

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 275 690

SP 028 343

**TITLE** Michigan State Plan for Professional Development 1985.  
**INSTITUTION** Michigan State Board of Education, Lansing.  
**PUB DATE** 85  
**NOTE** 27p.  
**PUB TYPE** Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)

**EDRS PRICE** MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.  
**DESCRIPTORS** Elementary Secondary Education; \*Inservice Teacher Education; \*Institutional Cooperation; Needs Assessment; \*Professional Development; \*Program Development; \*Statewide Planning

**IDENTIFIERS** \*Michigan

**ABSTRACT**

This report outlines plans and designated responsibilities developed under the direction of the Michigan State Board of Education for the purpose of providing direction and support for coordination of professional development program activities for teachers and other education professionals. The results of a need analysis for professional development in the state are discussed. Following this, the roles and responsibilities for program administration are delineated for authorities in the State Department of Education: (1) the office of professional development; (2) teacher preparation and certification services; (3) instructional specialist unit; (4) higher education management services; and (5) the State-Level Advisory Council. An outline is provided of the provisions of Sections 97 and 98 of the Michigan State School Aid Act. Ways in which this state effort will be implemented, coordinated, and evaluated are described. Appendices include a table of topic areas for the needs assessment endeavor and for program delivery, and a listing of current emphases in inservice teacher education and possible future trends in professional development programs. (JD)

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

ED275690

MICHIGAN  
STATE PLAN

for

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

1985

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS  
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

*E. Johnston*

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES  
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
Office of Educational Research and Improvement  
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 quality.

\* Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-  
ment do not necessarily represent official  
OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SP 028343

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   | <u>Page</u> |
|---|-------------|
| I. Introduction -----   | 1           |
| II. Need Analysis -----                                       | 5           |
| III. Program Administration -----                             | 7           |
| State Advisory Council -----                                  | 9           |
| IV. Section 97, State School Aid Act -----                    | 9           |
| V. Section 98, State School Aid Act -----                     | 11          |
| VI. Coordination -----  | 14          |
| VII. Evaluation -----   | 16          |
| <br>  |             |
| Needs Assessment Topic Areas -----                            | Appendix A  |
| Program Delivery Topic Areas -----                            | Appendix A  |
| The Shifting Emphasis to Inservice Teacher<br>Education ----- | Appendix B  |
| Need Areas Based on Certification Data -----                  | Appendix C  |
| Professional Development Planning Committee -----             | Appendix D  |

# STATE PLAN FOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

## I. Introduction

The purpose of this revised "State Plan For Professional Development" is to:

- provide direction and support for coordination of all Department of Education professional development program activities aimed at improving student learning;
- provide the basis for administration of Sections 97 and 98 of the State School Aid Act of 1985;
- promote collaboration of local and intermediate school districts, colleges, universities, community colleges, business, industry and professional education organizations in developing, implementing and evaluating professional development programs to strengthen the teaching profession and bring about school improvement;
- establish linkages between preservice teacher training and professional development that provides continuous upgrading of teachers' skills and knowledge which may lead to the awarding of credits or continuing education units (CEUs) for field-based programs for certificate renewal and other State Board of Education approved purposes.

This plan reflects the continued commitment of the State Board of Education to provide leadership and direction for professional development programs throughout the state.

In 1971 and 1972 the State Board of Education endorsed proposals for state support of locally defined professional development programs. In 1973 the Department developed a position paper and proposed statute authorizing a statewide network of teacher centers. In the fall of 1974 the State Advisory Council for Teacher Preparation and Professional Development rejected the 1973 position paper and instead adopted a series of guidelines for professional development center programs. Although the Council endorsed state support for such programs, a concern was expressed for the need for local response to professional development needs.

In a separate yet related action in 1974, the State Superintendent made a series of recommendations to the State Board of Education and the Governor as a result of the work of a state task force concerned with the accountability issue. Since this concern originated with Detroit, the State Superintendent proposed that a professional development center be authorized for Detroit. With the support of the State Board of Education and

the Governor, Michigan's first state funded professional development center became a reality and began operation in March 1976. In 1975 a task force to establish an outstate professional development center network was convened. The result was monies to support planning in 1976-77 for one or more outstate professional development centers. In 1976 two outstate centers to start up in the fall of 1977 were funded: the Regional 12 Professional Development Center and the Kent Professional Development Center. In 1976 the State Board of Education recommended the voluntary creation in intermediate school districts of advisory councils on professional development to work in coordination with the Department of Education to address the needs of local educators.

In November 1977 a "State Plan for Professional Development" was presented to the State Board of Education and approval delayed until resolution on key issues could be determined: eligibility for funding, the role of centers, the composition and selection of governing boards, funding, and the role and constitution of a state advisory council. In response, the State Legislature appropriated \$25,000 in 1978 for a special study to address the issues and make recommendations to the State Board of Education and the Legislature relative to an eventual network of 25 professional development centers which were never funded. An independent contractor worked with an advisory group composed of representatives from professional organizations, including teachers (50 percent), a school board member, central and building level administrators, colleges and universities, parent groups, and state and federally funded centers. The advisory group's recommendations were presented to the State Board of Education in March 1979. These recommendations were incorporated into the "State Plan for School Staff Development in Michigan" and the plan was approved by the State Board of Education in April 1979.

