

## EVALUATION DATA

### PARTICIPANT EVALUATION

Each training session entered into ProGOE<sup>2</sup> is based on a component in the Professional Learning Catalog and requires an online evaluation of training. The designer of the inservice activity specifies additional evaluation methods for the inservice. If a test is given, successful participants must have an 80% or higher score. Participants must complete evidence of implementation in addition to the online evaluation to receive inservice credits on their inservice transcripts.

### FOLLOW-UP/ IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITIES

All workshops or activities that are eligible for inservice credits require follow-up/implementation evidence by the participants. Follow-up evidence documents both participant learning and implementation of the training in the classroom or on the job. The types of follow-up which may be implemented are: structured mentoring/coaching (by coaches, mentors knowledgeable others not part of the district's personnel evaluation process, monitoring/feedback on the learning-may include direct observation, conferencing, oral reflection and/or lesson practice demonstration modeling); independent learning/action research (related to job responsibilities, specific professional learning goals or deliberate practice growth target should include evidence of monitoring job-embedded implementation of targeted learning); collaborative planning-monitoring (and feedback related to targeted professional learning, includes Learning Community or other properly implemented team learning practices focused on job-embedded learning supported by colleagues); participant product (related to training or learning process may include lesson plans, written reflection on lessons learned, audio/video exemplars, case study findings, modeling improved practice, samples for resulting student work, and / or collegial training resources); lesson study group participation (monitoring and feedback focused on both the research-based lesson study process and impact of the process on lessons implemented); electronic-interactive (with ongoing monitoring and feedback via online or face-to-face facilitation on targeted learning); electronic-non-interactive (with learning monitored thru online comprehension checks and / or participant's summative reports or modeling to peers or supervisors); Evaluation of practice indicators (the practice portion of district personnel evaluation processes for monitoring and providing feedback on evaluation indicator/components/domains are employed to monitor and provide feedback on implementation of the professional learning.

Note: this code may be used when the professional learning target(s) are aligned to specific personnel evaluation system indicators/components/and/or domains). District staff and site-based staff facilitate follow-up/implementation activities aligned with the Florida Staff Development Evaluation Protocol. Data is collected on follow-up via inservice records in ProGOE<sup>2</sup> and hard copies are filed in the Professional Learning and Development Office or with the coordinator of the training.

### PROGRAM EVALUATION

Inservice programs are evaluated by program coordinators, who collate the data from individual workshops and who write summary reports using data regarding particular programs. Online evaluations are completed for all ProGOE<sup>2</sup> inservice activities by every participant district-wide; results are collected and reported to the Department of Education annually. Add-on Certification Program Evaluations are submitted to the Bureau of Educator Recruitment and Professional Development for review and approval to ensure that program is comparable to the certification requirements for the coverage area specified.

Specific Professional Development programs were developed from objectives in the district Strategic Plan. Strategic Plan objectives are monitored regularly and used as one form of program evaluation. Support Staff workshops are determined by supervisors, the District Strategic Plan, district staff based on job performance needs assessments, and participant surveys.

Workshops or courses that are developed with the intent that teachers implement activities in the classroom include some type of program evaluation to gather data on student results correlated with training. The types of student data used for program evaluation are statewide assessments or teacher-made assessments or performance requirements. District staff and site-based staff facilitate evaluation activities aligned with the Florida Professional Development Evaluation Protocol. Data is collected on program evaluation/student data via inservice records and Professional Development Plans at the school sites.

District staff members use reports provided by the Florida Professional Development Evaluation Protocol reviews which take place in a multi-year cycle to analyze interview reports at three levels: district; school; and individual teacher perceptions and experiences with the district's professional development system. The individual strand data on planning, learning, implementing, and evaluating professional development provides comparison data to help identify strengths and developmental needs within the system.

### STUDENT EVALUATION

All workshops for teachers that are designed to be implemented in the classroom include some type of student achievement documentation linked to the implementation activities of the participants. For school-based training, collective impact of the training must be documented by correlating student achievement data with the inservice programs utilized. Student achievement data is reported in School Improvement Plans, statewide assessments, district assessments, and school-based assessments, as well as student performance checklists.

### STAFF EVALUATION

Classroom teachers measure the effects of professional development on their classroom practices. School leaders evaluate changes in instructional leadership practices. Other educators evaluate changes in practice around student services or task achievement outcomes. All workshops for instructional staff are designed to evaluate the impact and/or fidelity of the implementation. The trainings all fall under one of these categories: changes in instructional or learning environment practices (implemented in the classroom or directly with students observed or measured impact on educator proficiency through the district's instructional or school leader evaluation system indicators, components, and/or domains, and/or deliberate practice or IPDP/ILDG growth targets, and/or district or school level processes for tracking student progress); changes in instructional leadership (or faculty development practices observed or measured impact on leader proficiency, faculty or students); changes in student services (support practices); other changes in practices (supporting effective implementation of job responsibilities observed or measured impact on specific on specific job responsibilities); fidelity of implementation (of the professional learning process where impact on the job is not or cannot be observed or measured, evaluation is on alignment or actual training/development with planned high quality professional learning design and specific learning objectives(s)); changes in observed educator (proficiency in implementing targeted state standards or initiatives – e.g. FEAPs practices, Principal Leadership Standards, PD Evaluation Protocol Standards, MTSS); changes in observed educator (proficiency in practices that occur generally without students present - e.g. lesson design, collegial team learning processes, problem solving processes, needs assessments, data analyses, sharing practices with colleagues).