DOCUMENT RESUME

| | • • |
|--|--|
| ED 207 932 | SP 017 812 |
| AUTHOR TITLE | Manning, Patricia C.; Dziuban, Charles An Effective Model of In-Service Workshops for Elementary Teachers. |
| PUB DATE Note | Feb 81 14p.; Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (Detroit, MI, February 19, 1981). |
| EDRS PRICE DESCRIPTORS IDENTIFIERS | MF01/PC01 Plus Postage. Curriculum Development; Educational Needs; *Elementary School Teachers; *Inservice Teacher Education; Needs Assessment; *Participant Satisfaction; *Teacher Workshops Florida |
| | |

ABSTRACT

After needs assessments were conducted in six Florida school districts, strategies were developed for implementing creative and relevant workshops emphasizing curricular innovations and individualized instruction. Procedures and techniques evolved from 50 workshops given to 1500 elementary school teachers. Among the activities were: multimedia presentations, self awareness demonstrations, brainstorming techniques, and learning center tours. Reactions to the workshops were highly favorable, with positive ratings for the instructor a major component of participant satisfaction. (FG)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made, from the original document.

AN EFFECTIVE MODEL OF IN-SERVICE WORKSHOPS

FOR ELEMENTARY TEACHERS.

 \sim

ED20793

SPOI7812

Ξ,

by

Dr. Patricia C. Manning Dr. Charles Dziuban

University of Central Florida College of Education P.O. Box 25000 Orlando, Floridà 32816

A Vanguard Session: Presented to the Annual Conference of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

> Detroit, Michigan February 19,1981

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

ninna

11/1

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) "

U.S DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it. Minor changes have been made to improve

reproduction abality Points of view or opinions stated in this docu

contrision view or opiritions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

AN EFFECTIVE MODEL OF IN-SERVICE WORKSHOPS FOR ELEMENTARY TEACHERS

Problem

Throughout the country Colleges of Education must become active participants in developing meaningful teacher in-service programs. These programs are necessary in order to create and facilitate better liason with the community being served. The very survival of educational faculties may depend on their ability to develop and implement new and meaningful in-service programs. A sincere commitment is needed by College of Education faculties to increase and enhance their effectiveness in meeting the needs of the school communities they serve.

With the advent of the Teacher Genter Act of 1974 the Florida State Legislature provided the means for each county school district to take over and implement in-service programs for their teachers. However, without the immediate and innovative changes by the College of Education faculty, the roles of the colleges as an educational force in the community will be diluted.

According to the Florida Teacher Center Act, "Such teacher training programs should be funded through annual appropriations in the Florida Education Finance Program to each school district at the rate of \$5.00 per FTE (full-time equivalency) per student in each district or such higher rate as may be established annually be the legislature. Funds appropriated to school district's pursuant to this section shall be used exclusively for in-service personnel training programs meeting criteria established by the Department of Education

ð

for in-service master plans. This act should take effect July 1,1974." CSHB 369-5

A second important factor that dictates a need for change is the declining birthrate, especially in certain areas of Florida. The declining birthrate has made a decided impact on the elementary school enrollment, creating a surplus of elementary teachers. If this trend continues, pre-service education in Colleges of Education will have to sharply curtail their existing programs. Our society views the college degree with different eyes, and as a result colleges and universities are looking for new clientele. All of this rhetoric is merely to state the case: university faculty must become more involved with the school society they serve. Robert Hutchins states, "A contemporary scholar has no difficulty in saying that a university must be a service station for its community and at the same time an international organization." Therefore, it makes sense to have a more active involvement between the university faculty and the public school classroom.

It is from the direct involvement with the classroom teacher and students that relevance and creditability can be incorporated into any College of Education in-service program of the future.

Procedures

To demonstrate the changing needs of the school districts in the University of Central Florida service area, in-service directors in six districts conducted a needs assessment to determine the type of inservice programs most wanted by teachers. Their first priority was a

4

request for meaningful workshops on curricular innovations, particularly individualizing instruction.

The teachers (wanted ideas not idealism, training not trivia, learning not lectures, and planning not platitudes. With this mandate from classroom teachers, the investigators began preparing instructional workshops which included strategies appropriate for and relevant to the classroom.

To develop strategies for implementing creative and relevant • workshops, the following procedures evolved from fifty workshops which were conducted for over 1500 teachers in schools of four school districts in the Central Florida area (Brevard, Orange, Osceola, and Seminole): • Trocedure 1. A readiness activity was given to the teachers to set

the stage for the activities that would follow.

