



Public Schools of North Carolina

Educator Recruitment and Development

North Carolina Evaluation System Professional Development Updates

January 2010



“We [educators] cannot say how to teach for understanding or which material and activities to use until we are quite clear about which specific understandings we are after and what such understandings look like in practice.”

- Wiggins & McTighe



Professional Development Learning Protocol

Stage 1: Identify Learning Objectives	
Established Objectives Are learning objectives linked to standards?	
Enduring Understandings What are the most important terms and concepts? What specific understanding is desired?	Essential Questions What provocative questions will foster inquiry, understanding, and transfer of learning?
<i>Participants will know...</i>	<i>Participants will be able to...</i>
Stage 2: Determine Desired Results (Evaluation Plan)	
Performance Tasks (Action Plan): Through what performance tasks will participants demonstrate the desired understandings? By what criteria will performances of understanding be judged?	Other Evidence (Pretest/Posttest): Through what other evidence will participants demonstrate achievement of the desired results? How will participants reflect upon and self-assess their learning?
Stage 3: Design Curriculum	
Learning Activities: What learning experiences and instruction achieve the desired results? Are there opportunities to rethink and revise understandings and work? Do participants evaluate their work and its implications? Is the learning tailored to the different needs, interests, and abilities of learners?	



Course and Program Alignment

All seminars, webinars and online courses align with standards and specific elements

PROGRAM ALIGNMENT:	AP	NP	LPNP	LPXP	EVAAS	PLC	RM	SAIL
Standard 1: Strategic Leadership								
a. School Vision, Mission and Strategic Goal				✓				
b. Leading Change	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓		✓
c. School Improvement Plan		✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	
d. Distributive Leadership		✓				✓		
Standard 2: Instructional Leadership								
a. Focus on Learning and Teaching, Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓
b. Focus on Instructional Time	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓		
Standard 3: Cultural Leadership								
a. Focus on Collaborative Work Environment	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓		✓
b. School Culture and Identity	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓		
c. Acknowledges Failures; Celebrates Accomplishments and Rewards	✓	✓	✓	✓				
d. Efficacy and Empowerment						✓		
Standard 4: Human Resource Leadership								
a. Professional Development/Learning Communities	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
b. Recruiting, Hiring, Placing and Mentoring of staff		✓	✓	✓			✓	
c. Teacher and Staff Evaluation	✓	✓			✓			
Standard 5: Managerial Leadership								
a. School Resources and Budget		✓	✓	✓			✓	
b. Conflict Management and Resolution	✓		✓					
c. Systematic Communication	✓	✓	✓			✓		
d. School Expectations for Students and Staff		✓						
Standard 6: External Development Leadership								
a. Parent and Community Involvement and Outreach		✓	✓	✓				
b. Federal, State and District Mandates		✓	✓	✓			✓	
Standard 7: Micro-political Leadership								
a. School Executive Micro-political Leadership		✓	✓	✓		✓		✓



Professional Development Evaluation

Immediately Following Participation

- Satisfaction Survey (Guskey Level 1)
- Leadership Competency (Guskey Level 2)
- Knowledge (Guskey Level 2)

30-60 Days after Participation

- Impact of Climate on Implementation (Guskey Level 3)
- Action Plan Progress (Guskey Level 4)
- Level of Use (Guskey Level 4)

1-2 Years after Participation

- Impact on Conditions for Teaching & Learning (Guskey Level 5A)
- Impact on Student Performance (Guskey Level 5B)



Teacher Evaluation Tool Training

Phase I and II Districts

February	Region 7/8
March	Region 5/6
April	Region 3/4
May	Region 1/2

Regional Follow-Up Sessions

1 day per region

Phase III Districts (63)

February	Region 7/8
March	Region 5/6
April	Region 3/4
May	Region 1/2

Regional Training Sessions

2 days per region



Principal Evaluation Tool Follow-Up Modules

GoToMeeting & Webinars

2 Sessions A Month

- SMART Goals
- 21st Century Skills
- Professional Learning
Communities
- Effective Teaching Practices
& Developing Teacher
Leaders

February

March

April

May

*Summer opportunities in
development - 5 options per
month*



Online Course Development

In collaboration with partner organizations, we are currently developing online courses which are aligned with standards and shall be evaluated for effectiveness

- **Teachers**
- **Principals**
- **Lateral Entry Teachers**
- **Mentor Training Modules**



Leadership Development Model

Distinguished Leadership in Practice

Curriculum Components

Component 1	(Pre-Work/Readings) Creating and Sustaining High Performing, Continuously Improving Schools (all Standards) Follow-up Activities in Using Data to Align Vision and Mission to Priority Improvement Goals (Standards 1, 2)
Component 2	Maximizing Human Resources for Goal Accomplishment (Standard 4, all others)
Component 3	Improving Teaching and Learning through the Performance Evaluation and Coaching Process (Standards 1, 2, 3, 4, 7)
Component 4	Building a Collaborative Culture through Distributed Leadership (Standards 3, 2, 4, 5, 7)
Component 5	Creating a Strong Student and Stakeholder Focus (Standards 1, 2, 3, 6, 7)
Component 6	Leading Change for Optimum School Performance (Self-Assessment & Next Steps in Professional Growth)