Section 97 was added to the State School Aid Act of 1979 with \$3,200,000 included for "applicant districts and intermediate districts for local professional staff development and career education inservice activities."<sup>1</sup> Allocation was as an entitlement for each professional staff person whose district elected to participate. Needs assessments, program development, identification of resources, implementation and evaluations were all responsibilities of the 11-member Policy Boards, with teachers comprising at least 51 percent of each board. In the 1979-80 school year a state mandated advisory council assessed progress under

<sup>1</sup> State School Aid Act of 1979, Act No. 94, Public Acts of 1979.

Section 97 and concluded that "participation by the vast majority of school districts and teachers in the state serves as evidence the legislation addresses an important current need."<sup>2</sup>

The original legislation suggested Section 97 funds could appropriately be used for assisting teachers in complying with "equal educational opportunity federal legislation . . . ; in management training for administrators; utilization of assessment results for district and building level improvement in the basic skills; working with pupils with special needs including work in bilingual programs, mainstreaming programs, and academically talented pupils programs."<sup>3</sup>

The State Board of Education's commitment to improving education in Michigan through careful, long-range planning was evident in its emphasis on "Strengthening the Profession" in its January 1984 adopted Better Education for Michigan Citizens: A Blueprint for Action, as follows:

Michigan's teachers and administrators must be provided every opportunity to review and improve their professional skills and to acquire new knowledge if they are realistically expected to meet the growing demands of the information explosion, mandated educational programs, and rising expectations for schools.<sup>4</sup>

A June 1984 report by the Professional Development Subcommittee of the Bureau of Educational Services Advisory Committee, covering the years 1979 to 1984, found that "It appears Section 97 is accomplishing the purposes for which it was legislated," and that "Policy Boards have tended to move from the one time large gathering, with an outside expert providing 'awareness,' to building level focused activities planned for a specific situation within a building."<sup>5</sup> The 1983-84 Evaluation Report also found the level of participation in Section 97 by Michigan school districts increased 21 percent since 1980, serving 42,240 of the total professional staff in Michigan.

Legislative interest and support has continued for many of the original purposes for Section 97. Section 47, covering programs for Gifted and Talented, was added to the State School Aid Act in 1973. In 1984-85, Section 47 was increased substantially to provide funds for local school districts to develop comprehensive programs for

<sup>2</sup> State Advisory Council on Staff Development 1980 Annual Report.

<sup>3</sup> State School Aid Act of 1979, Act No. 94, Public Acts of 1979.

<sup>4</sup> Better Education for Michigan Citizens: A Blueprint for Action

The Michigan State Board of Education Plan, approved 1/11/84.

<sup>5</sup> Annual Report from Professional Development Subcommittee of Bureau of Educational Services Advisory Committee, 6/20/84.

gifted and talented students. As a part of that comprehensive program, local districts had to include a long-range plan for professional development. Bilingual, special education and vocational education programs also receive funding from other sources for professional development. As effective as Section 97 has been in meeting self-identified needs of teachers, there are other professional development needs of educators which are not able and should not be expected to be provided or funded under Section 97.

Among recommendations by the Professional Development Subcommittee in June 1984 was the establishment of categorical funding for proposals which "adequately respond to state identified needs for professional development (e.g., teacher computer literacy, communication skills, science, math)."<sup>6</sup> Section 98 of the State School Aid Act of 1985 will provide funds on a competitive grant basis to local and intermediate school districts to develop professional development programs which respond to the curriculum and instructional needs of students, teachers and the school program. Among specific content areas to be targeted in the 1985-86 school year are math, science, computer literacy, writing, composition, and other curricular areas.

In addition to the State Board's efforts, the Governor's Educational Summit Task Force of 1984, which attracted over 5,000 educators and other citizens, identified professional development as the number one priority area for legislative action. Specific recommendations for professional development in the Task Force report included increased funding for programs to improve instruction and curriculum, pilot projects to extend the school year for professional development with a focus on improved student learning, strengthened consortium efforts, expanded access to college/university research and resources emphasizing the needs of K-12 institutions, and the promotion of model professional development programs that improve student academic achievement.

Also in 1985, the State Board of Education is preparing revisions to the Certification Code which will require continuing professional development of teachers in order to retain certification. Either college work for credit hours or other approved professional development activities earning continuing education units (CEUs) will meet this requirement. Establishing standards for professional development activities which will warrant CEU credits will require close coordination and cooperation between Teacher Preparation and Certification Services, the Office of Professional Development, Higher Education Management Services, and the Instructional Specialists Unit within the Michigan Department of Education.

<sup>6</sup> Annual Report from Professional Development Subcommittee of Bureau of Educational Services Advisory Committee, 6/20/84.



This "State Plan For Professional Development" is consistent with the recommendations of the Better Education for Michigan Citizens: A Blueprint for Action, the Governor's Education Task Force, the Certification Code Commission, the Subcommittee on professional development and other national reports emphasizing the importance of professional development for the improvement of student learning.

