

Oxford Community Schools'

Concept Plan for Professional Learning ^C²EAR

October 4, 2011

CatsCast Educator Academy & Repository
professional learning in place of professional development

Prepared by:

Stephanie Throne, Ph.D., President and CEO

Everything DI

© 2011 Everything DI and Oxford Community
Schools

Executive Summary

"Professional development" is the most frequently identified "solution" to many of the proposed "outcomes" in Oxford's Project ReImagine proposal. While OCS dedicates more days to professional development (PD) than most districts in Michigan, and PD is cited several times in OCS' Strategic Plan as a "strategy" to achieve specific goals, a long-range PD plan has never been formulated.

The Concept Plan for Professional Learning lays the groundwork to train educators to teach and learn in a hybrid or blended learning format. Hybrid learning is OCS' answer to the impasse between the "get back to the basics"/standards-based approach vs. Quadrant D/real-world, high-level problem solving, collaboration and invention strategies. The launch of hybrid learning options will enable the District to heighten the efficiency of teaching and learning by leveraging and automating technology to profit from its strengths, which will free up educators to focus on their areas of expertise.

A central part of OCS' Concept Plan for Professional Learning is the creation of a School of Professional Learning (PD school) called the "CatsCast Educator Academy and Repository" (C²EAR). C²EAR will be housed online through eCollege (OCS' learning management system), and it will supply a myriad of digital assets, resources, learning communities, and classes and training for the administrative and teaching staffs in an online and/or hybrid (blended) format. Use of the same tool (eCollege) by administrative and teaching personnel as students of C²EAR will afford them greater leverage as instructors of their own pupils.

The layout of the four-year plan fosters ownership via the offering of electives, various options, and participation in communities of practice. Its end goals are to maximize educators' comfort with new tools and strategies for 21st-century, global learning, and to increase efficiency in select attributes and proficiency in identified skills.



Table of Contents

Background and Rationale	5
Research and Observations Relative to Perceived Environmental Challenges	15
Progress-to-Date	23
Accomplished	23
In Preparation	32
C²EAR Electives Coupled with Core Essentials	38
Conclusion	41
References	42
Appendices	44
Matrices Outlining Core Essentials and Electives in Years One-Four, and Available Resources and Assets (Beginning in Year Two)	58

CatsCast Educator Academy & Repository
professional learning in place of professional development

Background and Rationale

In November of 2009, the Michigan Department of Education announced that Oxford Community Schools (OCS) had been chosen as one of 14 Project ReImagine Demonstration Districts in the state. Project ReImagine came about as a result of State Superintendent Flanagan's desire to challenge "the educational community to boldly and dramatically reimagine their systems to ensure **all** students learn and achieve at high levels" (Michigan Department of, 2009, p. 1).

In Oxford's Project ReImagine proposal, the District outlined several bold initiatives to "prepare students to compete in a global world that is changing 24/7" (Smith, S. Throne, T. Throne, Skilling and Schwarz, 2009, p. 1). These initiatives complement the goals and objectives described in OCS' Strategic Plan, Mission Statement and Vision Statement. (A link to the aforementioned documents is provided in Appendix B.) Many of the solutions recommended for accomplishing Project ReImagine's outcomes are already in place, while others are in preparation. In the last three years, OCS has adopted more large-scale initiatives and has implemented them at a quicker pace than any other district in Michigan. Some of these initiatives include: Model Schools'/ICLE's (International Center for Leadership in Education) Rigor, Relevance, Relationships/Quadrant D Teaching paradigm; Response to Intervention; International Baccalaureate (IB) certification of all five elementary schools, Oxford Middle School, and Oxford High School; Fifth Core™ (daily foreign language program in grades K-8); Early College Program;

Oxford Virtual Academy; International Residence Academy; and the creation of the alternative high school program, Crossing Bridges.

OCS endeavors to uphold and fulfill its Mission and Vision Statements and to meet the goals listed in its Strategic Plan while concurrently practicing strategic intent. OCS' strategic intent is explained as follows in the Project ReImagine proposal:

OCS is fully committed to replacing the older model of teaching/learning for a new personalized and innovative one which embraces technology, pre-K to adult learning options, global community partnerships which foster collaboration and teamwork, international workplace settings in the classroom, Fifth Core™ languages, music and project-based learning. Oxford offers equally balanced and unparalleled opportunities in all three As: Academics, Arts, and Athletics.

Oxford's strategic intent is to provide a "world-class education" as it strives to create a model global school system and become a global educational leader. (Smith et al., 2009, p. 8)

While OCS' tech-savvy students are ready for a move to "a new teaching paradigm" (Prensky, 2008) (teachers as facilitators/guides of problem-based learning and collaborative tasks), teachers and administrators may not feel as prepared. Although OCS sets aside more time for professional development than most districts in Michigan, there is a great need to support teachers and administrators academically and emotionally as they attempt to simultaneously implement, coherently connect

and take ownership of several new instructional practices associated with these multiple initiatives.

Due to the demands and makeup of the educational profession itself, PD frequently seems to be designed first and foremost to improve student performance or success, rather than to focus on instructional skills or personal, professional growth (Buchler, 2003, pp. 4-5). Wei, Darling-Hammond, Andree, Richardson, and Orphanos (2009) suggest "efforts to improve student achievement can succeed only by building the capacity of teachers to improve their instructional practice and the capacity of school systems to advance teacher learning" (p. 3).

Goals 2.15, 2.16, 3.1 and 3.2 in OCS' Strategic Plan, along with the numerous references to professional development as "solutions" to proposed "outcomes" in Project ReImagine (particularly in section IV), indicate that the District recognizes the importance of ongoing professional development to better serve the needs of all students and the educators that instruct them. As a general rule, OCS has delivered most PD in a more traditional style, in which trainers or experts impart content knowledge (as "sages on the stage") to passive students (teachers and administrators) in large-group sessions. OCS understands the need to (and has already begun to modify) the format of current and future PD offerings in order to better prepare teachers to replace "the older model of teaching/ learning for a new personalized and innovative one" (Smith et al., 2009, p. 8). In addition, most past forms of PD appeared to lack opportunities for peer support, such as professional learning communities (a.k.a. communities of practice, learning teams, personal learning

networks, collaborative teams or communities, multiple learning communities, etc.), as well as individual options in a face-to-face, online or blended/hybrid format.

Although teachers and administrators work in a communicative profession and the job is people-oriented, the truth remains that teachers are quite isolated within their own classrooms on a daily basis. The same environment brings with it the danger of monotony and stagnation, not only for students, but educators as professionals. As Lois Brown Easton (2008) contends:

It is clearer today than ever that educators need to learn, and that's why *professional learning* has replaced *professional development*. Developing is not enough. Educators must be knowledgeable and wise. They must know enough in order to change. They must change in order to get different results. They must become learners, and they must be self-developing. (p. 756)

Differentiated professional development options for OCS' teachers and administrators are necessary to assist them in their journeys to attain 21st-Century Master Teacher status. The Project ReImagine proposal defines a 21st-Century Master Teacher as one who "is both 'globally' fluent and 'net' fluent to bring about innovation and 21st-century, international learning opportunities to students in his/her classroom or online" (Smith et al., 2009, 3). Varied, personalized options will equip teachers to create new learning experiences for students, such as those in a blended/hybrid format, with 21st-century tools in high tech/next generation global classrooms (congruent with Strategic Plan goals 2.15, 2.16, 3.1 and 3.2). These diverse options will

increase both confidence and competencies in delivering instruction infused with new technologies. At the same time, several offerings may spawn their own communities of practice that will allow for ownership and engagement with and support from fellow participants.

Therefore, Everything DI and Oxford Community Schools propose the construction of a professional learning framework that enables the creation of a solid foundation of essential, core skills and instructional practices, coupled with a menu of electives or options (to promote choices based on interest and levels of readiness and to personalize professional learning for OCS' educators). If OCS expects teachers to differentiate instruction and to model the learning skills and attitudes it wants students to emulate, the District's PD efforts should mirror similar opportunities and tactics to coach educators and cultivate both personal and collective growth. Research shows that students are more successful and find it more satisfying when they are taught in ways that are responsive to their readiness levels, interests, and learning profiles (Vygotsky, 1986; Csikszentmihalyi, 1997; Sternberg, Torff, & Grigorenko, 1998). When students play a role in their own learning, their levels of accountability increase. The same could be true for educators within a solid framework of professional development.

As all schools in the District are candidates for IB certification, virtually all professional learning opportunities for educators should be framed through an IB lens. The learning outcomes that the International Baccalaureate Organization (IBO) requires are those which OCS' educators must exemplify for their students and

cultivate for their own professional and collaborative maturity. As the IBO (2006) explains in its own publication on the "IB learner profile":

The IB learner profile is the IBO mission statement translated into a set of learning outcomes for the 21st century. The attributes of the profile express the values inherent to the IB continuum of international education: these are values that should infuse all elements of the Primary Years Programme (PYP), Middle Years Programme (MYP) and Diploma Programme and, therefore, the culture and ethos of all IB World Schools. The learner profile provides a long-term vision of education. It is a set of ideals that can inspire, motivate and focus the work of schools and teachers, uniting them in a common purpose. (p. 1)

These ten "attributes" or traits (of the IB learner profile) to which all students and educators should aspire are:

1. Inquirers
2. Knowledgeable
3. Thinkers
4. Communicators
5. Principled
6. Open-minded
7. Caring
8. Risk-takers
9. Balanced
10. Reflective (IBO, 2006, p. 5)

In order to supply differentiated options for educators to best equip them in their quest to become 21st-Century Master Teachers within IB-driven classrooms, OCS' Concept Plan for Professional Learning must provide opportunities that facilitate the four Cs:

- Construction over consumption
- Collaboration instead of isolation
- Choice, personalization and ownership of career path and community of practice
- Confidence and comfort with new technologies used to deliver 21st-century instruction

In the Concept Plan for Professional Learning, the instrument that will enable the four Cs listed above is the "CatsCast Educator Academy and Repository" (C²EAR). This School of Professional Learning, or PD school for educators, will be housed online through eCollege (OCS' LMS), and it will supply a myriad of digital assets, resources, learning communities, and online and/or hybrid (blended) classes and training for the administrative and teaching staffs.

