

INSERVICE EDUCATION FOR FLORIDA EDUCATORS

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

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 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 meetings and interviews with the various inservice education constituencies produced a number of findings regarding the content, delivery and impact of inservice education in Florida. The findings from each of these groups are delineated in the following sections.

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 included annual assessment of student achievement data. If the data indicates progress, the DOE identifies the best practices that contributed to the improvement in student performance. If the DOE review indicates a lack of progress, technical assistance is provided to the district, plus a requirement that the district(s) employ a different system of professional development. The following is a list of the additional requirements of F.S. 1012.98:

- 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

The evaluation process required by the new legislation has come to 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. The standards assess three levels of professional development: faculty, school, and school district. The components of the standards are planning, delivery, follow-up, and evaluation of professional development. The following table illustrates this standards matrix at the planning level:

Table 1. 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>Generating a District-wide Professional Development System: Based on the needs assessment, the district generates a district-wide Professional Development System that is aligned and linked with disaggregated</p>	<p>Reviewing Professional Development Plans: The school administrator determines the extent to which each training activity on each IPDP for the previous year accomplished the student performance gains that were</p>	<p>Administrator Review. The faculty member meets with the school administrator to determine any additional training needs based on performance appraisal data and school or grade level priorities.</p>

student achievement data, student and instructional personnel needs, School Improvement Plans, annual performance appraisal data for teachers and administrators, annual school reports, and district strategic planning.	predicted to result from the training activity, and identifies any unmet needs or undelivered training.	
	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.	Priority of Needs: First priority in determining professional development is given to needs identified through disaggregated classroom-level student achievement data.
	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 or improvement.	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.
	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.	
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.	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.	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.
Learning Communities: The school organizes adults into learning communities whose goals are aligned with those of the school and district.	Learning Communities: The faculty member participates in learning communities of adults whose goals are aligned with those of the school and district.	

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.

The Protocols provided nationally-recognized standards for the planning, delivery and assessment of inservice education, with a particular focus on its impact on student achievement. Through their uniform application to all Florida school districts, they provide a common platform for articulation of best practices across the state. They also allow for better utilization of state and district fiscal and human resources toward school improvement efforts.

In 2003, additional provisions were added to F.S. 1012.98. Most notably were the requirements that 50% of the categorical funding for staff development provided by the state was to be spent on activities related to reading instruction, that funded inservice programs must be research-based, and that “family involvement” be added to content area topics.

District and School-Based Inservice Activities

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.

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.

Towards meeting the goal of improved student performance, districts and schools have increased their focus on standards and the alignment of curriculum practices with the standards through their inservice activities. There has been a steady movement away from isolated, one-time training events, in favor of focused, school-based training activities featuring highly skilled veteran teachers, instructing, demonstrating, and modeling best practices in effective content area instruction, particularly in the areas of literacy and mathematics. Model classrooms have been established in many schools with class schedules structured in such a way as to allow other teachers to observe demonstration lessons in proven techniques for reading and math instruction. District-based training personnel conduct on-site school visits as follow-up activities to training events. These visits include observation and coaching of teaching performance to increase the learning transfer from the inservice activity to classroom practice.

Making the Connection: Palm Beach County's Successful Professional Development Formula

Many of Florida's school districts have restructured the content and delivery of inservice education for greater emphasis on the transfer of learning from the training event to the classroom. Palm Beach County School District has developed a system for its cadre of district and school-based trainers to increase the impact of training on student performance. Palm Beach's *Successful Professional Development Formula* is illustrated below and depicts the roles of the professional development facilitator throughout the training process from training event to student outcomes.

Table 2. Successful Professional Development Formula

A	+	B	+	C	=
The Learning Episode		Transfer of Knowledge Implementation/ Follow-Up		Assessment of Learning	
Your Role as a Facilitator: <i>Planning</i> <i>Delivery</i> Pre-assess skills Ask if the training relates to participants' goals <i>Follow-Up</i> Plan for transfer of learning to job site		Your Role as a Facilitator: <i>Follow-Up</i> Plan for transfer of learning to job site Coaching and mentoring as needed to ensure transfer of knowledge and skills Coordinate follow-up Set timelines for completion of follow-up		Your Role as a Facilitator: <i>Evaluation</i> Complete the component evaluation including analysis of impact on job performance and/or student achievement Use evaluation form to plan future professional development	

**Impact
&
Value**

In addition to providing this matrix for trainers, the district also created a rubric for the creation and maintenance of professional learning communities in the schools. Built on work previously created by the National Staff Development Council and Broward County and Milwaukee School Districts, Palm Beach County's rubric focuses on six dimensions: shared vision/values/norms, shared and supportive leadership, shared educational goals, collective learning and application, reflective practice, supportive structures. Each dimension has four levels, 1-institutionalization; 2-implementation; 3-initiation; 4-orientation, with Level 1 being the highest. Team members making up the learning community at each school review and discuss each of the dimensions and the accompanying proficiency levels, and rate each dimension based on the practices at their schools. The following is an example rubric for the "Reflective Practice" dimension.

