

NEW TEACHER WORKSHOP (DECEMBER 13, 2013):
EVALUATION REPORT

TEACHER PREPARATION INITIATIVE (TPI)

Yuzhou Chen

John Hoover

**Teacher Preparation Initiative/ August 2013/ Induction Emphasis (Paper = RST.Eval.14.NTW1)
Rebecca Krystyniak, Director
JHC**

NEW TEACHER WORKSHOP (DECEMBER 13,
2014):
EVALUATION REPORT

Executive Summary

Technical issues

1. We only placed raw data in the body of the report; the only interpretative information is included in this executive summary. A minor exception exists when we laid out needed technical details.
2. Since all that we have made available in this report are summary statements and raw data, we would gladly undertake additional analyses as requested by program developers and presenters.
3. In nearly every case, quality and utility session ratings were impacted by perceptions of the presenter's quality. The casual relationship more likely flows from presentation through quality to perceived utility. This may be a technical issue worth pursuing in future sessions.

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 (greater than 9 in 10) completed surveys.
2. Approximately 6 in 10 of the new teachers in the partner districts matriculated at SCSU, given that the data hear represent nearly a census of potential candidates.

3. New teachers representing all targeted grade levels and districts attended sessions. Sauk Rapids-Rice and Sartell-St. Stephen hired the most new teachers during '13-'14.
4. Nearly all participants reportedly were serving during their first year in their current district (new-to-district) (94%), with only three respondents purportedly entering their in-district second year (6%). Some new teachers had served under contract previously. Only 56% were in their first year of contractual teaching altogether with the other 34% serving anywhere from one to seven years.

Significant outcomes

1. Ratings proved slightly lower, on average than those for the August gathering, when nearly all attendees rated all sessions and presenters at levels reflecting 90% approval. It must be noted, however, that the December ratings proved moderately positive across sessions, with only ten of 32 ratings (session quality + session utility), 31%, receiving less than 90% approval.
2. The top-ranked sessions are listed below (see Tables 5-7 below)
 - The stress management session generally received extremely high ratings
 - Stress management facilitator/speaker
 - Stress management quality and utility (of information)
 - The technology presenter
 - Managing caseloads facilitator/presenter
 - Managing caseloads quality and utility

3. Very few quality/utility items received fewer than nine in ten positive responses; the items that received the lowest ratings are listed below. These may make targets for follow up throughout the '13-'14 academic year:

- At-risk diversity, was not as well received as other sessions, quality = 74%, utility of session = 56%
- Due process content (83% high quality)
- Differentiation content received lower-than-expected quality (77%) and utility (77%) ratings
- The informal networking sessions were seen as useful by 85% of participants

4. New teachers rated *all* goals set by project developers as having been met, given that 90% agreement is taken as criterion. In

terms of the highest possible ratings (4 out of 4, see Table 8), motivation to discuss topics (49%) and overall quality (52%) received the fewest A+ grades, while Opportunities to carry ideas back (65%) and take resources (56%) received the highest proportions of A+ "goals-met ratings.

5. A method for matching the content of future presentations match with new teachers' perceived need is to target sessions and materials around participant nominations (see Table 9). The content receiving most nominations are listed below in descending order:

- Responsive classroom (56% of participants nominating)
- Classroom management (54%)
- Technology (42%)
- Differentiation (35%)

NEW TEACHER WORKSHOP (DECEMBER 13, 2014):
EVALUATION REPORT

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.

Representation

Below, find three tables representing the characteristics of respondents, such as the district they represented (Table 1), and self-reported placement level. Valid percent refers to the percentage calculated as a function of the number of those venturing a response.

Table 1. District reported by participant.

District	Frequency	Valid Percent
Sartell St. Stephen	11	20.8
ROCORI	6	12.5
Sauk Rapids Rice	20	8.3
Holdingsford	3	6.3
Monticello	2	4.2
St. Cloud	6	2.1
Total	48	100.0

Table 2. Self-reported placement level.

Placement	Frequency	Valid Percent
Elementary, K-6	22	45.8
Middle or Junior High	5	10.4
Special Education	6	12.5
High School or K-12	13	27.1
Preschool	1	2.1
Other (Library)	1	2.1
Total	48	100.0

A more specific list of areas by grade level is provided as Appendix A. Please note that such items as “perceived need for professional development” (Table 9 below) could be disaggregated by level and assignment if this would prove helpful.

Table 3. College or University: Locus of most recently earned license.

Institute of Higher Education	Frequency	Valid Percent
SCSU	30	62.5
Other (All N = 1)	9	18.8
St. Benedict/ St. Johns	5	10.4
Luther college	2	4.2
University of Minnesota - Duluth	2	4.2
Total	48	100.0

Table 4. Years' experience¹.

Value	N	Mean	SD
Years Exp., current district	48	.06	.2
Total contractual years' experience ²	48	1.15	1.8

¹First year (clearly) = 45 (93.8%), Second Year (clearly indicated) = 3 (6.3%), Total first + second year teachers = 48 = 100%

²Range from 0 (first year = 56% to seven years (N = 1, 2.1%

Note: The “utility” of presenters as an entity is not interpretable. Thus, it is never assessed in these studies. Missing data in Tables 5-7 reflect this particular approach.