Each and every asset, resource, class and learning community made available within C²EAR will fulfill one of two key purposes: 1) they will enhance the efficiency of teaching so that educators can focus on their primary responsibility — coaching and instructing students, or 2) they will support and advance both educators' personal and professional development. All administrators and teachers

will be enrolled in C²EAR as students, and they will have access to its resources twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week. Use of the same tool (eCollege) by administrative and teaching personnel as students of C²EAR will afford them greater leverage as instructors of their own pupils. OCS plans to incorporate as many resources as possible within eCollege that will facilitate the automation of assessments so that teachers are able to spend the majority of their time guiding and training students, along with exploiting opportunities for both self- and collective advancement in their profession.

Why Hybrid?

When it comes to preparing students for global competitiveness, two contrasting theories predominate. There are those at the state and national levels of the educational system within the United States who insist that we must "get back to basics" in our schools and follow traditional, curricular standards, declaring "high" test scores as the ultimate goal. The second faction involves internationally-focused organizations and individuals that advocate the development of higher-order thinking skills, along with the ability to create and invent across multiple disciplines and in unknown situations. The problematic gap that exists between their philosophies is the following: if students do not comprehend basic skills and information, they cannot cultivate higher-order thinking skills. Without higher-order thinking skills and creativity, they will not be employable in the global marketplace of the 21st century.

OCS' solution to the dichotomy described above is hybrid or blended learning. The launch of hybrid learning options will enable the District to take advantage of both technology's and teachers' strengths, which will, in turn, benefit students, instructors and administrators. OCS will leverage and automate technology to profit from its strengths: helping students to grasp and develop basic skills/meet standards, presenting traditional content/lecture-based material in an appealing manner and at an individualized pace, and repeatedly drilling and assessing students on current and past information to improve comprehension and retention. Because technology frees teachers from "drill and kill" time/strategies, from lecture-driven lesson planning, and through the automation of assessments, educators are able to focus on their areas of expertise, which are: analyzing students' levels of readiness and determining what is needed to move them to the next level, utilizing the Rigor, Relevance and Relationship Framework to organize collaborative projects and create opportunities for real-world, high-level problem solving in virtual and face-to-face environments, and encouraging real-life opportunities for creativity and invention.

Educators will find that C²EAR will make use of the same approach. OCS will depend on technology to introduce and build basic skills and knowledge in an engaging way and at a customized speed, and offer repetitive forms of assessment and practice with material to ensure mastery. To improve opportunities for inventiveness and imagination, high-level problem solving and collaboration, OCS will furnish virtual, face-to-face and blending training resources, classes and assets (e.g., the i3 Foundational Cohort training that is explained later in this document).

A preliminary inventory of assets, classes, resources, etc., that C²EAR will offer will be explained in more detail later in this document. However, following is a brief description of its basic structure:

- Learning options and resources within C²EAR will be differentiated primarily by student (i.e., OCS educator) readiness, interest and learning profile.
- Every effort will be made to capture live/face-to-face PD training sessions and presentations for future review (for participants who attended those events in person) and/or first-time learning (for those who did not attend those events in person).
- C²EAR will provide "Core Essentials," such as "Hybrid/Online Facilitator Training" along with elective courses. Additional resources will include FAQs, resource sheets, self-tutorials and/or videos about hardware and software in OCS classrooms, professional learning communities, message boards, wikis, and blogs.
- Every effort will be made to secure SB-CEUs for training sessions, classes, and other learning options that meet Michigan's required minimum of three contact hours (face-to-face, online or hybrid format). For some learning options, graduate-level credits may be available.

In order to better understand the history behind and the process by which the rationale for and the design of C²EAR was conceived, the following two sections

document organizational and professional challenges related to the implementation of the Concept Plan for Professional Learning, as well as progress-to-date.

Research and Observations Relative to Perceived

Environmental Challenges

Oxford teachers and administrators recognize, based on pure observation and experience, that the students who enter today's classrooms today are distinct from those of the past. Though some educators already acknowledge that their pedagogical methods must change in order to reach and teach their digital learners, there are others who are uncomfortable with the tactical shift required to "ensure that all students learn with 21st-century tools in a 21st-century environment" (Smith et al., 2009, p. 6). In order to make this adjustment, which barriers must OCS overcome and which concerns must be addressed? Several of the concerns and barriers listed below are not unique to OCS, but rather, common to the teaching profession as a whole.

1. Repetition of Traditional Methodology and/or Teacher-Preferred Learning

Styles

Generally speaking, teachers usually teach the way in which they were taught, and they learn in the way they were taught to learn. Many instructors continue to replicate the lecture or presentation-based model of educating students, which

differs greatly from their students' preferred ways of learning. Interestingly enough, today's PD methodologies (informally called "sit-and-get," "drive-by," or "one-shot") often rely upon this same teaching approach, and many have discovered that it does not teach how to effectively transfer or apply essential knowledge and skills to their own, individual classrooms: "... data... indicate that on most topics of professional development, fewer than 50% of teachers rated their professional development as useful" (Wei et al., 2009, p. 58); "research on effective models of professional development suggests that intensive and sustained efforts over a period of time are more likely to be effective in improving instruction than intermittent workshops with no follow-up mechanisms..." (Wei et al., 2009, p. 59).

2. Gaps in Instructional Background, Coursework and Experience

Gaps in instructional background, coursework and experience present challenges as educators attempt to make the shift from twentieth- to twenty-first-century practices, curriculum and tools. Using a survey crafted by Grunwald Associates, Eduventures, Inc. surveyed more than 1,000 K-12 teachers and administrators in 2009 on the use of education technology. Survey results indicated that "...most teachers do not believe their pre-service education programs prepared them well to integrate technology into their classrooms or teach 21st-century skills" ("Research dispels common," 2010). A fair majority of those surveyed mentioned that they have never had any mentors or peers with whom they can collaborate or receive guidance.

In terms of online and/or hybrid teaching experience at a more local level, it seems that a fairly high percentage of OCS teachers and administrators have never taken an online or hybrid class, have never taught in an online or hybrid format, and/or have never created an online or hybrid course.

3. Ever-Growing Content Standards

In Michigan, many educators are overwhelmed by the vast amount of content knowledge that they must cover via grade level content expectations (GLCEs), which seems to continue to grow. In fact, teachers in the United States simply spend more physical time teaching than educators in at least 31 other countries:

U.S. teachers also average far more net teaching time in direct contact with students (1,080 hours per year) than any other member of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). By comparison, the OECD average is only 803 hours per year for primary schools and 664 hours per year for upper secondary schools. U.S. teachers spent about 80% of their total working time teaching students as compared to about 60% for teachers in these other nations, who thus have much more time to plan and learn together, and to develop high-quality curriculum and instruction. (Wei et al., 2009, p. 20)

As OCS awaits IB certification at all levels, educators are familiarizing themselves with another set of standards via IB training and preparation of unit planners.

4. Feelings and Perceptions of Pressure, Fear, and Urgency

Teachers and administrators feel the pressure (direct or indirect) that is placed on them to propel students and staff toward high levels of achievement, and to master and meet the demands of multiple initiatives that they may or may not embrace. As opposed to finding common ground or overlaps between the initiatives that are in place and moving forward at OCS, some view them as separate, unrelated strategies. Furthermore, the acceleration of IB candidacy and the present work associated with it (such as the creation of unit planners) can inhibit educators' ability or willingness to look beyond the immediate future and to grasp how other initiatives, resources, strategies and technology may actually assist them in their endeavor to meet the demands of the IB program. In addition, those who are not as technology savvy may be frustrated by or fearful of the various technologies that continue to change, evolve, and make their way into their classrooms at an accelerated pace. Still others tend to implement technology as an "add-on" rather than to integrate it usefully (i.e., to differentiate, customize learning, make connections to the real world, collaborate with others, create knowledge and artifacts, and to motivate and engage students).

5. Absence of Boundaries

Educators find that the margin between one's private and professional lives is frequently blurred or undefined. Physical work, such as grading, planning, monitoring online work, checking e-mail from students, colleagues or superiors, and additional forms of contact with the aforementioned groups of people beyond school hours (perhaps at school functions or extracurricular activities), follows teachers home. Relational demands of the profession can be challenging, as can balance. In these times of economic challenge, most educators wear several hats to fulfill dual (or additional) job roles, including extracurricular responsibilities.

