12-2017

ONGOING PROFESSIONAL LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES

Christie L. McMullen

ONGOING PROFESSIONAL LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES:

A POLICY ADVOCACY DOCUMENT

Christie L. McMullen

Educational Leadership Doctoral Program

Submitted in partial fulfillment

of the requirements of

Doctor of Education

in the Foster G. McGaw Graduate School

National College of Education

National Louis University

December, 2017

NLU Digital Commons Document Origination Statement

This document was created as *one* part of the three-part dissertation requirement of the National Louis University (NLU) Educational Leadership (EDL) Doctoral Program. The National Louis Educational Leadership EdD is a professional practice degree program (Shulman et al., 2006).

For the dissertation requirement, doctoral candidates are required to plan, research, and implement three major projects, one each year, within their school or district with a focus on professional practice. The three projects are:

- Program Evaluation
- Change Leadership Plan
- Policy Advocacy Document

For the **Program Evaluation** candidates are required to identify and evaluate a program or practice within their school or district. The "program" can be a current initiative; a grant project; a common practice; or a movement. Focused on utilization, the evaluation can be formative, summative, or developmental (Patton, 2008). The candidate must demonstrate how the evaluation directly relates to student learning.

In the **Change Leadership Plan** candidates develop a plan that considers organizational possibilities for renewal. The plan for organizational change may be at the building or district level. It must be related to an area in need of improvement, and have a clear target in mind. The candidate must be able to identify noticeable and feasible differences that should exist as a result of the change plan (Wagner et al., 2006).

In the **Policy Advocacy Document** candidates develop and advocate for a policy at the local, state or national level using reflective practice and research as a means for supporting and promoting reforms in education. Policy advocacy dissertations use critical theory to address moral and ethical issues of policy formation and administrative decision making (i.e., what ought to be). The purpose is to develop reflective, humane and social critics, moral leaders, and competent professionals, guided by a critical practical rational model (Browder, 1995).

Works Cited

Browder, L.H. (1995). An alternative to the doctoral dissertation: The policy advocacy concept and the policy document. *Journal of School Leadership, 5,* 40-69.

Patton, M. Q. (2008). *Utilization-focused evaluation* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Shulman, L.S., Golde, C.M., Bueschel, A.C., & Garabedian, K.J. (2006). Reclaiming education's doctorates: A critique and a proposal. *Educational Researcher, 35*(3), 25-32.

Wagner, T., et al. (2006). *Change leadership: A practical guide to transforming our schools.* SanFrancisco: Jossey-Bass.

4.21.14

ABSTRACT

As an answer to a lack of policy around follow up training between CRS Center Staff and school systems across the country, a policy needs to be created around providing follow up training opportunities nationally. This policy provides a repeatable, consistent model for CRS Center staff members to use with each school implementing CRS across the nation.   This paper outlines the policy for allowing teachers to see other teachers implementing CRS strategies in their schools, therefore increasing the use of these strategies in classrooms nationally. This process will be applicable for school districts that works with CRS nationally. This policy includes ways to get school systems to embrace learning from one another throughout the school year, improving teaching and learning.

PREFACE

Throughout the process of researching and writing, I have learned so much about myself and my profession. I am the Eastern Division Liaison for College Readiness System Center (CRS) which is a non-profit organization designed to provide professional learning opportunities to educators in school systems to support students in their pursuit to better futures. My role in the organization is to calibrate internal professional learning so that what we deliver to the 6200 schools across the nation is consistent and replicable. Since being in this position, I have realized that the organization has the potential to have even more of a positive impact on schools, if systems are put into place to support the consistency of work as well as the follow up learning necessary for implementing change.

I have worked with this organization in some capacity for 12 years, during which time I have seen it grow. As a consumer and then an employee, I recognized that implementation of the College Readiness System varied throughout the nation, but there was one major commonality in the implementation in every successful district. In districts where the use of strategies in classrooms were monitored and ongoing, sustainable changes to teacher practice took place. If the use of the strategies were not monitored after training, the use of strategies happened in small pockets and was not systemic. In the districts who monitored implementation the students had more options upon graduation and were better prepared for college and careers, through the building of skill sets in their K-12 schooling.

The improved results for students makes this policy proposal relevant and important to internal CRS stakeholders as well as external CRS school systems. If this policy were implemented for all CRS Center trainings, the system for monitoring and

modeling strategy use will be given to every school, along with guidance for use and a coach for support. Administrators will receive support and teachers will have a better understanding of expectations in the classroom, yielding improved learning opportunities for students.

As I wrote this policy advocacy paper, I had several leadership lessons reinforced. Change can be both intimidating and short lived if it is not done with intentional purpose and with appropriate support. This policy requires a change in practice for both CRS Center employees and external schools. In order for this change to be successful, a sense of urgency must be created and ongoing support for learning must be readily available.

In addition to creating positive change, I realized that modeling expectations is a powerful way to get desired results. I will need to model expectations with the internal staff so that the expectations for administrators can be modeled to schools. As a leader, I must be able to complete the tasks I ask of others. I must also be able to maintain a growth mindset for learning new ways of work.

Upon completion of this paper, I gained confidence in the potential of this policy. I shared it with the executive leadership of the CRS organization and the beginnings of the execution of the policy have begun. I learned how to properly research a policy and share it with others in a way that made it a desired option for the organization. I anticipate seeing this policy come to fruition within the next 12 months.

DEDICATION

To my family, for believing in me from start to finish.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION ONE: VISION STATEMENT

In response to the need for educational leaders to be more involved in educational policy development while expressing concern for a desire to develop reflective practices and a moral context, I am recognizing the need and value of involvement (Browder, 1995). If, as educational leaders, we are not focused on the creation of policies that will facilitate positive change for all stakeholders, we cannot complain about the current state of affairs. Educational leaders must determine which policies will prompt positive change and lobby to make sure those policies are created and most importantly, practiced.

I will be writing a statement of educational policy that will be shared and defended on educational, political, social, economic, and moral/ethical grounds. The policy advocacy document will give explanation to the need for this policy to take effect to improve education for all stakeholders involved. This process will help me become a moral leader while setting parameters for what needs to be done to improve the current situation (Browder, 1995, p. 54).

Introduction to the Problem

During my Program Evaluation, I researched and studied what happens to teacher practice when teachers observe one another while teaching. I found through interviews that observing one another boosted confidence in the teachers who observed and who were observed, and changed their teaching practices. The teachers began trying new high yield strategies that they had learned during trainings and ultimately improved their teaching methods. Cambridge conducted a larger study on what they called "instructional rounds," which were conducted similar to the walkthroughs I studied. In Cambridge's study, they were able to make direct connections between student learning

and teacher confidence when these rounds took place in a school. Scholars attribute the confidence boost to the fact that the teachers felt equipped to meet the expectations set for them in their teaching skill set (Blanding, 2009). In my opinion, this opportunity should be offered to all teachers, not just those in select schools or select classrooms. There should be a policy that every teacher who attends a two or three-day training through CRS Center should receive the opportunity for embedded professional learning when they return to their campus. The policy will be adopted by CRS Center and implemented with every school that contracts with them for professional development. This follow up training should include observing other teachers on their own campus at least twice a year.

A large contributing factor to the teachers feeling confident was the creation of a culture of trust on campus. The administrators who took time to build a culture of safety and trust around the non-evaluative nature of these observations and that they were meant to help the teachers learn had bigger gains in use of high yield instructional strategies than those who did not have that same level of trust and safety built for teachers. It is not enough for administrators to provide time for teachers to see one another teach; they must also create trust and safety among the staff that learning and trying new things is an acceptable and expected practice on campus.

In my research for my Program Evaluation study, I realized that a culture of safety and learning must be established for embedded professional learning to be effective. Instructional rounds were designed to remove all judgement from the observation and instead just focus on facts. Judgmental comments toward the teacher by those observing will be counterproductive to the growth of the educators in the school. In

instructional rounds, educators including superintendents, administrators, and teachers all observed together and they were asked to do four things: 1) Describe what they saw, not what they thought; 2) Analyze patterns; 3) Predict the type of learning that will result; 4) Recommend the next level of work (Blanding, 2009).

Of the four schools, I observed during my Program Evaluation, one did not have the proper culture for this type of collaborative learning. The teachers at that school felt judged and concerned that the observations will have an adverse effect on their evaluation. This concern resulted in a few instances of improvement, but was coupled with frustration because the learning was done in isolation. In the other three schools, the administrative teams were supportive of the process and set clear expectations for the work. They also built a culture where learning was safe and encouraged. Their results showed teachers who were confident in their teaching skills, had stronger growth in the use of high yield strategies and demonstrated rejuvenated educators.

If the practice matches the intent of the policy, this type of on the job, embedded, ongoing professional learning could have a very positive impact on an entire district of educators and therefore students. It will require a firm understanding and acceptance by all stakeholders of the purpose of the policy. A well-crafted policy should include the expectation that professional learning to improve instructional practice should include both training and follow up embedded practice. The policy should emphasize that a culture of trust and safety that encourages ongoing instructional improvement is important to the success of any professional learning. In addition, some professional learning opportunities must be provided the administrative teams about the logistics of the process. Without a well-planned and implemented roll out, this policy will likely not

improve instruction, but with the proper roll out, I believe it could be a game changer for education. I suggest that CRS Center provide this type of job embedded, ongoing professional learning as a follow up to the existing professional learning currently offered.

CRS Center trains over 60,000 teachers every year through a three-day, content specific Summer Institute and two- day content specific Write Path trainings. Although the training evaluations are positive and people continue to return to the trainings, there needs to be a more intentional follow up process for ensuring that the new strategies get utilized in classrooms. If we trained district staff members, such as instructional coaches and administrators, in the process for teachers to observe and learn from visiting other teachers in their classrooms when they return to campus and throughout the school year, then it is likely the effective use of the strategies regularly will increase (Cohen, 2014).

I became interested in the power of a policy that directs the inclusion of follow up embedded professional learning activities to reinforce learning from face to face training when I was writing my Program Evaluation. I realized that the teachers who had the opportunity to see other teachers teach were more confident in their own teaching skills. I believe that, after every large professional learning opportunity, teachers should be given the chance to follow up by seeing the strategies being used with students. This happens in some schools, where the administrators recognize the value of accountability and follow up after professional learning opportunities, but it should be a part of the training itself, so that more teachers can benefit.

The critical issues that make this a policy problem that warrants a response stem mostly from the new federal definition of professional development. President Obama,

on December 10, 2015, signed into law the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) (Hirsh, 2015). With this new act came a revised definition for professional learning for teachers. This new definition includes statements like "all trainings must be sustained, intensive, collaborative, job-embedded, data-driven, and classroom-focused." (p. 1). The current training offered by CRS Center fits the criteria in every way except the job-embedded piece. If the organization wants to remain a good fit for educators in America, it must find ways to offer job-embedded opportunities for teachers to continue their learning on their own campuses. The federal definition goes on to say that "follow up training (will be provided) to teachers who have participated in activities described in this paragraph that are designed to ensure that the knowledge and skills learned by the teachers are implemented in the classroom" (p. 2). This policy will give guidelines to help ensure that the follow up takes place on each campus in a meaningful way. It will enhance the teaching happening on campus.

In addition, I am recommending to CRS leadership that every two or three-day training offered by CRS Center be coupled with a training module that will instruct the administrators and coaches in the building on ways to provide job-embedded continued learning on campus for those who attended the training. My policy will require that a training module be created and shared with every school that attends a Summer Institute or Write Path training. Summer Institute is a 3-day content specific training taught by current teachers, administrators, and counselors from all over the country. These trainings are held in 12 cities across the country. Write Path trainings are also taught by current educators but is a 2-day content specific training held in various districts and regions across the country. The module can be supported through the coaching

framework used to assist districts with their implementation of the College Readiness System which I explain later in this paper.