## II. Need Analysis

In the past, the educational community generally relied upon individual educators to take the initiative for their own continued professional growth. Motivated by certification requirements and salary benefits, educators enrolled in graduate programs at colleges and universities. The graduate programs were designed to serve educators from many schools who probably would move to several different schools during their careers. Often, the programs were not designed to address the needs of specific school systems and their students.

As school staffs have become less mobile, traditional motivational factors, such as existing certification requirements and salary increments, have become less important. For example, approximately eighty-seven percent of all Michigan teachers have met all the requirements for continuing certification, sixty percent have at least a master's degree, over seventy-five percent have reached the top level of their salary schedules and the average number of years teaching is 17 years. Thus the state teaching population is significantly removed from their pre-service preparation and continuing certification requirements. This creates a need for a program of continuing professional development for teachers that will serve to improve their knowledge of curriculum content and instructional skills.

Additionally, as educators mature, many of them tend to become further removed from new knowledge development in their respective fields. There are few extrinsic incentives that would lead educators to pay for continuous professional development. As the possibility of "burn-out" has increased among educators, few long-term or substantive resources are available to alleviate the problem. Employment mobility into other private or public job markets is limited and as K-12 enrollment shifts, teachers have to teach students and subjects for which they have little or no preparation. At the same time, teachers, individually and collectively, have voiced their need for continual, well-planned, job-related programs to meet their needs as well as society's expectations for public education.

Currently, Section 97 of the State School Aid Act provides professional development programs which primarily address the needs of teachers. Appendix A lists the top ten needs and delivery



of programs offered by Section 97 programs. The data suggests a need for more programs which address the curriculum, instructional and program needs of students.

Several Section 97 programs have established links with colleges and universities and are beginning to influence preservice education. These links with colleges and universities have established a cooperative enterprise between the college/university, teacher organization, school district and profession to promote improvement of schools. The chart (Appendix B) from Inservice Education, Criteria For and Examples of Local Programs illustrates several changing aspects of teacher education as the emphasis shifts to a preservice - inservice continuum.<sup>7</sup> The data suggests that the current status and trends emerging in professional development would be greatly improved if stronger links were established with colleges, universities, and professional organizations, and if programs were based on the curriculum, instructional and program needs of students.

All these factors suggest that a statewide professional development plan to increase student learning and improve schools must address policy making and operational structures between institutions and agencies involved, decision-making processes, relationships between teacher education programs and district-based programs, and must engage participants in a consortium of professional educators for the advancement of student learning.

Based upon the needs analysis, the primary goals of the plan are as follows:

1. Design and implement a delivery system in which professional development becomes a legitimate part of an educator's regular responsibilities.
2. Design and implement an organizational structure that will provide linkage between local and intermediate school districts, colleges, community colleges, universities, business, industry and professional education organizations in the delivery of professional development programs.
3. Design and implement professional development programs that are effective in bringing about improved student learning.

<sup>7</sup> Edelfelt, R. A. "Inservice Education: Criteria For and Examples of Local Programs" Washington, West Washington State College, 1977.

Development." The authorities and responsibilities of several service areas will overlap and have to be coordinated to implement this state plan. Specifically, the following programs or service areas will play a major role in the implementation of this state plan:

**The Office of Professional Development will:**

- 1) administer Sections 97 and 98 of the State School Aid Act;
- 2) verify professional development plans through an approval process;
- 3) provide assistance and monitor the development and implementation of professional development plans;
- 4) facilitate coordination of professional development activities;
- 5) develop guidelines for effective professional development programs.

**Teacher Preparation and Certification Services will:**

- 1) administer recertification requirements as a part of professional development;
- 2) recertify applicants upon completion of requirements;
- 3) assist in the development of guidelines for professional development programs that address curricular areas;
- 4) develop, implement and administer a system for equivalency credit for professional development programs;
- 5) develop and maintain a file of credit and equivalency credit units that may apply to certification renewal;
- 6) promote continuity between college/university teacher education programs, community colleges and professional development programs in K-12 institutions.

**Instructional Specialist Unit will:**

- 1) administer the Economic Security Act enacted by United States Congress for professional development programs in the area of math, science, computer learning, and foreign languages;
- 2) assist in the approval of professional development programs that are specific to curriculum areas;

4. Design and implement a structure that will coordinate the various professional development program and activities within the Department of Education.
5. Develop an evaluation procedure to determine the impact of professional development programs on student learning.

The goals of this plan are consistent with the objectives of the 1979 plan for professional development and the State Board of Education's policy on professional development which states:

IT IS THE POLICY OF THE MICHIGAN STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION TO INITIATE AND MAINTAIN APPROPRIATE SUPPORT AND PROGRAMS WHICH ENCOURAGE EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS AT ALL LEVELS TO DESIGN AND IMPLEMENT PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS WHICH ARE BASED ON SOUND EDUCATIONAL THEORIES AND PRACTICES THAT CAN IMPROVE SCHOOLS, INCREASE STUDENT LEARNING AND PROMOTE EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS.

