

CHARACTERISTICS OF EFFECTIVE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT An Examination of the Developmental Designs Character Education Classroom Management Approach in Middle Grades Schools

David L. Hough

Missouri State University

More than 2,300 teachers in 241 schools across 25 states participating in a professional development approach to character education classroom management known as Development Designs 1 and Developmental Designs 2 (DD1 & DD2) were studied throughout the 2008-2009 academic school year. Data from this longitudinal program evaluation indicate that teachers implement a number of classroom management strategies at high levels only after having participated in sustained professional development provided by content experts over an extended period of time. In addition, classroom-based “coaching” was found to provide a value-added component that enhances program implementation as well as teaching and learning outcomes. Level of program implementation in high poverty schools, defined as those with 50%+ students receiving free or reduced lunches, was examined in an effort to determine relationships associated with improved student behavior, attendance, and achievement. High-poverty schools were found to meet or exceed adequate yearly progress (AYP) criteria at significantly higher rates when 75% + of their teachers implemented DD1 and DD2 for 2 or more years.

PURPOSE

A four-part program evaluation of DD1 & DD2 was conducted to examine relationships among the DD1 & DD2 character education professional development approach, teacher practice, and student/school outcomes. Central

to this evaluation is the degree to which characteristics identified as components of effective professional development are associated with levels of program implementation and sustainability. The overarching goal of the DD1 & DD2 professional development model is to develop positive character traits in

• **David L. Hough**, Dean Emeritus and Professor, College of Education, Missouri State University, Park Central Office Bldg. #207, Springfield, MO 65897. Telephone: (417) 836-8853. E-mail: DavidHough@missouristate.edu

Middle Grades Research Journal, Volume 6(3), 2011, pp. 129–143
Copyright © 2011 Information Age Publishing, Inc.

ISSN 1937-0814
All rights of reproduction in any form reserved.

students as demonstrated, taught, and monitored by teachers, staff, and administrators during special activities throughout each school day. In so doing, this approach is designed to instill values in students that will be reflected in behaviors associated with positive character traits that result in higher attendance and improved academic achievement. The objectives of multilayered evaluation are to describe the “effectiveness” of both the professional development model used and the character education classroom management approach implemented as well as to examine their respective relationships to teacher practice and student outcomes. The following research questions guided inquiry:

1. Based on the total number of educators trained in DD1 & DD2 between the beginning of the 2005-2006 academic school year and the end of the 2008-2009 academic school year, what is the relationship between level of training and implementation to academic achievement?
2. What are the most effective DD1 & DD2 professional development components as measured by changes in teacher perceptions and practices?
3. What is the relationship among DD1 & DD2 professional development and character education classroom management approaches to school climate, student behavior, attendance, and achievement?
4. How extensively do DD1 & DD2 strategies need to be implemented within middle school settings to yield measurable outcomes in teacher practice?

RELATED LITERATURE

Professional development has long been the focus of educational leaders, researchers, and policymakers with increasing interest given to better understanding of the relationship that exists between quality teaching and improved student outcomes. During the 1990s studies

began to report findings suggesting that when implemented properly, professional development benefited student learning. Successful staff development programs were often described as ongoing, job embedded, and systemic in their efforts to effect systemwide change. According to Darling-Hammond and McLaughlin (1995), successful professional development strategies were experiential, grounded in participants’ questions, collaborative among educators, connected to and derived from work with students, sustained and intensive, and linked to school goals. Overall, professional development now continues to be focused on improving student achievement. Therefore, the effectiveness of quality professional development programs must include measures of associations with positive student outcomes, including academic achievement.

Educators tend to recognize that effective teaching is not solely defined by the actions of teachers in classrooms, but by what students are able to do as a result of that teaching (Guskey, 2001). Since enactment of the No Child Left Behind legislation in 2001 that includes a requirement for “highly qualified” teachers, school districts are encouraged, if not mandated, to seek out and implement programs identified as “scientifically based” or “evidenced based” in terms of improving student achievement. Nearly \$1.5 billion in federal funds were spent on professional development efforts during the 2004-2005 academic school year (Birman et. al., 2007). Yet, in a report published by the Teaching Commission (2004) titled *Teaching at Risk: A Call to Action*, the alignment of such efforts with state and local standards have not been addressed adequately. Given both the time and financial investments in professional development and the apparent lack of alignment to standards, there continues to be discussion among researchers, school officials, and policymakers regarding the need for a “strong base of research to guide policy and practice” (Wayne, Yoon, Cronen, & Garet, 2009, p. 370).