Actions/Tentative Timeline

October 2009	Identify partnering organizations, gain commitment for proposed model's concept, reach consensus on the model's specific design, develop selection criteria for facilitators and first cohort of participants
Oct - Nov 2009	Identify roles and responsibilities of partners
Oct - Dec 2009	Identify potential facilitators/curriculum developers
Mar - May 2010	Identify first cohort of participants (70-100)
Jan - June 2010	Complete pre-implementation curriculum development
June 2010	Prepare facilitators to deliver/lead model
July 2010	Launch model for first cohort of participants
July 2010 - June 2011	Implement model, convene facilitators and selected participants to assess, revise and refine the curriculum and model's design at each phase
November 2010	Identify facilitators for second cohort of participants
Oct - Dec 2010	Identify second cohort of participants
Mar 2011 - Feb 2012	Launch second cohort, one in each region
Jan - Dec 2011	Continue to convene facilitators to assess, revise, and refine curriculum and model's design, utilizing feedback loop
Oct - Dec 2011	Identify third cohort of participants
Mar 2012 - Feb 2013	Implement model with continued oversight for quality control
August 2013	Conduct a third-party evaluation on model's effectiveness



Instructional Alternatives



Inclusion

Consultant Model

- Special education teacher will re-teach a difficult skill or help students practice a newly acquired skill
- General education teacher is Teacher of Record (TOR)



Inclusion

Teaming Model

- Special education teacher is assigned to one grade level team
- Special education teacher provides student information, possible instructional strategies, modification ideas and behavior strategies
- General education teacher is TOR



Inclusion

Collaborative Model

- The regular and special education teacher work together to teach students in a shared classroom

Models

- Parallel Teaching
- Station Teaching
- Alternative Teaching
- Co-Teaching

Daack, 1999



Collaborative Teaching

Parallel Teaching

- Special education and general education teacher each instruct a small group
- Teachers provide instruction at the same time
- General education teacher is TOR



Collaborative Teaching

Station Teaching

- Both teachers deliver instruction
- Students switch stations
- One station for independent work
- General education teacher is TOR



Collaborative Teaching

Alternative Teaching

- One teacher manages majority of the class
- Other teacher pulls small group
- Small group changes constantly
- General education teacher is TOR



Collaborative Teaching

Co-Teaching

- Both teachers instruct at the same time
- Flexibility in instructional formats
- General education teacher is TOR



Split Schedule

- Student With Disabilities enroll in a General Ed class
- During part of the class period, student goes to a Special Education Teacher to work on IEP goals related to this course



Split Schedule

Example:

- Student is in a 90 minute block course for English 10
- Goes to a Special Education teacher for last 30 minutes of the class time.



Technology

Distance Learning

- Course is taught by a Highly Qualified Teacher
- Delivered to the special education class via TV
- The special education teacher facilitates the class, answers questions, and assists with delivery of direct instruction
- General education teacher is TOR



The North Carolina Virtual Public School

- Partnership with the Exceptional Children and Curriculum and Instruction Divisions of the Department of Public Instruction
- Develop three modular courses in science, math, and English during the Spring of 2010
- Fall 2010 rollout nine courses



What does a blended, modular model look like?

Model A

Dedicated strand of NCVPS teachers who would teach individual classes

- Archived for later use
- Deployed as needed in school systems
- NCVPS teacher would be TOR,
- OCS teacher could deploy full course, selected modules, and/or a hybrid blend of the instruction at the school site to match student IEPs and course standards



What does a blended, modular model look like?

Model B

- Co-teaching situation where the courses would be taught live (real time)
- NCVPS teacher would be TOR
- Model would be harder to scale-up
 - Sheer number of teachers that would be required
 - Would be a great model for inclusion
 - Huge waiting list to accommodate it
 - Where gaps exist, model A hybrids could occur with it



Timeline

- **December 2009**
 - Key membership/leadership identified
- **January 2010**
 - OCS, C&I And NCVPS staff identify (standards, process, etc.)
- **February 2010**
 - Reviews of existing NCVPS content for modularization, compliance gaps, universal design, etc.
- **March 2010**
 - OCS modular population recommendations



Timeline, continued

- **April 2010**
 - Full course reviews and related training for online/blended courses
- **May 2010**
 - Course quality process and testing with seed pilots
- **Summer 2010**
 - Statewide training
- **Fall 2010**
 - Ongoing training
- **Blended training throughout**
 - Virtual communities to share, draft, house, and revise content



Other Considerations

- State and Federal law require the IEP team to determine least restrictive environment (LRE) based on a continuum of placement options and individual needs.
- Decisions should continue to be made based on individual student needs, not administrative convenience