Professional development in this plan is defined as a set of activities which influence the knowledge, attitudes and skills of educators toward changes in behavior and thinking to improve schools.

### III. Program Administration

The Office of Professional Development, located in the Bureau of Educational Services, School Program Services, will administer both Section 97 and Section 98 of the State School Aid Act. A planning process has been initiated to facilitate the coordination of professional development efforts of the Office of Professional Development with other service areas; i.e., Post-Secondary Education Services, School Program Services, Special Education Services, Vocational Education Services and Adult Education Services. Discussions with these service areas are underway to identify areas of work responsibilities that relate to professional development that can be coordinated.

The State Board of Education is reviewing proposed certification changes for educators in general education, special education, vocational education and administration. A recommendation under consideration is a renewable certificate every five years as a result of continuing professional development. If these recommendations are approved by the State Board of Education, a major role for each service area will be to develop content guidelines or program standards for special populations that will be the basis for designing professional development programs.

Role of the State Department of Education:

The State Department of Education is charged with leadership and general supervision of the "State Plan for Professional

- 3) serve as consultants to districts in the development and implementation of professional development programs which address curriculum needs;
- 4) develop content or curriculum guidelines for professional development programs.

**Higher Education Management Services will:**

- 1) promote continuity between college/university programs and professional development programs in K-12 institutions;
- 2) strengthen the involvement of colleges/universities in professional development programs;
- 3) assist higher education institutions to design credit courses, activities or workshops that are field-based and address curriculum and instructional improvement at the school.

**Role of the State-Level Advisory Council:**

The State Board of Education will serve as the State-level Advisory Council. Direction and input from the Professional Development Subcommittee of the Non-mandated Advisory Council approved on October 2, 1985, at the State Board of Education meeting, and appropriate referent committees will be reviewed. The Superintendent or State Board of Education will appoint appropriate referent committees as needed.

**IV. Section 97, State School Aid Act**

**A. Introduction**

Section 97 of the State School Aid Act provides funds for professional development programs to address locally identified needs in local and intermediate school districts since 1978. During 1983-84 school year, 105 policy boards, representing 90,832 professional employees in 54 intermediate and 533 local school districts, participated in the Section 97 program. These policy boards served 42,240 of the 95,409 professional employees in Michigan.

The individuals who participated were asked to evaluate the activities in terms of learning acquired, stimulation to change their current classroom practice, and potential for impact on student learning. Participants reported that they had indeed learned something new from the activity (4.12 on a 5-point scale). They reported that what they learned in the activity would cause them to do something different in the way

they carry out their work responsibilities (3.92 on a 5-point scale). Finally, participants reported that what they learned was likely to impact student learning (3.86 on a 5-point scale).

**B. Allocation:**

\$2,900,000 is allocated for 1985-86 from the State School Aid Act for local professional and non-professional development programs.

**C. Eligible Recipients:**

Eligible recipients for funds are local and intermediate school districts or a consortium of school districts.

**D. Distribution of Funds:**

Funds will be distributed on an entitlement basis using the following formula: each local or intermediate professional development program shall be eligible for \$25 per professional staff member. Local or intermediate school districts or a consortium of districts, or an intermediate school district consortium that includes all its constituent districts with a professional staff equal to or greater than 500 shall be eligible for an additional \$10.00 per professional staff member upon completion of an application as approved by the Department submitted by November 1, of each year.

**E. Major Emphasis:**

Section 97 is intended to promote the development and implementation of professional development programs which address local priority needs. The components of the program should:

- 1) enhance student learning and be specific to job requirements of educators;
- 2) require collaboration, role definition and expanded relationships among the groups involved in and affected by the process;
- 3) stress the coordination of professional development resources;
- 4) strengthen the evaluation design to determine the effectiveness of professional development programs.

**F. Basic Requirements:**

Basic requirements for Section 97 programs include the following:

- 1) establish a local policy board consisting of a minimum of 11 members, a majority of whom shall be teachers;
- 2) develop a three-year plan which establishes priorities for professional development programs;
- 3) identify professional development needs;
- 4) identify goals and objectives for professional development programs;
- 5) identify alternative strategies for the delivery of professional development programs;
- 6) identify a program evaluation process;
- 7) designate a program coordinator.

#### **V. Section 98, State School Aid Act**

##### **A. Introduction:**

Section 98 of the State Aid Act provides funds for professional development programs in the content areas; i.e., math, science, computer learning, writing, and other curricular areas. Community colleges and teacher preparation institutions may enter into agreements with districts that have been awarded grants under this section. Priority programs for this grant must address the initial target group of teachers who are presently teaching out of field, or reassigned in the last five years to teach in the area of their minor in math, science, computer literacy, writing, composition, and other curricular areas, or have insufficient course work in a particular content area. Applicants will be required to document how the program content is consistent with existing content guidelines established by the Instructional Specialists Unit, and incorporate higher level thinking skills. The Department will fund a minimum of one program for each curriculum area; i.e., math, science, computer literacy/competency, writing, reading and related language arts, comprehensive health education, social studies, foreign languages, and fine arts.

