

THE NORTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY'S
JOINT LEGISLATIVE EDUCATION OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

Interim Report:

*A Study
of Professional
Development Programs
for Public School Professionals*

Prepared by

NATIONAL STAFF DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL
OXFORD, OHIO



Interim Report:

*A Study
of Professional
Development Programs
for Public School Professionals*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	i
Introduction	
Quality Teaching – The Key to Improved Student Achievement	1
Professional Development –	
The Key to Quality Teaching Purpose of the Study	1
The Purpose of the Study	2
Limitations	2
Methods Used to Gain Information for the Interim Report	2
Section One	
The Importance of A System of Accountability	4
Professional Development Planning in North Carolina	4
Ways Professional Development Addresses Accountability Requirements	5
Section Two	
Defining Professional Development: “Pre-Service” and “In-Service”	7
Pre-Service Programs	7
Teachers of Excellence for All Children (NC TEACH)	8
Principal Fellows Program (PFP)	10
North Carolina Model Teacher Education Consortium (NCMTEC)	13
Section Three	
Descriptions of the UNC Center for School Leadership Development	
In Service Professional Development Programs	16
Principals Executive Program (PEP).	17

Interim Report:

A Study of Professional Development Programs for Public School Professionals

North Carolina Center for the Advancement of Teaching (NCCAT)	21
North Carolina Mathematics and Science Education Network (NC-MSEN)	24
North Carolina Teacher Academy (NCTA)	28

Section Four

Department of Public Instruction's Professional Development Programs . .	31
State Assistance Team	31
Closing the Achievement Gap	31
School Technical Services	31
International Opportunities	32
Beginning Teacher Induction Program	32

Section Five

Preliminary Findings.	33
-------------------------------	----

References	35
----------------------	----

Appendix

Summary of Research on High-Poverty, High-Achieving Schools	36
---	----

INTERIM PROGRESS REPORT EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Targeting North Carolina's state-supported professional development for teachers and principals, this Interim Report begins to analyze the professional development offered by the UNC Center for School Leadership Development programs. The Report classifies the various programs as preservice or inservice professional development, explaining and defining those terms:

Preservice Programs

NC TEACH

The North Carolina Principal Fellows Program (PFP), and

The North Carolina Model Teacher Education Consortium (NCMTEC)

Inservice Programs

The North Carolina Center for the Advancement of Teaching (NCCAT)

The North Carolina Teacher Academy (NCTA)

The Mathematics and Science Education Network (MSEN)

The Principals Executive Program (PEP)

The Interim Progress Report describes the work done for this Study, noting that information was gathered from the UNC Center for School Leadership Development programs through an NSDC developed Inventory Framework, based upon the *backmapping model* which is the focus of the upcoming planned school site visits. Information gathered from the Inventory, through personal interviews and phone interviews, and from multiple published and online materials – all this information serves as the basis for the preliminary analysis of individual programs. The analysis is structured around program mission, program governance, program design, and program efficiency and effectiveness.

The Department of Public Instruction's (DPI) staff development programs are listed and briefly described. More information on the impact of these programs will be sought during the school site visits and more information is needed from DPI.

The Interim Progress Report defines the state's accountability system, coupling it with national standards and initiatives, including the *No Child Left Behind* legislation. This delineation of the components of the accountability system is vital to being able to determine the alignment of professional development to these same components. This alignment positively impacts improved student results, according to research on high performing schools.

This *Interim Progress Report* is accompanied with a *paper on high performing, high poverty schools*. This paper studies the research with a focus on the characteristics of these schools as well as the professional development used by these high-performing schools.

Preliminary program analysis raises some issues for consideration for the Final Report. The feasibility and merits of consolidating and reducing the number of professional development programs presently being offered is under study, but cannot be fairly nor accurately assessed prior to the school site visits.

Some preliminary suggestions are made in the areas of accountability, governance, professional development, and evaluation. Some of the suggestions are that consideration be given to the General Assembly's authorizing an Office of Professional Development within the Department of Public Instruction, that the General Assembly consider whether the current governance structures inhibit or assist the various programs in meeting state priorities and needs of constituents, that the General Assembly request that the State Board of Education improve the process for meeting the professional development requirements for certification re-licensure, and that the General Assembly require a brief (1-2 pages) Formative & Summative Evaluation document to accompany the annual request for state appropriation.

These examples and others are offered here as areas for consideration, areas that may be of interest not only to the General Assembly, but to the State Superintendent, the State Board, and/or the Governor. These preliminary suggestions, after further analysis for the study, may be included, or excluded, from the Recommendations to be included in the Final Report of the Study in December 2002.

Study of Professional Development Programs For Public School Professionals

Introduction

Quality Teaching – The Key to Improved Student Achievement

Americans say the number one way to improve schools is to raise teacher quality, according to a recent poll commissioned by the Public Education Network and *Education Week*. There is widespread recognition in North Carolina that the American public is right – the success of all reform efforts hinges on teacher and teaching quality. The state's *Core Teaching Standards* define an effective teacher as one who improves student achievement. Focus on student results continues with the state's expectation that principals provide instructional leadership.

The state is nationally recognized for its support of professional development. A study¹ recognized North Carolina as one of the top two states that in the mid-1980s undertook the most substantial and systematic investments in teaching. In the early 1990s, North Carolina had a relatively large high-poverty student population and was near the bottom of state rankings. Since then, the state has posted the largest student achievement gains in mathematics and reading of any state in the nation.² The state continues the determined pursuit of academic excellence, just recently announcing that North Carolina's average SAT score moved up six points in 2001-02, placing the state above the southeast average for the first time.

Legislative staff reports that in 2000-01 the state invested over \$11,000,000 in direct appropriations for professional development for public school professionals. Local education agencies spent an additional \$22,400,000 from other state allotment categories for professional development. The General Assembly appropriated \$12,000,000 to the Center for School Leadership Development programs.

Professional Development – The Key to Quality Teaching

Research consistently documents the importance of teaching quality to student learning. A longitudinal Tennessee study of student achievement and teacher effectiveness analyzed results from annual statewide tests in grades three through eight beginning in 1990. Students whose initial achievement levels are comparable experienced “vastly different academic outcomes as a result of the sequence of teachers to which they are assigned.”³ A Texas study substantiated this result,⁴ as did Kati Haycock of The Education Trust.⁵

In examining data from the National Assessment of Educational Progress, Harold Wenglinsky found that the greatest influences on student achievement are classroom practices and *professional development that is specifically tailored to those practices*.⁶ Professional development and teaching quality are inextricably linked.

Purpose of this Study

The North Carolina Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee in July 2002 authorized a study of professional development. The study describes the professional development programs administered under the UNC Center for School Leadership Development and the Department of Public Instruction. The descriptions will examine mission, governance, program design, and measures of efficiency and effectiveness, with a special interest in evaluation that targets student results. School site visits will contribute to the assessment of programs' impact. The study will scrutinize the use of state professional development funds allocated to schools and school districts, and make recommendations regarding the application of federal funds in the context of state and local priorities and new *No Child Left Behind* (NCLB) expectations. Included will be research on professional development that "works" in high performing schools with an emphasis on high-poverty schools. Recommendations will suggest changes that could improve professional development for North Carolina's public school professionals.

This Interim Report of October 16, 2002 reviews North Carolina's accountability system and the professional development programs of the UNC Center for School Leadership Development, and the professional development programs of Department of Public Instruction. Two types of UNC Center programs are delineated: preservice programs and inservice programs. Program descriptions and analysis yield preliminary questions/findings and depict areas for further study in order to produce substantive recommendations for the Final Report, due December 16, 2002.

