based on the assumption that each educator deserved the opportunity to participate in high-quality professional development that results in higher levels of student achievement. Based on ten design elements, it is a resource to help teachers develop and implement a professional development plan that will significantly affect what they do in the classroom and make a difference in their ability to help all students reach high standards. The ten elements represent parts of a system that are linked to each other. (See appendices Part 1B.)

In “*What Makes Professional Development Effective?*” (Kappan, 2003), Tom Guskey analyzed 13 different lists of characteristics of effective professional development (all published in the last

ten years from a variety of organizations and associations) to find the extent to which the various lists agreed. Of the 21 characteristics cited in the lists, the most frequently cited was enhancement of teachers' content and pedagogical knowledge. Another frequently mentioned characteristic was the provision of sufficient time and other resources as essential to effective professional development. Time must be well organized, carefully structured, and purposefully directed. A third consistently noted characteristic was the promotion of collegiality and collaborative exchange. For collaboration to bring intended benefits it too must be structured and purposeful with efforts guided by clear goals for improving student learning. Evaluation procedures, critical in this day of accountability, was also frequently cited along with professional development that is school- or site-based. However, a recent review by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education, found that when decisions about professional development were primarily school-based, staff members paid only lip service to research and were more interested in programs similar to what they were doing than in those that produced results. A carefully organized collaboration between site-based educators, who are keenly aware of critical contextual characteristics, and district-level personnel, who have broader perspectives on problems, seems essential. The important concept is to decide on the criteria for effectiveness and provide clear descriptions of the contextual elements.

Although there is a great deal of agreement about what characteristics of professional development make it 'high quality', there is little evidence about the extent to which these characteristics are related to better teaching and increased student achievement. The field needs to continue to work to obtain this type of evidence.

In 1999, the Kansas State Department of Education in conjunction with Research and Training Associates, conducted a study that provided clear data about ongoing professional development in Kansas. The results of the study showed that Kansas met or exceeded three out of five indicators of progress toward meeting the national goal of continued improvement of professional skills for the nation's teaching force. Kansas ranked among the highest performing states on two of the indicators. Some of the findings included:

- About 60% of public secondary teachers hold a degree in their main teaching assignment (slightly lower than national average of 63%.)
- 99% of the teachers were certified in their main teaching assignment compared with the national average of 93%.
- 89% of public school teachers participated in professional development on one or more selected topics as compared with 85% nationally.
- About 16% of the teachers in Kansas had training to teach limited English-proficient students identical to the national average.
- Only 19% of beginning public school teachers participated in formal teacher induction compared with the national average of 27%.

The results also indicated a high percentage of staff participating in job-embedded professional development opportunities. In 1999, over 50% of the respondents were participating in the following types of activities: meetings related to instruction; curriculum development; grade level or content meetings regarding instruction; school improvement committees; and group examination of student work. In all cases, respondents viewed all the activities in which they participated as highly effective.

A more recent study (Fall 2003) completed by KSDE staff in conjunction with the work of the Kansas Learning First Alliance, gathered evidence on the impact of quality professional development practices used in the Kansas Challenge Award schools in lower performing schools with similar student populations. The first phase of that study consisted of the development and administration of a teacher survey, the results of which are summarized here.

In order to be considered for a Challenge Award, a school's state assessment results in mathematics or reading had to be significantly *higher* than would be expected, given the demographic make-up of the school's student population (percent of lower socioeconomic status, percent of minority population, and percent with disabilities). Criteria used for selection of the study's comparison schools were the same as criteria used for selection of the Challenge Award schools with one important exception: the achievement of students in the comparison schools was significantly *lower* than would be expected, given the demographic make-up of the school's student population. The final list included 126 Challenge Award schools and 130 comparison schools. Each of the 256 schools received survey packets for four teachers that met specified criteria, for a total of 1,024 possible participants. The actual number returned was 488, fairly evenly divided between Challenge Award and comparison schools.

