



# Division Embedded Professional Development Committee

Report to Red Deer Catholic School Board

February 2010

## Report Overview

To: Board of Trustees

## Report Introduction

This report is a summary of the work of the Division Embedded Professional Development Committee. The purpose of the report is to summarize the process and the findings of the committee that led to the recommendation being forwarded to the Red Deer Catholic School Board for consideration. Please note that this report and work of the committee is limited to the schools in Red Deer, Sylvan Lake and Innisfail. Due to shared busing arrangements with Wild Rose School Division, the two schools in Rocky Mountain House have been tied to early Friday dismissal and this will continue until there are significant changes to busing and calendar. This report is divided into sections/topics that were pertinent to the committee work. Each topic section includes a brief summary or discussion and is followed by summary comments from the committee. Where appropriate, criticisms or challenges faced by the committee on the discussion topic are listed. I want to applaud the committee members for their commitment and generous contributions to the committee. Members of the committee are:

Janis Carscadden	Parent Representative
Jolyne Crashley	Parent Representative
Mona Borle	A.T.A Executive
Nicole Laderoute	A.T.A Executive
Brice Unland	A.T.A Economic Policy Committee
Kim Mantle	A.T.A Economic Policy Committee
Greg Hall	A.T.A Principal
Al Libby	A.T.A Principal
Jennifer Cote	A.T.A. P.D. Committee Representative
Chris McCullough	A.T.A. P.D. Committee Representative
Diane MacKay	School Board Trustee
Adriana LaGrange	School Board Trustee
Dr. Lynne Paradis	Associate Superintendent – Learning Services
Dr. Paulette Hanna	Superintendent of Schools

The committee did considerable work in exploring the complex field of teacher professional development and communicating findings with stakeholder groups. Enclosed is the unanimous recommendation from the committee. Following is the report which summarizes some of the key activities and findings of the committee.

Yours in Christ,



Dr. Paulette Hanna  
Superintendent of Schools

## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

That the RDCRD Board of School Trustees approve an Embedded PD model that provides for a weekly Monday 70 minute early student dismissal to support ten minutes of transition time as students leave school and sixty minutes of quality embedded professional development for teachers.

The above recommendation is made with the following provisions of understanding:

- That each school principal assumes responsibility to communicate and work with parent councils and parents to address safety concerns that may be connected with this Embedded P.D. model. All schools must offer on site supervision at the school's expense.
- That the Superintendent will explore the possibility of changing school zones to playground zones.
- That school administration, in collaboration with school professional teaching staff, is accountable to ensure that all embedded P.D. is quality and directly related to the improvement of professional teaching practice instruction and improvement in student learning.
- That changes to the existing minutes in the school operational day in each school are kept to a minimum and the first consideration is given to reducing the number of full day P.D. days to reach this objective.
- That the Superintendent will monitor and evaluate the embedded P.D. program on an ongoing basis.

## 1. Committee Formation

At the regular school board meeting in June 2, 2009, a recommendation to support the implementation of Embedded Professional Development (EPD) with a weekly Monday 70 minutes early dismissal of students was defeated. The Board stated strong support for the concept of EPD and accepted that, over the three-year pilot project, teacher satisfaction rates with school professional development had improved considerably, and that a positive impact on Division student achievement seemed evident in the research supporting the recommendation.

**“THAT THE BOARD APPROVES OPTION 2 (ONE HOUR WITH 10-MINUTE TRANSITION TIME, FOR A TOTAL OF A 70-MINUTE EARLY DISMISSAL) EMBEDDED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SCHEDULE FOR DIVISION TEACHERS, EFFECTIVE THE 2009/2010 SCHOOL YEAR** **DEFEATED.**

Trustees felt that, while embedded professional development is good for teachers and students, this decision should be tabled, with parents being given an opportunity to have input into the decision. “

Prior to this meeting, the Superintendent had directed school administrators and central office staff to gather information on the status and support of embedded PD in Division schools. (Information was gathered from the Division during Feb – May 2009). Data and information was gathered from each school which included trend survey data on both Professional Development satisfaction and student achievement. Information from the local Alberta Teachers’ Association was also shared in the form of survey results. The Local had conducted discussions and developed a survey regarding support for EPD which showed strong teacher support for the recommendation.

After defeat of the motion, the Board gave direction to the Superintendent to gather more input from stakeholder groups on the topic of EPD ensuring that the parent stakeholder group was significantly involved. The status quo of early Monday dismissal of students by 30 minutes would continue to operate in the 2009 – 2010 school term while more information was gathered from parents and other stakeholder groups.