Table 3. Professional Learning Community Innovation Configuration

Dimension: Reflective Practice	Level 1 Institutionalization	Level 2 Implementation	Level 3 Initiation	Level 4 Orientation
Utilized non-defensive examination of practice Proficiency Level:_____	Learning team members formally and informally coach and mentor each other in order to provide feedback regarding practice.	Learning team members informally coach and mentor each other in order to provide feedback regarding practice.	Learning teams share practices among members.	Learning teams have no opportunity to share practices or provide feedback to each other.
Utilizes experimentation and continuous improvement Proficiency Level:_____	Learning teams engage in continual written and oral forms of reflection that create new knowledge and understanding and prompt continuous improvement.	Learning teams engage in continual written and oral forms of reflection that create new knowledge and understanding.	Learning teams engage in sporadic exploration of new knowledge and instructional strategies.	Learning teams have no opportunity to try new instructional strategies or expand on existing knowledge.

The language in the rubric reflects the emphasis on the linkage between training and classroom practices that lead to improved student performance. For each of the six dimensions, there are similar standards that range from the practices being embedded into the ordinary routines of the schools (Level 1) to the practices being slightly or not at all in evidence (Level 4).

Duval County School District: Creating a Model for Measuring Inservice Effectiveness

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.

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 replicatable research design that will allow any district with the identified data elements to test the impact of its staff development activities on student achievement.

Funding of Inservice Education

The state of Florida allocates \$36 million dollars for teacher training each year, on a per-FTE dollar amount to each school district in Florida. A chart 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:

- 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

In attempting to sort out what educational programs are funded from what sources, one encounters 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.