Limitations

There are some limitations to the Interim Report due to the volume of program materials being studied. The impact of variance in program length affects analysis of "cost per participant." Long-term funding data analysis will be sought from all programs. This interim analysis yields some preliminary findings and indicates areas for further study for recommendations for the Final Report, due December 16, 2002.

Methods Used to Gain Information for the Interim Report

Inventory Framework

Developed by NSDC, this Inventory was distributed to each of the UNC Center for School Leadership's programs through the UNC Vice-President of University School Programs. Each professional development program director responded to the Framework in August. Exceptions were made for several of the preservice programs, as their goals were different from the student results professional development focus of the Inventory. These directors responded with descriptive and historical information.

Website Information

While CSLD program directors completed the Inventory, NSDC staff collected program information from North Carolina State and university websites and from national organization websites that track state educational policy information.

Individual interviews

NSDC staff interviewed the UNC Vice-President of University School Programs and each program director the first week in September. Follow-up through e-mail and phone calls continues to inform and clarify program descriptions and initial analysis.

Research of Prior Studies, Evaluations, and Plans

NSDC staff researched reports, studies, and evaluations that pertain to North Carolina's professional development for public school professionals. A listing of these documents is planned as an Appendix for the Final Report.

Document Review

The Interim Progress Report was reviewed by the National Staff Development Council's Executive Director, Dennis Sparks, and by the Deputy Executive Director, Stephanie Hirsh. The Final Report will engage the additional perspectives of Joellen Killion, Hayes Mizell, and Thomas Guskey.

Section One

The Importance of A System of Accountability

North Carolina is consistently recognized by *Education Week's* annual report, *Quality Counts:50-State Report Card*, as coming close to having all the components of a complete accountability system. *Quality Counts* defines "complete" as the first six components listed below under Standards and Assessments. With today's educational focus on improved student achievement, the state and local components of the high-stakes system of accountability are enriched by the inclusion of national standards as illustrated by the additions to the following list:

Standards & Assessment

- Academic Student Standards or Objectives
- Academic Student Standards Assessments or Tests
with subsequent Disaggregated Data
- Report Cards noting the Performance of Individual Schools
- Public Rating and Comparisons of Schools
- Performance Rewards
- Available Assistance and Sanctions for Failing Schools
- Teaching Quality Standards or Certifications: National or State
- Professional Development Standards: National, State or Local

Professional development is most successful when the focus is on the knowledge and skill educators must possess to ensure students' successful mastery of the state's academic standards. Successful alignment of the collective effort of individuals, schools, and systems' external programs focuses the resources where they serve the greatest good. Some of the compelling reasons for aligning individual, school, district and state professional development efforts follow:

- There can be competing issues and needs that result in a conflict in planned priorities. The priorities must be addressed in a logical, coherent manner.
- Alignment with broader levels (teacher to school, school to district, district to state) can increase support for initiatives and better results.

In a position paper on Teaching Quality (2002), the Education Commission of the States (ECS) emphasizes that "*this alignment means, first of all, ensuring that professional development helps teachers teach successfully to statewide student standards. Secondly, it means ensuring that professional development enables teachers to be successful with the diverse range of students in their classrooms.*" ⁷

Professional Development Planning in North Carolina⁸

The following listing enumerates some of the plans that are required of schools and school districts:

Plans

- State Education Agency Plans: Academic, Technology, Other
- District Improvement Plans
- District Technology Plans
- District Professional Development Plans
- Local School Improvement Plans
- Local School Technology Plans
- Local School Professional Development Plans
- Individual Teacher/Educator Professional Development Plans
- Plan for Character Education Instruction
- Plan for Safe Schools

Each school is required by law to develop a three-year school improvement plan, with modifications each year as needed. The plans must be approved by the local board of education. The plans do not have to be submitted to the state for approval, but must be on file for review. There is no required format. Local boards also set their own due dates for the plans.

One component of the school improvement plan is the professional development plan. This corresponds with the "Quality Professionals" strategic priority of the State Board of Education (SBE). The activities outlined in the professional development plan are to be related to the goals and objectives in the school improvement plan.

Curriculum and assessment are aligned. A state *Standard Course of Study* describes the minimum content to be addressed in each subject at each grade level. All curricula are based on national content standards and are revised on a five-year cycle. State tests are based solely on state curriculum. As curricula are revised, the state tests are revised.

Professional Development Addresses Accountability Requirements

Teaching Standards

The North Carolina Professional Teaching Standards Commission (NCPTS) developed six *Core Standards for Teachers*. The NCPTS Commission is a teacher-majority body. Eight members of the Commission are appointed by the Governor, four members by the President Pro Tempore of the Senate, and four members by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. All regions and grade levels of public schools are represented on the Commission, as well as school administrators and higher education institutions. The Teaching Standards were adopted by the State Board of Education in November 1999. The standards are:

- Teachers know the content they teach.
- Teachers know how to teach students.
- Teachers are successful in teaching a diverse population of students.
- Teachers are leaders.
- Teachers are reflective about their practice.
- Teachers respect and care about students.

The Standards were developed over the course of 18 months with the input of hundreds of teachers in focus groups, in teacher town meetings, in sessions of the NC Teacher Academy, and in small group meetings in schools and offices across the state. The standards were cross-referenced with inTASC standards for beginning teachers, with National Board of Professional Teaching Standards for highly accomplished teachers, and with standards from professional teaching organizations.

The Commission expects these standards to be used to guide teacher preparation, teacher evaluation, and teacher professional development. The Teaching Standards Commission will continue to work to align all of these aspects of teacher development to the Core Standards as well as statewide student standards.

Professional Development Standards

The North Carolina Professional Teaching Standards Commission proposed professional development standards after studying the field. The State Board approved the Standards in 2000. The primary use is to design and evaluate professional development across the state. Research supports each of the standards in the list below.

Quality professional development:

- Provides time for teachers to engage in learning, reflection, application and evaluation
- Is driven in aspects of design, delivery, and application by teachers in collaboration with significant stakeholders
- Is responsive to educator needs, student learning, school and district improvement efforts, and state guidelines
- Is content based, and increases teachers' knowledge of subject matter, of student learning, and of assessment
- Models best teaching practices, accommodates teachers with different learning styles, and is based on adult learning theory
- Is ongoing and embedded in the daily lives of teachers, providing opportunities for continuous growth.

License Renewal Credit An Opportunity for Quality Professional Development ⁹

Currently, State Board of Education policy requires teachers, administrators, and instructional support personnel to complete 15 hours of renewal credit every five years to maintain a license. The policy provides that three to five of these hours must be in technology, and up to five hours (one per year) are earned for teaching during each renewal cycle. LEAs maintain records of the professional development activities completed by licensed employees and certify to the Licensure Section that individuals have completed sufficient hours each renewal cycle. Multiple providers offer professional development.

Section Two

Defining Professional Development: The Distinction Between “Preservice” And “Inservice”

Calls for high quality professional development appear throughout the 1100 page *No Child Left Behind* (NCLB) legislation. The federal government recognizes the goals of NCLB will only be achieved if states and systems pay simultaneous attention to teacher preparation (preservice) and professional development (inservice).¹⁰

North Carolina consistently calls for improvement in both preservice and inservice education of teachers. For decades, the state supported higher education’s teacher preparation programs’ efforts to improve course offerings. Beginning in the early 1980s, North Carolina authorized professional development programs for its teachers and principals. The state also initiated a recruitment program to address teacher shortages. When teacher and principal shortages were predicted to become extremely severe in some sections of the state, additional programs were formed to address this need in 1994 and 1999. Discussions began in the 1980s on the desire for some type of “professional development center.” The UNC Center for School Leadership Development evolved in the late 1990s, designed to coordinate the UNC’s multiple professional development programs, including those primarily designed for recruitment of teachers and principals.