##### **B. Allocation:**

\$1,800,000 is allocated for 1985-86 from the State School Aid Act for professional development programs which address needs identified by the State Board of Education.

**C. Eligible Recipients:**

Local and intermediate school districts in consortia with colleges/universities, or professional education organizations, or business and industry.

**D. Distribution of Funds:**

Funds will be granted through a competitive process to local and intermediate school districts for the development and operation of programs for teachers and administrators in accordance with criteria established and approved by the State Board of Education.

**E. Major Emphasis:**

- 1) address specific content and instructional needs of students;
- 2) enhance student learning and are specific to the job requirements of educators;
- 3) strengthen collaboration and coordination between and among local school districts, intermediate school districts, junior and community colleges, four-year colleges/universities, professional subject area and other non-profit educational organizations, affected educational collective bargaining units, and business and industry in field-based professional development programs for K-12 institutions;
- 4) require collaboration, role definition and expanded relationships among the groups involved in and affected by the process;
- 5) promote continuity between preservice and inservice; i.e., initial teacher preparation programs leading to certification and professional development programs which are more applicable to the school environment;
- 6) stress coordination of professional development resources;
- 7) promote institutional and organizational commitment to professional development;
- 8) develop procedures for accepting and recording credit and/or continuing education units for off-campus, field-based programs which meet criteria established by the State Board of Education;
- 9) strengthen the evaluation design to determine the effectiveness of the professional development programs.



- Goal 2: Design programs which are directly related to curriculum development and instructional improvement and are based on the needs of students, staff and communities.
- Goal 3: Provide for the delivery of programs which are consistent with fundamental principles of good teaching and learning where research and evaluation are an integral part of the program.
- Goal 4: Provide a reward system for teachers, administrators and college/university personnel who engage in professional development programs.
- Goal 5: Facilitate organizational commitment by establishing systems where professional development is a legitimate part of an educator's regular responsibilities.

## VI. Coordination

Inherent in a systematic approach to professional development programming is the notion of 1) coordination of existing resources and 2) collaboration among the various individuals and agencies concerned with the education of teachers and children. The 1979 "State Plan for Staff Development" described a process of the Department to link state and federal categorical programs to local professional development programs sponsored by the various programs and service areas within the Department. The need for the coordination of preservice and inservice activities which are more responsive to the needs of educator in today's public schools is still unmet. The 1979 plan established a system and an area for strengthened communication among the numerous education constituencies; state agency programs, higher education programs and local and intermediate school districts.

The goal was to provide a means for educators in Michigan to participate in meaningful professional development activities and enhance the educational process for students.

The following goals, objectives, major actions/strategies update and modify the 1979 plan.

**GOAL:** Design and implement a structure that will 1) coordinate the various professional development programs and activities within the Department, and 2) provide a communication network among Michigan Department of Education staff responsible for administration of professional development programs and activities.

**F. Basic Requirements:**

A major goal of the State Board of Education has been the strengthening of continuing professional development opportunities for teachers, administrators, and other school personnel. Significant changes in teacher education programs and certification standards will require continuing professional development as a condition for certification renewal for teachers. The State Board has directed the Department to provide continuing professional development programs to current certified teachers that may be assigned to a teaching position outside their major or minor field of academic preparation. An analysis of the Department of Education's Professional Register of Certified Personnel supports the State Board of Education's thrust to target certain populations of the current teaching force for continuing professional development (see Appendix C).

Basic requirements of Section 98 programs include the following. Each program is required to:

- 1) establish a planning committee consisting of teachers, administrators, university/college personnel, content experts from professional subject area and other non-profit education organizations, and support staff.
- 2) develop a professional development policy statement and a three-year plan which establishes priorities for professional development programs;
- 3) identify needs for the professional development program;
- 4) identify goals and objectives for professional development programs;
- 5) identify alternative strategies for the delivery of professional development programs;
- 6) identify follow-up support strategies to reinforce application of skills in the work environment;
- 7) identify a process for program evaluation.

The following five goal statements have been approved by the State Board of Education to assist districts in applying for Section 98 grants:

- Goal 1: Facilitate consortia among districts, colleges/universities, professional education organizations, and business and industry.

**OBJECTIVES**

1. Communicate regularly with all service areas within department conducting professional development activities.
2. Secure staff where feasible to work half-time in the Office of Professional Development to facilitate coordination.
3. Identify areas of work responsibilities related to professional development that can be coordinated with Office of Professional Development.
4. Develop guidelines for service areas linkage to funded professional development programs.
5. Prepare and disseminate a document identifying categorical inservice programs available through Michigan Department of Education service areas.

**MAJOR ACTIONS/STRATEGIES**

1. Arrange informal meetings to discuss and plan cooperative efforts.
2. Secure resources to support salaries for half-time positions for each service area with major professional development activities.
3. Meet with other service areas and develop strategies that can be coordinated.
4. Identify strategies for linkages to funded professional development programs.
5. Collect and compile information on programs available through Michigan Department of Education service areas.

