

Marquette High School

Professional Development Plan

2010-2011

Staff Development Committee Members

Gail Barth	Language Arts
Barbara Bourne	Business, ROTC, Technology Education
Kathy Britt	Science
Val Kamhi	Special School District
Don Coons	Guidance
Amy Doyle	Social Studies
Felicia Durst	Physical Education
Tara Harrow	Visual Arts
Katie Held	FACS
Greg Mathison	Administration
Lee Mitchell	Library Media Center/RNEA
Mary Parish	Talented and Gifted
Jennifer Sebold	Administration
Della Thompson	Foreign Language
Holly Thompson	Math
Mel Trotier	PDC Representative
Jason Winter	Performing Arts

Marquette Staff Development

Staff development is a continuous process that supports the long-range goals of the school improvement plan. Staff development provides those who impact student learning many opportunities to enhance the knowledge, skills, and attitudes, ultimately increasing student achievement. The district's goal of increasing student achievement is embedded in all Marquette staff development activities. Staff development is an inherent part of the Marquette School Improvement Plan.

Marquette's Professional Learning Communities (PLC) are based on collaboration. As such, our staff is organized into subject or course-specific teams. Members of each PLC are not just working with their colleagues; they are contributing to a collective effort to help all students achieve at high levels. An important element of this process involves learning from each other. We continually search for ideas, processes, and materials that will help us improve as educators and, in turn, help our students achieve at higher levels.

In addition to monthly meetings, each department is provided the opportunity to request release time during the school day to meet in course-alike groups. These groups work on developing learning targets and formative assessments. Release time for teacher collaboration is critical in supporting the strategies included for each long range goal. Various departments meet during first and second semester to share feedback and collaborate on the findings.

Several items were implemented last school year to ensure staff development is teacher-led and student-achievement driven. PLC sub-group leaders were identified and trained in each department. These department leaders remained consistent for this year. In addition to last year's PLC agenda, administrators have asked PLC groups to begin having dialogue regarding RSD Grading Policy 6450. Each PLC was asked to collaboratively come to consensus on five items so that staff practices remain within the grading regulation. Those five items are: Re-teach/Reassess; Extra Credit; Homework; Late work; Participation / Active Engagement.

Marquette has purposely assigned classrooms that create a specific area for each discipline. The departmentalization of the building provides significant advantages to the teachers in each department. They are able to communicate with each other on a daily basis, discuss various ideas and concerns, and seek input from other members of their department. Again, providing opportunities for collaboration is a very important component to the success of the school.

We are in a cycle of continuous improvement—gathering and analyzing data and information, identifying weaknesses and areas of concern, working together to develop strategies to address those specific concerns, supporting each other as we implement those strategies, and gathering new data and information to assess the impact of the strategies. This cycle is not an annual event, but is an ongoing process that drives the daily work of our teachers.

Target Areas

- Analysis of Data
- Achievement Test Scores
- Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)
- Course-alike Exams
- Formative and Summative Assessments
- SMART Goals
- Collaborative Consensus on RSD Grading and Reporting Policy 6450

Steps to Achieve Goals

- Collective analysis of student data through professional learning communities
- Curriculum Coordinators meet with PLCs to analyze data
- Disaggregate data to determine areas strengths and weaknesses
- After review of data, PLCs collaborate and create strategies to support the long range goals of the school improvement plan
- Reflective practices
- Best practice sharing
- Analyze ongoing student data to set future goals
- Provide instructional support in most areas through teaming during the sixth responsibility

Tools and Methods to Evaluate

- Student performance on formative and summative assessments, formal ALAs, MAP EOC, ACT, PLAN, PSAT, and AP Scores
- Department chairs and content-alike PLC team leaders will monitor and record the progress of each PLC
- Department chairs will share this progress with the staff development committee
- See “Professional Learning Community Goal Form” for measurement requirement

Staff Development 2010-2011 Activities

During the 2009-2010 school year, instructional leadership training in the Professional Learning Community setting was provided. The sessions helped the PLC team leader or subgroup leader to better understand his or her role as an instructional leader. All teams have the same leaders from last year and have been required to create at least one SMART goal for the year—SMART goal form attached.

