

DRAFT

INSERVICE EDUCATION FOR FLORIDA EDUCATORS: PHASE I

Purpose

The Council for Education Policy, Research and Improvement was directed by the 2004 House Appropriations Subcommittee on Education, to “evaluate the degree to which the in-service education programs of schools districts have resulted in improved student performance.” By January 15, 2005, the Council shall report the results of this investigation to the Governor, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House, and the Florida Board of Education.” This work was to be undertaken with the cooperation and utilization of the resources of the Department of Education.

Activities

The CEPRI staff undertook the study by utilizing resources at both the state, school district, and university level. Study activities included phone and personal interviews with Florida Department of Education (DOE) staff, district staff development directors/coordinators, university administrators, and regional educational consortia staff. The CEPRI staff met with Department of Education, and Florida legislative staff members determine the scope of financial resources allocated to inservice education and how these resources were utilized by the school districts. In addition, district and university staff development personnel were impaneled to address the CEPRI Council members to discuss the types of inservice activities conducted in their service areas and the impact of that training on student outcomes. The following section of the report will outline the findings from these activities.

Findings

Profiling Staff Development

At the state, district, and school level, education professionals throughout Florida have responded to the legislative call for the creation and maintenance of a high quality inservice education system that results in increased student performance. The *School Community Professional Development Act* of 2000 (Florida Statute 1012.98) called for a major revamping of the content and delivery of inservice education throughout the state, and additional provisos in 2003 placed an emphasis on the importance of literacy training, and the need to focus on the use of research-based approaches to professional development. The act had as its primary focus, creating strong linkages between teacher participation in inservice activities and improvement in student performance. The legislation has produced a number of changes in the structure and organization of inservice education. Key changes include the following:

- ◆ Every Florida teacher and school administrator must have a professional development plan that is updated annually
- ◆ Professional development plans must be based on annual performance appraisal information and student achievement data
- ◆ Professional development offerings (inservice) must be reflect the needs identified through classroom, school, district and state student achievement data, performance appraisal information and student-centered priorities
- ◆ Funding for professional development is derived from federal, state, and local sources
- ◆ Fund sources frequently mandate specific training program objectives

DRAFT

- ◆ Historically, the Florida Legislature has allocated \$36 million to school districts for teacher training. Priority areas for training include, Sunshine State Standards, classroom management, technology use, and assessment. In 2003, a new state mandate required that half of the state allocation be spent in the area of reading instruction.

Each Florida school district has a legislative mandate to develop and maintain inservice and education/training programs for instructional and non-instructional employees, based on an assessment of training needs in the district and local schools. The inservice programs are described in the district’s Master Plan for Inservice Education, which contains all the approved inservice activities or components that teachers and other certificated personnel may use in order to renew their professional certificates. The Master Plan must be updated annually by September 1st, and approved each year by the district school board.

Teachers in Florida are required to renew their professional teaching licenses (certificates) every five years. The Department of Education allows teachers the option of renewing their certificates either by taking six semester hours from a university, by earning 120 inservice credits commonly known as inservice or Master Plan points, or through a combination of semester hours and inservice points. Teachers with multiple areas of certification are given 10 years to renew all their subject areas. Table 1 illustrates the amount and categories of inservice education teachers and school administrators engaged in during the 2002-2003 school year.

Table 1. Inservice Hours for Teachers and School Administrators, 2002-2003

Inservice Area	No. of Hours
Language Arts	154,729
Mathematics	148,725
Reading	481,920
Science	100,994
Social Studies	42,843
Instructional Methodology	2,614,988
Technology	982,806
Assessment and Data Analysis	230,806
Classroom Management	179,785
School Safety/Safe Learning Environment	150,529
Management/Leadership Planning	820,924
General Support	1,199,890
Computer Education	3,835
Non-Core Academic Areas	1,517,618
TOTAL:	8,630,392

Source: FLDOE Division of Public Schools (2003)

In 2003, there were 157,981 instructional staff members (teachers, guidance counselors, media specialists, etc.) and 9,714 administrators (assistant principals, principals, etc.) in Florida public schools. A total of 8,630,661 hours of inservice education were reported, which equates to 51.6 hours per teacher. The top three areas of inservice were Instructional Methodology (32%), Non-Core Academic Areas (19%) and General Support (15%). These three areas comprised 66% of all inservice education.