While numerous barricades exist, it is imperative to determine direct relationships between professional development and educational programs and their impact on practice and student outcomes. Educational researchers continue to examine essential features of such program activities that impact teaching and learning (see, e.g., Garet, Porter, Desimone, Birman, & Yoon, 2001; Penuel, Fishman, Yamaguchi, & Gallagher, 2007). School-based reform initiatives and staff involvement do not guarantee schools/districts that student learning/achievement will increase. While the integration of professional development that occurs within the school tends to focus on collaborative development and active learning, successful learning is thought to occur when integrating experience, creation, solving problems, and collaborative learning. In order to achieve high levels of student understanding and achievement, teachers must first be skillful and knowledgeable in their content and methods; and schools must make the commitment to continuously support teachers' ongoing learning (Darling-Hammond, 1998). Desimone (2009) cites the research literature in support of five "critical features" that comprise effective professional development, purported to include: (1) a focus on content, (2) active learning, (3) coherence, (4) a specified duration of time, and (5) collective participation. Further, Desimone (2009) proposes a conceptual model or framework intended to guide the study of effective professional development for teachers as reflected in student outcome measures. The model suggests that professional development which is comprised of all five essential features will impact teachers' knowledge, skills, abilities, beliefs and attitudes. Such changes in teacher behavior directly impact changes in instruction, which in turn, it is hoped will improve student learning.

The outcomes-based professional development model discussions that began well over a decade ago are relevant today. According to Guskey and Sparks (1996), while many educators assume a direct relationship between staff

development and student achievement exist, few studies have presented findings that document strong, statistical significance. In addition, in their book, *A New Vision for Staff Development*, Sparks and Hirsh (1997), discuss problems with trying to link student learning exclusively to professional development. Other factors, such as district/school leadership, the application of academic standards, the quality of the curriculum, et cetera, all contribute to and influence student achievement. As a result, the National Staff Development Council first created professional development standards (Sparks, 2001) in order to provide a benchmark for program comparison and improvement.

A key to improving student achievement through professional development of teachers is to establish goals. Clear objectives should be formulated within a school system to guide staff development, utilizing student data as a resource to inform decisions. Objectives should be clearly defined, have a school-wide focus, limited in number, and achievable (Sparks, 1999). A set plan should relate current practices and establish ongoing procedures that lead to improvements in student achievement. Continuous evaluation at various levels and/or intervals should also be considered when setting such goals and procedures. These evaluations can provide information to assist in making educated decisions regarding professional development processes and effects (Guskey, 1999).

Individual teachers should be afforded opportunities to learn from fellow teachers in the same school, which encourages "constant learning" toward a larger goal (Lieberman, 1995). This type of constant learning can be fostered in various ways. Some school districts develop teams to assess the degree to which staff development is meeting the needs of teachers and to discuss changes within the school setting/system. It also provides team members with the opportunity to discuss the impact such staff development has upon addressing student needs, exchanging ideas,

etc., while building a sense of camaraderie within their school (Richardson, 2000).

In recent years, there has been a growing appreciation for the role that professional development plays and the potential impact it may have on overall school success. However, teachers, researchers and policymakers tend to indicate that the greatest challenge to implementing effective professional development is "lack of time" (Abdal-Haqq, 1996). Cook and Fine (1997) also points out that although time has emerged as the key issue in the analysis of school change, the challenge is not to find additional time within the school day, rather a more efficient use of available time may be the key. Although many policymakers see professional development as inherently "good," more does not necessarily equate to "better"; quality professional development should be implemented wisely, efficiently, and effectively (Guskey, 1999). Loucks-Horsley (1998) notes that the critical element to the success of change/reform efforts in schools relies on the people involved, the process utilized and the policies established.

METHODS

A mixed-methods design was utilized consisting of both quantitative and qualitative approaches. The evaluator met with staff from Origins in the fall 2007 to develop a four-part evaluation of the DD1 & DD2 character education classroom management professional development program. Origins is a nonprofit, fee-for-service organization headquartered in Minneapolis, MN. Origins provides services related to the development of socioemotional integrated academic learning strategies and approaches to assist elementary and middle grades teachers, staff, and administrators. The Developmental Designs approach and professional development model used to train teachers was developed by Origins in an effort to improve teaching and learning for young adolescents attending middle grades schools.

Part one of the evaluation consists of a descriptive study examining DD1 & DD2 programs operational in 241 schools across 25 states completed by 2,319 educators, mostly teachers. Origins provided the evaluator with preexisting records detailing DD1 & DD2 participation by teachers, administrators, counselors, and other school personnel from 2005 to 2008. These data were combined with 2008-2009 academic school year data as well as with web-based, school-level information accessed by the evaluator and entered into SPSS 17.0 for analysis. Multiple regression techniques were used to examine the strength of relationships among the independent and dependent variables, that is, teacher/school demographics and satisfaction with and implementation of the DD1 & DD2 approach and professional development model.