I envision that the policy will be effective in addressing a lack of consistent implementation of learned strategies following training because there will be two forms of on-campus follow up tied to it. The first follow up opportunity will come when the administrative team or the instructional coaches, depending on the school's professional learning system, watch the module and internalize the learning opportunity. This will help determine an action plan for how to implement the opportunity for teachers to observe one another while teaching. The second support will come in the form of a program manager assigned to each district to support them in the implementation of the College Readiness System and specifically this job-embedded learning opportunity. In my Change Leadership Project, I researched a coaching cycle, completed by the program manager with each district that implements CRS. The coaching cycle involves four interactions with a district level staff member, and those could include observations with teachers for the purpose of supporting this policy and assisting with fidelity of implementation.

Critical Issues

Professional learning in most districts involves an outside resource, and typically happens in a workshop setting. The teachers travel to a location and learn techniques out of context, without seeing the techniques being used with students. What frequently happens in those cases is that teachers do not implement the strategies once they return to their own campuses because they are not comfortable using the techniques with students (Cohen, 2014). The professional learning topics are not revisited intentionally or the

6

administrators do not look for the use of those specific strategies in classrooms on a regular basis. But if building teacher capacity is the goal of a school, administrators need to allow the teachers to design and lead professional learning while taking on an intentional coaching role. Administrators need to provide protected time for professional development after a workshop and create space for sharing ideas, all while providing accountability (Cohen, 2014).

This type of follow up to professional learning will allow teachers to see strategies being used by practitioners in their own building, with their own students. Those teachers who are being observed will be available to help coach and guide other teachers on the use of the strategies and how to make them work practically. Teaching and learning for students and educators will become more meaningful and applicable if teachers were able to see the strategies in action. When teachers are empowered, teacher morale increases (Eury, Snyder, & Melton, n.d.) If an administrative team allows time for classroom teachers to work with their colleagues, then their performance will enhance and students will benefit. If CRS Center created modules laying out how this type of follow up professional learning could be carried out by administrative teams the focus of control will change from the principal to the teachers, and the teachers will take ownership for their actions (Eury, Snyder, & Melton, n.d.).

As mentioned previously, the new federal definition of professional development specifically mentions that all professional development attended by teachers must include a job-embedded learning component. The professional development must also include a follow-up training to ensure that the strategies that were learned are being utilized (Hirsh

2015). This policy will meet both of those federal requirements for the 60,000 teachers that are trained each year.

The culture of a campus in terms of attitude towards learning plays a big role in the success of this type of initiative. The principal and administrative team must lay some groundwork around building a learning center culture. The environment must feel safe for teachers to try new things and learn from one another. If this process feels punitive or evaluative in nature, teachers will not allow themselves to be vulnerable in the process and change will not likely take place.

In Richard Elmore's research on instructional rounds, he realized that much of the walkthrough process was done so badly that administrators had to gain back the credibility they had lost with teachers. He also quoted a principal, who was a part of his study, who said that the proper conditions must be provided for this process to be possible. This process of instructional rounds happens in Connecticut, Iowa, Massachusetts, and Ohio. A few schools in Chicago are also doing this process. It is not, however, a widespread practice in other states, and to date has not been an intentional part of CRS Center's follow up to training (D'Orio, 2010).

The administrative teams will need to receive training in this process, but that training would be tied to the two or three-day training already being attended. A module would be included after the initial training and that module would help the administrators determine an action plan for allowing teachers to learn from one another. In addition to the action plan, the module would include some ways to build a culture for learning as well as share specific strategies that could be used when implementing this process.

Recommended Policy and Envisioned Effect

The policy I am recommending will provide additional training to every district as a follow up to CRS Center's large-scale trainings such as Summer Institute, a 3-day training, and Write Path, a 2-day training. This additional training will describe a process for giving teachers ownership over their continued learning through opportunities to watch highly effective teachers. A process will be outlined for the schools to carry out this type of embedded professional learning and will be coupled with additional training. It will be up to the schools to carry out the embedded professional learning and utilize the follow up option. If followed, the teachers will have the opportunity to select the types of strategies they wish to see modeled based on their own growth needs. They will then get to see those strategies carried out by a colleague.

By offering the opportunity for embedded professional learning, teachers will have a built-in learning environment on their campuses to learn best practices in teaching. Teachers will be better equipped to work with the students in their buildings after watching their colleagues masterfully interact with the same students they see daily. Specific strategies will be showcased depending on the initiatives of each building and the needs as outlined in their School Improvement Plans. The observations will be targeted around growth areas that have been set for the whole school as well as individual teachers.

This policy, designed to provide follow up training to take place on campus, will give principals enough flexibility and resources to have embedded professional learning on their campuses to cater to each school's needs and areas of focus. It will be a turnkey process that allows some flexibility to focus on the school's initiatives and needs. It will

give more specific expectations around professional learning than what currently exists in written policy. CRS Center does not currently have a policy around providing follow up professional learning to large scale trainings. It does provide a program manager to each district as a support, and he or she can recommend additional training options but that has been left up to individuals in the past.

If CRS Center had a policy that all two and three day professional learning included a module for follow up embedded learning, and if the district took advantage of these modules, it will increase comradery among teachers, exposing them to impactful teaching strategies, and in turn improving their own teaching skills. They will receive continuous training on how the strategies are supposed to be utilized. The students will benefit from this policy because their teachers will be using the most up to date, professional learning strategies, which require the students actively learn, rather than passively receive information. The district will benefit from having more highly effective teachers and less turn over as well as improved student achievement. (Eury, Snyder, & Melton, n.d.).

SECTION TWO: NEEDS ANALYSIS

Every student deserves to have excellent teachers. Becoming excellent teachers requires exposure to exemplary teaching (Public Impact, 2014). This can happen in a variety of ways, but should be an expected follow up opportunity after every professional development workshop. CRS Center trains over 60,000 educators every year. Those educators impact millions of students throughout their careers. Instituting a policy that will improve and impact follow up training and use of learned strategies will create the opportunity improve the learning experience for those millions of students.

Education Analysis

CRS Center will need to create follow up trainings. These can be used by various audiences after attending a large-scale training. The follow-up trainings will be attached to the existing two and three-day trainings and will help administrative teams. Administrative teams will need to be trained in how to create a culture for learning on their campuses for their teachers. This follow up training might involve a CRS Center program staff member walking with a principal and teachers to demonstrate how these types of observations could be handled. Since this follow up training will be attached to an existing training there will not be any additional cost associated with this portion.

The teachers will also need some initial training in what to look for when observing other teachers. The schools should come up with individual goals around these observations. Also, as the administrators observe classrooms, they will also look for evidence that the observations have changed classroom practices. New staff will need to be trained each year to ensure that everyone on campus understands the process. Directions and modules on how to train the teachers would be a built-in part of the

modules administrative teams would receive. It would be up to the administrative teams to train their own teachers.

The modules administrative teams would participate in would equip administrators with skills needed to guide teachers through this type of learning process. Having the opportunity to see other teachers teach helps teachers become more satisfied with their own growth. It builds confidence in their own capacity to teach, increasing productivity (Eury, Snyder, & Melton, n.d.). It also encourages teachers to stay longer in the profession at a time when so many are either leaving or thinking about leaving the profession. Keeping teachers who are well equipped to educate can lead to students learning more – not just content but skills needed not just to survive in but to find greater success in the 21st Century (Lambert & Mitrani, n.d.).

Professional development is often ineffective in schools because it happens off campus in isolation from actual teaching. This type of professional development will allow teachers to learn from practitioners who are teaching the exact same students in the same environment they face daily. Teachers seldom have the opportunity to see master teachers teach. Having an opportunity to do so could improve their craft and allow for "real time" learning. This type of learning can only occur through on-site coaching, reflection, and reviewing results on site with other colleagues (Lambert & Mitrani, n.d.).

Social Analysis

There are several social issues associated with this policy. If CRS Center implements the policy for embedded professional learning and the schools implement the modules properly a culture of safety and learning will be cultivated on each campus among the teachers. This type of culture will transcend to the students as well because

the teachers will feel safe trying new things and learning from one another, while encouraging the students to do the same. Having this type of culture will also encourage teachers to ask one another questions, creating a stronger bond and potentially teacher retention over the years. The teachers will feel supported. If high expectations for implementation are maintained and clear goals are set, then long-term change can take place. That support must come from the leaders, facilitators, and teachers participating (Lambert & Mitrani, n.d.).

The culture created when this type of learning is encouraged will also create a willingness to be vulnerable with peers and colleagues. The vulnerability will allow for genuine learning and growth to take place for the teachers, based on what I saw in the teachers in my Project Evaluation. This type of learning is different from what happens after a workshop, where the learning is often isolated and separate from actual practice. Teachers will be showing one another where they need extra support and growth through constructive feedback (Lambert & Mitrani, n.d.). They will then in turn support one another when they need extra help learning a new strategy or implementing a new idea. Collaborative culture needs to be built on over time, which could lead to a closer bond between staff.

If the administrators do not create a culture for of high expectations and trust prior to implementing this type of strategy, teachers will distrust one another and the administrators, causing unnecessary malice and frustration. The teachers will feel unjustly evaluated rather than empowered, and may harbor angst against one another or the administrators. This type of environment will be counterproductive to learning.

Assembling a network of the same staff members meeting over time allows for trust to be built and a respectful community to develop (City, 2011).

This policy to create modules for schools could instead create a system of comradery that will allow for teachers to learn from one another. Teachers often close their doors and teach in isolation, instead of learning from others who are working with the same students with the same circumstances as they are. Having a chance to see one another in action will build the environment for learning that will allow them to learn together and lean on one another.

Political Analysis

There are also political issues associated with the policy and the modules created for the schools. CRS Center cannot dictate how districts carry out this professional learning opportunity. It can be monitored through the program staff assigned to that district, but its implementation will be decided by district leaders. The district may run into contract issues that will need to be vetted with the union if they decide to use planning time for the observations. The union may also take issue with how teachers are selected to be observed and the potential impact on a teachers' overall evaluation. Some options the district might consider for protecting against these issues could include working with the union on what, if any, contractual provisions may need to be considered and possibly changed.

Selecting model teachers could lead to a feeling of favoritism if it is not done systematically and fairly. There will need to be predetermined criteria for which teachers get observed first. I believe it will be beneficial for all teachers to both be observed and do the observing. Making those observations most impactful might require that the

teachers see exemplar teachers first, so that they can glean the positive teaching attributes modeled. A research study in 2010 only found 11 studies that included findings on how to select teacher-leaders. It is not a simple, easily definable process, and yet it is a crucial one. This article gives some specific assessment areas when selecting leaders, which included demonstrated success in job description skills, strong behavioral competencies, and proven achievement in a role (Public Impact, 2014).

If the Superintendent of Schools feels he must include his school board in adopting this follow up after CRS training or in promoting it for some reason, CRS Center program staff can assist in this effort. He could invite school board members to attend an observation and debriefing session and watch the process in action. This might dispel any concerns and misconceptions the members might have. Witnessing the learning in action will also help solidify its value in the eyes of the district's policy makers. My policy change is for CRS Center to provide additional resources for ongoing professional learning, but the politics of the district and board could be problematic if the system of follow up is not carefully explained and implemented.

Economic Analysis

The economic implications can be either small or large depending on the way the process is executed. If the observations of other teachers require a substitute for class coverage, that cost will accrue. It is possible to conduct these observations without requiring substitutes but it might require some creative scheduling and possibly the trade-off of an after-hours event such as a faculty meeting. If the contract does not allow for the observations to take place during planning periods, a substitute will be needed for each teacher who is going to observe. That substitute could be shared between teachers,

if they only observe for one or two class periods, cutting the cost. Substitute costs vary, but run about $100 per day when fringe benefits are included.