6. Skepticism Associated with Responses to Past Feedback and Transitions Between Initiatives

While it appears that OCS' educators were asked for suggestions and input relative to PD in recent years, not all suggestions or input were honored, as they may have conflicted with the District's direction and/or the Strategic Plan, they were cost prohibitive, or the PD pertained to a very specialized course. As a result, some members of the staff perceived that they were not being heard or that their feedback was not considered. To maintain and increase staff motivation, interest and cooperation, it is essential to permit educators to continue future dialogue.

Moreover, a number of educators have communicated feelings of skepticism and concern about the Concept Plan for Professional Learning, largely for three reasons: 1) lack of identification with the transition from one initiative to

the next, e.g., Model Schools to IB. (Although moves from initiatives such as Model Schools to IB represent a logical progression (or "stepping stones"), some interpreted the progression as abandonment or discontinuance. While several discussions at staff meetings took place and PD days around the District were dedicated to communicate the transitions, many staff members grappled with the overall concept and the timing of transitions.); 2) the pressing need to focus on the preparation and completion of IB unit planners; and 3) fear that more work would be required of them and/or their colleagues.

7. Increasing Quantity and Quality of Professional Learning Opportunities Without Adding to the Number of PD Days

The formal PD calendar itself presented quite a challenge during the 2010-2011 school year, largely as a result of the unanticipated shift of five PD days to required Common Planning Time for IB. Data Days and Record Days, which have long been a part of the teachers' contract, significantly reduced the availability of the elementary teachers and administrators. Further, opportunities for vertical teaming in particular were scarce or non-existent, as the majority of PD days were not shared by teachers and administrators of all levels (elementary, middle and high). The shift to a new schedule in the 2011-2012 school year should facilitate more consistent opportunities for PD that include both horizontal and vertical teaming.

During the 2011-2012 school year, Oxford High School will allocate virtually all of its professional learning time to Wednesday mornings, with the exception of August 30 and 31, 2011, and March 6, 2012. (The March date reflects the date on which juniors will take the ACT exam, so PD on that date is for non-testing staff only.) OHS will start late (10:04 a.m. instead of 7:52 a.m.) on all but two Wednesdays (reserved for semester/final exam periods) for IB Planning (one hour) and Common Planning Time/prep period (one hour). OHS students will follow a "Collegiate Schedule" that involves the rotation of seven classes that will meet four times per week. Six classes will meet every day but delayed-start Wednesday, on which four classes will meet. Beginning in the 2012-2013 academic year, OCS will institute a shortened "May Term" (early May through early June) following the two-semester Collegiate Schedule. During the May Term, students will enroll in four classes that present opportunities for credit recovery, advanced studies or enrichment, dual enrollment, service, and preparatory (academic, skills-based) classes.

Oxford Middle School will begin late on the first, third, and if applicable, fifth Wednesdays of each month (10:15 a.m. instead of 7:32 a.m.) for IB Planning and Common Planning Time/prep period, and so that members of the OHS and OMS staffs may meet together for vertical teaming/planning. (The MYP program is intended for students aged 11-16, so an "overlap" of responsibility exists between the OHS and OMS staffs for these students.) PD time outside of delayed-start Wednesdays occurred on August 30 and 31 and will take place on the morning of October 28, 2011. On late-start Wednesdays, all class periods will be

Concept Plan for Professional Learning

Copyright © 2011 Everything DI & OXFORD COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

shortened. All classes will meet five days per week for the duration of the school year.

The elementary staffs have four half-days (mornings of November 28, 2011, January 16, 2012, and April 19, 2012; afternoon of October 7, 2011) and one full day (February 21, 2012) allotted specifically for PD ("Records Days" and "Data Days" are excluded from this tally), along with two "Collaborative" half-days (mornings of October 7, 2011, and March 19, 2012). These Collaborative Days are reserved for vertical and horizontal planning and/or co-planning. The staff members of each school ultimately determine how to utilize those collaborative days, but their activities must be approved by their building principals, and they must submit an agenda and minutes for each activity. Each building administrator determines a weekly meeting time of 50 minutes for instructional staff for IB Planning before school.

In addition to all of the changes and shifts in the school schedules and offerings, the creation of C²EAR will assist in OCS' effort to supply a greater number of valuable PD resources at a minimal cost. Around-the-clock availability of these digital assets, along with the continual updating/addition of further tools, will alleviate some of the conflicts associated with an active calendar and limited face-to-face time.

Progress-to-Date

Following is a description of the steps taken to initiate the Concept Plan for Professional Learning, the progress that has been made thus far, and potential, future steps.

Accomplished:

1. Potential Partner Meeting (March of 2010)

On March 1, 2010, Tim Throne, Tim Looch, Jim Schwarz, and Dr. Skilling met with representatives of several corporations to outline the District's perspective/vision in regard to technology and curriculum, as well as to explain the acceptable use of bond monies. This meeting was held prior to the bid opening date for various types of hardware and software that OCS would purchase with bond dollars. During this meeting, these potential partners learned how it would benefit their companies to go beyond simply submitting and winning a bid by teaming up with the District.

2. Initial Planning Sessions (summer and fall of 2010)

The PD Planning Team (Tim Throne and James Schwarz of Oxford Community Schools, Rock Morey and Scott Brune of Wright & Hunter, and Stephanie Throne of Everything DI) met together weekly over the course of the summer and throughout the fall of 2010. On separate occasions, all or some members met with specific vendors who could serve as potential PD partners prior

to and after the Tech Summit (held on August 26, 2010). Tim, Stephanie and Jim still meet as needed and communicate on a regular basis via email and phone.

3. **Tech Summit** (August of 2010)

At the Tech Summit, a brief sketch of the Concept Plan for Professional Learning was shared with potential partners, along with information about the District's Vision and Mission Statements, Strategic Plan, and a technology update. During a portion of the Tech Summit, potential partner representatives and members of the PD Planning Team dialogued and rotated in small groups to find out what each partner could offer Oxford in terms of PD resources, as well as their areas of expertise.

4. **Meeting and Sharing with Building Administrators and IB Coordinators** (October and November of 2010)

In October and November of 2010, the PD Planning Team met with the secondary principals, elementary principals, and IB coordinators during three separate sessions to present a brief of the Concept Plan for Professional Learning and to ask for their input and feedback. The Team discussed plans for two "brainstorming sessions" on PD days in November (November 8 at OHS for OHS and Crossroads staffs, and November 19 at OMS for OMS and elementary staffs). The PD Planning Team answered questions, listened to concerns, and invited additional feedback via email following the meeting.

5. **PD Survey** (November of 2010)

A PD Survey to solicit preliminary, individual feedback was created on SurveyMonkey, and the live link was sent to all principals for distribution to members of the teaching staff for completion in early November.

6. **PD Brainstorming Sessions with Staff** (November of 2010)

In order to garner more specific feedback and to provide teachers and administrators with the chance to give input on the future of PD at OCS, the PD Planning Team organized and carried out two "brainstorming sessions" (as mentioned in number three above). Following is a description of the agenda that the Team followed on both days from 8:00 to 11:00 a.m.:

- LGI: Introduction of facilitators — Jim Schwarz
- LGI: Agenda for day with description of objectives and vision — Jim Schwarz
- LGI: Description of Concept Plan for Professional Learning and purpose behind it — Tim Throne
- LGI: Instructions for completion of the Collaborative Document in groups — Stephanie Throne

(The Team utilized the PD Survey results and other feedback to formulate an electronic Collaborative Document for use during the sessions to further define OCS' PD wants and to ask for input on future delivery.)

- Break out with random groups to various classrooms for brainstorming and completion of Collaborative Document — facilitators, teachers and administration
- LGI: eCollege course shell demonstration to provide tips on how to get started on a few key tasks and tools — Jeff Wren, PowerSchool Studio Product Marketing Manager

The PD Planning Team made time for additional comments and questions via the use of a "Rest Stop" (mounted butcher paper with Sharpie markers), as well as during Tim's presentation, during Jeff's presentation, and via email at any time following the completion of the sessions.

7. **Atlas Rubicon Training** (November and December of 2010)

Educators were trained on the Atlas Rubicon curriculum mapping tool, which they use for IB planning, on the following dates: November 8, 2010 (OHS staff), November 19, 2010 (some OMS staff), and December 3, 2010 (some OMS staff and elementary staffs).

8. **IB Training** (January, March and April of 2011)

PD sessions on the writing of unit planners, the creation of language and assessment policies, and teaming took place on the following dates: January 28, March 1, and April 11, 2011 (OHS staff); March 1, March 14, and the morning of April 11, 2011 (OMS staff).

9. Meeting with Building Administrators for Additional Feedback and Sharing of Results of PD Survey and Collaborative Documents (February of 2011)

Jim Schwarz, Tim Throne and Stephanie Throne met with all building administrators on February 11, 2011, to share the results of the PD Survey and Collaborative Documents and to listen to additional comments and concerns.

10. Meetings and Brainstorming with Pearson (April of 2011)

On April 27 and 29, 2011, Stephanie Throne, Jim Schwarz, Tim Throne and Debbie Fox met with members of the Pearson team to brainstorm about the order of rolling out PowerSchool Studio products, as well as other issues related to the School of Professional Learning. (Tim Throne and Debbie Fox have participated in weekly update meetings via phone with Pearson since January of 2011.)

11. Pearson Inform Training (April of 2011)

Tim Throne, Debbie Fox, Jim Schwarz, Denise Sweat, and five of the building administrators participated in two days (April 27 and 28, 2011) of voluntary training on Pearson Inform, which reports and analyzes results from OCS' chief assessments.