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
2003-2004 FEFP - Third

Categorical Programs Funding Summary

District	Instructional Materials	Student Transportation	Public School Technology	Teachers Lead Program	Teacher Training	Class Size Reduction	Total Categorical Programs
	-1-	-2-	-3-	-4-	-5-	-6-	-7-
1 Alachua	2,389,978	6,753,433	553,095	177,227	398,819	4,870,370	15,142,922
2 Baker	398,580	1,051,428	88,421	28,447	63,758	746,139	2,376,773
3 Bay	2,244,395	4,206,123	509,205	163,970	367,172	4,522,935	12,013,800
4 Bradford	323,786	941,464	73,374	24,971	52,907	638,383	2,054,885
5 Brevard	6,347,093	10,851,473	1,418,702	455,125	1,022,981	12,900,104	32,995,478
6 Broward	23,667,983	30,056,947	5,236,052	1,708,177	3,775,552	52,054,251	116,498,982
7 Calhoun	196,771	463,155	43,366	13,737	31,270	369,134	1,117,433
8 Charlotte	1,571,392	3,341,689	346,813	111,130	250,076	3,056,460	8,677,560
9 Citrus	1,337,685	3,967,189	299,540	95,247	215,989	2,577,246	8,492,896
10 Clay	2,942,588	6,255,961	605,239	189,870	436,419	5,301,566	15,731,643
11 Collier	3,836,546	7,527,676	778,113	252,302	561,073	7,589,648	20,545,358
12 Columbia	826,875	2,315,561	188,531	61,993	135,944	1,608,240	5,137,144
13 Miami-Dade	30,485,053	28,953,288	7,125,806	2,334,669	5,138,194	71,289,689	145,326,689
14 DeSoto	439,643	857,452	99,322	32,236	71,618	874,580	2,374,851
15 Dixie	179,592	586,975	41,214	13,512	29,718	364,833	1,215,844
16 Duval	11,054,649	20,904,616	2,495,142	802,538	1,799,168	22,374,633	59,430,746
17 Escambia	3,604,234	11,582,576	840,008	268,758	605,703	7,333,079	24,234,358
18 Flagler	885,219	2,571,698	163,391	50,503	117,816	1,462,143	5,250,770
19 Franklin	108,930	182,992	25,561	8,182	18,431	227,756	571,852
20 Gadsden	547,424	2,015,705	124,281	40,674	89,615	1,107,307	3,925,006
21 Gilchrist	246,919	649,723	52,892	16,735	38,139	466,599	1,471,007
22 Glades	88,153	143,396	20,139	6,711	14,522	176,876	449,797
23 Gulf	176,326	440,594	41,313	13,009	29,789	357,563	1,058,594
24 Hamilton	168,961	400,846	39,023	12,439	28,138	336,812	986,219
25 Hardee	460,547	1,123,314	100,686	32,617	72,601	874,428	2,664,193
26 Hendry	633,390	1,537,496	147,841	48,695	106,604	1,327,022	3,801,048
27 Hernando	1,879,601	4,812,306	375,586	120,783	270,823	3,233,086	10,692,385
28 Highlands	1,018,135	2,329,598	225,727	72,270	162,765	1,992,802	5,801,297
29 Hillsborough	16,367,498	38,095,616	3,479,650	1,120,980	2,509,066	32,560,784	92,133,594
30 Holmes	262,816	906,168	65,275	21,061	47,068	547,505	1,869,893
31 Indian River	1,499,202	3,027,098	318,236	102,866	229,470	2,867,895	8,044,767
32 Jackson	575,604	1,997,649	133,966	43,818	96,599	1,186,382	4,034,018
33 Jefferson	126,083	410,339	27,727	9,220	19,993	239,167	832,529
34 Lafayette	65,564	235,676	19,790	6,566	14,270	168,292	530,158
35 Lake	3,341,013	7,926,126	657,009	206,006	473,748	5,829,832	18,433,734
36 Lee	6,328,512	13,636,972	1,282,052	411,165	924,448	11,941,298	34,524,447
37 Leon	2,704,004	4,471,650	117,497	198,762	445,258	5,596,466	14,033,637
38 Levy	520,093	1,664,550	118,586	37,688	65,508	1,021,785	3,448,210
39 Liberty	114,149	324,608	26,404	8,752	19,039	253,034	745,986
40 Madison	274,331	848,423	63,286	20,376	45,633	537,694	1,789,743
41 Manatee	3,564,447	6,376,993	773,305	250,858	557,606	7,200,594	18,723,803
42 Marion	3,434,505	9,362,174	772,959	245,155	557,356	6,875,664	21,247,813
43 Martin	1,559,910	3,876,507	300,210	110,678	245,315	3,170,265	9,302,885
44 Monroe	754,510	1,606,778	175,314	57,745	126,413	1,766,877	4,487,637
45 Nassau	876,910	2,587,331	203,171	65,682	146,500	1,759,785	5,639,359
46 Okaloosa	2,549,570	5,546,757	597,287	195,514	430,685	5,267,846	14,587,659
47 Okeechobee	643,209	1,648,163	139,061	44,626	100,273	1,238,734	3,814,096
48 Orange	15,317,172	26,230,217	3,198,511	1,015,994	2,306,345	30,152,533	78,220,772
49 Osceola	4,444,929	7,596,105	849,064	270,717	612,233	7,824,811	21,597,859
50 Palm Beach	15,288,555	29,216,593	3,278,541	1,061,174	2,364,053	32,802,923	84,011,839
51 Pasco	5,284,200	12,366,279	1,100,968	357,656	793,873	9,991,609	29,894,585
52 Pinellas	9,383,513	17,441,287	2,200,483	714,955	1,586,699	20,879,316	52,206,253
53 Polk	7,352,154	19,228,633	1,821,961	520,786	1,169,545	14,386,970	44,280,049
54 Putnam	1,001,338	2,655,725	230,999	74,802	166,586	2,045,690	6,175,110
55 St. Johns	2,194,500	5,203,968	448,787	143,299	323,606	4,031,568	12,345,728
56 St. Lucie	2,976,837	8,650,232	630,726	203,553	454,797	5,652,760	18,568,905
57 Santa Rosa	2,163,947	4,780,113	465,530	147,940	335,679	3,996,880	11,890,089
58 Sarasota	3,703,199	6,885,802	772,800	247,257	557,242	7,290,741	19,457,041
59 Seminole	5,704,349	11,304,736	1,254,762	398,977	904,789	11,249,955	30,817,548
60 Sumter	630,215	1,400,310	129,725	41,722	93,541	1,121,314	3,416,827
61 Suwannee	478,007	1,485,559	110,120	35,189	79,404	934,240	3,122,519
62 Taylor	273,896	842,936	63,031	20,410	45,450	547,777	1,793,500
63 Union	177,850	469,173	41,548	13,330	29,959	353,085	1,084,945
64 Volusia	5,632,890	10,617,746	1,242,514	396,184	895,938	11,248,467	30,033,739
65 Wakulla	391,678	1,848,278	89,447	28,554	64,498	796,239	3,218,694
66 Walton	581,167	1,785,028	124,348	39,504	89,664	1,049,756	3,669,467
67 Washington	294,626	943,385	66,884	21,582	48,228	567,315	1,942,020
68 Washington Special	48,188	0	0	4,015	8,035	96,114	156,352
69 FAMU Lab School	39,513	0	9,164	2,876	6,608	79,659	137,820
70 FAU Lab School	41,427	0	9,495	3,803	6,846	87,861	149,432
71 FSU Lab School	362,946	0	43,408	13,910	31,300	379,815	831,379
72 UF Lab School	96,765	0	22,662	7,516	16,341	192,896	336,170
73 Fla Virtual School	412,718	0	40,120	0	28,929	374,777	856,544
State	227,939,157	430,326,357	49,914,766	16,099,730	36,000,000	468,198,634	1,228,478,644

DRAFT

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.