DRAFT

F.S. 1012.98 created additional requirements for staff development that would result in a more coordinated system of training for education professionals. Among these additional requirements were the following:

- Districts to design a system of professional development
- DOE to approve the professional development systems
- Linkages among professional development activities, student and instructional personnel needs, school improvement plans, annual school reports, student achievement data and personnel performance appraisal data
- School principals must establish individual professional development plans (IPDP) for all instructional personnel
- Professional development offerings to focus in the areas of:
 - Subject/content teaching methods, especially reading
 - Sunshine State Standards
 - Technology
 - Assessment and data analysis
 - Classroom management
 - School Safety
 - Family Involvement

Individual Professional Development Plans

Prior to the enactment of F.S. 1012.98, the responsibility for obtaining the necessary training hours for certificate renewal was the independent responsibility of each individual teacher, with little to no input from school administrators, and no requirement that the training activities relate to the instructional needs at the school. With this legislation came the requirement that school principals establish and maintain an individual professional development plan (IPDP) for each teacher at the school, with a portion of the plan including some type of inservice education activity. Specifically, the IPDP must:

- be related to specific performance data for the students to whom the teacher is assigned.
- define the inservice objectives and specific measurable improvements expected in student performance as a result of the inservice activity.
- include an evaluation component that determines the effectiveness of the professional development plan.

Samples of the forms from various districts in Florida can be found in Appendix D.

Funding of Inservice Education

The state of Florida allocates \$36 million dollars for teacher training on a per-FTE dollar amount. Table 2, illustrating the per-district allocation is provided on the following page. These funds serve to support a number of inservice education activities, and since 2003, 50% of the funds have gone exclusively for the support of literacy training. State funds however, are not the only source of revenue for staff development. The federal government partially or fully funds numerous instructional programs, and a portion of the funding for each of these programs is used for teacher training. The following is a partial listed of the federally funded education programs that include dollars dedicated to teacher training:

DRAFT

Improving America's Schools Act (P.L. 103-382, amends ESEA of 1965)

- Title I: Helping Disadvantaged Children Meet High Standards
- Title II: Dwight D. Eisenhower Professional-Development Program
- Title III: Technology for Education
- Title IV: Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities
- Title VI: Innovative Education Program Strategies
- Reading Excellence Act (amends Title II, ESEA of 1965)
- Goals 2000: Educate American Act
- Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)
 - Part B
 - Part D
 - Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education
 - Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA)
 - Community and Adult Basic Education Programs of Instruction
 - Technology Literacy Challenge Grant
 - Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration Program

A total of \$181,939,051.90 was spent on staff development during the 2002-2003 school year from all fund sources, which equates to an average of \$1,151.66 per person. In attempting to sort out what specific inservice education programs are funded from what sources, there is the dilemma that state and federal funds jointly support many educational programs and the accompanying training activities. Getting an accurate picture of funding for inservice education is one of the challenges that will be discussed in greater detail in the second phase of this report.

