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INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE

The professional development system for Adult Basic and Literacy Education (ABLE) in Ohio has been evolving over the past several years in a process of continuous improvement for the benefit of ABLE practitioners and programs. Evaluation is an important component of this process for three reasons: 1) it can provide information on the effectiveness of specific professional development offerings, 2) it can help professional development facilitators improve their offerings, and 3) it can help inform professional development consumers in selecting appropriate trainings to improve their program’s performance. To fully integrate evaluation into the design of the Ohio ABLE professional development system, a cohesive evaluation model is required.

To this end, the ABLE Evaluation and Design Project at The Ohio State University has incorporated the collaborative work of ABLE professionals throughout the state to develop a conceptual model for evaluating professional development. Sponsored by the Ohio Board of Regents ABLE office (OBR ABLE), the result of this work is the Ohio ABLE Professional Development Evaluation Framework – a multi-tiered model that collects data on participant satisfaction, learning gains, and behavior changes related to professional development, as well as the impact of professional development on ABLE programs.

The purpose of this report is to provide an overview of the proposed framework and information on its multi-tiered design. The report describes the different levels of evaluation, defines their purpose, suggests appropriate evaluation methods, identifies who should be responsible for conducting the evaluations, and explains the utility of the evaluation results. This information is followed by a conclusions summary regarding the implementation of the framework within context of the current ABLE professional development system in Ohio.

METHODOLOGY

The proposed evaluation framework for professional development is the culmination of years of collaborative effort among ABLE professionals throughout the state, including the ABLE Resource Center Network, OSU ABLE Evaluation and Design Project, and OBR ABLE state office. The framework was designed in context of the focus on continuous improvement in the Ohio ABLE system and the state’s adoption of the K-12 professional development standards. Previous research conducted by the staff of the OSU Evaluation and Design Project (2008, 2009) provides a theoretical foundation for the proposed framework.
The model draws heavily from the work of Donald Kirkpatrick’s classic system for evaluating industry training (2006), as well as Thomas Guskey’s framework for evaluating professional development of K-12 educators (1998, 2002). Aspects of both multi-tiered paradigms were synthesized into the design of the proposed framework. The model also integrates the research of Christine Smith and Marilyn Gillespie on effective professional development for ABLE practitioners (2007) and Smith’s conceptualization of the types of knowledge needed to improve teacher quality (2010).

Work for this report included an examination of all current professional development offerings in the Ohio ABLE system, as well as a review of the instruments used to evaluate professional development. Sample evaluation instruments and other material pertinent to the research of this report are included in the Appendix.
Ohio ABLE Professional Development Evaluation Framework
The proposed framework for evaluating professional development in the Ohio ABLE system is a multi-tiered model consisting of the following four levels:

- **Level 1: Satisfaction**
  - Evaluation of participants’ initial reaction to professional development

- **Level 2: Learning**
  - Evaluation of the knowledge and skills that participants acquire through professional development

- **Level 3: Behavior**
  - Evaluation of participants’ application of knowledge and skills learned through professional development

- **Level 4: Impact**
  - Evaluation of the effect that professional development has had upon student and program performance

Figure 1:
Ohio ABLE Professional Development Evaluation Framework
Multi-Tier Design
Beginning with the first level of evaluation (satisfaction), each subsequent level provides a higher degree of evidence regarding the effectiveness of a professional development offering. It is assumed that latter levels of evaluation will be preceded by the former. For example, in order to fully analyze an evaluation of behavior change among participants (Level 3), it is important to consider how well they were able to learn the content (Level 2) and whether their reactions to the training were positive or negative (Level 1). In this way, the lower levels of evaluation will inform the results of the higher levels.

It is not assumed, however, that all professional development offerings will be examined at all four levels of evaluation. While every offering should be evaluated at Level 1, some may not lend themselves to evaluations of learning (Level 2), behavior (Level 3), or impact (Level 4). The latter levels of evaluation are increasingly complex and difficult to implement. Discretion will be needed by the evaluator in deciding which levels to apply. Evaluating at all four levels is ideal but is not always possible.

Trainer Continuum
It is the responsibility of the providers of professional development trainings to conduct the evaluations described in the proposed evaluation framework. Providers who conduct ABLE trainings throughout a region of the state are aptly suited to conduct evaluations at Levels 1 and 2; the relative straightforwardness of satisfaction and learning evaluations make them suitable to administer to large groups of people.

