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The purpose of Professional Development (PD) is to

“improve teaching and learning in order to facilitate individual, school-wide, and system-wide improvements designed to ensure that all students demonstrate proficiency on state academic standards.”

- Arkansas Statute § 6-17-704(b)

What is Professional Development?

- Set of coordinated planning learning activities for teachers, administrators, and non-licensed school employees that meets the following criteria:
  - Improves knowledge, skills, and effectiveness of teachers;
  - Improves knowledge and skills of administrators and paraprofessionals on instructional strategies, methods, and skills;
  - Leads to improved student academic achievement; and
  - Is research-based and standards-based.
Districts and charters must include no fewer than **six** PD days (or 36 hours) in educator contracts.

**Annual PD Plan**

Two hours of one of the following topics is required each year on a rotating basis over four years:

- **Child maltreatment**;
- **Parental involvement**;
- **Teen suicide awareness and prevention**; and
- **Arkansas history** (to teachers who provide instruction in Arkansas history).

**Other PD Requirements**

- Dyslexia
- Human trafficking
- Athletic coach
- Specific scientific reading instruction
- Bullying prevention and recognition of the relationship between incidents of bullying and risk of suicide
### Earning PD Hours

- Approved conferences
- Workshops
- Institutes
- Individual learning
- Mentoring
- Peer-coaching
- Study groups
- National Board for Professional Teaching Standards certification
- Distance learning
- Micro-credentialing
- Internships
- College or university course work
- Planning and preparing a curriculum and other instructional materials

### PD Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>PD is funded for the 1st time&lt;br&gt;Teacher contract extended&lt;br&gt;40-minute planning periods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Arkansas IDEAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>PLC pilot program is created</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Per-student funding rate is reduced&lt;br&gt;Required PD days is reduced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>PLC pilot program is expanded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Provides online PD for licensed educators and those wishing to obtain an Arkansas educator license.

Provides programs of study to assist teachers in obtaining additional grade band endorsements to existing licenses.

Integrated in DESE's educator licensure system

Requires all users to register and reregister annually

- 58,825 Users
- 631 Courses Offered
- 2.8 million PD credit hours awarded since 2007

Popular Courses:
- Science of Reading
- Family and Community Engagement
- Human Trafficking
- Child Maltreatment
- Dyslexia
Educators work collaboratively
Collective inquiry and action research

Increased student achievement through teacher collaboration, focus on learning, and a results orientation

Each participant is matched Pilot School Site Coach and receives a Pilot School Plan that includes the following:
- Up to 50 days of onsite PD from PLC at Work associates
- Book, video, and online resources for school staff
- Schoolwide subscriptions to global PD
- Registrations for PLC events
- Ongoing phone and email support from Pilot School Coach
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Professional Learning Communities

BLR Survey of PLC Schools

Positive Impacts

- Increased student achievement
- Increased attendance
- Decreased discipline referrals
- Growth for students with disabilities
- Student ownership of learning
- Increased teacher confidence

Challenges

- Access to Solution Tree resources
- Scheduling / Time out of classroom
BLR Adequacy Survey

**Superintendents**
- Online
- July 23 – Nov. 23, 2019
- All 235 Districts Responded
- 24 of 25 Charters Responded

**Principalships**
- Online and Site Visits
- Online: Oct. 14 – Dec. 12, 2019
  - 72% Response Rate
- Site Visits: Oct. 29 – Dec. 18, 2019
  - 74 schools

**Teachers**
- 2,482 surveys distributed
- 52% Response Rate
- Final Survey Received Jan. 15, 2020

---

**What percentage of your PD is provided by each of the following options?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PD Source</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>PD Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District- or school-provided PD</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>Collaboration with school leaders/administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD provided by educational cooperatives</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>Collaboration with instructional facilitators/academic coaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District- or school-facilitated use of Arkansas IDEAS</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>College graduate level courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration with other teachers</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>Out-of-state conferences or workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual use of Arkansas IDEAS</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-state conferences or workshops</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual use of Arkansas IDEAS</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD provided by educational cooperatives</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District- or school-facilitated use of Arkansas IDEAS</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration with other teachers</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual use of Arkansas IDEAS</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-state conferences or workshops</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District- or school-provided PD</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD provided by educational cooperatives</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District- or school-facilitated use of Arkansas IDEAS</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration with other teachers</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual use of Arkansas IDEAS</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-state conferences or workshops</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Top Five Useful PD Types
1. Collaboration with other teachers
2. Collaboration with school leaders/administrators
3. Provided by educational collaboratives
4. Collaboration with instructional facilitators/academic coaches
5. In-state conferences or workshops

Distribution of PD Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017-18</th>
<th>2018-19</th>
<th>Funding Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Appropriation</td>
<td>$20.6 million</td>
<td>$25.1 million</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Districts and Charters</td>
<td>$12.4 million</td>
<td>$13.1 million</td>
<td>Per-Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AETN (Arkansas IDEAs)</td>
<td>$3.1 million</td>
<td>$2.8 million</td>
<td>Per-Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solution Tree (PLC Pilot Program)</td>
<td>$4 million</td>
<td>$8.5 million</td>
<td>Flat Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Remaining PD Funds*</td>
<td>$1.1 million</td>
<td>$731k</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Estimates determined based on the amount remaining after distributing to districts, charters, AETN, and Solution Tree.
### Per-Student PD Funding by Statute

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>% of PD from Other Categorical Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>$26.67</td>
<td>$36.22</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>$26.05</td>
<td>$36.91</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>$26.05</td>
<td>$36.22</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>$26.05</td>
<td>$36.39</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>$26.05</td>
<td>$35.45</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### How are PD funds spent?

