

“READY, SET, TEACH: TOOLS FOR SUCCESS”

NEW TEACHER WORKSHOP (AUGUST 5, 2013)

TEACHER PREPARATION INITIATIVE (TPI)

John Hoover

**Teacher Preparation Initiative/ August 2013/ Induction Emphasis (Paper = RST.Eval.13.3)**

**Rebecca Krystyniak, Director**

**JHC**

“READY, SET, TEACH: TOOLS FOR SUCCESS”  
NEW TEACHER WORKSHOP (AUGUST 5,  
2013)

**Executive Summary**

*Technical issues*

1. Only raw data were organized into tables for the benefit of planners. All analyses and interpretation are presented only in this executive summary.
2. Since all that I have made available in this report are summary statements and raw data, I offer to undertake additional analyses as requested by program developers.
3. Because of a noteworthy ceiling effect, planners could seek additional variability by examining the proportion of participants and coaches that selected the highest ratings (“4”) of items tapping both quality (of activities) and professional utility.

*Sample statistics*

1. Two general conclusions appear warranted for the case of new teachers.  
(a) Members of the target audience (districts, subject areas) attended the sessions and nearly all participants (~9 in 10) completed surveys.
2. Nearly 7 in 10 new teachers matriculated at SCSU, though the sample represented a variety of institutions.
3. New teachers representing all targeted grade levels and districts attended sessions.

4. The mean years’ experience for new teachers was 1.7. First year participants = 21 (50.0), Second Year (clearly indicated) = 9 (21.4); total first + second year teachers = 30 = 71.4%. The sessions reached the intended audience.

*Significant outcomes*

1. In nearly every domain measured, new teacher participants rated both the quality of offerings and the usefulness of sessions exceptionally positively. To provide a feel for this, I note that at no time did more than 2 (of ~ 45 respondents) rate *any* event (quality or utility) lower than the scale’s midpoint.
  - Participating new teachers selected the top two choices on 95% of “quality” ratings (40/42).
  - Participating teachers selected the two top utility scores across 88% of sessions and speakers (21/24)
2. Put another way, the new teacher workshop was exceptionally well planned, organized and the presenters did a nearly uniformly good job.
3. Very few quality items received fewer than nine in ten positive responses, only the bulleted items:
  - Middle school facilitators (83%)
  - Creating implementation plans to take away (83%)
4. Only the following three utility items fell below 90% endorsement:
  - Team building at tables (88%)

- Middle school classroom management breakout sessions (80%)
- Creating implementation plans to take away (83%)

5. New teachers rated *all* goals set by project developers as having been met.
6. New teachers rated at-risk students as their first choice for future professional development (77%), followed by, in order, managing stress (58%), responsive classrooms (56%), teaching for diversity (44%), and “additional” classroom management skills (42%).

### ***Recommendations***

1. Project developers and presenters should be congratulated on the extremely high

ratings of summer events. Clearly, they proved successful. However, these results, even the utility ratings, have not yet been linked statistically with actual performance increments—of either new teachers or coaches. Thus, it might prove useful to connect developmental opportunities such as these to performance ratings. This could only occur after a month or so of experience had accrued.

2. The ratings for quality and utility proved highly correlated—even with the small degree of variability produced by the nearly universal high ratings. Thus, the utility items should be eliminated; respondents could be instructed to rate sessions for both quality and usefulness simultaneously. In addition, it may prove possible to reduce the number of items in other ways.

“READY-SET-TEACH: TOOLS FOR SUCCESS”  
NEW TEACHER WORKSHOP (AUGUST 5,  
2013)

**Method**

Unless otherwise stated, all direct-service are evaluated via asking participants to complete questionnaires designed to elicit information about the estimated quality and utility of activities held at training sessions; in addition, via the survey format, we ask participants to assess whether or not, or to what degree planners attained the goals for the project, set on an a priori basis. Finally, we have asked for input regarding future professional development topics.

Space is provided for participants to write details about their experience at the event. In addition, we elicit input about targets for upcoming events and trainings. This report is based upon data from an event held during the summer of 2013, N participating new teachers = 45).

I have laid out results as follows, unless otherwise stipulated: Means, numbers and percentages are worked into most of the tables. The datum entitled “valid percent” refers to percentages based upon the total number of respondents who answered at any level of a give item. This figure is provided unless otherwise specified. In many tables,

the “percent high quality” or “percent high utility” represents the proportion of respondents who selected either of the two highest ratings (e.g., 3 or 4 on a four-point scale). Higher values always represented more positive reactions to events and speakers.

