NEW TEACHER WORKSHOP (FEBRUARY 26, 2014):
EVALUATION REPORT

TEACHER PREPARATION INITIATIVE (TPI)

Yuzhou Chen

John Hoover

NEW TEACHER WORKSHOP (FEBRUARY 26, 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 explanations of why certain statistical decisions were taken.

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.

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. A wider net was cast for invitations, so the audience spread beyond the partner districts.

2. Approximately 5 in 10 of the new teachers participating in the sessions had attended St. Cloud State. More than 20 regional and national institutions were represented.

3. New teachers representing all targeted grade levels and districts attended sessions. Among partner districts, Sauk Rapids-Rice sent the most educators (N = 16, or 25% of those from the six partner districts).

4. The target audience was reached with over 8 in 10 participants reportedly serving in their first three years of contractual experience.

Significant outcomes

1. Ratings proved exceptionally high. Ms. Sweeny's approval ratings along with the ratings of the utility of her sessions can be estimated at 100% based on normal sampling distributions. These ratings proved very positive.

2. Participants rated both the quality and utility of the opportunity to network slightly lower, with eight in 10 approving—still an indicator of overall success.

3. New teachers rated **all** goals set by project developers as having been met. We estimate that, across goal statements, 93% of participants agreed that program goals had been achieved.

4. Qualitatively, "goals-met" ratings ran from a high of 100% (carry ideas and practices back) to a low of 83% (opportunity to network). Our conclusion is that all goals were met, but that ways need to be sought to improve on or increase opportunities to network.

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 7). The content receiving most nominations are listed below in descending order:
   - Student engagement (40% of participants nominating)

- Classroom management (36%)
- Technology (32%)
- Differentiation (33%)

6. Interestingly, the rank order of selections was nearly identical to those selected in the summer of 2014.

NEW TEACHER WORKSHOP (FEB 26, '14):
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 project goals set ahead of time. 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 on February 26 2014, featuring a presentation by Ms. Willow Sweeney representing Top-20 Training (http://www.top20training.com/about.php). The N of participating educators = 65, though only 62 participants provided responses to the end of the survey.

We 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 selected a

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

response. 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 presentations and 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 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.

function of the number of those venturing a response.
The high proportion of "not entered," reflects the fact that respondents represented many districts across the state. We will examine raw data to see if we can pull more information for this item.

Table 1. District self-reported by participant.

District	Frequency	Valid Percent
Not Entered	28	43.1
Sauk Rapids Rice	16	24.6
Sartell	7	10.8
Monticello	6	9.2
Rocori	4	6.2
St. Cloud	3	4.6
Holdingford	1	1.5
Total	65	100.0

Table 2. Self-reported placement level.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Total	54	83.1	100.0
Elementary (K-6)	21	32.3	38.9
Middle School	16	24.6	29.6
Secondary	12	18.5	22.2
Pre-K	4	6.2	7.4
P-12	1	1.5	1.9
Missing System	11	16.9	----
Total	65	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 (If N > 1)	Frequency	Valid Percent
SCSU	25	48.1
Concordia (Moorhead)	3	5.8
St. Benedict/ St. Johns	3	5.8
Bemidji State	3	5.8
Gustavus Adolphus	3	5.8
College of St. Scholastica	2	3.8
University of Minnesota - Duluth	2	3.8
Other (all N = 1)	11	21.1
Missing Data	13	-----
Total	65	-----

"Years' experience" data paints a different picture than is the case in past investigations. This is because a broader sample of educators was invited to the presentation. Nonetheless, over three-fourths (82%) of respondents were in their first three years of teaching—certainly meaning that planners reached their target audience.

Table 4. Years' experience[1].

Value[1]	N	Mean	SD
Years Exp., overall	55	2.1	2.6

[1]First year (clearly) = 15 (27.3% of those responding; assuming values of 0 and 1 = "in first year" yields 28 first-year educators = 51%. Range = 0-13.0. About 4 in 5 respondents (83%) reported serving in their first three years.

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 event strands and activities.