Part two consisted of an evaluation of DD1 & DD2 professional development workshops conducted during the summer 2008 at multiple locations across the United States. In all, 662 educators completed 1-week DD1 workshops, and 238 educators completed follow-up DD2 workshops, for a total of 900 educators. A survey questionnaire was developed by the evaluator in collaboration with Origins staff to determine levels of knowledge, experience, and confidence participants had with regard to the various character education classroom management strategies addressed during the summer institute. The questionnaire was formatted for use and administration at three different times: (1) on the first day of the workshop as a preworkshop questionnaire, (2) on the last day of the workshop as a postworkshop questionnaire, and (3) in February 2009, as a follow-up (during classroom implementation) workshop questionnaire. The follow-up instrument included an additional set of items that asked participants to provide information regarding their actual level of use (after 6 months' classroom teaching) of each (Developmental Designs for Middle Schools) DDMS strategy addressed during the summer workshops. Repeated measures analysis of variance techniques were used to examine differences

among groups across the three data collection time frames.

In addition, the evaluation principal investigator conducted three focus groups with seventh grade through 12th grade educators at the conclusion of three different week-long workshops at three different locations in June and July 2008. The focus group interviews followed a structured protocol that included ten leading questions, lasted 45 minutes, and were taped. The principal investigator also recorded field notes on a computer. Transcripts of the tape recordings were completed by a paralegal transcription expert, and data were content analyzed to examine emerging themes.

Part three of the evaluation focused on a subset of middle grades schools whose teachers had been implementing DD1, DD2, or both, for more than 1 year. All teachers completed two different questionnaires administered online. The first was designed to generate perceptual data regarding teacher/classroom level of implementation of DD1 & DD2 strategies. The second measured perceived school climate using a "school climate index." In addition, student, teacher, and school level data were obtained unobtrusively by the evaluator from each school's report card. All data were transferred into SPSS 17.0 for analysis. One-way ANOVA techniques were used to examine differences among the schools, and MANCOVA techniques were used to examine differences between individual schools and the entire sample with regard to levels of DD1 and DD2 implementation, school climate, and student outcomes.

Part four of the evaluation focused on 20 middle schools in a large, urban Midwestern school district. Eleven different Origins professional development facilitators conducted 15 five-day professional development workshops held July 6-10, July 13-17, and August 3-7, 2009, in the school district, during which time they demonstrated as many as 17 DD1 and 12 DD2 middle grades behavior management and academic engagement strategies. A total of 360 district educators, mostly teachers, participated in the week-long workshops—317

in DD1 and 43 in DD2. On the last day of each summer workshop, Origins professional development facilitators administered a survey questionnaire that was completed by all participants in attendance.

DATA SOURCES AND PARTICIPANTS

Data consisted of DD1 & DD2 program attendance records, web-based school demographic and descriptive data, survey questionnaires, state data files, and teacher focus group interviews. Preexisting program attendance records were used to create a profile of the population of all educators who had completed DD1 & DD2 workshops from 2005 to 2008. These data provided descriptive information pertaining to participant and school demographics.

School-level demographic and descriptive data were collected from school, district, and state web sites. These data were used to validate, cross-reference, update, and augment existing baseline data previously collected by Origins staff. School-level data collected in this manner were used throughout all three phases of the evaluation.

Preworkshop, postworkshop, and follow-up workshop questionnaires were developed by the evaluation team. Items were identical in content on all three questionnaires, albeit necessarily worded somewhat differently with regard to verb tense for each administration time frame. The follow-up questionnaire included an extra set of items pertaining to teachers' perceptions of DD1 & DD2 implementation over the course of their first 6 months teaching during the 2008-2009 academic school year. The DD1 & DD2 follow-up questionnaire is presented in the Appendix.

State data files were accessed to obtain information regarding student referrals, attendance, and state assessments. These data were obtained from publically accessible state documents either directly from each state's department of education or via school district "hard copy" data submissions. Because state assess-

ment criteria varied, a single measure of meeting or not meeting AYP was used to measure student achievement at the school level.

Focus group interview data were collected by the evaluation principal investigator on three separate occasions at three separate institutes. A total of 7, 12, and 9 participants, respectively participated in these sessions. Focus group data consisted of principal investigator field notes, tape recordings, and additional notes taken by an Origins staff member who served as a coprincipal investigator.