- Approximately 43 percent of the Comparison School and 29 percent of the Challenge School teachers have had ten years or less of teaching experience.
- Challenge School teachers reported that they had participated in more leadership roles than Comparison School teachers reported they had. Only 14 percent of the Challenge School teachers, compared to 36 percent of the Comparison School teachers, said they had not taken part in a leadership role.
- Although differences in the amount of time spent in professional development were not large, when analyzed by each type of professional development, Challenge School teachers participated in significantly more professional development overall.
- Challenge School teachers also rated the benefit of professional development more positively. About 44 percent of the Challenge School teachers, compared to 31 percent of the Comparison School teachers, said that professional development had had a direct, positive effect on their teaching.
- No matter in which type of school they taught, teachers did not feel that professional development activities included enough time to think carefully about, try out, and evaluate new ideas; or that professional development had increased their ability to meet diverse student needs. Both groups commented that professional development at their schools was closely connected to the school improvement plan.
- When asked to rate 22 characteristics of staff development on how true they were for their own schools, teachers from both types of schools gave the highest rating to statements related to the support for professional development that came from building and district administrators and to a statement about all teachers being part of learning teams.
- The lowest ratings were given to items related to having enough time to work and plan together. Challenge School teachers were more likely to agree that in their schools, learning teams meet at least weekly, the district office is strongly committed to improving teaching through professional development, decisions about professional development

are based on data, there are well-planned follow-up activities after professional development, technology is frequently integrated, and teachers and administrators work together to provide relevant professional development that allows teachers to develop deep knowledge of their content.

- When asked to rate eleven characteristics of professional development according to importance and current strength at their schools, the greatest difference between importance and strength for both groups of teachers was in opportunities for on-the-job practice of new skills and strategies with feedback and for integrated and coherent professional development, with one activity building on the next.
- Comparison School teachers showed a large discrepancy between importance and strength regarding focus on instructional content; and Comparison School teachers also displayed a large discrepancy regarding opportunities to observe each other's instruction and provide constructive feedback.
- When asked to write in other characteristics that Comparison School teachers thought were important, the most common characteristics mentioned were ensuring teacher involvement and focus and including more time.
- Teachers' responses about professional development became less positive with school level. In other words, elementary teachers were much more positive about professional development quality and relevance and about the support they received for professional development than were high school teachers.
- Regarding characteristics of professional development that are related to achievement, Challenge School teacher means for all of the professional development characteristics items were slightly higher than the Comparison School teacher means.

The biggest difference in structure appeared to be that teachers in Challenge Schools in general have more teaching experience, are included in leadership roles at a higher rate, meet more regularly, are more likely to base professional development decisions on data, have the support of administrators and are included by administrators in decisions related to professional development, and have more opportunity for follow-up activities.

Vision

Educators are bombarded by innumerable new programs and strategies. Not all new education programs and approaches are created equal. Many are not derived from our best professional knowledge and the majority are more "opinion-based" than "research-based." Although they may be intuitively appealing and use the most current education lingo, evidence of their effectiveness in improving student learning is often scant or nonexistent. For example, "brain-based learning" has been the focus of numerous books and articles, dozens of education conferences, and countless professional development sessions. At present, there is not substantial evidence to show that a thorough understanding of brain functioning and neuroscience leads to more effective instructional practice and improved student learning. Educators must be much more cautious in committing themselves to new programs and approaches and must weigh carefully the supporting evidence. They must also be willing to gather their own evidence and analyze effects in their own setting. This is not to imply that new programs and approaches are never better. Sometimes they are, and occasionally strong

evidence justifies their implementation. But before any major implementation effort, educators should demand evidence and thoroughly examine the validity and relevance to their context.

Carefully designed "needs assessments" are considered essential in planning well-targeted and highly efficient professional development endeavors. But while they offer valuable information, evidence indicates most "needs assessments" are misnamed. Instead of defining "needs," they typically identify problems, dilemmas, concerns, and wants. Gathering information from educators about current problems and concerns is distinctly different from determining needs. The analysis of student data to pinpoint what areas of instruction need attention is valuable. It must be remembered that needs change, not only because new ones are recognized but also because programs come and go, population demographics change, professional knowledge expands, and students' learning needs vary. Although most educators can articulate the problems and difficulties they are experiencing, they may not be aware of their actual needs for professional learning.