There is overlap, however, between providers and local programs at the higher levels of evaluation – especially when professional development is provided internally by the program. For Level 3, program administrators may be best suited to evaluate changes in behavior and performance among teachers and staff. For Level 4, trainers external to the programs often will not have access to the type of program outcome data necessary to adequately judge impact; as such, these evaluations can be conducted at the local level, by state ABLE staff, or by an external evaluator.

Participant Continuum
The proposed evaluation framework collects data on the effects of professional development for both individual participants and local programs. The first three levels gather evidence of satisfaction, learning, and changes in behavior among individual participants. Between Levels 3 and 4, this emphasis shifts from individual results to changes that can be measured at the program level. At Level 4 – the highest level of evaluation in the proposed framework – the focus is exclusively on the impact of professional development on program performance.
The following key concepts are integral to the design of the proposed Ohio ABLE Professional Development Evaluation Framework:

**Measurable Evaluation Objectives**
It is crucial that providers of professional development who conduct evaluations define the desired outcomes prior to the trainings. These outcomes need to be quantified and measurable to accurately assess the strengths and weaknesses of the professional development. Such measurable evaluation objectives should be created for all four levels of evaluation.

**Data-Informed Decision Making**
Providers of professional development can use evaluation results to improve and refine their current offerings. They can also use these data to inform their creation of future offerings.

Local ABLE programs can utilize the results of these evaluations to identify which professional development offerings were the most and least effective for their administrators, teachers, and staff. This information can help programs in selecting which professional trainings to pursue each year as part of their continuous improvement.

In accordance with Standard 6.5 of the Ohio ABLE and K-12 professional development standards, these data can also be analyzed at a macro level to evaluate the overall professional development process in the Ohio ABLE system.

**Proof versus Evidence**
According to both Guskey (1998) and Kirkpatrick (2006), it is exceedingly difficult to prove the impact of professional development. In order to do so, one would need to control for all other factors that may influence the results. While both authors suggest applying an experimental evaluation design when possible (i.e., comparing results of experimental vs. control groups), both concede that this approach is often impractical to implement.

In the absence of proof, the value of professional development evaluation is measured by the quality of evidence that it provides. This evidence can be used by training providers toward improving their current trainings and designing new offerings. As consumers of professional development, it can also be used by local program administrators, teachers, and staff to inform their selection of offerings. Therefore, the goal of the proposed evaluation framework is to collect the strongest possible evidence regarding the effectiveness of professional development in terms of satisfaction, learning, behavior, and impact.
LEVEL 1: SATISFACTION

Description
Level 1 evaluations concern participants’ immediate response to a professional development activity. In accordance with the Ohio ABLE and K-12 professional development standards, this level of evaluation is aligned with Standard 6.1 (PD is evaluated by assessing levels of participant satisfaction and learning of content). It is currently the most common form of evaluation for professional development in the Ohio ABLE system and is the easiest to administer.

Purpose
The purpose of the first level of evaluation is to collect evidence regarding the extent to which participants were satisfied with a professional development offering. Such evaluations often prompt participants to provide feedback in one or more of the following areas:

- **Content:** The relevance, utility, clarity, value, difficulty, and importance of the subject matter presented
- **Process:** The quality of the instruction, activities, materials, and technology of the training, including the quality of the facilitator
- **Context:** The appropriateness of the setting, facilities, and accommodations of the professional development experience
- **Awareness:** The extent to which participants were aware of the purpose and goals of the professional development prior to the training

Methodology
The standard survey instruments created by the OSU ABLE Evaluation and Design Project for ABLE trainings and conferences are appropriate for collecting most Level 1 evaluation data. These instruments can be modified to suit the needs of the various types of professional development offerings in the Ohio ABLE system. A sample is included in Appendix A of this report.

It is preferable to administer these evaluations immediately following the conclusion of the professional development event. This will help to minimize the time between the participants’ experience and their reaction to the experience, which is optimal for the collection of Level 1 data.

To encourage honest feedback, reaction evaluations should be anonymous. It is important to inform the participants that the survey will not collect identifying information in order to prevent individuals from being identified by their individual responses.
Responsibility
Providers of professional development in the Ohio ABLE system should conduct Level 1 evaluation for all professional development offerings.