DRAFT

Table 2. Sources of Funding for Staff Development

District	General Fund	Special Revenue	Misc.	TOTAL
Alachua	\$ 1,080,428.42	\$ 614,431.64	\$ -	\$ 1,694,860.06
Baker	\$ 57,266.98	\$ 186,281.83	\$ -	\$ 243,548.81
Bay	\$ 552,405.07	\$ 898,525.46	\$ -	\$ 1,450,930.53
Bradford	\$ 27,751.88	\$ 85,838.08	\$ -	\$ 113,589.96
Brevard	\$ 1,081,187.95	\$ 2,062,795.04	\$ -	\$ 3,143,982.99
Broward	\$ 10,432,234.70	\$ 6,932,317.17	\$ -	\$ 17,364,551.87
Calhoun	\$ 21,115.91	\$ 60,106.94	\$ -	\$ 81,222.85
Charlotte	\$ 689,824.60	\$ 332,945.36	\$ -	\$ 1,022,769.96
Citrus	\$ 388,128.05	\$ 513,185.14	\$ -	\$ 901,313.19
Clay	\$ 981,453.35	\$ 372,640.05	\$ -	\$ 1,354,093.40
Collier	\$ 2,795,191.00	\$ 1,953,137.00	\$ -	\$ 4,748,328.00
Columbia	\$ 412,226.66	\$ 283,913.00	\$ -	\$ 696,139.66
Dade	\$ 9,357,972.76	\$ 21,793,703.08	\$ -	\$ 31,151,675.84
DeSoto	\$ 63,347.62	\$ 99,881.43	\$ -	\$ 163,229.05
Dixie	\$ 65,317.98	\$ 119,125.37	\$ -	\$ 184,443.35
Duval	\$ 7,027,241.45	\$ 9,860,622.06	\$ -	\$ 16,887,863.51
Escambia	\$ 1,841,133.43	\$ 1,516,381.88	\$ -	\$ 3,357,515.31
Flagler	\$ 323,454.62	\$ 186,771.98	\$ -	\$ 510,226.60
Franklin	\$ -	\$ 8,598.67	\$ -	\$ 8,598.67
Gadsden	\$ 183,638.52	\$ 393,944.31	\$ -	\$ 577,582.83
Gilchrist	\$ 18,706.82	\$ 11,347.06	\$ -	\$ 30,053.88
Glades	\$ 29,219.40	\$ 30,066.43	\$ -	\$ 59,285.83
Gulf	\$ 145,565.25	\$ 54,182.82	\$ -	\$ 199,748.07
Hamilton	\$ 249,940.38	\$ 167,362.89	\$ -	\$ 417,303.27
Hardee	\$ 98,997.10	\$ 267,652.23	\$ -	\$ 366,649.33
Hendry	\$ 181,304.09	\$ 46,220.74	\$ -	\$ 227,524.83
Hernando	\$ 1,058,234.76	\$ 677,654.16	\$ -	\$ 1,735,888.92
Highlands	\$ 501,974.57	\$ 779,216.44	\$ -	\$ 1,281,191.01
Hillsborough	\$ 3,828,868.99	\$ 4,096,300.87	\$ -	\$ 7,925,169.86
Holmes	\$ 23,912.14	\$ 69,659.03	\$ -	\$ 93,571.17
Indian River	\$ 455,068.61	\$ 291,722.89	\$ -	\$ 746,791.50
Jackson	\$ 203,750.23	\$ 291,210.64	\$ -	\$ 494,960.87
Jefferson	\$ 25,845.06	\$ 121,935.06	\$ -	\$ 147,780.12
Lafayette	\$ 9,073.71	\$ 26,702.85	\$ -	\$ 35,776.56
Lake	\$ 1,379,543.00	\$ 825,044.00	\$ -	\$ 2,204,587.00
Lee	\$ 2,319,892.84	\$ 3,254,735.62	\$ -	\$ 5,574,628.46
Leon	\$ 574,791.47	\$ 1,523,867.46	\$ -	\$ 2,098,658.93
Levy	\$ 215,391.76	\$ 207,150.96	\$ -	\$ 422,542.72
Lilberty	\$ 25,611.10	\$ 35,199.97	\$ -	\$ 60,811.07

DRAFT

Table 2. Sources of Staff Development Funding (Cont.)

District	General Fund	Special Revenue	Misc.	TOTAL
Madison	\$ 29,649.22	\$ 20,308.65	\$ -	\$ 49,957.87
Manatee	\$ 2,579,700.01	\$ 1,339,996.58	\$ -	\$ 3,919,696.59
Marion	\$ 2,316,038.78	\$ 1,601,227.03	\$ -	\$ 3,917,265.81
Martin	\$ 359,149.12	\$ 387,912.15	\$ -	\$ 747,061.27
Monroe	\$ 238,912.91	\$ 127,801.35	\$ -	\$ 366,714.26
Nassau	\$ 302,012.01	\$ 194,027.12	\$ -	\$ 496,039.13
Okaloosa	\$ 498,561.96	\$ 131,200.30	\$ -	\$ 629,762.26
Okechobee	\$ 288,483.84	\$ 176,027.09	\$ -	\$ 464,510.93
Orange	\$ 7,253,889.41	\$ 7,682,817.89	\$ 28,165.94	\$ 14,964,873.24
Osceola	\$ 1,434,077.03	\$ 784,529.74	\$ -	\$ 2,218,606.77
Palm Beach	\$ 5,641,973.77	\$ 6,336,377.25	\$ -	\$ 11,978,351.02
Pasco	\$ 7,355,943.11	\$ 2,234,942.29	\$ -	\$ 9,590,885.40
Pinellas	\$ 2,794,860.31	\$ 2,661,310.71	\$ -	\$ 5,456,171.02
Polk	\$ 1,057,350.87	\$ 2,530,001.24	\$ -	\$ 3,587,352.11
Putnam	\$ 69,631.77	\$ 104,610.14	\$ -	\$ 174,241.91
St. Johns	\$ 608,458.06	\$ 497,054.20	\$ -	\$ 1,105,512.26
St. Lucie	\$ 545,283.93	\$ 656,615.37	\$ -	\$ 1,201,899.30
Santa Rosa	\$ 355,146.93	\$ 423,684.59	\$ -	\$ 778,831.52
Sarasota	\$ 820,371.85	\$ 1,438,463.45	\$ 88,756.97	\$ 2,347,592.27
Seminole	\$ 734,745.00	\$ 955,697.00	\$ -	\$ 1,690,442.00
Sumpter	\$ 238,837.16	\$ 240,397.42	\$ -	\$ 479,234.58
Suwannee	\$ 300,778.02	\$ 105,306.66	\$ -	\$ 406,084.68
Taylor	\$ 43,317.10	\$ 118,939.55	\$ -	\$ 162,256.65
Union	\$ 19,626.01	\$ 12,933.21	\$ -	\$ 32,559.22
Volusia	\$ 2,822,699.00	\$ 1,942,447.00	\$ -	\$ 4,765,146.00
Wakulla	\$ 71,622.66	\$ 24,300.14	\$ -	\$ 95,922.80
Walton	\$ 96,187.38	\$ 293,172.28	\$ -	\$ 389,359.66
Washington	\$ 78,518.22	\$ 64,813.31	\$ -	\$ 143,331.53
Total:	\$ 87,682,837.67	\$ 94,139,291.32	\$ 116,922.91	\$ 181,939,051.90