Table 5 . Self-reported ratings of strands, Part 1 (Stress Management).

<u>Activities</u>	<u>Quality Ratings</u>				<u>Utility Ratings</u>			
	<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>
Stress Management: Overall Content of Session	47	3.7	.6	95.7	45	3.6	.5	97.8
Resources from Session	47	3.5	.6	95.7	45	3.5	.6	93.3
Presenter of Session (quality)	47	3.9	.3	100.0	--	---	---	---

Table 6. Self-reported ratings of strands, Part 2 (First breakout).

<u>Activities</u>	<u>Quality Ratings</u>				<u>Utility Ratings</u>			
	<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>
First Break-Out Session: Special Education and Due Process: Presenters/ Facilitators	12	3.8	.6	91.7	---	---	---	---
Special Education and Due Process: Content of Session	10	3.6	.7	90.0	6	3.50	.84	83.3
Technology: Presenter/ Facilitator	17	3.8	.4	100.0	---	---	---	---
Technology: Content of Session	17	3.8	.6	94.1	14	3.79	.58	92.9
Working with Students At-Risk/Diverse Learners: Presenter/Facilitator	19	3.4	.8	84.2	---	---	---	---
Working with Students At-Risk/Diverse Learners: Content of Session	19	3.1	.8	73.7	16	2.9	.90	56.3

Table 7. Self-reported ratings of strands: Second breakouts

<u>Activities</u>	<u>Quality Ratings</u>				<u>Utility Ratings</u>			
	<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>
Second Breakout Session: Differentiation: Please rate Presenters/Facilitators (quality)	40	3.3	.8	80.0	---	---	---	---
Differentiation: Please rate content/discussions (quality)	39	3.1	.7	76.9	34	3.0	.7	76.5
Managing Caseloads: Please rate Presenters/Facilitators (quality)	8	3.9	.4	100.0	---	---	---	---
Managing Caseloads: Please rate content/discussions (quality)	9	3.9	.3	100.0	6	3.7	.5	100.0
Informal Networking: Networking Session (quality)	32	3.2	.9	81.3	26	3.2	.9	84.6
Facilitators of Session (quality)	30	3.2	.9	83.3	---	---	---	---

Table 8. Meeting preset goals, reverse order by percent met at highest level.

<u>Goal Area</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>Percent Met</u>	<u>Percent Highest Rating</u>
opportunities to carry ideas and practices back to one's professional life	43	3.6	.6	95.3	65.1
the opportunity to take useful resources away from the conference.	43	3.5	.7	97.7	55.8
Overall Quality of the Conference: the opportunity to informally network (speak with colleagues about personal concerns and professional issues/ meet new people/ pick up existing friendships)	46	3.5	.6	95.7	52.2
the motivation to discuss the topics under consideration both formally and informally.	43	3.4	.6	95.3	48.8

Table 9. Nominations for future professional development in descending order.

Topic	N	Number Nominating	Percent Nominating
Responsive Classroom	48	27	56.3
Classroom Management	48	26	54.2
Technology	48	20	41.7
Differentiation in the Classroom	48	17	35.4
Managing Stress	48	12	25.0
How to Reach At-Risk Students	48	12	25.0
Teaching in a Diverse Classroom	48	12	25.0
Other topics: Social Skills curriculum, autism spectrum, Provide CEUs, Guided reading (N = 2), mathematics and reading application, Establishing positivity, dealing with administrators, Classroom organization, Common core	48	1-2 (each)	2.1-4.2

Appendix A Detail of Area by Level

	Frequency	Valid Percent
1st	1	2.1
1st grade	3	6.3
2nd grade	1	2.1
3-5th grade English/ LA	1	2.1
3rd grade	2	4.2
4th grade	1	2.1
4th grade special education	1	2.1
5th grade	1	2.1
6th grade math/ alternative learning	1	2.1
7-8 language arts	1	2.1
7th & 10th science	1	2.1
7th grade social studies	1	2.1
7th/8th grade special education	1	2.1
ADSI (K,1,2,3)	1	2.1
Elementary	1	2.1
Elementary K-5 music	1	2.1
Elementary library media specialist	1	2.1
First grade	3	6.3
Health Physical education High school	1	2.1
High school health & phy ed	1	2.1
High school language arts	2	4.2
High school math	1	2.1
High school Spanish	2	4.2
High school special education	1	2.1
HS SPED	1	2.1
K	1	2.1
K-4 special education	1	2.1
Kindergarten	3	6.3
Kindergarten: math language / 5th grade writing	1	2.1
Literacy K-2	1	2.1
Middle school arts	1	2.1
Middle school choir	1	2.1
Middle school language arts 8th grade	1	2.1
Middle school math-7th grade	1	2.1
Music K-5	1	2.1
Physical education; Elementary	1	2.1
Preschool Elementary speech therapy	1	2.1
SME-SPED-EBD 7/8	1	2.1
Technology education	1	2.1
Total	48	100.0