COMMON PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT DAY EVALUATION STUDY

John Hoover

COMMON PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
DAY
EVALUATION STUDY

Executive Summary

1. The participants were distributed across grade levels as expected. Though several substitute teachers attended (N = 6), only one individual represented a private school. Marketing efforts could be organized to recruit greater participation from three partner groups: Sartell, ROCORI, and St. Cloud State faculty members.

2. An unintended benefit was that teachers new in their careers were slightly overrepresented. Attendees proved quite experienced with an average 10 years under their current contract and 12 years of full-time experience. A wide range of service years was observed, with 25 participants (36.2%) serving in their first two years.

3. The conference logistics and site were extremely well received. Within natural rounding error these aspects received 100% approval ratings.

4. As described in the instrument, the un-conference idea received very limited support. If planners want to develop this idea, they might consider first including it as a session in a more traditional conference.

5. Conference presentations tended to receive high ratings in terms of both quality of the presentation and utility of the knowledge and skills provided The overall mean quality rating (of 4) was 3.48, with 93% viewing the presentations as of moderate to high quality and 57% rating presentations as being of high quality; the commensurate results for "utility were 3.38 (of 4), 87%, and 54%.

6. The five highest-rated sessions for quality seemed to reflect skills that could be applied to the classroom, though Flaminio's information on self-regulation fell into this category as well: (a) Literacy and movement, (b) Keynote (intentional pathways to self-regulation), (c) Augmented reality in the classroom, (d) Math for the elementary classroom, and (e) Augmented classroom reality.

7. The five highest-rated sessions for practical utility are listed below: (a) Race in America, (b) Keynote, (c) Daily five math, (d) Building your reading toolkit, and (e) Power of mistakes.

8. I estimate the response rate at 57% or 71 of 125—120 participants who came to meetings + 5 volunteers who attended at least one session. This return rate is more than sufficient for generating reasonable inferences about quality and utility.

9. I recommend that in future efforts paper copies be made available for participants who remain uncertain about their technology capacity.

COMMON PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
DAY
EVALUATION STUDY

Introduction
A committee reporting to the Support Working Group planned a common professional development day targeting the six districts partnering with St. Cloud State University. The conference was held at Sauk Rapids-Rice High School on June 11, 2014.

I have subdivided the remainder of this evaluation study into sections reflecting attendee demographics, the quality-utility of presentations, and overall conference logistics.

Please feel free to contact the TPI office for copies of the paper and to request further analyses. Short reports for participants will be provided under separate cover. This study is intended primarily for this year's for the planning committee and for those preparing next year's efforts.

Results: Characteristics of Participants
The characteristics of respondents are shown in Tables 1-4. The partnership was well represented with a few exceptions and participants roughly reflected the grade distributions in the districts. Perhaps it could be argued that ROCORI, SCSU, and Sartell were slightly underrepresented.

Table 1. Participants by self-reported teaching level.

	Frequency	**Valid Percent Selected**[1]
Elementary + Early	36	50.7
Elementary in 5-8	1	1.4
Jr. High or Middle School	19	26.8
Secondary	11	15.5
Multiple Grades	5	7.0
SCSU	2	2.8

[1][1]Ratings not independent (some respondents selected two answers).

Table 2. Years' experience as reported by participants.

	N	**Mean**	**SD**
Number of years full time	69	10.32	10.28
Number of years overall	68	12.22	10.65

Because of the large SD in relationship to the mean, I calculated the frequencies, noting that, despite the high mean years' experience, new teachers (in their first three years) proved somewhat over represented (36.2%). This seems an unintended benefit of the conference in that it lends support to teachers working during their induction stage of development as educators.

Table 3. District designations in descending order.

District	Frequency	Valid Percent
St. Cloud	24	33.8
Monticello	15	21.1
Sauk Rapids-Rice	12	16.9
Holdingford	8	11.3
Sartell St. Stephen	5	7.0
ROCORI	3	4.2
SCSU	3	4.2
Brainerd	1	1.4
Total	71	100.0

Table 4. Self-reported substitute and private status.

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Serving primarily as a substitute teacher	6	8.5
Serving primarily at a private school	1	1.4

Results: Overall Ratings

Results for the overall satisfaction with the conference and its planning are presented in Table 5. In addition, a question was posed regarding the possibility of changing the format to the Harrison Owen's un-conference approach. "An un-conference is a participant-driven meeting. The term "un-conference" has been applied, or self-applied, to a wide range of gatherings that try to avoid one or more aspects of a conventional conference, such as fees, sponsored presentations, and top-down organization" (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Unconference).

Table 5. Logistics of the conference and related issues.

	N	Mean	SD	Moderate to High Values	Highest Values
Overall rating: How likely are you to attend next year (1 [very unlikely] to 4 [very likely])?	69	3.46	.61	94.2	52.2
How satisfied were you with the facilities (1 [very dissatisfied] to 4 [very satisfied])?	69	3.67	.56	98.6	69.6
Overall logistics and site		3.57		96.40	60.90
How appealing does the *un-conference* approach seem to you (1 [not appealing at all] to 4 [appeals to me])[1]	69	2.58	.86	53.7	14.5

[1] *The un-conference approach.* One approach to professional development is entitled the "un-conference approach: The un-conference is characterized as a gathering wherein educators are guided through the process of forming into interest groups and presenting to each other on an ad-hoc (not strictly planned) basis. Communication is likely to continue after the initial meeting day.