Curriculum Coordinators may be contacted throughout the school year as Learning Communities need their input. An administrator—the evaluating principal—is assigned to each Learning Community and will be an active participant. Throughout the school year some members of the Learning Communities will participate in vertical team meetings, curriculum meetings, grade level meetings, collaboration with specialists, and best practice sharing with their counterparts within the district. Also teachers will push in to their colleagues classes three hours a week in order to provide the teacher with instructional support.

Training TBD - as needed

(8:30-11:30)—**See PowerPoint presentation #1—“PLC Sub-group training.”** PLC training provided for identified sub-group leaders selected to lead department PLCs. Identifying team leaders in addition to Department Chairs allowed Marquette’s building leadership capacity to grow in number and effectiveness. Training topics included strategies that educated team leaders on how to effectively and efficiently facilitate a PLC team meeting. These team leaders remained consistent; therefore, it was unnecessary to implement this training session again this fall. We plan to train any additional PLC leaders as necessary.

August 11, 2010

(9:00 – 11:00) – **See PowerPoint presentation #2 – “SBGR Facts and FAQs”.** The Professional Development committee was presented information regarding the timeline agreed upon by high school principals for reporting out about progress toward the implementation of regulation 6450 on grading and reporting. Greg Mathison led the presentation and asked that the information be shared with departments at the first school-wide PLC meetings in September.

September 14, 2010

(12:30-3:00)—Using 2010 test data and relevant classroom data, Learning Communities will meet to review and evaluate their goals, strategies and results from 2009-2010. They will begin discussing goals for 2010-2011. They will examine any relevant data to help them establish their goals. Department chairs will also begin exploring RSD grading regulation 6450 and the timeline for implementation with department members. PLC leaders will take on the challenge of leading the collaborative decision making process and coming to consensus on the five items

(homework, late work, extra credit, reteach/reassess, participation / active engagement) by December 1, 2010. PLCs will be asked to report their decisions to the administration.

September 27, 2009

(10:56-3:05)—[See PowerPoint presentation #3—"10-11 School Improvement Process"](#)

The School Improvement Plan committee met to address the following:

- Determine, through examination of data, if we achieved our Long-Range Goals
- Create two overarching Long-Range Goals with respective yearly objectives to meet District-level SIP format

October 12, 2010

(12:30 – 1:30) – Topic PLCs met for the first time this semester. Staff members led different sessions which were differentiated according to patterns of staff readiness and interest. For example, Jennifer Sebold led an introduction to SBGR session ([see attached facilitator plans for "Topic PLC – Standards Based Grading 101"](#)), while Greg Mathison led an advanced SBGR group. Many teachers volunteered to lead other groups of interest as well ([see attached registration sheet](#)).

(130-3:00)— PLCs began discussion of SMART goals. See accompanying information regarding SMART goals ([example provided on pages 8-10 of this document](#)). Also, PLCs continued the dialogue on the implementation of Standards Based Grading.

October 18, 2010

(During Planning Periods) [See PowerPoint presentation #4—"10-11 School Improvement Plan Period Meeting" Presentation](#)

The revised Long-Range goals and yearly objectives for 2010-2011 were presented to all staff.

November 9, 2010

(12:30-3:00)—Content specific Learning Communities will formulate strategies and evaluation methods that support the school improvement long-range goals based on accumulated data and staff development activities from 2010-2011. Also, this is the last formal PLC meeting time for consensus building on the five reportable areas for SBGR.

December 7, 2010

(12:30-3:00)—To encourage staff camaraderie, an all-staff Chili cook-off will be held at the beginning of this staff development time. Following the cook-off, content specific Learning Communities will continue work on SMART goal objectives and SIP strategies.

January 14, 2011

(12:30-1:30)—Topic PLC groups meet to share implementation stories and continue the November discussion.

(1:30-3:00)—Content specific Learning Communities will continue work on SIP strategies. Also, department PLCs will begin discussion to create agreement on the five SBGR issues for the department.

February 18, 2010

(12:30-3:00)—Content specific Learning Communities meet to continue collaborative planning of strategies to meet goals. Continue discussion, implementation, and evaluation of strategies currently in place in the School Improvement Plan. Departmental consistency and consensus will be determined and reported to department supervisors.