The distinction between the two words, *preservice* and *inservice*, may raise issues in this study. The Center for School Leadership Development’s (CSLD) seven programs targeted by the Legislative Education Oversight Committee for this *Study of Professional Development* fall into both categories. Preservice programs are designed to prepare students for teaching positions and/or to prepare teachers for administrative positions. Inservice programs address the ongoing professional learning needs of educators in classrooms and/or principals in schools or superintendents in districts.

Preservice Programs

Designed to help with teacher and principal shortages in North Carolina, these programs address recruitment and preparation. Brief descriptions illustrate the particular thrust of the preservice programs of the Center for School Leadership. Preservice programs are:

- NC TEACH (Teachers of Excellence for All Children),
- NC Model Teaching Consortium Network (NCMTCN), and
- Principals Fellowship Program (PFP).

Teachers of Excellence for All CHildren (NC TEACH)

Mission

Recruiting potential teachers for the state's most severe shortage areas, NC TEACH works with higher education institutions to recruit, train, and support highly skilled mid-career professionals. This 12-month, lateral entry, teacher licensure program also develops online learning courses for universities' teacher education courses to fast-track lateral entry candidates. These courses utilize a graduate-level, problem-based approach focused on what teachers must know and be able to do in order to teach.

Governance

Created by Senate Bill 1124 in 1999, NC TEACH was developed jointly by the State Board of Education and the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina. Funding came from Title II of the Higher Education Act. NC TEACH is governed by the University of North Carolina General Administration's Center for School Leadership Development. NC TEACH is administered by the Program Director under the leadership of the UNC Vice-President for University-School Programs.

Description

Applicants for NC TEACH must hold a relevant undergraduate degree from an accredited college or university with a minimum of a 2.5 cumulative GPA; a 3.0 is desired in the undergraduate major. They must demonstrate successful work experience of at least three years. Applicants are then carefully screened by NC TEACH staff and by an admission committee at the applicant's host site. Once requirements are met, the candidate participates in an interview at the host site. They are evaluated on "their thinking approach, clarity of expression, self-confidence, enthusiasm, and commitment."¹¹ Upon acceptance by NC TEACH, they apply to the host site graduate school, paying all tuition and fees assessed for the 12-18 graduate hours they earn.

The program minimally takes 12 months and includes an intensive summer institute of five weeks. Upon completion, a provisional license is granted and the NC TEACHER is responsible for securing a teaching position. During the first year, there are monthly seminars and mentors work with the new teacher for two years. After two semesters of teaching and upon passing the PRAXIS content examination, an initial license is granted, provided there are no deficiencies in content courses.

Program Efficiency

Recruitment Through its marketing plan, NC TEACH attracts a large enough pool of candidates to allow for initial screening and selection of highly qualified candidates. The program has experienced rapid growth as illustrated in the following chart.

Participant and Employment Numbers

	Cohort 2000-2000	Cohort 2001-2002	Cohort 2002-2003
Total Applications	289	419	1502
Accepted Applicants	198	268	539
Attended Orientation	135	212	492
Enrolled Summer Institute	124	190	412
Completed Summer Institute	92	168	389
Employed	89 teachers -97%	161 teachers - 96%	To be determined
No. of Employing Schools Districts	77 Schools 50 Districts	144 Schools 77 Districts	To be determined

Funding Completing the end of its third year of funding by the US Department of Education (DOE), NC TEACH has approval for \$822,000 in carry-forward funds from the Title II Higher Education Grant #P336A990038. Funding from the DOE is flow-through funding via the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. This year, the General Assembly's legislative action provided recurring funding of \$500,000/year to sustain NC TEACH.

Cost per Teacher The yearly information results from dividing the funds available by the number of participants who completed the summer institute and were then eligible for a provisional teacher license.

			Number of Teachers	Cost per Teacher
Year One:	DOE	\$765,191	92	\$8317
Year Two	DOE	\$817,690	168	\$4867
Year Three	DOE	\$866,340	389	\$2227
Three-year average cost per teacher				\$3644

Program Effectiveness

Teacher Shortages The program goal addresses shortages in multiple areas. NC TEACH is preparing more math and science teachers than any other teacher education program in the state.

Growth NC TEACH has grown rapidly, continuing to refine its marketing plan to attract high quality professionals to the teaching profession. It has produced 649 lateral entry teachers with provisional certificates during its three-year existence.

Retention Rate With first year data, the program is demonstrating a retention rate of 80% of its original 89 employed teachers. Further impact information and comparison on data will be sought.

Principal Fellows Program (PFP)¹²

Mission

Providing merit-based scholarships to interested individuals to prepare for a career in school administration, the North Carolina Principal Fellows Program ensures that the best, most highly qualified students are able to earn a Master of School Administration degree at one of the nine constituent institutions of the University of North Carolina.

Governance

The program was established by the General Assembly in 1994 to provide North Carolina with a cadre of well-trained administrators for the state's public schools. The program is governed by the University of North Carolina General Administration's Center for School Leadership Development. The Principal Fellows Commission, appointed by various state boards, offices and agencies, has responsibility for approving sites, determining selection criteria, and establishing the method of and selection of Fellows. The State Education Assistance Authority performs all fiscal and administrative functions of the scholarships, including fiscal remediation, disbursement and receipt of funds, and the scheduling of repayment for those who do not fulfill their service commitment.

Description

Principal Fellows receive \$20,000 annual scholarship loans to cover the cost of tuition, fees, and living expenses to enroll in the Master of School Administration degree programs at nine constituent institutions of the University of North Carolina. Fellows are selected by the Principal Fellows Commission based on criteria for admissions to school administrator programs established by the Quality Candidate Committee in 1993 under Chapter 199, HB 257, Section 5. Fellows must apply and be accepted unconditionally to an eligible MSA program to participate. No more than 200 scholarship awards can be made each year.

The first year, the Fellows are enrolled in full-time academic study (minimum of nine hours) and must maintain a minimum GPA of 3.2. The second year, Fellows participate in a full-year internship in a North Carolina public school. Throughout the two years, Fellows participate in additional enrichment activities focused on state educational issues and topics (not funded by General Assembly appropriations). The enrichment activities include seminars on technology and leadership skills (funded by a \$125,000 BellSouth grant from 1996-98), focus groups on various issues, and participation at the NC Association of School Administrators Annual Leadership Conference. Fellows must serve as an administrator for four years within six years of graduation or repay the scholarship loan, plus 10% interest.

Program Efficiency

The original allocation of scholarships was 50 in 1993 and over the past eight years has increased to 181 due to additional appropriations by the General Assembly. Each year, all available scholarship loans have been granted. The program has a 98.6% graduation rate. Only 10 of the 707 Fellows have withdrawn prior to graduation. As of October 2001, 423 of the 442 Fellows held jobs as North Carolina public school administrators.

Year	Enrolled*	Graduated	Employed
1994-95	39		
1995-96	107	38	36 (95%)
1996-97	150	67	64 (96%)
1997-98	160	76	73 (96%)
1998-99	162	83	80 (96%)
1999-00	179	79	79 (100%)
2000-01	183	99	93 (94%)
2001-02	175	84	69 (82%)
2002-03	180	90 (projected)	85 (projected)
TOTALS	1236	616	579

* Includes first and second year students.