Because district-initiated professional development activities have a less-than-stellar record of success, professional development planning has been moved in large part to the local school level. Funds for professional development are often placed at the discretion of individual site-based school councils based on the premise that the commitment and good will of educators at the school level will guide them in making wise and prudent professional development decisions. It is true that school-based educators have a wealth of experience that can be invaluable in fashioning professional development. Nevertheless, these individuals work under extremely demanding conditions that often make it impossible for them to develop expertise in the most current ideas and research on ways to improve student learning. Without this expertise, or ready access to such expertise, school-based decisions can become shared naiveté. Just because something is planned at the local school level does not make it good. Care must be taken to not mistake interesting activities, such as action research or study groups, for valid and meaningful professional development. Content makes a difference. To solve this problem it will require a change in the way professional development activities are planned, organized, and carried out.

Once the myths are dispelled, it is important to look at **specific guidelines and concepts** for ensuring the wise planning and implementation of professional learning. Although adhering to these guidelines may not guarantee the effectiveness of all professional development activities, ignoring them could result in inefficient and unproductive efforts

If professional development time is to be used well and lead to truly meaningful improvement, activities that fill that time must clearly focus on learning and learners. While these activities may take a variety of forms, all should be related to a school mission that emphasizes important and worthwhile learning goals for all students. This focus forms the criteria by which professional development content and materials are selected, processes and procedures developed, and assessments and evaluations prepared. It can help to mobilize teachers and school administrators to make major changes in how they and their students participate in the school. Most importantly, it helps keep efforts on task and prevents distraction by peripheral issues that waste time and divert energy.

If schools are to function as true learning organizations, they must support learning for both students and educators. For this reason, school schedules at all levels are being restructured to add time for professional learning. It is not the amount of professional development time, but how the time is used that counts. To gain these improvements, newly acquired professional development time must be used well. Doing so will not be easy, but if the focus is on learning and learners, engagement in rigorous self-analysis, and study of the history of new ideas, while proceeding gradually and continually evaluating progress, improvements will be ensured..

A variety of restructuring designs have been proposed to gain more professional development time. Some of these options include increasing the flexibility of educators' daily schedules, extending the school day, extracting time from the existing schedule, altering staff utilization patterns, and adding days to the school calendar for professional development activities. Simply doing more of the same; however, is not necessarily better. It can actually lead to diminished results, higher levels of frustration, and increased cynicism. If the additional time for professional development is to yield truly meaningful improvements, time must be used wisely, efficiently, and effectively. This will require deep and profound changes in the organizational culture of most schools and in the perspectives of educators who work within them.

More challenging student performance standards paired with rigorous accountability policies call for significant changes in instructional practices that can't be accomplished through modest, short-term professional development efforts. Instead, expanded learning opportunities for teachers and school administrators, generous support from peers, mentors, and coaches, and extended time to practice, reflect, critique, and practice again must be provided. The new practices must become "habits of mind" that can be implemented almost subconsciously. This takes many trials, and ongoing feedback can be critical to making the practice and implementation the best it can be.

Building-level and district leaders – both formal and informal leaders – must collaborate and work together, combining their experience, expertise, and resources in planning professional learning that models high-quality professional learning criteria. Outside expertise tapped through school-university partnerships, regional service centers, and educational cooperatives can also be especially valuable in these efforts. Student results often dictate the "content" focus, but the context in which adults learn and work very often determines how much of the new content will be implemented into classroom routines. Teacher-to-teacher talk is as important as principal-to-teacher talk and is another form of shared leadership. For professional development to be relevant and engaging, it must be focused on the specific learning needs of the participants and reflect their input. This learning might come from higher education preparation programs or specifically designed professional learning opportunities at a district/school level. Shared leadership also helps to shape the culture of a school. The organizational culture is an important factor in determining whether teachers participate in professional development and what impact that participation has. School cultures that encourage collegiality, reflection, risk taking and collaborative problem solving facilitate effective professional learning.