In January-February 2010, personnel in a large, urban Midwest school district administered follow-up program implementation questionnaires to the school district's teachers, counselors, principals, and others who had completed the DDMS1 and DDMS2 training in the summer 2009. These questionnaires were designed to generate perceptual data pertaining to the extent to which teachers and other school personnel had been implementing the various strategies addressed in the summer workshops, as well as the degree of confidence teachers have with regard to implementing these strategies.

Teacher DD1 and DD2 participation per school ranged from one to 45, with 15 or fewer participants in 17 of the 28 district middle grades schools. DD1 included 317 participants and DD2 included 43 participants. Because of these participation and group differences, comparisons were made only by random selection of 30 participants from each group. Six middle grades schools in the district represented a 30 (or fewer) to 1 ratio of students per DD1-trained teacher. This represents more than a third of all teachers in each school and two thirds of all teachers in three of the schools among this group. One school with 80% of their teachers trained produced a ratio of 22 students per trained teacher. A second school's participation rate was 71%, and a third's participation rate was 68%.

Among those trained in DD1 and DD2, 318 (88.3%) were teachers, 11 (3%) were principals, 2 (6%) were counselors, and 29 (8.1%) filled other roles such as assistant principals and

resource specialists. Just over 78% of the summer 2009 participants ($n = 282$) were female, and 288 (80%) hold master's degrees or master's degrees plus additional college hours. Participants' years in education range from 1 to over 31 with most 52.5% ($n = 189$) having 10 or fewer and 10.3% having 26 or more years' experience in education. A greater number ($n = 311$) 86.9% have been at their current school for 10 or fewer years with just over 13% having been at their current school for more than 10 years. Similar numbers are evident in terms of the number of years summer 2009 participants had been in their current positions at their schools with 322 (89.9%) having been in those positions for 10 or fewer years and 10% reporting having been in their current positions for 11 or more years.

Most participants were teaching sixth grade ($n = 105$) 29.2%, and most taught language arts ($n = 70$) 20.4%. If one adds the number of participants who teach sixth, seventh, or eighth grade ($n = 224$) to the number of participants who teach all three grade levels ($n = 73$), this represents 82.5% of all participants. Approximately two thirds of the participants teach one of the core subjects; for example, if one adds the number of participants who teach language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies ($n = 227$), this represents 66.2% of the total.

Using the above stated descriptive data it is possible to create a profile of the most common type of educator in this school district who completed Development Designs training during the summer of 2009: a female teacher with less than 10 years' experience in education who holds a master's degree and has been teaching a core subject to sixth- to eighth-grade students for fewer than 5 years at her current school. Using discriminate analysis statistical techniques it is possible to accurately identify such a participant 81% of the time.

FINDINGS

To address the first research question regarding the relationship between levels of training

and implementation to student achievement, multiple regression techniques were applied to archival school-level data from the 2005-2006, 2006-2007, and 2007-2008 academic school years in addition to additional data collected during the 2008-2009 academic school year. Discriminate analysis was also used to describe groups of schools and predict whether or not they would meet AYP. Based on the total number of educators trained in DD1 & DD2 over the multiyear period studied ($n = 2,319$) in 241 different schools across 25 states, the relationship between level of training and implementation was found to be highly correlated Pearson $r = .79$ ($p < .05$). When examined along with school size, grade spans, socioeconomic status, and percent minority students, level of participation in DD1 & DD2 accounted for 17% of the variance relative to whether or not a school met AYP during the 2008-2009 academic school year. Canonical discriminate functions accurately predicted 86% of the schools that met AYP when 75% or more of the teachers had completed DDMS2, had been implementing the character education professional development strategies for over 1.5 years, and had a high level of confidence in using 66% or more of the strategies learned during their institute training. This finding did not vary significantly with the addition of coaching as another independent variable.

To address the second research question regarding the most effective DD1 & DD2 professional development components as measured by changes in teacher perceptions and practices, both quantitative and qualitative methods were used. First, repeated measures analysis of variance was used to examine mean differences in both DD2 cohorts across the three questionnaire administration time frames: pre, post, and follow-up. Second, focus group data were content analyzed using the constant comparative method of data synthesis. Repeated measures ANOVA results found significant differences between groups in terms of duration of implementation $F(1,2308) = 13.74, p < .05$; content expertise of

the professional developer $F(1, 2311) = 11.49, p < .05$; level of school "buy-in" $F(1, 2299) = 9.88, p = .032$; alignment to school goals $F(1, 2310) = 9.72, p = .033$; application to current classroom needs $F(1, 2314) = 8.91, p = .041$; and teacher experience/congruity with practice $F(1, 2,312) = 7.94, p = .044$. Subsequent analyses of focus group data confirmed these findings as five strands or themes emerged that match the statistically significant results above. These can be delineated conceptually in narrative as follows:

In order for character education professional development to be viewed as effective by teachers,

1. The person(s) presenting the information must be expert over the content they are discussing, demonstrating, and persuading their audience to consider. Their methods are deemed to be of less value than their ability to provide expert knowledge and address questions in a professional manner, and they must present the research base on which the program is founded in a plausible way, again demonstrating mastery over the information.
2. Multiple teachers or teams of educators that may include a principal or counselor and/or other specialty personnel must show support either by attending and participating in the PD or by encouraging and taking part in the program's implementation after the training.
3. The topic, program, strategies, and/or approaches presented must be aligned to one or more school goal.
4. Practical application to current classroom needs must be evident.
5. The strategies presented must be appropriate to the background and experiences of the teachers involved.

The third research question examined the relationship among DD1 & DD2 professional development and character education classroom management approaches to student behavior, attendance, and achievement. One-

way ANOVA techniques were used to examine differences among a sample of six different schools to determine if differences exist when compared to one another and the sample in terms of behavior, attendance, and achievement. This analysis confirmed previous findings that schools with 75% or more of their teachers trained in DD2 that had been implementing the character education professional development model for more than 1.5 years did not differ significantly in the number of behavior referrals, attendance rates, or students scoring proficient on state assessments. This finding lends credence to the assumption that a sustained character education professional development model implemented schoolwide over time can produce positive student outcomes, including but not limited to higher academic achievement, regardless of socioeconomic status, percent of students on free or reduced lunch, school size, or grade configuration.

The fourth research question asked “How extensively do DD1 and DD2 strategies need to be implemented with middle school settings to yield measurable outcomes in teacher practice? Data from the large, urban Midwest school district were used to address this last question.

Professional development made operational in the initial year of implementation was found to have only limited use in most classrooms. However, when coupled with a second year of training and implementation, its impact on teachers increases significantly. Educators who took part in the DD1 and DD2 professional development workshops during the summer 2009 reported a high level of satisfaction for the training they received as well as high levels of confidence in implementing DD1 strategies and practices about which they learned. Even so, DD1 participants’ confidence levels decreased from the summer 2009 to spring 2010 while DD2 participants’ confidence levels increased over the same period of time. Because most all ratings from teacher participants are relatively high, it would be of value to determine the specific reasons. One

might assume that DD1 is of only limited benefit until the second year of DD2 training and implementation. If the high level of satisfaction is due, in part, to extended practical application of strategies and practices that can be used in proactive ways in classrooms to improve student behavior and learning outcomes while instilling positive character traits, then policies supporting continual implementation should be addressed.

Teachers found DD1 and DD2 training to be of great value and left their respective summer workshops feeling confident they could implement what they had learned in their classrooms throughout the 2009-2010 academic school year. Levels of implementation were high for DD1 and DD2 but noticeably more for the DD2 participants. As one might expect, confidence and implementation were generally related; however, only after DD2 training and a second year of implementation did DD1 confidence increase.

The 43 DD2 participants who had completed DD1 training the prior year noted that almost 50% ($n = 22$) had participated in school-based DD1 professional development the prior year on average 6 times (ranging from 2 to 12 times). In addition, 33 DD2 participants noted they had received coaching with an average of five classroom visits by a coach during the 2008-2009 academic school year (with a range of 3 to 9 visits). Five respondents reported having received coaching from a Developmental Design “coach,” 19 reported having received coaching from school district staff, and seven reported having received coaching from both a Developmental Designs coach and school district personnel.

In all but one of the 12 categories of practices and strategies, “circle of power and respect,” common to both DD1 and DD2, teachers’ confidence levels decreased. Cohen’s d effect sizes ranged from .03 to .77. Caution must be taken when attempting to make comparisons between the groups because of the size differences; however, both groups rate “circle of power and respect” as the practice they implement most: DD1 respon-

dents $M = 4.06$, $s = 1.30$ and DD2 respondents $M = 4.83$, $s = .64$; with a mean difference of .77. DD2 respondents rate their levels of implementation higher on each of the 15 DD1 practices and strategies than do DD1 respondents. These mean differences range from .21 to 1.25, with 12 mean differences at .50 or higher. DD1 respondents' implementation means also include much greater variability than do DD2 respondents.