12. i3 Foundational Cohorts (summer of 2011) and **Initial Follow-Up Visit** (September of 2011)

Over the course of the last twelve to eighteen months, the PD Planning Team has conversed frequently via phone and email with i3's president and CEO, Floyd

Braid, and met with him in person on September 9, 2010, November 15, 2010, and March 14, 2011.

The PD Planning Team arranged for the training of three foundational cohort groups in July and August. Cohort #1 was comprised of MYP and DP teachers, Cohort #2 included building administrators and IB coordinators, and Cohort #3 consisted of PYP educators. These cohorts follow a train-the-trainer model and involved an initial, face-to-face training period of 30 hours over five days. The training sessions for the three cohorts were scheduled as follows:

- Cohort #1 (MYP and DP teachers): July 18-22, 2011
- Cohort #2 (building administrators and IB coordinators): August 8-12, 2011
- Cohort #3 (PYP teachers): August 15-19, 2011

The cohorts' focus was effective curriculum and technology integration, and the plan for this particular PD option enabled the training of 36 teachers and administrators total (elementary through high school levels). The participants in these cohorts are voluntarily striving to become 21st-Century Master Teachers.

i3's president and CEO, Floyd Braid, provided cohort members with an "immersion, buffet style" of training. During the face-to-face sessions, Floyd took participants through a project-based learning model that mirrored the unit of inquiry framework required by the IB program. Floyd presented academic tasks that integrated a variety of technology tools, and cohort members determined which tasks and tools were manageable for them at that point in time. He modeled the use

of various strategies and tools using the PowerSchool Studio suite of products and the eCollege (LMS) portal. These face-to-face sessions lasted five days (six hours of total training per day), and they included coaching and individualized projects on the final day ("Design-Develop-Build Day"). Most participants elected to begin developing their own classroom or building communities (online) or to work on the construction of their course resources within eCollege. Options to earn SB-CEUs and graduate-level credit were secured for cohort members.

Floyd will follow up with cohort members during future visits, usually meeting with them during their planning or conference periods, to provide additional coaching and assistance. This portion of the training ("Phase 2: Coaching and Mentoring") involves ongoing, self-prescribed coaching and mentoring that builds upon the concepts that participants investigated in their face-to-face sessions. Floyd made his first follow-up visit during the week of September 19, 2011. From September 19 to 22, he observed, coached and/or mentored 28 of the 36 educators that were a part of the three cohorts. Floyd also introduced the digital portfolio format that educators will use to self-prescribe and track their own "Flex Goals," i.e., in Floyd's words, "personal learning goals" set to "integrate technology more effectively and appropriately into everyday instruction."

Floyd created and utilized supplementary resources for all of the cohorts that are housed as "training classes" within C²EAR. Further, Floyd will construct a version of his cohort training online so that those who did not attend the face-to-face sessions can "attend" the training in the future.

The train-the-trainer model is attractive to OCS for several reasons:

- The instructional staff and administrators are accustomed to and will accept this training methodology because a similar one is already in place (Teacher Leaders program affiliated with Model Schools).
- Over 60% of the respondents to the PD Survey indicated that collaborative teaming is the preferred way to deliver PD. Teaming, coaching, and mentoring plays a key role not only in the development of these cohorts, but in the future as cohort members interact and share knowledge with their colleagues.
- Generally, most people respond more positively to peer teaching or coaching than to instruction provided by superiors. Conversely, administrators often find that peer collaboration enables them to include instructional staff in decision making and leadership responsibility, and to help deepen professional relationships in order to effect collective change and improvement in their schools.
- If desired, subsequent cohorts may potentially choose a specific concentration for their own teams that still center on effective technology and curriculum integration, such as whiteboards, clickers/student response systems, mobile devices, and so on. This tactic allows for small groups of people to become "specialists" in particular resources, tools and strategies, thereby avoiding the impossible notion that everyone must become experts in everything.

13. Welcome Back Tech Guide with Classroom “Walk-Through” and Training for all Secondary Educators on Pearson Limelight and eCollege/LMS (August 30 and 31, 2011)

After the Welcome Back Breakfast on August 30, secondary teachers moved to their classrooms in order to complete a task list of assignments that enabled them to explore their new instructional technology. The “Welcome Back Tech Guide” contained the task list, in addition to labeled images of the tools and step-by-step instructions, video links, and reference guide (“quick start”) links on how to operate the tools. Members of the Technology Staff circulated to assist teachers and responded to their requests/inquiries.

On August 31, secondary teachers and administrators were invited to attend a day of training on Pearson Limelight and eCollege. Limelight is OCS’ real-time assessment software that allows teachers to create and deliver tests quickly, provides test banks aligned to state standards and other standards, and reports and analyzes test data to inform instruction. eCollege is OCS’ learning management system (LMS), a software application for the administration, documentation, tracking, and reporting of e-learning programs, classroom and online events, and training content.

In Preparation:

1. Additional Coaching and Mentoring of i3 Foundational Cohort Members

(October of 2011-January of 2012 and beyond)

Floyd plans to return on the following dates in 2011 and 2012: October 17-20, November 14-17, December 6-9, and January 9-12. During these visits, Floyd will continue to conduct classroom observations, work with the teachers to develop individualized coaching plans, and deliver coaching and mentoring support. He will also provide off-site mentoring and coaching when he is not physically present in Oxford.

2. Hands-on Adobe training

The PD Planning Team offered to arrange hands-on training for the OMS and OHS staffs with an IB-certified Adobe Educator in January of 2011 to create products for use in IB unit planners/in IB-driven classrooms using the Adobe Digital School Collection (ADSC) suite of products. However, due to lack of staff readiness, this training will be scheduled at a later date.

3. Formation of Additional Collaborative Teams or Communities of Practice and Suggested Scaffolds Needed to Sustain Them

Research and First Steps

Collaborative teaming will accommodate what Eleanor Drago-Severson (2004) calls "the three qualitatively different ways of knowing that are most common in adulthood" that apply directly to leadership practices and teacher development: 1) those who know what they are supposed to do and perform accordingly, 2) those who participate under leadership with peers to define and refine their knowledge and contributions (consensus), and 3) those who author the knowledge and methods to be evaluated and applied by others (thought leaders and pioneers) (pp 30-31) . Drago-Severson draws heavily on the work of psychologist Robert Kegan and his constructive-developmental theory. Both Kegan and Drago-Severson stress the urgency for more "transformational learning" ("learning that helps adults to develop capacities to better manage the complexities of work and life") vs. "informational learning" ("increases in knowledge and skills that are also important and can support changes in adults' attitudes and possibly, their competencies") (Drago-Severson, 2004, p. 23).

There is potential for a large quantity of communities of practice to support both the initiatives that are already in place at OCS, as well as those that may develop as a result of the huge number of PD resources that have been offered to the district. As a beginning point, the PD Planning Team solicited input from administrators and teachers in the Collaborative Document used as a part of the PD sessions on November 8 and 19, 2010. Breakout groups were asked to list names of teachers or administrators who could serve as "champions" or "ambassadors" for

various initiatives and key tools that support IB. Ambassadors or champions could function as "go-to" people for tips and assistance in the near future until the possible learning communities are in place and fully functioning, and/or could participate on or lead one of the teams. The initiatives and tools listed were:

- PowerSchool Studio (learning management suite of products that includes PowerSchool, Limelight, Inform, and eCollege)
- Atlas (curriculum mapping tool for IB)
- Differentiated instruction
- Adobe Digital School Collection and video capturing and editing tools
- Interactive whiteboards and data projectors
- Microsoft Office 2010 and Windows 7
- Web 2.0 technologies

Other tools and initiatives to add to the list above are student response systems (clickers) and MediaCAST's digital content storage and delivery tools.

Beyond the PD Planning Team's attempt to encourage teachers and administrators to self- or peer-nominate for some form of leadership of the various teams, OCS must be willing to grant ownership of communities of practice to their pioneers and followers. Following are some suggestions as to what OCS might do to provide support for them and to encourage ownership and maturity.