Source: Florida Department of Education

Florida Department of Education and the Professional Development System Evaluation Protocol

Over the past four years, there has been a concentrated effort at the state level to reframe the context and content of inservice education in the state. In 2000, Florida Statute 1012.98, the *School Community Professional Development Act*, was enacted requiring the Department of Education to design methods by which school districts may evaluate and improve professional development systems. The evaluation process required by the new legislation has come to be known as the Professional Development System Evaluation Protocol. The system is based on standards established by the National Staff Development Council (NSDC) and is designed for use by the DOE during on-site visits in school districts, by district staff in preparation for site visits, and by school staff and School Advisory Councils for self-assessment. All school districts are participating in a review of its professional development system by the Department of Education through a multi-year site visit schedule. A basic systems approach is used in the reviews that address the following questions:

DRAFT

- **Planning** – What planning occurs to organize and support the professional development for teachers?
- **Delivery** – How and how well is the professional development delivered to teachers?
- **Follow-Up** – What follow-up is provided to ensure that teachers use the skills and knowledge gained through the delivered professional development?
- **Evaluation** – What evaluation occurs to ensure that the professional development resulted in teacher use in the classroom and improvements in student learning as a direct outcome?
-

Tables 3 through 5 on the following pages illustrate the key components of the standards.

A site visit to a school district includes:

- A. Interviews with district-level staff
- B. Reviews of documents relating to the district's professional development system, including school improvement plans, annual performance appraisal data, annual school reports and student achievement data.
- C. Reviews of memos and directives to school principals concerning the System.
- D. Site visits to selected schools at all levels where reviewers interview principals, school advisory council chairs, selected teachers and review individual professional development plans for instructional personnel.

The Department generates a report for the school district that documents the results of the site visit, areas of strength and any areas in need of improvement. Numerical results are presented as a district rating for each standard at each level of the System.

An examination of a 2004 DOE school district review found that the district received specific feedback on areas of strength and areas that need improvement based on the standards in the professional development Protocol. Areas of strength were identified as follows:

- ◆ District Level Standards – Content, Time Resources, Dollar Resources, Coordinated Records, Leadership, Growing the Organization, Student Gains.
- ◆ School Level Standards – Reviewing Professional Development Plans, Coordinating with School Improvement Plan, Content, Coordinated Records.
- ◆ Faculty Level Standards – Content, Coordinated Records.