The scholarship budget for 2001-2002 was \$3,620,000. The operational budget was \$133,082, paying the salaries and benefits of two program staff, per diem for the board, office supplies, rent, a 1% administrative fee to the CSLD, and other services. The cost per Fellow is \$20,735 with administrative costs. The administrative costs are 3.5% of the per Fellow costs. The program will start to charge a \$25 application fee that should raise an additional \$4,000 of revenue to cover additional costs in 2003-04.

Two programs, Principals' Fellows Program and Principals' Executive Program, offer learning enrichment opportunities as one aspect of their service for principals and principal candidates. Consideration regarding opportunities for coordination or consolidation of these experiences will be examined further.

Program Effectiveness

Program coordinators document the effectiveness of the PFP program by focusing on the number of fellowships granted and high retention rate of those candidates. Comparisons with national data regarding principal preparation programs will be sought. A formal evaluation of the effectiveness of those candidates by an external reviewer was commissioned, but then withdrawn due to budgetary constraints of the University General Administration.

Supply and Demand There have been 526 graduates since 1996. Of the graduates 494 have been employed as an Assistant Principal or Principal in North Carolina and only 14 (3%) have left and are currently repaying their scholarship loan. According to state supply and demand data, demand for principals and assistants will range between 495 and 535.

The employment rate of Fellows is 94%. To date, 132 Fellows (27%) have moved from Assistant Principal to Principal positions and 15 were hired as principals immediately upon graduation.

School Performance Data from a few years ago when 72 Fellows were serving as principals, indicated that 63% of their schools were rated as exemplary or above and 28% received no recognition. No Fellow is leading a low-performing school.

Evaluations Evaluations of enrichment activities have been rated uniformly excellent, however evaluations have focused on the presentation and organization of seminars as opposed to measures of improved performance by staff and/or students.

North Carolina Model Teacher Education Consortium (NCMTEC)

Mission

The North Carolina Model Teacher Education Consortium is a partnership of local districts, community colleges, four-year colleges and universities, and the Department of Public Instruction to collaboratively provide affordable, accessible, high quality education and training to aspiring and practicing educators in participating school districts in eastern North Carolina.

Governance

The NCMTEC was established in 1989 as a collaborative effort by the General Assembly to increase the quantity of highly qualified educators, particularly minority educators, in the Northeastern region of the state. NCMTEC became part of the University of North Carolina General Administration in January 1999 and joined the CSLD in 2000. The Consortium has 44 local systems, 27 community colleges, ten four-year institutions, and the DPI as members. Each member district pays a \$1 per student fee. NCMTEC is governed by an Executive Committee with representation from Consortium constituents and by the UNC Center for School Leadership Development.

Description

The Consortium began with a \$50,000 appropriation from the General Assembly in 1989 with school superintendents in five poor, rural counties to address the shortage of teachers in the northeastern part of the state. The program continued to grow and was expanded to include 20 districts in southeastern North Carolina with additional non-recurring funds. The Consortium dropped from 38 districts to 18 in 1999-2000 without the additional appropriations, but was expanded again in 2000-2001 and now serves 44 districts.

Employees of participating school systems are eligible for NCMTEC services, but they must affiliate with a college or university and pass entrance and exit exams similar to other college students. The Consortium provides pathways for paraprofessionals and lateral entry, emergency and provisional licensed teachers who aspire to become fully licensed teachers in the districts where they are employed. NCMTEC provides tuition and textbook assistance (textbooks were free of charge until spring 2002), onsite advising sessions, transcript evaluations, PRAXIS and other test preparation, and loaning of laptops for aspiring teachers. The Consortium also provides courses for practicing educators, has paid for 121 slots at NCCAT for National Board preparation, and, until recently, offered graduate programs.

Program Efficiency

With funding cut in half in 2001, NCMTEC eliminated its graduate offerings, doubled undergraduate course tuition from \$40 to \$80, and ended its policies of providing complimentary textbooks. As can be seen in the chart, the number of people served, funding, and cost per participant has varied. Additional information regarding sources of revenue, scope, and type of services will be sought to make determinations on the efficiency of the program.

Fiscal Year	People Served	# of Districts	Legislative Allocation	Legislative cost per participant
1989-90	170	7	\$50,000	\$294
1990-91	201	7	\$100,00	\$498
1991-92	235	7	\$150,000	\$638
1992-93	274	9	\$170,000	\$620
1993-94	355	10	\$185,000	\$521
1994-95	506	10	\$185,000	\$366
1995-96	332	10	\$185,000	\$557
1996-97	323	10	\$335,000	\$1,037
1997-98	574	18	\$785,000	\$1,368
1998-99	1134	38	\$2,285,000	\$2,015
1999-00	1374	18	\$825,000	\$600
2000-01	2855	46	\$2,125,000	\$744
2001-02	1656	44	\$892,386	\$539

In 2001-2002, the Consortium had a total budget of \$1,224,553. This includes its legislative allocation and \$332,116 in annual membership dues of its 44 partner districts. Salaries and benefits over that period were \$385,628 - 31.5% of the NCMTEC total budget.

The Consortium maintains its offices in Raleigh. The Consortium asserts that districts have an average return of 391.04% on their investments of \$1 per student membership fees. Evidence base for this assertion will be sought in the next phase of this study.

Program Effectiveness

Participants Effectiveness data centered on the number of participants in various programs. In its 13 years the Consortium has served a variety of participants:

- 1,442 teacher assistants and other paraprofessionals have successfully completed college courses at local community college sites and received reduced tuition and free textbooks.
- 2,018 lateral entry teachers have successfully completed college courses required for licensure with reduced tuition and free textbooks.
- 1,696 teachers received tuition assistance and textbooks through graduate course offerings (now only Exceptional Children's courses at NC Central).
- 454 employees received assistance in PRAXIS, GRE and MAT prep seminars.
- 121 teachers received full scholarships to attend NCCAT to prepare for National Board Certification.

- 76 NCMTEC program participants received full tuition and a stipend of \$500 per month to take a leave of absence while student teaching.
- 5,885 public school employees and non-traditional college students received support and coaching as they pursued teacher certification.

Employment and Retention Questions regarding results of services provided will be investigated further. A number of program participants continue to work in North Carolina public schools. Of the 131 paraprofessional program completers, 76% have been retained. Almost half of the 75% of teachers and administrators taking graduate course work earned a graduate degree or sixth year certificate. Of the 3739 clients in licensed positions, there has been an 89% retention rate over 12 years.

Section Three

Descriptions of the UNC Center for School Leadership Development's "Inservice" Professional Development Programs

While raising requirements for initial teacher or principal licensure is a means to assure highly qualified teachers and principals, it does not address the needs of teachers or principals in schools today. Nor does it address how, over time, individuals continue to improve. Many educators acknowledge that they were never adequately prepared to handle today's rigorous new challenges of accountability. *No Child Left Behind* describes these programs as "inservice." Other language used to describe such strategies is staff development, or professional development, or professional learning.

This section of the Interim Report describes the UNC Center for School Leadership Development's programs whose main focus is professional development for public school teachers and principals. The Center for School Leadership's "inservice" programs were envisioned and designed for the purpose of delivering high quality professional development to public school teachers and administrators. Some programs list multiple outcomes in their goals, coupling professional development with outcomes that include: Reward and retention of veteran teachers, avoiding dropout of minority students, and supporting teachers seeking National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) certification.

Principals' Executive Program (PEP)

Mission Overview

The Principals' Executive Program sponsors programs to address the professional learning needs of its clients at various stages of their administrative careers, enabling principals, assistant principals, and other designated school leaders to promote the highest levels of teacher and student success.