1. Building leaders could "confirm" ambassadors or champions based on the information supplied in the Collaborative Document, or teachers and administrators who are interested in a particular PLC may join together and select their own leadership.
2. OCS should consider one or more of the following options to support educators and teams in effective technology and curriculum integration.
 - a. Hire at least one, but preferably two or three instructional coaches. Instructional coaches could provide job-embedded training or mentoring by means of co-teaching with a classroom teacher and/or teaching a lesson to the students while the classroom teacher observes. Instructional coaches could meet with small groups or teams of teachers interested in the same topic, tool or strategy during a conference or planning time. As the number of technology and curricular resources increases at an incredible pace, instructional coaches can suggest and model the use of different tools, based upon teachers' levels of readiness. While members of the Technology Department staff have been able to offer some assistance to educators in this area in the past, they have not been trained in classroom instruction. Further, instructional coaches could build online content and resources for teachers and administrators to access for use in their classrooms. As vendor trainer/leaders of cohorts (such as the i3 Foundational Cohorts) phase out with the completion of their training, instructional coaches should be equipped and ready to step in to continue on with coaching.

b. If finances prohibit the hiring of instructional coaches, an alternative would be to allow a small pool of teachers to be released from one period of teaching per day to meet with colleagues to assist them and/or share with them during the their conference or planning times (i.e., allow these teachers to teach one less class period per day in exchange for helping their colleagues). This pool of teachers could be comprised of members from the i3 Foundational Cohorts (or perhaps, champions/ambassadors). If daily release time is not feasible, perhaps OCS could allow for an alternative amount of release time via the provision of substitute teachers.

c. If finances prohibit the hiring of instructional coaches, and option b above were not viable, the role of the IB Coordinator could possibly expand to accommodate instructional coaching.

d. Since teaching "I.B. 2.0" (as described in Project ReImagine) means utilizing twenty-first century technologies and strategies, all educational staffs could dedicate a portion of their weekly IB Planning (and/or Common Planning Time) to address effective technology and curriculum integration in some shape or form.

e. OCS could consider hosting its own, face-to-face, educational conference and/or facilitate a virtual one, possibly called the "OxfordNET (Virtual) Conference." OCS could determine whether or not to restrict attendance and/or speaking engagements to OCS educators only, which could provide opportunities to showcase/present sample work and/or projects that demonstrate effective technology and curriculum integration, as well as to learn from their colleagues. If OCS were to invite speakers

and attendees from outside the district, this conference could be used as a positive marketing tool and a possible revenue generator (fees for attendance). The same would be true if OCS were to host the conference virtually. Alternatively, specific PLCs might choose to sponsor their own conferences or seminars.

f. The creation of communities within C²EAR will enable online communication and collaboration for teams via wikis, message boards and blogs (but will not supplant the desire for face-to-face interaction).

g. In order to determine how OCS can accommodate the time needed for peer teaching, coaching and collaborative teaming, it would be helpful to have an interactive calendar within C²EAR that would detail all of the PD that is planned for various levels, as well as when and where it will take place. Access to a comprehensive calendar would eliminate duplication of efforts, would allow for informed decision making about PD planning, and would permit cross-pollination of communities, interests, and so on.

h. For adult learners, some type of discussion of reward and recognition must take place in order to encourage and sustain personal and professional growth. In the Professional Development Survey, the PD Planning Team asked respondents to indicate which incentives (other than stipends) would encourage them to pursue PD opportunities outside of the traditional school day and those that are required as a part of the PD calendar. (Summaries of Results of the PD Survey and the Collaborative Document are provided in Appendices C-E.) Roughly 83% (responding either "strongly agree" or "agree") said that "grant monies set aside for

instructional projects and/or technology" would be the top incentive.

"Customization of your next technological tool (tablet, laptop, etc.)" came in second with approximately 70% (responding either "strongly agree or agree") of the vote, followed by "opportunity to attend or present at an educational conference" (with about 56% responding either "strongly agree" or "agree").

Other possibilities means of recognition could include: 1) a certificate of completion, 2) an achievement honorarium, 3) a "gold star" or some other form of honor on a formal evaluation, and/or 4) public recognition at a staff or district-wide event. In terms of number two above, OCS could consider compensating educators for a certain number of hours of PD completed on their own time (not during delayed-start days, release time or PD days in which students are not in school).

C²EAR Electives Coupled with Core Essentials

For the benefit of its instructional and administrative staffs, OCS pursued a best of breed approach to gather resources by soliciting commitment from technology partners to supply content and deliver resources for instruction on applied use. This approach came about as a means to help satisfy the following, high-level, wants and needs: 1) teachers would welcome more instruction and planning time to incorporate interactive technologies into their classrooms and instructional delivery opportunities; 2) teachers would benefit from a common set of tools on which to base instructional content preparation and delivery; 3) automation

of assessments would enhance the efficiency of teaching; and 4) students would appreciate increased access to interactive technologies, which, in turn, would better prepare them for the global marketplace.

As noted earlier in this document, Everything DI and OCS propose the construction of a professional learning framework that enables the creation of a solid foundation of core skills and instructional practices, coupled with a variety of electives or options (to promote choices based on interest and levels of readiness and to personalized professional learning for educators). Pages 58-62 specify some of the elective options and core essentials that OCS has delivered, as well as those that the District is in the process of preparing and/or seeks to plan in the next three years.

"Core Essentials" are labeled as such because they reflect crucial types of training and development to effect the following goals:

- Familiarize educators with new technology and ready them for integration
- Continue training for programs/initiatives already in place
- Solicit feedback on initiatives and the integration of technology and curriculum
- Develop more hands-on or small group training to increase the instructional staff's levels of readiness and comfort with new technology and pedagogies
- Initiate learning options beyond face-to-face
- Establish PLCs for support, coaching and mentoring

All elective options and essential tasks will assist educators in their endeavor to meet District-wide objectives for various initiatives and to provide opportunities for customized, professional development. The majority of the initial or ramp-up year (2010-2011) was devoted to planning, the installation and testing of the PowerSchool Studio suite of products, and the organization and construction of other resources and tools for inclusion in C²EAR. The next several years will be years of growth. It is not feasible in terms of time or resources to anticipate that all of the options will be covered or fully available in the first year or two, so coaching and training will be spread out over time. As years three and four approach, OCS should have begun the process of reflection in order to determine how to become self-sustained in stabilizing the various models of instruction that the teachers and administrators will develop and refine.

The vendors who provide training options listed in this document and in the tables below all utilize some type of evaluation tool to assess their efforts. Some of the evaluation tools are mentioned within the tables, while others will be determined. However, OCS will also ask for regular, electronic feedback on participants' PD experiences, which will be tracked and aggregated through C²EAR in order to continuously refine and improve professional learning opportunities. OCS will attempt to catalogue employees' participation in both elective PD offerings and Core Essentials so that educators have a record of their own "personal learning plan" at their disposal.

Conclusion

Similar to a strategic plan or other guiding document to which an organization refers, the Concept Plan for Professional Learning articulates a potential path to and through uncultivated territory. The Concept Plan provides a suggested foundation on which to build, but in no way can it express with total accuracy what might take place in the future. New technologies will continue to emerge, and instructional strategies will continue to evolve. Various opportunities for different types of training and learning will materialize, whether they are created in-house or delivered by other organizations (other districts, ISDs, vendors, and so on). PLCs, cohorts, and/or other groups may decide to request specific training and/or electives, based on experiences that are yet to happen, passions that are already in place and/or may develop in the future, as well as needs that may arise. Changes and modifications to the plan over time will be necessary in order to ensure maximization of the four Cs for educators, which will, in turn, benefit students and the communities with which they interact — now and in the future.

References

- Brown Easton, L. (2008). From professional development to professional learning. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 89(10), 755-759, 761.
- Buchler, B. (2003). *Terms of engagement - Rethinking teachers' independent learning traits*. Naperville, IL. NCREL and Learning Point Associates.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1997). *Finding flow: The psychology of engagement with everyday life*. New York: Basic Books.
- Drago-Severson, E. (2004). *Helping teachers learn: Principal leadership for adult growth and development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- International Baccalaureate Organization (2006). *IB learner profile booklet*. Cardiff, Wales: Retrieved from http://www.ibo.org/programmes/documents/learner_profile_en.pdf
- Michigan Department of Education (2009). *Project reimagine demonstration districts fact sheet*. Lansing: Retrieved from [http://www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/Demonstration Districts Fact Sheet_4-29-09_276790_7.pdf](http://www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/Demonstration_Districts_Fact_Sheet_4-29-09_276790_7.pdf)
- Prensky, M. (2008). The role of technology in teaching and the classroom. *Educational Technology*, Retrieved from [http://www.marcprensky.com/writing/Prensky-The Role of Technology-ET-11-12-08.pdf](http://www.marcprensky.com/writing/Prensky-The_Role_of_Technology-ET-11-12-08.pdf)
- Research dispels common ed-tech myths. (2010, August). *eSchool News*, p. 8.

Smith, G., Throne, S., Throne, T., Skilling, W., & Schwarz, J. (2009). "ReImagine 21st-century learning: Creating the model global school." grant proposal.

Sternberg, R. J., Torff, B., & Grigorenko, E. L. (1998). Teaching triarchically improves student achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 90(3), 374-384.

Vygotsky, L. (1986). *Thought and language*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Wei, R. C., Darling-Hammond, L., Andree, A., Richardson, N., & Orphanos, S. (2009). *Professional learning in the learning profession: A status report on teacher development in the United States and abroad*. Dallas, TX. National Staff Development Council.

C²EAR

CatsCast Educator Academy & Repository
professional learning in place of professional development

Appendix A

Various Types of Professional Development

Category	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5
Academic Coursework	Degree or Certification				
Workshops or Sessions	Workshops	In-services	Conferences		
Formal Research	Publish	Participate in research	Apply research to own context		
Informal	Collegial Activities	PLNs	Serve as a mentor or be mentored as a mentee	Blogging or creating other educational content	Reading, listening to podcasts, watching videos about education or teaching
Classroom-embedded	Learning from or collaborating with students	Workshops given in a real classroom situation	In-classroom mentor teacher or coach	Team teaching or student teaching	Observation
Action Research	Deliberate, reflective practice to change own teaching				

Source: <http://blog.genyes.com/index.php/2008/04/24/what-is-professional-development/>

Appendix B

View OCS' Strategic Plan and Mission and Vision Statements:

<http://oxfordschools.org/images/87/Strategic%20Plan%20Update%20-%20June%20091.pdf>



C²EAR

CatsCast Educator Academy & Repository
professional learning in place of professional development

Appendix C

Summary of Results of Professional Development Survey Completed by OCS Instructional and Administrative Staffs (first week of November of 2010)

During the first week of November of 2010, classroom teachers and administrators (individually) completed an electronic survey about their professional development needs and experiences. The results of this survey, along with other feedback, were used to formulate the collaborative document that participants completed in groups during the breakout sessions on November 8 and 19, 2010. These two documents represent part of an effort to personalize training for educators based on their current needs and to collaborate for future professional growth and success. A statistical summary of nine of the core questions from the Professional Development Survey appears below.