- **Salaries and Benefits**: 26%, 23%, 22% (2016-17, 2017-18, 2018-19)
- **Purchased Services**: 68%, 69%, 70%
- **Supplies and Materials**: 4%, 5%, 5%
- **Other Uses**: 3%, 3%, 3%
How are PD funds spent…Purchased Services

- Consultants, Speakers, Course Registration Fees: 55%, 56%, 55%
- Substitutes: 7%, 6%, 6%
- Travel: 26%, 26%, 25%
- Other: 11%, 12%, 13%

2016-17 2017-18 2018-19
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Teacher Excellence and Support System (TESS)

- Act 1209 of 2011
- First Fully Implemented Statewide in 2014-15
- Observe, evaluate, and supports teachers
- Teachers include:
  - Licensed and non-licensed K-12 classroom and specialty teachers:
    - Gifted and talented coordinators, instructional specialist, school counselors, school psychologists, speech language pathologists
Teacher Excellence and Support System (TESS)

- Based on Charlotte Danielson’s Framework for Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning and Preparation</th>
<th>Classroom Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>Professional Responsibilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Leader Excellence and Development System (LEADS)

- Act 709 of 2013
- First fully implemented statewide in 2014-15
- Statewide evaluation system for administrators
- Building or district level leaders (excluding superintendents)
Leader Excellence and Development System (LEADS)

- New rubric fully implemented in 2019-20
- Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (PSEL)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Organization and Management</th>
<th>School Culture and Climate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and Learning</td>
<td>Human Capital Management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similarities between TESS and LEADS

- Novice Teacher or Beginner Administrator = less than 3 years
- Career Summative Educator = 3 years or more experience
- Summative Evaluations given every 4 years
- Evaluations can be given at any time
- Novice or Beginners must be provided support by district/charter
Similarities between TESS and LEADS

- Four rating options are available
- Educator creates/receives a Professional Growth Plan (PGP)
- Waiver available from SBOE
- Can be placed in Intensive Support Status

Differences between TESS and LEADS

**TESS**
- Announced and Unannounced Observations
  - Direct Observation
  - Indirect Observation
  - Artifacts
  - Data

**LEADS**
- Formative Observation Conferences
- Does not require direct observation
- Evidence can be gathered from stakeholders, students, or school’s physical environment
**Changes to TESS**

- Student Growth Measures
- Frequency of Evaluations
- Novice Teachers
- Formative Years
- Types of Evidence
- Waiver
- Component Ratings

**TESS and LEADS Ratings**

- State Level
- 2018 and 2019 ONLY
- Ratings prior to 2017-18 included ratings from Novice Teachers and Beginner Administrators
- Ratings now only include Career Summative Ratings
- Includes districts/schools with waivers, preschools, School for the Blind, School for the Deaf
- Do not include ratings from specialty teachers
**TESS Ratings**

- Distinguished: 14% (2018) vs. 16% (2019)
- Proficient: 82% (2018) vs. 80% (2019)
- Basic: 2% (2018) vs. 3% (2019)
- Unsatisfactory: 0% (2018) vs. 0% (2019)

**LEADS Ratings**

- Exemplary: 15% (2017-18) vs. 21% (2018-19)
- Proficient: 80% (2017-18) vs. 72% (2018-19)
- Progressing: 5% (2017-18) vs. 6% (2018-19)
- Not Meeting Standards: 0.2% (2017-18) vs. 0% (2018-19)
How useful is the new TESS evaluation system in terms of providing support and improving teaching in your district - 2019?

To what extent do you agree with the following statement: The TESS evaluation system requires too much time and effort - 2019?
How useful is the LEADS evaluation system in terms of providing support to school leaders and improving leadership in your district?

![Bar Chart]

To what extent do you agree with the following statement: The LEADS evaluation system requires too much time and effort.

![Bar Chart]
Which of the following do you believe are most valuable in evaluating teachers' effectiveness? (Please select your top three choices.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>TESS</th>
<th>LEADS</th>
<th>TESS/LEADS</th>
<th>Ratings</th>
<th>Survey Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students' daily work/projects/portfolios</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom observation by administrators</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student academic growth scores (individual growth in student assessments)</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom observation by teacher leaders</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback/surveys of students</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scores from student assessment</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback/surveys of parents</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you believe that teachers in your school are evaluated fairly and consistently?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>TESS</th>
<th>LEADS</th>
<th>TESS/LEADS</th>
<th>Ratings</th>
<th>Survey Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, always</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of the time</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some of the time</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, never</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm not sure</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additional Comments from Teachers

- 45 Open-Ended Comments
- Tedious, Time-Consuming, and Cumbersome
- Not Effective System
- EdReflect was not user-friendly
- Too subjective
- Demoralizing
- Mentorship of new teachers
- Rubrics for specialty teachers

Site Visits - TESS

Positives
- Good support and coaching tool
- Good rubric and domains
- Objective
- Provided common language
- Set clear expectations
- Supportive of reductions to requirements
- User-friendly technology

Challenges
- Good support tool – not great evaluation tool
- Time-consuming - Too many requirements
- Existing school issues
- Evaluating specialty teachers
- Not user-friendly technology
### Site Visits - LEADS

**Positives**  
- User-friendly  
- Set clear expectations  
- Encourages self-reflection  
- Generated good conversations  
- Supported realignment with TESS

**Challenges**  
- Rubric not properly aligned with duties  
- Logistical – school specific issues

---

**Questions?**