On the heels of the 1983 report, *A Nation at Risk*, influential North Carolina educators convinced the Legislature of the importance of having strong leaders as school principals, and the Principals' Executive Program (PEP) was born in 1984 with a state appropriation of \$374,000. This program, while wanting to ensure good managers, also provides a deep understanding of school issues and a broad set of intellectual and cultural experiences. Modeled after the Advanced Management Program at Harvard Business School, the design grew from the belief that this format would develop a capacity for strong leadership.

According to Annual Reports, the intense, four-week, intermittent PEP program quickly grew to be highly respected by its attendees, by the superintendents who nominated them, and by various influential educational groups with whom it collaborated. That respect continued, persevering through almost two decades, even through the addition of PEP programs, change in residential and time requirements, and change in leadership. PEP aligns its programs with the State Board of Education's Five Strategic Priorities, with the UNC Board of Governor's Strategic Plan and with national standards such as the Interstate Leadership Licensure Consortium and the National Staff Development Council's Standards for Staff Development.

PEP began a transition in programming focus to students as a result of shifts in the state and national accountability systems. In response to state educational leadership and national professional development standards, PEP is offering more of its programs in field settings.

Governance

PEP began, under the governance of The Institute of Government at UNC-Chapel Hill, providing training programs for government employees. In the early 1990s, PEP reported to the Provost of UNC-Chapel Hill. In January 1997, PEP was placed under the jurisdiction of UNC General Administration. In 1998, the program was placed under the administration of UNC's newly created Vice-President of University-School Programs.

Design

Many of PEP's programs have and are undergoing change driven by the increasing centrality of student achievement data in the work of the principal and by the need to comply with new accountability requirements under *No Child Left Behind*. The following multiple programs operate under the auspices of PEP. They are designed to address learners' needs, student achievement data, and state and national initiatives.

Instructional Leadership (ILP) ILP is the newest program designed for principals of schools that qualify through poverty and/or student achievement for Reading Excellence Act (REA) grants,

Comprehensive School Reform Development (CSRD) grants, or inclusion in the Center for the Improvement of Early Reading Achievement (CIERA).

Leadership Program for New Principals (LPNP) Student achievement data is the focus of a four-week journey in professional learning, a host of second and third-year principals learn to confront and use the student achievement data that inundates them annually. Participants report on instructional sessions held with their teachers regarding their uses of student achievement data.

Higher School Performance Program (HSPP) Improving student achievement motivated PEP's creation of this program in 1998. Admission is based in part on having student achievement data that are less than acceptable. HSPP provides a highly focused, turnkey set of professional development experiences to aid principals in turning performance profiles in an upward direction.

Leadership Program for High School Principals (LPHSP) In the past, candidates for this program were accepted from across the state without regard to student achievement. However, for the 2002-2003 school year, participation is restricted to High school principals whose schools previously received state-sponsored assistance teams whose school performance profile failed to meet expected growth targets. This revised LPHSP program, operating under the acronym INCHS (Improving North Carolina High Schools) is now underway.

Coaching for Charter School Principals In 2000-2001, half of North Carolina's low-performing schools were public charter schools. Many charter school directors lacked specific expertise in effective school leadership. With the assistance of the Department of Public Instruction's Office of Charter Schools, PEP created a coaching program for low-performing charter schools. Successful school administrators, retired from full-time service but still active, were employed and trained as coaches.

Leadership Program for Charter School Principals Patterned around the frameworks for our Higher School Performance Program, this program is customized to provide leadership lessons.

Developing Future Leaders (DFL) This program is for superintendents concerned about the turnover rate in the principalship to help attract persons interested in becoming school administrators.

Principals as Technology Leaders Program (PATL) This is a new leadership curriculum strand dealing with the relationship between use of instructional technology and student achievement.

Customized School Improvement Workshops These PEP offerings are based on needs identified by student achievement data and delivered at the district/school site. For example, workshops on Curriculum Compacting and Seminar Teaching are viewed by many principals as strategies for addressing the learning needs of higher-achieving students. Eventually, these strategies are for all students.

Program Efficiency

The Principals' Executive Program appears to leverage its state appropriation to attract other funding. Take note that some participants come for four to six day programs while others attend one-day seminars or even workshops of a few hours. Efficiency data will be sought to examine individual programs for budget and cost per participant as a part of program analysis. Cost comparisons between programs

within PEP and other state or national programs can then better determine efficiency. This issue will be pursued for the Final Report.

	Funding
State Appropriation	\$1,500,000
Fees and Subscriptions	250,000
School (Grants) Technical Assistance	200,000
Teacher Retention Initiative from State Foundation	40,000
Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation Technology Grant	<u>1,000,000</u>
Final phase of \$3,000,000 grant	
TOTAL 2002-2003	\$2,990,000

People Served and Cost per Participant with Comparisons

People Served in 2001-2002	Cost per Participant – Total Budget
2400	\$1246
Cost per Participant – State Appropriation	\$ 625
Cost Comparison: Harvard Principals Center (week)	\$3600 + lodging/travel
Center for Creative Leadership (week)	\$5000 + lodging

Program Effectiveness

Evaluations are designed and redesigned for each program as it is reviewed. There are multiple levels of evaluation. Some address the program itself; others address the program's impact on participants and students.

Evaluation Strategies PEP's staff describes its program as data-driven, research-based, and evaluated formatively and summatively to seek efficiency and effectiveness. The evaluation strategies are part of program design and are adjusted when programs change. The evaluations play the instrumental role in reframing problems surfacing in the respective programs. All program evaluations are reviewed collaboratively by PEP program directors, the PEP director, and associate director. Follow-up debriefings explore program quality.

Connecting PEP Work to Student Results PEP is committed to connecting its work to student results on state tests. PEP has, and, is field-testing several instruments and data-collection devices to secure the kind of impact data needed for summative evaluation. For example, in the three Higher School Performance Program classes where achievement data is available, 79% of the HSPP graduates report improvement in overall student performance as measured by ABC accountability data. Other examples of evaluation strategies to determine program impact on student results follow:

Leadership Program for Assistant Principals (LPAP) A survey of LPAP graduates determines how they use the content they learned in the LPAP program. Each question in the survey is an open-ended item requesting how the respondent assesses the use of their learning

in influencing classroom instruction and/or student success. This survey is being administered this fall to graduates of last year's LPAP classes.

Superintendents' Survey PEP designed a survey to ask superintendents to assess what differences they see in their administrators who participated in one of PEP's residential programs. The survey asks superintendents to focus on how changes in leadership practices might show in indicators of school improvement. Several items in this survey specifically relate to superintendents' perceptions of leadership development and student achievement. This survey is being inaugurated as an online instrument this fall and will become an annual survey.

Principals as Technology Leaders Program (PATL) As research evidence mounts to support the relationship between use of instructional technology and student achievement, the need to examine this impact emerges as a priority. An online survey, designed by PEP, invites all PATL graduates to provide impact feedback. The survey examines any influences the use of instructional technology might have on student achievement.

North Carolina Center for the Advancement of Teaching (NCCAT)

Mission Overview

The goals of NCCAT are to reward excellence in teaching, to renew participants both personally and professionally, and to retain outstanding career teachers in North Carolina schools. NCCTA aligns its programs with the State Board of Education's Five Strategic Priorities, with the UNC Board of Governor's Strategic Plan, and with national standards such as the Interstate Leadership Licensure Consortium and the National Staff Development Council's Standards.