Question #8 asked participants to rank their preferences in terms of 'professional development delivery styles/opportunities.'

- The **top two responses in the five** (most preferred) category were:
 1. Collaborating with other professionals in small groups (such as by grade-level/content team or vertical content team or professional learning community/network (PLC/PLN)): 67%
 2. Workshops and hands-on activities: 41%

- The **top four responses in the four category** (as results were very close) were:
 1. Conferences: 41%
 2. Observation of peers' classes: 37%
 3. Participation in study group/cohort with professionals from other districts: 36.2%
 4. Peer coaching/mentoring: 36.1%

Question #9 solicited input on areas in which respondents would like more PD or training.

- These two topics earned the highest percentages in the "strongly agree" category:
 1. IB: 47%
 2. Pearson Studio (Learning Management System): 41%

- These topics earned the following percentages in the "agree" category:
 1. Differentiated instruction: 56%
 2. PBL: 49%
 3. Adobe Digital School Collection: 45%
 4. Data analysis to guide/inform instruction: 43%
 5. Web 2.0 Technologies: 41%
 6. RTI: 37%
 7. Model Schools: 32%

Question #10 inquired about the **scheduling of PD sessions** (outside of traditional PD days). The majority of options were unfavorably received (after school, weekends, weekday evenings, summer, and during conference/planning time). Short sessions during IB/Common Planning Time was the most positively received option (72% responding "yes"), and approximately 53% indicated "yes" to before school possibilities.

Question #11 asked for **comments about respondents' professional experience** at OCS. "Agree" was the most popular response to the first four statements listed below. The percentage of educators that answered "agree" follows each statement, along with additional information in parentheses.

1. Educators are provided with opportunities to learn from one another/collaborate: 55% agree (15% strongly agree)
2. Adequate time is provided for PD: 47% agree (15% strongly agree)
3. Sufficient funds are made available for PD opportunities: 52% agree (9% strongly agree)
4. Release time is offered for PD: 57% agree (11% strongly agree)

5. Most educators responded in disagreement (approximately 59% either disagreed or strongly disagreed) with the last statement: "The non-instructional time (for collaboration with colleagues, individual planning, meetings/conferences with students/parents, etc.) for educators at OCS is sufficient."

Question #12 gathered feedback as to the **incentives (other than stipends) that might 'encourage educators to pursue PD opportunities outside of the traditional school day and those that are required as a part of the PD calendar.'**

"Agree" was the most popular response to the first three statements listed below. The percentage of educators that answered "agree" follows each statement, along with additional information in parentheses.

1. Grant monies set aside for instructional projects and/or technology: 54% agree (29% strongly agree)
2. Customization of your next technological tool (tablet, laptop, etc.): 42% agree (28% strongly agree)
3. Opportunity to attend or present at an educational conference: 34% agree (22% strongly agree)
4. Opportunity to present at a staff meeting or IB Common Planning Time: 32% disagree (25% agree)

Question #13 measured educators' **perceived levels of support when they 'try to implement PD strategies** they have learned in the past and will learn this year.'

"Agree" was the most popular response to the three statements listed below. However, there was a close split between those who agreed and disagreed with statement three. The percentage of educators that answered "agree" follows each statement, along with additional information in parentheses.

1. I have the curriculum materials I need: 57% agree (8% strongly agree)
2. There is someone in my school who can give me sound advice and/or assistance: 58% agree (13% strongly agree)
3. I have the instructional supplies and material I need, including essential technology: 34% agree (31% disagree)

Questions #14 and #15 addressed **respondents' participation in 'their own personal learning communities/networks (PLC/PLN).'** Sixty-three percent responded that they were "unsure" as to whether they were a part of or had established their own PLC/PLN. Twenty-two percent indicated an "interest" in doing so, while 16% replied that they had 'already established/were participating' in one. As for the people who answered "already established/participating," roughly 67% identified their role as "active participant" in their PLCs/PLNs.

Question #16 gauged educators' interest in **meeting with an instructional coach or peer mentor weekly, bi-weekly or monthly for help in specific areas.**

"Agree" was the most popular response to the areas/topics listed below. The percentage of educators that answered "agree" follows each statement, along with additional information in parentheses.

1. For help with differentiation of instruction: 56% agree (13% strongly agree)
2. For help with learning and utilizing Web 2.0 strategies effectively: 35% agree (11% strongly agree)
3. For help with RTI strategies: 46% agree (13% strongly agree)
4. For help with PBL/IBL (Inquiry-Based Learning) strategies: 54% agree (17% strongly agree)
5. For help with effective technology integration into lessons: 47% agree (26% strongly agree)
6. For help with existing hardware and software, such as phone/voice mail, MS Office, Windows 7, etc.: 32% agree (13% strongly agree)

Question #17 measured respondents' interest in **participating in a "foundational cohort"** on effective curriculum and technology integration that would follow a train-the-trainer model (and involve an initial, face-to-face training period of 18 hours over three days). The majority of educators were "unsure" (56%). Seventeen percent responded "yes," while 27% answered "no."

Thanks to everyone who responded! Your feedback was very valuable!



Appendix D

Summary of Results of Collaborative Document Completed by Crossroads and OHS Instructional Staffs on PD Day (November 8, 2010)

As a part of the morning session of the PD day at OHS on November 8, 2010, educators completed an electronic collaborative document in random breakout groups. The purpose of the completion of this document was to solicit further input from members of these staffs on future PD wants and needs. A statistical summary of six of the core questions appears below.

Question #4 gauged teachers' interest in **meeting with a peer or instructional coach** (individually or in a small group) about a particular topic during a conference (planning) period once a month or bi-monthly. Sixty percent responded that "six to eight" people in each group would be willing to meet, and another 10% said "nine or more" people in their groups would be willing.

Question #5 asked for input in order to "**permit more frequent and lengthier periods of time**" for **team- or community-based collaboration with peers**. The five most common responses (in no particular order) were:

1. Late start
2. Departmental common planning time (with the possibility of coming in on a Saturday in exchange for a future PD day off)
3. More PD days
4. Online forums, chats and meetings
5. Current PD days

Question #6 inquired how teachers might '**strengthen and/or contribute to their team or community beyond the traditional school day.**'

- In terms of participating on message boards, blogs or wikis with their teams, the results were fairly evenly spread (20% - strongly agree; 20% - agree; 30% - neutral or undecided; 20% - disagree; and 10% - strongly disagree).

- When asked if they 'would read printed materials, online articles, listen to podcasts, etc., about their team's focus topic and share with the team,' the responses were equally divided in each category (20%).
- Educators seemed most positive about the prospect of attending or presenting at a conference individually or with a partner and sharing with their teams. Eighty percent of the groups responded "strongly agree" or "agree" to the conference option.
- Other suggestions for team building included more PD days and optional, immediate PD sessions that would enable them to use the tools and/or skills mentioned in question #6 itself (wikis, blogs, etc.).

Questions #7 and #8 addressed peer mentoring.

- Teachers felt strongly (almost 89% responded "strongly agree" or "agree") that a seasoned teacher in a new teacher's content area should determine mentor-mentee pairings.
- Almost 56% disagreed that the principal or assistant principal(s) should decide the pairings, while there was a strong division about whether a new teacher should seek out his/her own mentor (50% agreed, while 50% disagreed or strongly disagreed).
- Instructors mentioned that it would be helpful for administrators to check with them first about serving as mentors, as well as to possibly develop a pool of volunteers that might be willing to mentor new teachers.
- In terms of strengthening a peer mentor-new teacher relationship, the five most frequent responses (in no particular order) were:
 1. Share the same lunch and/or conference (planning) period.
 2. Assign the pairings before the school year starts.
 3. Meet with/connect with each other at least once a week.
 4. Offer common planning time.
 5. Allow for flex or release time for the mentor to observe his/her mentee, and for the new teacher to observe his/her mentor.

Question #11 measured teachers' interest in **participating in a "foundational cohort"** on effective curriculum and technology integration that would follow a train-the-trainer model (and involve an initial, face-to-face training period of 18 hours over three days).

- Virtually all of the groups indicated at least some type of general interest, pending more information, particularly as to the timing/scheduling of the training and how it might affect professional and personal commitments.
- Some of the groups responded with a specific number of people. Of the ten groups responding, a total of nine people indicated a definite interest.

Thanks to all participants for your helpful feedback!

The logo for C2EAR features the text "C²EAR" in a large, blue, serif font. A yellow speech bubble shape is positioned behind the text, with its tail pointing towards the bottom right.

CatsCast Educator Academy & Repository
professional learning in place of professional development

Appendix E

Summary of Results of Collaborative Document Completed by Elementary and OMS Instructional Staffs on PD Day (November 19, 2010)

As a part of the morning session of the PD day at OMS on November 19, 2010, educators completed an electronic collaborative document in random breakout groups. The purpose of the completion of this document was to solicit further input from members of these staffs on future PD wants and needs. A statistical summary of nine of the core questions appears below.