For a school staff to reach its goals, they must first have a clear sense of where they are, collectively and individually. Just as it is recommended to differentiate instruction for students, the same should be true for adults. Realizing professional development goals requires careful

examination of current evidence. Specifically, it requires rigorous self-analysis at the individual and school levels. To determine if the professional learning is having an impact, staff must regularly examine all forms of evidence on student learning to identify potential weaknesses in the curriculum or instructional program. If most students are missing certain assessment questions, or failing to meet certain criteria spelled out in a scoring rubric, there is more likely a teaching problem than a student learning problem. Carefully analyzing such evidence at the classroom and school levels, combined with collaborative planning of strategies to remedy identified problems, needs to become a regular part of ongoing, job-embedded professional development efforts.

Higher education who provide services to educators must support school district leaders, teachers and students in reaching high standards of achievement and to be prepared for future responsibilities in school systems. Some possibilities include: aligning training to school and student needs; ensuring that research is linked to effective practices that help all students learn the content in courses; providing prospective and practicing educators with deep content knowledge and the associated pedagogy; collaborating directly with school districts regarding professional development needs; developing internal capacity of teachers to sustain learning over time; creating school partnerships that have longevity; and developing effective uses of technology to expand and enhance training options.

Recommendations for the Kansas State Board of Education to Consider

1. **Officially adopt the National Staff Development Standards** as standards that educators in Kansas should use to design, implement, and evaluate professional learning in Kansas schools and districts. The Kansas State Board of Education in 2002 endorsed the piloting of the standards in district professional development programs. Once officially adopted, an understanding of the standards could become a part of the required annual Professional Development Council training. The more recent document, *Moving NSDC's Staff Development Standards into Practice: Innovation Configuration* provides the innovation configurations (similar to rubrics) for the standards for five specific role alike groups: teachers, principals, central office staff members, the superintendent, and the school board for the standards for which each group has responsibility. The resource provides clear articulation of best practice (level 1) for the various components in each standard. A second volume of this type of resource is currently being developed for higher education, service agencies and state departments of education. Many states have already adopted these standards and are beginning to use the Innovation Configuration to increase the use of high-quality professional learning in their states.
2. Provide **incentives** for schools/districts that establish **time** for professional learning for their teachers within the duty day on a regular basis. This would not be unlike provisions for individual teacher planning time or duty-free lunch. A bolder step would be to link a percentage state allocation for professional development funds to all districts who demonstrate they can implement time within the duty week.
3. Kansas should establish a way to identify best practices or models of high-quality professional learning. These sites/programs would become part of a resource for other schools/districts to contact seeking advice on professional learning that makes a difference in student learning and would provide recognition for successful practices. The practice could be similar to the procedures used in Missouri for the Commissioner's Professional Development **Awards** or a plan similar to the Malcolm Baldrige process for schools in Ohio, or the ranking system for professional development used in Florida.
4. In collaboration with other entities in the state, such as the Kansas Learning First Alliance, offer **Leadership Academies** should be offered for aspiring administrators and teacher leaders that embody and model the NSDC Standards and that demonstrate changes in knowledge, behaviors, and skills. The content of these academies might include modules on various competencies for leaders such as those used by the Partnership of the Georgia Leadership Institute for School Improvement and the Southern Regional Education Board. This recommendation could encompass ideas from the seven KSDE board goals.
5. Request **funding** for professional development for all districts. The money originally envisioned when the first Kansas Inservice Plan was put in place, never became a reality. The portion of money slowly decreased and was no longer available in 2003-04. If professional learning is key to making a difference for student learning, the resources needed should be provided to districts. A two percent allocation, such as Missouri or

Minnesota use would be preferable to the formula used with the Kansas Inservice Plan. Investing in high-quality professional development is an important long-term investment to ensure that all students meet high standards.

6. Continue to **research** what is working in Kansas in relation to professional development tied to student achievement gains. Data collected from the most recent KSDE survey suggests that teachers in Challenge Award schools could provide valuable information about effective professional development characteristics. A second phase of this study should be carried out in order to gather even richer, fuller data regarding effective professional development in these two types of schools. What this might look like is more extensive and in-depth questioning and analysis to yield more evidence about those professional development characteristics that are related to better teaching and increased student achievement.