Procedure 2. A multi-media presentation of a "Little Boy" was shown. The underlying theme is a teacher stifles the creativity of a little boy by sterile, staid, stagnant teaching methods and environment.

Procedure 3. A discussion was conducted on how the workshop leader as an elementary classroom teacher humanized and individualized the instruction in an elementary classroom of low socio-economic students housed in an egg-crate room located in a community that was against any changes. By doing this, an atmosphere of creditability with the teachers was established so that a feeling of "Hey! She's been there" was generated which was important if teachers were going to tune in and not tune out.

Procedure 4. Self-awareness techniques were demonstrated to teachers to develop self-concept strategies for their students.

5

Procedure 5. Strategies from Sidney Simon (1972) <u>Values Clarifica-</u> <u>tion</u> were used, such as Values Voting, Twenty Things You Love To Do, and a Values Continuum. Glasser's (1969) classroom meeting concept was discussed to help teachers create a humane, non-threatening environment. Procedure 6. A multi-media presentation of the <u>Warm Fuzzies</u> story and how it can be incorporated in the learning processes of children

4

was shown to all teachers.

Procedure 7. The techniques of brainstorming were introduced as a means of teaching problem solving to students.

Procedure 8. An addio-visual presentation of a song by Ray Stevens "Everything is Beautiful" was shown to the group. This song lends itself to establishing a climate of a humanizing environment for all children.

Procedure 9. An audio-visual presentation by the workshop leader using examples of individualizing instruction through the use of learning centers. Pictures were made by the investigator in a myriad of classroom settings from egg-crate rooms to open expanses in buildings, from kindergarten to the sixth grade. The visuals included cartoons intended to instill in the viewer the idea of incorporating a humanizing atmosphere in their classrooms. Interspersed throughout are visuals of a "ditto dragon" (a cartoon character), which is a ditto machine that looks like a dragon, a dragon that devours the ambition of children doomed to work ditto sheets all day.

Procedure 10. A sample learning activity package was given to each. participant designed to assist teachers in planning individual activities for their students. Procedure 11. The teachers maneuver through and actually manipulate learning centers that were constructed by the investigator. As the teachers go through the centers the workshop leader demonstrates and explains the organizational structure of the centers, the management system, what happens at each center, the time required to experience each center, how materials were made, and the approximate cost of each center.

Regults

Each subsequent workshop was improved through feedback from the previous workshop. This feedback was supplied from each district by means of an existing in-service evaluation form. These evaluation instruments provided salient data on the effectiveness of the workshops. The teachers' responses from each district were compiled, tallied, and are presented in the following_tables.

Table I represented 15 workshops given in the Brevard School District with 475 teachers responding. The Brevard In-Service Anstrument consisted of eight categories. The category-rated highest was "the leader conducted this in-service with enthusiasm." The category that was rated lowest was "the physical facilities were appropriate for the activity." . The Osceola County In-Service Instrument in Table II portrays 275 teacher responses and 72% rated the workshops as very effective, and 25% effective, thereby illustrating that the majority of the teachers felt the workshops were able to meet their needs.

Table III, Seminole County In-Service Training Evaluations, exhibits the responses of 350 teachers from ten elementary schools. The workshops were given an overall "outstanding" rating of 98%.

5.

The Orange County In-Service Evaluation Instrument (Table IV) represented the responses from 389 teachers. The workshops were held in thirteen elementary schools within the school district. The category receiving the highest rating (98%) was "evaluation of consultants/instructors."

Perhaps it would be difficult to assess the effectiveness of the workshops from the four in-service evaluations since they are dissimilar. There were 50 workshops given to 1500 teachers in four school districts where evaluations were made by the in-service representative. For Brevard teachers the workshops overall evaluations were 94% or "to a high degree." Orange County teachers gave a 98% excellent rating for the "overall evaluation of this activity." Seminole teachers responded with 96% above average, for rating the component or workshop overall.

The data substantiated the conclusion that of 1500 teachers in four school districts the workshops were rated high by 90% of participants, therefore, illustrating that the workshops were relevant and provided meaningful experiences for public school elementary classroom teachers.

TABLE I

BREVARD COUNTY SCHOOLS OPINION SURVEY OF IN-SERVICE PARTICIPANTS Selected Criteria

X in the block following each criteria that best expresses how you feel about this staff development experience.

1. The methods and/or media used to present this in-service were effective.

2.. The objectives of this in-service were clarified and discussed.

There was agreement between announced 3. objectives and what actually took place.