Evaluation Items	Ratings				Utility Ratings			
Activities related to Willow Sweeney	N	Mean	SD	Percent High Quality	N	Mean	SD	Percent High Utility
Sweeney Session: Overall Rating (Quality)	63	4.00	---	100.0	60	4.00	---	100.0
Resources from Sweeney Session	61	3.82	.53	96.7	56	3.89	.49	96.4
Presenter (Sweeney)	63	3.98	.13	100.0	---	----	---	-----
TOTALS (RESPONSE TO SPEAKER)	---	3.93	---	98.9	---	3.95	---	98.2
Other Aspects of Event								
Networking during dinner	55	3.25	.80	81.9	54	3.24	.89	81.4

Note the extremely high scores both for the quality and utility of the main presenter's speech. Likewise, over 9 in 10 participants felt that the planners had met all of their goals (93%, see Table 6).

Table 6. Meeting preset goals, reverse order by percent met at highest level.

Goal Area	N	Mean	SD	Percent Met	Percent Highest Rating
[The workshop successfully and effectively produced] opportunities to carry ideas and practices back to one's professional life	62	3.85	.36	100.0	85.5
[The workshop successfully and effectively produced] the opportunity to take useful resources away.	62	3.58	.64	95.1	64.5
[The workshop successfully and effectively produced] The motivation to discuss the topics under consideration both formally and informally.	61	3.56	.62	93.4	62.3
Goal (The workshop successfully and effectively provided) the opportunity to informally network (speak with colleagues about personal concerns and professional issues/ meet new people/ pick up existing friendships)	59	3.31	.79	83.1	49.2
TOTALS ACRSS GOAL AREAS	---	3.58	----	92.9	65.4

Table 7. Nominations for future professional development in descending order.

Topic	N	Number Nominating	Percent Nominating
Student engagement	62	25	40.3
Classroom management	62	22	35.5
Technology	62	20	32.3
Differentiation in the classroom	62	20	32.3
How to reach at-risk students	62	17	27.4
Responsive classroom	62	14	22.6
Managing stress	62	13	21.0
Teaching in a diverse classroom	62	12	19.4
Common core	62	12	19.4
Teacher evaluation	62	9	14.6

The number nominating each choice for future professional development is shown above in Table 6. In each case we selected 62 (respondents remaining at the time of the evaluation) as the N. We did this because respondents tended to select only "YES" and to leave "NO" blank in identifying topics. A clear drop-off is noted after the first four choices; the following topics all received 20 nominations or more: (1) student engagement, (2) classroom management, (3) technology, and (4) differentiation.

Appendix A
Detail of Area by Level

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid		11	16.9	16.9	16.9
	1	3	4.6	4.6	21.5
	10-12	1	1.5	1.5	23.1
	11	1	1.5	1.5	24.6
	11/12	1	1.5	1.5	26.2
	2	1	1.5	1.5	27.7
	2-3	1	1.5	1.5	29.2
	3	1	1.5	1.5	30.8
	4	1	1.5	1.5	32.3
	5	2	3.1	3.1	35.4
	5-8	1	1.5	1.5	36.9
	5/ kindergarten	1	1.5	1.5	38.5
	6	3	4.6	4.6	43.1
	6-8	3	4.6	4.6	47.7
	6,7,8	1	1.5	1.5	49.2
	6/8	1	1.5	1.5	50.8
	7	3	4.6	4.6	55.4
	7-12	1	1.5	1.5	56.9
	7-8	1	1.5	1.5	58.5
	8	1	1.5	1.5	60.0
	9	2	3.1	3.1	63.1
	9-1	1	1.5	1.5	64.6
	9-10	1	1.5	1.5	66.2
	9-12	6	9.2	9.2	75.4
	all grade	1	1.5	1.5	76.9
	Early Childhood Special Ed	2	3.1	3.1	80.0
	K-4	1	1.5	1.5	81.5
	K-5	4	6.2	6.2	87.7
	K,1,2,3	1	1.5	1.5	89.2
	K,1,3	1	1.5	1.5	90.8
	Kindergarten	2	3.1	3.1	93.8
	P-5	2	3.1	3.1	96.9
	Pre-k	1	1.5	1.5	98.5
	Pre-K	1	1.5	1.5	100.0
	Total	65	100.0	100.0	