For items related to workshop activities, respondents were requested to rate both the quality of the activity, in terms of the presentation, specifically, “...the degree to which speakers or activities retained your interest, seemed informative, and were tied to a reasonable theory or level of background information.” Utility ratings were tied to, “...the degree to which an activity struck you as immediately relevant and applicable in your professional and/or personal lives.”

We requested information about the quality of speakers’ efforts, but *not* the utility of the speakers—utility was addressed only as it related to topics.

Raw data were organized into tables for the benefit of planners. All analyses and interpretation are presented only in the executive summary. Any enquiry or extended analyses can be requested from the TPA assessment team.

**Raw Data: “Ready-Set”**

Table 1. College or University: Locus of most recently earned license.

<b><u>College or University</u></b>	<b><u>Frequency</u></b>	<b><u>Valid Percent</u></b>
SCSU	29	64.4
St. Ben's (3)/ St John's	4	8.8
Concordia	2	4.4
SMSU Marshall	2	4.4
Remaining (all with N = 1)	8	17.8
Total	45	100.0

Table 2. District of employment for new teachers.

<b><u>District</u></b>	<b><u>Frequency</u></b>	<b><u>Valid Percent</u></b>
Sauk Rapids-Rice	16	35.6
St. Cloud Area	11	24.4
Sartell- St. Stephen	8	17.8
Holdingford	4	8.9
ROCORI	2	4.4
N/A	2	4.4
Milaca	1	2.2
Monticello	1	2.2
Total	45	100.0

Table 3. Self-identified licensure domains in descending order by frequency.

<b><u>Licensure Domain</u></b>	<b><u>Frequency</u></b>	<b><u>Percent</u></b>	<b><u>Valid Percent</u></b>
Elementary	8	17.8	21.1
Early Childhood (+ECSE)	5	11.1	13.2
Special Education	5	11.1	13.2
Comm Arts & Lit	4	8.8	10.5
Mathematics	4	8.8	10.5
K-12 Music	3	6.7	7.9
World Languages	2	4.4	5.3
Secondary Science	2	4.4	5.3
Physical Education	2	4.4	5.3
English Learners	1	2.2	2.6
Social Studies	1	2.2	2.6
Technology Education	1	2.2	2.6
Total	38	84.4	100.0
Missing System	7	15.6	----
Total	45	100.0	----

Table 4. Self-identified assignment domains in reverse order by frequency.

<u>Assignment</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>
Multiple Secondary	13	28.9	30.0
Primary (K-3)	10	22.2	25.0
Early Childhood	5	11.1	12.5
Middle School (clearly noted by participant)	5	11.1	12.5
Multiple eled (k-6)	5	11.1	12.5
Intermediate (4-6)	1	2.2	2.5
Indeterminate	1	2.2	2.5
Total	40	88.9	100.0
Missing System (No R)	5	11.1	
Total	45	100.0	

Table 5. Years' experience<sup>1</sup>.

	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>
Years Exp.	42	1.7	2.9
Valid N (listwise)	42		

<sup>1</sup>First year (clearly) = 21 (50.0), Second Year (clearly indicated) = 9 (21.4), Total first + second year teachers = 30 = 71.4%

Table 6. Generic items (initial and introductory sessions) quality and utility ratings

Activities	Quality Ratings				Utility Ratings			
	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>Percent High Quality</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>Percent High Utility</u>
Team building @ tables	42	3.5	.6	95.2	41	3.27	.67	87.8
Welcome overview	43	3.5	.6	97.7	42	3.36	.53	97.6
Opening remarks (K)	45	3.7	.5	100.0	44	3.52	.55	97.7

Table 7. Quality and utility of content and breakouts for relationship building.

	Quality Ratings				Utility Ratings			
	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>Percent High Quality</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>Percent High Utility</u>
<b>Whole-group content and facilitator</b>								
Relationships (begins, never ends)	45	3.6	.5	100.0	44	3.68	.47	100
Relationships presenter	45	3.7	.5	100.0	---	----	----	----
<b>Breakout sessions related to relationship building</b>								
Break: Early childhood	7	3.7	.5	100.0	7	3.7	.5	100.0
Early Child: Facilitator	7	3.9	.4	100.0	--	----	---	-----
Break: elementary (red)	9	3.6	.5	100.0	9	3.6	.5	100.0
Elementary facilitators (red)	10	3.6	.5	100.0	--	----	---	-----
Break: Elementary (blue)	13	3.8	.4	100.0	13	3.8	.4	100.0
Elementary Facilitators (blue)	10	3.8	.4	100.0	--	----	---	-----
Break: Middle	6	3.5	.5	100.0	7	3.6	.5	100.0
Middle Facilitators	6	3.3	.8	83.3	--	----	---	-----
Break: High	12	3.8	.6	91.7	11	4.0	.0	100.0
Break: High school facilitators	10	3.9	.3	100.0	--	----	---	-----

Table 8. Quality and utility of content and breakouts for classroom management.

