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1.0 INTRODUCTION

The professional development of educators is a subject of great interest not only in Montana, but also in every other state. The U.S. Department of Education’s September 1998, report, Promising Practices: New Ways to Improve Teacher Quality, begins with the statement, “Teaching is the essential profession, the one that makes all other professions possible.” It continues, stressing that “without well-qualified, caring, and committed teachers” the best curricula, the finest assessments, the safest schools and the highest academic standards cannot “ensure that our children are prepared for the challenges and opportunities in America’s third century.” The difference, it was noted, between those who will thrive in our economy and those who will not will depend more than ever on the quality of their education. Critical to that quality will be the on-going, career-long professional development of teachers, and of the principals who support them.

This is why the business of this report is important. It was prepared in accordance with a Request for Proposals issued by the Montana Certification Standards and Practices Advisory Committee (CSPAC, RFP 00-102R). The expressed interest of CSPAC, working in partnership with the Board of Public Education and the Office of Public Instruction, is to “enhance the quality of professional development related to in-service for K-12 educators in Montana.” The purpose of the study resides in this interest: it is to compile the information necessary to implement a statewide professional development program for Montana.

The study mandate encompasses several components:

- A comprehensive review of present professional development activities and the development of an inventory of professional development services available for K-12 educators in Montana
A review of recent studies of best practices and the identification of models of effective evaluation for professional development activities conducted in Montana, the Northwest, and throughout the nation

Based on this work, a series of recommendations to CSPAC of effective models of professional development that include evaluation components.

According to the RFP, the findings are to be presented in a final written report to CSPAC that would include both an inventory of professional development activities and recommendations on strategies to implement and evaluate successful models.

Although it was not called for in the RFP specifically, the research team believes that an assessment of needs for professional development among educators in Montana was necessary to provide an appropriate context. Such an assessment was suggested in the study proposal, and this suggestion was accepted. Thus, the results of this component of the study also appear in this report.

Although perhaps obvious, it also is worth noting that the study mandate did not call for a 'management review' of professional development programs and how they are managed and delivered in Montana. The research team did not evaluate the organizational setting for these services in any great depth. Nevertheless, some reference to the organizational context proved inescapable, since recommendations and strategies not clearly linked to specified entities with respect to such aspects as planning, management, and oversight responsibility would be incomplete. Perhaps fortunately in this sense at least, Montana’s organizational framework for professional development is fairly straightforward and comparatively easily explained.

The state does not have a strategic plan for the delivery of professional development, nor does it have an especially complex establishment. Rather, local school districts are required to prepare professional development plans in accordance
with the state’s Standards for Accreditation. The Standards for Accreditation for professional development are these:

(10.55.714 Professional Development) (1) As part of a continuous program for instructional and administrative improvement, each school district shall provide a minimum of three days of professional development annually for each certified employee. A day of professional development is defined as six hours of actual contact time. Professional development time may be divided into no less than two-hour increments to facilitate delivery of professional development programs.

(2) By April of each year, the school district shall formulate a professional development plan which includes: (a) Goals and objectives appropriate to the professional development needs of teachers, administrators, school trustees, and other school personnel; (b) Acceptable activities; (c) Evaluation methods required for each activity in the plan.

(3) The Board of Trustees shall establish an advisory committee to develop and evaluate the plan. The committee shall include but not be limited to teachers, administrative personnel, and trustees. A majority of the committee shall be teachers.

(4) The plan shall be on file in the school’s administrative office or with the county superintendent. It shall be available to employees and the public.

The Office of Public Instruction exercises approval authority over the various providers. In addition to the districts, there are a number of players, or providers; these include Montana’s colleges and universities, local associations, county superintendents, regional administrator groups, and regional curriculum councils. As noted later, there are more than 200 providers approved by the Office of Public Instruction to provide professional development services.

There is no further authoritative definition of professional development, and beyond the reference material on accreditation standards, there is no strategic statewide approach with respect either to programs or technology in place in Montana. Hence, it is reasonable to say that the professional development system in Montana is loosely-coupled. Montana is not unique in this regard. The study’s review of best practices revealed no highly organized solutions, although, it should be stated, it was focused on programs rather than statewide systems.
As will be seen, there is a lot of professional development activity underway in Montana. This does not mean, however, that every educator has ready access to anything needed. A statewide map highlighting localities in which programs are available is presented in the Appendix. It is an impressive picture, but may be misleading. While teachers in most localities have access to some professional development courses and programs, few can claim access to even a respectable fraction. Location, time, resources, and marketing are the intervening variables, and too often they also are the impediments.

Opinions about professional development among Montana educators are remarkably well spoken. Educators are aware of what is available and they display much willingness to participate. People also have views, however, about what is needed to make it better. Respondents described the professional development requirements as too relaxed. They believed there are no clear external incentives or requirements for educators to pursue the opportunities that are available, although, again, many do. Such attitudes might be summed in a few words: teachers do not know what to take, districts do not know what to require, and legislators do not know what to fund.

The findings and recommendations of this report take these views into account, but, again, the emphasis is on needs, supply, best practices, and recommendations.

The report is organized accordingly. The next chapter, Chapter 2.0, details the results of the need assessment. Best practices are described in Chapter 3.0. Chapters 4.0 and 5.0 present the results of the principals’ and the teachers’ surveys, respectively. Chapter 6.0 comprises efforts to bring these together in summary form and present recommendations. These recommendations are predicated on the assumption that professional development and continuing in-service education for educators in Montana are matters of vital importance. The recommended strategies and emphases are offered
in the belief that this importance should and can be realized in a manner uniquely suited to this great state.
2.0 MONTANA EDUCATORS’ PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND CONTINUING IN-SERVICE EDUCATION NEEDS STUDY

An important aspect of the Montana Educators’ Professional Development and Continuing In-Service Education Needs study is the identification and categorization of all professional development programs available to Montana’s educators. In this regard, a Professional Development Provider Survey (Appendix E) was mailed in September 2000 to 207 Office of Public Instruction-approved providers of professional development offerings for K-12 educators throughout Montana. Providers surveyed included: school districts; public schools; education-related associations, alliances and councils; special services cooperatives; education cooperatives; foundations; state and federal agencies (e.g., Department of Child and Family Services, Lee Metcalf National Wildlife Refuge); community colleges; public and private colleges and universities; and the Montana Office of Public Instruction.

A total of 147 responses were received, for a response rate of 71 percent. Of the respondents, 131 (89 percent) were public providers and 16 were private. In addition, in order to sample various perspectives on existing professional development available in Montana, the CSPAC Project Coordination Team assisted the study team with the identification of interviewees. Interviews were conducted with university deans, members of the school directors and teacher association staffs, curriculum council staff, librarians and school counselors.

2.1 Clients Served

The majority of the clients served fit into three categories: teachers, administrators, and board members. Ninety-seven percent, or 143 of the respondents, reported offering professional development for teachers. Professional development for
administrators was reported by 101 (69 percent) of the providers, and board member development was identified by 24 percent, or 35 of the respondents.

A fourth category, “Other”, was checked by 33 (22 percent) of the respondents. Their responses included the following client groups, with the number of providers who reported serving each group noted in parentheses.

- General public (10)
- Parents (9)
- Classified personnel (7)
- K-12 and adult students (6)
- Curriculum specialists (1)
- Counselors/psychologists (3)
- Home schoolers (1)
- Pre-school teachers/Head Start (2)
- Professionals needing CEU’s (1)
- Agencies serving children with disabilities (1)
- State and county employees (1)
- Health care workers (1)
- Higher education (1)
- Yellowstone boys and girls staff (1)

Among the private providers, 44 percent reported offering professional development to board members, while 21 percent of the publics reported serving that group.

### 2.2 Professional Development Offerings

Sixteen categories of professional development were included on the survey. The number of reported offerings within each category are listed below in descending order.

- Teaching methods 215
- Integrating technology in instruction 161
- In-depth study of content area 160
- Student performance assessment 147
- Classroom management strategies 119
- Special education/disabilities (physical, learning) 97
- Implementing new standards 94
- Parental involvement 89
- Integrating technology in school management 86
- School management/budgeting/personnel 81
- Education law 64
Respondents were also offered the category of “Other” for program entries. Those programs resulted in the following six categories.

- Safety and health 23
- Personal growth 3
- Leadership updates/critical information 7
- Grants and grant-writing 2
- L & C story and techniques 4
- Transfer classes (to 4-year institutions) 2

The following professional development offerings were mentioned once each: Biblical teaching, curriculum assessment, early literacy, early career support, early childhood conference, goal-setting and scheduling, school improvement, social norms, world view orientations, mobility, ecology project/study, college courses on Montana school budget issues, and facilitation of MSBA meetings via interactive TV. Two providers noted that they offer programs and courses responsive to expressed current teacher and student needs.

2.3 **Locations Served**

Respondents were asked to indicate the location(s) where each program they listed is offered. A list of their responses can be found in Appendix A.

2.4 **Length of Offerings**

The lengths of program offerings reported were expressed in numerous ways. For example, program duration ranged from a one-half day workshop or seminar to a five-year project, from a one-hour to a one-day program, or from one week to one year.
There were some significant patterns, however, in the number of offerings scheduled for certain groupings by program duration. For example, by combining all one-day programs with those lasting six, seven and eight hours, the total is 206. This makes the one-day professional development session by far the largest category, in terms of program duration, currently offered in Montana.

The following summarizes for the majority of programs, the various lengths of the offerings.

- ½ hour – 5 hours
  - 71
- 1 day
  - 206
- 1 ½ days
  - 8
- 2 days
  - 95
- 3 days
  - 28
- 4 days
  - 9
- 5 days
  - 11
- 6 days
  - 4
- 2 weeks
  - 1

The length of additional programs were variously described as lasting 45 hours, 15 days, 25-50 hours annually, one quarter, and from one to four semesters. Two respondents identified year-long programs and another a program lasting from four to six months. One respondent noted a two-year program that starts with a new cohort every second year.

### 2.5 Frequency of Offerings

Respondents were asked to identify the frequency with which they offer each professional development program they listed (e.g., annually, monthly, weekly, one time,
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etc.). The following presents, in descending order, the number of responses in each category.

- Annually 157
- 3 times/year 9
- 1 time, only 64
- 4 times/year 7
- Monthly 21
- 4-6 times/year 4
- 2 times/year 17
- On-going 4
- Summer 14
- 15 days/year 3

One provider who reported offering a professional development program two times a year indicated that it is available “two times a year in each city.” Program frequencies mentioned twice include:

- two times a month
- three PIR days each school year
- daily
- four in-services a year

The following frequencies were noted one time each:

- seven times a year
- two times a month by content area
- three times, only
- semester course
- ten times a year
- seventeen times a year
- on-going over a period of three years

2.6 Program Follow-Up

Providers were asked to indicate “the nature of the follow-up” to their professional development programs. The following four categories of program follow-up were mentioned most frequently by the respondents. Each category is followed by the number of times it was mentioned.
- On-site observations and critiques/“coaching” 29
- Building/District/State level support 27
  (release time for collaboration, administrator meetings, curriculum meetings, service provider meetings, contacts)
- Reinforcement programs/advanced courses 26
  (refresher courses, meetings, research on effective strategies)
- Peers/mentoring 21
  (contact, support, tutoring, study groups, portfolio development)

Faculty meetings, as a means of program follow-up, were noted 12 times. In nine instances, respondents said they provide telephone and personal contact follow-up with their program participants. Annual staff reviews were identified three times as a means of follow-up, the availability of the instructor for follow-up contacts with participants was noted twice and the use of classroom progress sheets was mentioned once.

In five cases, respondents mentioned the need for card renewal every three years, thus necessitating continued contact and follow-up. It also was noted that agencies offer more than 150 classes for renewal credits.

The University of Montana holds a monthly meeting with their program’s on-site coordinator. Another provider incorporates follow-up on retreat items in daily devotions and at their Wednesday in-services.

One mention was made regarding the “frequent use of a web site to communicate” on an on-going basis with program participants. Regarding programs offered to parents, it was noted four times that individual follow-up and coaching was provided.

The use of surveys and evaluations regarding the programs themselves was mentioned 31 times. In 46 instances, respondents reported having no follow-up with their program participants.
2.7 **Delivery Systems**

Respondents were asked to identify the delivery system(s) used with their professional development offerings. The over 380 answers to that question follow.

- Workshops: 252
- Seminars: 66
- Mentors: 21
- Distance Learning: 17
- Traditional classroom: 11
- Conferences/meetings: 4
- Video: 4
- Computer labs: 2
- Field Trips: 2
- Multi-media: 2
- Study groups: 1

In addition to the systems noted above, several respondents referred specifically to the Northwest Region Education Lab (NWREL), the state’s curriculum cooperatives and the colleges and universities and their resources as deliverers, and providers of delivery systems, for Montana educators’ professional development. Several respondents also noted the importance of a “hands-on” aspect to delivery, whether in workshops, on field trips or when working with a mentor.

2.8 **Opportunities for Collaboration**

Respondents were asked if they provided, or facilitated the development of, collaborative opportunities for educators. These opportunities were presented in four categories:
The responses to the first category, “opportunities for collaboration among peers within the same school”, were:

- Teams/team teaching 30
- Common preparation/planning period 24
- Mentors 14
- Staff meetings 10
- In-services 5

Many respondents identified accommodations or special arrangements they make in order to encourage collaboration among teachers. Most noted early release days that ranged from one per month to one each week. In addition, several noted that they pay for substitutes so general education teachers can meet to plan, discuss curriculum, attend workshops, etc. Another specifically mentioned hiring special education substitutes so the special education and general education teachers can meet. One respondent referred to a “specialist period” that frees classroom teachers for meetings, and yet another provides “incentives” so teachers can, and will, observe one another teaching.

The responses to the second category, “collaborative opportunities for peers throughout the district”, were:

- District-wide curriculum development 25
- Technology (video conferencing, data processing team, e-mail, training, etc.) 9
Meetings (idea exchange, networking, etc.)  8
District-wide in-service planning  2
District-wide early release (facilitates inter-school collaboration)  2
Mentoring  2
Structured observations of teachers in other schools  1
Multiple schools in district with Eisenhower Grants  1
District-wide work on Montana Behavioral Initiative  1

Respondents also noted their use of the curriculum cooperatives to facilitate collaborative work among educators across district lines.

The responses to the third category, “opportunities for collaboration or partnerships with colleges or universities”, included numerous references to working with the state’s public and private colleges and universities. Illustrative of these many collaborations is the following sample of activities.

- Assistance in developing teaching strategies
- Joint grants (e.g., reading, technology, health and wellness, etc.)
- Staff internships
- Assistance in meeting accreditation requirements
- Field experiences for pre-service teachers
- Teachers-in-residence at college
- Integrating science and math with standards
- Numerous specialized trainings
- After-school college-based program
- Assistance with performance assessment (e.g., business education, physical education, counseling)
- Partnership in instructional services and teacher preparation
- Responding to specific expressed needs of schools on or near Indian Reservations
- Collaborations involving credit-bearing opportunities for teachers
- Summer program with university students teaching reading to elementary students
- Tribal college collaborations with schools and universities
- On-site master’s degree programs
Respondents could also respond in the “Other” category, providing information regarding collaborative opportunities not matching the previous options. An illustrative sampling of these numerous collaborations follows.

- DARE Program
- Student handbook collaboration with rural schools
- School-museum partnerships
- Collaborations with the Helena Area Librarians’ Organization
- Collaborations with the State Agency Roundtable of Librarians
- Work with community consultants
- Collaborations with business and industry
- Multiple district consortia
- Social worker presentations for students, teachers, and administrators on child abuse issues
- Collaboration with ITV and use of Internet
- Collaborations with community-based special services

2.9 Future Program Offerings

Respondents were asked to identify any professional development programs their organization planned to offer in the future. Following is a list of their responses.

- Chemical Safety II
- More summer workshops
- Enhancing Classroom Climate
- Spring 2001 Mini-Conference
- Young Author’s Conference
- Back-to-School Conference
- Grant to pay substitute teachers while teachers receive technology training (applied for)
- Writing assessment
- Ballot Advocacy Legal Issues
- Boardsmanship
- Collective bargaining
- Employment Law Basic
- Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA)
- Standards assessment
- National Board Certification Subsidy Scholarships and Candidate Support
- Technology (computer/software usage; as teaching tool)
- Student Motivation
- NASA In-Service
- Distance learning opportunities
- Working in a web site (http://fwp.state.mt.us) for teachers and students
- Mentoring
- Cultural and linguistics issues in classroom assessments
- Bus driver safety
- Cognitive coaching
- Follow-up on “Six Traits Writing”
- Cross-curriculum Lewis & Clark Unit K-12
- Montana Improving Schools Through Accreditation (MISTA)
- Learning styles of autistic students
- Emergency literacy program
- Curriculum alignment (across/between goals)
- Support for native languages (continued)
- Basic skills (continued)
- Chemical abuse prevention (continued)
- Facility improvement and technology development
- Dealing with “at risk” students
- Assessment to meet state standards
- Contextual teaching and learning
- New Science series (cooperative/hands-on between schools)
- Science and math content programs geared to multi-level training
- Family Medical Leave Act Basics
- On-Site Contract Analysis
- Open Meeting Laws (beginning/advanced)
- Author’s Day (four professional authors visit schools throughout year)
- Montana Teacher Forum
- Gifted education
- Post-traumatic stress disorder
- Problem-solving in mathematics
- Early Childhood
- Phonological awareness
- Intervention assistance teams
- Technology benchmarks
- Curriculum and Instruction master’s program (University of Montana)
- Occupational therapy (half-day)
- Classroom management strategies
- Parliamentary Procedure Basics
- School Law A-Z
- School Law Ethics Requirements
- Sexual Harassment Standards
- Student Discipline Basics
- Aging and issues of mental health
- Inquiry-based science instruction
- Speech
- Transitional grade for marginal students
- Educational Leadership master’s degree (MSU-Bozeman)
- Teacher Termination Hearing & Process Basics
- Understanding & Minimizing Potential District Liability in Extracurricular Activities
- Wellness and health
- Service provider presentations
- Effective instruction strategies
3.0 BEST PRACTICES IN PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS FOR EDUCATORS

3.1 Introduction

As all who are familiar with the field know, professional development for educators comprises an enormously broad and eclectic combination of activities, ranging from comparatively highly specified curricula presented in a highly structured manner to informal interactions among peers at the discipline and building levels.

To some extent this variety is reflected in the National Staff Development Council’s [NSDC] categorization of professional development activities into two types: ‘formal’ and ‘informal.’ ‘Formal learning’ is defined as learning that is coordinated by someone other than the teachers themselves, bound by time, organized around specific learning outcomes, usually held outside of the school setting, and not directly related to the daily work of teaching. It includes conferences, workshops, training programs, making and attending presentations, etc.

Formal learning encompasses conventional conceptions of professional development. Many also agree that it is this formal learning that provides the foundation for educators, although teachers may value more highly the time spent in informal learning experiences.

Professional development of this second type, ‘informal learning,’ is more difficult to definitionally confine than its more structured ['formal learning'] counterpart. According to NSDC, some informal learning is available for credit; some is not. Some occurs during the regular school year; some does not. Some involves the participation of university schools of education; some does not. Some is offered by organizations providing services in the field as proprietary endeavors, and some is not; and some is provided by districts and teachers’ associations, and, of course, some is not.
At least one teacher insists that professional development is involved each time she speaks with another teacher. One of the teachers interviewed for the present study reports that she spends 8 hours a day, 180 days a year on professional development, apparently considering everything she does on the job as aspects of her learning program space. Presumably, these are examples of informal learning.

The diversity is virtually limitless, and in one sense that may be a virtue. But because of that, because some formal learning is considered short-lived and sometimes superficial, and perhaps also because the even less structured category of informal learning is usually accepted as an essential form of professional development, the field is often criticized as fragmented, unproductive, irrelevant and lacking in evaluation practices.

To some extent each of these adjectives is accurate. Certainly different perspectives on the worth and effectiveness of professional development enter accordingly, and these emanate both from those who work in the public schools and those who are affected by them. Different perspectives on keys to school improvement also enter at this point, and they contribute both to the intensity of the criticism and to different opinions on the best solutions or directions of change. Most agree that competent and effective teachers are both at the core and vital to the success of any school improvement initiative. Most also agree that effective professional development programs are vital to effective teaching. The devil is in the details, to coin a phrase, and opposing views on what is needed and how to provide it are common. Attitudes on what constitutes best practices in professional development will differ correspondingly.

In March 2000, the Education Commission of the States [ECS] hosted a debate between Linda Darling-Hammond, of the National Commission on Teaching, and Chester E. Finn, Jr., of the Thomas B. Fordham Foundation. The two organizations
display strongly opposed positions on education improvement and the quality of teaching.¹ Both of the debaters agreed on the nature of the over-arching problem (e.g., “too many poorly qualified teachers teaching; too many teachers lack adequate subject-matter knowledge), but few teachers would be flattered by these generalities.

During the debate, Ms. Darling-Hammond placed the importance of reinventing teacher preparation and professional development second on her list of five crucial strategies. Her comments on the subject are rich in portent for professional development program planners throughout the country. In her words, “... the issues are mostly about connecting clinical work in schools with knowledge about what works for teaching. Another issue is having professional development that is sustained, content-rich, and curriculum-embedded instead of what we call the sort of ‘drive-by workshop’ or ‘spray and pray’ approach to professional development.” Other strategies also involve particular aspects of professional development (e.g., getting serious about standards, encouraging and rewarding teacher knowledge and skills, organizing schools for student success).

While Mr. Finn had little to say about professional development directly on this occasion, his recommended approach to the basic issue, improving teacher quality, is more pragmatic than Ms. Darling-Hammond’s. According to Finn: “Let’s do whatever works. Let’s lighten up on the inputs and regulations and procedures, while getting ever more persnickety about results. Set standards, sure, and have accountability mechanisms in place. But link both standards and accountability for teachers to the desired outcomes – namely, actual evidence that students are actually learning what they actually need to know from the actual teachers in their actual classrooms. That should be our credo. But we don’t need a policy formula. We should try a lot of different

¹ “Two Paths to Quality Teaching, Implications for Policymakers.” (Denver, June 2000).
things and find out which approaches are most likely to produce these results most often."

Ms. Darling Hammond’s solutions to the problem of effectiveness would be to increase state support for high quality professional development and to embed professional development in teachers’ daily work. One might infer from Mr. Finn’s statements that he would be comfortable with ‘anything that would work’ (e.g., both formal and informal learning approaches) as long as effectiveness could be proved through rigorous evaluation and evidence that desired levels of student learning were being reached.

Though they are not mutually exclusive, these two perspectives comprise distinct views on what is needed, and they affect opinions on what may or may not constitute best practices in professional development. Stated differently, one’s view of best practices tends to gravitate to those that accord most closely with one’s preferred route to education improvement.