Bibliography for Professional Development

BLUEPRINTS – *A Practical Toolkit for Designing and Facilitating Professional Development: “Activities: Providing Effective Professional Development, Phase One.”* Available from: NCREL (North Central Regional Educational Laboratory, 1900 Spring Road, Suite 300, Oak Brook, Illinois 60523-1480, (800) 356-2735 www.ncrel.org

BY YOUR OWN DESIGN – *A Teacher’s Professional Learning Guide:* Available from: ENC (Eisenhower National Clearinghouse, 1921 Kenny Road, Columbus, OH 43210-1079, (800) 621-5785 www.enc.org/pdguide

Education Commission of the States, *In Pursuit of Quality Teaching*, Denver, 2003.

Hord, Shirley, ed., *Learning Together, Leading Together, Changing Schools through Professional Learning Communities*, NSDC, 2003.

Killion, Joellen, *Assessing Impact Evaluating Staff Development* . National Staff Development Council, Oxford, OH (2002).

Lambert, Linda, *Building Leadership Capacity in Schools*, . ASCD, Alexandria, Virginia (1998).

Loucks-Horsley, Susan, Peter W. Hewson, Nancy Love & Catherine E. Stiles, *Designing Professional Development for Teachers of Science and Mathematics*, Corwin Press, Inc. Thousand Oaks, CA (1997).

Louis, K.S., Kruse, S., and Marks, H. (1996). Schoolwide professional community. Fred Newmann and Associates (Ed.), *Authentic Achievement: Restructuring Schools for Intellectual Quality*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Marzano, Robert J., Debra J. Pickering, Jane E. Pollock, *Classroom Instruction That Works*, . ASCD, Alexandria, Virginia (2001).

National Association of Secondary School Principals, *Breaking Ranks: Changing an American Institution* 1996.

National Education Commission on Time and Learning (1994). *Prisoners of time*. Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Roy, Pat and Shirley Hord, Moving NSDC’s Staff Development Standards Into Practice: Innovation Configurations, NSDC, 2003.

Sparks, Dennis and Stephanie Hirsh, *A New Vision for Staff Development*, . NSDC/ASCD, Alexandria, Virginia (1997).

Sparks, Dennis and Stephanie Hirsh, *Strengthening Professional Development: A National*

Strategy Oxford, Ohio, NSDC, 2000.

Sparks, Dennis, Designing Powerful Professional Development for Teachers and Principals, NSDC, 2002.

WestEd, *Teachers Who Learn, Kids Who Achieve: A Look at Schools with Model Professional Development*, San Francisco, 2000.

Articles

Guskey, Thomas, Apply time with wisdom, *Journal of Staff Development*, Spring 1999 (Vol. 20, No. 2)

Guskey, Thomas, The age of our accountability. Part One, Part Two, Part Three. *The Journal of Staff Development* 19 (4), pp. 36-44 (Fall, 1998). Also available in BLUEPRINTS CD (see citation above).

Guskey, Thomas, What Makes Professional Development Effective? *Phi Delta Kappan*, June 2003.

Guskey, Thomas , You can collect awfully good evidence , *The Journal of Staff Development*, 19 (4), pp. 42-43 (Fall, 1998).

Lieberman, A. (Ed.). (1995). *The Work of Restructuring Schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Loucks-Horsley, Susan, Try on strategies to get a good fit. , *The Journal of Staff Development* 20 (3), pp. 56-60. (Summer, 1999)

Louis, K.S., Kruse, S., and Raywid, M.A. (1996). Putting teachers at the center of reform. *NASSP Bulletin*, 80 (580), 9-21.

Sparks, Dennis, The educator examined. , *The Journal of Staff Development*. 19 (3), pp. 38-42 (Summer, 1998).

References

Abdal-Haqq, I. (1996). Making time for teacher professional development. *ERIC Digest*.

Cody, C.B., & Guskey, T.R. (1997). Professional development. In J. C. Lindle, J. M. Petrosko, & R. S. Pankratz (Eds.), *1996 Review of research on the Kentucky Education Reform Act* (pp. 191-209). Frankfort, KY: The Kentucky Institute for Education Research.

Denham, C., & Lieberman, A. (1980). *Time to learn*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Guskey, T.R. (1992, November). What does it mean to be "research-based"? *The Developer*, p. 5.