**OUTCOMES**

1. Increased awareness and improved cooperation among service areas.
2. Improved communication and linkages within the Michigan Department of Education.
3. Improved coordination of professional development activities.
4. Michigan Department of Education linkages with funded professional development programs.
5. Publication describing inservice programs available through the Department.

## VII. Evaluation

The outcomes of activities for groups involved in professional development should be stated as short, intermediate, and long-range goals or program objectives. Outcome examples are the impact of the plan at the local, intermediate and state levels; the effects of professional development training activities delivered to school staff; and the influence of professional development activities on student learning at all organizational levels.

Results to be expected from the plan for professional development are 1) increased ability to identify professional development needs; 2) improved skills in identifying and developing training models; 3) increased coordination in program development, implementation, and evaluation; 4) greater knowledge of available resources; 5) improved access to professional development programs; 6) enhanced student learning in relation to short-range, intermediate-range, and long-range criteria; and 7) increased confidence in professional development.

It is important to examine the processes and products of the system in order to determine whether the system is doing what it is supposed to do effectively. The assumptions, goals, and outcomes of the plan are the best guide for developing recommendations in the area of evaluation. To permit the plan to be evaluated on criteria unrelated to its purposes, goals, and outcomes is inappropriate and counterproductive.

The objective for the evaluation phase of the state plan should include but not be limited to the following:

- 1) Examine the extent to which the plan has been implemented; the extent to which its components are in place and functioning.
- 2) Examine the effectiveness of individual professional development activities.
- 3) Examine the effectiveness of local professional development efforts.
- 4) Examine the effectiveness of the plan with regard to public reactions to it and the reactions of the profession to it.
- 5) Examine the plan's impact on staff performance and student learning.
- 6) Determine the projected use of the evaluation data.

## NEEDS ASSESSMENT

### TOPIC AREAS

This data was compiled from the applications submitted by districts. Districts identified their top ten professional development needs by topic areas. Ranks were determined based on an average of the number of respondents to a particular item.

| <u>RANK</u> | <u>1982</u>                    | <u>1983</u>                         | <u>1984</u>                         | <u>1985</u>   |
|-------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 1           | Stress                         | Student Motivation                  | Computer As A Teaching Tool         | Computers/Technology                                |
| 2           | Student Motivation             | Discipline/Disruptive Student       | Student Motivation                  | Student Motivation                                  |
| 3           | Discipline                     | Computer As A Teaching Tool         | Discipline/Disruptive Students      | Effective Instruction                               |
| 4           | Student Self Concept           | School Climate                      | Curriculum Development              | Personal Development-Stress/Burnout                 |
| 5           | Reading & Language Arts        | Classroom Management                | Conferences/Workshops               | School Climate/Sch Improvement                      |
| 6           | Gifted & Talented              | Parent & Community Relations        | School Climate/School Improvement   | Discipline/Disruptive Students                      |
| 7           | Community & Parent Involvement | Personal Development-Stress/Burnout | Personal Development-Stress/Burnout | Classroom Management/Organization                   |
| 8           | Resources, Methods & Materials | Conferences/Workshops               | Parent & Community Relations        | Curriculum Development                              |
| 9           | Communication                  | Developing Student Self-Concept     | Classroom Management/Organization   | Student Self-Concept                                |
| 10          | Upgrading Subject Matter       | Reading                             | Developing Student Self-Concept     | Individual Professional & Instructional Development |

## PROGRAM DELIVERY

### TOPIC AREAS

Rank determined based on the number of programs delivered on a topic area.

| <u>RANK</u> | <u>1981</u>                                   | <u>1982</u>                                   | <u>1983</u>                                   |
|-------------|---|---|---|
| 1           | Reading & Related Language Arts               | Reading & Related Language Arts               | Computer Usage                                |
| 2           | Personal Development - Stress Management      | Computer Usage                                | Reading & Related Language Arts               |
| 3           | Special Education - Learning Disabled         | Subject Area Skills Other Than Math & Reading | Classroom Management                          |
| 4           | Computer Usage                                | Personal Development - Stress Management      | Discipline/Disruptive Students                |
| 5           | Classroom Management                          | Discipline/Disruptive Students                | Subject Area Skills Other Than Math & Reading |
| 6           | Subject Area Skills Other than Math & Reading | Creative Arts                                 | Curriculum Development                        |
| 7           | Discipline/Disruptive Students                | Special Education - Learning Disabled         | Inservice for Administrators                  |
| 8           | Gifted & Talented                             | Curriculum Development                        | Personal Development - Stress Management      |
| 9           | Mathematics Instruction                       | Classroom Management                          | School Climate & School Improvement           |
| 10          | Student Motivation                            | Student Motivation                            | Special Education - Learning Disabled         |