The matter of evaluation is especially relevant. Best practices presume effectiveness, although evidence of rigorous evaluation is conspicuous by its absence. In the present case it becomes an especially pertinent issue, since the directive for this study includes a call for best practices in evaluation programs as well as learning activities. The professional development literature is less than replete with examples of evaluation methods or examples, and in many cases the indicated examples of best learning practices are not accompanied with details about the evaluation process. Indeed, best professional development practices sometimes are those that exemplify advocated goals and strategies with respect to improvement, opening the further possibility of circular reasoning, i.e., guidelines that are themselves derived from program experiences which then are listed as examples of best practices.
In any case, the notion of best practices seems to fit better with professional development programs than it does with evaluation programs. The evidence is that evaluation efforts, if pursued at all, tend to be specific to the program being evaluated. Thus, the presence of a requirement for evaluation may be one of the features that exemplify and qualify professional development program best practices, but there is little in the literature on the subject of best evaluation program practices, per se. Hence, in this case, the best evaluation practices would seem to be those that fit the characteristics of the program being evaluated, that would use relevant evaluation criteria for validation, that are rigorously pursued, and that would reflect sound program evaluation concepts. Beyond this, the literature review uncovered very little on evaluation best practices that would be of use to this study, except, perhaps, to note that this aspect of effectiveness is like a road waiting to be paved.

Another conceptual issue for the present paper centers on the matter of appropriate level of detail, i.e., is the interest in best practices at the class or building level, or is it in more general models or approaches? In Montana the emphasis is on a statewide system, as distinct from professional development courses or programs that focus on classroom practices, per se, although the two obviously are related. The inter-relationship is evident in the fact that any effective statewide program must encourage and accommodate more locally based course strategies and methods. Thus, some attention to each level is inescapable, although, again, an emphasis of this study must be on the statewide solution. The present report attempts to address both levels by starting with a section devoted to the broad issues, which is followed by a section that addresses best practices that exist at the building or district level.
The paper strives to avoid being encyclopedic by a focus on comparatively recent studies and reports. It is far from exhaustive, although an effort has been made to provide a reasonably descriptive cross-section of activities.

The ultimate goals of the paper are to summarize the findings of a review of a number of prescribed attributes and examples of best practices in professional development ("guidelines") and propose a list of qualities and criteria that can be considered in the design of a statewide program for Montana. Both appear in the final section of this report. Findings and recommendations that develop from the other components of the full study will be based at least in part on this review of best instructional and evaluation practices.

3.2 The Importance of Professional Development Programs

The relationship between school improvement and professional development is direct, and awareness of this is widespread both in Montana and the rest of the country. A good example is the National Commission on Time and Learning’s report, *Prisoners of Time* (1994), which argues that state school improvement programs are placing demands on teachers to improve both their subject matter knowledge and their pedagogical skills. Needs for cultural sensitivities impose still another dimension, as do interests in school-based management, which expand teachers’ responsibilities with respect to curriculum, testing, governance, and collaboration. In effect, the new definitions of what constitute teachers' work are ramifying into almost every aspect of professional development.

The professional development of educators, both classroom teachers and administrators, is a subject of nationwide discussion. The U.S. Department of Education’s report, *Promising Practices: New Ways to Improve Teacher Quality*, referred
to further below, begins with the statement, “Teaching is the essential profession, the one that makes all other professions possible.” It continues by stressing that “without well-qualified, caring, and committed teachers” the best curricula, the finest assessments, the safest schools and the highest academic standards cannot “ensure that our children are prepared for the challenges and opportunities in America’s third century.” The difference noted between those who will thrive and those who will not is that it will depend more than ever on the quality of their education. Critical to that quality will be the on-going, career-long professional development of teachers.

These observations accord well with statements made by Montana teachers themselves. In 1996-97, the MGT research team conducted a project for CSPAC “to gain first-hand feedback from practicing teachers as to the relevance of their formal training in preparing them to teach....” More than 200 on-site interviews were conducted with elementary and secondary educators throughout Montana. Although the primary focus was on pre-service preparation, a significant component dealt with professional development. This is what the teachers said about that:

- Professional development and continuing in-service education are matters of vital importance to Montana teachers.
- Professional development must be accessible in terms of schedule, delivery system, and cost.
- Professional development must address current social changes and concerns, the profound effects of which teachers face each day.
- Professional development must employ the best research available regarding teaching and learning.
- Professional development must provide training in the best practices of educational leadership.
- Professional development must encourage collaborative efforts among educators and promote the building of academic communities. Educators frequently request opportunities to interact with their peers as well as with college and university education faculty members.
Professional development must provide basic and current training in educational technology and the effective use of software in teaching and learning.

Professional development must provide a bridge between pre-service training and full-time teaching. This can include an extensive induction program, peer or master teacher mentors, regular group planning sessions, and so forth.

Professional development must provide on-going content area instruction in all disciplines to keep teachers current.

Professional development must address practical and informational needs such as classroom management, teaching strategies, parental involvement, education law, district governance, and so forth.

Professional development must have the support, in time and finances, of district and/or state entities.

Professional development must reflect the expressed needs of the educators for which it is intended.

Whichever other criteria are used to select candidates for best practices accolades, if they are to have relevance to Montana, they must be pertinent to the interests represented on the above list.

Montana’s teachers are not alone in these feelings. The findings and recommendations of recent major papers on professional development programs for educators, starting with the US Department of Education’s 1998 report, suggest that they are in good company.

**Guidelines or Standards for Best Practices in Educator Professional Development**

*Promising Practices: New Ways to Improve Teacher Quality, USDE, September 1998:*

According to this paper, “Most districts support teachers’ investment in their professional knowledge and skills. Teachers take advantage of classes sponsored by their districts, work on advanced certificates or degrees, and attend workshops and summer institutes. Yet, these efforts have little impact on student learning because they tend to be disjointed, unfocused, and offer teachers few opportunities to learn by doing
and reflect on practice with their colleagues. In other words, professional development frequently lacks connections to practice and to high standards of student achievement or teacher development.” [emphasis added]

The report goes on to note that changing these practices is likely to prove difficult, as such disconnected activities represent a significant industry in education. The greatest hope resides in the fact that there is now much agreement about what professional development should be. Thus, according to the report, professional development should:

1. Be focused on what teachers in individual schools need to know and be able to do for their students
2. Be based on shared concerns and strengths. Teachers should collaborate in the design and implementation of programs.
3. Build ‘professional communities’ committed to higher student learning.

The report notes that two important professional development tools have emerged in recent years. These are:

- The professional development school as a replacement for the traditional relationships between college campuses and K-12 schools. Essentially, in this new partnership, the whole school is transformed into a clinical site dedicated to best practices and professional growth.
- Teacher networking comprises the other development. Teacher networks, stimulated by foundation funding and telecommunications are becoming major forces for professional growth.

The programs used as examples are those that manifest these features. They include the Southern Maine Partnership, established in 1985, which is an example of the professional development school approach. The Southern Maine Partnership links 30 school districts, three private schools, the Maine College of Art, Southern Maine Technical College, and the University of Southern Maine in a school-university collaboration intended to foster the simultaneous renewal of educators in the schools and the post-secondary institutions.
Evidence of project evaluation processes is not provided in the USDE report, exemplifying one of the problems associated with evaluation noted above, and progress is reported in fairly general terms. According to the USDE report, since the partnership began it has:

- Developed collaborative work in standards and assessment
- Established linkages with local businesses and business leaders
- Created a new teacher education program at the USM that is located in partnership schools and co-directed by the university and school-based educators
- Fostered and published teachers’ writings about professional and school experiences
- Strengthened and expanded the conversation/networking purpose of the partnership.

The Georgia League of Professional Schools is another example of the school-university partnership cited in this report. Sponsored by the College of Education at the University of Georgia, the League is open to any school in which at least 80 percent of the staff are willing to work on a school-based improvement program that they identify. The descriptive material does not refer to evaluation or to results. According to the report, more than 100 schools at all grade levels belong to the League.

The San Francisco Unified School District is cited as an example of the teacher networking model. Commitment to improving all students’ achievement scores in core academic areas is the unifying goal for the district’s professional development program. Essentially, the district provides whatever professional development services teachers need to accomplish it. The district has put together a package of professional development opportunities and allows schools to tailor them to their own special needs.
The program centers on the three core academic areas – literacy, math, and science – the district feels are most important for student success in the future. Program components include:

- New teacher support and mentoring
- Leadership teams to help schools implement the district’s curriculum
- On-site support
- Required professional development plans from district departments and school sites, as well as from individual teachers
- Designation of 26 schools as model schools for site-based professional development whose practices can be emulated by other schools in the district
- The use of master practitioners – teachers, administrators, and classified staff – to provide modeling and coaching
- A learning resource bank from which school sites can draw.

According to the USDE report, results are apparent in the facts that student scores on standardized tests have increased significantly in reading and math for three consecutive years, and students are spending more time now than before studying science. Whether these correlations are the product of a rigorous evaluation model is not apparent from the report, as is the case, of course, with any description of the evaluation process itself.

**In Pursuit of Quality Teaching: Five Key Strategies for Policymakers,**  
**Education Commission of the States, 2000**

The Education Commission of the States includes high-quality and widely accessible professional development programs for teachers among its five key strategies in its report, “In Pursuit of Quality Teaching.” The policy options available to states with respect to this strategy are:

- Set high standards for professional development and establish policies that support these standards
- Become familiar with the elements of adult learning that work
- Provide incentives for teachers to participate in relevant professional development programs
- Monitor effectiveness
- Leave as many decisions about professional development as possible to the districts and the schools
- Ensure that professional development is a core component of school reform initiatives across the state
- Expand teacher access to effective professional development activities – particularly to hard-to-staff schools and isolated rural districts
- Establish a state-level clearinghouse of promising professional development programs and strategies, including those developed by individual schools and districts, and make it easily accessible to principals and teachers
- Ensure that all schools and districts have the resources, time, and money to participate in effective professional development; the resources should derive from a combination of outside sources and reallocations of existing resources
- Enable schools and districts to incorporate professional development into teachers’ routine work

According to this report, high-quality professional development activities display the following characteristics:

- Focus on the intersection of content and pedagogy
- Include opportunities for practice, research, and reflection
- Are embedded in educators’ jobs and take place during the regular school schedule
- Are sustained over time
- Reflect the principles of adult learning in its content and format
- Include and foster collegiality and collaboration among teachers and principals.

It continues with these observations, each of which also involves aspects of effectiveness, albeit no prescriptions for evaluation are offered:
For teachers to change how they teach, professional development must extend well beyond the transmission of knowledge and focus on analytic and reflective learning.

For professional development to be relevant and engaging, it must be focused on the problems of participants and reflect their input.

Adults learn best when they share power and authority with their instructors.

Finally, the ECS report cites findings in the literature to the effect that most state and local professional development programs distinguish between professional development and job responsibilities, treating the formal learning experience as a ‘discrete, outside-of-the job activity.’ This severely limits their effectiveness and discourages schools from pursuing more informal opportunities for teachers to learn.

Recognizing the importance of professional development as a vehicle for improving teachers’ ability to teach to student content standards, an interest that the present study also finds to be strong in Montana, the ECS report found that few if any states or districts use it systematically.

**USDE National Awards Program for Model Professional Development**

According to the Mission and Principles of the USDE National Awards Program for Model Professional Development (NAPMPD), high-quality professional development involves rigorous and relevant content strategies and organizational supports that ensure the preparation and career-long development of teachers and others “whose competence, expectations and actions influence the teaching and learning environment.” It requires partnerships among schools, higher education institutions and other appropriate entities “to promote inclusive learning communities of everyone who impacts students and their learning. Those within and outside schools need to work together to bring to bear the ideas, commitment and other resources that will be necessary to
address important and complex educational issues in a variety of settings and for a
diverse student body."

In the words of the mission statement, “Equitable access for all educators to such
professional development opportunities is imperative. Moreover, professional
development works best when it is part of a system-wide effort to improve and integrate
the recruitment, selection, preparation, initial licensing, induction, ongoing development
and support, and advanced certification of educators.”

The NAPMPD principles stress:

■ A focus on teachers as central to student learning while including all
  other members of the school community;

■ An emphasis on individual, collegial, and organizational improvement;

■ A respect for the intellectual and leadership capacity of teachers,
  principals, and others in the school community;

■ Attention to the best available research and practice in teaching,
  learning, and leadership;

■ Ways for teachers to develop further expertise in subject content,
  teaching strategies, uses of technologies, and other essential
  elements in teaching to high standards;

■ Continuous inquiry and improvement embedded in the daily life of
  schools;

■ Collaborative planning by those who will participate in and facilitate
  that development;

■ Substantial time and other resources;

■ A coherent long-term plan; and

■ Evaluation on the basis of its impact on teacher effectiveness and
  student learning; and using this assessment to guide subsequent
  professional development efforts.

Examples of National Awards Program winners appear later in this paper.
In this 1995 report, Thomas B. Corcoran argues that in most districts professional development is thought of almost exclusively in terms of formal education activities, such as courses or workshops. Policymakers at the state level have paid little attention to the form, content or quality of professional development, leaving such matters to the discretion of local boards and district administrators. In Corcoran’s view, this ‘laissez-faire’ approach to professional development, with its inefficient and ineffectual arrangements, must come to an end if teachers are to be adequately prepared to meet new classroom challenges.

According to Corcoran, several times a year school administrators release students for a whole or half day and schedule an in-service program that may or may not be relevant to teachers’ professional development needs. “These programs may feature experts who speak to all teachers on a ‘hot’ topic or they may consist of a number of simultaneous workshops offered by ‘trainers,’ . . . with teachers choosing the sessions they wish to attend.” There is seldom any follow-up, and subsequent in-service sessions are usually devoted to other sets of topics.

He insists that there is no consensus about best practices in professional development. “Innovators are trying some interesting new approaches, and a few states are implementing changes for new teachers, but the vast majority of districts are doing what they have always done.”

Corcoran notes that a number of organizations have proposed setting standards for teachers’ professional development and offers a set of guiding principles based on what these other experts and organizations have suggested. The most promising are those that:
Stimulate and support site-based activities. Professional development is likely to have greater impact on practice if it is closely linked to school initiatives to improve practice.

Support teacher initiatives as well as school or district initiatives. These initiatives could promote the professionalization of teaching and may be cost-effective ways to engage more teachers in serious professional development activities.

Are grounded in knowledge about teaching. Good professional development should encompass expectations educators have for students, child-development theory, curriculum content and design, instructional and assessment strategies for instilling higher order competencies, school culture, and shared decision-making.

Model constructivist teaching. Teachers need opportunities to explore, question and debate in order to integrate new ideas into their repertoires and their classroom practice.

Offer intellectual, social, and emotional engagement with ideas, materials, and colleagues. If teachers are to teach for deep understanding, they must be intellectually engaged in their disciplines and work regularly with others in their field.

Demonstrate respect for teachers as professionals and as adult learners. Professional development should draw on the expertise of teachers and take differing degrees of teacher experience into account.

Provide for sufficient time and follow-up support for teachers to master new content and strategies and to integrate them into their practice.

Are accessible and inclusive. Professional development should be viewed as an integral part of teachers’ work rather than as a privilege granted to ‘favorites’ by administrators.

New approaches that hold promise and align with these principles include the following:

- They respect the expertise of accomplished teachers
- They are integrated with teachers’ work
- They are based on current research on teaching and learning
- They recognize teachers as a valuable source of information and include them in design and implementation
- They must be ongoing, school-based and embedded in teacher work
Corcoran notes, however, that little is known about costs or effects. These offer good places to start and include **joint work and job enrichment**, terms that refer to such shared responsibilities as team teaching, curriculum committees, and other associations that create interdependence among teachers and require cooperation. It also promotes learning on the job as it provides opportunities for productive exchange and reflection. Job enrichment refers to the expansion of teachers’ work in ways that require new skills.

Corcoran also lists **teacher networks**. These tend to focus on specific subject matter. They offer access to a professional community in which teachers can engage in conversations and share ideas about ways to improve practice. The National Writing Project and California’s subject matter collaboratives are cited as effective examples.

**Collaborations between schools and colleges** represent a third category. Schools and colleges must work together if professional development opportunities are to be provided in sufficient intensity for sufficient numbers of teachers. Those that exist tend to be fragile because of their dependence on outside funding. Corcoran insists that it is important that these involve liberal arts faculty as well as faculty in schools of education.

Also for Corcoran, **professional development schools** represent a special form of collaboration between schools and colleges. These can bring both novice and experienced teachers together with university clinical faculty in a professional setting to improve practice through observation, low-risk experimentation, reflection, and coaching.

**Teachers as researchers** opportunities involve teachers conducting research in their classrooms and schools in association with university faculty. Many of the projects are defined by the teachers themselves. The results can stimulate discussions, help schools define problems, and lead to changes in practice and policy.

Corcoran also views the process of applying for **National Board Certification** as an excellent professional development opportunity for teachers, as it requires them to
document their practice, reflect on their strengths and weaknesses, and demonstrate specific knowledge and skill.

Appropriate goals for policymakers seeking to improve professional development, in Corcoran’s view, include the following:

- Focusing professional development on core problems of teaching and learning
- Balancing individual and organization interests in professional development and restructuring incentives so that they are more closely aligned
- Embedding more professional development in the workplace so it is more closely related to teachers’ work experience
- Ensuring that high quality professional development opportunities are accessible to teachers who serve the most vulnerable students, and
- Improving the productivity of professional development.

Corcoran does not provide many examples of programs or initiatives that embody these qualities beyond those mentioned, and evidence of evaluation research is not presented in his paper.

**Thomas Guskey, University of Kentucky, “Results-Oriented Professional Development: In Search of an Optimal Mix of Effective Practices (1999)**

Guskey agrees with the new importance attached to professional development, noting that “Every modern proposal to reform, restructure, or transform schools emphasizes professional development as a primary vehicle in efforts to bring about needed change.” He is concerned, however, about the effectiveness of these endeavors, and his article opens with a review of the research on that subject. He then offers a series of guidelines drawn from the research on professional development and closes with a discussion of the potential effects of implementing these guidelines.

With respect to the research, Guskey notes that most has been directed to the inadequacies of different approaches; only occasionally are solutions proposed. He also expresses concern about some apparent dichotomies facing reformers as they attempt
to make sense of these solutions. The main problem for him is that most efforts focus on a search for one right answer. The results are prescriptions of general practices described in broad and nebulous terms that offer little guidance to practically minded reformers who want to know exactly what to do and how to do it. They also ignore the importance of context – what works in one setting, may not in another.

Because of different contexts, no one right answer ever will be found; rather, the search must focus on finding the optimal mix, and the best that can be offered is a series of procedural guidelines. These are:

- Recognize change as both an individual and an organizational process. Schools cannot be improved without improving the skills and abilities of the professional educators within them. Organizational structures, however, can stand in the way of significant improvement. The key is an optimal mix.

- Think big but start small. The magnitude of the change that is called for is inversely related to the likelihood of achieving it. Successful professional development programs are those that approach change in a gradual and incremental fashion. The key, again, is finding the optimal mix.

- Work in teams to maintain support. Planning, implementation, and follow-up activities should all be seen as joint efforts, providing opportunities for those with diverse interests and responsibilities to be involved. Teamwork, however, must be balanced. Large-scale participation during the early stages is sometimes counterproductive.

- Include procedures for feedback on results. As obvious and important as they are, however, the procedures for gathering feedback on results must be balanced with other concerns, e.g., they cannot be disruptive of instructional concerns, should not require inordinate amounts of extra work, etc.

- Provide follow-up, support, and pressure. Balance is necessary. Substantial amounts of pressure from leaders may be necessary to overcome inertia, recalcitrance, and resistance, but it should not stifle individual initiative.

- Integrate programs. The steady stream of innovations in education causes practitioners to view all new programs as isolated fads that soon will pass, to be replaced by others. The integration of innovations into existing programs must be precisely treated and described.
Guskey, whose treatise is essentially literature-based, does not offer examples of instances or programs in which these guidelines have been applied and tested.


The Commission’s statement on teacher preparation and professional development is one part of its larger blueprint for recruiting, preparing, and supporting teachers. Essentially, it calls for a reinvention of teacher preparation and professional development. This involves:

- Organizing teacher education and professional development programs around standards for students and teachers
- Developing extended, graduate-level teacher preparation programs that provide a yearlong internship in a professional development school
- Creating and funding mentoring programs for beginning teachers, along with evaluation of teaching skills
- Creating stable, high-quality sources of professional development.

This paper does not elaborate to any great degree on these features, nor does it provide examples of programs that pursue them. There also are no recommended evaluation models or components.


The National Center for Education Statistics statistical analysis report is retrospective, based on an analysis of data pertaining to operations already in place. It does, however, address the issue of continued learning for teachers, and some of its findings are relevant to the interest of the present paper. Echoing a widely expressed view, the report notes that “continued learning is particularly important because the nation’s schools have been increasingly challenged by policy initiatives to ‘do better and do it differently.’” The call to reconceptualize the practice of teaching is at the core of most education reform programs. Thus, one of the National Education Goals – Goal
Four – involves professional development programs for teachers, denoting its importance as a vehicle for school reform and education excellence.

The report also notes that beginning teachers are often not fully prepared for effective teaching, particularly in a profession for which the demands are constantly changing and expanding. Continued learning, which the authors separate into two categories – ‘formal professional development’ and ‘collaboration with other teachers,’ enters at this point.

With respect to formal or traditional professional development approaches – school and district self-development programs wherein teachers attend workshops, conferences, and summer institutes – have been criticized as relatively ineffective because they are short term, lack continuity and follow-up, are usually isolated from participants’ school and classroom contexts, and take a ‘passive’ approach to training, allowing little opportunity for practice and reflection with colleagues. Stated differently, traditional approaches lack connections to the challenges teachers face in their classrooms.

The NCES survey to test these assumptions was conducted in 1998. It found a high proportion of teachers had participated in professional development activities that were consistent with the emphases of education reform, and the pattern was generally apparent among both new and veteran teachers. Most of this, however, was short-term, a day or so. Study in content area fields represented an exception in that longer periods of involvement were apparent. Exceptions in the other direction, i.e., less than a day, were in training aimed at addressing the needs of students with disabilities and classroom management.

With respect to teachers’ assessment of program effectiveness, this varied by subject matter. Few teachers reported that a program did not help at all, and for all
programs, 70 to 80 percent of the participants reported that they were at least moderately or somewhat effective. The study did attempt to correlate time devoted to participation in professional development and found enough evidence to suggest that increased time spent in this activity was associated with teachers’ perceptions of significant improvements in their teaching.

The second professional development form represented in the study is collaboration with other teachers. The report notes that there are two forms of such collaboration – opportunities provided by the school and those that occur through professional networks across schools and other institutional structures. In the former case, team teaching, mentoring, and formally planned meetings are the important strategies. In the latter, school-university collaborations or partnerships, teacher-to-teacher and school-to-school networks, and participation in district, regional or national task forces are the featured forms.

Most teachers felt that participation in some collaborative activity yielded positive results in terms of improved classroom teaching: generally, the more the involvement, the greater the perception of improvement.

Insofar as professional development issues were concerned, the survey ended on this note. The remaining chapters were devoted to other aspects of teaching (supportive work environment, teachers’ feelings of preparedness, etc.) The study was not structured to provide specific examples of effective programs or best practices; nor did it deal with evaluation models.