- Guskey, T.R. (1996a, Oct. 23). To transmit or to 'construct'? The lure of trend infatuation in teacher professional development (Commentary). *Education Week*, 16(8), p. 34.
- Guskey, T.R. (1998a). Making time to train your staff. *The School Administrator*, 55(7), 35-37.
- Guskey, T.R. (1998b). The age of our accountability. *Journal of Staff Development*, 19(4),36-44.
- Guskey, T.R., & Sparks, D. (1991). What to consider when evaluating staff development. *Educational Leadership*, 49(3),73-76.
- Guskey, T.R., & Sparks, D. (1996). Exploring the relationship between staff development and improvements in student learning. *Journal of Staff Development*, 17(4), 34-38.
- Harkreader, S., & Weathersby, J. (1998). *Staff development and student achievement: Making the connection in Georgia schools*. Atlanta, GA: Council for School Performance, Applied Research Center.
- Kelleher, James, A Model for Assessment-Driven Professional Development, *Phi Delta Kappan*, June, 2003.
- Loucks-Horsley, S., Stiles, K., & Hewson, P. (1996). Principles of effective professional development for mathematics and science education: A synthesis of standards. *National Institute for Science Education Brief*, 1(1), 1-6.
- Murphy, C. (1997). Finding time for faculties to study together. *Journal of Staff Development*, 18(3), 29-32.
- Raywid, M.A. (1993). Finding time for collaboration. *Educational Leadership*, 51(1), 30-34.
- Sparks, D. (1998). The singular power of one goal: Interview with Emily Calhoun. *Journal of Staff Development*, 20(1),54-58.
- Wolfe, P., & Brandt, R. (1998). What do we know from brain research? *Educational Leadership*, 56(3), 8-13.
- Woodilla, J. Boscardin, M.L., & Dodds, P. (1997). Time for elementary educators' professional development. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 13(3), 295-309.
- McKinnon, Shanara L., *Building a Professional Learning Community, On the Same Page*, Educational Research Service, Arlington, VA, 2003

Online

Education Trust: *Putting Standards Into Practice*. <http://www.edtrust.org/main/sip.asp>

Honor in the Boxcar: Equalizing Teacher Quality [Online]. *Thinking K-16*. 4 (1). The Education

Trust, (Spring, 2000). www.edtrust.org

NCPE: *Resources: Baldrige-Based Strategic Planning Process*. <http://www.ncpe-online.org>

NCREL: *Pathways to School Improvement: Professional Development*. <http://www.ncrel.org>.

NCREL: *Professional Development: Learning From the Best Toolkit*.
<http://www.ncrel.org/pd/toolkit.htm>

Wade, C. (2001. Nov./Dec.). It's About Time. *Best Practices and Policies*, 7, 1-2
www.teachingquality.org/newsletter/issues/2001/issue07-page1.htm

NSDC (National Staff Development Council). www.nsd.org

USDOE: *Goals 2000: Building Bridges, the Mission and Principles of Professional Development*. <http://www.ed.gov/G2K/bridge.html>

APPENDIX

Part I – Published lists of Attributes of Quality Professional Development

A. National Staff Development Council Standards

The National Staff Development Council's revised Standards for Staff Development reflect what NSDC and the broader staff development community have learned about professional learning since the creation of the original standards in 1995. The revision of the standards was guided by three questions:

- What are all students expected to know and be able to do?
- What must teachers know and do in order to ensure student success?
- Where must staff development focus to meet both goals?

Staff development standards provide direction for designing a professional development experience that ensures educators acquire the necessary knowledge and skills. Staff development must be results-driven, standards-based, and job-embedded.

Context

LEARNING COMMUNITIES – Staff development that improves the learning of all students organizes adults into learning communities whose goals are aligned with those of the school and district.

LEADERSHIP – Staff development that improves the learning of all students requires skillful school and district leaders who guide continuous instructional improvement.

RESOURCES – Staff development that improves the learning of all students requires resources to support adult learning and collaboration.

Process

DATA –DRIVEN – 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.