Confidence levels increased in all but one area, that is to say, the DD1 practice identified as "plan-work-reflect (PWR)." Confidence in utilizing the "buddy room" and implementing the "circle of power and respect," were the two DD1 strategies where confidence rose the most with mean differences of .55 and .54, respectively. The greatest gain in confidence among the DD2 practices and strategies is in the area of utilizing "social interaction" with a summer 2009 mean of 4.03 and a spring 2010 mean of 4.57, producing a mean difference of .54. Similar findings can be seen for "exploratory modeling," and "reflection."

Schools choosing to utilize the DD1 and DDS2 approaches to classroom management and academic engagement via character education should invest in at least two years of training and coaching to maximize program potential. Both the second year of training and implementation are critical if teachers are to master strategies and become confident in implementing them. At a minimum 60% of teachers in any given school should be trained in both DD1 and DD2 to achieve significant positive student results schoolwide. Outcome measures to be examined should include attendance, behavior, and achievement. Support staff and administrators should join teachers in acquiring DD1 and DD2 skills, so they can use the same strategies in all school settings.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

While previous scholarship regarding theorized components of effective professional development based in large part on conven-

tional wisdom may hold many truths, this study supports recent research and demonstrates how five components identified herein were operationalized in ways that produced effective professional development: (1) content experts demonstrating mastery, (2) expert discussions and understanding of research-based applications, (3) support from the entire school community, (4) topic alignment to school goal(s), and (5) practical application to current classroom needs. Moreover, three factors were found to be in place that were positively related to effective professional development resulting in positive teaching and learning outcomes: (1) the professional development per se must be sustained for at least two years and (2) implemented in the classroom for more than 1.5 years with (3) 75% or more of teachers in the school participating.

When these professional development components are in place, the character education classroom management model studied was found to impact teaching and learning in positive ways. Teachers were found to base classroom management approaches on research-based strategies and incorporated these strategies into everyday instructional methods. When this is accomplished by 75% or more of teachers in any given elementary or middle grades school (or a combination of both, say in an elemiddle school setting) for more than 1.5 years, statistically significant improvements in behavior, attendance, and achievement can be documented.

Providing research-based evidence for character education programs that improve school climate adds much to the existing body of knowledge on this topic, as well. Character education has been linked to school climate which, in turn, has been associated with positive behavior, improved attendance, and higher academic achievement as measured by various state assessments.

Previous research indicates that other factors such as school size, socioeconomic, and percent of minority students account for much of the variance in many educational initiatives. Findings from this study do not confirm those

assertions, albeit that was not an area of study herein, given that all schools examined were considered high poverty sites. For example, since research indicates that school climate and student performance are positively related, we would expect larger schools (with lower climate scores) to have poorer student performance. These patterns were not found in the data generated in the schools studied here.

EDUCATIONAL IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

The relationships among character education professional development, classroom practice, and the student outcomes studied here, that is, student behavior, attendance, and achievement; along with school climate are of importance to educators, policymakers, and researchers. Mediating effects of school size, socioeconomic status, percent of students classified as minorities, et al. variables were found to be of less importance when studying these relationships. This dispels beliefs that minority children living in poverty and attending large schools cannot become successful. By implementing school- and teacher-driven character education professional development at high levels over an extended period of time, high poverty schools can succeed. This is not to say that improving conditions in schools is not important; to the contrary, improving conditions in schools is imperative, and one now documented way to achieve this is through effective professional development focused on character education as a model for classroom management and instructional support.

Teachers should be encouraged to sustain their focused professional development for a minimum of 2 years and implement strategies for 1.5+ years. Policymakers should develop incentives for teachers to accomplish both of these goals related to involvement and implementation. Researchers should test the new two-pronged theory of effective professional development posited here to determine the validity and relative merits of each. If the

development prong of professional improvement must be coupled with a sustained implementation prong based on new research-based strategies and approaches, then educational practice may be in need of fundamental change to bring about the type of schoolwide reform envisioned by most stakeholders. In sum, high poverty school communities should have reason to develop more optimistic and realistic views for achieving school success as measured by AYP criteria through renewed professional development efforts focused on character education classroom management and instructional support.

REFERENCES

- Abdal-Haqq, I. (1996). *Making time for teacher professional development*. Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teaching and Teacher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED400259)
- Birman, B., Le Flock, K. C., Klekotka, A., Ludwig, M., Talor, J., Walters, K. et. al. (2007). *State and local implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act: Vol. 2. Teacher quality under NCLB: Interim report*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education; Office of Planning, Evaluation, and Policy Development; Policy and Program Studies Services.
- Cook, C. J., & Fine, C. (1997). Finding time for professional development. *Pathways to school improvement*. Retrieved from <http://www.ncrel.org/sdrs/areas/issues/educatrs/profdev/pd300.htm>
- Desimone, L. M. (2009). Improving impact studies of teachers' professional development: Toward better conceptualizations and measures. *Educational Researcher*, 38(3), 181-199.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (1998). Teacher learning that supports student learning. *Educational Leadership*, 55(5), 6-12. Retrieved from <http://www.ascd.org/frameedlead.html>
- Darling-Hammond, L., & McLaughlin, M. W. (1995). Policies that support professional development in an era of reform. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 76, 597-604.
- Garet, M. S., Porter, A.C., Desimone, L.M., Birman, B. & Yoon, K.S. (2001). What makes professional development effective? Analysis of a