The data represented on these NCES tables permit one to draw some inferential clues about what may be useful criteria to define best practices from the categories that
are used to report the numbers. For example, the effects of participation in such programs are:

- Provides information that is new to the participant
- Changes the participants’ views of teaching
- Caused participants to change their teaching practices

Similarly, estimates of which groups have influence on the content of in-service programs (on average, districts [66.4%], principals [72.4%] and teachers [70.6%] were estimated by responding principals to have more influence than the state department of education [21.3%], the school board [20.5%], and parents [5.1%]. One might infer that principals believe that educators’ influence on content is an important value.

According to other figures, less than a third of the participating teachers (30.6%) agreed that teachers in their school had ‘a great deal’ of influence on content. Most, 41.9 percent, felt they only had some. A significant fraction, 27.5 percent, felt they had little or no influence. Teacher influence on content, accordingly, might be an evaluation criterion.

The comparative presence of different delivery arrangements is apparent on still another NCES table. In this case, teachers who had participated in a professional development activity during the most recent year distributed as follows. The first percentage figure is the national average, the second is Montana’s:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delivery Arrangement</th>
<th>National</th>
<th>Montana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District sponsored workshop</td>
<td>85.3%</td>
<td>90.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School sponsored workshop</td>
<td>80.3%</td>
<td>79.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University adult education course</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College course in teacher’s field</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional association sponsored</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures suggest that professional development, like politics, tends to be local, although higher education and professional association endeavors have a greater presence in Montana than nationally.
The NCES’ categorization of participation by content area also demonstrates the distribution nationally and by state. The respondents are teachers who participated in professional development since the end of the last school year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational technology for instruction</th>
<th>National 47.2%</th>
<th>Montana 56.4%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field related teaching methods</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-depth study in their field</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student assessment</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative learning</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The amount and type of support received for professional development is of much interest to Montana teachers. The type and amount nationally and in Montana during the NCES data year are the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Release time</th>
<th>National 47.0%</th>
<th>Montana 51.4%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time built into schedule</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel expense</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition or fees</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional growth credits</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of these</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An aspect of evaluation is apparent in the numbers associated with questions about effects of teachers who had participated in the various forms of professional development. State specific data were not reported. The national average figures are the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provided with new information</th>
<th>National 85.0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Led to seek more information</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caused changes in teaching practices</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed view on teaching</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally a waster of time</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, these data do not speak to best practices directly, but they do offer clues as to the sorts of things that are going on and how teachers and other educators react to them, and they are helpful in that respect.
The Knowledge Loom: What Works in Teaching and Learning

The ‘Knowledge Loom’ is the product of a USDE grant to the Northeast and Islands Regional Educational Laboratory at Brown University to establish a database of information on best practices in teaching and learning. The result is a website that contains links to detailed information on an impressive variety of best practices in education. In the case of professional development, several principles for practice are offered. Professional development should:

- Be based on analyses of the differences between (a) actual student performance and (b) goals and standards for student learning.
- Be connected to a comprehensive change process focused on improving student learning.
- Be continuous and on-going, involving follow-up and support for further learning, including support from sources external to the school that can provide necessary resources and new perspectives.
- Be organized around collaborative problem solving.
- Be primarily school-based and built into the day-to-day work of teaching.
- Incorporate evaluation of multiple sources of information on (a) outcomes for students and (b) the instruction and other processes that are involved in implementing the lessons learned.
- Involve teachers in the identification of what they need to learn and in the development of the learning experiences in which they will be involved.
- Provide opportunities to gain an understanding of the theory underlying the knowledge and skills being learned.

Other Studies and Papers

In a January 2000 paper ("Exemplary Schools Model Quality Staff Development"), Joellen Killion reported that her study of eight schools that were designated as model professional development schools under the USDE’s National Awards Program found that teachers in the program engaged in diverse and extensive learning that is
‘continuous, multifaceted, focused on the school’s identified goals, and usually school-based.’ These programs are characterized by

- a choice of content and opportunities for learning at times that are convenient to teachers;
- collaboration about the ‘real work’ of schools;
- alignment of school goals with student learning needs;
- strong principal; and
- adequate resources and time.

Teachers also valued more opportunities for informal learning, which is defined as learning that is job-embedded, job-related, teacher directed, spontaneous, continuous, and unbound by rigorous time schedules. It includes teacher planning, grade-level or department meetings, conversations about students, reflection on students’ and teachers’ work, problem solving, mutual assisting, classroom-based action research, coaching and supporting, school-based decisions, assessment, curriculum, and instructional resource development. Teachers determine what and how much they will learn and how much effort they will invest. In the award winning schools, more informal than formal learning occurred.

This is considered in contrast with ‘formal learning,’ which is defined as learning that is coordinated by someone other than the teachers themselves, bound by time, organized around specific learning outcomes, usually held outside of the school setting, and not directly related to the daily work of teaching. It includes conferences, workshops, training programs, making and attending presentations, etc. Formal learning provides the essential foundation, although teachers value more highly the time spent in informal learning experiences.

Dennis Sparks [“What teachers should expect from staff development,” NSDC, 1999] offers a checklist for teachers to use to determine whether their staff development
program “has the potential to produce instructional changes that will cause all students to learn at high levels.” He reports that NSDC staff believe that staff development programs should:

- Deepen teachers’ knowledge about the content they teach. This requires sustained, intellectually rigorous study. Occasional awareness sessions and after school make and take workshops alone are insufficient.

- Expand teachers’ repertoire of research-based instructional skills. Teachers must be taught how to use methods that are consistent with those they will use in the classrooms. ‘At the elbow assistance’ is necessary, and this can come from other teachers, trainers, or the school principal.

- Create regular opportunities for serious collaborative work. ‘Quality staff development programs have at their core a small team of teachers who plan lessons together, critique student work, and assist in problem solving.’ These teams should meet for an hour or so several times a week.

- Develop classroom assessment skills that allow teachers to regularly monitor gains in student learning resulting from improved classroom practices.

- Encourage innovation, experimentation, and collegial sharing of new ideas and practices.

- Connect teachers to other professionals within and beyond their schools. Teacher networks, electronic and face-to-face, are essential.

In another article, Joellen Killion comments on the key roles that school leaders can play in promoting staff development [“Leaders have key role in promoting staff development,” *Results*, October 1998]. She cites the findings of a September 1998, report of the Georgia Council for School Performance in which principals and other school leaders demonstrated their commitment to effective professional development by:

- Sharing responsibility for staff development decisions

- Participating in the staff’s learning experiences and discussing with them what they are learning;

- Finding resources and time for staff development;

- Evaluating the effect of teacher learning;
Working cooperatively to develop school, district, and state policies that ensure that all staff have opportunities for continuous learning;

Encouraging staff members to extend their content knowledge and content-specific pedagogy;

Joining in staff development budget decisions;

Making decisions based on NSDC’s Standards for Staff Development; and

Encouraging public support of teacher learning.

Exhibit 3-1 illustrates the themes that emerge from this literature and their presence across the spectrum of studies and reports.

---

**EXHIBIT 3-1**

**SUMMARY OF GUIDELINES FOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS**

*Stated and Inferred*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Montan Teachers</th>
<th>Promising Practices</th>
<th>ECS</th>
<th>NAPMPD</th>
<th>CPRE</th>
<th>Guskey, &amp; Others</th>
<th>NCTAF</th>
<th>Knowledge Loom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accessible: Schedule, System &amp; Costs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address Current Issues</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address Research Findings</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Practices of Ed. Ldrshp.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address Ed. Tech.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge pre-service &amp; in-service</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-going content instruction; sustained</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical: classroom management, teaching strategies, Ed. Law, etc.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official financial support</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflect educators' views of what is needed</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### EXHIBIT 3-1
SUMMARY OF GUIDELINES FOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS
(Stated and Inferred)
(Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Montana Teachers</th>
<th>Promising Practices</th>
<th>ECS</th>
<th>NAPMPD</th>
<th>CPRE</th>
<th>Guskey, &amp; Others</th>
<th>NCTAF</th>
<th>Knowledge Loom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Build professional communities</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on High Standards</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tied to School Reform</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on Remote Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Based</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-Term Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development School</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Networks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor-in Teacher Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Organization &amp; Individual Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate with Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Align School Goals with Student Needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage Innovation, Experimentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include Theory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3 **Examples of District, School, or Classroom Practices**

Programs that display the recommended characteristics often are presented as examples of best practices. The USDE National Awards Program for Model Professional Development is illustrative in this regard. The programs that are selected for the award must display the recommended characteristics.

**USDE National Awards Program for Model Professional Development**

Exemplary National Awards Programs must be consistent with the mission and principles of the National Awards program, be broadly focused, have professional development as an integral part of school culture, address the needs of all of the students who are served, and promote professional development practices that ensure equity by being free of bias and accessible to all educators. These are the guiding criteria. Recognition is based on how well candidates demonstrate that their professional development activities result in increased student learning. The programs of the schools selected for award correspond with the purposes of the program and ‘best practices’ are defined accordingly.

Four cohorts of Award winners have formed since the first awards were made in 1996. Recipients for 1999-2000 illustrate the programs distinguished thus far. The following descriptions, taken from the NAPMDP website, are repeated here in a narrative that is modified only slightly from its original form. Special or particular processes or methods are emphasized in this restatement.

Concord Road Elementary, Ardsley, New York, is a K-4 school in an upper-middle class suburb, 20 miles north of New York City. The students at Concord Road have consistently met and exceeded New York State performance requirements. Administrators, as well as teachers, read, discuss, and meet with consultants, attend workshops and conferences and become involved in mutually determined initiatives.
Curriculum time is provided so that teachers can meet weekly to discuss curricular issues. The heart of the professional development program lies in grade-level and cross-grade common interest teams that are routinely given the opportunity to meet with experts, as well as to problem solve as a group.

New ideas are introduced and change is effected through a four-phase process: awareness, orientation, guided implementation and evaluation. The four-phase process includes a staff introduction establishing awareness about the proposed professional development initiative. Then small group or individualized orientation occurs during which information is gathered, planning occurs, and questions are addressed. Guided implementation follows as consultants and/or school administrators provide feedback, as well as ample time for peer collaboration and discussion. Success or additional needs are assessed during the evaluation stage.

One of the goals of the Concord Road professional development program is to improve teachers' ability to work with diverse learners within the classroom setting. Accomplishment of this goal is evidenced by the fact that special education and limited-English-proficient students are making consistent progress. In 1997, 90 percent of the special education students met the minimum competency requirements in reading, while in 1998 and 1999 100 percent of special education students performed at or above the minimal requirement. On the math assessment based on the New York State learning standards, 98 percent of the fourth graders performed at the proficient and advanced levels. Students are required not only to demonstrate computational accuracy, but also to explain and support their problem-solving strategies in writing.

Jacob Hiatt Magnet School, Worcester, Massachusetts, was established as an inner-city magnet school to foster racial integration. It attracts more than 700 students from throughout the district. Its student body is 51 percent white, 32 percent Hispanic, 12
percent African American and 5 percent Asian. Six percent of the school's population receives special education services.

Professional development has been at the forefront since doors opened in 1990. Teachers are the driving force for the professional development program. The staff participates in collaborative sessions during and after school. Analyzing test scores, looking at student work, and revising curriculum and teaching practices to improve achievement drive the staff decision-making process.

_The school uses portfolios in conjunction with formalized test data to document student growth and achievement. To help assess the effectiveness of new instructional approaches and curriculum, the school staff devised and copyrighted a Portfolio Table of Contents, which outlined the mathematical problem-solving pieces, discovery science tasks, and writing selections to include in student portfolios._

Portfolio assessments in all classrooms, on-site teacher research, and utilization of innovative instructional practices have all impacted on students’ academic successes as evidenced by their performance on formal and informal assessments. Students performed above district and state levels on Grade 3 Iowa Reading Tests from 1997-1999 and scored significantly above district levels on the Grades 4, 5, and 6 Stanford Achievement Tests in both 1998 and 1999. Students also have performed well on the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) achievement test in both 1998 and 1999, ranking in the top seven of the forty district elementary schools in all subject areas.

The New England Center for Children, Southboro, Massachusetts, is a private, nonprofit school serving 215 students with autism, pervasive development disorder, behavior disorder and related disabilities. Providing educational services to this
historically underserved and challenging group of children requires specialized services delivered by competent professionals at all levels of the school.

The Center has developed a professional development model that fosters the optimum growth of each employee through the provision of expert supervision and mentoring, extensive training opportunities, participation in advanced degree programs on-site, and periodic attendance at professional meetings and conferences.

*Program directors and specialists attend biweekly meetings that provide a forum for reviewing ongoing research projects, discussing recent publications, sharing effective program strategies, and discussing and evaluating curriculum issues. Staff members engage in ongoing professional development through the acquisition of continuing education credits and participation in advanced accreditation and certification programs. The Center supports a minimum of two yearly in-services with guest speakers who are selected on the basis of their expertise in particular educational or clinical areas relevant to student needs.*

Progress report data from the 1998-1999 school year indicate that students have met or made significant progress on 75 percent of their educational objectives. Vocational skills data from students who have graduated in the past three years indicate that over 75 percent have successfully worked in paid jobs in the community while at the Center and over 85 percent of graduating students have completed volunteer internship positions in local businesses and public agencies.

Pebble Hills Elementary School, El Paso, Texas, has an extremely diverse student population, 78 percent Hispanic, 4 percent African American, .8 percent Asian and 18 percent White. Close to 25 percent of the students are limited-English-proficient and taught in bilingual classrooms.
The school embarked on a major reform initiative of instructional and professional development practices in 1995. The school staff examined instructional practices, student achievement data and current research on effective professional development and established a professional development model that includes research-based practices, mentoring, model lessons, coaching, and problem solving around specific problems of the practice of teaching and learning.

Two instructional specialists support teachers in this effort. They facilitate conversations about "behind the glass" model lessons, in which teachers are observed by others. Teachers participate in weekly 45-minute instructional meetings. A "Professional Development Center" also is located on campus where weekly meetings are held and professional journals, books, and videos are available for staff.

The most apparent evidence of the success of the professional development model is the continual climb over the past four years of grades 3-6 student achievement as assessed by the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills. In addition, the campus developed a database of student assessments in literacy for its kindergarten through third grade students beginning with the 1998-99 school year. This charts the progress in literacy across time for K-3 students to assess program effectiveness and individual student progress in their primary grades.

The Broward County Public School District, Broward County, Florida, is the largest fully accredited school system in the nation. To meet the needs of a diverse multicultural/multiethnic population with students from 159 countries, speaking 53 languages, the district has created a professional development system that focuses on impacting student achievement through increased teacher effectiveness.

The program, Professional Pathways, ensures that staff development is long-term, based on research, relates to school improvement, and addresses both student and
teacher needs. The plan has large system support, effective leadership, a willingness to use outside consultants, extensive community and parent involvement, and an evaluation system for feedback and reform.

*Professional Pathways requires all professionals to write annual professional development goals that must be aligned with the school’s improvement plan.*

*Professional development opportunities for staff members include individual activities, school-based activities, and certain district mandated activities. The district distributes Focus on Professional Pathways, a monthly publication describing professional development issues, opportunities, and information. A Clearinghouse Information Center contains resources that support the staff development initiatives within the district.*

Since 1996, state writing assessment scores have increased in elementary grades and state mathematics assessment scores have increased in all levels, K-12. In addition, the district’s average Scholastic Achievement Test scores and average American College Test scores have increased since 1997. Advanced Placement Test results indicate that the average score of district students increased 4.6 points over the previous year, compared to the statewide increase of 1.7 points.

Mountain Brook City Schools, Mountain Brook, Alabama, serves 3,898 students in suburban Birmingham, Alabama. The professional development plan addresses five major areas: (1) the purposes, benefits and advantages of professional development; (2) the current research in regard to the characteristics of effective professional development activities; (3) the program areas of a comprehensive professional development program; (4) the processes that should be used to plan, implement and evaluate a comprehensive program; and (5) the current resources available for professional development.
Professional development goals emerge and are pursued through three main vehicles. First is the School Improvement Team at each school, chaired by the principal and composed of teachers, support staff, and parents. The second is assessment of the needs of the teaching staff at each school via grade-level department meetings. In addition, a district-level group comprised of the Director of Instruction and the six assistant principals from each school, ensures a methodical, deliberate, and sustained approach to professional development.

Teachers report positive effects of this emphasis on professional development when they assess their own skills and the performance of their students. Data from various objective measures, including the SAT, show a steady increase across schools, grade levels and content areas that have been targeted through professional development.

Wichita Public Schools, Wichita, Kansas, is a large urban district of 48,547 students of which 46 percent of the students are minority and 51 percent qualify for free and/or reduced lunch.

The schools are guided by a strategic plan developed in 1993. An important component is an effective, aligned professional development program focused on the four district goals: increased student achievement, reduction in the achievement gap between groups of students, increased graduation rate, and prepared graduates.

Exemplary practices include campus support teachers who provide on-site coaching in best practices; individual professional development plans for every employee -- certified and non-certified -- that focus on achievement of the district objectives; and school improvement planning that includes a results-based staff development plan for all teachers.
Reading, writing and math scores are improving. Since 1995 the average percentile scores for third grade have jumped from the 50th percentile to the 61st percentile; fifth grade math has gone from the 54th percentile to the 64th percentile.

3.4 **Evaluation Programs and Practices**

As noted previously, when it comes to evaluation programs, which represent the second of the interests conveyed by CSPAC to the research staff, examples of best practices are sparse. Rather than evaluation programs, per se, the literature speaks to evaluation results. Guideline references to evaluation tend to be general, stressing its value and importance but typically not venturing much beyond that. When advocates pursue the topic, they often address the evaluation component in familiar and general methodological terms. An example is represented in the views of people at the North Central Lab, “each professional development effort should be accompanied by a well-designed evaluation plan for determining its effectiveness. This plan should focus extensively on the use of ethnographic research, extend over time, and give value to the interrelationship of individual change and systemic change in education.” They continue the case with the view that professional development programs must be assessed to document their value to the school organization, individual educator, and ultimately the students.

As another example, to ensure the effectiveness of each professional development effort, the National Staff Development Council (1995) recommends that "evaluation be seen as an ongoing process that is initiated in the earliest stages of program planning and continued beyond program completion." The development of the evaluation strategy should commence at the beginning of the planning process for each professional development program."
This is pretty much in keeping with standard evaluation practices, and the methodological dimension enters at this point. According to the NSDC treatise, evaluation has two important goals: to improve the quality of the program, and to determine its overall effectiveness. The first involves formative evaluation, which is done at intervals during the professional development program’s operation for purposes of fine-tuning to improve quality. Evaluation also should focus on the overall effectiveness of a professional development program. In this case, summative evaluation is involved, essentially an evaluation performed at the conclusion of the program.

The NSDC goes a little further by recommending that evaluations involve data collected at three levels: educator practices, organizational changes, and student outcomes. The first level of summative evaluation is to assess the changes in the educators as a result of participating in the professional development program. The second level is to assess the ways in which the school organization has changed. To assess this level of change, evaluators need to look for increased collaboration, an improved relationship between administration and teachers, and general changes in the culture of the school.

Evaluation prescriptions also tend to reflect the special goals or interests of the prescribing organization. As noted earlier, the Mission and Principles of Professional Development of the National Awards Program emphasize that professional development should be evaluated "on the basis of its impact on teacher effectiveness and student learning." The nature of appropriate evaluation programs is not probed beyond the instructions to applicants, who are directed to pay particular attention to the selection criteria, which require them to:

- Present objective data that illustrate the relationship between professional development activities and increases in student achievement, and
Provide evidence that achievement gaps between groups of students have been narrowed as a result of professional development.

In a letter to applicants, program director Terry Dozier advises them to note that the “selection criteria now require applications to include data on student achievement that reflect multiple measures and cover a period of three years or more. As many school districts are only now beginning to implement performance assessments that are aligned with new content standards, applicants are expected to use whatever data sources they have relied upon during this multi-year period to measure student achievement. In addition, high quality applications can be expected to clearly address the linkage between needs assessments, improvement plans, professional development activities, and teacher and student outcomes.”

Evaluation evidently does occur (viz. the descriptions of National Awards Program recipients presented above), but the details of the evaluation processes are seldom described in the literature, rather, only the findings. So it is difficult to evaluate the evaluation component, and there is little material to guide a ‘best evaluations practices’ selection process.

Also to be noted is the paucity of evaluation efforts that seek to isolate the independent variable and its effects (‘net impact analysis’). This would seem to be a particularly important need in view of the other contextual changes that usually accompany a new initiative in professional development (e.g., school improvement efforts, creation of performance and achievement standards and assessment programs, changes in teacher recruitment and retention policies, etc.)

Multivariate statistical analysis could lead to greater understanding of the relative importance of each of the likely variables to the observed changes in results. Without such ‘net impact’ evaluation programs, it would be difficult to deduce ‘causal’ relationships. The literature does not delve much below the generic references to
formative and summative evaluation, and little information on specific methodological  
approaches is available. Thus, deductions about causes soon reduce to inferences  
about correlational relationships.

Sophisticated evaluation approaches exist, however, and, linked to clear  
evaluation criteria, could be used to determine whether professional development  
programs and initiatives are actually accomplishing desired goals or whether the  
relationship is true or spurious.

3.5 **Composite Program Guidelines**

This review of this cross-section of the literature could continue, but it seems that  
the features of a professional development model on which most people agree can be  
identified at this point. The principal reservation pertains to the absence of evaluation  
studies, but that horse has run hard already. The list does reveal a common sense  
quality, however, and this is an at least partially offsetting strength. Thus, it appears that  
a statewide program for Montana should take account of at least the following, many of  
which are presented in the Montana teachers’ list of suggestions described earlier:

- **Stress collaboration. It should involve collaborative opportunities**  
  for peer interaction and with college and university faculties, and  
  it should emphasize the building of academic communities.

Evaluation criteria should focus on the existence and evidence of the effectiveness  
of opportunities for peer interaction at the building and curriculum levels, including  
professional interactions between new and experienced teachers, and with university  
and college faculty, both in the education and relevant academic departments. The  
accomplishment and effectiveness of academic communities, school-institutions of  
higher education partnerships, and teacher networks should be demonstrable outcomes  
and evidence of the presence of the collaboration feature.
Best Practices in Professional Development Programs for Educators

- Rest on solid research findings with respect to theory, content, and pedagogy. It also should provide opportunities for research, both for teachers in terms of opportunities to practice, reflect, and report results, and for those interested in identifying what does and does not work with respect to educators’ professional development.

  Evaluation criteria might center on evidence of the presence of relevant research findings in lesson and program plans, teachers’ opinions and reports, and other evidence of improved teacher and student learning.

- Be content-rich, on-going, and sustained over time, with a strong emphasis on continuing content area instruction to keep teachers current in their fields. While it should accommodate opportunities for educators to learn about new developments and theories, it should belie impressions of ‘drive-by workshops’ approach to professional development.

  Evaluation criteria might emphasize the presence or absence of long-term plans, course evaluation results, the presence and satisfaction of curriculum committees, educator opinions about course relevance, content, and adequacy, and student assessment scores.

- Include emphases on practical aspects of teaching, including such matters as classroom management, teaching strategies, parental involvement, district governance, education law, and similar interests.

  Evaluation criteria should center on program curriculum and content reviews, the presence of widespread educator collaboration in course and program need assessments, and educator evaluations of the presence, sufficiency, and relevance of such learning opportunities.