EVALUATION – Staff development that improves the learning of all students uses multiple sources of information to guide improvement and demonstrate its impact.

RESEARCH-BASED – Staff development that improves the learning of all students prepares educators to apply research to decision making.

DESIGN – Staff development that improves the learning of all students uses learning strategies appropriate to the intended goal.

LEARNING – Staff development that improves the learning of all students applies knowledge about human learning and change.

COLLABORATION – Staff development that improves the learning of all students provides educators with the knowledge and skills to collaborate.

Content

EQUITY – Staff development that improves the learning of all students prepares educators to understand and appreciate all students, create safe, orderly and supportive learning environments, and hold high expectations for their academic achievement.

QUALITY TEACHING - Staff development that improves the learning of all students deepens educators' content knowledge, provides them with research-based instructional strategies to assist students in meeting rigorous academic standards, and prepares them to use various types of classroom assessments appropriately.

FAMILY INVOLVEMENT - Staff development that improves the learning of all students provides educators with knowledge and skills to involve families and other stakeholders appropriately.

B. High Quality Professional Development for Teachers

Designs for Learning presents ten design elements for high quality professional development based on the [California Standards for the Teaching Profession](#) :

1. Uses student performance and achievement data, including student feedback, teacher observation, analysis of student work and test scores, as part of the process for individual and organizational learning
2. Uses a coherent long-term professional development planning process, connected to the school plan, that reflects both site-based priorities and individual learning needs
3. Provides time for professional learning to occur in a meaningful manner
4. Respects and encourages the leadership development of teachers
5. Develops, refines, and expands teachers' pedagogical repertoire, content knowledge, and the skill to integrate both
6. Provides for and promotes the use of continuous inquiry and reflection
7. Provides for collaboration and collegial work, balanced with opportunities for individual learning
8. Follows the principles of good teaching and learning, including providing comfortable, respectful environments conducive to adult learning
9. Creates broad-based support for professional development from all sectors of the organization and community through reciprocal processes for providing information and soliciting feedback
10. Builds in accountability practices and evaluation of professional development programs to provide a foundation for future planning

C. Principles of High-Quality Professional Development

From USDOE, 1994 – Goals 2000 and used for USDOE professional development awards awarded to Olathe, Wichita, Lawrence, and a school in Manhattan along with winners from other states.

The mission of professional development is to prepare and support educators to help all students achieve to high standards of learning and development.

Professional Development:

- focuses on teachers as central to student learning, yet includes all other members of the school community;
- focuses on individual, collegial, and organizational improvement;
- respects and nurtures the intellectual and leadership capacity of teachers, principals, and others in the school community;
- reflects best available research and practice in teaching, learning, and leadership;
- enables teachers to develop further expertise in subject content, teaching strategies, uses of technologies, and other essential elements in teaching to high standards;
- promotes continuous inquiry and improvement embedded in the daily life of schools;

- is planned collaboratively by those who will participate in and facilitate that development;
- requires substantial time and other resources;
- is driven by a coherent long-term plan;
- is evaluated ultimately on the basis of its impact on teacher effectiveness and student learning; and this assessment guides subsequent professional development efforts.