4. This in-service met my immediate and/or my long range needs.

5. The physical facilities were appropriate for the activity

The leaders conducted this in-service 6. with enthusiasm.

97 The participants appeared to feel free to interact with the leaders or other partici-94 pants.

It was evident that there was planning and 8. preparation for this in-service 97

The highest possible rating is 4.0

applicabl

Not

degree

average

above

L L

6%

9

12

9

15

3

6

3

2

2

high degree

very

ൻ

To

94%

91

88

91

79

degreé

average

below

To.

TABLE II

)

4

ERIC

OSCEOLA COUNTY EVALUATION FOR IN-SERVICE WORKSHOP

| | 1 | • | • | · . | , , | | L ' |
|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------|---|--------------------------------|-----------------|------------|
| Consult | tant: P. Mannir | ng ~ | • | | | `` | |
| Compone | ent: Individua | lizing Instr | uction . | i. | N=275 | - | • ' |
| · • | · · · | · & ' | | | | | |
| • • • • • • • • | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | -j | |
| *** | Verý . | | · • · | | Very | , | |
| | Effective | Effective | Adequate | Ineffectivé | Ineffective | | |
| | 72% | • 25% | 2% | 1% | | | |
| · · · | s Below | / | • | · { | · · · | - | |
| what di | d'you like abou | t the worksh | ops? | Suggestions | for Improvem | ents. | |
| • Conșu | ideas to use wi ltant was very i | | ۰ ۱ | No improv in-serv | ements needed ice workshop. | on this | × , |
| • | perative, | | | More works | shops like it | _for speci | fic |
| | lent - great sei | nses. of humon | c. 🧳 | areas. | | | |
| • Very | ef fec tive. | | 、 、 | • I didn't : ments, | like the seat | ing arrang | e- |
| to i | ave us tangible individualize. | examples on We need exam | how ples | · Longer in | | • | e |
| | lectures. | •• | | • More time | for browsing | and feedba | ack. |
| د | materials - oper ty of materials | | | Making som shop hou | ne materials (nrs. | during worl | K - |
| | d both instruct | | | · · · | | | |
| • I foun | d it.to be one shops I've atte | of the most | | • | | Ŧ | - .3 |
| Wast | ictor knew her s e time. | | | - | | ۰۰ _ب | |
| : • Provid indi | ed many "on han vidualizing in | ds"_ideas fo the classroom | r n. | `` | | , , | |
| Attrac speal | tive displays. ker. Open disc | She-was a dy ussion. | ynamic | e en | | • •. F. | ÷ |
| • The "hi idea: | ands on" activi sl | t les and grea | at '• | | , . ; | • | • |
| \$ | · · · | · / | | | • | - • | • |
| - | , | | | - | | • • | |

TABLE III

. THE SCHOOL BOARD OF SEMINOLE COUNTY, FLORIDA . INSERVICE COMPONENT EVALUATION FORM

| Component: | Learning Cente | rs | Objective: | Individualizati | .on , | | | |
|-------------|----------------|----------|-------------|-----------------|-------|----------|----|--|
| Instructor: | Pat Manning | | Ďate: | 1977-1980 | \$ | <u>ې</u> | | |
| Affiliation | of Instructor: | Universi | ty of Centr | al Florida | • | 3 | •. | |

:

N = 350 ~

| OUTSTANDING | GOOD | FAIR | INADEQUATE | NOT APPLICABLE | COMPONENT DESIGN |
|-----------------|------------|------|------------|----------------|--|
| 89 | 4 | 7 | | | •Objectives stated in understandable terms |
| . 20 | 10 | ·. | | | Appropriateness of objectives for improving job performance |
| 93 | . 7 | | | | Relevance of learning activities to objectives |
| 92 | 6 | .2 | | | Appropriateness of materials provided |
| 90 | 9 | 1 | | | Appropriateness of activities |
| 92 | 8 | | • | | Met the needs anticipated |
| | , | | | | CONSULTANT OR WORKSHOP LEADER |
| 92 | 7 | 1 | | | Knowledge of the subject |
| 9 1 | . 8 | 1 | | | Clarity of Presentation |
| 90 | 9 | 1 | • | | Organization |
| 89 | r 6 | 5 | | , | Use of Time |
| 92 | 8 | _ | , | | Use of materials |
| 95 | 5 | | | • | Enthusiasm for the Subject |
| 95 | 、5 | | | * | Ability to relate to the participants |
| ⁻ 90 | 8 | 2 | | | Provision for feedback on participants' performance or progress during the component |
| 98 | . 2 | | | , | Overall Effectiveness |
| | | | | •• | 11 |