- Stimulate and be based on assurances of sustained funding.

  Evaluation criteria might encompass cost and expenditure reviews, evidence of funding authorities’ support of and commitment to professional development, and what funders need in terms of evidence of satisfaction with these activities.

- Reflect educators’ views of what is needed.
Evaluation criteria should revolve around the existence or absence of channels for educator input into the program need assessment and design processes and their opinions about content relevance and course effectiveness.

- **Be accessible to teachers, in terms of time, location, and cost. It should be affordable, offered at a convenient time and manner, and to the extent possible, available to educators at the building level.**

Evaluation criteria should feature reviews of costs, methods, delivery sites, and educator participation.

- **Entail effectiveness monitoring and evaluation.**

Evaluation criteria, to the extent possible, should emphasize net impact evaluations. The determination of evaluation criteria and appropriate and feasible methods should involve the entire professional community, including college and university faculty. Consideration also should be given to identifying the types of evaluation data that would be valued by program funders and potential supporters.

- **Place a strong emphasis on rural delivery.**

Evaluation criteria obviously should include statewide goals with respect to the distribution and accessibility of professional development programs for educators throughout Montana, varied and appropriate delivery systems, and surveys that include opportunities for educator comments on accessibility.

These are the qualities on which most of the materials reviewed in this paper most frequently agree. Others also have merit. These include:

- Professional development for educators should address current issues.
- It should include information on best practices in education leadership.
- It should address education technology.
- It should be focused on the achievement of high standards.
- It should be closely linked to the public’s school improvement interests.
It should bridge individual teacher and organization goals, on the one hand, and student needs, on the other.

- It should feature steps to integrate new ideas with existing school programs.
- It should encourage innovation and experimentation.

This chapter closes on this note as attention turns to principals' and teachers' views of professional development in Montana, the subjects of the next two chapters.
4.0 MONTANA EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PRINCIPALS’ SURVEY

One important aspect of the study to examine the professional development of educators in Montana was the statewide survey of principals. A representative random sample of 100 practicing principals was surveyed by telephone. This sample consisted of principals from elementary, middle, high and consolidated schools. Ninety-nine principals were from Montana’s public schools and one was with a private institution.

The objectives of the survey were to determine the extent and nature of existing and needed professional development services, appropriate topic and content areas, and preferred delivery methods and schedules. In addition to questions regarding their own professional development needs, principals were asked questions regarding the needs of their teaching staff.

4.1 Summary Findings

- Respondents: 2/3 Male, 1/3 Female
- 51% Elementary, 7% Middle, 14% High School, 28% Other
- 55% Rural, 40% Urban, 5% Remote
- Average experience 9.75 years
- Stay Current through reading and attendance at workshops
- Overwhelming majority participates in professional development activities and have done so in the past 4 months.
- Most professional development activities are workshops or courses offered by a Montana higher education institution, either on campus or at a school site.
- Quality, relevance and availability of professional development rated high (above 7 on a 10 point scale).
- Highest areas of overall professional development needs:
– Best Classroom Practices
– Application of Educational Technology
– Specific Content Areas
– Current Research Findings
– Meeting Needs of Students with Disabilities

Courses needed but not available – School Management, Finance, Leadership, Safety.

Most important factors for attendance:

– Convenient Time
– Financial Assistance
– Convenient Location

Average time and distance willing to travel:

– 118 Miles
– 2+ Hour

Montana Principal Survey Summary Information

Respondents: 99

Percent Female 33
Percent Male 67

School Type: count

Percent Elementary 51
Percent Middle 7
Percent High 14
Percent Other 28

Ownership Type:

Percent Public 99
Percent Private 1
Percent Other 0
Survey Questions:

Q-1 How long have you been a principal? Average: 9.75 years
Q-2 How long in Montana? Average: 9.03 years
Q-3 How long at this school? Average: 5.62 years

Q-4 How would you describe your school? count
   a) Urban 40
   b) Rural 55
   c) Very Remote 5

Q-5 How large, in terms of average total enrollment, is your school? count
   a) <100 13
   b) 101-200 17
   c) 201-300 22
   d) 301-500 26
   e) 501-1000 8
   f) >1000 13

Q-6 How many teachers are there on staff? 37.5

Q-7 How do you stay current in your career as a principal? count
   Reading 58
   District in service, workshops 50
   Professional conference/seminar 41
   Collaboration 28
   College 33
   Internet 7
   Certification 7

Q-8 Are professional development opportunities available to you as a principal? count
Montana Education Professional Development Principals’ Survey

Yes 87
No 9
I don’t know 3

Q-9  What are these in general?  count
a) In-service workshop 76
b) Locally-available courses in the evenings or weekends 52
c) Courses on the internet 39
d) Other 43
Blank 6

Q-10  How are they offered?  count
a) In the school 39
b) At a local higher education center 24
c) At a nearby college or university 50
d) At another site in the community 14
e) The internet 26
f) Other 35
Blank 4

Q-11  By whom are they offered?  count
a) Provided by a MT institute of higher learning 62
b) Provided by an independent for-profit service 24
c) Provided by the curriculum co-op 30
d) Provided by an out-of-state institute of higher learning 24
e) Provided by the school district 51
f) Other 41
Blank 4
Q-12 What are your personal goals with respect to professional development? count

a) Remain current in my professional field 70

b) Remain current with respect to teaching & learning strategies so that I can appropriately evaluate teachers in the school 71

c) Meet state and district requirements 47

d) Obtain an advanced degree 24

e) Other 20

Q-13 On a 1-10 scale, with 10 being the highest score, how would you rate the sufficiency of the present professional development opportunities for principals in Montana?

Average 6.1

Q-14 On the same scale, how would you rate them for teachers?

Average 7.1

Q-15 Which sorts of professional development and continuing inservice opportunities might you consider most important for yourself? count

Teaching/Learning styles, curriculum 32

Collaboration, interpersonal relationships, leadership 28

Student/Classroom management, safety 22

Other 19

School management – budgeting etc. 18

Laws 15

Technology 13

Assessment 12

Evaluation 11

Change 9

Current trends 8

Standards 6
Q-16 Which do you consider most important for the teachers in your school? count

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching/Learning styles, curriculum</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student/Classroom management, safety</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current trends</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration, interpersonal relationships, leadership</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q-17 Do you regularly enroll in or pursue such opportunities?

- Yes: 90
- No: 9

Q-18 When was the last time you did so? count

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. 1-4 months ago</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 5-8 months ago</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 9-12 months ago</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. 12-16 months ago</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. &gt;16 months ago</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q-19 What were these?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Oriented</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Conferences</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership/Certification/Courses</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Management/Assessment</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Safety</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Styles</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q-20 How did you learn of the availability of such opportunities?  
- Direct mail/email: 58  
- District, School, Board: 38  
- Professional groups, publications: 34  
- Internet: 16  
- Colleges: 7  
- OPI: 5  
- Peers: 6  
- Other: 6  

Q-21 Are these information sources adequate?  
- Yes: 85  
- No: 14  

Q-22 Are they timely in terms of your planning needs?  
- Yes: 83  
- No: 16  

Q-23 On a scale of 1-10, how would you rate the value of these opportunities overall to you as a principal?  
- Average: 7.6  

Q-24 How would you rate their quality?  
- Average: 7.6  

Q-25 How would you rate their relevance?  
- Average: 7.7
Q-26 How would you rate their continuing availability?

Average: 7.3

Q-27 How would you rate the extent to which they are embedded in the realities of school management?

Average: 6.9

Q-28 How would you rate the extent to which they are accessible?

Average: 6.7

Q-29 How would you rate the extent to which they are rooted in the knowledge base for school administration?

Average: 7.2

Q-30a Are there other opportunities that are not available to you now that would help you if they were available?

Yes 59

No 40

Q-30b What are these?  count

School Mgmt, finance, leadership, safety, interpersonal comm. 21
Specific subject areas 10
Teaching/Learning Styles, Curriculum 8
Teacher evaluation 7
Change 7
Collaboration, parent relations 7
Assessment 7
Trends 5
Ed Law 5
Other 8
Q-31 On a 1-10 scale, how would you rate your need for professional development and continuing inservice opportunities directed to each of the following:

Q-31a Current research findings respecting teaching and learning.

Average: 7.5

Q-31b Best classroom practices.

Average: 8.0

Q-31c Applications of education technology to school mgmt, teaching and learning.

Average: 7.8

Q-31d Content areas of interest to you.

Average: 7.8

Q-31e What are these? count

Math 24
Reading 21
Technology 17
Language 13
Science 11
Social Science 4
Other – see list provided 85

(Princ Q_31e Query)

Q-31f Classroom management strategies

Average: 7.1

Q-31g Parental involvement

Average: 7.0

Q-31h Education law

Average: 7.1
Q-31i District governance
Average: 5.9

Q-31j Meeting needs of students with disabilities
Average: 7.5

Q-31k Meeting needs of culturally diverse populations
Average: 6.2

Q-31l Working with a team of service providers
Average: 6.5

Q-32 What would encourage you to pursue more professional development and continuing inservice opportunities? count
a. Convenient time 66
b. Convenient location 52
c. More convenient delivery system 25
d. Assistance with tuition or costs 56
e. Other 22

Q-33 How far would you be willing to commute regularly to take professional development and continuing in-service education opportunities?
Hours – average 2.2
Unlimited – count 5
Miles – average 118.3
Unlimited - count 5

Q-34 How often?
Times/year – average 32.5
Unlimited 2
Q-35a Have you or would you pursue professional development and continuing in-service opportunities that were available online?

Yes  82  
No  17  

Q-35b On a scale of 1-10, how would you rate the quality of this medium with respect to your professional development and continuing education needs?

Average:  5.9  

Q-35c Would you like to see more courses offered in this manner?

Yes  69  
No  30  

Q-36 Forgetting for a second the questions you have already answered, and taking time with your answer, if you could do three things to make professional development and continuing education opportunities more attractive and relevant to school administrators in Montana, what would they be? 

Time  48  
Relevance  45  
Location/accessibility  34  
Cost  32  
Practical  32  
Variety/Frequency/Follow-up  17  
Delivery  14  
Other  27  

Q-37 What do you think are the three greatest problems with professional development opportunities for teachers in Montana? 

Time  68  
Cost  63  
Location/accessibility  44  
Relevance  32  
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Availability/Frequency/Follow-up  
Accessibility  
Other  

Q-38 No problems  
All responses blank  
Q-39 If you could do three things to make professional development and continuing education opportunities more attractive and relevant to teachers in your school, what would these be?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Relevance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Variety/availability/frequency/follow-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Subject Matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q-40a Can you think of any questions about the professional development and continuing education opportunities available to you in Montana that I should have asked but have not?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q-40b What would these questions be?  
Q-40c How would you answer them?  
Q-41 Anything else you would like to add?
5.0 MONTANA EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
TEACHERS’ SURVEY

One important aspect of the study to examine the professional development of educators in Montana was the statewide survey of teachers. A representative random sample of 200 practicing teachers was surveyed by telephone. This sample consisted of teachers from elementary, middle, high and consolidated schools. One-hundred and ninety-three teachers were from Montana’s public schools, three were from private institutions and five taught in reservation schools.

The objectives of the teacher survey were to determine the extent and nature of existing and needed professional development services, topic and content area needs, and their preferred delivery systems and schedules.

5.1 Summary Findings

- Respondents: 1/3 men, 2/3 women
- 31% Elementary, 33% Middle, 12.5% HS, 23.5% Other
- 96.5% Public, 1% Private, 2.5% Reservation
- Average years teaching, 17
- Average years teaching in Montana, 16
- 63.5% stay current by accessing opportunities offered by colleges, 55.5% through district offerings, 35.5% by reading and 31% by attending professional conferences.
- 95.5% said professional development and in-service opportunities are available to them.
- On a scale of 1-10, teachers rated the overall value of offerings a 7.8.
- Continuing availability of offerings received an average rating of 7.2.
- The majority of offerings are provided through school-based workshops, teacher in-services and local courses.
Most professional development activities are held in the school or at a nearby college or university.

On a scale of 1-10, teachers rated the sufficiency of professional development and in-service offerings as 6.25.

Remaining current in their content area and current with respect to teaching and learning strategies were the goals of 69.5% and 60%, respectively.

26.5% said that professional development in their subject area was not generally available. On a scale of 1-10, the need for content area opportunities rated highest at 7.8.

Second highest average rating of 7.7 went to the need for courses addressing the application of technology to teaching and learning.

The need for more information regarding social changes affecting student learning received an average score of 7.6.

Meeting the needs of students with disabilities received an average rating of 7.4

74% said they have pursued, or would pursue, courses on-line.

- Quality of on-line offerings was rated 5.84 on a scale of 1-10.
- 69% of teachers desire more on-line offerings.

Cost, location and time are the primary factors that would make professional development more accessible.

5.2 Montana Teachers’ Survey Summary Information

Respondents: 200

Male: 71 35%
Female: 129 65%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School type</th>
<th>count</th>
<th>percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Elementary</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Middle</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) High School</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Other</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ownership type:

  a) Public 193 96.5%
  b) Private 2 1%
  c) Reservation 5 2.5%
  d) Other 0 0%

Average # teachers: 38.87

No response: 3

Survey Questions:

Q-1 How long have you been a teacher?

  Average: 17.14 years.

Q-2 How long in Montana?

  Average: 16.3 years.

Q-3 How long at this school?

  Average: 10.88 years.

Q-4 Which grades do you teach? count percent

  a) K-5 57 28.5%
  b) 6-8 30 15%
  c) 9-12 59 29.5
  d) Other 54 27%

Q-5 Which subjects? count percent

  All/General 53 26.5%
  Resource/Special Ed/Title I 20 10%
  Fine Arts 18 9%
  History/Social Studies 15.5 7.75%
  Sciences 14.5 7.25%
### English/Language Arts/Reading
- Count: 14.3
- Percent: 7.15%

### Math
- Count: 11.9
- Percent: 5.95%

### Agricultural Education/Industrial Arts/Vocational Technology
- Count: 10
- Percent: 5%

### Library
- Count: 10
- Percent: 5%

### Health/Physical Education
- Count: 8.8
- Percent: 4.4%

### Business
- Count: 7
- Percent: 3.5%

### Family and Consumer Science
- Count: 3
- Percent: 1.5%

### Foreign Languages
- Count: 2
- Percent: 1%

### Montessori/Talented and Gifted
- Count: 2
- Percent: 1%

### Other
- Count: 10
- Percent: 5%

### Q-6 How would you describe the school in which you teach?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Remote</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Q-7 How large, in terms of average total enrollment, is your school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;100</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-200</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201-300</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301-500</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501-1000</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;1000</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Q-8 How do you stay current in your career as a teacher? count | percent
--- | ---
College | 127 | 63.5%
District | 111 | 55.5%
Reading | 71 | 35.5%
Professional Conference | 62 | 31%
Computer | 21 | 10.5%
Professional Organization | 19 | 9.5%
Collaboration | 15 | 7.5%
Certification | 14 | 7%
Other | 23 | 11.5%

### Q-9 Are professional development and continuing in-service education opportunities available to you as a teacher? count | percent
--- | ---
Yes | 191 | 95.5%
No | 7 | 3.5%
Don’t know | 2 | 1%

### Q-10 What is the nature of these, in general?

- a) School-based work shops | 147 | 73.5%
- b) Teacher in-service day meetings | 139 | 69.5%
- c) Locally available courses in the evenings, weekends, or summers | 114 | 57%
- d) Courses on the internet | 47 | 23.5%
- e) Other | 11 | 5.5%
- No response | 1 | .5%

### Q-11 Where are they offered?

- a) In the school | 152 | 76%
- b) At a local higher education center | 24 | 12%
c) At a nearby college or university 110 55%
d) At another site in the community 54 27%
e) The Internet 0 0%
f) Other (Please Describe) 67 33.5%
No response 1 .5%

Q-12 By whom are they offered?
a) Provided by the Education Association 66 33%
b) Provided by the School/District 148 74%
c) Provided by the Curriculum Co-op 36 18%
d) Provided by a Montana institution of higher learning (Which?) 116 58%
   Montana State University 17 14.6%
   University of Montana 13 11.2%
   Montana State University Northern 9 7.7%
   University of Great Falls 6 5.2%
   Western Montana University 5 4.3%
   Montana State University Billings 4 3.4%
   Carroll College 3 2.5%
   Miles Community College 2 1.7%
   Other 17 1.5%
e) Provided by an independent for-profit service 1 .5%
f) Provided by an out-of-state institution of higher learning 22 11%
g) Other (Please explain) 45 22.5%
No response 4 2%
Q-13 What are your personal goals with respect to professional development?

a) Remain current in my content field 139 69.5%

b) Remain current with respect to teaching and learning strategies 120 60%

c) Meet state or district requirements 58 29%

d) Obtain an advanced degree 65 32.5%

e) Other 6 3%

No response 1 .5%

Q-14 On a 1-10 scale, with 10 being the highest score, how would you rate the sufficiency of the present professional development and continuing in-service education opportunities for teachers in Montana?

Average: 6.25

Q-15 Which sorts of professional development and continuing in-service education opportunities might you consider most important?

Subject 52 26%

Technology 38 19%

Student Management 35 17.5%

Styles 32 16%

Current 23 11.5%

Collaboration 21 10.5%

Hands on 18 9%

Assessment 9 4.5%

Change 7 3.5%

School Management 7 3.5%

Standards 4 2%

Other 45 22.5%
Q-16  Do you regularly enroll in or pursue such opportunities?
   a) Yes: 181 90.5%
   b) No: 19 9.5%

Q-17  When was the last time that you did so?
   a) 1-4 months ago 116 59%
   b) 5-8 months ago 50 23.5%
   c) 9-12 months ago 10 5%
   d) 12-16 months ago 4 2%
   e) >16 months ago 18 9%
   No response: 2 1%

Q-18  What were these?
   Subject 60 30%
   Technology 34 17%
   Convention 30 15%
   Strategies 24 12%
   College 19 9.5%
   Student Management 10 5%
   Assessment 4 2%
   Change 3 1.5%
   Other 29 14.5%

Q-19  How do you learn of the availability of such opportunities?
   Mail 108 54%
   District 93 46.5%
   Peers 46 23%
   College 35 17.5%
Internet 26 13%
Professional Group/Publication 22 11%
OPI 11 5.5%

Q-20 Are these information sources adequate?
Yes 170 85%
No 29 14.5%
Don’t know 1 .5%

Q-21 Are they timely in terms of your planning needs?
Yes 169 84.5%
No 29 14.5%
No response 2 1%

Q-22 How would you rate the value of these opportunities overall to you as a teacher?
Average: 7.8

Q-23 How would you rate their quality?
Average: 7.6

Q-24 How would you rate their relevance?
Average: 7.7

Q-25 How would you rate their continuing availability?
Average: 7.2

Q-26 How would you rate the extent to which they are embedded in the realities of classroom teaching?
Average: 6.7

Q-27 How would you rate the extent to which they are collaborative, accessible, and inclusive?
Average: 6.8
Q-28 How would you rate the extent to which they are rooted in the knowledge base for teaching?

Average: 7.1

Q-29 Are there any professional development and continuing in-service education opportunities that are not generally available to you now that would help you if they were offered?

Yes 119 59.5%
No 77 38.5%
Don't know 4 2%

Q-30 What are these?

- Subject 53 26.5%
- Student Management 13 6.5%
- Collaboration 10 5%
- Styles 9 4.5%
- Assessment 3 1.5%
- Change 2 1%
- Standards 2 1%
- Education Law 1 0.5%
- Teacher Evaluation 1 0.5%
- Current 1 0.5%
- Other 44 22%

Q-31 On a 1-10 scale, how would you rate your need for professional development and continuing education opportunities directed to each of the following:

a) Social changes that are likely to affect student learning?

Average: 7.6

b) Current research findings respecting teaching and learning?

Average: 6.7
c) Teaching methods?
   Average: 7.0

d) Applications of education technology to teaching and learning?
   Average: 7.7

e) Content areas of interest to you?
   Average: 7.8

f) What are these?  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>count</th>
<th>percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Arts</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

g) Classroom management strategies?
   Average: 6.1

h) Parental Involvement?
   Average: 6.5

i) Education law?
   Average: 6.5

j) District governance?
   Average: 5.7
k) Meeting needs of students with disabilities?
Average: 7.4

l) Meeting needs of culturally diverse populations?
Average: 6.2

m) Working with a team of service providers?
Average: 6.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q-32</th>
<th>What would encourage you to pursue more professional development and continuing in-service education opportunities?</th>
<th>count</th>
<th>percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Assistance with tuition or costs</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Convenient location</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Convenient time</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>More convenient delivery system</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>Other (Please explain)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response:</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q-33 How far would you be willing to commute regularly to take professional development and continuing in-service education opportunities? (miles, one way)
Average: 82.87

Q-34 How often?
Average: 40 times per year

Q-35 A) Have you or would you pursue professional development and continuing in-service education opportunities that were available on-line?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>count</th>
<th>percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q-35 B) On a scale of 1-10, How would you rate the quality of this medium with respect to your professional development and continuing education needs?

Average: 5.84

Q-35 C) Would you like to see more courses/programs offered in this manner?

Yes 138 69%
No 62 31%

Q-36 What do you think are the three greatest problems with professional development opportunities for teachers in Montana?

Location 118 59%
Cost 116 58%
Time 107 53.5%
Relevance 45 22.5%
Variety 36 18%
Speaker 22 11%
Practical 21 10.5%
Delivery 11 5.5%
Follow-up 5 2.5%
Other 43 21.5%

Q-37 No Problems: 3 1.5%

Q-38 Forgetting for a second the questions you have already answered, and taking your time before you answer, if you could do three things to make professional development and continuing education opportunities more attractive and relevant to classroom teachers in Montana, what would these be?

Cost 119 59.5%
Location 76 38%
Time 66 33%
Relevance 52 26%
Variety 48 24%
Practical 39 19.5%
Delivery 31 15.5%
Speaker 29 14.5%
Follow-up 5 2.5%
Other 52 26%

Q-39a Can you think of any questions about the professional development opportunities available to you in Montana that I should have asked but have not? 18 9%

Q-39b What would these questions be?

Q-39c How would you answer them?