Utility
The data collected from Level 1 evaluations can be used to:

- **Improve current professional development offerings**
  Quantitative satisfaction data can be used to establish baselines of performance for elements of the training that are continuously evaluated. Subsequent reaction data can then be measured against the baseline to show whether participant satisfaction has increased, decreased, or remained the same.

- **Improve methods for building awareness of professional development offerings**
  Level 1 data can provide information on how well participants understood the purpose and goals of the professional development prior to the training. These results can be used to improve the methods used to communicate these trainings to the field.

- **Inform the creation of future professional development offerings**
  Level 1 data can be used to identify additional training needs of the participants, which can help inform the development of future offerings.

- **Provide foundation for higher levels of evaluation**
  Level 1 data can help explain the success or failure of professional development at subsequent evaluation levels. It is important that participants are highly satisfied with the professional development, as this may affect knowledge transfer (Level 2), participants’ implementation of the training (Level 3), and the overall impact of the training on student and program performance (Level 4).
LEVEL 2: LEARNING

Description
Level 2 evaluations concern the knowledge and skills learned by participants as a result of professional development. In accordance with the Ohio ABLE and K-12 professional development standards, this level of evaluation is aligned with Standard 6.1 (*PD is evaluated by assessing levels of participant satisfaction and learning of content*). These are currently conducted with many of the professional development offerings in the Ohio ABLE system, though to a lesser extent than Level 1. Comparatively, Level 2 evaluations are more difficult to conduct than those of the previous level.

Purpose
The purpose of the second level of evaluation is to collect evidence regarding changes in participants’ knowledge, skill, or attitudes that can be attributed to professional development. The knowledge, skill, or attitudes that are to be measured must be defined by the training provider prior to the event.

Methodology
The standard survey instrument created by the OSU ABLE Evaluation and Design Project can be modified to include general items regarding changes in knowledge, skill, and attitudes that participants may have experienced as the result of a training. These items could be presented as statements and employ a Likert-type scale that would allow respondents to indicate the degree to which they agreed or disagreed with the statements.

However, to evaluate the success or failure of pre-defined learning objectives tied to specific training content, a separate evaluation instrument likely will be needed in the form of a learning assessment. Assessment questions can be created by the training facilitator based on the pre-defined learning objectives of the training. These assessments can be administered immediately following the conclusion of the professional development event. They can also be administered afterward after a certain period of time (a week to a month) in order to assess knowledge retention. Possible assessment instruments include:

- Pre/post assessments administered before and after the training
- Multiple-choice/matching/fill-in-the-blank assessments

Activities that allow participants to demonstrate knowledge or model skills can also be used as Level 2 assessments. Examples of such activities that are currently incorporated into the ABLE professional development system include reflective papers and lesson plans. For such activities, it is recommended that the training facilitator create a rubric to uniformly evaluate the results.
While anonymity does not apply to most Level 2 evaluations, it is important for the participants to be informed in advance as to how the results of the evaluations will be used and the extent to which their responses will be confidential.

Sample survey instrumentation for Level 2 is included in Appendix B of this report.

**Responsibility**
Providers of professional development in the Ohio ABLE system should conduct Level 2 evaluations for all professional development trainings that lend themselves to learning assessments. This applies to the majority of the professional development offerings that are currently available.

**Utility**
The data collected from Level 2 evaluations can be used to:

- **Confirm the effectiveness of professional development offerings**
  Learning evaluations offer evidence as to whether the participants were able to acquire new knowledge or skills as a result of a training.

- **Provide foundation for higher levels of evaluation**
  Level 2 data can help explain the success or failure of professional development at subsequent evaluation levels. The extent to which participants are able to learn from a professional development training is crucial to how successful they will be in implementing what they have learned (Level 3) and using it to improve student and program performance (Level 4).
LEVEL 3: Behavior

Description
Level 3 evaluations concern the application of the knowledge and skills that participants learned from their participation in professional development. In accordance with the Ohio ABLE and K-12 professional development standards, this level of evaluation is aligned with Standard 6.2 (*PD is evaluated by evidence of new skills applied to practice*). While all professional development can be evaluated at Level 3, such evaluations must allow participants adequate time to implement what they have learned into practice. As such, these evaluations must be conducted at a point in time after a training event. Because of the necessary time delay, Level 3 evaluations are less common and more difficult to conduct than those of the previous two levels.

