

Summary of Professional Development District On-Site Reviews 2002-2003

During 2002-03, implementation of the Professional Development Protocol focused on preparing teams of reviewers; providing technical assistance to districts in the area of evaluation, specifically regarding the assessment of the impact of staff development on students; and creating a process for reporting of data collected through the district on-site reviews. Five on-site reviews for district professional development systems were conducted in spring 2003. A four point rating system (1- Unacceptable; 2- Marginal; 3- Good; 4- Excellent) was used to measure the quality of the professional development system in the areas of planning, delivery, follow-up and evaluation at the district, school and faculty levels.

A summary of findings for the five district systems reviewed was completed. According to the data collected there are several standards on which all five districts scored 3 (Good) or above at the district level. In the category of *planning*, all five districts had ratings of 4 (Excellent) in the area of Content. This indicates that the training activities in the districts' Professional Development Systems focus primarily on the Sunshine State Standards, subject content, teaching methods, technology, assessment and data analysis, classroom management, and school safety. In the category of *delivery*, all districts scored 3 (Good) or higher in the following areas: relevance of professional development, learning strategies, sustained training, dollar resources, coordinated records, and leadership. These data suggest that the districts' professional development offerings reflect the student achievement objectives of the school district, appropriate learning strategies are used; training delivered is sufficiently sustained to ensure mastery by participants; sufficient dollar resources are available; staff development records are up-to-date and the district supports professional development as a key strategy for supporting improvement efforts. In the *follow-up* category, all five districts scored 3 (Good) or better in the area of follow-up coordination which means follow-up services provided across multiple schools receiving training are effective.

At the school level, there are three areas in which all district ratings were fairly low, suggesting that technical assistance is needed. These include Reviewing Annual Performance Data and Learning Communities (*planning* category), both of which had mean scores of 2.2 (Marginal), and Web-Based Resources and Assistance (*follow-up* category), which had a mean score of 2.1 (Marginal). Concerning the review of annual performance data, this standard examines whether the school administrator reviews the results from annual performance appraisals for faculty and uses these results in determining the professional development to be planned for individual faculty members as well as those to be planned for the school. Another weakness in planning was in the organization of learning communities at the school level. Additionally, improvement is needed in providing faculty and school administrators with follow-up web-based resources and assistance related to training completed. In general, across all standards and indicators there were no areas at the school level in which all districts had scores of 3.0 and above, indicating that there are gaps in district professional development services directed to schools.

At the faculty level, there are four areas in which all district ratings were fairly low. Under the category of *planning*, both Individual Professional Development Plan and Learning Communities had ratings averaging around 2.0 (Marginal). These results indicate that improvement is needed in relating the Individual Professional Development Plan for teachers to specific student performance data and in aligning training objectives for professional development activities planned for teachers and the evaluation of the impact of these training goals on student performance. Under the category of *follow-up*, web-based resources and assistance had a mean rating of 2.1 (Marginal) at the faculty level. Therefore, there is an apparent need for districts' to target web-based resources and assistance related to training completed to school administrators and faculty. In the category of *evaluation*, action research had an average rating of 1.4 (Unacceptable) across the five districts which suggests that evaluations on the effect of training accessed by teachers is not incorporated into pilot studies or action research efforts.

The implications for technical assistance efforts in the area of professional development are clear. The areas of individual professional development plans, learning communities, web-based resources and action research will be

targeted as areas for improvement and assistance. Best practices in the areas of planning and delivery will be recognized and shared with other staff developers through our educator portal, teachinflorida.com and regional technical assistance sessions.