Q-40 Is there anything else you would like to add at this point? 78 39%
### EXHIBIT 5-1
**Selected Cross Tabulations by School Location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>URBAN</th>
<th></th>
<th>SUBURBAN</th>
<th></th>
<th>RURAL</th>
<th></th>
<th>VERY REMOTE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Availability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Work shops</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) In-service</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Local</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Internet</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Other</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) In school</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Higher Ed</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Nearby College</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Another site</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Internet</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Other</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Regularly Enrolled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. How Informed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof Group</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPI</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Adequacy of Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Continuing Availability</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.63</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.16</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Not Available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student management</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Styles</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education law</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher evaluation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### EXHIBIT 5-1
SELECTED CROSS TABULATIONS BY SCHOOL LOCATION, CONTINUED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>URBAN</th>
<th></th>
<th>SUBURBAN</th>
<th></th>
<th>RURAL</th>
<th></th>
<th>VERY REMOTE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>32. Incentives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>33. Travel Distance</strong></td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>111.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>35A. Internet</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>35B. Quality of Service</strong></td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>35C. Desire More Internet</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>36. Problems</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### EXHIBIT 5-2
Selected Cross Tabulations by School Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Elementary</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>9. Availability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>54 95%</td>
<td>29 97%</td>
<td>57 97%</td>
<td>51 94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2 4%</td>
<td>1 3%</td>
<td>1 2%</td>
<td>3 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>1 2%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>1 2%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10. Type</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Workshops</td>
<td>47 82%</td>
<td>20 67%</td>
<td>42 71%</td>
<td>38 70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) In-service</td>
<td>48 84%</td>
<td>17 57%</td>
<td>40 68%</td>
<td>34 63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Local</td>
<td>41 72%</td>
<td>18 60%</td>
<td>29 49%</td>
<td>26 48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Internet</td>
<td>8 14%</td>
<td>7 23%</td>
<td>19 32%</td>
<td>13 24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Other</td>
<td>18 32%</td>
<td>9 30%</td>
<td>22 37%</td>
<td>15 28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11. Location</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) In school</td>
<td>49 86%</td>
<td>20 67%</td>
<td>42 71%</td>
<td>41 76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Higher Ed</td>
<td>12 21%</td>
<td>2 7%</td>
<td>6 10%</td>
<td>4 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Nearby College</td>
<td>9 16%</td>
<td>17 57%</td>
<td>30 51%</td>
<td>24 44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Another site</td>
<td>21 37%</td>
<td>10 33%</td>
<td>13 22%</td>
<td>10 19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Internet</td>
<td>8 14%</td>
<td>3 10%</td>
<td>12 20%</td>
<td>8 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Other</td>
<td>16 28%</td>
<td>9 30%</td>
<td>23 39%</td>
<td>19 35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16. Regularly Enrolled</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5 9%</td>
<td>30 100%</td>
<td>50 85%</td>
<td>49 91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>52 91%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>9 15%</td>
<td>5 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>19. How Informed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>31 54%</td>
<td>18 60%</td>
<td>29 49%</td>
<td>34 63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>34 60%</td>
<td>14 47%</td>
<td>31 53%</td>
<td>10 19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers</td>
<td>14 25%</td>
<td>7 23%</td>
<td>8 14%</td>
<td>17 31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>13 23%</td>
<td>3 10%</td>
<td>9 15%</td>
<td>10 19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>9 16%</td>
<td>4 13%</td>
<td>7 12%</td>
<td>6 11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof Group</td>
<td>5 9%</td>
<td>4 13%</td>
<td>11 19%</td>
<td>2 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPI</td>
<td>2 4%</td>
<td>1 3%</td>
<td>3 5%</td>
<td>5 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>20. Adequacy of Information</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>51 89%</td>
<td>3 10%</td>
<td>48 81%</td>
<td>44 81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6 11%</td>
<td>27 90%</td>
<td>10 17%</td>
<td>10 19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>1 2%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>25. Continuing Availability</strong></td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>7.63</td>
<td>7.16</td>
<td>7.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>30. Not Available</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>8 14%</td>
<td>7 23%</td>
<td>22 37%</td>
<td>16 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student management</td>
<td>2 4%</td>
<td>1 3%</td>
<td>2 3%</td>
<td>8 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>3 5%</td>
<td>3 10%</td>
<td>3 5%</td>
<td>1 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Styles</td>
<td>3 5%</td>
<td>1 3%</td>
<td>4 7%</td>
<td>1 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>1 2%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>2 3%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>1 2%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>1 2%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards</td>
<td>2 4%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education law</td>
<td>1 2%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher evaluation</td>
<td>1 2%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>1 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13 23%</td>
<td>5 17%</td>
<td>8 14%</td>
<td>18 33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## EXHIBIT 5-2
SELECTED CROSS-TABULATIONS BY SCHOOL TYPE, CONTINUED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Elementary</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Incentives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Travel Distance</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>92.6%</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>98.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35A. Internet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35B. Quality of Service</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>6.14%</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>5.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35C. Desire More Internet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.0 COMPARISON OF SURVEY DATA WITH INVENTORY AND BEST PRACTICES

Previous chapters have provided the results of the surveys of principals and teachers regarding professional development needs in Montana, a review of the best practice literature and an inventory of current offerings. This chapter provides a comparison of selected survey responses with best practice and inventory data. Each of the matrices provided in exhibits 6-1 through 6-5 include the following:

- The title of the exhibit identifies the area of survey response being compared with the data. The numbers in parenthesis following the title identifies the specific questions from which the results are derived from; P identifying the question from the principal survey and T identifying the question from the teacher survey. The surveys are included in Appendix C and D of this report.

- The identified need as derived from the survey results and whether it was identified as a need by teachers, principals or both. An identified need is defined as one on which over 10 percent of the respondents cited the need or one which received an average of greater than 7.5 on a 10-point scale.

- Whether or not the need was identified as desirable in the best practice research.

- Whether or not the need is currently available in Montana as identified in the provider survey.

While each exhibit provides information regarding a different area of the study, overall conclusions that can be reached from these data include:

- The overwhelming majority of needs identified by Montana educators reflect those identified in the best practice research.

- The needs identified (including those that are perceived to be unavailable) are, in fact, offered within the state. This conclusion, when combined with the location and delivery methodology, will assist with the development of a program model.

- The desire to utilize the latest technology in the provision of programs is a key factor for future professional development program offerings.
The most important professional development needs for teachers are seen somewhat differently by teachers and principals. Teachers reflect the strong desire for content area programs, while principals see the need more in the areas of classroom management and teaching/learning styles. Both groups see the need for professional development in the areas of technology and research. As with most needs identified in the study, best practice research confirms the results and the programs are being offered within the state.
EXHIBIT 6-2
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR EDUCATORS IN MONTANA
SURVEY / BEST PRACTICES / INVENTORY MATRIX

PROGRAMS NEEDED BUT NOT AVAILABLE  (P-30; T-30)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identified Need*</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Best Practice</th>
<th>Inventory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specific Content Areas</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Management</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Identified as a need by at least 10% of respondents or average greater than 7.5 on 1 – 10 scale

Both principals and teachers feel that specific content area programs are needed but not necessarily available. Since the inventory indicates that these programs are currently offered within the state the issue is more likely one of time, location and delivery method.

EXHIBIT 6-3
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR EDUCATORS IN MONTANA
SURVEY / BEST PRACTICES / INVENTORY MATRIX

PROGRAM FORMAT  (P-9; T-10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identified Need*</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Best Practice</th>
<th>Inventory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Based Workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inservice Day Programs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening, Weekend, Summer Courses</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet Courses</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Identified as a need by at least 10% of respondents or average greater than 7.5 on 1 – 10 scale

Clearly, the format of professional development programs in Montana reflect those that are identified in the best practice research. These data, when examined in conjunction with the other matrices, again point to the need to identify methods for delivery (i.e. when and where) rather than the content and format.
### EXHIBIT 6-4

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR EDUCATORS IN MONTANA
SURVEY / BEST PRACTICES / INVENTORY MATRIX

**PROGRAM PROVIDERS (P-11; T-12)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identified Need*</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Best Practice</th>
<th>Inventory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education Association</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School / District</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Co-op</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana Institutions of Higher Education</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of State Institution of Higher Education</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent for Profit Service</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Identified as a need by at least 10% of respondents or average greater than 7.5 on 1 – 10 scale

While the identification of providers is not applicable to the best practice research, it is interesting to note that along with the expected listing of program providers (school district, Montana institutions of higher education, curriculum cooperatives and the education association) survey respondents also included out of state institutions and independent services as key providers of professional development in Montana.
EXHIBIT 6-5
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR EDUCATORS IN MONTANA
SURVEY / BEST PRACTICES / INVENTORY MATRIX

*Identified Need*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identified Need*</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Best Practice</th>
<th>Inventory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery Method</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Speaker</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Content</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Identified as a need by at least 10% of respondents or average greater than 7.5 on 1 – 10 scale

Many of the factors that would make professional development in Montana more attractive are those that have been identified in the best practice research. This factor along with the data included in each of the above exhibits will be taken into consideration regarding the conclusions and recommendations that are included with this report.
Many of those who were contacted during the course of this study agree that a more holistic view of educators’ professional development is needed. This applies not only to the evolution from novice to experienced practitioner but to the various components of the education experience as well, most notably, to the professional development of educators once they leave the college campuses and enter the field.

It is clear that Montana educators devote a lot of time and energy to professional development. It also is clear that Linda Darling-Hammond’s observation, noted earlier in this report, about what is needed with respect to these services applies to Montana as much as it does to the national scene; in her words, what is needed is: “professional development that is sustained, content-rich, and curriculum-embedded instead of what we call the sort of ‘drive-by workshop’ or ‘spray and pray’ approach to professional development.” Most Montana educators probably would agree with this assessment.

The contradiction evident in Ms. Darling-Hammond’s choice of metaphors also depicts contradictions that attend professional development generally, ultimately stymieing anyone desiring a simple and promising solution. While most people, educators and non-educators alike, would agree that effective professional development opportunities are essential to high quality teaching, most also would agree that the obstacles to achieving that vision are great. Educators have little time during the work part of their day to even think about, let alone pursue, additional training. Thus, some release time has proved to be essential. But release time for teachers to participate in continuing education is expensive, fiscally and otherwise. Thus, the delivery of relevant education opportunities that are accessible and affordable, both fiscally and otherwise, also can be very expensive.
The alternative, requiring teachers to pursue professional development possibilities entirely on their own can seem like asking a lot. Thus, compromises are made. Returning to Ms. Darling-Hammond, professional development opportunities that are "sustained, content-rich, and curriculum-embedded," which is what educators say they want, too often seem to be faded by the ‘drive-by workshop’ responses, leaving few with deep satisfaction either with what is provided or with what is accomplished by virtue of that.

This is a fair general impression that would be affirmed by many educators in Montana. Even so, this study has found that educators in this state are remarkably interested in professional development opportunities and supportive of what they get. Although nothing was found by way of perfection, there is much going on in Montana, and a considerable amount of it reflects sustained, content-rich, and curriculum-embedded qualities. The search for best practice models that might be readily transported to Montana was far from unproductive, and many promising ideas and experiments were encountered. Success certainly was realized in the case of program characteristics that might be used as design or evaluation criteria. Many accord with Montana educators’ stated needs.

It is time to draw together what has been learned from the interviews and survey of professional development service providers in Montana, the principals’ survey, the teachers’ survey, and the review of best practices, and to identify some of the alternatives that may be established to meet them.

7.1 **The Supply**

Providers, which include schools, districts, professional associations, alliances, councils, cooperatives, foundations, public agencies, colleges and universities, and the
State Office of Public Instruction present a lot of services, mainly to teachers, administrators, and board members. The preponderance centers on teaching methods, integrating technology into instruction, content area studies, student assessment, and classroom management strategies. Special education, new standards, parental involvement, and management technologies comprise the next tier.

These services are widely distributed throughout the state, but accessibility is an issue, although perhaps not of the magnitude one might presume for a state the size of Montana. It is, however, an issue.

Most programs involve a day or less; nearly 90 percent require no more than two days. More than half are offered on an annual basis, and about three-quarters are either offered annually or on a one-time basis. The presence of follow-up techniques (critiques, reinforcement programs, etc.) is apparent. Follow-up, however, is not the same as evaluation. Evidence of meaningful forms of that is much more scarce.

Most programs (about two-thirds) are delivered as workshops. Seminars account for an additional 17 percent. Perhaps surprisingly, in view of Montana’s size and geographical and climatic diversity, distance education is not substantially represented (about one percent).

Collaborative opportunities, one of the themes of the best practices literature, are represented in Montana both with respect to collaborative opportunities in the school and throughout the district, and with colleges and universities. People like them and would like to see more.

Thus, it is clear that a lot of professional development activity is occurring in Montana, and much of it appears to parallel important aspects of what are considered best practices. Educators also note, though, that important unmet needs exist.
7.2 The Needs

Most of Montana’s educators, principals and teachers alike, avail themselves of professional development opportunities, and most of them rate the relevance and availability relatively high (7 or higher on a 10-point scale). A very high percentage of Montana’s teachers, more than 95 percent, believe that professional development and in-service opportunities are available to them. They also give them a comparatively high grade. Teachers, for example, rate their value as 7.8 on a 10-point scale.

Educators in both categories consider time of offering, cost of attendance, and location of offering as the most important considerations governing their decision to attend. These also can comprise significant barriers to their ability to attend.

Principals indicated they would travel more than two hours, or more than 100 miles, to attend. Teachers indicated a willingness to pursue distance education opportunities by a substantial fraction (nearly three-quarters). They were somewhat less enthusiastic about the courses that are offered, grading them at less than a six on a 10-point scale. Teachers seem to feel better about the sufficiency of present offerings, rating them at more than a six on this basis.

The two groups of educators displayed a number of common interests when they were asked to identify subject needs. Education technology, content-area instruction, remaining abreast of relevant research, and, in the case of principals, classroom management and educating students with disabilities were prominent among the subject matter needs that were listed. Principals report that courses in School Management, Finance, Leadership, and Safety are needed but generally are not available. Teachers report that content-area studies are in short supply, closely followed by education technology.
While both groups cited school-based workshops and local courses as the main delivery approaches, principals referred more frequently to higher education courses, offered on campus or at the school, more frequently than teachers; conversely, in-service opportunities were cited more frequently by teachers.

Educators have some sense of what is offered in Montana, although they also understand that much of this may not be readily available to them individually because of such impediments as location, time, resources, and marketing. They also share a number of opinions about what is needed and what it will take to get them to avail themselves of what is available. Their opinions generally reinforced what the teachers who were the respondents in an earlier CSPAC study had to say about professional development in Montana:

- **Professional development is a matter of vital importance to Montana teachers.**
- **It must be accessible in terms of schedule, delivery system, and cost.**
- **Professional development must address current social changes and concerns, the profound effects of which teachers face each day.**
- **It must employ the best research available regarding teaching and learning.**
- **It must provide training in the best practices of educational leadership.**
- **Professional development must encourage collaborative efforts among educators and promote the building of academic communities.** Educators frequently request opportunities to interact with their peers as well as with college and university education faculty members.
- **It must provide basic and current training in educational technology and the effective use of software in teaching and learning.**
- **It must provide a bridge between pre-service training and full-time teaching. This can include an extensive induction program, peer or master teacher mentors, regular group planning sessions, and so forth.**
- **Professional development must provide on-going content area instruction in all disciplines to keep teachers current.**
It must address practical and informational needs such as classroom management, teaching strategies, parental involvement, education law, district governance, and so forth.

It must have the support, in time and finances, of district and/or state entities.

Professional development must reflect the expressed needs of the educators for which it is intended.

Neither these earlier participants nor the respondents in the present study were queried directly on their views on state-of-the-art approaches to the delivery of professional development programs. The fact that their opinions often corresponded with more academic views of best practices, however, seems to extend a special form of validity.

### 7.3 Best Practices Characteristics and Models

As noted, only a few new professional development models per se were revealed by this study. These will be returned to later. More common were lists of characteristics of effective programs, which, in turn, can be divided into principles and emphases. These may be more useful to Montanans than prototypical models, since they can be used for design purposes and as criteria for evaluating what is done. Hence, the two, characteristics and models, are treated separately here. This is what was learned about each.

### 7.4 Features of Effective Programs:

#### Principles

- Programs should be guided by what teachers in individual schools need to know and be able to do for their students; they should be grounded in knowledge about teaching and encompass the expectations educators have for students, child-development theory, curriculum content and design, instructional and assessment strategies for instilling higher order competencies, school culture, and shared decision-making.

- They should be based on shared concerns and strengths. Teachers should collaborate in the design and implementation of programs;
programs should encourage innovation, experimentation, and collegial sharing of new ideas and practices and connect teachers to other professionals within and beyond their schools.

- Teacher networks, electronic and face-to-face, are essential.

- Programs should strive to build ‘professional communities’ committed to higher student learning.

- Montana should set high standards for professional development and establish policies that support these standards.

- Programs should be integrated; the steady stream of innovations in education causes practitioners to view all new programs as isolated fads that soon will pass, to be replaced by others. The integration of innovations into existing programs must be precisely treated and described.

- To the extent feasible, incentives should be provided for teachers to participate in relevant professional development programs; teacher access to effective professional development activities – particularly to hard-to-staff schools and isolated rural districts – should be expanded in Montana.

- Programs should be monitored and evaluated for their effectiveness; evaluations should be based on a coherent long-term plan and focus on affects on teacher effectiveness and student learning and be used to guide subsequent professional development efforts. Professional development program evaluation should be seen as an ongoing process that is initiated in the earliest stages of program planning and continued beyond program completion. It should emphasize evaluation criteria suited to the goals and purposes of the program. Evaluations should incorporate multiple sources of information on (a) outcomes for students and (b) the instruction and other processes that are involved in implementing the lessons learned.

- Professional development programs must be ongoing, school-based and embedded in teacher work.

- They should leave as many decisions about professional development as possible to the districts and the schools.

- Professional development should be made a core component of school reform initiatives.

- Attention should be continuously devoted to the best available research and practice in teaching, learning, and leadership.
7.5 **Emphases or Desired Characteristics**

- Professional development programs should entail support and mentoring for new teachers; the use of master practitioners – teachers, administrators, and classified staff – to provide modeling and coaching should be considered.

- Programs should employ leadership teams to help schools implement the district’s curriculum.

- They should feature on-site support and provide for sufficient time and follow-up support for teachers to master new content and strategies and to integrate them into their practice.

- They should build on required professional development plans from district departments and school sites, as well as from individual teachers.

- They should employ a learning resource bank from which school sites can draw.

- They should focus on the intersection of content and pedagogy.

- Professional development programs should include opportunities for practice, research, and reflection, be embedded in educators’ jobs, and take place to the extent possible during the regular school schedule; they should deepen teachers’ knowledge about the content they teach, and expand teachers’ repertoires of research-based instructional skills.

- Programs should include regular opportunities for serious collaborative work. ‘Quality staff development programs have at their core a small team of teachers who plan lessons together, critique student work, and assist in problem solving.’ These teams should meet for an hour or so several times a week.

- Programs should be sustained over time, reflect principles of adult learning in content and format, and include and foster collegiality and collaboration among teachers and principals.

- Professional development programs should focus on core problems of teaching and learning; teachers should be encouraged to develop further expertise in subject content, teaching strategies, uses of technologies, and other essential elements in teaching to high standards.

- Programs should balance individual and organization interests in professional development and restructuring incentives so that they are more closely aligned.
7.6 Models:

To the extent possible, they should be embedded in the workplace so as to be more closely related to teachers’ work experience.

7.6 Models:

■ The professional development school is viewed as a replacement for the traditional relationships between college campuses and K-12 schools. Essentially, in this new partnership, the whole school is transformed into a clinical site dedicated to best practices and professional growth in association with the college campus. Schools and colleges work together to provide professional development opportunities in sufficient intensity for sufficient numbers of teachers. It is important that these involve liberal arts faculty in the college, as well as faculty in schools of education. Professional development schools represent a special form of collaboration between schools and colleges. They seek to bring both novice and experienced teachers together with university clinical faculty in a professional setting to improve practice through observation, low-risk experimentation, reflection, and coaching.

■ Teacher networking comprises another promising development. Teacher networks, stimulated by telecommunications are becoming major forces for professional growth. These tend to focus on specific subject matter. They offer access to a professional community in which teachers can engage in conversations and share ideas about ways to improve practice.

■ Teachers-as-researchers’ opportunities involve teachers conducting research in their classrooms and schools in association with university faculty. Projects often are defined by the teachers themselves. The results can stimulate discussions, help schools define problems, and lead to changes in practice and policy.

■ National Board Certification also is seen as an excellent professional development opportunity for teachers, as it requires them to document their practice, reflect on their strengths and weaknesses, and demonstrate specific knowledge and skill.

7.7 State-Level Considerations:

■ A state-level clearinghouse of promising professional development programs and strategies, including those developed by individual schools and districts, made easily accessible to principals and teachers, could enhance efforts to collect, organize, and share information about effective professional development practices and evaluation results.

■ Schools and districts should have the resources, time, and money to participate in effective professional development; the resources might
derive from a combination of new or outside sources and reallocations of existing resources.

- Distance education opportunities appear to be acceptable to a wide spectrum of Montana educators, but utilization of this medium in the delivery of professional development services does not appear close to its potential. The promise of these technologies as a solution to some of the endemic problems of cost, release time, and educator-sensitive accessibility to professional development seems to be almost without limit. Distance education might not be an entirely appropriate alternative to face-to-face interactions among educators at statewide and regional conferences, but it surely has enormous potential as a supplement to them. There is an important opportunity for state leadership in this domain.

7.8 RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Professional development and continuing in-service education should be treated as matters of vital importance to Montana. The state should develop a program that is based on a long-range strategic plan predicated on a phased process leading to statewide comprehensiveness.

2. The partnership among the Board of Public Education, the Office of Public Instruction, and CSPAC formed to enhance the quality of professional development related to in-service for K-12 educators in Montana, and which guided the development of this report should assure responsibility for the plan’s development and implementation.

3. The plan should address at minimum the following considerations.

   - The state’s capacity to ensure that all schools and districts have the resources, i.e., time, money and personnel to participate in effective professional development strategies.

   - Matters of resources, which might derive from a combination of new or outside sources and reallocations of existing resources.

   - The creation of competitive grants for pilot programs. Since comprehensiveness cannot be accomplished overnight, the plan for Montana should test the efficacy of the professional development program features identified in this report and the effectiveness of different delivery systems and models.

4. The Department of Education should consider the creation of a state-level clearinghouse of promising professional development programs and strategies, including those developed by individual schools and districts, curriculum cooperatives, and other Montana providers. Such a clearinghouse might be developed in collaboration with the state’s colleges and universities and should be easily accessible to principals and teachers.
5. The state should aggressively pursue distance education as an alternative or supplement delivery system for professional development. Distance education opportunities appear to be acceptable to a wide spectrum of Montana educators, but utilization of this medium has not reached its potential. The promise of these technologies as a solution to the endemic problems of cost, release time, and educator-sensitive accessibility to professional development is almost without limit.

6. Consideration should be given to the greater use of incentives for educators to engage in professional development on a continuing basis. National Board Certification may be another option, as it requires teachers to document their practice, reflect on their strengths and weaknesses, and demonstrate specific knowledge and skill. An official program to sanction the NBC could increase its popularity, while providing another path to education improvement.

7. Recertification should require the completion of professional development courses that are related directly to the educator’s field of practice. Preparation for recertification should involve individual professional development programs that are sustained, content rich and curriculum embedded.

8. Different and promising new approaches to professional development are being tested in several states. While no single model can meet the needs of all Montana districts, the following three models hold promise for Montana and should be considered.

- The professional development school model is viewed as a replacement for the traditional relationships between college campuses and K-12 schools. In this new partnership, the whole school is transformed into a clinical site dedicated to best practices and professional growth in association with the college campus. Schools and colleges work together to provide professional development opportunities in sufficient intensity for sufficient numbers of teachers. It is important that these involve liberal arts faculty in the college, as well as faculty in schools of education. Essentially, they seek to bring both novice and experienced teachers together with university clinical faculty in a professional setting to improve practice through observation, low-risk experimentation, reflection, and coaching.