## THE SHIFTING EMPHASIS TO INSERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION

| <u>Where We Are or Have Been</u>   | <u>Where We Seem to be Going</u>   |
|--|--|
| <b>Staff roles and responsibilities</b>  |  |
| Inservice education and career development viewed as an individual responsibility  | Inservice education and career development viewed as an individual, colleague-to-colleague, and school responsibility                            |
| College/university personnel functioning as managers   | College/university and school district personnel functioning as program facilitators   |
| Interns* working individually and in teams, usually with one teacher   | Teachers, interns, and aides working cooperatively   |
| Parents working occasionally on a short-term, voluntary basis  | Parents, aides, and interns working in the school as partners on a continuous basis  |
| <b>Operational procedures</b>  |  |
| Courses offered primarily on the college/university campus at times established by the college/university                          | Teachers, the school district, and the college/university collaborating to develop inservice education wherever and whenever needed and desired  |
| The college/university independent and autonomous in determining inservice education   | Inservice education determined by assessing the needs of school program and school personnel and cooperatively using the information in planning |
| Inservice education programs largely repetitive and stereotyped  | Creative models of inservice education developed through infusing new ideas  |
| Instructional improvement viewed as an administrative concern and responsibility   | Instructional improvement viewed as a professional concern and responsibility  |
| Inservice education funded solely by the individual or the school system and controlled by the college/university or school system | Inservice education funded through the college/university and the school district, but controlled by a professional consortium                   |
| Funds provided to the college/university based on student credits  | Funds provided to the college/university or school district based on program needs   |

\*The term "intern" is used to describe the prospective teacher

---

**Training programs**

---

Offer isolated courses and workshops, or course sequences planned to meet college/university degree requirements

Facilitate individually developed professional programs as part of career-long training

---

Process large numbers of teachers through the same courses, with everyone doing essentially the same things

Personalize and individualize programs to improve curriculum or instruction

---

View the individual as the client

View the individual and the organization in which he or she works as clients

---

Often rely on big names as experts

Rely on many people, but particularly on one another in the organization as helpers

---

**Governance**

---

The college/university exclusively autonomous

The college/university, teacher organization, and school district collaborating

---

The decision-making process closed

The decision-making open and shared

---

The college/university staff advising and consulting

The college/university, teacher organization, and school district operating on a parity basis

---

The college/university having complete and total power

Shared power among cooperating organizations

---

The college/university acting in isolation

The college/university acting within a consortium involving the teacher organization, school district, and community

---

Teacher education viewed solely as a function of the college/university

Teacher education viewed as a cooperative enterprise between the college/university, teacher organization, school district, and the profession

---



NEED AREAS BASED ON CERTIFICATION DATA\*

| <u>General<br/>Assignment Area</u> | <u>Number<br/>of Staff<br/>Assigned</u> | <u>Number of<br/>Staff Without<br/>Major/Minor</u> | <u>% Without<br/>Major/Minor</u> | <u>Rank</u> |
|------------------------------------|---|--|----------------------------------|-------------|
| 1. Science                         | 5,724                                   | 1,168  | 20                               | 3           |
| 2. Social Studies                  | 6,433                                   | 2,252  | 35                               | 2           |
| 3. Language Arts                   | 9,111                                   | 3,150  | 35                               | 2           |
| 4. Math                            | 4,745                                   | 1,688  | 36                               | 1           |
| 5. Foreign Language                | 1,376                                   | 71   | 5                                | 4           |

Specific  
Assignment Area\*\*

## 1. Science\*\*\*

|                       |       |       |    |   |
|-----------------------|-------|-------|----|---|
| a. General<br>Science | 3,156 | 1,561 | 49 | 2 |
| b. Biology            | 977   | 73    | 7  | 5 |
| c. Chemistry          | 495   | 113   | 23 | 4 |
| d. Physics            | 274   | 105   | 38 | 3 |
| e. Geology            | 137   | 79    | 58 | 1 |

## 2. Social Studies\*\*\*\*

|                   |       |       |    |   |
|-------------------|-------|-------|----|---|
| a. Social Science | 3,678 | 1,278 | 35 | 3 |
| b. Economics      | 114   | 78    | 33 | 4 |
| c. Geography      | 324   | 199   | 61 | 1 |
| d. History        | 1,722 | 394   | 23 | 5 |
| e. Political Sci. | 293   | 144   | 49 | 2 |

## 3. Language

|                  |       |       |    |   |
|------------------|-------|-------|----|---|
| a. Language Arts | 1,006 | 818   | 81 | 1 |
| b. English       | 5,981 | 953   | 16 | 5 |
| c. Journalism    | 211   | 127   | 60 | 3 |
| d. Speech        | 357   | 71    | 20 | 4 |
| e. Reading       | 1,556 | 1,181 | 76 | 2 |

\* The data does not take into account what teachers may have done on their own in professional development to upgrade and/or improve their skills subsequent to the time they received most recent certification.

\*\* No specific assignment areas for math.

\*\*\* Psychology, sociology, anthropology, cultural studies, behavior science not included.

\*\*\*\* Astronomy and environmental studies not included.

## PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLANNING COMMITTEE

Karla Atkinson  
Mich. Dept. of Education  
4th floor/South tower  
School & Community Affairs

C. Danford Austin  
Teacher Certification  
4th floor/South tower  
Lansing, MI 48909

Linda Belknap  
Wayne County I.S.D.  
33500 Van Born Road  
Wayne, MI 48184

Merice Blackburn  
27852 Rainbow Circle  
Lathrup Village, MI 48076

Charles Blackman  
306 Erickson Hall/MSU  
College of Education  
East Lansing, MI 48824

Clarence Brock  
St. Clair Co. ISD  
499 Range Road/Box 5001  
Port Huron, MI 48061-5001

Mary Christian  
Michigan Education Assoc.  
1216 Kendale, Box 673  
East Lansing, MI 48823

Deb Clemmons  
Mich. Dept. of Education  
2nd floor/south tower  
Office of Prof. Development

Ron Crowell  
Dept. of Educ. & Prof. Develop.  
Western Michigan Univ.  
Kalamazoo, MI 49008

Terry R. Day  
620 Hall St.  
Eaton Rapids, MI 48827

Craig Dean  
Eaton County ISD  
1790 E. Packard  
Charlotte, MI 48813

Bill Emigh  
St. Clair Co. ISD  
499 Range Rd., Box 5001  
Port Huron, MI 48061-5001

Polly Friend  
4500 Walnut Lake Rd.  
West Bloomfield, MI 48033

Linda Goldsmith  
Kent ISD  
2915 Hall St., S.E.  
Grand Rapids, MI 49506

Gayle Green  
Tuscola ISD  
135 Cleaver Rd.  
Tuscola, MI 48723

June L. Hopkins  
Monroe Co. ISD  
1101 S. Raisinville Rd.  
Monroe, MI 48161

Wendell M. Hough  
441 College of Education  
Wayne State University  
Detroit, MI 48202

Cindy Jones  
4860 Weber Rd.  
Saline, MI 48176

Ruth Kiah, Detroit Center  
Prof. Growth & Development  
Wayne State University  
Detroit, MI 48202

Sara Lincoln  
Mich. Dept. of Education  
2nd floor/south tower  
Office of Professional Development

Barbara C. Jacoby  
Ingham ISD  
2630 W. Howell Road  
Mason, MI 48895

Therese Lorio  
Guest Middle School  
10855 Fenkell  
Detroit, MI 48238

Ron Pollack  
Macomb ISD  
44001 Garfield  
Mt. Clemens, MI 48044

Cynthia S. Rowe  
4324 Darron Drive  
Lansing, MI 48917

Ruth Rowe  
Allegan County ISD  
310 Thomas St.  
Allegan, MI 49010

Joan St.Clair  
Ottawa Area ISD  
13565 Port Sheldon Rd.  
Holland, MI 49423

Jane Scandary  
Mich.Dept. of Education  
Spec.Educ.Unit  
2nd floor/south tower

Zoe P. Slagle  
Mich.Dept. of Education  
School Management Services  
4th floor/south tower

Pat Slocum  
Mich. Dept. of Education  
Grants Coordination  
4th floor/south tower

Teaster Smith  
Michigan Education Association  
1216 Kendale  
East Lansing, MI 48823

Betty Stevens  
Tech.Assistance  
Michigan Department of Education  
4th floor/south tower

Claude Stewart  
Mich.Dept. of Education  
Comp.Educ.Unit  
2nd floor/south tower

Robert Tilmann  
Berrien County ISD  
711 St. Joseph Avenue  
Berrien Springs, MI 49103

Lewis I. Turco  
Big Rapids Public School  
500 N. Warren  
Big Rapids, MI 49307

Lois Ulintz  
L'Anse Creuse Public Schools  
34641 Jefferson  
Mt. Clemens, MI 48045

Jacqueline A. Urso  
Lansing School District  
159 W. Kalamazoo  
Lansing, MI 48933

Barbara VanOtterloo  
2815 Amberly  
Birmingham, MI 48010

Beth VanVoorhees  
1189 W. 8 Mile Rd.  
Whitmore Lake, MI 48169

Bob Vermeulen  
Mich. Assoc. of School Boards  
421 W. Kalamazoo  
Lansing, MI 48933

Brian Walton  
8029 Gale Road  
Goodrich, MI 48438

Alan Weber  
Gratiot Isabella ISD  
1131 E. Center St.  
Ithaca, MI 48847

E. Joan Webkamigad  
Mich. Dept. of Educ.  
School Program Services  
2nd floor/south tower

Margaret Wernet  
Shiawassee I.S.D.  
Corunna, MI 48817

Michigan State Plan for Staff Development

Published by

The Michigan State Board of Education

\* \* \*

Bureau of Educational Services

Teresa V. Staten, Associate Superintendent

\* \* \*

Special Thanks to Members  
of the

Professional Development Planning Committee

\* \* \*

September 1985

**MICHIGAN STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION  
STATEMENT OF ASSURANCE OF COMPLIANCE WITH FEDERAL LAW**

The Michigan State Board of Education complies with all Federal laws and regulations prohibiting discrimination and with all requirements and regulations of the U.S. Department of Education. It is the policy of the Michigan State Board of Education that no person on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin or ancestry, age, sex, marital status or handicap shall be discriminated against, excluded from participation in, denied the benefits of or otherwise be subjected to discrimination in any program or activity for which it is responsible or for which it receives financial assistance from the U.S. Department of Education.