Results: Session Ratings

Session ratings were collected and analyzed as follows: In an initial step, I re-coded all variables with "did not attend" as missing values. Next, I calculated and reported means and standard deviations on the four-point scale that resulted.

The last two columns deserve explanation. The right-most column contains the percentage of attendees reporting the highest levels of quality and utility (indicated "4" or "high quality/ useful to me"). Recall that I removed non-attendees from the equation. The second column from the left contains the percentage of responding attendees who selected either level "3" ("tended to be of high quality/utility") plus "4" ("high quality/ useful to me"). Note that higher values always represent greater levels of quality and utility.

The following descriptor was employed for QUALITY ratings: "*Quality* in this context refers to the holistic degree to which the speaker (s) retained your interest and seemed to be well organized and informative". UTILITY (usefulness) was described as follows: "In this context, *Utility* refers to the degree to which the topic or activity struck you as immediately relevant and applicable in your professional and/or personal lives". In each case (except for Table 5), I arranged data in descending order by mean quality value(S).

The section starts with the five highest-rated sessions in terms of presentation quality presented in Table 6. Table 7 includes the sessions seen as most useful to attendees. I only included sessions with attendance greater than N = 5.

Highest rated in terms of presentation quality

Table 6. The five highest-rated presentations by quality (with X > 5 attendees).

Sessions	N	Mean	SD	Moderate to High Quality & Utility	Highest Quality & Utility
Literacy and Movement: (Joe McCarthy): QUALITY	12	3.92	.29	100.0	91.7
Keynote: Intentional Pathways to Self-Regulation: The Science and Practice of Mindfulness, Movement and Social Emotional Learning (Flaminio): QUALITY	67	3.81	.39	100.0	80.6
Augmented Reality in the Classroom (Paul Schlangen): (afternoon session) QUALITY	8	3.75	.71	97.5	87.5
Daily 5 Math for the Elementary Classroom (Nancy Davis): (morning session) QUALITY	19	3.58	.69	89.5	68.4
Augmented Reality in the Classroom (Paul Schlangen): (morning session) QUALITY	24	3.54	.66	91.7	62.5
Mean of top 5 for quality	---	3.72	----	95.74	78.14

Highest rated in terms of usefulness of information

Table 7. The five highest ratings presentations by utility (usefulness) (with X > 5 attendees).

Sessions	N	Mean	SD	Moderate to High Quality & Utility	Highest Quality & Utility
Race in America: (Rob Galler): UTILITY	8	3.75	.71	87.5	87.5
Keynote: Intentional Pathways to Self-Regulation: The Science and Practice of Mindfulness, Movement and Social Emotional Learning (Flaminio): UTILITY	67	3.63	.57	95.5	67.2
Daily 5 Math for the Elementary Classroom (Nancy Davis): (morning session) UTILITY	17	3.59	.71	88.2	70.6
Building Your Reading Toolkit!: (Dawn Gent, Beth Lovdahl & Linda Corrigan): UTILITY	27	3.44	.85	85.2	63.0

Table 7, Continued

Sessions	N	Mean	SD	Moderate to High Quality & Utility	Highest Quality & Utility
Power of Mistakes to Engage Learners (Mike Rogers and P-12 Students): (morning session) UTILITY	32	3.41	.71	87.5	53.1
Average of 5 highest utility ratings	---	3.56	----	88.78	68.28

Note that the keynote appeared in both lists—among the top 5 in both quality and utility. Otherwise, sessions dealing with specific skills (toolkit ideas) tended to receive the highest ratings. The exception was Galler's presentation that seemed to appeal, in terms of content, to social studies educators.

The remainder of this report is made up of individual session ratings. These Tables are organized by sessions, not content.

Table 8. Quality and utility ratings: Keynote/ Pathways to self-regulation (Kathy Flaminio).

Ratings Categories	N	Mean	SD	Moderate to High Quality & Utility	Highest Quality & Utility
Quality ratings (1-4)	67	3.81	.39	100.0	80.6
Utility ratings (1-4)	67	3.63	.57	95.5	67.2
Mean of presentation across quality and utility	67	3.72	----	97.75	73.9

Table 9. Morning sessions in reverse order by mean quality values.