- Teacher networking comprises another promising development. Teacher networks, stimulated by telecommunications are becoming major forces for professional growth. These usually focus on specific subjects and offer access to a professional community in which teachers can engage in conversations and share ideas about ways to improve practice.

- Teachers-as-researchers involve teachers conducting research in their classrooms and schools in association with university faculty. Projects usually are defined by the teachers themselves. The results can stimulate discussions, help schools define problems, and lead to changes in practice and policy.
9. Montana should set high standards for professional development and establish policies that support these standards. Professional development programs for Montana educators should manifest the following features:

- Be accessible in terms of schedule, delivery system, and cost.
- Address current social changes and concerns, the profound effects of which teachers face each day.
- Employ the best research available regarding teaching and learning.
- Provide training in the best practices of educational leadership.
- Encourage collaborative efforts and provide educators with opportunities to interact with their peers as well as with college and university faculty members.
- Provide basic and current training in educational technology and the effective use of software in teaching and learning.
- Bridge pre-service training and full-time teaching for new teachers: extensive induction programs, peer or master teacher mentors, and regular group planning sessions, among others, can be used in this respect.
- Provide on-going content area instruction in all disciplines to keep teachers current.
- Address practical and informational needs such as classroom management, teaching strategies, parental involvement, education law, and district governance.
- Have the support, in time and finances, of district and state entities.
- Reflect the expressed needs of the educators for which they are intended.
- Integrate innovations in education into existing programs.
- Provide incentives for teachers to participate.
- Be monitored and evaluated for their effectiveness; evaluations should be based on a coherent plan, focus on effects on teacher effectiveness and student learning and be used to guide subsequent professional development efforts.
- Be ongoing, school-based and embedded in teacher work.
TEACHING METHODS

- Early Steps (Reading Intervention)
- Grade Level/Department Team Meetings
- Differentiation in Curriculum
- Curriculum and Assessment
- Spelling and Communication Arts (4 classes)
- Citizen and Mentoring
- Exploring Inquiry Through Questions
- School to Work – Cornell University
- GLOBE Protocols Part 2, Spring 2000
- Schoolyard Ecology for K-4 Teachers
- Montana TALES Model Project #1 (Teaching and Learning in Every School)
- Family Math and Science
- Project Wild and Project Learning Tree
- Teens in Tourism
- Project Learning Tree
- Early Literacy
- Where Does It Come From? Teaching Children How Things Are
- Tech-Prep Workshop - Counseling, Articulation, Education
- Multi-grade Teaching
- Diversity in the Classroom
- Reading Recovery
- Effective Instruction Strategies
- Six Trait Writing
- Elementary/Middle School Science Methods
- Readers Workshop
- Curriculum Issues
- The Effective Teacher
- Critical Reading Instruction Support
- Increasing Student Spelling Achievement
- Reading Renaissance Training
- Local History
- Making Algebra Child’s Play
- Exploring Science Outdoors
- Cowboy Poetry Writing Curriculum Workshop
- ADHD & Behavioral Interventions
- Changes in IDEA
- Rural School Orientation
- Project Success
- Reading Renaissance II
- Motivation and Inspiration
- Magical Classroom
- Education East
- The Effective Teacher with Harry Wong
- MMEA State Convention
- Incorporating Critical Thinking into the Classroom
- MAFCS Annual Meeting
- Contextual Teaching and Learning
- International Conference of Hutterian Educators
- Integrating Reading & Writing Strategies
- Themes, Schemes, & MI Teams
- Student Writing Assessment Training (SWAT)
- Teaching Methods
- Assessment of Teaching
- Six Traits Retraining
- Six Traits of Reading & Writing
TEACHING METHODS (CONTINUED)

- Cooperative Learning
- AMCI (NWREL)
- Meeting the Needs of Gifted & Talented
- Great Teachers Bridge the Past to the Present
- Teacher Literacy: A Learning Map for Students
- Fine Arts Curriculum
- Social Studies Curriculum
- Computerized Gradebook
- Hands-on Meteorology – Science
- Creating World-Class Readers Plus
- Developing Online Courses for Students
- Integrating Internet into Student Coursework
- Utilizing Spreadsheets/Student Projects and Data
- Developing Class Web Pages
- Word Processing and Classroom Learning
- Email Use
- What Head Start Is
- CDA-Credential (Child Development Association)
- Special Ed Update – Title I Program
- Computer/Internet Workshops
- Curriculum Assessments
- Alternative Assessments for Students
- School Improvement Program
- School Improvement Program
- Six Traits Writing
- Lewis & Clark
- Career Counseling Update
- General School/Curricular Improvement
- PIR days

- Leadership Training for Administrators
- Classified Health, Safety, Playground Management
- Parts is Parts! Fractions and Ratios
- Effective Practices in Native American Education
- Movement Activity & Problem Solving for Classroom Teachers
- Story Telling and Humanities-Based Questions for Children’s Literature & Visual Phonogram Strategy
- Lasting Lessons: More than Bears, Turkeys and Snowmen
- Integration: Bringing Health and Wellness into the Classroom
- Professional Development Days
- Dimensions of Learning I & II
- 6 Traits of Writing
- Traits of a Successful Reader
- Cast-A-Spell
- Reading Comprehension and Brain Research
- Assessment in the Classroom
- Music
- Integration of Technology
- Outdoor Education
- Special Education
- Sports and PE
- Language Arts and Literature
- Math Their Way
- People Institute
- MBA Essentials Certificate
- 2 PIR Days before school starts
- Aligning to new state standards-on-assessment
- Variety of Areas of Need Pertaining to Sp Ed issues in Montana
- Transition Outcomes Project
- Success for All – Reading
- Different Ways of Knowing
TEACHING METHODS (CONTINUED)

- Expeditionary Learning – Outward Bound
- Onwards to Excellence
- School Violence
- State Wide Inservice
- Montana Behavioral Institute
- Computer/Technology Grading System
- NASA Workshop
- EOS Workshop
- Staff Inservice
- Technology Preservice Days
- Conferences for CEU’s offered for Teachers
- High Trust Workshop
- Opportunities in Estate Planning for CPA’s
- Impact of Violence on the Family
- The Act of Successful Failure
- Anger Management
- Introduction to Grant Writing
- Child Sexual Abuse
- Administrative Intern Program
- Mann Training
- Six Trait Writing
- Sign Phonics
- Assorted Technology Courses
- New Teacher Orientation
- Special Education Regulation & Methodology
- Give Teachers Classrooms Resources to Teach On Conservation, Wildlife, Parks
- Project Wild
- Leopold Project
- Aquatic Project Wild in conjunction with Water Education for Teachers (Project WET)
- Hooked on Fishing, Not on Drugs
- Volunteers
- Administrators
- 3 days required by state law
- Goals 2000 Grants
- Educ Work Shop
- MSSA Professional Development & Curriculum Consortium
- MSSA Professional Development & Curriculum Consortium
- MSSA Requested Assistance
- 504
- Communication Arts
- Training Tapes (VCR)
- First Aid/CPR
- Title I – Writing Program – Inclusion
- Gender Equity Training
- Brain Research and Strategies for Applied
- Quality School Program
- Teaching with Love and Hope
- Technology in the Classroom
- Morning Devotions
- Wednesday In-service
- Staff In-service Retreat
- October PIR days
- January PIR day
- Teacher Check-out
- Administrator In-service
- Parent Orientation
- PIR Staff Development
- New Teacher Staff Development
- Mentoring Program
- Curriculum Staff Development
- Montana State Library CE programs at Montana Library Association Conference
- MSL Fall Workshop
- Summer Institute
- Continuing Education Programs
- Montana Board Certification
- Teton County Education Days
- Advanced Learning Systems
TEACHING METHODS (CONTINUED)

- MEA-MFT Educator’s Conference
- Lewis & Clark Story Curriculum Connections
- Native American Issues in the Lewis & Clark Story
- GIS and the Lewis & Clark Story
- Lewis & Clark Training Academy
- Strengthening Teaching Skills
- Second Step
- School to Work
- Programs developed as needed for teachers of Garfield County
- Children with Disabilities
- HIV/AIDS Teacher Training Workshops
- Montana History Conference
- Montana History Camp for Educators
- Professional Development Workshops
- Technology
- Student Behavior Management Techniques
- Critical Thinking/Creative Writing
- Managing AR is Simple
- Computer Basics
- Monthly Technology Inservice
- County Inservice
- Discovery Workshop
- Advanced Driver Education Program
- OPI/MTEA Annual Conference
- Inservice Sessions
- Spring Mini Conference
- Back to School Conference
- Discipline with Dignity
- Success with At Risk Students
- Discipline that Builds Self-Discipline
- Communicating with Love and Logic
- Six Trait Writing
- Accelerated Reader
- Technology Update
- Sign Phonics/Phonemic Awareness
- Special Education Forum
- Annual Intervention Assistant Team Workshop
- College Courses
- MCC Educator’s Conference
- MAC Technology
- Internet
- District Offered Mini-Academies
- Title I Grant
- Title II Eisenhower Grant
- District Sponsored Staff Development
INTEGRATING TECHNOLOGY IN INSTRUCTION

- Technology Training
- Technology
- Inservice Sessions
- Creating World-Class Readers Plus
- Developing Online Courses for Students
- Integrating Internet into Student Coursework
- Utilizing Spreadsheets/Student Projects and Data
- Developing Class Web Pages
- Word Processing and Classroom Learning
- Email Use
- What Head Start Is
- Computer/Internet Workshops
- School Improvement Program
- School Improvement Program
- Computer Technology
- Microsoft Excel
- Computer Systems & Trouble Shooting
- Appleworks
- Advanced Internet Search
- TALES – Teaching and Learning in Every School
- Web Page Design
- Webquest Creation
- Integrating Technology Across the Curriculum
- Internet and e-mail
- High School Technology (4 classes)
- Integrating the Internet into School Curriculum
- Internet and Web Basics
- Office 97 MicroSoft Word/Excel
- Quickbooks for Agriculture
- Beginning Quicken
- Digital Images and Image Editing
- Intermediate Integration Technology
- Knowing Your PC Inside and Out
- Technology
- Technology Academy
- Internet Applied to the Classroom
- Twin Pillars: Responsibility & Potential
- Building a Web Page
- InfoTrack Library Magazine Data Base
- Internet Basics
- Microsoft Word in the Classroom
- Clarisworks for Teachers
- Diagnostic Testing
- Technology Series
- Beginning Technology Tools
- Intro to Excel
- Intro to Word
- Intro to Works
- Technology Training
- Power Point Workshop
- Internet in the Classroom
- Microsoft Word/Powerpoint/Excel
- Microsoft Access
- Integrating Technology into the Classroom
- Education East
- Mini-Tech Courses
- Computer Applications
- Technology in Schools
- Desktop Publishing
- Pagemaker/Photoshop Introduction
- MMEA State Convention
- MAFCS Annual Meeting
- Technology for Classroom
- Internet & Powerpoint for classroom use
- Engaged Learning & Technology Integration
- Beginning Internet
INTEGRATING TECHNOLOGY IN INSTRUCTION (CONTINUED)

- Instructional Technology Training
- Integrating Technology into Curriculum Assessment
- K-5 Software
- Beginning Word
- Int. Word
- Intro to Excel
- Intro to Powerpoint
- Int. Powerpoint
- MS Publisher
- MS Access
- Info Track
- Multimedia Tools
- Internet in the Classroom
- Computer Applications
- Excel, Advanced Powerpoint, One Computer in a Classroom, Microsoft Access
- Advanced Internet/E-mail, Introduction to Office 2000, Beginning Excel, One Computer in a Classroom, Web-Page design/Adobe Go-Live, Intermediate Excel, Gradebook Program, Beginning Access, Multi-media Design, Gradebook Program, Office 2000, Microsoft Publisher
- Schoolmaster
- Tom Snyder: The One Computer Classroom
- Technology Academy
- Computerized Gradebook
- Internet/E-mail Basics
- Inservice Software Application Workshops on Word, Graphics, Publisher, PowerPoint, Excel, & Internet
- Transportation – Safety Issues
- Accounting Technology
- Lewis & Clark
- Career Counseling Update
- Technology, Computer & Software Use
- PIR days
- Professional Development Days
- Assessment in the Classroom
- Music
- Integration of Technology
- Outdoor Education
- Language Arts and Literature
- Math Their Way
- People Institute
- MBA Essentials Certificate
- 2 PIR Days before school starts
- Aligning to new state standards-on-assessment
- Different Ways of Knowing
- Expeditionary Learning – Outward Bound
- Onwards to Excellence
- State Wide Inservice
- Computer/Technology Grading System
- NASA Workshop
- EOS Workshop
- Staff Inservice
- Technology Preservice Days
- High Trust Workshop
- Opportunities in Estate Planning for CPA’s
- Administrative Intern Program
- Mandt Training
- Six Trait Writing
- Sign Phonics
- New Teacher Orientation
- Special Education Regulation & Methodology
- Volunteers
- Administrators
- 3 days required by state law
- Goals 2000 Grants
- Special Ed Issues for Administrators
- Issues and Trends of Special Ed
- Educ Work Shop
INTEGRATING TECHNOLOGY IN INSTRUCTION (CONTINUED)

- MSSA Professional Development & Curriculum Consortium
- MSSA Professional Development & Curriculum Consortium
- MSSA Requested Assistance
- Communication Arts
- Training Tapes (VCR)
- Technology in the Classroom
- Wednesday In-service
- Staff In-service Retreat
- October PIR days
- January PIR day
- Administrator In-service
- Parent Orientation
- Faith Challenge Banquet
- Parent Activity In-service
- PIR Staff Development
- Curriculum Staff Development
- Teton County Education Days
- Advanced Learning Systems
- MEA-MFT Educator's Conference
- GIS and the Lewis & Clark Story
- Strengthening Teaching Skills
- School to Work
- Electric Library & Infotrac
- Intro to Email #2
- Technology Classes
- Programs developed as needed for teachers of Garfield County
- Technology Training
- Technology In Science Classroom
- Global Positioning and Internet Use in Classroom
- HIV/AIDS Teacher Training Workshops
- Integrating Technology into Classroom Instruction
- Monthly Technology Inservice
- Curriculum Workshop
- County Inservice
- Discovery Workshop
- OPI/MTEA Annual Conference
- Spring Mini Conference
- Back to School Conference
- Special Education Forum
- College Courses
- MCC Educator's Conference
- MAC Technology
- Internet
- District Offered Mini-Academies
- Title I Grant
- Title II Eisenhower Grant
- District Sponsored Staff Development
INTEGRATING TECHNOLOGY IN SCHOOL MANAGEMENT

- Technology
- Intro to Excel
- Intro to Word
- Intro to Works
- Technology Training
- Power Point Workshop
- “Grademaster” Workshop
- MCEL Fall Conference
- MAEMSP Conference
- MASS Conference
- MASSP Conference
- Models of Block Scheduling
- Workshop – Dr. Lynn Foster, U of MT
- Twin Pillars: Responsibility & Potential
- Intro to Excel
- Intro to Powerpoint
- Int. Powerpoint
- MS Publisher
- Gradebook Program
- Advanced Internet/E-mail, Introduction to Office 2000, Beginning Excel, One Computer in a Classroom, Web-Page design/Adobe Go-Live, Intermediate Excel, Gradebook Program, Beginning Access, Multimedia Design, Gradebook Program, Office 2000, Microsoft Publisher
- Schoolmaster
- Technology Academy
- Computerized Gradebook
- Creating World-Class Readers Plus
- Integrating Internet into Student Coursework
- Utilizing Spreadsheets/Student Projects and Data
- Developing Class Web Pages
- Word Processing and Classroom Learning
- Email Use
- What Head Start Is
- Computer/Internet Workshops
- School Improvement Program
- School Improvement Program
- Computer Technology
- Lewis & Clark
- Special Services Gathering
- Career Counseling Update
- Integration of Technology
- Outdoor Education
- Language Arts and Literature
- Math Their Way
- Onwards to Excellence
- State Wide Inservice
- Computer/Technology Grading System
- NASA Workshop
- Staff Inservice
- Technology Preservice Days
- High Trust Workshop
- Administrative Intern Program
- Mandt Training
- Six Trait Writing
- Sign Phonics
- New Teacher Orientation
- Administrators
- Clerk Training
- Wednesday In-service
- Staff In-service Retreat
- October PIR days
- January PIR day
- Support Staff In-service
- Administrator In-service
- PIR Staff Development
- New Teacher Staff Development
- Mentoring Program
- Curriculum Staff Development
- Teton County Education Days
- Strengthening Teaching Skills
- School to Work
INTEGRATING TECHNOLOGY IN SCHOOL MANAGEMENT (CONTINUED)

- Technology Training
- Montana Conference of Education Leadership
- MSBA Spring Workshops
- MCC Educator's Conference
- District Offered Mini-Academies
- District Sponsored Staff Development

- Integrating Technology into Classroom Instruction
- Monthly Technology Inservice
- County Inservice
- School Law
- OPI/MTEA Annual Conference
- College Courses
STUDENT PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT

- 2000 Special Education Conference on disabilities
- Increasing Student Achievement
- “Grademaster” Workshop
- Rural School Orientation
- Assessment Workshop
- Project Success
- Education East
- School Evaluation
- MMEA State Convention
- Authentic Assessment
- MAFCS Annual Meeting
- Curriculum Assessment
- Performance Assessment & Rubric Design
- Project Success
- Twin Pillars: Responsibility & Potential
- Designing Classroom Assessment
- Balancing Standardized and Classroom Assessment
- Meeting the Needs of Gifted & Talented
- Creating World-Class Readers Plus
- Developing Online Courses for Students
- Integrating Internet into Student Coursework
- Utilizing Spreadsheets/Student Projects and Data
- Word Processing and Classroom Learning
- Reviewing, Understanding & Implementing the New Language Arts K-12 Curriculum
- What Head Start Is
- CDA-Credential (Child Development Association)
- Special Ed Update – Title I Program
- Computer/Internet Workshops
- Curriculum Assessments
- Alternative Assessments for Students
- MASP 2000 Fall Conference – Neuropsychology of Reading Disorders: Diagnosis and Intervention
- School Improvement Program
- School Improvement Program
- Six Traits Writing
- Lewis & Clark
- Special Services Gathering
- Career Counseling Update
- PIR days
- Leadership Training for Administrators
- Professional Development Days
- Dimensions of Learning I & II
- 6 Traits of Writing
- Traits of a Successful Reader
- Cast-A-Spell
- Reading Comprehension and Brain Research
- Assessment in the Classroom
- Integration of Technology
- Outdoor Education
- Language Arts and Literature
- Math Their Way
- 2 PIR Days before school starts
- Aligning to new state standards-on-assessment
- Transition Outcomes Project
- Success for All – Reading
- Different Ways of Knowing
- Expeditionary Learning – Outward Bound
- Onwards to Excellence
- State Wide Inservice
- Montana Behavioral Institute
- Computer/Technology Grading System
- Mac Bledsoe
- NASA Workshop
STUDENT PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

- EOS Workshop
- Staff Inservice
- Technology Preservice Days
- Impact of Violence on the Family
- The Act of Successful Failure
- Anger Management
- Child Sexual Abuse
- Administrative Intern Program
- Special Education Regulation & Methodology
- Give Teachers Classrooms Resources to Teach On Conservation, Wildlife, Parks
- Project Wild
- Leopold Project
- Aquatic Project Wild in conjunction with Water Education for Teachers (Project WET)
- Hooked on Fishing, Not on Drugs
- Volunteers
- Administrators
- 3 days required by state law
- Goals 2000 Grants
- Issues and Trends of Special Ed Educ Work Shop
- MSSA Professional Development & Curriculum Consortium
- MSSA Professional Development & Curriculum Consortium
- MSSA Requested Assistance
- Communication Arts
- Title I – Writing Program – Inclusion
- Gender Equity Training
- Brain Research and Strategies for Applied
- Quality School Program
- Wednesday In-service
- Staff In-service Retreat
- October PIR days
- January PIR day
- Teacher Check-out
- Administrator In-service
- Parent Orientation
- PIR Staff Development
- Curriculum Staff Development
- Montana Board Certification
- Advanced Learning Systems Assessment
- MEA-MFT Educator’s Conference
- School to Work
- Programs developed as needed for teachers of Garfield County
- Technology Training
- Authentic Assessment
- HIV/AIDS Teacher Training Workshops
- Montana History Conference
- Montana History Camp for Educators
- Professional Development Workshops
- Technology
- Monthly Technology Inservice
- Curriculum Workshop
- County Inservice
- School Law
- OPI/MTEA Annual Conference
- Inservice Sessions
- Spring Mini Conference
- Back to School Conference
- Discipline with Dignity
- Success with At Risk Students
- Discipline that Builds Self-Discipline
- Communicating with Love and Logic
- Annual Intervention Assistant Team Workshop
- MCC Educator’s Conference
- MAC Technology
STUDENT PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

- Internet
- District Offered Mini-Academies
- Title I Grant
- Title II Eisenhower Grant
- District Sponsored Staff Development
PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT

- Project Success
- Technology
- MCEL Fall Conference
- Twin Pillars: Responsibility & Potential
- Inservice Software Application Workshops on Word, Graphics, Publisher, PowerPoint, Excel, & Internet
- What Head Start Is
- CDA-Credential (Child Development Association)
- Special Ed Update – Title I Program
- Computer/Internet Workshops
- Alternative Assessments for Students
- School Improvement Program
- School Improvement Program
- Lewis & Clark
- Special Services Gathering
- Career Counseling Update
- Leadership Training for Administrators
- Reading Comprehension and Brain Research
- Assessment in the Classroom
- Music
- Integration of Technology
- Outdoor Education
- Special Education
- Sports and PE
- Language Arts and Literature
- 2 PIR Days before school starts
- Variety of Areas of Need Pertaining to Sp Ed issues in Montana
- Success for All – Reading
- Different Ways of Knowing
- Onwards to Excellence
- School Violence
- State Wide Inservice
- Montana Behavioral Institute
- Computer/Technology Grading System
- Mac Bledsoe
- NASA Workshop
- EOS Workshop
- Staff Inservice
- Conferences for CEU’s offered for Teachers
- High Trust Workshop
- Impact of Violence on the Family
- The Act of Successful Failure
- Anger Management
- Child Sexual Abuse
- Sign Phonics
- New Teacher Orientation
- Special Education Regulation & Methodology
- Hooked on Fishing, Not on Drugs
- Volunteers
- Administrators
- Educ Work Shop
- MSSA Requested Assistance
- 504
- Communication Arts
- Training Tapes (VCR)
- Title I – Writing Program – Inclusion
- Conflict Transformation
- Quality School Program
- Parent Orientation
- Faith Challenge Banquet
- Parent Activity In-service
- PIR Staff Development
- New Teacher Staff Development
- Mentoring Program
- Montana Board Certification
- Second Step
- School to Work
- Programs developed as needed for teachers of Garfield County
- Montana History Camp for Educators
PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT (CONTINUED)

