
Florida Professional Development Protocol System

Protocol Overview Session
April 30, 2012



Florida Department of Education
Bureau of Educator Recruitment, Development and Retention

Introductions



- Abigail Letcher,
Program Specialist,
Bureau of Educator
Recruitment,
Development and
Retention, FDOE
- Debbie Cooke,
WPGL Consulting
and FASD



Purpose of Session



- Overview of PD System Requirements and Reason for Protocol Standards
- Summary of Protocol Standards
- Overview of Site Visit Process
- Information for Districts Preparing for a Review
- Information for Future Review Team Members
- Where to Go/Who to Contact for More Information



History of Protocol Standards



- 2000 – 2002: Florida Legislature directs Department to develop a system for evaluating the quality of district professional learning systems; establishes F.S. 1012.98, School Community Professional Development Act
- 2001 - 2002: Development of Florida's Professional Development System Evaluation Protocol
- 2002 – 2006: First Review Cycle
- 2006 – 2009: Second Review Cycle
- 2009 – 2010: Revision of Protocol Standards
- 2010: Current Version of Protocol Standards incorporated into State Board Rule 6A-5.071 Master Inservice Plan Requirements
- 2010 – Present: Third Review Cycle – Four Year Cycle, Year Two is 2011-2012



Statutory Requirements - Section 1012.98, F.S.



- Purpose of Professional Development System:
 - Increase student achievement
 - Enhance classroom instructional strategies that promote rigor and relevance throughout the curriculum
 - Prepare students for continuing education and the workforce
- Continuous support provided for all education professionals and temporary intervention for those who need improvement in knowledge, skills, and performance
- Provide scientific research-based professional learning
- Support School Improvement Plans
- Collaborative development with stakeholders



Statutory Requirements (cont.)



- Responsibilities of districts
 - District professional development systems aligned with student and personnel needs and data sources, including:
 - Student achievement
 - School discipline
 - School environment surveys
 - Assessments of parental satisfaction
 - Performance evaluations
 - School Improvement Plans
 - Content of district systems
 - Technology-based delivery
 - Follow-up activities
 - Evaluation methods



Statutory Requirements (cont.)



- Responsibilities of State DOE
 - Best practice methods by which the state and district school boards may evaluate and improve the professional development system (standards)
 - Report annually any school district that, in the determination of the department, has failed to provide an adequate professional development system (criteria for review in standards)



Development of Protocol System



- Alignment with national standards and state initiatives
- Collaboration with professional learning experts around the state
- Field testing
- Feedback and comments
- Redevelopment overview



Redevelopment for Third Cycle



- Change in terms: “educator” instead of “teacher”; professional “learning” instead of “development”
- New standards:
 - 3.1.3 Research/Evidence Basis
 - 3.1.4 Content Standards for Student Outcomes
 - 3.1.5 Integration of Initiatives
 - 3.1.6 Leadership Development - review of standard suspended for remainder of cycle
 - 3.1.7 Non-instructional Staff
 - 2.1.5 Individual Leadership Development Plan
- Modified Standards:
 - 3.2.2. Content Focused
 - 2.2.7. Coordinated Records
 - 3.1.8. Professional Learning Facilitators
 - 3.4.6. Fiscal Resources



Overview of Standards



- 65 Standards
- Three Levels:
 - District
 - School
 - Educator
- Four Strands in Each Level:
 - Planning
 - Learning
 - Implementing
 - Evaluating



Judgment Scale – based on professional judgment



- 1. Unacceptable: little or no evidence that the district is implementing the standard
- 2. Marginal: inconsistent evidence (observed in a few faculty or schools, a few components of the standard)
- 3. Good: considerable evidence (observed in many faculty or schools, many components of the standard)
- 4. Excellent: pervasive evidence (almost all faculty and schools, almost all components of the standard)



Site Visit Process



- Four-year cycle to review all 67 school districts and 4 university research schools
- Notification for 2012-2013 is coming soon
- Review team composition – peer reviewers, contracted team leader
- Sampling of schools – representative sampling, at least 10% of district schools
- District-level report is shared after visit– individual school findings not reported



Site Visit Process

(cont.)



■ District Reviews

- ❑ Site visits to selected schools – 1 day/2 team members and district office – team size varies based on district size
- ❑ Interviews with educators, school administrators, district staff
- ❑ Team reviews documents for all levels
- ❑ Judgments on each standard are made collaboratively by team members visiting school sites/district office



Site Visit Process

(cont.)



■ District Office Visit

- Interviews with professional development director and other staff members involved in professional learning
- Document Reviews:
 - District professional development systems and other district plans such as Master Inservice Plans, district technology and reading plans
 - District strategic plans that incorporate professional learning initiatives
 - Evaluations of professional learning



Site Visit Process

(cont.)



■ School Visits

- Educator Level interviews – 5 teachers selected by reviewer across grade levels – about 30-45 minutes each
- School Level interviews – principal and/or assistant principal or school administrative team – about 1 to 1 ½ hours
- Document Reviews:
 - Individual Professional Development Plans (IPDP) for five selected teachers (1.1.1 and following)
 - School professional development plans
 - School calendars



Preparing for a Site Visit



- Notification of review and confirming dates with Department
- Recommendations for hotels
- Coordinate times and confirm school selections with Team Leader
- Provide teacher lists for selected schools
- Provide directions to schools
- Gather documents for team to review



Reviewer Qualifications



- Reviewer Sources:
 - DOE or district professional development staff
 - Regional Consortia or other service provider
 - Institutions of Higher Education with approved teacher education programs
- Reviewer Qualifications
 - Active or retired staff member of organizations above
 - 5 or more years in educational administrative positions
 - 2 or more years of expertise in planning, conducting, or administering professional development programs



Reviewer Training Dates



- New Reviewer Preparation Session
 - Two day session
 - Tentatively week of July 30 or August 6, 2012
 - Announcement will be made through DOE's Paperless Communication System and through PD Director Listserv
- Experienced Reviewer Update Session
 - TBD
 - Webcast



Protocol System Documents Online



- Florida's Professional Development System Evaluation Protocol 2010:
<http://www.fldoe.org/profdev/pdf/pdsprotocol.pdf>
- Reviewer's Guide, Third Cycle:
<http://www.fldoe.org/profdev/pdf/pdsreviewers.pdf>
- Requirements for District Professional Development Systems: <http://www.fldoe.org/profdev/cklist.asp>
- Cross District Reports and Checklists for Reviews:
<http://www.fldoe.org/profdev/pdstandards.asp>



Contact Information



- Debbie Cooke, WPLG Consulting and FASD
 - Phone: 561-629-8078
 - Email: wpglconsulting@comcast.net
- Abigail Letcher, Program Specialist
 - Phone: 850-245-0548
 - Email: abigail.letcher@fldoe.org
- Eileen McDaniel, Bureau Chief
 - Phone: 850-245-0562
 - E-mail: eileen.mcdaniel@fldoe.org
- Dr. John Moore, Senior Educational Program Director
 - Phone: 850-245-0546
 - Email: john.moore@fldoe.org