The North Carolina Center for the Advancement of Teaching was established by the North Carolina Legislature in 1985 as a response to concerns that beginning and veteran teachers' leaving the profession contributed to the teaching shortage. The primary program goal was teacher retention. The legislative mandate was, "to provide career teachers with opportunities to study advanced topics in the sciences, arts and humanities and to engage in informed discourse assisted by able mentors and outstanding leaders from all walks of life; and otherwise to offer opportunity for teachers to engage in scholarly pursuits, through a center dedicated exclusively to the advancement of teaching as an art and as a profession."

Governance

The Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina established an NCCAT Board of Trustees and delegated to the Board of Trustees all the powers and duties the Board of Governors considered necessary or appropriate for the effective discharge of NCCAT functions. The program since been made a part of the UNC Center for School Leadership Development and therefore, NCCAT's Program Director reports to the UNC Vice-President for University-School Programs.

Design

NCAAT began as a residential program opportunity for all teachers on a self-selective basis. Since 1985, it has evolved to provide a number of professional development opportunities for teachers in a variety of settings.

Driven by Learners' Needs The cornerstone of NCCAT's programming began in the design and implementation of renewal seminars for public school teachers. A strong intellectual thrust has always driven this design process based on the assumption that teachers who experience the joy of learning transfer that enthusiasm to their students.

Focuses on District and State Student Achievement Data Low-performing, low-socioeconomic schools and districts are targeted for special programming with NCCAT's individual professional development programs, *Beginning Teachers*, *Connections*, and most grant-funded projects.

Aligns with National and State Initiatives In accordance with *No Child Left Behind* and *Put Reading First*, NCCAT wrote and received a three-year MeBane Grant, *Developing Teachers for K-3 Reading Success*. This literacy grant supports ASSET (All Students Succeed through Excellent Teaching), a state initiative designed to close the achievement gap for high-risk minority and low-socio-economic students.

NCCAT and DPI Recent partnerships at the state level include those with the NC Department of Public Instruction for whom state assessment models and state mentor training programs were developed and implemented.

NCCAT and School Districts' Beginning Teacher Programs Grants and partnerships with several school districts support the NCCAT *Connections* program designed to provide support for beginning teachers, reduce the attrition rate for beginning teachers, and improve the mentoring programs in the participating school systems. *Connections*, now in its sixth year, began as a cooperative effort between the NCCAT, Vance County Schools and Robeson County Schools. For 2002-2003, NCCAT will run *Connections* for Vance, Edgecombe, Martin, and Montgomery counties.

NCCAT and School Leadership Teams A new DeWitt Wallace-Readers Digest grant targeted to strengthen instructional leadership will allow NCCAT to work with 11 school leadership teams composed of a principal or assistant principal and two teachers.

Program Efficiency

Funding Immediately accessible data reported NCCAT served 5200 teachers in 2000-2001, a 136% increase in six years. Further study will include examination of individual offerings for program cost per participant as well as number of days per offering. Cost comparisons between programs within NCCAT and other state or national programs will help determine efficiency.

State Appropriation	\$3,707,264 (after cuts and freeze)
Grants and Contract funds	142,336
TOTAL 2001-2002	\$3,849,600

People Served and Cost per Participant

People Served in 2001-2002	Cost per Participant – Total Budget
5855	\$657
	Cost per Participant – State Appropriation
	\$ 633

Formative Evaluation Throughout each NCCAT event, programs evaluators observe and assess the impact of the experience and talk informally with participants to gauge effectiveness. At the end of each event, every participant is asked to complete a paper-and-pencil end-of-seminar evaluation, including Likert-scale items and open-ended questions.

Program Effectiveness

Retention Data According to figures recently obtained from the Department of Public Instruction, 91% of teachers who attended an NCCAT seminar within the past three years are still teaching in North Carolina classrooms today. An additional, 2% of NCCAT alumni since 1998 are still working in the schools but have moved on to administrative positions. Only 7% have left the profession through retirement, leave of absence, relocation, or job change. Retention data for

beginning and continuing teachers will be studied in comparison to available state and national data.

Evaluation Data NCCAT uses internal and external evaluations to assess and redirect its programming. Every five years a large-scale mail-out survey studies long-term effects of the NCCAT experience. To obtain third-party observations of behavioral change related to participation in NCCAT seminars, in 1998, NCCAT surveyed the impressions of principals and assistant principals. To study affective changes in teachers related to participation in NCCAT seminars, the 1997 Burnout and Teacher Efficacy Study utilized the Maslach Burnout Inventory and the Gibson and Dembo Teacher Efficacy Survey. Previous researchers had validated these two instruments, each known to influence student achievement. In addition to internal studies, NCCAT has employed external evaluators five times since 1985.

Recognizing the increased expectation to see more direct links to improved student achievement, NCCAT is examining its curriculum to highlight its alignment with the characteristics of schools with high achievement results for its students.

NCCAT has documented increased leadership behavior for teachers who participate in NCCAT seminars. The 2002 Alumni Survey found that 88% of respondents reported more readily sharing their expertise and experience with fellow teachers. This finding of leadership and collaboration is supported by the 1988 Principals and Assistant Principals study. Of those responding, 72% reported that teachers who had attended NCCAT more readily shared their experience and expertise with fellow teachers.

North Carolina Mathematics and Science Education Network (NC-MSEN)

Mission Overview

Legislative mandate in 1984 gave NC-MSEN two goals: strengthen the quality and increase the pool of mathematics and science educators, and increase the pool of students who graduate from North Carolina's high school prepared to pursue careers requiring mathematics and science. MSEN added a third goal to support and engage in research regarding professional development for math and science teachers' professional growth. In 1985-86, NC-MSEN added a fourth goal to encourage minority students to pursue education and careers in fields related to mathematics and science, including teaching. In the last several years MSEN adopted goal five to collaboratively work with teachers, schools, and other stakeholders, and goal six to design and to deliver high quality professional development programs that will improve student learning in mathematics and science. Goal seven focuses on communication about NC-MSEN resources available to support educators' and policymakers' work.

In 1980-81 educational leaders expressed concern over the shortage of mathematics and science teachers as well as the number of teachers in the field who lacked depth in content knowledge. UNC Chapel Hill and UNC Charlotte offered assistance that culminated in a mathematics-science education center on the campus of Chapel Hill. This led to the identification of four "outreach" centers that focused on middle and high school teachers.

The UNC General Administration demonstrated its approval of the model by allocating GA funds to develop a network of centers. In 1984 the state General Assembly provided funding for ten centers across the state. NC-MSEN actively pursued grants and frequently the General Assembly expanded the grant funding to increase programs.

Governance

The NC-MSEN program is under the governance of the UNC General Administration Vice-President for University-School Programs and is a part of the Center for School Leadership Development.

The Network, as an entity, has a Statewide Advisory Board, whose purpose is "to facilitate the development of NC-MSEN's efforts to foster a working partnership among mathematics, science, and education departments within universities, the public schools, business/industry, and government to plan and implement the NC-MSEN program goals." Each of the Centers has its separate advisory board, which helps to guide its planning, programming, and interactions with stakeholders in their individual service regions.

Design

The NC-MSEN offers two fundamental services: Statewide teacher professional development in mathematics, science, and technology provided through ten centers, and the Pre-College Program for students in grades 6-12. The complementary nature of the programs allows teachers to apply concepts learned in professional development programs directly in the classroom.

Driven by Learners' Needs The NC-MSEN assumes statewide leadership for substantive professional development programs for teachers of mathematics and science. The needs are linked

closely to the North Carolina *Standard Course of Study*. The primary strategy to determine learners' needs is to work closely with partner districts to determine needs of their faculties.