- Montana Conference of Education Leadership
- MSBA Spring Workshops
- Critical Thinking/Creative Writing
- Curriculum Workshop
- County Inservice
- School Law
- OPI/MTEA Annual Conference
- Inservice Sessions
- Back to School Conference
- Discipline with Dignity

- Success with At Risk Students
- Discipline that Builds Self-Discipline
- Communicating with Love and Logic
- District Offered Mini-Academies
- Title I Grant
- District Sponsored Staff Development
IN-DEPTH STUDY OF CONTENT AREA

- Teller Wildlife Educational Services
- Project Wild
- Wet and Wild (Science/Ecology)
- Sharing the Joy of Nature
- Glaze Workshop
- Earth Science
- Life Drawing Workshop
- Outdoor Education at Birch Creek
- Roadside Geology for Teachers
- Plant Ecology
- Birds and Birding for Educators
- Aquatic Invertebrate Ecology for Teachers I
- Aquatic Invertebrate Ecology for Teachers II
- APS Inquiry-Based Physiology
- 2000 Montana Economic Outlook Seminars
- Winter Ecology for Educators
- Schoolroom Ecology
- Tips and Techniques of Engine Rebuilding
- Tips and Techniques of Engine Rebuilding
- Diagnosis and Tune-up of Gasoline Engines
- Glass Beards and Lampworking
- Home Remodeling
- Elementary Math Institute
- Nutrition Education for Teachers
- The Space Station and You
- Teaching with Space
- Jason/Geographic Alliance
- El Math Institute Part I
- El Math Institute Part II
- Artist and the Wilderness
- Mammals of Yellowstone
- Montana’s Historic Missouri River (2 classes)
- Montana Ghost Towns
- Teaching Science Outdoors: A Thematic Approach
- Plants of the Eastern rocky Mountain Front
- Montana History: A time and Place in Northeastern Montana
- History of Yellowstone Park
- Wildflowers of the Northern Rockies
- Classroom of Storytellers: Building Community Through Storytelling
- Natural History: Glacier National Park
- River Ecology I
- Glacier’s Grizzlies II
- River Ecology II
- Glacier’s Early Days
- Geology Along the Highline
- Prairie Patchwork
- The 100 Years That Made 2000AD
- NASA Aerospace Workshop
- Local History
- Fun Math Activities for Grades 4-8
- Accelerated Reader
- Making Algebra Child’s Play
- Exploring Science Outdoors
- Close Up Teacher Program
- Cowboy Poetry Writing Curriculum Workshop
- Brewery Flats Workshop – Reclaiming Spring Creek
- Montana Fisheries
- Reading Renaissance II
- Education East
- MMEA State Convention
- MAFCS Annual Meeting
- International Conference of Hutterian Educators
- Creative writing/Earthquake prep/CPR), Geography,
IN-DEPTH STUDY OF CONTENT AREA (CONTINUED)

- Library Research (3 classes)
- 6-trait writing
- Who is Montana Fish Wildlife & Parks
- Polymers for the Classroom
- How Toys are Made
- Fine Arts Curriculum
- Social Studies Curriculum
- Creating World-Class Readers Plus
- Developing Online Courses for Students
- Utilizing Spreadsheets/Student Projects and Data
- Developing Class Web Pages
- Word Processing and Classroom Learning
- Email Use
- Reviewing, Understanding & Implementing the New Language Arts K-12 Curriculum
- CDA-Credential (Child Development Association)
- Curriculum Assessments
- Alternative Assessments for Students
- School Improvement Program
- School Improvement Program
- Computer Technology
- Six Traits Writing
- Lewis & Clark
- PIR days
- Parts is Parts! Fractions and Ratios
- Movement Activity & Problem Solving for Classroom Teachers
- Athletic Training for the Experienced Athletic Trainers and Coaches
- Story Telling and Humanities-Based Questions for Children’s Literature & Visual Phonogram Strategy
- Enhance Your Talents as Art Professionals!
- Non-Toxic Print Making Intensive Workshop
- Physics is Interesting? UGH!
- Schools in American Society
- Dimensions of Learning I & II
- 6 Traits of Writing
- Traits of a Successful Reader
- Cast-A-Spell
- Reading Comprehension and Brain Research
- Assessment in the Classroom
- Music
- Outdoor Education
- Special Education
- Sports and PE
- Language Arts and Literature
- Student Safety
- Aligning to new state standards-on-assessment
- Success for All – Reading
- Different Ways of Knowing
- Expeditionary Learning – Outward Bound
- Onwards to Excellence
- State Wide Inservice
- NASA Workshop
- EOS Workshop
- Staff Inservice
- High Trust Workshop
- Impact of Violence on the Family
- The Act of Successful Failure
- Anger Management
- Child Sexual Abuse
- Six Trait Writing
- Sign Phonics
- Special Education Regulation & Methodology
- Give Teachers Classrooms Resources to Teach On
- Conservation, Wildlife, Parks
IN-DEPTH STUDY OF CONTENT AREA (CONTINUED)

- Project Wild
- Leopold Project
- Aquatic Project Wild in conjunction with Water Education for Teachers (Project WET)
- Hooked on Fishing, Not on Drugs
- 3 days required by state law
- Goals 2000 Grants
- MSSA Professional Development & Curriculum Consortium
- MSSA Requested Assistance
- Communication Arts
- Gender Equity Training
- Brain Research and Strategies for Applied
- Wednesday In-service
- Staff In-service Retreat
- October PIR days
- January PIR day
- Teacher Check-out
- PIR Staff Development
- Curriculum Staff Development
- Montana Board Certification
- Teton County Education Days
- MEA-MFT Educator’s Conference
- Beginning Pottery
- Science and Art Connection
- Science Extravaganza
- Foreign Language
- Wilderness and Land Ethics
- Love Your Engine
- MBI Summer Institute
- Lewis & Clark Story Curriculum Connections
- Native American Issues in the Lewis & Clark Story
- GIS and the Lewis & Clark Story
- Lewis & Clark Training Academy
- Strengthening Teaching Skills
- Technology Training
- HIV/AIDS Teacher Training Workshops
- Montana History Conference
- Montana History Camp for Educators
- Professional Development Workshops
- Monthly Technology Inservice
- Curriculum Workshop
- County Inservice
- Discovery Workshop
- Advanced Driver Education Program
- OPI/MTEA Annual Conference
- Inservice Sessions
- Spring Mini Conference
- Back to School Conference
- Annual Intervention Assistant Team Workshop
- District Offered Mini-Academies
- Title I Grant
- Title II Eisenhower Grant
- District Sponsored Staff Development
IMPLEMENTING NEW STANDARDS

- Increasing Student Achievement
- MCEL Fall Conference
- MASS Conference
- Curriculum & Learner Outcomes
- Twin Pillars: Responsibility & Potential
- From Curriculum to Implementation
- Curriculum workshop
- What Head Start Is
- Curriculum Assessments
- Alternative Assessments for Students
- School Improvement Program
- School Improvement Program
- Special Services Gathering
- Career Counseling Update
- PIR days
- Leadership Training for Administrators
- Dimensions of Learning I & II
- 6 Traits of Writing
- Traits of a Successful Reader
- Cast-A-Spell
- Music
- Outdoor Education
- Special Education
- Language Arts and Literature
- Student Safety
- 2 PIR Days before school starts
- Aligning to new state standards-on-assessment
- Success for All – Reading
- Different Ways of Knowing
- Expeditionary Learning – Outward Bound
- Onwards to Excellence
- School Violence
- State Wide Inservice
- Montana Behavioral Institute
- Computer/Technology Grading System

- EOS Workshop
- Staff Inservice
- Technology Preservice Days
- Conferences for CEU’s offered for Teachers
- Administrative Intern Program
- New Teacher Orientation
- Special Education Regulation & Methodology
- Volunteers
- Administrators
- 3 days required by state law
- Goals 2000 Grants
- Educ Work Shop
- MSSA Professional Development & Curriculum Consortium
- MSSA Professional Development & Curriculum Consortium
- MSSA Requested Assistance
- Communication Arts
- Title I – Writing Program – Inclusion
- Morning Devotions
- Wednesday In-service
- Staff In-service Retreat
- October PIR days
- January PIR day
- Administrator In-service
- PIR Staff Development
- Montana State Library CE programs at Montana Library Association Conference
- MSL Fall Workshop
- Summer Institute
- Continuing Education Programs
- Montana Board Certification
- Assessment
- MEA-MFT Educator’s Conference
- Strengthening Teaching Skills
- School to Work
IMPLEMENTING NEW STANDARDS (CONTINUED)

- Programs developed as needed for teachers of Garfield County
- Technology Training
- HIV/AIDS Teacher Training Workshops
- Montana History Camp for Educators
- Professional Development Workshops
- Monthly Technology Inservice
- Curriculum Workshop
- School Law
- OPI/MTEA Annual Conference
- Back to School Conference
- Special Education Forum
- District Offered Mini-Academies
- Title I Grant
- Title II Eisenhower Grant
- District Sponsored Staff Development
EDUCATION LAW

- School Law and Standards
- Rural School Orientation
- New Leaders Conference
- Fall Superintendent Conference
- MCEL Fall Conference
- MASS Conference
- GTCC New/Early Career Teacher Orientation
- IDEA Review
- Twin Pillars: Responsibility & Potential
- Inservice to Rural Teachers
- Inservice Software Application Workshops on Word, Graphics, Publisher, PowerPoint, Excel, & Internet
- What Head Start Is
- Special Ed Update – Title I Program
- Curriculum Assessments
- Alternative Assessments for Students
- MASP 2000 Fall Conference – Neuropsychology of Reading Disorders: Diagnosis and Intervention
- School Improvement Program
- School Improvement Program
- Special Ed Workshop
- Special Services Gathering
- Leadership Training for Administrators
- Professional Development Days
- Special Education
- Sports and PE
- Language Arts and Literature
- Student Safety
- 2 PIR Days before school starts
- Variety of Areas of Need Pertaining to Sp Ed issues in Montana
- Transition Outcomes Project
- School Violence
- State Wide Inservice
- Montana Behavioral Institute
- Staff Inservice
- Administrative Intern Program
- Mandt Training
- New Teacher Orientation
- Special Education Regulation & Methodology
- Administrators
- Special Ed Issues for Administrators
- Issues and Trends of Special Ed
- MSSA Requested Assistance
- 504
- Gender Equity Training
- Mentoring Program
- Montana State Library CE programs at Montana Library Association Conference
- MSL Fall Workshop
- Summer Institute
- Continuing Education Programs
- School Related Legal Issues
- HIV/AIDS Teacher Training Workshops
- Montana Conference of Education Leadership
- MSBA Spring Workshops
- Board Workshops
- Curriculum Workshop
- School Law
- OPI/MTEA Annual Conference
- Back to School Conference
- Special Education Forum
- New Teacher Training
- District Offered Mini-Academies
- Title I Grant
- Title II Eisenhower Grant
- District Sponsored Staff Development
DISTRICT GOVERNANCE

- New Leaders Conference
- Fall Superintendent Conference
- MCEL Fall Conference
- MASS Conference
- What Head Start Is
- Curriculum Assessments
- Alternative Assessments for Students
- School Improvement Program
- School Improvement Program
- Special Ed Workshop
- Career Counseling Update
- Leadership Training for Administrators
- Professional Development Days
- Special Education
- Language Arts and Literature
- 2 PIR Days before school starts
- Onwards to Excellence
- State Wide Inservice
- Staff Inservice
- Administrative Intern Program
- Mandt Training
- Special Education Regulation & Methodology
- Administrators
- Clerk Training
- MSSA Requested Assistance
- 504
- Communication Arts
- Wednesday In-service
- Staff In-service Retreat
- October PIR days
- January PIR day
- Teacher Check-out
- Support Staff In-service
- Administrator In-service
- Parent Orientation
- Faith Challenge Banquet
- Parent Activity In-service
- New Teacher Staff Development
- Mentoring Program
- Montana State Library CE programs at Montana Library Association Conference
- MSL Fall Workshop
- Summer Institute
- Continuing Education Programs
- Strengthening Teaching Skills
- Second Step
- School Related Legal Issues
- HIV/AIDS Teacher Training Workshops
- Board Workshops
- Curriculum Workshop
- School Law
- Back to School Conference
- District Offered Mini-Academies
- Title II Eisenhower Grant
- District Sponsored Staff Development
LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY

- Twin Pillars: Responsibility & Potential
- Creating World Class Readers, Plus
- Reviewing, Understanding and Implementing the New Language Arts K-12 Curriculum
- Special Ed Update – Title I Program
- School Improvement Program
- School Improvement Program
- Special Services Gathering
- Career Counseling Update
- ESL Classes
- Special Education
- Language Arts and Literature
- Success for All – Reading
- Different Ways of Knowing
- Onwards to Excellence
- State Wide Inservice
- Wednesday In-service
- Staff In-service Retreat
- October PIR days
- January PIR day
- MEA-MFT Educator’s Conference
- Technology Training
- School Law
- Title I Grant
- Title II Eisenhower Grant
- District Sponsored Staff Development

DISABILITIES (PHYSICAL, LEARNING)

- 11th Annual Conference on Services for Children and Adolescents with Educational Disabilities
- On the Other Hand
- Fall Superintendent Conference
- MCEL Fall Conference
- MAEMSP Conference
- MASS Conference
- MASSP Conference
- MAFCS Annual Meeting
- IDEA Review
- Twin Pillars: Responsibility & Potential
- Montana Behavioral Initial
- Creating World Class Readers, Plus
- Reviewing, Understanding and Implementing the New Language Arts K-12 Curriculum
- What Head Start Is
- Transportation – Safety Issues
- Special Ed Update – Title I Program
- MASP 2000 Fall Conference – Neuropsychology of Reading Disorders: Diagnosis and Intervention
- School Improvement Program
- School Improvement Program
- Special Ed Workshop
- Lewis & Clark
- Special Services Gathering
- Career Counseling Update
- PIR days
- Classified Health, Safety, Playground Management
- Recognizing Speech Problems in YOUR classroom
- Professional Development Days
- Reading Comprehension and Brain Research
DISABILITIES (PHYSICAL, LEARNING) (CONTINUED)

- Assessment in the Classroom
- Music
- Outdoor Education
- Special Education
- Language Arts and Literature
- Math Their Way
- 2 PIR Days before school starts
- Variety of Areas of Need Pertaining to Sp Ed issues in Montana
- Different Ways of Knowing
- Onwards to Excellence
- State Wide Inservice
- EOS Workshop
- Staff Inservice
- Technology Preservice Days
- Conferences for CEU’s offered for Teachers
- Administrative Intern Program
- Mandt Training
- New Teacher Orientation
- Special Education Regulation & Methodology
- Give Teachers Classrooms Resources to Teach On Conservation, Wildlife, Parks
- Project Wild
- Leopold Project
- Aquatic Project Wild in conjunction with Water Education for Teachers (Project WET)
- Hooked on Fishing, Not on Drugs
- Administrators
- Special Ed Issues for Administrators
- Issues and Trends of Special Ed
- 504
- Communication Arts
- Training Tapes (VCR)
- Title I – Writing Program – Inclusion
- Wednesday In-service

- Staff In-service Retreat
- October PIR days
- January PIR day
- PIR Staff Development
- New Teacher Staff Development
- Curriculum Staff Development
- Montana State Library CE programs at Montana Library Association Conference
- MSL Fall Workshop
- Summer Institute
- Continuing Education Programs
- Teton County Education Days
- MEA-MFT Educator’s Conference
- Strengthening Teaching Skills
- Second Step
- School Related Legal Issues
- Technology Training
- Children with Disabilities
- HIV/AIDS Teacher Training Workshops
- School Law
- OPI/MTEA Annual Conference
- Spring Mini Conference
- Back to School Conference
- Discipline with Dignity
- Success with At Risk Students
- Discipline that Builds Self-Discipline
- Communicating with Love and Logic
- Special Education Forum
- Annual Intervention Assistant Team Workshop
- College Courses
- MCC Educator’s Conference
- MAC Technology
- District Offered Mini-Academies
- Title I Grant
- Title II Eisenhower Grant
- District Sponsored Staff Development
DIVERSE CULTURAL BACKGROUNDS

- International Conference of Hutterian Educators
- Twin Pillars: Responsibility & Potential
- Tribal Education Conference
- Creating World Class Readers, Plus
- Reviewing, Understanding and Implementing the New Language Arts K-12 Curriculum
- Special Ed Update – Title I Program
- Safety In Our Schools/Pharmacological Issues
- School Improvement Program
- School Improvement Program
- Lewis & Clark
- Special Services Gathering
- Career Counseling Update
- Effective Practices in Native American Education
- Professional Development Days
- Music
- Language Arts and Literature
- Success for All – Reading
- Different Ways of Knowing
- Expeditionary Learning – Outward Bound
- Onwards to Excellence
- State Wide Inservice
- Staff Inservice
- High Trust Workshop
- Administrative Intern Program
- Special Education Regulation & Methodology
- Give Teachers Classrooms Resources to Teach On Conservation, Wildlife, Parks
- Project Wild
- Leopold Project
- Aquatic Project Wild in conjunction with Water Education for Teachers (Project WET)
- Hooked on Fishing, Not on Drugs
- 504
- Gender Equity Training
- School Safety
- Wednesday In-service
- Staff In-service Retreat
- October PIR days
- January PIR day
- PIR Staff Development
- New Teacher Staff Development
- Curriculum Staff Development
- Teton County Education Days
- MEA-MFT Educator's Conference
- Native American Issues in the Lewis & Clark Story
- Technology Training
- HIV/AIDS Teacher Training Workshops
- Critical Thinking/Creative Writing
- School Law
- OPI/MTEA Annual Conference
- Back to School Conference
- Annual Intervention Assistant Team Workshop
- MCC Educator’s Conference
- District Offered Mini-Academies
- Title I Grant
- Title II Eisenhower Grant
- District Sponsored Staff Development
WORKING WITH SERVICE PROVIDERS

- Education East
- Twin Pillars: Responsibility & Potential
- What Head Start Is
- Transportation – Safety Issues
- Special Ed Update – Title I Program
- Curriculum Assessments
- School Improvement Program
- School Improvement Program
- Special Services Gathering
- Career Counseling Update
- Leadership Training for Administrators
- Outdoor Education
- Special Education
- Sports and PE
- Student Safety
- Aligning to new state standards-on-assessment
- Transition Outcomes Project
- Success for All – Reading
- Onwards to Excellence
- State Wide Inservice
- EOS Workshop
- Staff Inservice
- Impact of Violence on the Family
- The Act of Successful Failure
- Anger Management
- Introduction to Grant Writing
- Child Sexual Abuse
- Special Education Regulation & Methodology
- Administrators
- Issues and Trends of Special Ed
- Title I – Writing Program – Inclusion
- Wednesday In-service
- Staff In-service Retreat
- October PIR days
- January PIR day

- Montana State Library CE programs at Montana Library Association Conference
- MSL Fall Workshop
- Summer Institute
- Continuing Education Programs
- Second Step
- School Related Legal Issues
- Programs developed as needed for teachers of Garfield County
- HIV/AIDS Teacher Training Workshops
- School Law
- Spring Mini Conference
- Back to School Conference
- Discipline with Dignity
- Success with At Risk Students
- Discipline that Builds Self-Discipline
- Communicating with Love and Logic
- Special Education Forum
- MAC Technology
- District Offered Mini-Academies
- Title I Grant
- District Sponsored Staff Development
CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES

- MANDT Certification
- MANDT Recertification
- Conflict Transformation (3 classes)
- How to Deal with Violence in the Schoolhouse
- MANDT Training
- Suicide Prevention QPR
- Good Talking Words
- Rural School Orientation
- Project Success
- Motivation and Inspiration
- Magical Classroom
- Education East
- MMEA State Convention
- MAFCS Annual Meeting
- Six Traits Retraining
- Twin Pillars: Responsibility & Potential
- Dealing with Grief
- In Service Day
- MANDT Training (5 classes)
- Talking about Touching
- MANDT Training
- The Key is Love
- Beyond Basic Management: Working with the Tough Kids
- Waging Peace
- Creating World Class Readers, Plus
- Reviewing, Understanding and Implementing the New Language Arts K-12 Curriculum
- What Head Start Is
- CDA-Credential (Child Development Association)
- Special Ed Update – Title I Program
- Computer/Internet Workshops
- Safety In Our Schools/Pharmacological Issues
- School Improvement Program
- Love and Logic
- Special Ed Workshop
- Schoolwide Student Management
- MEA/ATF Conference
- Lewis & Clark
- PIR days
- Leadership Training for Administrators
- Schools in American Society
- Professional Development Days
- Reading Comprehension and Brain Research
- Assessment in the Classroom
- Music
- Outdoor Education
- Special Education
- Language Arts and Literature
- Student Safety
- Math Their Way
- 2 PIR Days before school starts
- Aligning to new state standards-on-assessment
- Variety of Areas of Need Pertaining to Sp Ed issues in Montana
- Success for All – Reading
- Different Ways of Knowing
- Expeditionary Learning – Outward Bound
- Onwards to Excellence
- School Violence
- State Wide Inservice
- Montana Behavioral Institute
- Computer/Technology Grading System
- Mac Bledsoe
- Staff Inservice
- Technology Preservice Days
- High Trust Workshop
- New Teacher Orientation
- Special Education Regulation & Methodology
CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES (CONTINUED)

- Volunteers
- 3 days required by state law
- Goals 2000 Grants
- Educ Work Shop
- MSSA Professional Development & Curriculum Consortium
- MSSA Professional Development & Curriculum Consortium
- 504
- Communication Arts
- Training Tapes (VCR)
- Increasing Human Effectiveness
- Title I – Writing Program – Inclusion
- Gender Equity Training
- Brain Research and Strategies for Applied
- Conflict Transformation
- School Safety
- Teaching with Love and Hope
- Morning Devotions
- Wednesday In-service
- Staff In-service Retreat
- October PIR days
- January PIR day
- Teacher Check-out
- Administrator In-service
- PIR Staff Development
- New Teacher Staff Development
- Mentoring Program
- Teton County Education Days
- MEA-MFT Educator’s Conference
- Strengthening Teaching Skills
- Programs developed as needed for teachers of Garfield County
- Time to Teach
- Emergency Planning/School Safety
- HIV/AIDS Teacher Training Workshops
- Student Behavior Management Techniques
- Critical Thinking/Creative Writing
- Monthly Technology Inservice
- County Inservice
- School Law
- Back to School Conference
- Discipline with Dignity
- Success with At Risk Students
- Discipline that Builds Self-Discipline
- Communicating with Love and Logic
- Special Education Forum
- Annual Intervention Assistant Team Workshop
- Behavior Consultant Training
- MCC Educator’s Conference
- District Offered Mini-Academies
- Title I Grant
- Title II Eisenhower Grant
- District Sponsored Staff Development
- Peer Mediation
- Field Management
- Flex Day Inservice7
SCHOOL MANAGEMENT