Purpose
The purpose of the third level of evaluation is to collect evidence that participants have implemented what they have learned through their professional development training. This type of evaluation focuses on changes in behavior that have developed among the participants as a result of the professional development. The changes that are to be measured must be defined by the training provider prior to the event.

Methodology
It is unlikely that a universal survey instrument could adequately address all of the various types of trainings and content that can be evaluated at Level 3. Instead, behavior evaluations must rely more upon an evaluation process rather than a single evaluation instrument. As such, Level 3 evaluations should have the following procedural elements:

- Define the behavior objectives of the training
  The provider of the professional development should define which behaviors the training is attempting to increase, decrease, or otherwise modify as a result of the training.

- Specify dimensions of quality and quantity for the behavior objectives
  In defining the behavior objectives, the provider should define the criteria for measures of desirable behavior including the frequency with which the behaviors should take place.

- Determine time duration between training and evaluation
  Since participants need time to plan and reflect on how to implement knowledge and skills gained through a training, providers will need to decide how long to wait before evaluating the success or failure of implementation. Depending on the complexity of the behavior objectives, this delay could range from one week to three months. Providers may also consider conducting a second round of evaluation within six months of the training as a follow-up to the initial evaluation.
**Determine methods of evaluation**

The training provider will need to decide upon one or more evaluation methods to utilize for evaluating changes in behavior. Possible methods include:

- Onsite observations of participants
- Written descriptions of implementation process by participants (reflective journals, portfolios, etc.)
- Follow-up interviews with participants
- Self-reporting evaluations on implementation

Similar to Level 2, anonymity typically does not apply to evaluations conducted at Level 3. It is still important, however, to inform the participants in advance about how the results of these evaluations will be used and the extent to which their responses will be confidential.

A summary of various Level 3 evaluation questions and topics to explore is included in Appendix C of this report.

**Responsibility**

Providers of professional development in the Ohio ABLE system should conduct Level 3 evaluations for professional development offerings that lend themselves to being evaluated at one or more points in time after an initial training event. This type of evaluation demands more time and resources than do those of the previous levels, so providers will need to be practical in prioritizing which training programs should receive evaluations at Level 3. In some cases, local program administrators might be best suited to conduct internal evaluations regarding changes in behavior among teachers and staff. It may also be appropriate for state ABLE staff to facilitate certain methods of evaluation (e.g., onsite observations).

**Utility**

The data collected from Level 3 evaluations can be used to:

- **Confirm the effectiveness of professional development offerings**
  
  Level 3 evaluations offer evidence as to whether participants are able to take what they have learned from professional development and use it to change their practice.

- **Inform ABLE programs regarding their selection of professional development**
  
  The results of Level 3 evaluations can help program administrators, teachers, and staff judge the effectiveness of the professional development in which they participated, which may help inform their future selections.
• **Provide foundation for Level 4 evaluation**
  The extent to which participants can implement what they have learned is crucial to understanding how professional development can be used to improve student and program performance at Level 4.

---

**LEVEL 4: IMPACT**

**Description**
Level 4 evaluations concern the improvement of student and program outcomes that can be attributed to professional development. In accordance with the Ohio ABLE and K-12 professional development standards, this level of evaluation is aligned with Standard 6.3 (*PD is evaluated by the extent to which organizations change to improve*) and Standard 6.4 (*PD is evaluated on its impact on achievement of all students*). Impact evaluations are the most complex and difficult to implement.

**Purpose**
The purpose of the forth level of evaluation is to collect evidence showing that professional development has had a positive impact on the outcomes of ABLE programs and their students. Both the outcomes and the criteria by which they are measured should be defined prior to the training.

**Methodology**
Similar to Level 3, it is unlikely that a universal survey instrument could adequately address all of the various types of trainings and content that can be evaluated at Level 4. As such, evaluation of improvement at the program level must rely more upon an evaluation process rather than a single evaluation instrument.

Furthermore, Level 4 evaluation will likely rely on existing data sources. It could be the case that administrators have a variety of in-house approaches for recording and tracking data useful to judge program-level improvement as a result of the professional development of the staff. Existing data sources that could be utilized for Level 4 evaluations include:

- ABLELink data
- Record of Accomplishment section of the Individual Professional Development Plan (IPDP)
- Program Professional Development Plan (PPDP)
- Local Program Desk Review
- Local Program Data Quality Checklist (staff training)
A more rigorous form of impact research would involve rolling-out a specific professional development offering on a staggered basis and then comparing the program outcomes associated with the trained participants versus those that have yet to be trained. This type of longitudinal tracking may be possible for professional development offerings that are implemented as multi-site, multi-year initiatives.