Positive economic impacts will include better teacher retention. If teachers feel supported they are more likely to stay in the district, cutting down the cost of recruiting, rehiring and training new teachers. Many districts have high teacher turnover rates, causing a large loss in revenue for each teacher that must be replaced. Making teachers feel better equipped to do their jobs well, and connecting them with another teacher for mentorship through this process of having on the job training should make them more competent and confident, and less likely to leave (Blanding, 2009).

These districts and schools have already committed to attending training with CRS Center in the form of a two or three-day workshop style training. This ongoing training option would be built into the training they are already attending. There would not be an additional cost associated with the follow up training. The module would be part of the final day of the workshop training and the coaching support is already a part of membership for CRS schools.

The training from CRS ranges depending on the number of people attending and the type of training they are attending. The two-day trainings usually run between $300 and $400 per person and the three-day trainings cost between $700 and $850 per person plus travel costs. The travel costs will vary depending on the location of the workshop. The two-day workshop can be held in a specific district eliminating travel costs.

In addition to the cost of the workshop, the district will need to pay for the school to become a CRS member. This cost is on a sliding scale based on the number of schools in the district that are members. The average cost is $2500 per year and that allows the

school access to all the online materials for each content area and the district will receive coaching by a CRS member.

The policy I am purposing would add a module at no additional cost to a school or district. The module would be part of the training that these districts have already committed to attending. Instead of an additional cost, these modules have the ability to improve the schools return on their training investment by making the training ongoing and job embedded.

Districts will also receive a higher return on their professional learning investment if the teachers utilize the strategies they have learned in training. Learning Forward, a national education based professional learning organization, has done implementation studies showing that it takes three to five years of ongoing implementation support to bridge the knowing-doing gap and integrate new ideas into practice. Effective professional learning "integrates research about individual, organizational, technical, and adaptive change" (Lambert & Mitrani, n.d.). This integration will occur through supporting and sustaining implementation for long term success."

Moral/Ethical Analysis

The moral and ethical issues involved with this policy are a little less specific. All students deserve to have the very best educators. It is our moral imperative to equip teachers to be the very best they can be for their students. If the teachers are supporting one another in the process of learning they will also hold one another accountable for being the very best they can be for their students (Public Impact, 2014).

A system that includes teachers in key roles in their own development shows respect for them as professionals. When we exclude teachers from such matters, it is a

form of disrespect (Eury, Snyder, & Melton, n.d.). This is a fundamental ethical issue that will need to be addressed if CRS Center accepts this policy and puts it into practice. Allowing teachers to share their practices with one another will expose teachers to the use of strategies in real time with their own students. The selection of the teachers to be observed as well as the teachers who will do the observing could create angst.

Choosing the best teachers to be featured during these observations may require the principals to make some ethical decisions not to play favorites but instead to feature the best based on the criteria predetermined by the district. This process of allowing teachers to watch one another teach cannot be about featuring the popular teachers, but instead featuring the teachers who best execute the strategies that others should replicate (Public Impact, 2014).

Exposing classrooms in this way will also expose non-examples in teaching and administrators will have to address poor teaching practices. This can be the most difficult process under my new policy of providing steps for having teachers observe one another. Judgements about the process must be separate from evaluating for summative purposes. The latter goes against the basic principle of focus on improving teaching and not assessing practice for purposes of disciplining or terminating staff. Administrators will have to address the inappropriate behavior in a way that is both ethical and tactful to remove the issue from the building.

Teachers and administrators would both need to avoid judging the classrooms that are visited and instead choose the stance of a learner. These observations are not designed to be evaluative but instead to be informative. The individuals involved must choose to learn from the exposure rather than judge one another. Creating a safe

18

environment for learning will be paramount to maintaining the integrity of this process

for all the educators involved.

SECTION THREE: ADVOCATED POLICY STATEMENT

In order to successfully advocate for a policy, the vision and needs analysis for the policy must be clearly laid out and communicated. Change is difficult in most circumstances, but change without clear vision is not sustainable (Wagner, et. al, 2006). In this section, I will outline the goals and objectives of this policy, making the vision clear as well.

Goals and Objectives of the Policy

Goals and objectives both play an important role in the execution of any new idea. When I looked up the difference between the two I came across some very clear definitions. Goals are long-term accomplishments that require time to complete. In addition to that definition, goal has the word "go" in it that indicates action (Kumar, 2011). I have three main goals for my policy. The first goal is to increase the understanding of job embedded professional learning opportunities among leaders, by providing relevant, practical training designed to provide year-long learning on a campus. The second goal is to improve morale of teachers through ongoing, relevant professional learning opportunities that will provide a deepened understanding of student centered strategies and how to use them. The third goal is to decrease training costs for schools by increasing teacher training impact from existing learning opportunities. Teachers will retain more of the information learned at trainings decreasing the need for additional training.

Objectives are concrete attainments that can be reached by following set steps. "Objects" are concrete, such as timelines, personnel needs, and budgets (Kumar, 2011). The objectives for my three goals are as follows. I propose that this policy be

implemented after one school year of research and resource creation and then remain ongoing. I will also assess the personnel needs to make this policy a reality in terms of creation of resources and additional training requirements. Cost control is the third objective. This relates to efficiency, which means keeping expenses as minimal as possible while maximizing the impact.

Stakeholders Related to the Policy

According to dictionary.com, a value by definition is the importance, usefulness, or worth of something.   Also, values relate to those things individuals hold as personally important to whatever actions they might want or be willing to take. When working with values in a professional sense, it is imperative that one has an understanding of people's personal and professional values to aid in reaching a consensus for next steps, particularly when creating a policy. My values and the values of stakeholders line up in regards to this policy advocacy paper because ultimately we are all working to better prepare students for their future, whatever that may be.

Although this policy has the potential to impact a multitude of stakeholders, there are four main groups that I believe are essential stakeholders in my policy proposal. They are organizational staff, teachers, administrators, and students. These four groups will all be directly impacted by the implementation of this policy. The needs, values, and preferences of these stakeholders will vary slightly, given their different perspectives and the potential impact on the role of the stakeholder.

CRS Center organizational staff will be impacted by the implementation of this policy. They will have to both create the modules needed for the policy to become a reality and monitor the fidelity of the use of the modules. The needs of the organizational

staff will vary depending on their role in the process. For those staff members who will

be tasked with creating the modules to be shared with external partners, it is imperative

that they have a firm understanding of the needs of the various school leaders. One of the

most critical needs is developing the proper skill set for designing the modules to meet

the needs of the external partners. For the staff members who work directly with external

partners on the implementation of this recommended ongoing professional learning, it is

important that they are able to coach schools towards implementation with fidelity and

growth.

       The values associated with the organizational staff include believing in the value

of involving others in, professional learning, and relevant field work. These values are

democratic in nature, using fraternity and liberty to obtain specific benefits from the other

stakeholders involved. Fowler (2009) says, these values pertain to fraternity and

efficiency.

       The organizational staff's preferences that will be affected by this policy include

the desire for more students to be impacted positively by the training that takes place

during the summer, and a more intentional interaction opportunity between the program

staff member and the school or district. The first preference links back to CRS Center's

mission, to "close the achievement gap by preparing all students for college readiness and

success in a global society (source excluded for anonymity). In this organization, the

mission drives all actions and this policy will help prepare more students by preparing

more teachers to equip the students with the skills necessary to be college and career

ready. The second preference speaks specifically to the daily work of program staff. The

program staff work with districts and schools to ensure that they are implementing the

College Readiness System with fidelity, and this policy will further enhance that work by providing a framework for follow up training.

Teachers make up a second stakeholder group that will be impacted by this policy. Teachers have a need to be taught the skills necessary to impact positively students and then the ability to utilize those skills in the classroom. Many professional learning opportunities do not include follow up interactions once teachers return to their campuses. This policy guides the requirement that the embedded professional learning module is included in training and the implementation of the embedded follow up impacts teachers. This will create ongoing follow up opportunities that will take place on each campus and will be led by colleagues within the building. The teachers will have the opportunity to see the strategies being utilized in the classrooms in their building and will have people available to ask questions about implementation on their own campuses. The need to see the strategies being used with students will be taken care of with this policy and the teachers will have a built-in support system for implementation.

This type of support system will create a less threatening school environment for persons who fear the inclusion of summative evaluations even though the stated goal is a formative or supportive process. The teachers will no longer have to guess how a strategy is supposed to be executed with students, but could instead see it happen. The teachers will feel secure and supported.

The teachers will also have a chance to work intentionally with other professionals in the art of teaching. The walkthrough opportunities will create a space for dialogue around teaching and learning with colleagues. These conversations will be

supported by a coach or administrator on campus giving further validity to the conversation.

The third need that will be met through the implementation of a policy that creates a guideline for allowing teachers to see one another teach using a specific protocol is ongoing professional learning. As mentioned before, the federal definition of professional learning includes "ongoing" but as educators it goes beyond just a definition. Teachers need to see teaching in action in their own buildings to further boost their confidence in the use of the strategies. This training will be planned to intentionally take place throughout the school year as a just in time response to the needs of the educators involved (Tomlinson, 2014).

The teachers' values that will be addressed by this process of embedding instructional rounds into the school year include order; a thoughtful way of work and interaction, and fraternity; brotherhood and being a part of something bigger. Order is a general social value. It is considered a high priority in all societies (Fowler, 2009). This policy meets the value of order for teachers by giving a systematic approach to ongoing, job-embedded professional learning. The fraternity value will be met by this policy because it will create a non-threatening environment where teachers can rely on one another for learning and growth. CRS Center embedding ongoing professional learning to be carried out on campuses allows opportunities for teachers to learn from one another in a non-evaluative space where questions can be asked and learning is happening in classrooms live with students (Tomlinson, 2014).

The teacher preferences that are satisfied by the implementation of this policy include job embedded professional learning with their own students on their own campus

throughout the year. Teachers do not like to leave their classrooms to learn in a workshop setting that feels isolated. Instead they want to learn by seeing teachers actually use the strategies (Guskey, 2014). This job embedded approach will require less time out of the building and more resources for asking questions.

Teachers also rarely have the opportunity to see great teaching in action. This policy will require CRS Center to design a step by step plan for creating those types of opportunities on a campus. The administrative team and coaches will lay out a schedule for teachers to learn from one another by observing master teachers in content specific scenarios (Guskey, 2014). The observations will be intentional, as deemed by the administrative team and the teachers, and the follow up will include a chance for the teacher to ask questions about what was seen. Seeing a master teacher execute a strategy provides context for the teacher observing to understand the nuances of the learning opportunity.

Administrators are the third group of stakeholders that will be directly affected by this policy. The policy will initiate a module that guides schools to create an action plan for ongoing professional development after the initial training happen back on individual campuses. The administrative teams will need to set this process in motion, by watching the training modules and embedding the training into the school year so that the learning is ongoing. The administrators will play a vital role in the implementation of this policy on campuses.

The needs of the administrators include addressing the importance of having quality teachers for every student, creating a culture of learning for the adults and the children on campus, and the creation of a competent, content staff. These needs will be

met if the policy was implemented with fidelity. In order for the policy to be successfully implemented, the administrators involved will have to choose to plan for this type of ongoing professional learning to take place throughout the school year.

Having quality teachers for every student will improve the overall performance of the students in the school. This type of success will improve morale of both the teachers and the students, creating a stronger learning environment, and opportunities for strong conversations about learning (Settlage & Johnston, 2014). It will improve the type of learning that every student will be exposed to, improving the structure of learning school wide.