Sessions	N	Mean	SD	Moderate to High Quality & Utility	Highest Quality & Utility
Power of Mistakes to Engage Learners (Mike Rogers and P-12 Students): QUALITY	35	3.49	.66	91.4	57.1
Power of Mistakes to Engage Learners (Mike Rogers and P-12 Students): UTILITY	32	3.41	.71	87.5	53.1
Google and iPads (Angie Kalthoff): QUALITY	25	3.40	.58	96.0	48.0
Google and iPads (Angie Kalthoff): UTILITY	19	3.16	.76	78.9	36.8
Responsive Classroom, Me Moves, and Other Student Engagement (Andrea Coulter): QUALITY	25	3.36	.70	88.0	48.0
Responsive Classroom, Me Moves, and Other Student Engagement (Andrea Coulter): UTILITY	19	3.37	.76	84.2	52.6
Assessing Student Learning with Technology (Laura Mackenthun): QUALITY	13	3.38	.65	96.0	44.0
Assessing Student Learning with Technology (Laura Mackenthun): UTILITY	13	3.23	.60	92.3	30.8
Using Digital Conferences and Screen Recording Software (Nichole Feuchtman): QUALITY	8	2.88	.64	75.0	12.5
Using Digital Conferences and Screen Recording Software (Nichole Feuchtman): UTILITY	6	3.17	.75	83.3	33.3

Table 10. Late morning sessions (11:10-12:00) in reverse order by mean quality values.

	N	Mean	SD	Moderate to High Quality & Utility	Highest Quality & Utility
Daily 5 Math for the Elementary Classroom (Nancy Davis): QUALITY	19	3.58	.69	89.5	68.4
Daily 5 Math for the Elementary Classroom (Nancy Davis): UTILITY	17	3.59	.71	88.2	70.6
Augmented Reality in the Classroom (Paul Schlangen): QUALITY	24	3.54	.66	91.7	62.5
Augmented Reality in the Classroom (Paul Schlangen): UTILITY	18	3.17	.92	94.4	44.4
Power of Mistakes to Engage Learners (Mike Rogers and p-12 Students): QUALITY	20	3.25	.64	90.0	35.0
Power of Mistakes to Engage Learners (Mike Rogers and p-12 Students): UTILITY	21	3.33	.73	85.7	47.6
Stop, it's SAMR Time! (Brad Scherer): QUALITY	4	3.00	.82	75.0	25.0
Stop, it's SAMR Time! (Brad Scherer): UTILITY	4	3.25	.50	100.0	25.0
Getting Assessment Right: Teacher and Professor Improvement (Hoover/ Minnema): QUALITY	11	2.73	.90	63.6	18.2
Getting Assessment Right: Teacher and Professor Improvement (Hoover/ Jane): UTILITY	11	2.64	.92	54.5	18.2

Table 11. Afternoon sessions (1:00-1:50) in reverse order by mean quality values.

	N	Mean	SD	Moderate to High Quality & Utility	Highest Quality & Utility
Augmented Reality in the Classroom (Paul Schlangen): QUALITY	8	3.75	.71	97.5	87.5
Augmented Reality in the Classroom (Paul Schlangen):UTILITY	9	3.33	1.00	88.9	55.6
Tennis: A Lifetime Sport, No Courts Required (Vendor Session: Tony Stingley): QUALITY	5	3.60	.55	100.0	60.0
Tennis: A Lifetime Sport, No Courts Required (Vendor Session: Tony Stingley): UTILITY	3	2.67	1.53	66.7	33.3
Building Your Reading Toolkit!: (Dawn Gent, Beth Lovdahl & Linda Corrigan): QUALITY	27	3.48	.64	92.6	55.6
Building Your Reading Toolkit!: (Dawn Gent, Beth Lovdahl & Linda Corrigan): UTILITY	27	3.44	.85	85.2	63.0
Photos and your iPad: (Laura Mackenthun): QUALITY	13	3.38	.65	92.3	46.2
Photos and your iPad: (Laura Mackenthun): UTILITY	13	3.08	.95	76.9	57.1
Google Forms: Have You Form-ally Met? (Angie Kalthoff): QUALITY	7	3.00	1.00	92.3	46.2
Google Forms: Have You Form-ally Met? (Angie Kalthoff): UTILITY	7	3.29	1.11	76.9	57.1

Table 12. Late afternoon sessions (2:10-3:00) in reverse order by mean quality values.

	N	Mean	SD	Moderate to High Quality & Utility	Highest Quality & Utility
Literacy and Movement: (Joe McCarthy): QUALITY	12	3.92	.29	100.0	91.7
Literacy and Movement: (Joe McCarthy): UTILITY	12	3.92	.29	100.0	91.7
Race in America: (Rob Galler): QUALITY	11	3.64	.50	100.0	63.6
Race in America: (Rob Galler): UTILITY	8	3.75	.71	87.5	87.5
Engaging Learners through Essential Questions: (Mike Rogers and Kirstin Bratt): QUALITY	17	3.47	.72	88.2	58.8
Engaging Learners through Essential Questions: (Mike Rogers and Kirstin Bratt): UTILITY	17	3.24	.75	82.4	41.2
Responsive Classroom, Me Moves, and Other Student Engagement: (Coulter): QUALITY	19	3.37	.60	94.7	42.1
Responsive Classroom, Me Moves, and Other Student Engagement: (Coulter): UTILITY	18	3.28	.89	83.3	50.0
Building Your Reading Toolkit!: (Dawn Gent, Beth Lovdahl & Linda Corrigan): QUALITY	9	3.22	.44	100.0	22.2
Building Your Reading Toolkit!: (Dawn Gent, Beth Lovdahl & Linda Corrigan): UTILITY	9	3.33	1.00	77.8	33.3