The Glenn Report's (Before It's Too Late) acknowledgement that student achievement in mathematics and science is closely correlated with the content preparation of classroom teachers also drives the development of professional development in the content area.

NC-MSEN also works to identify, develop, and deliver professional development to meet the needs of stronger teachers who wish to earn National Board Certification, to engage in research experiences during the summer or travel to enhance their education.

Focuses on District and State Student Achievement Data The Centers do not have direct access to disaggregated student data. District and school clients are encouraged to share it to assist with program planning. In cases where that does not happen, programs are designed according to more generic national and state data.

Published student achievement data from the ABC reports are reviewed to identify high-performing and low-performing schools. Disaggregated ABC data are used whenever districts make it available (this does not occur in most situations) in determining with the districts the goals of professional development projects. Several approaches are used based on the data:

- Work with the district or the specific school leadership teams in low-performing/proficiency schools to reach congruence on what can be done collectively to improve teaching quality. This provides an avenue for gaining additional data and information that will assist teachers in improving their knowledge and skills so they can provide more challenging and inquiry-based science and mathematics instruction.
- Identify areas of weakness (strands and major concepts) that appear in end-of-course (EOC) test results. These will guide program design. In mathematics, for example, EOC data has shown that students are not proficient in measurement, data collection and interpretation, proportional reasoning, and probability and statistics. Some or all of these are the foci of professional development projects such as the NC Middle Math (NCM2) Project and the pending NC Partnership for Improving Mathematics and Science (NC-PIMS) and smaller professional development programs at the local level.

The approach to determining program goals, services, and outcomes vary among the NC-MSEN Centers and the schools/school districts that they serve. Some Centers work with a larger number of "hard-to-staff" schools, feeder schools for high schools that have low achievement scores, low-wealth schools, and/or schools with enrollments of 60% or more of poor and minority students.

Includes Collaboration/Partnership

Performance-based assessment from The Third International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) and the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) studies were used to initiate the North Carolina Infrastructure in Science Education (NC-ISE) project (a.k.a. K-8 *Science Infrastructure Leadership Project*). The DPI and several corporations, including Carolina Biological Supply, Dupont, Glaxo SmithKline, Kendall-Hunt, and Bayer Corporation, also support

this joint venture. The NC-ISE project focuses on content, pedagogy, and leadership development and is designed to create a statewide support system for science teachers.

Summer Science Leadership Institutes, 1999-2002, have involved the development of districts' plans to reform science teaching through inquiry-and standards-based instruction.

Provides Support

The Centers make use of skilled master/lead teachers in order to focus learning on the needs of teachers and to provide on-site assistance for teachers to acquire the necessary skills to make a difference in their classroom.

Formative Evaluation

All of the Center sponsored activities for teachers require a post-session evaluation. Many of the questions on the form deal with the learning needs of the participants. The evaluation instrument also provides for open-ended comments by the program participants.

Participant Data NC-MSEN collects demographic data on its participants on ethnicity, gender, geographic location, subjects taught, and number of years in the profession. Participants are asked to indicate reasons for attending workshops or seminars. When giving reasons for participation, over 50% identified upgrading math or science skills; 20% identified completing re-certification requirements; 5% were pursuing initial certification, and 6% were completing a graduate degree.

Measuring Professional Development Quality Questionnaires assess participants' perceptions regarding the utility, quality, and effectiveness of workshops. Using a five-point Likert scale where a score of "1" indicates strong agreement with a statement and "5" indicates strong disagreement, the participants' were overwhelmingly positive about the value of their professional development experience. There were 95.6% who indicated "the activity will be valuable for my teaching."

In addition, 94% of the 2,683 participants returning the evaluation questionnaire (n=2,860) indicated that they intend to use the information provided regularly in their classrooms.

Eisenhower Professional Development workshops had 703 participants from 65 school districts. Almost half were teaching at schools characterized by high poverty levels. Upon completion of workshops, questionnaires yielded results with 98% agreeing or strongly agreeing that the activity would be valuable for their teaching.

Funding

2000-2001

2001-2002

State Appropriation	\$ 518,971	\$ 458,270
Federal Grant	\$1,923,726	\$1,645,322
Private Funds	\$ 54,349	\$ 24,274
State Grant	\$ 13,750	-0-
TOTALS	\$2,510,796	\$2,127,866

Program Effectiveness

Evaluation Data Centers expect that local school districts and schools achievement data must be used to help evaluate the service and the outcomes of the programs that are provided. Feedback from 4000 participants in NC-MSEN professional development in the year 2000-2001 indicated that 94% used the skills and knowledge they had acquired in their classrooms. State appropriations that year were only 30% of the NC-MSEN budget.

The Mathematics and Science Education Network uses its state allocation to leverage additional funding opportunities. Projects are designed to improve the achievement of K-12 students in science and mathematics. The National Science Foundation and the Department of Education have just announced NC-MSEN as a \$21,300,000 award winner, the largest grants in this first series of awards of the NCLB \$1 billion mathematics and science partnership initiative.

North Carolina Teacher Academy (NCTA)

Mission Overview

The mission of the Teacher Academy is to recognize the importance of continuous learning to the growth of a career teacher by providing quality professional development in the areas of school leadership, instruction, core content, and the use of modern technology.

The General Assembly called for the establishment of the Academy in 1993, to support site-based management implementation. The North Carolina Teacher Academy's "grassroots involvement" was structured to bring more teachers into design and implementation of professional development at the school level.

NCTA experienced legislative fiscal support throughout the 1990s. With the budget crisis beginning in 2000, NCTA lost \$553,000 in 2001-2002 funding. This 12% budget cut was in addition to the 10% cut assigned to each CSLD program.

Governance

A 1994 state task force recommended that the Department of Public Instruction provide coordination for the North Carolina Teacher Academy initiative. In 1995, the General Assembly removed the Teacher Academy from DPI and placed it under the governance of University of North Carolina General Administration. With a decision-making Board of Trustees, authorized by the UNC Board of Governors, the NCTA program is now assigned to the UNC Center for School Leadership's Vice-President for University-School Programs.

Design

The North Carolina Teacher Academy delivers staff development to school systems at their request, based on their identified school improvement goals. While the North Carolina Teacher Academy provides staff development to school systems during the academic year, the primary delivery model has been week-long summer programs either in a residential setting or in a local school district, which gives educators time to learn both theory and pedagogy related to a topic.

The Teacher Academy offers staff development described in *the NCTA Staff Development Catalog*. In addition, the Academy tailors staff development to meet the specific needs of a school if it is within an area of expertise.

The Academy staff identifies the foremost research and practice related to the identified needs of educators. The North Carolina Teacher Academy delivery model has been developed based on the theory that best practices are those that have been tried in a classroom setting. National consultants and experts in a variety of areas provide training to outstanding classroom teachers in North Carolina. Those teachers then implement the strategies in their classrooms and, after identifying the most effective strategies, develop an instructional module for delivery to classroom teachers in North Carolina, which combines theory and pedagogy.

The NC Teacher Academy has numerous modules that specifically focus on teaching to diverse learners. For example, in the area of differentiated learning the Academy offers workshops and

training in separate modules of Learning Styles, Multiple Intelligences, Best Practices Based Upon Brain Research, and Reading in the Content Areas targeted to students who have difficulty understanding informational text.

The Academy has developed a cadre of teachers trained to be professional development facilitators. This intensive training and subsequent facilitating develops teacher leadership and provides skilled leadership to individual schools and districts. The Teacher Academy sets expectations that teachers and teams will disseminate newly acquired strategies within their schools.