A summary of various Level 4 evaluation questions and topics to explore is included in Appendix D of this report.

**Responsibility**
Local programs can conduct Level 4 evaluations for professional development offerings that they have identified as a means for improving specific program outcomes. It is possible that this type of internal evaluation process could be integrated into the instrumentation of the PPDP form (refer to Appendix D for an example of a PPDP form that has been modified accordingly). For complex, systemic research on the impact of multi-year professional development on ABLE program outcomes and student achievement, the state ABLE staff and training providers could collaborate to evaluate professional development impact. In some cases, an external evaluator may be required.

**Utility**
The data collected from Level 4 evaluations can be used to:

- **Confirm the effect of professional development on ABLE students and programs**
  Impact evaluations offer evidence as to the effect of professional development on the outcomes of ABLE students and programs.

- **Inform ABLE programs regarding their selection of professional development**
  Evaluation at Level 4 can help ABLE administrators, teachers, and staff discern the relationship between their choice of professional development and its subsequent impact on their program.
General

- Upon reviewing the existing evaluation instruments currently used in the Ohio ABLE professional development system, it is clear that a standard evaluation instrument will suffice for most Level 1 evaluations. However, given the wide range of training formats and content, it is also apparent that a universal instrument approach will be inadequate for Levels 2, 3, and 4. As evaluation progresses to the higher levels in the framework, evaluators will need to customize one or several evaluation instruments based on the contextual qualities of professional development that they are evaluating.

- For Levels 3 and 4, documenting behavior change and impact may require more than administering self-reporting survey instruments. For this reason, evaluation at the higher levels of the framework may rely more on processes of evaluation rather than specific survey instruments.

- Providers of professional development should become accustomed to establishing measurable evaluation objectives during the design phase of professional development. The providers should know which outcomes they will be evaluating before the professional development training is implemented.

- All professional development evaluation should include some type of quantifiable data for aggregate analysis. Comparatively, the value of evaluations that collect only qualitative comments is limited.

Level 1: Satisfaction

- Most professional development offerings in the Ohio ABLE system currently employ satisfaction evaluations using the survey instrument created by the OSU ABLE Evaluation and Design project.

- This standard satisfaction survey instrument could be revised to reflect Christine Smith’s recommendation to assess participants’ awareness of the goals of a professional development offering prior to the training.

Level 2: Learning

- Learning assessments are currently used with some types of professional development such as the New Staff Orientation training module. Since these can be conducted at the time of the training, this is a feasible method of evaluation that could be extended to more professional development trainings with little difficulty.
• Reaction papers are required for alternative delivery professional development offerings of self-guided activities such as books and videos. As these are essentially evaluations of participants’ understanding of the material, they can be considered evaluations of acquired knowledge. To strengthen the evaluation component, providers could create rubrics to assess knowledge gained and aggregate the results among the individual participants. Since reaction papers are a major component of Level 2 evaluations in the ABLE professional development system, it is important that a standard method for evaluating such work be implemented.

### Level 3: Behavior

• Level 3 evaluations are more difficult to conduct than those of the previous two levels because they require a time delay between the training and the evaluation. Subsequently, this type of evaluation occurs less frequently in the current professional development system. While more of this type of evaluation is recommended, it may not be feasible to extend it to all forms of professional development.

• Although self-reporting evaluations of behavior change are a legitimate and convenient method for conducting Level 3 evaluations, a more valid method would be direct observation. This could be conducted by either program administrators or the training providers via onsite visits.

### Level 4: Impact

• Impact evaluations are the most challenging to conduct since it is difficult to control for all variables that can affect program performance. For evaluations at the state level, this could be addressed by using a roll-out strategy in which the trainings are staggered over a period of time. The program outcomes associated with the trained participants could then be compared to those that have yet to be trained. This would be a complicated undertaking and likely applicable to only multi-year professional development initiatives.