Creating a culture of learning for adults and students will also build morale and allow for improvement. When teachers engage in a cycle of continuous improvement about what they are teaching, the students reap the benefits (Cervone & Martinez-Miller, 2007). The administrative teams also experience the benefit of a well-equipped staff who is content and more likely to continue in the profession because they feel as if they can adequately do their job with support. Less teacher turnover offers peace of mind to the administrative team.

I believe this culture of learning will breed a competent, content staff. The teachers will have an excitement for learning and teaching that allows them to feel confident to try new things (Van Tassell, 2014). This confidence will increase morale for the teachers and the administrators, which will directly impact the students.

The values that will be touched by this policy and the creation of modules for administrators will be order, efficiency and economic growth. The administrators will have a thoughtful way of work and interaction mapped out for them through the modules

which gives order to their actions. In addition to order, the administrators will get their best return on investment, responding to their value of efficiency, since they will have more competent teachers and less teacher turnover.

In addition to order and efficiency, the decreased teacher turn over will allow for economic efficiency. Based on a five-year study conducted in Chicago, IL, Milwaukee, WI, Granville County, NC, and Jemez Valley and Santa Rosa, NM, a teacher turnover cost calculator was created. This study showed that the cost per teacher ranges based on the size of the district, but runs between $4,366 and $17,872 per teacher. There is a large range in the cost per teacher because of varying salaries and professional development costs which are dependent on the location. It is more expensive to retrain teachers in Chicago than it is in New Mexico due to cost of living and teacher salaries. It was estimated, in this study that Chicago Public Schools lost $86 million per year on teacher turnover (Barnes, Crowe, & Schaefer, 2007). This policy will cut down on teacher turnover and empower teachers to become stronger in their profession, saving the schools thousands of dollars by keeping teachers employed.

I think administrators will prefer the relatively low cost associated with this type of ongoing training. After the initial training, the only real cost to the school will be for substitute teachers, if needed. It will be possible to run the trainings during planning periods, as long as one remained in compliance with the collective bargaining agreement with teachers. I believe these low costs will yield a high return on investment given the creation of competent, confident teachers, and the potential retention of students and their increased academic success.

The final group of stakeholders who stand to benefit from the implementation of the professional learning module that results from CRS Center adopting my policy is the students. The students will be exposed to more effective teachers and teaching and an improved environment of learning for the teachers as well as the students. The students' need for a quality education and opportunities beyond high school will be met through the high-quality teaching they will experience in the school. The best teachers will be modeling their practices for the rest of the educators in the schools, helping to replicate high quality teaching and learning. The students will have a chance to learn from the most competent teachers possible, thus increasing their ability to learn and grow as students.

The main value that the students will have gained through the implementation of the professional learning module that results from CRS Center adopting my policy will be a high-quality education. A high-quality education is an economic value. It can lead to students becoming meaningful contributors to not just continuing education and finding employment, but also prepare them to be more valued contributors to our economy by possessing those skills so essential to life throughout the 21st Century. I believe students will be better equipped to hold high paying jobs in their futures because they will have more college and career ready skills taught to and modeled for them by the teachers who are given the chance to learn from one another. The students will also be given opportunities to be more creative in their learning if the teachers are exposed to more ways to make the learning relevant and engaging. Teacher skills could also improve based on the exposure to the type of teaching and learning that is taught during the summer trainings and reinforced throughout the school year. This is an example of

the teachers using the cycle of continuous improvement (Cervone & Martinez-Miller, 2007).

The students' preference for active, technology driven learning experiences will be the final benefit to stakeholders. When I was an assistant principal, I never received any referrals or discipline issues from the teachers' classrooms that were engaging and using high yield strategies. In contrast, in the classrooms where the teachers did not use high engagement strategies, I often had to intervene with the students because they were misbehaving. When I asked the students about their behavior, they simple told me, "I was bored." These same students had no issue in the engaging teacher's classroom.

Rationale for the Validity of the Policy

As previously mentioned when outlining the needs, values, and preferences of the stakeholders involved with the CRS Center modules designed after adopting my new policy, there are many articles and books that reinforce the validity of this policy. This policy will help ensure that teachers no longer receive isolated professional learning experiences, but instead have opportunities throughout the school year to reinforce the learning that took place during a workshop.

The first goal is of my policy is to increase the understanding of job embedded professional learning opportunities among school leaders, by providing relevant, practical training designed to provide year-long learning on a campus. The second goal is to improve morale of teachers through ongoing, relevant professional learning opportunities through a deepened understanding of student centered strategies and how to use them. The third goal is to decrease training costs for schools by increasing teacher training impact from existing learning opportunities.

The goal of increasing the understanding of job embedded professional learning opportunities among leaders through training and an action plan that will provide yearlong learning on a campus meets the expectations of the federal definition of professional learning. The definition states that all professional learning opportunities be ongoing and job embedded (Hirsh, 2015). Helping administrators understand how to meet this federal mandate, not because it is a mandate, but because it is what is best for students is critical. It will allow those administrators to focus on the many other aspects of running their schools because the professional learning portion will be planned. The action plan that they will create will be mapped out prior to the beginning of the school year and the modules will make the process very smooth and low maintenance.

My policy will help meet the goal of improving the morale of teachers through ongoing, relevant professional learning opportunities through a deepened understanding of how to use student centered strategies. The Crossroads Model of professional learning discusses the importance of having strong in depth discussions about learning between teachers (Settlage & Johnston, 2014). These conversations will be an integral part of the implementation of this policy. The administrative teams will be given several protocols around how to get teachers to have these serious conversations about their classroom practices, and these will be reinforced through the opportunity to see one another teach. This will improve morale and increase the teachers' excitement for learning and teaching (Van Tassell, 2014).

The third goal is to decrease training costs for schools by increasing teacher training impact from existing learning opportunities. As mentioned earlier in this chapter, the cost of retraining teachers can be as much as $17,000 per teacher per year

(Barnes, Crowe, & Schaefer, 2007). That figure is based on the cost of hiring a new person, training him to the level of the exiting teacher, and providing a mentor to the new teacher for support. Raising morale and increasing opportunities for on the job training could lead to retaining teachers and cutting retraining costs dramatically. In addition to not having to retrain teachers, the cost to give teachers ongoing, job embedded professional learning through this process is relatively low as well. The main cost for this type of learning opportunity will be for substitute teachers to cover those who are observing others. The cost might be less, but regardless the improved results will be worth the cost. Avoidance of societal costs of ill-prepared citizens and dropouts is important to consider. The percent of non-high school graduates on welfare and in prison times the related costs will yield a significantly high cost one can avoid through improved education that is relevant and focuses on 21st Century skills.

I propose that this policy be implemented after one school year of research and resource creation and then remain ongoing. I will also assess the personnel needs to make this policy a reality in terms of creation of resources and additional training requirements. Operational efficiency will be the third objective. Keeping costs as minimal as possible while maximizing the impact as mentioned in the previous paragraph is what efficiency means.

Training will be required for CRS staff first. Once the staff is trained, they will have the opportunity to share what they have learned with administrative teams. The training will include how to properly orchestrate the walkthroughs on campus, what to look for when in the classrooms, and how to debrief the process to gain understanding for

the teachers. The final piece that will be trained in the module will be how to create a culture of safe teaching and learning.

Choosing classrooms that model mastery teaching will require the administrators to know their teachers and their capabilities in the classroom well. The strategies that are taught by CRS Center are research based strategies that require students to be active learners. The administrators will be taught what this type of teaching looks like through modeling during the workshop training.

The debrief of this process plays a key role in the success of this learning opportunity. The administrators will be shown how to conduct a productive debrief and the CRS program staff will reinforce this learning when they coach the schools in their CRS implementation. Teachers will leave the debrief with specific next steps for execution in their own classrooms.

Building the culture that is safe for teaching and learning means creating an environment where it is acceptable to try new things and make mistakes. The administrators will be given protocols to use with their staff to build a teaching and learning culture. This type of culture will take time and effort to create.

Conclusion

This policy, requiring CRS Center to include a follow up training element to all two and three-day workshops, will allow for educators to receive on the job, ongoing professional learning that is relevant, job embedded, and cost effective. The policy will require that modules be written and shared with those who attend the trainings and will include an action plan for the school year. By planning how this job embedded learning will take place, administrators will be better equipped to support the teachers and their

32

learning. Also, the teachers will feel more capable of trying the new strategies in their classrooms and the students will get to experience more competent and confident teachers.

I have found that teachers feel better equipped to teach their students when they have had the opportunity to watch other teachers teach. This policy would assist administrators in creating an action plan for those types of observations to take place in the school. According to the research I have conducted, the more confident teachers are in their practice the more likely they are to stay in their current schools. This confidence in the work has the ability to cut down on teacher turnover and ultimately training costs. Administrators and teachers would both benefit from the implementation of the action plans around ongoing professional learning on campus. A well-crafted module and specific training for administrators could be the key to improved use of best practices in classrooms.

<center>**SECTION FOUR: POLICY ARGUMENT**</center>

Every argument has two sides. In this section I outlined the arguments for and against it. I thought the latter was critical. By recognizing and anticipating potential arguments against my policy, I was able to address them proactively.

Moral leadership requires leaders to aim to serve. Those who lead morally build consensus, establish unity, and act with nobility (Tamang, 2013). My policy requires a shift in thinking on the part of an organization for learning to continue beyond a single event. It requires unity in thinking of administrators who believe learning should continue throughout the school year. It also requires leaders to follow a plan and act according to that plan. I believe school leaders will need to have to focus consistently on working the plan to continue monitoring these practices in each school building for this policy to be effective. This will hold both teachers and administrators accountable for its success. This focus is essential at each school for the policy to work effectively.

<center>**Arguments for the Policy**</center>

The purpose of this policy advocacy is to enhance the use of more effective teaching yield strategies in classrooms so that students are presented material in the most beneficial way for learning. This policy has the potential to impact the performance of administrators, teachers, and students. The positive components of this argument include multiple facets such as job embedded professional learning, ongoing training, positive morale development, and increased confidence for teachers, less teacher turnover, and improved student achievement.

CRS Center works with 40,000 educators from almost 6,000 schools each year. This policy will assure follow up, job embedded professional learning opportunities for

<center>34</center>

all of them. The policy will require that CRS Center to provide a module guiding the administrative teams in ways to engage educators in the use of high yield teaching strategies throughout the school year. The high yield teaching strategies include research based strategies in the categories of Writing, Inquiry, Collaboration, Organization, and Reading (WICOR) (source withheld for anonymity). Teachers will have the opportunity to see people use these strategies with students on their own campuses, and the administrators will provide space to discuss how to incorporate those strategies into their lessons. The federal definition of professional learning requires that trainings be job embedded to maximize learning (Hirsh, 2015). It is my job as a moral leader to create unity among the principals that learning must be continuous for it to be most effective.

Through the creation of the modules, CRS Center will provide an outline and a timeline for administrators to use with their staff to showcase the use of best practices on their campuses while asking a series of questions to enhance learning. Doing this with colleagues in their schools allows teachers to see what these strategies look like with their own students, making the practice job embedded. Having the teachers who are observed on staff allows teachers to begin asking one another questions about the teaching practices they observed daily if they wish. The learning will not have to happen in isolation or in a workshop setting, but instead in actual classrooms during the school day.

Using classroom walkthroughs as a learning tool, as this job embedded opportunity suggests, keeps teachers on a continuous feedback cycle. The implementation of the modules created because of my policy will require the teachers to "hypothesize, implement, reflect on implementation, and determine next steps" (Cervone & Martinez-Miller, 2007). The reflection portion of this cycle includes guidance and

space for growth in learning and practice. Talking about teaching while watching

teaching allows for learning to happen organically on a campus. This policy will include

guidelines for creating these types of opportunities.