Driven by Learners' Needs The Teacher Academy conducts focus groups consisting of K-12 teachers and administrators chosen from schools across all regions of the state to determine their most crucial learning needs. Survey instruments are subsequently developed from the focus group data and mailed to a large sample population of educators. This process was last carried out in 1999, when 5,000 surveys were distributed. A significantly high response rate of 61% was obtained.

Focuses on District and State Student Achievement Data While the Teacher Academy does not have direct access to student achievement data, input from classroom teachers indicate what skills they need to improve student achievement. Through the new ASSET project NCTA will incorporate strategies for analyzing and using student data into modules designed to help schools close the achievement gap.

Aligns with Accountability System The North Carolina Teacher Academy's program is fully aligned with the North Carolina State Board of Education standards as outlined in the North Carolina Professional Teaching Standards and Legislative mandates. The content design of each Teacher Academy module supports the objectives of North Carolina *Standard Course of Study* and gives teachers opportunities to develop instructional strategies to use in its delivery. Some modules deal specifically with the school improvement plan required by the state.

Program Efficiency

Formative Evaluation Ongoing formative evaluation is used to refine and revise each of the Teacher Academy modules. A research assistant is employed by the Teacher Academy to gather and analyze the data collected during the summer sessions. Formative evaluation techniques, including the development of pre/post tests, feedback cards, samples of student work, and hallway interviews are used to monitor and adjust programs. The evaluation of the modules has also been based on Kirkpatrick's four levels of evaluation:

1. Reactions: What did the learners think of the training?
2. Learning: What did learners learn?
3. Behavior: What learning, skills, etc. did learners apply on the job?
4. Results: What changes in results and productivity occurred on the job?

Learners Needs in Program Design With the intensity of the focus on student achievement results and its accompanying plethora of accountability measures and test data, NCTA relies on a 1999 teacher survey for K-12 learners' needs.

Funding

State Appropriation	\$3,694,239 (after cuts and freeze)
Grants or Other Funding	-0-
TOTAL 2001-2002	\$3,694,239

People Served and Cost per Participant

PEOPLE SERVED IN 2000-2001	COST PER PARTICIPANT – STATE APPROPRIATION
4445	\$ 831

The Teacher Academy served 4,445 educators during 2001-2002 as enumerated below:

- 1123 follow-up participants who attended an academy one day in fall and one day in spring.
- 988 participants who attended a residential four-day academy – June 2002.
- 956 participants who attended a local four-day academy – June 2002.
- 1378 participants from 25 schools in 19 districts who received 36 hours of staff development.

Since it's beginning in 1994, the Teacher Academy has served 34,303 educators, 10,076 of who are educators. The participants represent 1,689 schools from 116 of 117 LEAs. Data beginning with July 1, 2002 is not included in these figures.

The Teacher Academy is accepting only 40% to 60% of the teams that apply each year. The following criteria are used to select participants:

- applying teams must meet the requirements/prerequisites outlined in the application;
- school teams from low-wealth and/or low-performing schools are assured a slot if they meet the criteria;
- priority is first given to school teams that have not previously attended the Academy;
- one to three school teams are selected from each applying district on the first selection round.

Program Effectiveness

Summative The Teacher Academy has a Continuous Improvement Model as part of its Shaping Successful Schools module content. Internal and external assessment processes are specifically taught so that faculties may utilize them in strategic planning for identifying their greatest professional needs, action planning for raising student achievement, and creating their school improvement plans. Participants are encouraged to replicate and utilize these needs assessments with their faculties.

Section Four

Department of Public Instruction's Professional Development Programs

State Assistance Teams

The Department of Public Instruction (DPI) works with schools designated as low-performing under the ABC's of Public Education plan. Assistance team members comprised of practicing teachers, representatives of higher education, school administrators, doctoral students and others review and investigate all facets of school operations, develop specific recommendations, and provides services to increase the capacity of the staff. DPI works with assistance team members to provide training. There are currently 12 K-8 teams and three 9-12 teams. DPI provides additional voluntary assistance to low-performing and at-risk schools through its state consultants

Closing the Achievement Gap

In recommendation #5 and #6 of the plan for Raising Achievement and Closing Gaps, the State Board, the Department of Public Instruction and the UNC-CSLD commit to designing and funding a flexible professional development initiative and increasing the time available for teachers to update and gain new skills in working with diverse populations. DPI identified schools for the CSLD to work with and is working on identifying a cadre of trainers to deliver staff development on maximizing student potential as well as establishing a clearinghouse (with UNC-CSLD) on high quality professional development.

Staff Development Coordination

In the Division of School Improvement, the Staff Development Coordination section provides technical assistance and support that enables schools to meet the needs of students they serve. The section with a section chief, assistant, and five consultants, provide professional development and consultation upon request, serve as liaisons to schools assigned State Assistance Teams, and develop staff development training modules. The section has developed modules on classroom management, differentiated instruction, high expectations and student achievement, aligning curriculum, balanced literacy programs, parental involvements and many other topics.

School Technical Services

Also in the Division of School Improvement, the School Technical Services section provides support to low-performing schools in achieving their performance goals in reading, writing, and math. The Section provides technical assistance by providing classroom demonstration lessons, collaborating with school staff to provide formative observation, and prescribing and/or delivering needed staff development to school-based practitioners. Five consultants and one section chief provide services for the Section.

International Opportunities

Since 1989, DPI has worked with the Visiting International Faculty Program to bring teachers from abroad to the state and provide North Carolina teachers the opportunity to immerse themselves in a new country for the school year.

Beginning Teacher Induction Program

Since 1986, DPI has provided training to mentor teachers to work with novices as part of the state's beginning teacher induction program through the development of training modules and conferences.

Section Five

Preliminary Findings

Analysis of the professional development programs targeted by this Study is still underway. It is premature to present recommendations based solely on analysis of materials and interviews with program directors. NSDC intends to use the practitioners' input to further investigate and respond to the Oversight Committee's request for specific recommendations.

Some areas surfaced that require the attention of the investigators. As programs and specific topics are further identified and analyzed, these issues and findings will be finalized for, or excluded from, the Final Report. They are offered here as areas for consideration, areas that may be of interest not only to the General Assembly, but also to the State Superintendent, the State Board, and/or the Governor.

Questions/Findings Impacting Alignment of Services with the North Carolina Accountability System

Coordination How are coordination and staff development technical assistance functions assumed by the Department of Public Instruction best managed? What is in the best interest of service to the field?

Alignment How do North Carolina's professional development programs targeted by this study, UNC-CSLD and the DPI, help educators understand the rationale for and provide assistance with "align plans and professional development with state and local accountability structures and requirements? How do these same programs meet these same expectations?

Planning Is there a need for a standard format and due date to be developed for School/District Improvement Plans? School/district plans throughout the state presently have no common format or due date. Are there legitimate benefits of the current system as viewed by practitioners? Do the concerns expressed by technical assistance providers (DPI and UNC-CSLD) outweigh such benefits?

Questions/Findings Regarding Governance Structures

Authority Do the current governance structures inhibit or assist the various programs in meeting state priorities and needs of constituents? What is the relationship between the UNC Vice-President of University School Programs and the independent governing/advisory boards of the various programs?

Service Duplication Under what conditions are program overlaps and/or duplications acceptable? What are the highest leverage roles for DPI and UNC-CSLD? Can the state maximize resources by reclarifying expectations for DPI and UNC-CSLD? How are new services identified and negotiated throughout the system to avoid duplication or leverage resources?