• Impact evaluations can also take place at the local program level. In a process similar to that required by the PPDP, programs could identify Indicators of Program Quality in need of improvement each year and then select relevant professional development trainings to address these areas. Programs could quantify the selected Indicators to establish baseline data and performance goals. After program staff participates in the professional development, programs could evaluate the degree to which performance goals were achieved. Through this process, programs could get a sense of the effect that professional development trainings have had on performance (if any), which could inform programs in their future training selections.
Literature Sources


OSU Evaluation and Design Project Reports


Appendix A

Level 1: Satisfaction Instrument .................................................................18
Level 1: Sample Questions .........................................................................19

The standardized survey instrument created by the OSU ABLE Evaluation and Design Project for single session training evaluation is included in this appendix. In addition, this appendix contains a progression of sample evaluation questions.

Appendix B

Level 2: Modified Satisfaction Instrument ...............................................20
Level 2: New Staff Orientation Sample .....................................................21

The standardized survey instrument offered in Appendix A is presented here with a modification to include learning-related questions. Also, a sample of items from the New Staff Orientation is included.

Appendix C

Level 3: Sample Implementation Questions ...........................................22

This appendix contains sample questions that can inform the collection of data to measure changes in behavior as a result of professional development.

Appendix D

Level 4: Modified PPDP ...........................................................................23
Level 4: Sample Questions .......................................................................24

This appendix contains a suggested modification to the FY 2011 Ohio ABLE Program Professional Development Plan and questions to consider when conducting an impact evaluation.
Level 1: Satisfaction Instrument

Below is an excerpt from the current standardized evaluation instrument used in all Ohio ABLE single session trainings to collect participant satisfaction data.

1. My goal for attending this session is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>An Expert</th>
<th>Skilled/Knowledgeable</th>
<th>A Novice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SESSION CONTENT:

In regards to this session, the content presented...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIGNIFICANTLY</th>
<th>GENERALLY</th>
<th>SOMEWHAT</th>
<th>VERY LITTLE</th>
<th>DON'T KNOW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. is USEFUL to me........................................................................... 3 3 2 1 0
4. is APPLICABLE to my job.......................................................... 3 3 2 1 0
5. has CHANGED my THINKING...................................................... 3 3 2 1 0
6. has REINFORCED my THINKING.................................................. 3 3 2 1 0

7. List at least one thing you learned today that you will use in your classroom/program.

Concerning the content of the session you attended, how much have each of the following INCREASED?

| KNOWLEDGE of the content presented................................. | 3 3 2 1 0 |
| CONFIDENCE that you can apply the knowledge to your job........... | 3 3 2 1 0 |
| MOTIVATION to implement the content/techniques presented....... | 3 3 2 1 0 |
Level 1: Sample Questions

An alternative approach to capturing satisfaction data at the end of a session is to build in specific points for checking in with participants throughout a professional development event. The table below bridges Christine Smith’s recommendation to assess participants’ awareness of the goals of a professional development offering prior to the training with existing evaluation questions. The sample questions are arranged to show the progression from the start of the session to the end. In some cases a specific question can trigger multiple follow-up questions at the end of the session (the After column).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before</th>
<th>During</th>
<th>After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What are your goals for</td>
<td>Is this session allowing you to meet your</td>
<td>Were your goals for attending this session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attending this session?</td>
<td>goals?</td>
<td>met?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List the goals of this session.</td>
<td>Is the session meeting the listed goals?</td>
<td>Did the session meet the listed goals?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Were the goals of the session clearly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>presented?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are your expectations</td>
<td>Is the training meeting your expectations?</td>
<td>Was the training what you expected?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for this training?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Was the training described properly on the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>registration form and in the accompanying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>information sheet?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Level 2: Modified Satisfaction Instrument

The satisfaction instrument presented in Appendix A has been modified below to collect data on participants’ knowledge, skills, and attitudes (KSAs). In this sample, the professional development provider would first determine the KSAs to be learned through the training and then the form would be customized to reflect the KSAs.

1. My goal for attending this session is:

2. On this topic, I consider myself:

   An Expert Skilled/Knowledgeable A Novice

   3 2 1

SESSON CONTENT:

In regards to this session, the content presented...

3. is USEFUL to me .................................................................

4. is APPLICABLE to my job .....................................................

5. has CHANGED my THINKING ..............................................

6. has REINFORCED my THINKING ..........................................  

7. List at least one thing you learned today that you will use in your classroom/program.

Concerning the content of the session you attended, how much have each of the following INCREASED?