Michael Fullan talks about the importance of job embedded learning in his *Six

Secrets of Change book. His third secret is "capacity building prevails." He says that it

is wise to invest in the continuous development of staff, which is what my policy will

require (Fullan, 2008). He also talks about urban education as being "America's hill to

climb" (p. 63). We can measure the hill, photograph the hill, walk around the hill, talk

about the hill, but at some point, we need to actually climb it. Watching people teach and

then asking them to replicate it in their own classrooms is causing people to climb the

educational "hill" and understand how to reach it. This type of learning and leading is

moral in nature because it unifies the staff, giving them a common understanding and

specific direction for what learning should be in their classrooms. This job embedded

professional development will provide continued training for professionals after leaving

the summer institute or Path training. This translates into year-round learning with

minimal cost. Workshops are the most common type of training situations, but they

involve travel costs and registration fees. This type of continued training will allow for

the learning to happen all year, at little to no additional cost. The only costs will be for

substitute teachers, and that is only a cost if the observations will happen during

observing teachers' assigned classes. One way to eliminate that cost is to have

administrators cover the teacher's classes while they go to observe. This could happen

when the teacher is giving an assessment, so as not to jeopardize learning time. I knew a

principal who made this a common practice in his building, and it made his teachers feel

valued. He said his teachers thanked him for his willingness to be "in the trenches" and his willingness to support their learning. The bonus was that it did not cost him anything monetary, only time (Spiro, personal communication, 2014). A moral leader's goal is to serve and lead others by example. A principal who is willing to serve his teachers will gain their support and loyalty.

Anytime a school can save money and still reap the positive benefits of learning is a win for the school. Another principal I worked with used planning time to conduct walkthroughs with teachers, but gave them back that time by excusing them from a faculty meeting if they participated in a walkthrough. The teachers will observe a class during their planning time, then complete a short exit slip that they turned in. The exit slip explained what they learned and what they were going to use in their own classrooms in the next two weeks. The principal will then go and observe them trying the new strategy. He found that he could share the information he will have shared at the faculty meeting via email or in small group settings. This approach did not cost the school anything and the teachers appreciated the follow up and accountability.

In conducting my research for my Program Evaluation Project, I interviewed twelve teachers who had participated in this type of walkthrough process on their campuses. All twelve said that they found the process to be beneficial to their own learning and their teaching practices. The number one thing they mentioned as a positive motivator to do this was their own boost in confidence. The teachers said that they "felt they were better equipped to try the strategies after seeing them" and they have focus on consistently working the plan, continuing to monitor the expected teacher instructional practices in each school, and hold both teachers and administrators accountable for the

use of the strategies. Increasing the confidence of educators allows them to try new ways

of work and rely on one another to get new ideas. This policy will create a platform for

this type of learning to happen in thousands of schools (McMullen, 2017).

Teacher turn-over affects schools across the nation. As mentioned earlier in this

paper, studies have shown that losing a single teacher can cost a school as much as

$17,000, depending on the state (Barnes, Crowe, & Schaefer, 2007). If teachers are

confident in their work and feel equipped to do their jobs, they are less likely to leave.

This policy will potentially increase confidence and therefore lower teacher turnover rate

in the schools where they implement the process. Principal Hall discussed his shift in

turnover numbers once his teachers felt more confident in their teaching abilities (Hall &

Simeral 2008). All the schools trained by CRS Center will be taught how to do this

walkthrough process.

Perhaps the most important positive reason for CRS Center to implement my

policy is improved student achievement. Students learn best by doing something, not by

being told something. The high yield strategies that will be taught and then observed

require the students to be take an active role in learning through writing, inquiry,

collaboration, reading, and organizational practices. By implementing my policy and

including additional modules to increase teachers' ability to provide high quality

instruction, student achievement will be positively impacted.

MIT conducted a study on active learning and found that by reading, writing,

collaborating and asking questions, students are forced to engage in higher order thinking

and therefore stronger learning (Bonwell & Eison, 1991). Twenty-six years later,

educators still agree that active learning creates long term understanding. This study has

been the basis for many more studies about how to get students to retain information. The higher the student engagement, the better the retention of information. Student achievement will improve if active learning becomes the norm. In 2014, STEM instructors realized that traditional lecturing did not create retention, especially for students from disadvantaged backgrounds (Freeman, et. al., 2014). All students deserve to improve their achievement, and one way to make that happen is to increase the amount of active learning happening on a campus.

Arguments Against the Policy

I not only expected opposition, but welcomed it to help my idea come to fruition. If I only analyzed this policy from the positive side, I will likely miss counter-arguments that could impede the approval and implementation of it. I worked to understand better both sides of the argument about my policy to create opportunities for ongoing professional learning following a specific workshop style training. As a moral leader, I want to create unity with this policy, while leading by example. Embedded teacher development is so promising for improving teaching and learning. It will be irresponsible not to implement it. This policy will involve a very large number of people, so it will require creative sharing and messaging to help people see how this is or is not beneficial for the organization and ultimately for schools and students.

My policy will require the CRS organization to create modules to be used by schools. The use of the modules will have to happen in the schools themselves, with limited outside accountability for use. The negative impacts that must be considered include the varying levels of professional understanding on how to build culture. Those varying levels will need to be addressed with the modules created. I need to address the

additional work that this policy will add to existing teams within the organization. It will

be difficult to monitor whether the modules are being used. There is also the chance that

bad practices might be replicated in schools that are participating. Also, I will address

the potential anxiety teachers could feel from the process if a culture of safety is not

created. Finally, I must address the perception that CRS Center is meddling in the

practices of schools.

The policy I am recommending requires that CRS Center include in its

professional learning model for two and three day trainings a module that provides follow

up training activities for each school to implement that includes follow up opportunities

to observe the strategies taught during workshop style trainings. A con to this policy

involves the varying levels of professional understanding of what needs to be done to

make these observations and learning opportunities fruitful. This will be a new practice

for some administrators and many teachers. The potential for teachers to find the

observations too stressful or evaluative in nature is high. In an article about allowing

teachers to observe other teachers, Hirsh says it is a risky thing to have colleagues

scrutinize your professional practice. Teachers must trust each other to make this process

beneficial (Israel, n.d.). Although the article states that the practice of observing one

another is a positive one for teachers, it also emphasizes the need to create the right

culture for the observations. Since the CRS Center modules my policy requires will be

up to the different schools to implement, it is likely that some administrators will attempt

to implement without creating the correct culture of trust first. The results could be

counter-productive to the intended outcome of improved practice.

The modules will need to include specific examples of how to set a culture of trust, collaboration, and safe for teachers to learn through embedded teaching staff development. Even if the modules include ways to create this kind of culture, it is still up to the individual administrators to interpret the learning and implement it successfully. The creators of the modules will need to anticipate the needs of multiple levels of professional understanding, which is a difficult reality, since the modules as implemented by the teachers will be watched and interpreted after the training is over. One way to overcome this obstacle will be to address the continuous learning opportunities during the workshop with the administrators in attendance. The administrators will then be able to ask questions and get clarification on how to implement successfully.

My policy will also create additional work for the professional learning team at CRS Center. Other assignments will not be removed from its employees to cover this task. The module writers will need to be creative and knowledgeable of the learners 'needs. Ideally, principals and coaches will also need to be consulted prior to the final product, to help anticipate needs. This will all require dedicated man hours to the project without additional staff. People may feel overtaxed and therefore might not give the project the proper attention. As a moral leader, I will need to support the staff by working with them to establish a joint, clear vision and help others understand the value of this policy and its potential outcomes for students.

After the modules are created and shared, CRS Center has no way to mandate use. The organization does not have any real way to mandate the use of any of the taught strategies, and this process will fall into the same category. Program managers are assigned to each district and they have four intentional interactions with a district level

contact person to discuss implementation, but it will still be up to each district and building level administrative team to implement the practice. Follow up assistance must be requested by the schools, which may not happen from the schools that need the assistance. Even though teachers observing teachers in a safe capacity is a practice that is gaining momentum in the educational world's professional development systems, there will be no mandate for the use of this one (Israel, n.d.). My leadership will need to be demonstrated here by guiding our internal staff to serve the schools in a way that meets their needs specifically without only assuming their needs. The staff will need to be encouraged to ask questions that will help them to determine how to support each school.

In addition to a lack of mandate, monitoring the use of this type of professional learning could prove problematic. Right now, CRS Center serves approximately 6300 with a staff of less than 100 program managers and state directors. It is not feasible for each school to be visited by a CRS staff member annually, leaving it up to the school and the school systems district director to monitor the use of best practices. This policy will lead to inclusion of the modules which could be powerful but will need to be monitored internally. If the schools' administrative teams do not understand the value and opportunity of the practice, it will not be a priority on campus. In the schools that CRS Center is able to visit, the practice could be monitored but due to the nature of the support for each school, the monitoring levels could be inconsistent.

Due to the varying levels of monitoring and support, it is possible that ineffective practices might be replicated rather than effective ones. If the teachers being observed in classrooms are not using best practices, or if the observations are not debriefed with the

teachers, a teacher might actually adopt practices that will not help the children be more effective learners.

Most administrators have received extensive training throughout their tenure on what highly effective teaching includes but teachers might not yet know. Without a debriefing process with a trained professional, a teacher could inadvertently misinterpret what he saw. The training modules will outline best practices intentionally, but all observations rely on the interpretation of the person observing. Coaching and open discussions should remedy this concern, but it is still a valid one. Practice and intentional conversations between administrators should remedy this concern.

Hirsh's comments about allowing teachers to observe other teachers specifically calls out the need to establish a culture that "nurtures a collegial exchange of ideas and promotes a certain level of trust" (Israel, n.d., p. 1). Without this type of collaborative culture, teachers could experience anxiety when others come to observe, for fear they will be judged. These observations should be student focused, not teacher focused, and the teachers must trust this to be true. If the administrators do not establish this safe culture, the teachers could feel threatened by these observations instead of finding them valuable. This lack of a safe culture could have an adverse effect on the use of best practices which will ultimately impact students.

In my Program Evaluation, I conducted walkthroughs with teachers in four secondary schools. In one of the four, a safe culture was not established by the principal and assistant principal. The use of best practice strategies went down between the first and second semester because the teachers did not feel that using the strategies was a benefit to the students or to them. Instead, they felt like they were ostracized by their

colleagues for trying new things. Through interviews I learned that the teachers who were using the strategies felt threatened by their colleagues at this school, but in the other three schools the teachers felt supported and equipped. A safe environment must be established for this policy to be beneficial to the teachers and students.

The last negative possible outcome to my policy involves the perceptions of the administrative teams. If the modules are given to the administrative teams after a workshop style training, some teams may feel as if CRS Center is meddling in their school affairs. By suggesting that this type of follow up occur, the administrators may feel it implies that they do not know how to run their schools in terms of professional development. In the spirit of leadership, I will need to be very cognizant of word choice and perceptions prior to releasing the modules. I need to have school leaders and teachers review the modules to avoid any language that might feel is condescending or accusatory. This type of training may be happening now in some schools, the policy could make it more widespread, but if it is perceived as meddling it will stop before it starts.

Conclusion

I addressed both the pros and cons of this policy. One of the most important pros involves providing ongoing, job embedded professional learning opportunities to schools after a training. Instead of the training ending when the workshop ends, the training will continue throughout the school year, allowing teachers to learn from one another. This type of ongoing learning will improve teaching and learning for the teachers and can result in improved student achievement. The most challenging cons involve addressing varying levels of understanding for this type of ongoing learning in a consistent module.

The administrators will all have a different understanding of how this process might work in their schools, but all levels of understanding will need to be supported.

If I am not willing to serve staff to help them see the value of this policy, it will be a burden rather than a benefit. I will need to create significant agreement among all stakeholders as to the value and purpose of my policy and the necessary execution of the strategies in school buildings. My learning over the last three years has shown me that no change can be sustained without vision and focus for making the change. I also discovered the important role culture plays in the development and implementation of this type of embedded learning.