TABLE III

(Continued)

- IV:, Additional comments:
 - 1. One of the best things yet!
 - Let's do it again soon! The workshop time was so great for all of us and our kids.
 - 3. Most worthwhile; would like to see some early dismissal days i devoted to making more of these centers.
 - 4. The presentation excellent. I brought back many ideas for classroom use.
 - 5. Extremely worthwhile.
 - 6. Very informative; well prepared.
 - 7. Liked the "hands-on" approach.
 - 8. Love her "hands-on" approach, eagerness to help and consideration in letting teachers use her materials to copy.
 - 9. Let's do it again soon! The workshop time was so great for all of us.

TABLE IV

| . ORANGE COUNT | I IN-SERV | ICE EVALU | JATION | | • |
|---|------------------|------------|---------------|------------|------------|
| ACTIVITY TITLE Individualizing Inst | ruction | • | Come | PONENT # _ | <u> </u> |
| DATE 1977-1980 | • | | ` | | > |
| | ۱. | • ; | · · | · · · · | • |
| PLÉASE, CHECK: | <i>C</i> . | | | ••• N = | 389 (|
| POSITION | | | INSTRUCTIC | N | |
| ·90%·01%9%Instruc-Non-instruc-Adminis. | [[- | 100% | | | |
| tional tional Superv. Oth | ier | Elem. | Second. | Adult | Óther |
| EXPERIENCE | | DEGREE | | | |
| 02% 10% 60%. , 28 | | DEGREE | 80% · | 17% | 03% |
| <u>New</u> . 1-3 3-9 7.10. | Yrs. | H.S | B.S. | M.S. | Masters |
| 0 Yrs. Yrs. Yrs. Pl | <u>us.</u> | / | B.A. | M.A. | Plus , |
| Please rate the following items based | on your p | articipat | ion | • | |
| | | • | ' | | e C |
| , ACTIVITY ANALYSIS | Excellen | t High | Average | Low | Deer |
| BASED ON PARTICIPATION | +5 | <u>4 4</u> | $\frac{3}{3}$ | <u> </u> | Poor 1 |
| I. How would you rate this activity | 90% | 5.9/ | E au | | • |
| overall? | 90% | 5% | 5% . | | |
| II. How would you rate each of the | | - | | | |
| following? | | , | | | |
| A. Organization of the activity | 91% | - 6% | • 3% | | |
| B. Were activity objectives | | <u>د</u> | | · | |
| adequately defined? | 96% | 4% | | | |
| C. Were the objectives | 1 | | | • | · |
| accomplished ? | 93% | · 3% | 3% | 1% | ** |
| D: Pace of the Activity | 98% | 1% | 1% | | |
| E. Clarity of the presentation | | · | | | ·4 |
| | 96% | 2% | 1% | 1% | |
| F. Interest level of the material presented | 95% | 1% | 1% | 3% | |
| • | · · · · | · , | | | - <u> </u> |
| G. Usefulness/Practicality of the presentation | 92% | 3% | 3% | 2% | • |
| III. Evaluation of the consultant/ | | | | | |
| instructor(s) | 98% | 1% | 1% | | |

13

ERIC Full Back Provided Bay ERIC

REFERENCES

Glasser, William. <u>Schools Without Failure</u>. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1969.

Hutchins, Robert M. <u>The Learning Society</u>! New York: Praeger Publishers, 1968, p.119.

Lessor, Richard. Fuzzies. Illinois: Argus Comm., 1971.

Manning, Patricia C. "Getting It All Together With Math Learning Centers" <u>Manipulative Activities and Games in the Mathematics</u> <u>Classroom</u>. NEA, '1979,

Manning, Patricia C. "The Me I See" <u>Children Our Concern</u>, February, 1980.

Manning, Patricia C. "Science Inquiry Centers" <u>Science and Children</u>. National Science Teachers Association, April, 1980.

Manning, Patricia C. "Pat's Pearls" Contributing Editor, <u>Social</u> Studies Teacher. April and September, 1980.

Manning, Patricia 6 "Math Learning Centers" School Science and Math. December, 1980

Simon, Sidney and others. <u>Values Clarification</u>. New York: Hart Publishers, 1972.

Stevens, Ray. Everything Is Beautiful. Tennessee: Ahab Music Co., Inc., 1970.

Witter, Joe and Myrick, Robert D. <u>Facilitative Teaching: Theory and</u> Practice. California: Goodyeaf Publishing Co., Inc., 1974, p.134.