DRAFT

Table 3. Standards for Professional Development : Planning

Professional Development Protocol Standards Matrix: District, School, Faculty Levels: Planning		
District	School	Faculty
<p>District Needs Assessment: The district conducts an annual needs assessment that includes a school-by-school analysis of disaggregated student achievement data by content area and skills and surveys or other methods of collecting data from faculty and staff in all schools on areas of need for professional development.</p>	<p>School Needs Assessment: The school conducts an annual needs assessment that includes a classroom-by-classroom analysis of disaggregated student achievement data by content area and skills and surveys or other methods of collecting data from all faculty and staff on areas of need for professional development.</p>	<p>Individual Needs Assessment: The faculty member reviews classroom-level reports of disaggregated student achievement data by content area and skills in addition to school initiatives, the School Improvement Plan, teacher certification needs, professional growth interests, and other information to identify individual needs for additional professional development.</p>
	<p>Reviewing Annual Performance Appraisal Data: The school administrator reviews the results from annual performance appraisals of faculty and uses these results in determining professional development for individual faculty members and the school.</p>	<p>Priority of Needs: First priority in determining professional development is given to needs identified through disaggregated classroom-level student achievement data.</p>
	<p>Coordinating with SIP: The planning process for school-level professional development is conducted in conjunction with and considers needs, goals, and objectives identified in the School Improvement Plan to meet Goal 3, including training needed for school-wide or content area changes and improvements.</p>	<p>Individual Professional Development Plan: The Individual Professional Development Plan (IPDP) is directly related to specific student performance data for those areas to which the teacher is assigned, contains clearly defined training objectives, specifies measurable improvement in student performance resulting from the training activity, and includes an evaluation component documenting the expected student performance gains.</p>

DRAFT

Table 3. Standards for Professional Development : Planning (Cont.)

Professional Development Protocol Standards Matrix: District, School, Faculty Levels: Planning		
District	School	Faculty
	<p>Generating a School-wide Professional Development System: As part of the School Improvement Plan, the school administrator and School Advisory Council generate a school-wide Professional Development System that is aligned and linked with disaggregated student achievement data, student and instructional personnel needs, School Improvement Plans, annual performance appraisal data for teachers and administrators, annual school reports, and school and district strategic planning.</p>	
<p>Content: Training activities in the district’s Professional Development System focus primarily on the Sunshine State Standards, subject content, teaching methods, technology, assessment and data analysis, classroom management, and school safety.</p>	<p>Content: Training activities specified in the school’s professional development system focus primarily on the Sunshine State Standards, subject content, teaching methods, technology, assessment and data analysis, classroom management, and school safety.</p>	<p>Content: Training activities in the plan focus primarily on the Sunshine State Standards, subject content, teaching methods, technology, assessment and data analysis, classroom management, and school safety.</p>
	<p>Learning Communities: The school organizes adults into learning communities whose goals are aligned with those of the school and district.</p>	<p>Learning Communities: The faculty member participates in learning communities of adults whose goals are aligned with those of the school and district.</p>

DRAFT

Table 4. Standards for Professional Development: Delivery

Professional Development Protocol Standards Matrix: District, School, Faculty Levels: Delivery		
District	School	Faculty
Relevance of Professional Development: The training objectives of the delivered training reflect directly the student achievement objectives of the school district and specify the outcome expectations of course offerings.	Relevance of Professional Development: The training objectives of the delivered training reflect directly the objectives specified in the school's Professional Development System.	Relevance of Professional Development: The training objectives of the delivered training reflect directly the objectives specified in the IPDP
Learning Strategies: The training uses learning strategies appropriate to the intended goal that apply knowledge of human learning and change including modeling effective teaching practices as well as practice and feedback.	Learning Strategies: The training uses learning strategies appropriate to the intended goal that apply knowledge of human learning and change including modeling effective teaching practices as well as practice and feedback.	Learning Strategies: The training uses learning strategies appropriate to the intended goal that apply knowledge of human learning and change including modeling effective teaching practices as well as practice and feedback.
Sustained Training. Training delivered is sufficiently sustained and intense to ensure mastery of the needed skills by the participants.	Sustained Training. Training delivered is sufficiently sustained and intense to ensure mastery of the needed skills by the participants.	Sustained Training. Training delivered is sufficiently sustained and intense to ensure mastery of the needed skills by the faculty member.
Use of Technology: Training is delivered through a variety of technologies that support individual learning.	Use of Technology: Training is delivered through a variety of technologies that support individual learning.	Use of Technology: Training is delivered through a variety of technologies that support individual learning.
Time Resources: Sufficient time resources are available to implement the planned professional development.	Time Resources: Sufficient time resources are available to implement the planned professional development	Time Resources: Sufficient time resources are available to implement the planned professional development
Dollar Resources: Sufficient dollar resources are available to implement the planned professional development.	Dollar Resources: Sufficient dollar resources are available to implement the planned professional development	
Coordinated Records: The district maintains up-to-date records for all professional development including certification and inservice points that is easily accessible by school faculty and administrators.	Coordinated Records: The school administrators can easily access the district-maintained up-to-date records for all professional development including certification and inservice points for school faculty and administrators.	Coordinated Records: The school faculty can easily access the district-maintained up-to-date records for all professional development including certification and inservice points
Leadership: The district recognizes and supports professional development as a key strategy for supporting significant improvements.		
Growing the Organization: The district seeks out and fosters professional development and promotion for employees with potential.		