- national sample of teachers. *American Educational Research Journal*, 38(3), 915-945.
- Guskey, T. R. (1999). Apply time with wisdom. *Journal of Staff Development*, 20. Retrieved from <http://www.nsd.org/educatorindex.htm>
- Guskey, T. R. (2001). Use test results as tools to improve teaching [Electronic version]. *Education Digest*, 66, 25-29.
- Guskey, T. R., & Sparks, D. (1996). Exploring the relationship between staff development and improvements in student learning. *Journal of Staff Development*, 17. Retrieved from <http://www.nsd.org/educatorindex.htm>
- Lieberman, A. (1995). *Practices that support teacher development: Transforming conceptions of professional learning*. Retrieved from http://www.ehr.nsf.gov/REC/publications/NSF_EF/lieber.htm
- Loucks-Horsley, S. (1998). Managing change: An integrated part of staff development. In S. Caldwell (Ed.), *Staff development: A handbook of effective practices*. Retrieved from http://www.enc.org/professional/learn/change/resources/readings/document.shtm?input=ACQ-137039-7039_001
- Penuel, W. R., Fishman, B., Yamaguchi, R., & Gallagher, L. P. (2007). What makes professional development effective? Strategies that foster curriculum implementation. *American Educational Research Journal*, 44(4), 921-958.
- Richardson, J. (2000). Learning benefits everyone. *Journal of Staff Development*, 21, 1-12
- Sparks, D., & Hirsh S. (1997). A clear, coherent plan. In *A new vision for staff development* (pp. 24-33). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Sparks, D. (1999). The singular power of one goal: interview with Emily Calhoun. *Journal of Staff Development*, 20, 1-6.
- Sparks, D. (2001, May). NSDC revises staff development standards. *Results*. Retrieved from <http://www.nsd.org/educatorindex.htm>
- Teaching Commission. (2004). *Teaching at risk: A call to action*. New York, NY: Author.
- Wayne, A. J., Yoon, K. S., Zhu, P., Cronen, S., & Garet, M. S. (2008). Experimenting with teacher professional development: Motives and methods. *Educational Researcher*, 37(8) 469-479.

APPENDIX: DD1 & DD2 FOLLOW-UP SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

DD1 & DD2

Follow-Up Implementation Questionnaire

The following survey aims to assess teacher perceptions of their professional development and implementation of Developmental Designs. The survey questionnaire responses are confidential, and responses will only be shared in combination with others.

Descriptive Information

(Please place an X in the appropriate box and/or supply information as requested.)

1. Name of your school: _____
2. What is your current position?

<input type="checkbox"/> Classroom Teacher	<input type="checkbox"/> Principal	<input type="checkbox"/> Counselor
<input type="checkbox"/> Other: <i>Please explain</i> _____		
3. What is the highest level of education you have completed? (Please indicate only one choice)

<input type="checkbox"/> Bachelor	<input type="checkbox"/> Bachelors + additional graduate hours
<input type="checkbox"/> Masters	<input type="checkbox"/> Masters + additional graduate hours
<input type="checkbox"/> Specialist	<input type="checkbox"/> PhD/EdD

4. What is your gender: Female Male
5. How many years have you been employed as a professional educator? _____ # of years
6. How many years have you worked at the school where you are currently employed?
_____ # of years
7. How many years have you been in your current position at this school? _____ # of years
- (Please answer this question with regard to your answer in Question 2, even if the grade levels you now teach have changed from those in the past.)*
8. If you are a classroom teacher, what grade(s) do you currently teach? (Circle all that apply.)
4th 5th 6th 7th 8th N/A
9. Please indicate all subjects or content areas you currently teach.
- _____
- _____
- _____

Developmental Designs

For Question 10, please indicate the practices and strategies you have implemented as a result of DDMS2 training. Please circle the number that most appropriately represents your level of implementation during the current school year.