8. Overall KNOWLEDGE of the content presented........................

9. Overall CONFIDENCE that you can apply the knowledge to your job......

10. Overall MOTIVATION to implement the techniques presented.........

KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS, AND ATTITUDE (Before and after this training)

11. [INSERT KSA]  

12. [INSERT KSA]  

13. [INSERT KSA]  

14. [INSERT KSA]  

15. [INSERT KSA]  

December 2010
The Ohio ABLE New Staff Orientation contains multiple modules of content with embedded learning assessments. The following quiz offers a sampling of current items.

1. The name of the computer program used to collect and report data in Ohio is:
   a. OhioLit
   b. NRS
   c. ABLELink
   d. OPAS

2. Which of the following is not a primary reason for attending?
   a. enter employment
   b. decrease public assistance received
   c. placement in postsecondary education or training
   d. receipt of a secondary school diploma or passing of the GED test

3. What system in Ohio is used to meet the requirements of the federal government?
   a. OhioLit
   b. NRS
   c. ABLELink
   d. OPAS

4. Which core performance measure do you have the greatest control over?
   a. educational gains
   b. decrease public assistance received
   c. placement in postsecondary education or training
   d. receipt of a secondary school diploma or passing of the GED test

5. Which assessment information is used for reporting and for determining educational gains?
   a. raw scores
   b. scale score
   c. grade level equivalents
   d. educational functioning levels
Level 3: Sample Implementation Questions

This appendix contains sample questions that can inform the collection of data to measure changes in behavior as a result of professional development. These samples are intended to provide a basic understanding of behavior evaluation. Professional development providers would customize the questions and consider a variety of methods for collecting the data (e.g., interview, observation, questionnaire, reflective journal).

Information for Implementation

1. List at least one thing you have implemented in your classroom/program from the training.

2. Explain one “take away” from the training that has stuck with you.

Description of Implementation

3. Since the training, how have you used the strategies in your classroom/program?

4. Comparing the training to your current practice, how has your practice improved because of the training?

5. What have you done differently in your practice as a result of the training?

6. How do you vary your implementation of what you learned in the training in order to accommodate your classroom?

7. Reflecting on your current practices, are they:
   - directly influenced by what you learned in the training
   - influenced by participating in the training
   - as a result of another source (explain)

Degree of Implementation

8. To what extent has the information in the training changed your classroom routine?

9. How regularly are you using the techniques presented in the training in your program?

10. To what extent have you integrated the strategies from the training into your work?
Level 4: Modified PPDP

The following is a modification to Part I of the current Program Professional Development Plan (PPDP) instrument based on the description of Level 4 impact evaluation contained in this report.

Sample Program Professional Development Plan (Part 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need to be Addressed by PD</th>
<th>PD Activities to Address the Need</th>
<th>Number of Staff Attending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Est.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Impact on Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Impact on Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Impact on Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Impact on Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Impact on Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Level 4: Sample Questions

When conducting an evaluation of the impact of professional development, one approach to consider is gathering data from multiple perspectives. The following questions are modifications of Guskey’s 1998 work, Evaluating Professional Development.

Program Policy Perspective (Program Level)
- What program policies relate directly to this professional development?
- Are the professional development goals aligned with the program’s mission?
- Are any program policies in conflict with the professional development goals?
- What program policies are directly or indirectly affected by the professional development?
- How did the professional development alter the program procedures?

Implementation Perspective (Administrator, Teacher, and Support Staff Level)
- Was relevant information made available to you during planning and implementation?
- Did you have the necessary materials for implementation?
- Were resources provided in a timely manner?
- Were problems addressed quickly and efficiently?
- Was access to expertise available when problems arose?

Support Perspective (Administrator, Teacher, and Support Staff Level)
- Were you encouraged by colleagues to try new practices or strategies?
- Do you worry about being criticized if positive results are not readily apparent?
- Does the emphasis on success discourage you from trying new approaches?
- Do you have opportunities to visit the programs of colleagues and observe their practices?
- Do colleagues observe your program and discuss ideas and strategies with you?

Leadership Perspective (Administrator Level)
- Are you an attentive participant in professional development activities?
- Do you encourage involvement in program-wide decision making?
- Do you work with teachers to improve instructional practices?
- Do you encourage peer coaching and mentoring relationships?
- Do you facilitate regular follow-up sessions and activities with staff?