Table 5. Standards for Professional Development: Evaluation

DRAFT

Professional Development Protocol Standards Matrix: District, School, Faculty Levels: Evaluation		
District	School	Faculty
<p>Implementing the System: The district conducts a formal evaluation of professional development that documents the extent to which planned professional development was implemented, and information on the extent of participation across schools and subgroups</p>	<p>Implementing the System: The school conducts an evaluation that documents that the school-wide Professional Development System was implemented as written or revised and that faculty members applied the newly learned knowledge and skills in the classroom.</p>	<p>Implementing the Plan: The faculty member and school administrator conduct an evaluation that documents that the IPDP was implemented as written or revised and the faculty member applied the newly learned knowledge and skills in the classroom.</p>
<p>Transfer into Classroom: At least 10% of the professional development conducted throughout the district will include a formal evaluation documenting that faculty members applied the newly learned knowledge and skills in the classroom.</p>		
<p>Student Changes: The evaluation documents that the professional development accessed contributed to expected student performance gains.</p>	<p>Student Changes: The evaluation documents that the professional development accessed contributed to expected student performance gains.</p>	<p>Student Changes: The faculty member documents the professional development accessed contributed to expected student performance gains.</p>
<p>Evaluation Methods: Evaluations of the effect of training on student achievement are demonstrated through standardized achievement tests when available or through other achievement measures such as district achievement tests, teacher-constructed tests, action research, and checklists of performance when appropriate.</p>	<p>Evaluation Methods: Evaluations of the effect of training on student achievement are demonstrated through standardized achievement tests when available or through other achievement measures such as district achievement tests, teacher-constructed tests, portfolios, action research, and checklists of performance when appropriate.</p>	<p>Evaluation Methods: Evaluations of the effect of training on student achievement are demonstrated through standardized achievement tests when available or through other achievement measures such as district achievement tests, teacher-constructed tests, portfolios, and checklists of performance when appropriate.</p>
		<p>Action Research: Evaluations of the effect of training are incorporated into pilot studies and action research conducted by the teacher.</p>

DRAFT

Table 5. Standards for Professional Development: Evaluation (Cont.)

Professional Development Protocol Standards Matrix: District, School, Faculty Levels: Evaluation		
District	School	Faculty
<p>Use of Results: The district uses the results of the district-level evaluation as part of the needs assessment process for the next school year’s district professional development planning process and to discontinue professional development if it does not demonstrate improvements in student performance.</p>	<p>Use of Results: The school administrator and SAC use the results of the school-level evaluation as part of the needs assessment process for the next school year’s professional development planning process and to discontinue professional development if it does not demonstrate improvements in student performance.</p>	<p>Use of Results: The faculty member uses the results of the IPDP evaluation as part of the needs assessment process for the next school year’s IPDP development and to discontinue professional development if it does not demonstrate improvements in student performance.</p>
<p>Expenditures: The district documents the total expenditure of resources for professional development and is in compliance with f.s. 1012.98 and any proviso language governing the state supported categorical professional development activities. Expenditures include a breakdown by these categories: Sunshine State Standards, subject content, teaching methods, technology, assessment and data analysis, classroom management, and school safety, and family involvement.</p>	<p>Expenditures: The school administrator documents the total expenditure of resources for professional development and is in compliance with f.s. 1012.98 and any proviso language supported categorical professional development activities. Expenditures include a breakdown by these categories: Sunshine State Standards, subject content, teaching methods, technology, assessment and data analysis, classroom management, and school safety, and family involvement.</p>	
<p>Student Gains: The district demonstrates and overall increase in student achievement as measured by the Department’s school grading system.</p>		

Source: Florida Department of Education

The DOE trained on-site review team members and in March, 2003, began conducting on-site reviews. 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. Once a school district has gone through a review, a number of resources are available to aid them in efforts to enhance their professional development programs. These resources include:

- Training on the use of the protocols
- Online resources, support from NSDC staff
- Ongoing training in the area of Evaluation
- Regional technical assistance sessions
- Training in the areas of Learning Communities and Action Research
- Templates of checklists adapted for PDA’s

Early overall results revealed that planning and delivery were strengths at all three levels (district, school, faculty), while improvement is needed in the areas of inservice follow-up and evaluation.

DRAFT

The first series of on-site program reviews utilizing the protocols produced a number of districts cited for “best practices” in inservice education. The Department of Education produced a list of these “best practices” entitled, *Promising Practices in Professional Development*. See Appendix A-C for a complete listing of the practices.