	Quality Ratings				Utility Ratings			
	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>Percent High Quality</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>Percent High Utility</u>
<b>Whole-group content and facilitator</b>								
Making invisible visible (content):	43	3.8	.5	97.7	42	3.8	.6	95.2
Making visible presenter	44	3.8	.4	100.0	--	----	---	-----
<b>Classroom management breakout session</b>								
Early childhood	6	3.8	.4	100.0	6	4.0	.0	100.0
Early childhood facilitator	6	4.0	.0	100.0	---	----	---	-----
Elementary red	9	3.7	.5	100.0	9	3.7	.5	100.0
Elementary Red facilitators	9	3.7	.5	100.0	---	----	---	-----
Elementary blue	13	3.7	.5	100.0	13	3.6	.5	100.0
Elementary blue facilitators	11	3.6	.5	100.0	---	----	---	-----
Middle school	5	3.4	.5	100.0	5	3.4	.9	80.0
Middle facilitators	5	3.6	.5	100.0	---	----	---	-----
High school	10	3.7	.5	100.0	8	3.9	.4	100.0
High school facilitators	12	3.9	.3	100.0	---	----	---	-----

Table 9. Quality and utility of professional communication sessions

<b>Communication Content &amp; Presenter</b>	Quality Ratings				Utility Ratings			
	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Percent High Quality</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Percent High Utility</b>
Prof Communication e--mail	43	3.4	.6	95.3	41	3.4	.7	90.2
Prof Communication e-mail: Presenter	43	3.5	.5	100.0	---	---	---	---
Prof Communication Social media	41	3.4	.5	97.6	40	3.3	.8	95.0
Prof Communication Social media: Presenter	42	3.5	.6	97.6	---	---	---	---
Communication Teamwork	41	3.2	.6	90.6	40	3.3	.6	90.0
Communication Teamwork Presenter	39	3.4	.6	94.9	---	---	---	---

Table 10. Quality and utility of breakouts for professional communication.

<b>Breakout Sessions</b>	Quality Ratings				Utility Ratings			
	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Percent High Quality</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Percent High Utility</b>
Communication breakouts early child	7	3.6	.5	100.0	7	3.6	.5	100.0
Communication breakouts early child: Presenter	6	4.0	.0	100.0	---	---	---	---
Communication breakout Elem red	11	3.5	.5	100.0	10	3.4	.5	100.0
Communication breakout Elem red: Presenter	11	3.5	.5	100.0	---	---	---	---
Communication breakout Elem blue	11	3.5	.5	100.0	11	3.6	.5	100.0
Communication breakout Elem blue: Presenter	10	3.6	.5	100.0	---	---	---	---
Communication breakout middle	7	3.7	.5	100.0	6	3.3	.5	100.0
Communication breakout middle: Presenter	6	3.7	.5	100.0	---	---	---	---
Communication breakout high school	11	3.7	.5	100.0	10	3.7	.5	100.0
Communication breakout high school: Presenter	11	3.8	.4	100.0	---	---	---	---
Creating implementation plans to take away	25	3.2	.7	84.0	24	3.2	.7	83.3

Table 11. Meeting preset goals.

<b>Goal Area</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Percent Met</b>	<b>Percent Highest Rating</b>
Implementation plans to take: Utility	24	3.2	.7	100.0	84.0
Goal: Motivation to discuss	43	3.7	.5	100.0	72.3
Goal: opportunity to carry ideas back	43	3.7	.5	97.7	67.2
Goal: Opportunity to take useful resources	41	3.6	.5	97.6	65.9



Table 12. Nominations for future professional development in descending order.

Topic	N	Number Nominating	Percent Nominating
How to reach at-risk students	43	33	76.7
Managing stress	43	25	58.1
Responsive classroom	43	24	55.8
Classroom differentiation	43	23	53.5
Teaching in a diverse classroom	43	19	44.2
Additional classroom management	43	18	41.9
Other nomination (no other nomination received more than one vote)	43	8	18.6