The three elements of culture I identified in this section were a need for a safe learning environment, a willingness to create unity through collaboration, and trust among the teachers and the administrative teams. The administrative teams will need to assure their staff that they are free to try new teaching strategies without judgement but instead with support. The administrators can do this by not using these observations as evaluations but instead as learning tools. The teachers will need to understand how collaboration could enhance their classroom successes. This collaborative time needs to be protected and provided by administrative teams. The teachers and administrators must also trust one another to do what is best for students and each other. A culture of trust may take time to establish and master, but the results will positively impact all aspects of the school's faculty, staff, and students. Trust, collaboration, and security in a safe place for professional development can be built and maintained through observations and coaching conversations around teaching and learning.

This policy, though valuable in my eyes, must be seen as valuable to others to make it out of the idea phase. CRS Center must understand the value of this type of ongoing learning beyond the current model. Administrators and teachers must understand the need for accountability for use of new strategies. The teachers must embrace the idea of ongoing learning and trust their colleagues to support that learning. If all stakeholders can articulate the importance of this shift, the change will be sustainable and beneficial.

SECTION FIVE: POLICY IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

In order for the policy I am advocating to become a reality, there must be a plan for implementation that is administratively feasible. This plan outlines how the advocated policy could be implemented if it were to be adopted. Based on the nature of my policy being a shift for an organization, with the potential to impact thousands of schools, I will be giving a specific outline of what the organization will need to do as well as what the schools will need to do to carry out the new way of work.

Stages of Implementation

According to Fowler, there are six stages to standards-based, policy reform. First you must define the issue, which requires that all parties understand the purpose of the policy as outlined. Then an agenda must be set for getting the policy in front of the policy makers, whether that is local, state, or federal officials. The policy must then be formulated, adopted, implemented and eventually evaluated for effectiveness (Fowler, 2009).

Defining my policy requires an understanding of the organization it will impact. CRS Center is a non-profit professional learning organization. The majority of the professional learning offered by CRS Center takes place in a workshop type setting, and this policy will allow for an ongoing, job-embedded component to the learning to happen at each school. The policy will require that an action plan be created by schools it serves as a follow up to all two or three-day trainings, laying out a plan for monitoring the use of the strategies taught during the trainings. CRS Center will provide a module that will guide administrators through the creation of the action plan and will assist in the

implementation of the plan as needed. This module will be shared with external partners during Summer Institute season in 2019.

Creating follow up opportunities for teachers and administrators to experience job-embedded professional learning creates differentiation for teachers and meets their individual needs. This approach counters the current common practice of having all teachers attend the same training regardless of previous job experiences and expertise (Rock, 2002). Job-embedded professional learning along with reflective coaching, which will also be a part of my policy, provides specific learning opportunities for individual teachers.

As step two of Fowler's model suggests, my policy will need to be submitted to the Excellence Assurance Model (EAM) team, comprised of a cross-functional team of employees. In additional to being a team, this is a product pipeline submission option for the organization. The proposal sent to EAM will be reviewed and if deemed worthy it will be sent to the CEO of CRS Center and the CRS Center Board for final approval. The CEO sets the board agendas, and will need to be briefed on the importance of this policy. My policy keeps CRS Center in compliance with the federal definition of professional learning, which includes the terms "ongoing" and "job-embedded", allowing it to be funded using federal dollars (Hirsh, 2015). Without implementing this policy, it is possible that federal dollars will not be able to be used for teachers to attend CRS Center trainings. Much of the funding currently used to send teachers and administrators to training comes from Title II federal dollars, which can be used for professional learning (source excluded for anonymity). This step will need to happen in the spring of 2018, if roll out is to happen in the summer of 2019.

My policy will then need to be formulated, as Fowler suggests, into a tangible, well-written action plan that makes the process clear for the end users (Fowler, 2009). Often policies struggle to be properly implemented due to their vague explanation and end users unclear understanding. The formula for this policy will require a plan for internal creation of the policy as well as a plan for external implementation which must occur in the schools. The internal staff must understand the value of ongoing professional learning for school staff members that are trained during the summer institutes and path trainings. In addition to seeing value in the process, CRS's internal staff must develop a quality product that can be used by the schools without large amounts of additional support. Though not part of my policy, in order for my policy to have the ultimate impact intended, the schools must then be able to implement the plan for ongoing professional learning in their schools. Again, roll out to staff would take place in the spring of 2018.

This policy must also be adopted and implemented by two main stakeholders, the internal CRS Center staff and the external partners who choose to use CRS strategies in their schools. Fowler says that the adoption must be clear and consistent (Fowler, 2009). The internal staff must accept the idea that there is a need to take the existing model to a deeper level of understanding and implementation by creating opportunities for the monitoring of the use of strategies throughout the year. The current model does include the creation of a site plan for implementing the College Readiness System with fidelity. This system of teaching trains educators so that all students are given appropriate rigor and support. It does not specifically address the need to have intentional ways to ensure that the strategies are being used in classrooms on a regular basis. The internal staff and

the external partners will need to adopt the idea that every school should specifically monitor the use of the strategies throughout the school year to get the most positive results.

Implementation with fidelity needs to be the case for any initiative to be successful. The internal CRS staff will need to be educated and calibrated in how to monitor the use of these action plans and the external partners will need to understand the value of implementation with fidelity. The calibration will ensure that all schools are given the same type of support in this process. During implementation, accompanying regulations and rules do not dictate that the policy will go into operation (Fowler, 2009). Instead its success lies in the ability to motivate educators to implement the policy the way it was intended. Raising awareness and understanding will allow this policy to succeed.

The final stage in Fowler's system is evaluation. The policy must be evaluated to determine the success of implementation and the necessary changes needed to improve use. For this policy, feedback from the internal staff as well as the external partners will be needed on an ongoing basis to ensure usefulness of the goal of my policy as well as ways to identify and address the gaps and issues with implementation. This could be done both through candid conversations between program staff and districts as well as through surveys, capturing more quantitative data on the needs of the end users. The evaluation of this policy would need to begin a few months after roll out to the staff (early summer 2018) and continue every two to three months until it is shared with external partners. Once it has been shared with external partners, it will need to be evaluated once a

semester for the first year of implementation to determine the necessary shifts to improve the process and its results.

Implementing Change

Kotter makes it clear in his stages of implementing change that "creating urgency" is paramount to maintaining systemic change (Kotter, 1996). The best way to create urgency in this case is to improve the understanding of all stakeholders of the need for change. The federal definition of professional development now includes the terms "ongoing" and "embedded" saying that all professional development opportunities must include ongoing and embedded components to be funded using federal dollars. Many schools use Title II and Title V dollars to fund attendance at summer institutes and path trainings (source excluded for anonymity).

In addition to the potential loss of funding, it is paramount for all students to receive the best possible instruction so that they will be equipped to complete successfully their jobs in the future. If teachers use these high yield strategies, the students will be shown the skills they need to be successful in their future jobs. These types strategies are taught through summer institutes and path trainings. According to Tony Wagner, in his book *The Global Achievement Gap,* there are seven survival skills that all students should be taught. His list includes critical thinking, collaboration, oral and written communication, and accessing and analyzing information (Wagner, 2008). CRS focuses on WICOR, which is an acronym for writing, inquiry, collaboration, organization, and reading (source omitted to protect anonymity). I will submit that WICOR strategies cover all of Wagner's suggested skills. The urgency of accepting and

incorporating this policy into CRS Center's professional development model cannot be overstated. It impacts the preparation of our students for their future careers.

All stakeholders need to understand their role in the implementation of this policy. The internal CRS staff will need to create a quality professional learning package to be used by schools. It must include practical learning modules that guide schools in the implementation of ongoing, job-embedded professional learning. The external partners, in this case the districts' and schools' administrative teams and instructional coaches, must understand the value of the modules created through this policy and the opportunity it will afford the students and teachers at the school.

Establishing Organizational Policy

CRS Center, as an organization, has an internal system called the Excellence Assurance Model (EAM). EAM consists of a team of cross departmental members who receive all requests for new products, services, or policies. If someone in the organization has a suggestion for a change in products, services, or policies they complete a form explaining the new idea and its implications on the organization at large. The team reviews the request and then speaks directly to the person who made the request to gather more information. If the idea is deemed valuable to the organization, it is given to the CEO and board for approval and given the appropriate funding and man power for execution.

I have included a copy of the EAM request form in the Appendix. It includes what the policy is, who it might impact, what is needed to carry it out, and the purpose of the policy. These issues must be sufficiently addressed for the new policy to be considered by the executive team.

Multilevel Support Structure

In order for any policy to work, it must be supported at all levels. My policy will need both internal organizational support and external school based support. There will need to be support of internal program staff in the form of training for those designing the modules and training for those who will teach the modules. The training for those who will design the modules will need to give proper context to the company's team members who will be using the modules, enabling them to make the most appropriate product that will meet the needs of the schools.

Once those modules have been created, the program staff will need to receive training on how to support the schools in the use of the modules and implementation of the ongoing professional learning model. This training will need to happen throughout the school year and will need to be differentiated based on the staff's needs and prior knowledge. After the staff works with the schools for a while on the implementation of this new practice, I will survey the staff and determine what additional training is needed.

Support will also be needed for the administrative teams and instructional coaches who will be working in the schools to implement the new follow up to the summer institutes and path trainings. The modules will be given to the administrative teams and instructional coaches, but there will be questions about implementation. Those questions can be answered by program staff assigned to each district. In addition to asking questions, the administrative teams and instructional coaches will be supported when the program staff come to visit their districts. This happens once or twice a year depending on the needs of the school. During these visits, the program staff can help check for the fidelity of use of the strategies as well as the system for exposing the teachers to the

strategies through walkthroughs. In some schools, this will be a new practice and may require some guidance upon implementation.

The teachers will need to be supported in this new process as well. For many teachers, this will be the first time they have ever been in other teachers' classrooms. They may need to ask questions or receive training on what to look for in the classrooms. The administrative teams and instructional coaches will set the stage for how these walkthroughs will be conducted on each campus. If they have a solid understanding of the purpose they will need to demonstrate and share that understanding with the teachers. A culture of safety will also assist with supporting the teachers. If the teachers understand and trust that they are not being evaluated during these walkthroughs but are instead learning about the implementation process, the changes will be much better received (Van Tassell, 2014). If teachers are expected to implement strategies immediately without support they could feel threatened. This process of including instructional rounds throughout the school year is meant to support them in their implementation, but they must first understand the process. This understanding of the strategies will come from exposure and careful explanation.

These support systems will need to be ongoing, meeting the needs of those involved as they arise. The needs of each stakeholder group will not necessarily be evident at the onset of the implementation. Some will come up later as the system begins to be utilized. Constant discussion and analysis of the needs of participants can happen for each group through an assessment plan. The assessment plan will serve as a source for identifying ways for improvement. CRS Center uses the continuous improvement cycle as its model for ongoing assessment. The schools working with CRS Center have

all been exposed to this model as they implemented the College Readiness System. The continuous improvement cycle will be applied to this new way of learning as well, and each stakeholder group will have the opportunity to Plan, Do, Study, and Act on this implementation as well (Sawyer, 2012).

Conclusion

The goal of my policy is that professional learning be job embedded and ongoing, creating effective learning opportunities for students by better equipping teachers (Florida Department of Education, 2011). In accordance with the principal's competencies in Florida, I will assure that this policy provides direction to the CRS Center staff in creating modules that cover all four domains. Student achievement, domain one, will be addressed because the teachers will be observing and using best practices throughout the school year. Domain two, instructional leadership, is addressed through this policy because the focus is on learning for the teachers and the students. Staff development will be needed for multiple stakeholders to ensure quality implementation. The learning will be modeled for teachers and made a priority by the administrative teams (Florida Department of Education, 2011).