Other Agencies for Training

In addition to the training divisions embedded in every school district in Florida, professional development is delivered through other sources, including educational consortia, university centers, and private centers. The educational consortia in Florida are represented by four agencies, The North Florida Educational Consortium (NEFEC), the Crown Consortium, the Panhandle Area Educational Consortium (PAEC), and Heartland Consortia. These four consortia serve mainly small and rural districts throughout the state and provide both instructional and administrative training for their member districts. Table 6 provides a brief overview of the mission and services of each of the consortia

In 1998, the Florida Learning Alliance (FLA) was created for the purpose of increasing academic achievement of students in small and rural districts in Florida. Heartland, NEFEC, and PAEC consortia, along with the Florida Virtual School comprise the alliance, and represent 117 high schools and middle schools and 112 elementary schools in 34 small and rural school districts around the state. Funded through a 5-year, \$10 million grant from the U.S. Department of Education Technology Innovation Challenge Grant, FLA’s goal is to develop a telecommunications network, course offerings, teacher training and other benefits to enhance the educational programs in these rural school districts. The six core goals of FLA are:

1. To eliminate the urban rural disparity in educational opportunities;
2. To connect all schools in the three educational consortia to a sustainable distance education infrastructure, professional staff development process, and educational technology;
3. To link the three educational consortia, the Florida Department of Education, and the Florida Virtual School in an alliance that increases their influence on achieving equal opportunity;
4. To provide teachers and students with learning models that facilitate the use of technology in acquiring new skills and knowledge;
5. To ensure access to relevant high quality professional staff development programs;
6. To provide follow-up professional staff training with implementation assistance and ongoing technical support.

DRAFT

Table 6. Overview of Florida’s Regional Consortia

	Objective	Nature of Training	Member Districts	Participating Districts
Crown Consortium	* Deliver workshops and seminars for principals, principal candidates and other educational managers/leaders (including teacher leaders, School Advisory Council members); Provide technical assistance to districts for the further development and implementation of management development systems to address state standards; Foster joint management/leadership development activities among the Department of Education, districts, and universities; Promote each district's internal capacity for building leadership; Provide human and material resources to the member districts of the Crown Consortium.	Offers Personalized Management Consulting Services and Technical Assistance to Superintendents and School Board Members, Principals, Assistant Principals, Interns, District Staff Members, Other Supervisors and Managers, Potential Educational Leaders, School Advisory Council Chairpersons and Members, and Teachers	Alachua, Baker , Bradford , Citrus, Clay, Columbia , Duval, Hamilton, Levy , Marion, Nassau , Putnam , St. Johns, Taylor , Union , and P.K. Yonge	NA
Heartland Educational Consortium	Provides services to member districts and helps districts achieve their goals and objectives through sharing ideas and resources to enhance the delivery of programs and services.	The Consortium provides services and resources in many areas: staff development in school improvement and accountability, leadership groups in curriculum and administration, training activities for all levels of school personnel, grant writing, printing, and an annual leadership conference.	Desoto, Glades, Hardee, Hendry, Highlands, and Okechobee	NA
North East Florida Educational Consortium (NEFEC)	Helps member districts cooperatively meet their educational goals and objectives by providing programs and services that individual districts would not be able to provide as effectively or as economically when acting alone.	NEFEC provides over 35 programs and services to 14 member districts, districts within the Crown Region and other small and rural districts within the state of Florida. These programs and services are administered through two divisions at NEFEC: Instructional Services and General Services.	Baker , Bradford , Columbia , Dixie, Flagler, Florida School for the Deaf & the Blind, Gilchrist, Lafayette, Levy , Nassau , P.K.Yonge , Putnam , Suwannee, and Union	NA
Panhandle Area Educational Consortium (PAEC)	The mission of PAEC is to enable all member and participating school districts to attain their goals by: *providing leadership and support services, *maximizing the use of resources, *linking schools, and *facilitating communication across the consortium.	The PAEC team in concert with the Professional Development Center (PDC) works to establish a coordinated system of profession development in traditional, broadcast, and web-based media. All activities include observable objectives for the participant and the pupil which are designed to accelerate student achievement.	Calhoun, FSU Schools, Franklin, Gadsden, Gulf, Holmes, Jackson, Jefferson, Liberty, Madison, Taylor , Wakulla, Walton, and Washington	Bay, Escambia, Hamilton, Leon, Nassau, Okaloosa, and Santa Rosa

Districts in bold are members of multiple consortia.