- Peaceable Schools
- Changes in IDEA
- New Leaders Conference
- Fall Superintendent Conference
- MCEL Fall Conference
- MAEMSP Conference
- MASS Conference
- MASSP Pre-Conference
- MASSP Conference
- Models of Block Scheduling
- Workshop – Dr. Lynn Foster, U of MT
- IDEA Review
- Teacher Orientation
- Computerized Gradebook
- What Head Start Is
- Computer/Internet Workshops
- Curriculum Assessments
- Safety In Our Schools/Pharmacological Issues
- School Improvement Program
- School Improvement Program
- Love and Logic
- Lewis & Clark
- Special Services Gathering
- Career Counseling Update
- Leadership Training for Administrators
- Schools in American Society
- Integration of Technology
- Language Arts and Literature
- Student Safety
- Math Their Way
- People Institute
- MBA Essentials Certificate
- 2 PIR Days before school starts
- Success for All – Reading
- Expeditionary Learning – Outward Bound
- Onwards to Excellence
- State Wide Inservice

- Computer/Technology Grading System
- Staff Inservice
- Technology Preservice Days
- Conferences for CEU’s offered for Teachers
- High Trust Workshop
- Administrative Intern Program
- Special Education Regulation & Methodology
- Administrators
- Clerk Training
- First Aid/CPR
- Conflict Transformation
- School Safety
- Morning Devotions
- Wednesday In-service
- Staff In-service Retreat
- October PIR days
- January PIR day
- Teacher Check-out
- Support Staff In-service
- Administrator In-service
- Parent Orientation
- Faith Challenge Banquet
- Parent Activity In-service
- Strengthening Teaching Skills
- Montana Conference of Education Leadership
- MSBA Spring Workshops
- Board Workshops
- County Inservice
- School Law
- Discipline with Dignity
- Success with At Risk Students
- Discipline that Builds Self-Discipline
- Communicating with Love and Logic
- District Offered Mini-Academies
- District Sponsored Staff Development
BOARD MEMBER RESPONSIBILITIES

- New Leaders Conference
- MCEL Fall Conference
- Inservice Software Application Workshops on Word, Graphics, Publisher, PowerPoint, Excel, & Internet
- Creating World-Class Readers Plus
- Developing Online Courses for Students
- Integrating Internet into Student Coursework
- Utilizing Spreadsheets/Student Projects and Data
- Developing Class Web Pages
- Word Processing and Classroom Learning
- Email Use
- Reviewing, Understanding and Implementing the New Language Arts K-12 Curriculum
- What Head Start Is
- Special Ed Update – Title I Program
- Curriculum Assessments
- School Improvement Program
- School Improvement Program
- MSBA Meeting Facilitation via Interactive TV
- Special Education
- Student Safety
- 2 PIR Days before school starts
- Aligning to new state standards-on-assessment
- Onwards to Excellence
- School Violence
- State Wide Inservice
- Montana Behavioral Institute
- Computer/Technology Grading System
- High Trust Workshop
- Administrative Intern Program
- Special Education Regulation & Methodology
- MSSA Requested Assistance
- Title I – Writing Program – Inclusion
- Wednesday In-service
- Staff In-service Retreat
- Parent Orientation
- Faith Challenge Banquet
- Montana State Library CE programs at Montana Library Association Conference
- MSL Fall Workshop
- Summer Institute
- Continuing Education Programs
- Second Step
- School to Work
- School Related Legal Issues
- Montana Conference of Education Leadership
- MSBA Spring Workshops
- Board Workshops
- Curriculum Workshop
- County Inservice
- School Law
- Back to School Conference
- Discipline that Builds Self-Discipline
- Communicating with Love and Logic
- District Offered Mini-Academies
- District Sponsored Staff Development
SAFETY AND HEALTH

- CPR/First Aid
- Prevention Works: Becoming an Asset Builder (drug & alcohol prevention) 2 classes
- Suicide Prevention QPR
- CPR/First Aid
- Wellness & Fitness
- School Safety
- First Aid
- School and Individual Safety
- First Aid - CPR
- CPR/Sports Safety
- CPI Training
- CPR
- Intervention to Prevent Crisis
- First Aid
- CPR
- CPR (Renewal)
- Work Site Safety
- CPR – First Aid
- First Aid Clinic (5 classes)
- Health Wellness and High Performance (3 classes)
- Adult CPR
- Standard First Aid
- Community CPR
- CPR Renewal
- First Aid Renewal
- First Aid/CPR Renewal
- First Aid/CPR Renewal
- Health Enhancement Program
- First Aid/CPR
- HIV Class
- Montana Forum on School Safety
- Safety In Our Schools/Pharmacological Issues
- First Aid
- First Aid
- Evacuation Procedures, intruder, fire, earthquake, disaster drills
- Classified Health, Safety, Playground Management
- Outdoor Education
- Student Safety
- School Violence
- Impact of Violence on the Family
- Anger Management
- Child Sexual Abuse
- First Aid/CPR
- First Aid/CPR
- School Safety
- Emergency Planning/School Safety
- HIV/AIDS Teacher Training Workshops
- Chemical Safety
- Job Safety
- Domestic Violence
LEADERSHIP UPDATES/CRITICAL INFORMATION

- Educational Videos, Teleconferencing
- MISTA Blue Ribbon
- School Improvement Project
- Professionals & Para-professionals Roles and Responsibilities
- Inservice to Rural Teachers
- MASP 2000 Fall Conference – Neuropsychology of Reading Disorders: Diagnosis and Intervention
- Increasing Human Effectiveness
- Montana State Library CE programs at Montana Library Association Conference
- MSL Fall Workshop
- Summer Institute
- Continuing Education Programs
- Montana Teacher Forum
- MEA-MFT & MPEA Classified Conference
- The National Conference on Social Norms

L & C STORY & TECHNIQUES

- Lewis & Clark Across Central Montana
- Lewis & Clark Expedition: Portage Around the Great Falls
- Following Lewis and Clark Over the Rocky Mountains
- Lewis and Clark Fight Site
- Elderhostel
- Pupil Instruction – Related
- Lewis & Clark Training Academy
- Scholar in Residence
- Lewis & Clark Story Curriculum Connections
- Native American Issues in the Lewis & Clark Story
- GIS and the Lewis & Clark Story
- Lewis & Clark Training Academy

PERSONAL GROWTH

- Extraordinary in the Ordinary Path
- Recovering Your Spirit
- Mac Bledsoe Motivational Workshop
- The Colors of my Rainbow
- Early Career Support Conference
- Develop Leadership Capacity
- Lessons in Leadership
- Dennis McLaughlin
- Increasing Human Effectiveness
- Morning Devotions
- Wednesday In-service
- Staff In-service Retreat
- October PIR days
- January PIR day
- Teacher Check-out
- Support Staff In-service
- Administrator In-service
- Parent Orientation
- Faith Challenge Banquet
- Parent Activity In-service
- MEA-MFT Summer Conference

GRANTS & GRANT WRITING

- Twin Pillars: Responsibility & Potential
- Grant Writing Workshop
- Introduction to Grant Writing

TRANSFER CLASSES (TO 4-YR INSTITUTIONS)

- Associate of Science
- College Courses
MONTANA EDUCATORS’ PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND CONTINUING IN-SERVICE EDUCATION NEEDS STUDY

SCHOOL PRINCIPALS’ TELEPHONE SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Respondent: __________________________

Male: _____ Female: ________

Telephone #: __________________________

School: _______________________________

School Type: (Elementary, Middle, High School, Other)

Ownership Type: Public______ Private_______ Reservation_______ Other_______

Date: _________________________________

Interviewer: __________________________

Synopsis: The Montana Certification Standards and Practices Advisory Council (CSPAC) has contracted with MGT of America to conduct a study of professional development for K-12 educators in Montana.

This study, the Montana Educators’ Professional Development and Continuing In-Service Education Project, is intended to develop an information and data foundation that will contribute to the design and implementation of a statewide professional development program for K-12 educators in Montana.

A telephone survey of a representative sample of school principals in Montana is vital to the need assessment component of the study. The objectives are to determine the extent and nature of existing and needed services, appropriate topic and content areas, and preferred media and schedules.

The telephone survey will be directed to 100 principals. The questions are expected to involve no more than 20 minutes. The following survey questions have been prepared with these considerations in mind.

Survey Questions:

1) How long have you been a principal? _________ years.

2) How long in Montana? _________ years.

3) How long at this school? _________ years
4) How would you describe your school?
   a) Urban  
   b) Rural  
   c) Very Remote  

5) How large, in terms of average total enrollment, is your school?
   a) <100  
   b) 101-200  
   c) 201-300  
   d) 301-500  
   e) 501-1000  
   f) >1000  

6) How many teachers are on staff? _________  

7) How do you stay current in your career as a principal?  
   _____________________________________________________________  

8) Are professional development and continuing in-service education opportunities available to you as a principal? Yes _____ No ______ Don’t know ____________  

9) What are these in general?  
   a) In-service workshops  
   b) Locally-available courses in the evenings or weekends  
   c) Courses on the Internet  
   d) Other  

10) How are they offered?  
    a) In the school  
    b) At a local higher education center  
    c) At a nearby college or university  
    d) At another site in the community  
    e) The Internet  
    f) Other (Please Describe)  

11) By whom are they offered?  
    a) Provided by a Montana institution of higher learning (Which?)  
    b) Provided by an independent for-profit service  
    c) Provided by the Curriculum Co-op  
    d) Provided by an out-of-state institution of higher learning  
    e) Provided by the school district?  
    f) Other (Please explain)  

12) What are your personal goals with respect to professional development?  
    a) Remain current in my professional field
b) Remain current with respect to teaching and learning strategies so that I can appropriately evaluate teachers in the school
c) Meet state or district requirements
d) Obtain an advanced degree
e) Other

13) On a 1-10 scale, with 10 being the highest score, How would you rate the *sufficiency* of the present professional development opportunities for principals in Montana? _______

14) On the same scale, how would you rate them for teachers? _______

15) Which sorts of professional development and continuing in-service education opportunities do you consider most important for yourself? ________________________________________________________________

16) Which do you consider most important for the teachers in your school? ________________________________________________________________

17) Do you regularly enroll in or pursue such opportunities?
   a) Yes _____
   b) No ______

18) When was the last time that you did so? ______________________________

19) What were these? __________________________________________________

20) How do you learn of the availability of such opportunities? ________________________________________________________________

21) Are these information sources adequate?
   a) Yes _____
   b) No ______

22) Are they timely in terms of your planning needs?
   a) Yes _____
   b) No ______

23) On a scale of 1-10, how would you rate the value of these opportunities overall to you as a principal? ______________

24) How would you rate their quality? ______

25) How would you rate their relevance? ______

26) How would you rate their continuing availability? ______
27) How would you rate the extent to which they are embedded in the realities of school management? ________

28) How would you rate the extent to which they are accessible? ________

29) How would you rate the extent to which they are rooted in the knowledge base for school administration? _______

30) A) Are there any professional development and continuing in-service education opportunities that are not generally available to you now that would help you if they were offered? _______

   B) What are these? ________

31) On a 1-10 scale, how would you rate your need for professional development and continuing education opportunities directed to each of the following:

   a) Current research findings respecting teaching and learning? ______________________

   b) Best classroom practices? ______________________

   c) Applications of education technology to school management, teaching, and learning? ______________________

   d) Content areas of interest to you? ______________________

   e) What are these? ______________________

   f) Classroom management strategies? ______________________

   g) Parental Involvement? ______________________

   h) Education law? ______________________

   i) District governance? ______________________

   j) Meeting needs of students with disabilities? ______________________

   k) Meeting needs of culturally diverse populations? ______________________

   l) Working with team of service providers? ______________________

32) What would encourage you to pursue more professional development and continuing in-service education opportunities?

   a) Convenient time (Please explain)

   b) Convenient location (Please explain)

   c) More convenient delivery system (Please explain)

   d) Assistance with tuition or costs (Please explain)

   e) Other (Please explain)
33) How far would you be willing to commute regularly to take professional development and continuing in-service education opportunities? _____ hours _____ miles

34) How often? _____

35) A) Have you or would you pursue professional development and continuing in-service education opportunities that were available on-line? _____

   B) On a scale of 1-10, how would you rate the quality of this medium with respect to your professional development and continuing education needs? _____

   C) Would you like to see more courses/programs offered in this manner?
      a) Yes __
      b) No _____

36) Forgetting for a second the questions you have already answered, and taking time with your answer, if you could do three things to make professional development and continuing education opportunities more attractive and relevant to school administrators in Montana, what would these be? ________________________________

   ________________________________

   ________________________________

37) What do you think are the three greatest problems with professional development opportunities for teachers in Montana? ________________________________

   ________________________________

   ________________________________

38) No Problems _____________

39) If you could do three things to make professional development and continuing education opportunities more attractive and relevant to the teachers in your school, what would these be? ________________________________

   ________________________________

   ________________________________

40) A) Can you think of any questions about the professional development and continuing education opportunities available to you in Montana that I should have asked but have not? ________________________________

   ________________________________

   ________________________________

   B) What would these questions be? ________________________________

   ________________________________
C) How would you answer them?

41) Is there anything else you would like to add at this point?

Thank you for your time and thoughts on this important subject. Your opinions will be represented in the report that is being prepared for CSPAC, and I know they will be considered in any programs or changes that come out of it.
TEACHERS’ TELEPHONE SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Respondent: ______________________________

Male: _______  Female: _______

Telephone #: ______________________________

School: ______________________________

School Type: (Elementary, Middle, High School, Other)

Ownership Type: Public ______ Private ______ Reservation _____ Other ______

School Size: (Total # Students ___________ Total # Teachers ___________)

School Characteristics: Urban ______ Rural _______ Very Remote _______

Date: ______________________________

Interviewer: ______________________________

Synopsis: The Montana Certification Standards and Practices Advisory Council (CSPAC) has contracted with MGT of America to conduct a study of professional development for K-12 educators in Montana.

This study, the Montana Educators’ Professional Development and Continuing In-Service Education Project, is intended to develop an information and data foundation that will contribute to the design and implementation of a statewide professional development program for K-12 educators in Montana.

A telephone survey of a representative and stratified number of K-12 educators in Montana (urban, rural, large district, small district) is vital to the needs assessment component of the study. The objectives are to determine existing and needed services, needed topic and content areas, and preferred media and schedules.

The telephone survey will encompass 200 respondents. The contacts are expected to involve no more than 20 minutes. The following survey questions have been prepared with these considerations in mind.

Survey Questions:

1) How long have you been a teacher? _________ years.

2) How long in Montana? ____________years.

3) How long at this school? _________ years.

4) Which grades do you teach? ______________________
5) Which subjects? _______________________________

6) How would you describe the school in which you teach?
   a) Urban
   b) Suburban
   c) Rural

7) How large, in terms of average total enrollment, is your school?
   a) <100
   b) 101-200
   c) 201-300
   d) 301-500
   e) 501-1000
   f) >1000

8) How do you stay current in your career as a teacher?
   ________________________________________________

9) Are professional development and continuing in-service education opportunities available to you as a teacher? Yes _____ No ______ Don’t know __________

10) What is the nature of these, in general?
    a) School-based workshops
    b) Teacher in-service day meetings
    c) Locally-available courses in the evenings, weekends or summers
    d) Courses on the Internet
    e) Other ________________________________

11) Where are they offered?
    a) In the school
    b) At a local higher education center
    c) At a nearby college or university
    d) At another site in the community _____________________________
    e) The Internet
    f) Other (Please Describe) ______________________________

12) By whom are they offered?
    a) Provided by the Education Association
    b) Provided by the School/District
    c) Provided by the Curriculum Co-op
    d) Provided by a Montana institution of higher learning (Which?)
    e) Provided by an independent for-profit service
    f) Provided by an out-of-state institution of higher learning
    g) Other (Please explain) ________________________________
13) What are your personal goals with respect to professional development?
   a) Remain current in my content field
   b) Remain current with respect to teaching and learning strategies
   c) Meet state or district requirements
   d) Obtain an advanced degree
   e) Other _____________________________

14) On a 1-10 scale, with 10 being the highest score, how would you rate the sufficiency of the present professional development and continuing in-service education opportunities for teachers in Montana? __________

15) Which sorts of professional development and continuing in-service education opportunities might you consider most important?
   ______________________________________________________________

16) Do you regularly enroll in or pursue such opportunities?
   a) Yes _____
   b) No ______

17) When was the last time that you did so? ______________________________

18) What were these? ____________________________________________

19) How do you learn of the availability of such opportunities?
   ______________________________________________________________

20) Are these information sources adequate?
   a) Yes _____
   b) No ______

21) Are they timely in terms of your planning needs?
   a) Yes _____
   b) No ______

22) How would you rate the value of these opportunities overall to you as a teacher?____________________

23) How would you rate their quality? ________

24) How would you rate their relevance? ________

25) How would you rate their continuing availability? ________

26) How would you rate the extent to which they are embedded in the realities of classroom teaching? ________

27) How would you rate the extent to which they are collaborative, accessible, and inclusive? ________
28) How would you rate the extent to which they are rooted in the knowledge base for teaching? ______

29) Are there any professional development and continuing in-service education opportunities that are not generally available to you now that would help you if they were offered? ________________

30) What are these? ____________________________________________

31) On a 1-10 scale, how would you rate your need for professional development and continuing education opportunities directed to each of the following:

   a) Social changes that are likely to affect student learning? ____________
   b) Current research findings respecting teaching and learning? ____________
   c) Teaching methods? ______________________________________________
   d) Applications of education technology to teaching and learning? ________
   e) Content areas of interest to you? _________________________________
   f) What are these? ________________________________________________
   g) Classroom management strategies? _________________________________
   h) Parental Involvement? __________________________________________
   i) Education law? _________________________________________________
   j) District governance? ____________________________________________
   k) Meeting needs of students with disabilities? _______________________
   l) Meeting needs of culturally diverse populations? ____________________
   m) Working with a team of service providers? _________________________

32) What would encourage you to pursue more professional development and continuing in-service education opportunities?

   a) Convenient time (Please explain)
   b) Convenient location (Please explain)
   c) More convenient delivery system (Please explain)
   d) Assistance with tuition or costs (Please explain)
   e) Other (Please explain)

33) How far would you be willing to commute regularly to take professional development and continuing in-service education opportunities? ______

34) How often? ________

35) A) Have you or would you pursue professional development and continuing in-service education opportunities that were available on-line? ________
B) On a scale of 1-10, How would you rate the quality of this medium with respect to your professional development and continuing education needs? _____

C) Would you like to see more courses/programs offered in this manner?
   a) Yes ____
   b) No ____

36) What do you think are the three greatest problems with professional development opportunities for teachers in Montana?

___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________

37) No Problems _____________

38) Forgetting for a second the questions you have already answered, and taking your time before you answer, if you could do three things to make professional development and continuing education opportunities more attractive and relevant to classroom teachers in Montana, what would these be?
   a) ___________________________________________
   b) ___________________________________________
   c) ___________________________________________

39) A) Can you think of any questions about the professional development opportunities available to you in Montana that I should have asked but have not?

___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________

B) What would these questions be?_____________________________________

___________________________________________________________________

C) How would you answer them?_____________________________________

___________________________________________________________________

40) Is there anything else you would like to add at this point?______________

___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________

Thank you for your time and thoughts on this important subject. Your opinions will be represented in the report that is being prepared for CSPAC, and I know they will be considered in any programs or changes that come out of it.
The Montana Certification Standards and Practices Advisory Council (CSPAC) has contracted with MGT of America to conduct a study of professional development for K-12 educators in Montana.

This study, the Montana Educators' Professional Development and Continuing In-Service Education Project, is intended to develop an information and data foundation that will contribute to the design and implementation of a statewide professional development program for K-12 educators in Montana.

A mail survey of professional development program providers is essential to the development of an inventory cataloging all professional development programs currently available to Montana’s K-12 educators. Additionally, the results of this survey will establish the extent and nature of existing programs.

The mail survey is being sent to all professional development providers in Montana. The information you provide is a significant aspect of this study, and important to Montana’s teachers and students. Thank you, in advance, for your participation.

**Background Information:**

1) Name of organization: ________________________________

   Organization is: Public ___ Private ___

2) Your clients include:
   - Teachers
   - Administrators
   - Board Members
   - Other, please identify ________________________________

3) Name of individual completing this survey:

   ________________________________

4) Please provide a telephone number and/or e-mail address, should a follow-up contact for additional information or clarification be needed:

   ________________________________
**Survey Questions:**

Please provide information regarding all professional development programs offered by your organization. (If you have this information cataloged and/or described in a different way, please feel free to give us a call to discuss whether those documents could be substituted.)

Program 1: __________________________________________________________________________

Brief Description:
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________

Intended Audience: ___________________________________________________________________

Length of Program (e.g. hours, days, weeks, etc.) _________________________

Frequency of Offering (e.g. annual, monthly, etc.) _________________________

Nature of follow-up:___________________________________________________________

Delivery System(s) (e.g. seminar, workshop, distance learning, mentors, etc.)
________________________________________________________________________________

Location(s) ______________________________________________________________________

Program 2: __________________________________________________________________________

Brief Description:
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________

Intended Audience: ___________________________________________________________________

Length of Program (e.g. hours, days, weeks, etc.) _________________________

Frequency of Offering (e.g. annual, monthly, etc.) _________________________

Nature of follow-up:___________________________________________________________

Delivery System(s) (e.g. seminar, workshop, distance learning, mentors, etc.)
________________________________________________________________________________

Location(s) ______________________________________________________________________
Program 3:  __________________________________________________

Brief Description: __________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________

Intended Audience: ________________________________________________

Length of Program (e.g. hours, days, weeks, etc.) ________________________

Frequency of Offering (e.g. annual, monthly, etc.) _________________________

Nature of follow-up:_________________________________________________

Delivery System(s) (e.g. seminars, workshop, on-line, distance learning, mentors, etc.) __________________________________________________________

Location(s) _______________________________________________________

Program 4:  __________________________________________________

Brief Description: __________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________

Intended Audience: ________________________________________________

Length of Program (e.g. hours, days, weeks, etc.) ________________________

Frequency of Offering (e.g. annual, monthly, etc.) _________________________

Nature of follow-up:_________________________________________________

Delivery System(s) (e.g. seminars, workshop, on-line, distance learning, mentors, etc.) __________________________________________________________

Location(s) _______________________________________________________

Please feel free to use additional pages as necessary.

Using program numbers above, please complete the following matrix regarding the specific topics covered.
Please check all that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Addressing needs of students with:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OTHER:

---

---

---

---
Do you provide and/or facilitate any of the following collaborative opportunities?

- peers within same school (common planning period, joint research, team teaching, mentoring, planned meetings for exchange of ideas, etc.)
  Please describe:________________________________________________________
  ________________________________________________________________

- peers throughout the district (joint research, planned meetings for exchange of ideas, formal networks, etc.)
  Please describe:_______________________________________________________
  ________________________________________________________________

- Opportunities for collaborations or partnerships with colleges or universities.
  Please describe:_______________________________________________________
  ________________________________________________________________

- Other collaborative opportunities:_____________________________________
  ________________________________________________________________

Please list professional development programs, if any, that your organization has planned for future implementation.

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

If you have any questions, please contact Vicki DeLorey or Ed Humble at:

Phone: (360)866-7303
e-mail: vdelorey@mgtamer.com

Please return your survey (fax or mail) by Wednesday, September 20, 2000.

MGT of America, Inc.
1607 Cooper Point Road NW, Suite 102
Olympia, WA  98502
Fax: (360)866-7337

Thank you