Domain two, instructional leadership, will be addressed through my policy because the focus is on learning for the teachers and the students. The modules will include ways for learning to be modeled for teachers and made a priority by the administrative teams (Florida Department of Education, 2011). Staff development will be needed for multiple stakeholders to ensure quality implementation and the modules will address this.

Organizational leadership, domain three, is addressed both within CRS Center, through the creation of the modules, and in schools through the implementation of the modules. The policy will lead to the development of modules that leaders can use as they work to improve teaching and learning in their schools. This is an important standard within this domain, and needs constant attention to improve schools (Florida Department of Education, 2011).

The fourth domain, professional and ethical behavior, is addressed through the "commitment to the success of all students." By allowing teachers to see one another teach and discussing the use of best practices school wide, all students will be exposed to a higher yield of instructional strategies (Florida Department of Education, 2011). All students could be positively impacted by this policy if the training and follow up embedded professional development is implemented with fidelity.

Implementation of this policy has the potential to impact positively all stakeholders. In my research, I found that teachers felt better equipped to do their jobs after watching one another teach. If that type of learning could be replicated in 6,500 schools across the nation, students would be the biggest benefactor. Administrators are tasked with supporting their teachers and this policy will help create a concrete way to give strong support.

SECTION SIX: POLICY ASSESSMENT PLAN

In monitoring progress and evaluating outcomes and results of this policy once it is implemented, a policy assessment plan will be necessary. My assessment plan outlines how those responsible for policy implementation will be held accountable and what report procedures will be executed. This assessment plan will also determine what aspects of the policy need to be measured.

Policy Assessment Plan

My policy requires that CRS Center staff include in their professional learning model the requirement of an action plan for schools to monitor the use of high yield strategies throughout the school as a follow up to training sessions conducted by CRS Center. My assessment plan needs to have two components. The first part of the assessment plan will need to be established to determine whether the modules designed to train the coaches and administrators are sufficient and well written. The second part of the assessment plan will be designed to determine if the schools are equipped enough to utilize the modules to change their practice.

Determining whether the modules are sufficient and well written requires input from end users. Once the modules are written they need to be field tested with a pilot group of schools. The schools will need to be at different stages of implementation with the College Readiness System. The feedback given by this pilot group needs to be analyzed and then interventions and tweaks to the modules will have to be made in accordance to the needs of the pilot groups. This analysis needs to be done once a semester in the first year of implementation, and then once a year after that. Getting ongoing feedback should prevent the modules from becoming irrelevant. CRS has access

to 6,500 schools and frequently uses small groups of them for various pilots. The same selection process that is used for those initiatives would be used for this one, selecting willing participants from existing trainings.

Assessing the understanding of the practice of this action plan at each school will require surveys and interviews with a random selection of administrators possessing a variety of experience with the College Readiness System. These questions will be geared more toward the use of the action plan designed and less about the module itself. The purpose of this portion of the assessment plan is to see if schools are implementing the suggested practices and seeing results.

In addition to the interviews and surveys, it will be beneficial to create cohorts of administrative teams who are using this process in their schools. The cohorts could learn from one another and inform the work of other schools by giving feedback to CRS Center. A cohort model will also increase synergy of ideas and improve implementation. Much like the idea of Edcamp, which is a training where teachers are empowered to share their best ideas in a free flowing manner, there will not necessarily be a set schedule for the cohort. Instead it will be an opportunity where administrators could share best practices and learn from one another (Swanson, 2014). A few states currently have principals' collaborative groups where CRS systems are discussed, but this assessment plan will increase the number of administrators that will have the opportunity to participate in these types of conversations.

The assessment plan will also need to determine whether implementing this policy has had an impact on the use of CRS strategies in classrooms. If teachers do not increase their use the strategies taught, then the system will not improve instruction and

needs to be revamped. The evaluation can be done through anonymous surveys of the teaching staff asking if their use of strategies has changed in any way after the walkthroughs became a common practice. This type of assessment will require either a baseline survey, taken prior to the implementation of the policy, or questions worded to ask teachers to interpret how the process has changed their practice. If it is not changing practice, then the entire concept will need to be revisited to determine why.

There are four key factors that determine if change efforts will be sustained over time. They are frameworks, leaders, community, and institutionalization (Perkins & Reese, 2014). The assessment plan for this policy, through carefully worded surveys could address all four of these factors. The questions will be designed to ask administrators, teachers, and CRS Center staff members about the frameworks that exist around the policy, how the leaders have embraced, or not embraced the process of creating opportunities for ongoing professional learning on campus, what all stakeholders think of this process, and how the modules is utilized school wide.

Policy Accountability Plan

As was the case with the assessment plan, I need to have two components to my accountability plan for my policy. The first portion is to hold the internal CRS team accountable for keeping the modules updated and to educate the staff members who will be training others on the creating of an action plan for professional learning. The second is to hold the principals and administrative teams accountable for using the action plan to monitor the use of high yield strategies in classrooms.

Internally, the CRS stakeholders will be held accountable through the organization's evaluation system. Currently, employees meet with their supervisors

twice a year to discuss their Employee Performance Goals (EPG). During these discussions, the employees who work with districts will need to discuss how they are supporting districts in their implementation of ongoing, job embedded professional learning. This could be set as an organizational goal for all program staff or it could be written individually by each program staff employee. The supervisors will then provide support to the employee if this goal is not being met. This support could come in the form of training, shadowing other employees, or coaching.

The administrative teams and instructional coaches will also need to be held accountable for the use of the action plan for monitoring high yield strategy use in classrooms. This accountability could come in a couple forms. Each district that implements CRS must employ a CRS District Director, who is a school board employee who oversees the implementation of the College Readiness System. The district director is expected to interact with the schools regularly to monitor their implementation of the CRS system. The use of the action plan for ongoing professional learning could be embedded in those ongoing conversations and meetings.

The CRS Center program staff member could also hold schools accountable for the use of this action plan during their coaching visits. The coaching visits that the CRS Center staff member does not necessarily happen at every school, however, but it does happen in every district. The program staff member could assist the district director in holding the schools accountable by modeling conversations around these action plans.

This type of support could be done through the use of checklists, to assist with the vast number of schools some districts are monitoring. In *The Checklist Manifesto*, Gawande argues that every situation that might be repeated could benefit from having a

checklist (Gawande, 2009). The checklist in this case will have some specific items that every action plan should have and the program staff member could very simply look for those specific items to be put into action. The consistency that a checklist could create will allow for a large amount of information on the fidelity of implementation to be shared in a concise, consistent way.

Both the implementation of the plan and the administration of the plan must be addressed. The checklist will help determine how the plan is being administered and whether or not the necessary elements have been put into place. The administrative team has dates for classroom visits, the teachers have time built into their schedules to watch other teachers teach, or the expert teachers have been identified.

The implementation of the plan is more subjective. If the administrative team did not create a safe culture for learning, then the teachers will feel threatened instead of empowered (Perkins & Reese, 2014). How a school implements a plan for ongoing professional learning will determine its success. This will be more difficult to measure, but can be demonstrated through anonymous surveys and interviews as well.

Conclusion

If the vision and purpose of my policy is carefully assessed and stakeholders are held accountable for the use of the policy, teachers will be better equipped to teach and students will have more positive learning experiences in schools. The assessment process needs to be consistent and ongoing, informing necessary tweaks and adjustments to implementation. The accountability process will increase value and purpose of the training opportunities and improve implementation. Inspecting what is expected

increases the likelihood that high yield strategies will be used in classrooms, improving

learning for students.

SECTION SEVEN: SUMMARY IMPACT STATEMENT

The last section of my paper includes a reflective summary impact statement. The anticipated consequences of implementing my advocated policy as intended are summarized below. I intend to outline succinctly my thoughts on this policy's implications and potential results and reflect on next steps.

Appropriateness of the Policy

The federal definition of professional development specifically calls out the need for all opportunities to be job embedded and ongoing. In order for the training that CRS Center provides through Summer Institutes and Write Path to fit this national definition there must be a follow up component built into the training. The follow up component will need to be carried out by the administrators and coaches in each school, but can be supported by CRS Center staff members. The federal definition has been adjusted to include these components because if training is not job embedded and ongoing the strategies learned will not be monitored and utilized as frequently (Hirsh, 2015).

Implementing a policy in an organization that trains over 60,000 teachers and administrators each year will improve the implementation of the training received for those schools and teachers, therefore positively impacting the educational experience for the students attending those schools. My policy will take an already well respected professional learning organization and increase the impact and influence it is able to have.

Implementing this policy will also improve equity, equality, and adequacy of learning in the schools who attend the training. Currently some administrators monitor the use of strategies after a training and some do not. In schools, the number one frustration with professional learning is that the strategies are not used once the educators

return to their campuses (Swanson, 2014). This policy leads CRS Center professional learning teams to create modules that will improve the professional learning follow up enabling teachers and administrators to improve their practice which will close the gap by providing a step by step plan for how to increase the use of the strategies through a guided action plan and support. Administrators will all receive the tools needed to implement a solid action plan for monitoring learning (equality), while having opportunities to contact CRS program staff if they need more explanation or help executing their action plans (equality). Each school's staff members who attend will also receive adequate support for trying this new way of work.

The values that will be addressed in the implementation of this policy include quality, economic growth, and community (fraternity) (Fowler, 2009). Each one of these values is held by a variety of stakeholders, but all ultimately serve the goal to increase student achievement for all students on the participating campuses. The value of quality is the cornerstone for why this work should be done.

Administrators and coaches want the educators in their buildings to be equipped to teach children in the most effective way possible. The more effective the educators are the higher the student achievement, the lower the teacher turnover rate, and the better overall success of the school. Educators, both administrators and teachers want to know how to do their jobs well so that they can best serve the students, be recognized for their good work and see students become well rounded, well-educated citizens. All these desires speak directly to the value of quality.

Economic growth, in the case of school systems, includes producing students with the skills to be positive contributors to society. Breaking the trend of generational

poverty by equipping students with the skills they need to attend college and technical schools beyond graduation helps to break that trend. The strategies that are taught at Summer Institute and Write Path trainings are all college and career readiness skills based.   If the strategies are used in all classrooms, the students will be equipped to have educational and career options upon graduation. These can then lead to improving the economy and way of life of their communities, states, and the nation,

When teachers feel equipped to perform their jobs well, they are less likely to leave the profession. The cost of losing a teacher and having to train a new one can be as much as $17,000 per teacher depending on location and tenure of the teacher (Barnes, Crowe, & Shafer, 2007). If teachers are given the opportunity to learn from one another and become better equipped to do their jobs, they are less likely to leave their schools or the profession. The value of economic growth will be met for the administrators and the teachers through the implementation of this policy.

The third value that will be addressed by the implementation of this policy will be community, or as Fowler calls it "fraternity" (2009). If teachers are given the opportunity to watch one another teach and then discuss the learning on a scheduled basis, then their sense of community and trust in the system will improve. They will have a strong network of collegial support that will help them improve their teaching craft. The action plan set by the administrative teams will require carving out time for teachers to learn from one another. Many teachers feel isolated in their profession, closing their doors and staying within their own four walls (City, 2011). Having this policy implemented by CRS Center professional learning will help provide professional learning modules that create training in practices to break down walls and give teachers the freedom to

collaborate and become a genuine community of learners. There is a thin line between fraternity and risk, and the balance lies in building trust in the schools.

