|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **LEA Tool 3.3**  | **Collecting evidence of impact** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Directions** | Use this tool to judge the value and impact of professional learning on teaching and student learning. The five levels of measuring are hierarchically arranged, from simple to more complex. With each succeeding level, the process of gathering evaluation data requires more time and resources. Data gathered at each level provide vital information for improving the quality and measuring the impact of professional learning. Using the suggested measures or others that you have available and gather the data from professional learning activities funded by Title IIA to answer the following questions. |
| **Strategy** | Prior to implementation of professional learning, use Resource 3.1 to identify the data that will be collected. It is critical that a team should work together to write the evaluation while planning the professional learning activities. Stakeholder input is critical to measuring the things that will have the most impact on teaching and learning. |
| **Target audience** | This tool is designed to be used by the persons responsible for implement- ing professional learning in a school or district. These tools should serve as a guide to ensure the professional learning is addressing the district’s goals and the needs of all students and teachers. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **What is measured?** | **Questions:** |
| **Level 1 Professional learning (PL) quality** | Is the PL well- designed pedagogically? | Is it accessible to its intended audience? | Is it well aligned to content and quality standards? | Do intended outcomes align with our system’s priorities and what our educators need? |
| **Possible measures** | **Responses:** |
| * Rubrics that measure PL alignment to:
	+ District Strategic Plans
	+ School Improvement Plans
	+ PL Plans
* Rubrics that

assess PL design in accordance with:* + Learning objectives and timing
	+ Citations from research/ literature
* Review of proposed observation tools and other data collection strategies for rigor during the application stage
* Other?
 |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **What is measured?** | **Questions:** |
| **Level 2****Educator reactions** | Did teachers find the PL useful, relevant or understandable? | Was the content engaging? |
| **Possible measures** | **Responses:** |  |
| * Perceptional end-of-PL survey items
* Exit ticket responses
* Other?
 |  |  |
|  |
| **What is measured?** | **Questions:** |
| **Level 3****Educator learning** | What skills or knowledge did the teacher acquire/ develop? | Did an educator’s attitude change as a result of the PL? |
| **Possible measures** | **Responses:** |  |
| * Walk-throughs with feedback provided
* Documented changes based on feedback
* Documentation of how data is used systemically to inform changes
* Written responses/assessments on pedagogy, content-area knowledge, etc.
* Surveys to determine change in educator perspectives
* Presentations
* Pre-/post assessments
* Other?
 |  |  |
|  |
| **What is measured?** | **Questions:** |
| **Level 4****Change in educators’ practice** | Did the PL create a sustained change in teaching or leading practice? | Did the PL create a sustained change in the collective attitude of educators? |
| **Possible measures** | **Responses:** |
| * Examples of use of new practices (e.g. videos, student work)
* Artifacts
* Classroom observations
* Educator evaluation data
* Lesson/unit plans
* Educator plans (self-directed/ directed/ improvement/developing)
* Student/admin surveys (e.g. Tripod data)
* Interviews with participants
* Participant oral or written reflections
* Other?
 |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **What is measured?** | **Questions:** |
| **Level 5****Change in student outcomes** | Did the changein practice impact student outcomes? | Did the changes drive improvements in some contexts (e.g. schools/ subjects and not others)? | What other factors could have impacted the outcomes? |
| **Possible measures** | **Responses:** |
| * Performance on state/local assessments, including common formative assessments
* Performance on assessments purposefully aligned to PD objective
* Student questionnaires (for example, on level of engagement)
* Student work/other artifacts of practice
* Student behavior data
* Closure in gaps between subgroups
* Classroom observations
* Learning walks
* Students with disabilities’ success in inclusive class- rooms, or progress toward general curriculum in substantially separate classrooms
* Other?
 |  |  |  |
| Source: Adapted from *Does it make a difference? Evaluating professional development* by Thomas R. Guskey. Copyright 2002 ASCD; The Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Educatio[n, http://www.doe.mass.edu/educators/](http://www.doe.mass.edu/educators/) title-iia/ |