Question #3 gauged OMS staff's interest in **meeting with a peer or instructional coach** (individually or in a small group) about a particular topic during a conference (planning) period once a month or bi-monthly. About 33% percent responded that "six to eight" people in each group would be willing to meet, and another 33% said "nine or more" people in their groups would be willing.

Question #4 asked elementary teachers to identify when a good time would be to **meet with a peer or instructional coach** (individually or in a small group) about a particular topic once a month or bi-monthly. The five most common suggestions (not in any particular order) were:

1. Release time and/or comp. time
2. 8 am
3. During IB Common Planning Time
4. During the school day
5. PD days

Question #5 solicited input on how to "**permit more frequent and lengthier periods of time**" for **team- or community-based collaboration with peers in one's own building (horizontally)**. Some of the responses included:

1. Late start or early release day
2. Common planning time
3. Peer training
4. Online collaboration at home with stipend

5. Current PD days
6. Release time and/or Saturday pay and/or stipends
7. Paid summer academy
8. Scheduling specials to accommodate block collaboration time
9. Conference with breakout sessions
10. Two-hour monthly meeting after school

Question #6 inquired how teachers might '**collaborate vertically with colleagues' (in other buildings)**. Some of the responses included:

1. Late start or early release day
2. Current PD days
3. Release time and/or Saturday pay and/or stipends
4. Conference with breakout sessions
5. PD once a week
6. Online collaboration with LMS (learning management system)
7. IB coordinators pass on information and monitor while others meet two to three times per year for half-day
8. PD days at beginning and end of year for fifth and sixth grade teachers and eighth and ninth grade teachers
9. Paid summer academy
10. Live feeds

Question #7 gathered feedback as to how teachers might '**strengthen and/or contribute to their team or community beyond the traditional school day.**'

- In terms of participating on message boards, blogs or wikis with their teams, ten groups indicated that they were undecided about, disagreed, or strongly disagreed that they were willing to do so outside of the school day. The remaining five groups replied they "strongly agree" or "agree" (responding either "six to eight" or "nine or more" people) about their willingness to interact online.
- When asked if they 'would read printed materials, online articles, listen to podcasts, etc., about their team's focus topic and share with the team,' eleven groups indicated that they were undecided, disagreed, or strongly disagreed. Two groups answered they agreed (responding either "six to eight" or "nine or more" members), while the remaining three were fairly evenly split between all five response categories.

- Educators seemed most positive about the prospect of attending or presenting at a conference individually or with a partner and sharing with their teams. Seven of the fifteen groups answered that they would "strongly agree" or "agree" with the conference option. Three groups responded "strongly disagree," two were "neutral or undecided," and three were fairly evenly split between all five response categories.
- Other suggestions for team building included:
 1. Stipends and/or release time
 2. SB-CEUs
 3. Creation of after school clubs/groups
 4. Observation time at other districts

Question #8 asked if teachers might "prefer the option of working on unit planners on Saturday for a sub stipend instead of receiving release time during the week." Eighty percent of the groups responded that only "zero to two" people would choose this option.

Questions #9 and #10 addressed **peer mentoring**. Teachers had strong feelings about the questions in this section of the collaborative document.

- Twelve of the fifteen groups indicated that most members ("nine or more") replied in the following manner as to whether a seasoned teacher in a new teacher's content area should determine the mentor-mentee pairings: three - "strongly agree"; five - "agree"; two - "neutral or undecided"; one - "disagree"; and one - "strongly disagree."
- Six of the groups disagreed or strongly disagreed (with almost all groups indicating a response of "nine or more" members) that the principal or assistant principal(s) should decide the pairings. Seven of the groups answered that they were "neutral or undecided" or agreed (with five of those groups indicating a response of "nine or more members").
- Twelve of the fifteen groups did not support the idea that a new teacher should seek out his/her own mentor (two groups disagreed and ten strongly disagreed).
- Instructors mentioned that it would be helpful for administrators to check with them first about serving as mentors, as well as to possibly develop a

pool of volunteers that might be willing to mentor new teachers. Additional ideas are listed below.

- In terms of strengthening a peer mentor-new teacher relationship, some of the suggestions included:
 1. Share the same lunch and/or offer a common planning time.
 2. Provide SB-CEUs and/or stipends for mentors.
 3. Meet with/connect with each other at least once a week.
 4. Offer flex or release time for the mentor to observe his/her mentee, and for the new teacher to observe his/her mentor.
 5. Allow mentor and mentee to attend a conference together.
 6. Supply documentation that explains the mentor-mentee relationship, program, expectations, etc., as well as an informational/"procedure" sheet for teachers new to a particular school.

Question #11 measured teachers' interest in **participating in a "foundational cohort"** on effective curriculum and technology integration that would follow a train-the-trainer model (and involve an initial, face-to-face training period of 18 hours over three days).

- Virtually all of the groups indicated at least some type of general interest, pending more information, particularly as to the timing/scheduling of the training and how it might affect professional and personal commitments.
- Some of the groups responded with a specific number of people. Of the fifteen groups responding, a total of fifteen people indicated a definite interest.

Thanks to all participants for your helpful feedback!

Matrices Outlining Core Essentials and Electives in Years One-Four, and Available Resources and Assets (Beginning in Year Two)

Core Essentials for All Levels: Years One-Four

Level	Year One (2010-2011)	Year Two (2011-2012)	Year Three (2013-2014)	Year Four (2014-2015)
Elementary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IB • Atlas Rubicon • Model Schools • PD Brainstorming sessions and Collaborative Document • Technology: Introductory sessions on Windows 7, Office 2010, PowerSchool Studio, and Phones/Unified Communications • Easy IEP for Special Education Staff only 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PowerTeacher • Interactive Whiteboards • Digital portfolios (Adobe Acrobat) and/or Adobe Digital School Collection training with IB-certified Adobe Education Leader 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limelight • MediaCAST (digital content storage and delivery tools) • Mobi (tablets) and Student Response Systems (clickers) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inform • eCollege • Hybrid/Online Facilitator Training (online course)
Middle School	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IB • Atlas Rubicon • Model Schools • PD Brainstorming sessions and Collaborative Document • Technology: Introductory sessions on Windows 7, Office 2010, PowerSchool Studio, and Phones/Unified Communications • Easy IEP for Special Education Staff only 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limelight • Mobi (tablets) and Student Response Systems (clickers) • MediaCAST (digital content storage and delivery tools) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inform • eCollege • Hybrid/Online Facilitator Training (online course) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adobe Digital School Collection (possible training with IB-certified Adobe Education Leader)
High School	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IB • Atlas Rubicon • Model Schools • PD Brainstorming sessions and Collaborative Document • Technology: Introductory sessions on Windows 7, Office 2010, PowerSchool Studio, and Phones/Unified Communications • Easy IEP for Special Education Staff only 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limelight • Mobi (tablets) and Student Response Systems (clickers) • Hybrid/Online Facilitator Training (online course) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inform • eCollege • MediaCAST (digital content storage and delivery tools) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adobe Digital School Collection (possible training with IB-certified Adobe Education Leader)

Electives for All Levels: Years One-Four

Level	Year One (2010-2011)	Year Two (2011-2012)	Year Three (2013-2014)	Year Four (2014-2015)
Elementary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pearson Inform training for building and Central Office Administrators 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summer i3 (Foundational Cohorts) training and additional coaching and follow-up, as needed MDE's free, online offer (for one SB-CEU through October 15) for completion of the <i>21 Things for the 21st Century Educator</i> pre-survey Attendance at Alan November's speaking engagement at Clarkston Community Schools in November Participation in <i>21 Things for the 21st Century Educator</i> or <i>21 Things for the 21st Century Administrator</i> programs Rigorous coursework/training available for Master Teachers or Participant Teachers through the Intel Teach Program: "Intel Teach Essentials," "Intel Teach Thinking with Technology," and "Intel Teach Elements" Attendance at Microsoft Summer Institutes for Teacher Leaders (PBL-focused one-day sessions for individuals or three-day sessions for teams on tools for collaboration, communication, and organization) or Educational Leadership (three-day sessions for teams on process, people, and technology) Competitive opportunities for recognition and rewards via Microsoft's Innovative Education Forum (IEF) or Intel's "Schools of Distinction" program Speaking engagements at a future ISTE Conference (national conference sponsored by the International Society for Technology in Education) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Second wave of i3 (Foundational Cohorts) training and additional coaching and follow-up, as needed Participation in <i>21 Things for the 21st Century Educator</i> or <i>21 Things for the 21st Century Administrator</i> programs Rigorous coursework/training available for Master Teachers or Participant Teachers through the Intel Teach Program: "Intel Teach Essentials," "Intel Teach Thinking with Technology," and "Intel Teach Elements" Attendance at Microsoft Summer Institutes for Teacher Leaders (PBL-focused one-day sessions for individuals or three-day sessions for teams on tools for collaboration, communication, and organization) or Educational Leadership (three-day sessions for teams on process, people, and technology) Competitive opportunities for recognition and rewards via Microsoft's Innovative Education Forum (IEF) or Intel's "Schools of Distinction" program Speaking engagements at a future ISTE Conference (national conference sponsored by the International Society for Technology in Education) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DyKnow training: <i>Vision</i> student response tools, class capture functionality, collaborative learning tools, and anytime-anywhere access tools; <i>Monitor</i> classroom management software for the monitoring of hundreds of computers in wireless and wired environments via a central server design. Participation in <i>21 Things for the 21st Century Educator</i> or <i>21 Things for the 21st Century Administrator</i> programs Rigorous coursework/training available for Master Teachers or Participant Teachers through the Intel Teach Program: "Intel Teach Essentials," "Intel Teach Thinking with Technology," and "Intel Teach Elements" Attendance at Microsoft Summer Institutes for Teacher Leaders (PBL-focused one-day sessions for individuals or three-day sessions for teams on tools for collaboration, communication, and organization) or Educational Leadership (three-day sessions for teams on process, people, and technology) Competitive opportunities for recognition and rewards via Microsoft's Innovative Education Forum (IEF) or Intel's "Schools of Distinction" program Speaking engagements at a future ISTE Conference (national conference sponsored by the International Society for Technology in Education)