<u>Kansas Inservice Program</u>	<u>Quality Performance Accreditation</u>	<u>Certification/Licensure*</u>
<p>1972: Kansas State Board of Education (KSBE) adopted a goal to promote the continuous development of educational personnel in Kansas.</p> <p>1979: The National Council of States of Inservice Education provided funding to promote inservice activities at the state level.</p> <p>1981: The first draft of a state plan for Pre-service and Inservice Education was developed.</p> <p>1982-1984: Draft plans were developed and refined to outline the objectives and activities through which KSBE could implement a planned professional development program.</p> <p>1983: Five Kansas school districts pioneered “The Kansas Inservice Education Program” by developing 5-year plans for staff development. The plans were submitted to and approved by KSBE.</p> <p>1985: The Kansas legislature passed the State Inservice Education Opportunities Act, which provided funding for staff development. It also gave individual teachers an alternative path to re-certification using district inservice credits.</p> <p>1989: KSBE adopted new strategic directions for Kansas education. A special emphasis was placed on staff development: “extend and update the professional and leadership excellence of Kansas educators for quality education.”</p> <p>1992: The state legislature mandated the inservice program for all districts in Kansas and required each district provide at least two inservice days for the 1992-93 school year and at least three days in the 1993-94 school year.</p> <p>1994: Three hundred thirty seven educational agencies in Kansas developed five-year staff development plans and received approval from KSBE.</p>	<p>1989: KSBE determined its strategic direction for providing quality instruction in Kansas.</p> <p>1991: Adoption of Quality Performance Accreditation (QPA) process with its four basic components: (1) school and district outcomes related to the process of continuous improvement (2) community based programs/the learning community concept (3) world-class standards of academic performance through mastery of essential skills (4) human resource development/staff training and retraining. This component required schools to develop and implement an ongoing staff development plan to support the school mission and improvement plan and demonstrate teachers’ skills in effective instructional strategies.</p> <p>1992: Issue Paper on Results-Based Staff Development endorsed by the State Board</p> <p>1993: Legislature tied QPA into the school finance law and mandated the development of school-site councils that include administrators, teachers, community and business members, and parents.</p> <p>1994: Kansas Inservice Act was amended to include the requirement of alignment of the inservice education program with the mission, academic focus, and school improvement planning process called for in QPA. Schools also had to submit an annual report with data on how schools were doing on the eight state outcomes.</p> <p>1995: Annual report for QPA had to include information on levels of implementation and the means of assessment for three staff development priorities established by the schools (school improvement plan). The schools’ annual report data replaced the inservice requirement for a District Annual Update.</p> <p>1998: Beginning 1998-99 school year, all schools scheduled for their first onsite visit were required to have a results-based staff development component added to their school improvement plan.</p>	<p>1980s: Kansas educators recognize the need to reform education to meet the demands of an increasingly competitive and fast paced world.</p> <p>1989: KSBE adopted strategic directions and envisioned important changes for schools, which included a focus on the importance of training new teachers and retraining through professional development, the teachers currently practicing.</p> <p>1992: State Board of Education directed the Professional Standards Board to develop a redesign of educator preparation and licensure consistent with the Quality Performance Accreditation System (QPA).</p> <p>1996: First Draft of "Redesign of Licensure of Kansas Educators developed for public review and comment.</p> <p>1998: Regulations for the proposed new Licensure system studied and revised by the State Board of Education.</p> <p>2000: Regulations for the new licensure system approved by the State Board of Education.</p> <p>2001: SBE Goal II: Recruit, Prepare, and Retain a Competent and Caring Teacher for Every Classroom and Leader for Every School.</p> <p>2001: Kansas Professional Education and Teaching Standards Adopted by the State Board.</p> <p>2003: Kansas Licensure System goes into effect.</p> <p><small>*The term <u>license</u> means a document issued by KSBE (upon determining that an individual has demonstrated a set of endorsement outcomes) and used as a record of approval to practice as a licensed educator in Kansas. In the past, the term <u>certification</u> has been used instead of license.</small></p> <p style="text-align: right;">Revised 4/29/02—KB</p>

<p>1994-95: State Inservice Education Opportunities Act was amended: Districts were to develop policies and plans for the provision of inservice education programs: (1) based on identified needs at the individual, building and district levels; (2) offered anytime during the school year; (3) aligned with the mission, academic focus, and school improvement planning process called for in QPA</p> <p>1998: Memo and legal opinion regarding Points, Contacts Hours and RBSD</p> <p>1999: Study of Professional Development Practices in Kansas</p> <p>2002: Revised Kansas Inservice Program Regulations approved by SBE. (91-1-205 & 206 and 91-1-215--91-1-219)</p> <p><u>July 1, 2003:</u> Kansas Inservice Program Regulations officially go into effect.</p>	<p>1999: Quality Performance Accreditation Regulations revised: "Each school improvement plan shall include a result-based staff development plan focusing on the results of the instruction or training for individuals and schools</p> <p>2001: Quality Performance Accreditation Ten Year Study resulting in a report and recommendations to SBE.</p> <p>2002: A revised framework for the Kansas school accreditation system will be developed.</p>	
---	--	--