Vision Supporting the Policy

The vision that drove me to write about this policy stems from my core belief that all students have the right to learn from the very best. My own children have had a combination of stellar teachers and struggling teachers. They have not ever attended a school where this type of learning takes place among the educators in the building, but I have seen these types of schools first hand. Everything about the schools that allow teachers to watch one another teach feels different. The teachers are more confident. The rigor level is higher. The students are more engaged, and learning happens in every classroom. I believe that every child, including my own, deserves to attend a school where those things are the norm not the exception. I want to do what I can to ensure that this type of learning becomes the norm in all schools, but am focusing now on the CRS schools across the nation, so that students can reap the benefits.

There is a high school in southern Florida that embodies the title "teaching and learning center." The principal believes in having a well-trained staff, but the training does not stop with Summer Institute. The training happens all year long on her campus, through her teachers, and is truly ongoing and job embedded. She understands the power of seeing best practices and having collegial conversations. She implemented an action plan that allowed for learning to be continuous for her teachers and her administrators. The school board supports her way of work by allowing her to have the resources and personnel necessary to continue this process of on-site teaching and learning. All professional learning takes place on campus during the school year and reinforces what

they learned in summer workshop trainings. The teachers teach one another in areas of need, as determined by the staff, not by the administrators. The process of learning is active and ongoing.

All children deserve to go to a high school like this one. My vision is that all the schools exposed to CRS's training will be equipped to become more like the school I just described. I realize that the level of implementation will vary based on the leadership of the school, but at least all teachers should have access to the tools to make "teaching and learning" centers.

<div align="center">

How the Policy Serves Stakeholders

</div>

My policy serves the needs and concerns of all stakeholders (administrators, teachers, students, and CRS Center staff) in a variety of ways. I will separate the needs and concerns of each party to best address how the policy will work towards meeting all of them. The accountability plan for my policy will determine how well these needs and concerns are met, but the plan will be clearly laid out.

Administrators have a need to increase student achievement campus wide regardless of socioeconomic status, race, or culture. All students need to have an opportunity to learn from the best teachers possible. Administrators also need their teachers to be equipped to educate all students well. They are concerned, however, with all the teaching and learning initiatives they have in their buildings already, and will need to see how this one fits with everything else they are mandated to do. I will address both this need and concern by providing opportunities for the administrators to see how this process ties to the other mandates they have been given, and how it can improve the overall health of the campuses.

Teachers need to feel well equipped to do their jobs and need to be able to learn in a safe environment. This policy will provide opportunities to learn on their own campuses and see highly effective teaching strategies being utilized with actual students. The modules will provide suggestions for questions to ask so that the learning can be directed towards the specific needs of the teachers. They will also assist the administrative teams in creating a safe environment for this type of learning. The process will be monitored and supported to insure it provides a chance for teachers to learn without fear of penalty.

Students need the chance to learn from the best teachers possible. They need to be equipped to have options when then graduate from high school. They need to have the appropriate skill sets to be successful in those options whether they are college or career based (Wagner, 2008). This policy addresses those needs by providing guidance to the CRS Center professional learning to expand the model to include embedded professional learning following face to face 2-3 day trainings. The training equips teachers to equip the students through high quality teaching strategies, and then continually giving opportunities for the teachers to improve their skills. The students need the best, and this policy will help increase the pool of teachers who can provide the "best" that the students deserve.

The final stakeholder group involved with this policy directly is CRS Center staff. The needs of the CRS staff members include having the skill sets to build the teaching and learning modules, and the ability to monitor the implementation of the policy at the school level. The people who build the modules will have done this sort of work in their jobs prior to working for CRS Center. They will be former principals and coaches who

had successfully implemented this type of action plan in their schools. The program staff that will be monitoring the implementation of the policy will receive ongoing training. It will include shadowing staff who have experienced these action plans first hand and allowing for ongoing, job embedded professional learning to happen within the organization as well.

Conclusion

I designed this policy specifically to improve teaching and learning for students. If done with fidelity, having a template to follow to create an action plan for ongoing professional learning could change the outcomes a school gets from its teachers and ultimately its students. However, a plan only works if it is executed properly. This policy's chances for success lies in multiple hands. The CRS Center staff members will need to write comprehensive, easy to follow modules that administrators and coaches from all backgrounds can follow and understand. The administrators and coaches must be willing to ask questions and implement the modules and action plans to the best of their ability, providing opportunities for teachers to learn from one another. Teachers must be willing to learn from others and change their practices to improve their craft.

My vision is to improve learning for as many students as possible so that we can produce global citizens who are equipped to lead us in the future. If this policy leads to improved chances of that vision becoming a reality in even one more school, then it will be a positive change. With the right assessment tools in place, I believe the learning yield will be much higher than one more school. I believe it will positively impact the lives of thousands, maybe even millions of students.

69

Principals have many different initiatives to juggle daily, but I think being an instructional leader should take top priority. This module and the subsequent action plan would allow for instruction to improve on their campus with minimal preparation. The training that the administrators would need would be built into a training that they have already committed to attending. The follow through would be up to each principal, however it would be supported by a district director within the district and a CRS program staff member.

This type of ongoing professional learning fits within all school improvement plans because highly functional instruction leads to student achievement, which is the focus of every plan. The support and guidance that the administrative teams would receive from CRS would translate into instructional success on campuses without a difficult planning process. Once principals understand how this will positively impact their students, the buy in and excitement for the process will inevitably follow.

REFERENCES

Barnes, G., Crowe, E., & Schaefer, B. (2007). *The cost of teacher turnover in five school districts executive summary*. Washington, DC: National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. Retrieved from https://nctaf.org/wp-content/uploads/CTTExecutiveSummaryfinal.pdf

Blanding, M. (2009, May 12). *Treating the "instructional core": Education rounds*. Retrieved from https://www.gse.harvard.edu/news/uk/09/05/treating-instructional-core-education-rounds

Bonwell, C. & Eison, J. (1991). *Active learning: creating excitement in the classroom*. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED340272) http://ericae.net/db/edo/ED340272.htm

Browder, L.H. (1995). An alternative to the doctoral dissertation: The policy advocacy concept and the policy document. *Journal of School Leadership, 5,* 40-69.

Cervone, L., & Martinez-Miller, P. (2007, Summer). Classroom walkthroughs as a catalyst for school improvement. *Leadership Compass, 4*(4). Retrieved from https://www.naesp.org/resources/2/Leadership_Compass/2007/LC2007v4n4a2.pdf

City, E. A. (2011). Learning from instructional rounds. *Coaching: The New Leadership Skill, 69*(2), 36-41.

Cohen, D. (2014, December 5). Re: Professional development evolving (repost) [Web log post]. Retrieved from http://dbceducation.com/professional-development-evolving/

D'Orio, W. (2010). Why can't school leaders be more like doctors? *Scholastic Administrator, 9*(6), 50.

Eury, A. D., Snyder, M. A., & Melton, J. (n.d.). *How administrators can empower teachers*. Retrieved from http://www.teachhub.com/working-together-administrators-role-empowering-teachers

Florida Department of Education. (2011). *The Florida principal leadership standards*. Retrieved from http://www.fldoe.org/teaching/professional-dev/the-fl-principal-leadership-stards/

Fowler, F. C. (2009). *Policy studies for educational leaders: An introduction* (3rd ed). Boston, MA: Prentice Hall.

Freeman, S., Eddy, S. L., McDonough, M., Smith, M. K., Okoroafor, N., Jordt, H., & Wenderoth, M. P. (2014). Active learning increases student performance in science, engineering, and mathematics. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *111*(23), 8410-8415. doi:10.1073/pnas.1319030111

Gawande, A. (2009). *The checklist manifesto.* New York: Henry Holt and Company.

Guskey, T. R., (2014). Planning professional learning. *Educational Leadership. 71*(8), 11-16.

Hall, P., & Simeral, A., (2008). *Building teachers' capacity for success; A collaborative approach for coaches and school leaders.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervisors and Curriculum Development.

Hirsh, S. (2015, December 18). *New bill offers a good start on defining PD*. Oxford, OH: Learning Forward: The Professional Learning Association. Retrieved from https://learningforward.org/who-we-are/professional-learning-definition

Israel, M. (n.d.). *Teachers observing teachers: A professional development tool for every school*. Retrieved from http://www.educationworld.com/a_admin/admin/ admin297.shtml

Kotter, J. P. (1996). *Leading change.* Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Kumar, M. (2011, October 12). *Difference between goals and objectives*. Retrieved from http://www.differencebetween.net/business/difference-between-goals-and-objectives/

Lambert, J., & Mitrani, V. (n.d.). *Standards for Professional Learning.* Oxford, OH: Learning Forward: The Professional Learning Association. Retrieved from https://learningforward.org/standards/implementation

McMullen, C. (2017). WICOR walkthroughs and teacher practice: A program evaluation project (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). National Louis University, Chicago, IL.

Perkins, D. N., & Reese, J. D., (2014). When change has legs: Four key factors help determine whether change efforts will be sustained over time. *Educational Leadership 71*(8), 42-47.

Public Impact. (2014). *Teacher-led professional learning: To reach every student with excellent teachers—Selecting teacher-leaders*. Chapel Hill, NC: Author. Retrieved March 12, 2017 from http://opportunityculture.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/Selecting_Teacher-Leaders-Public_Impact.pdf

Rock, H. M., (2002). Job-embedded professional learning and reflective coaching. *The Instructional Leader 5*(8), 1-4.

Rost, J., (1996). *Leadership for the twenty-first century*. Westport, CT: Praeger

    Publishers.

Sawyer, I., (2012, October 10). Plan, do study, act: A professional development model

    [Web log post]. Retrieved from https://www.collaborativeclassroom.org/blog/

    2012/10/10/plan-do-study-act-a-professional-development-model

Settlage, J., & Johnston, A. (2014). The crossroads model. *Educational Leadership,*

    71(8), 67-70.

Swanson, K. (2014) Edcamp teachers take back professional development: How can

    participant-led, one-day events open up new possibilities for professional

    learning? *Educational Leadership, 71*(8), 36-40.

Tamang, B. (2013, August 13). What do you mean by moral leadership? [Web log post].

    Retrieved from http://www.globalethicsnetwork.org/profiles/blogs/what-do-you-

    mean-by-moral-leadership

Tomlinson, C. (2014). Classroom-based professional learning. *Educational Leadership,*

    71(8), 90-91.

Van Tassell, R. (2014). The trouble with top-down: A small group of teachers were

    energized by learning from one another—until the learning was mandated.

    Educational Leadership, 71(8), 76-78.

Wagner, T. (2008). *The global achievement gap: Why even our best schools don't teach*

    the new survival skills our children need -and what we can do about it. New

    York: Basic Books.

Wagner, T., Kegan, R., Lahey, L., Lemons, R., Garnier, J., Helsing, D., Howell, A., &

    Rasmussen, H. T. (2006). *Change leadership: A practical guide to transforming*

    our schools. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Appendix: Excellence Assurance Model Request Form

New item

What did you see?
>Please describe the issue and tell us the following as appropriate:

>• Who is impacted?
>• Frequency of the occurrence
>• If it involves an existing procedure, policy, or process, and
>• Any steps taken to resolve the issue (Please submit another form if you have multiple suggestions)

How do you suggest we solve it?*

What brought this issue to your attention?
>Please describe the source of your suggestion, for example, your own observation or feedback from a client or vendor.

Anything else we should know?

Email

For follow up.

EAM Admin

Process Owner

Accountable Stakeholder
Title

Value Change
Select an option

Purpose

Admin Review Status
Select an option

Management Review Status
Select an option

PO EAM Action
Select an option

PO Review Status
Select an option

Team Review
Select an option

Leadership Review Status
Select an option
Resources

Status

Received

Actions Taken / Next Steps

Supporting Documents

CRS Department
Select an option

Action Reason / Comments
Procedure owner reasons / comments for choice of how to handle suggestion.

Attachments

Add attachments