<p>Middle School</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pearson Inform training for building and Central Office Administrators 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summer i3 (Foundational Cohort) training and additional coaching and follow-up, as needed • MDE's free, online offer (for one SB-CEU through October 15) for completion of the <i>21 Things for the 21st Century Educator</i> pre-survey • Attendance at Alan November's speaking engagement at Clarkston Community Schools in November • Participation in <i>21 Things for the 21st Century Educator</i> or <i>21 Things for the 21st Century Administrator</i> programs • Rigorous coursework/training available for Master Teachers or Participant Teachers through the Intel Teach Program: "Intel Teach Essentials," "Intel Teach Thinking with Technology," and "Intel Teach Elements" • Attendance at Microsoft Summer Institutes for Teacher Leaders (PBL-focused one-day sessions for individuals or three-day sessions for teams on tools for collaboration, communication, and organization) or Educational Leadership (three-day sessions for teams on process, people, and technology) • Competitive opportunities for recognition and rewards via Microsoft's Innovative Education Forum (IEF) or Intel's "Schools of Distinction" program • Speaking engagements at a future ISTE Conference (national conference sponsored by the International Society for Technology in Education) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Second wave of i3 (Foundational Cohort) training and additional coaching and follow-up, as needed • Participation in <i>21 Things for the 21st Century Educator</i> or <i>21 Things for the 21st Century Administrator</i> programs • Rigorous coursework/training available for Master Teachers or Participant Teachers through the Intel Teach Program: "Intel Teach Essentials," "Intel Teach Thinking with Technology," and "Intel Teach Elements" • Attendance at Microsoft Summer Institutes for Teacher Leaders (PBL-focused one-day sessions for individuals or three-day sessions for teams on tools for collaboration, communication, and organization) or Educational Leadership (three-day sessions for teams on process, people, and technology) • Competitive opportunities for recognition and rewards via Microsoft's Innovative Education Forum (IEF) or Intel's "Schools of Distinction" program • Speaking engagements at a future ISTE Conference (national conference sponsored by the International Society for Technology in Education) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DyKnow training: <i>Vision</i> student response tools, class capture functionality, collaborative learning tools, and anytime-anywhere access tools; <i>Monitor</i> classroom management software for the monitoring of hundreds of computers in wireless and wired environments via a central server design. • Participation in <i>21 Things for the 21st Century Educator</i> or <i>21 Things for the 21st Century Administrator</i> programs • Rigorous coursework/training available for Master Teachers or Participant Teachers through the Intel Teach Program: "Intel Teach Essentials," "Intel Teach Thinking with Technology," and "Intel Teach Elements" • Attendance at Microsoft Summer Institutes for Teacher Leaders (PBL-focused one-day sessions for individuals or three-day sessions for teams on tools for collaboration, communication, and organization) or Educational Leadership (three-day sessions for teams on process, people, and technology) • Competitive opportunities for recognition and rewards via Microsoft's Innovative Education Forum (IEF) or Intel's "Schools of Distinction" program • Speaking engagements at a future ISTE Conference (national conference sponsored by the International Society for Technology in Education)
-----------------------------	--	---	--	--

<p>High School</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pearson Inform training for building and Central Office Administrators 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summer i3 (Foundational Cohort) training and additional coaching and follow-up, as needed • MDE's free, online offer (for one SB-CEU through October 15) for completion of the <i>21 Things for the 21st Century Educator</i> pre-survey • Attendance at Alan November's speaking engagement at Clarkston Community Schools in November • Participation in <i>21 Things for the 21st Century Educator</i> or <i>21 Things for the 21st Century Administrator</i> programs • Rigorous coursework/training available for Master Teachers or Participant Teachers through the Intel Teach Program: "Intel Teach Essentials," "Intel Teach Thinking with Technology," and "Intel Teach Elements" • Attendance at Microsoft Summer Institutes for Teacher Leaders (PBL-focused one-day sessions for individuals or three-day sessions for teams on tools for collaboration, communication, and organization) or Educational Leadership (three-day sessions for teams on process, people, and technology) • Competitive opportunities for recognition and rewards via Microsoft's Innovative Education Forum (IEF) or Intel's "Schools of Distinction" program • Speaking engagements at a future ISTE Conference (national conference sponsored by the International Society for Technology in Education) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Second wave of i3 (Foundational Cohort) training and additional coaching and follow-up, as needed • Participation in <i>21 Things for the 21st Century Educator</i> or <i>21 Things for the 21st Century Administrator</i> programs • Rigorous coursework/training available for Master Teachers or Participant Teachers through the Intel Teach Program: "Intel Teach Essentials," "Intel Teach Thinking with Technology," and "Intel Teach Elements" • Attendance at Microsoft Summer Institutes for Teacher Leaders (PBL-focused one-day sessions for individuals or three-day sessions for teams on tools for collaboration, communication, and organization) or Educational Leadership (three-day sessions for teams on process, people, and technology) • Competitive opportunities for recognition and rewards via Microsoft's Innovative Education Forum (IEF) or Intel's "Schools of Distinction" program • Speaking engagements at a future ISTE Conference (national conference sponsored by the International Society for Technology in Education) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DyKnow training: <i>Vision</i> student response tools, class capture functionality, collaborative learning tools, and anytime-anywhere access tools; <i>Monitor</i> classroom management software for the monitoring of hundreds of computers in wireless and wired environments via a central server design. • Participation in <i>21 Things for the 21st Century Educator</i> or <i>21 Things for the 21st Century Administrator</i> programs • Rigorous coursework/training available for Master Teachers or Participant Teachers through the Intel Teach Program: "Intel Teach Essentials," "Intel Teach Thinking with Technology," and "Intel Teach Elements" • Attendance at Microsoft Summer Institutes for Teacher Leaders (PBL-focused one-day sessions for individuals or three-day sessions for teams on tools for collaboration, communication, and organization) or Educational Leadership (three-day sessions for teams on process, people, and technology) • Competitive opportunities for recognition and rewards via Microsoft's Innovative Education Forum (IEF) or Intel's "Schools of Distinction" program • Speaking engagements at a future ISTE Conference (national conference sponsored by the International Society for Technology in Education)
---------------------------	--	---	--	--

Available Resources and Assets (Beginning in Year Two) for All Levels

Resource/Asset Name	Description/Purpose
PowerSource	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A free, online hub of learning resources described by Pearson as "a community-focused customer support portal for all Pearson School Systems products" (https://powersource.pearsonschools.com/login.action). • Some of the resources include Mastery in Minutes (short, video-based tutorials) and more comprehensive (self-paced) Distance Learning courses.
Cats' Den Community within C ² EAR	<p>Tech Resources area that includes links to the following resources about common hardware and software used by OCS' educators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Video tutorials and vignettes • FAQs and troubleshooting information • Quick reference guides, step-by-step guides and user manuals • Vendor-based teacher resource exchanges and forums • Training events and webinars • Message boards for educators
PLCs/Learning Communities within C ² EAR (within the Web 2.0 and Instructional Tools area of the Cats' Den)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Message boards, wikis and blogs for sharing of ideas and pooling of resources, plans and activities • Categorized web links according to content, age/grade level, and/or teachers' and students' levels of readiness
Microsoft Education's free software, applications, online resources, webcasts, and communities	<p>Some of the resources for familiarization with and use of Microsoft tools and products include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lesson plans, teacher guides, learning community, software and applications, webcasts, and how-to articles: http://www.microsoft.com/education/teachers/default.aspx • School of the Future: http://www.microsoft.com/Education/Schoolofthefuture/default.aspx • Career Forward, a self-contained online class for middle and high school students: http://www.microsoft.com/education/uspil/careerforward/ • Shout, a partnership between Microsoft Partners in Learning, the Smithsonian Institution, and TakingITGlobal, "connects educators with rich content, tools, expertise, and collaboration opportunities that get students to take action on global issues:": http://www.microsoft.com/education/ww/leadership/partnerships/pil/innovation/Pages/global-connections.aspx • InterroBang, "a game in which you complete real-world missions to win prizes, learn problem solving and connect with others to change the world" (for middle and high school students): http://playinterrobang.com/about
Adobe Education Exchange Resources	<p>Some of the resources for familiarization with and use of Adobe products include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Atomic Learning tutorials: http://edexchange.adobe.com/pages/home • eSeminars, live events, OnDemand seminars on Adobe PD site: http://www.adobe.com/education/resources/training/index.html • Tutorials and showcases: http://tv.adobe.com • Lesson plans, collaboration, and discussion with other educators using Adobe products: http://edexchange.adobe.com/pages/home • Digital School Collection Resources (lesson plans, digital portfolios, assessment tips): http://www.adobe.com/education/instruction/adsc/