March 8, 2011

(12:30-3:00)—Meet in content specific Learning Communities for collaborative planning of strategies, to share successes, and to improve on areas of weaknesses determined by data analysis. Continue work on previously set goals and strategies.

April 21, 2011

(12:30-3:00)—Content specific Learning Communities meet to share effective strategies from current year. A Professional Development self-assessment will be completed by all staff members.

May 10, 2011

(1:30-3:00)—Meet in Learning Communities to share effective strategies from current year. Learning Communities will make thoughtful and accurate assessments of the team's progress regarding student achievement. A summary of the year's work will be provided on the Year-End Summary sheet (example provided on page 11 of this document.) Further reflection will be provided on the "Reflection Summary" (example provided on page 12 of this document.) The teams will also redirect and discuss possible goals for 2010-2011; however, these goals cannot be determined until data from 2010-11 is received and evaluated which occurs in the fall of 2011.

SMART Goal and School Improvement Strategy Development Refresher

We believe that learning and school improvement are linked; but finding tools and methods that help us act on that belief can be difficult. This is why we use SMART goals when developing our School Improvement Plan strategies and determining the annual direction for our Professional Learning Communities. I've put together a little refresher that may help you when your PLCs begin developing the goals for this year. SMART goals are:

Strategic and specific

Measurable

Attainable

Results-based

Time-bound

Strategic goals are linked to the bigger picture. In our case, the bigger picture is Marquette's School Improvement Plan (SIP). Strategic and specific just means that the goal or goals will have both broad-based, yet long-term impact because they are focused on the specific needs of the students for whom the goal is intended.

Measurable is simply that: being able to measure or know whether our actions made the kind of difference we wanted. Measurement can and should happen in a variety of ways using different tools and strategies. This is evident throughout our SIP.

Why have goals if you can't reach them? Within our control and using our current resources (time, money, etc.), the goal or goals we set must be attainable. This requires that delicate balance of developing a goal that stretches and challenges us, yet is truly reachable.

Results-based goals differ from process goals. Most goals in education are process goals focusing on the activities or strategies we want to use. When we assess the effectiveness of a process goal, we're really just checking to see if the program or strategy was implemented—if the process was changed. Process goals and the information they provide are fantastic tools. But we need the results-based goals to answer the "so what" question. **So**, we did these things, **what** improvement do we expect to see? That's the "so-what" question. A results-based goal asks us to identify what we want to see after—or as a result of—implementing a new program or strategy.

Time-bound goals give us a time limit for when we should check for results. It helps us determine the attainability of the goal. It also reminds us that we need to periodically check to see how well or how quickly we are progressing.

Finally, as you begin discussing PLC goals and SIP strategies with your colleagues, ask the following five questions. It is my hope they will generate discussions that will help you determine the approach to your PLC goals and SIP strategies for this year.

1. Where do we want to be?
2. Where are we now?
3. How will we get there?
4. What are we learning/taking away from our PLC?
5. Where should we focus next?

Staff Development 2010-2011 Professional Learning Community Goal

Goals should be:

- S**trategic and Specific
- M**easurable
- A**ttainable
- R**esults-Oriented
- T**ime Bound

Keep in mind: What is it we expect students to learn?
 How will we know they have learned it?
 How will we respond when they don't learn?
 How will we respond when they do learn?

Grade Level or Course/Department:

Learning Community Team Members:

Goal # ____: (to be determined through analysis of student data):

How does the goal link to Marquette's School Improvement Plan and your CCOs?

**Staff Development 2010-2011
Learning Community Year End Summary**

Grade Level or Course/Department:

Learning Community Team Members:

Goal # _____

Summary of Learning Community Activities for the 2009-2010 school year
(please use additional pages if needed)

What collaboration took place?

What were the effects on student learning?

Reflection Summary for 2010-2011 Professional Development

As you reflect on the Professional Development opportunities Marquette provided this year, please answer the following questions. Your reflections will help us as we plan and prepare for next year.

Looking back, where did I want to be and where did I want my students to be?

Where was I when I started?

Where am I now?

How did I get there?

What did I learn or take away from either my Department or Topic PLC?

Where should we focus next?