DRAFT

A number of universities around the state have centers dedicated to instructional and administrative training. Two such institutions are the Lastinger Center at the University of Florida in Gainesville, and the University of Central Florida Academy in Orlando. The Lastinger Center's mission is to increase academic achievement of elementary students by improving the quality of teaching, learning, leadership and parent involvement. A particular focus is on improving the performance of high poverty elementary schools in urban settings. The center was founded by Allen and Delores Lastinger through a \$4 million endowment, and implements "high quality, research-based, job-embedded" inservice education in urban schools that focuses on student achievement, teacher practice, school performance, principal leadership and parental involvement.

The University of Central Florida's Academy for Teaching, Learning and Leadership was established in 2001. It was built on a foundation of partnerships including the university's six colleges, other Florida colleges and universities, public and private K-12 schools, business and community leaders. In its outreach to K-12 schools and school districts, the UCF Academy has established a Mathematics and Science Professional Development Program (MSPD). The goals of the program are to:

- ◆ Provide high quality professional development to improve student achievement by strengthening teacher content knowledge and related pedagogy
- ◆ Build a collaborative relationship with districts and/or schools to improve communication and identify the professional development needs that will support teacher confidence and competence
- ◆ Coordinate a network of learners to support communication and collaboration, dispositions for thinking, shared expertise and reflective practice that result in increased student achievement.

To date, over 7,400 teachers have attended Academy institutes, and increased student achievement was demonstrated via completed pre- and post- tests of students of MSPD participants.

These and other professional development centers provide additional avenues for teacher training and create partnerships between and among universities and school districts.

The Schultz Center for Teaching and Learning

In its attempts to improve the content and quality of its inservice education programs, the Duval County School District has partnered with the Schultz Center, a private educational training organization, to create a model for measuring the impact of teacher participation in inservice education on student achievement. The Schultz Center has created a registration portal that captures all of the district level and school-based inservice activities into a single database. From that database, staff development personnel and school administrators can obtain inservice records by school and/or individual teacher to discover the type and amount of inservice activities that teachers have participated in over the last several years. The Schultz Center is also compiling a database that charts the staff development activities of school and district-based trainers. These activities include direct delivery of training in workshop formats, individual coaching and mentoring sessions with teachers, demonstration lessons in schools, and content area discussion groups.

DRAFT

Working with Duval County School District testing and evaluation staff and other district administrators, the Schultz Center is attempting to create a program evaluation model that will test the impact/effectiveness of specific training activities on student achievement. CEPRI is a partner in this effort, providing research services in terms of study design and methodology. The anticipated outcome of these efforts is to create a replicable research design that will allow any district with the identified data elements to test the impact of its staff development activities on student achievement.

Proposed Extension of the Study

The CEPRI staff was asked to “evaluate the degree to which the inservice education programs of schools districts have resulted in improved student performance.” In partial fulfillment of this request the staff has compiled a narrative summary of efforts at both the state and school district level to meet the goal of improving student achievement through participation in inservice education programs. The accordant changes that have come about in the delivery and implementation of inservice education since the enactment of F.S. 1012.98 have been recent and the effectiveness of these new approaches is still in the process of being evaluated. In addition, because of the complexity of the funding mechanisms used to finance inservice education, there still remains the questions of the actual dollar amount that is allocated to inservice education in each of the 67 Florida public school districts. The following is a list of study extension proposals for activities that will seek to answer these questions:

1. Contact staff development directors and other appropriate district personnel in school districts that have completed the first cycle of on-site reviews using the Professional Development System Evaluation Protocols and gather data on the evidence of improved student performance based on staff development participation/practices.
2. Continue attempts to get a more accurate accounting of staff development dollars by contacting the Auditor General’s office to determine what cost accounting reports are submitted by school districts detailing their staff development expenditures.
3. Continue to work with Schultz Center and Duval County School District personnel to develop a model for measuring the effectiveness of staff development in terms of improved student achievement.
4. Conduct a detailed and descriptive analysis of the staff development funding mechanisms in a representative sample of Florida school districts.
5. Identify “best practices” in staff development that positively impact student achievement, particularly in low-performing schools/districts.

With the successful completion of these proposed activities, CEPRI will have a comprehensive picture of the impact of selected staff development activities on student achievement, as well as a profile of the financial efforts that contribute to these activities. In addition, CEPRI, in collaboration with the Schultz Center, will develop a model for determining the effectiveness of particular inservice education activities on raising student achievement scores.