10. I have implemented the following DD2 practices and strategies ...

<i>DD2 Practices and Strategies</i>	<i>Not at All</i>							<i>Don't Know</i>
a. Reflective language that bridges & probes	0	1	2	3	4	5	DK	
b. Expert input—teacher has kids reading related material	0	1	2	3	4	5	DK	
c. Kids making choices	0	1	2	3	4	5	DK	
d. Social interaction between students	0	1	2	3	4	5	DK	
e. Active experience	0	1	2	3	4	5	DK	
f. Students present work to other(s)	0	1	2	3	4	5	DK	
g. Any kind of reflection	0	1	2	3	4	5	DK	
h. Teachers providing kids opportunities to make connections	0	1	2	3	4	5	DK	
i. Exploratory modeling	0	1	2	3	4	5	DK	
j. Y charts	0	1	2	3	4	5	DK	
k. Rules posted	0	1	2	3	4	5	DK	
l. Quality controls (e.g. checklists, “have to’s,” etc.)	0	1	2	3	4	5	DK	
m. ALL DD2 practices and strategies combined	0	1	2	3	4	5	DK	

For Question 11, please indicate the practices and strategies you have implemented as a result of DD1 training. Please circle the number that most appropriately represents your level of implementation during the current school year.

11. I have implemented the following DD1 practices and strategies ...

<i>DD1 Practices and Strategies</i>	<i>Not at All</i>					<i>Very Little</i>					<i>Extensively</i>					<i>Don't Know</i>
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
a. Circle of power and respect (CPR)	1	2	3	4	5	DK										
b. Teachers noticing rule breaking	1	2	3	4	5	DK										
c. Redirecting for small things (e.g. rules, routines, side conversations, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5	DK										
d. Take a break	1	2	3	4	5	DK										
e. Loss of privilege	1	2	3	4	5	DK										
f. Repair damage created by student mistakes	1	2	3	4	5	DK										
g. Buddy room	1	2	3	4	5	DK										
h. Fix-it plans	1	2	3	4	5	DK										
i. Descriptive nonjudgmental language	1	2	3	4	5	DK										
j. Problem-solving social conference	1	2	3	4	5	DK										
k. Behavior contracts	1	2	3	4	5	DK										
l. Problem solving conflict resolution	1	2	3	4	5	DK										
m. Modeling and practicing routines	1	2	3	4	5	DK										
n. Reflective loop/plan-work-reflect (PWR)	1	2	3	4	5	DK										
o. All DD1 practices and strategies combined	1	2	3	4	5	DK										

For Questions 12-13, please circle the number that most appropriately expresses your opinions regarding the degree of confidence you now have in implementing the following practices and strategies of DD2 and your degree of confidence in implementing DD1 practices and strategies.

12. How confident are you in implementing the following DD2 practices and strategies?

<i>DD2 Practices and Strategies</i>	<i>Less Confident</i>					<i>Most Confident</i>					<i>Don't Know</i>
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
a. Reflective language that bridges & probes	1	2	3	4	5	DK					
b. Expert input—teacher has kids reading related material	1	2	3	4	5	DK					
c. Kids making choices	1	2	3	4	5	DK					
d. Social interaction between students	1	2	3	4	5	DK					
e. Active experience	1	2	3	4	5	DK					
f. Students present work to other(s)	1	2	3	4	5	DK					
g. Any kind of reflection	1	2	3	4	5	DK					
h. Teachers providing kids opportunities to make connections	1	2	3	4	5	DK					
i. Exploratory modeling	1	2	3	4	5	DK					
j. Y charts	1	2	3	4	5	DK					

17c. If “Yes,” how important do you believe coaching has been as a professional development approach for helping you implement DD2 practices and strategies?

Less Important *Most Important*
 1 2 3 4 5

18. Do you want more support in implementing DD2 practices through coaching? Yes No

19. When did you participate in DD1 training? Month: _____ Year: _____

20a. After completing the DD1 training, did you participate in school-based professional development focused on DD1 practices and strategies? Yes No

20b. If “Yes,” how many times did you attend staff meetings and/or staff development workshops related to DD1? _____ # times

21. Have you participated in DDMS1 coaching? Yes No

22a. Do you want more support in implementing DD1 practices through coaching? Yes No

22b. If “Yes,” how many times did a coach visit your classroom? _____ # times

22c. If “Yes,” how important do you believe “coaching” has been as a professional development approach for helping you implement DD1 practices and strategies?

Less Important *Most Important*
 1 2 3 4 5

23. Comments regarding DD1 or DD2 (use back if necessary):

Thank you for taking time to complete this follow-up implementation questionnaire designed to ascertain your perceptions regarding the Developmental Designs approach and its impact on school/classroom climate and student outcomes. If you have any questions concerning this evaluation or this survey, please feel free to contact the principal investigator, per the attached information.