In June, it became apparent from the Local A.T.A. that the status quo was not acceptable because the model was not fully embedded P.D. Although A.T.A. stated they were in support of embedded P.D., the 60 minutes of teacher time being used during the three-year pilot would need to be revisited. At an emergent general assembly of the local teachers in late June, teachers passed a motion that demonstrated that there was no longer teacher support to continue this practice. They passed a subsequent motion which indicated that, despite the withdrawal of their 30 minutes of volunteer time, they

were willing to work with Division stakeholders to develop an acceptable EPD model, which would take effect in September of 2010.

To deal with a difficult decision to ensure quality P.D., administration explored strategies to address the challenges of making 30 minutes of weekly P.D. work. Senior administration, working with Division staff and administration, made a decision to utilize the Monday weekly 30-minute early dismissal but to adjust the use of it for P.D. It was decided that schools would do one hour of P.D. every alternate Monday and a schedule was set for the year that was the same for all schools. The schedule was implemented. Time, or more specifically, a notable shortage of available time for P.D. has been voiced as a concern by all schools during the first six months of the 2009 – 2010 school year.

In response to the Board request for more input from stakeholders, the Superintendent set up a committee to further explore embedded P.D. The committee was designed to meet the following requirements:

- A. Two representatives would be selected to represent each of the following stakeholder groups:
  - i. Senior Administration;
  - ii. Board of Trustees;
  - iii. Alberta Teacher Association Local #80 Executive;
  - iv. A.T.A. Local #80 Economic Policy Committee;
  - v. A.T.A. Local #80 P.D. Committee Representatives;
  - vi. Parents; and
  - vii. Division Administrators.
- B. The EPD committee would work as a collaborative group to explore the research, evidence and perspectives of EPD in RDCSD.
- C. The committee would meet regularly and the best case scenario would be to have a recommendation to the Board on future EPD for the March 2010 meeting. Dates: October 8, October 13, December 2, January 20, February 9 (Public Meeting), February 23.
- D. The committee would have widespread representation and balance and try to address representation that:
  - i. included parent representatives who had significant involvement in our schools as parent council leaders;
  - ii. included city and rural;
  - iii. gender balance;
  - iv. included essential teacher input from several groups ( Alberta Teacher Association Local Executive, Economic Policy Committee, School division P.D. committee);

- v. represented a broad range of support for existing EPD; and
- vi. included input from all divisions (elementary, middle school and high school).

E. Selection: Senior administration representatives were appointed by the Superintendent. The Superintendent was the Chair of the committee. The School Board selected the School Board Trustee representatives. The A.T.A. Executive appointed the representatives from the Executive, the Economic Policy Committee and the P.D. Committee representatives. An invitation was extended to all School Parent Council Chairs inviting parent representatives. The Superintendent invited two Principal representatives and the first two volunteers were appointed to the committee.

Highlights: The committee was focused on their task, discussed topics in depth and agreed to speak on behalf of their stakeholder group. Attendance was excellent at meetings.

Challenges: Some parents from the community voiced the concern that the committee should have had more parent representatives. However, only two volunteered and they both did an outstanding job in keeping in contact with all school councils. Their workload was heavier than other committee members in the area of communication, telephone calls, and attendance at extra meetings. They were generous in providing their home telephone numbers and email addresses to optimize their contact with parents who had questions or concerns regarding EPD. The two parent representatives were kept extremely busy communicating with individual parents, parent council chairpersons and other council representatives.

## 2. Role of Committee

It was established at the first meeting that committee members would:

- review** research and data on embedded P.D. as it relates to student learning;
- examine** past and existing embedded P.D. practices in the Division;
- generate** a recommendation to the school board on future embedded P.D.; and
- create** a draft implementation plan recognizing limitations and addressing risk factors.

## 3. Historical Background Informing Committee Work

A. Information and awareness:

Considerable time during the first two meetings of the committee was spent in the area of awareness and information on the topic of EPD. In order for the committee to make

an informed and responsible recommendation, it was deemed important that all members had a foundational background in:

- i. the research on teacher learning and effective professional development;
- ii. the desired impact of effective PD on student learning and achievement ;
- iii. history of the school division PD approaches;
- iv. feedback from educators on the impact that the three year pilot of EPD had on teacher instruction and PD as well as other pertinent facts about the A.T.A. union practices, the ATA Local #80 collective agreement; and
- v. emergent P.D. needs of teachers to best address the needs of 21<sup>st</sup> century learners.

#### B. Division Professional Development – A Brief History

RDCRD has had many forms of teacher professional development over the last 30 years. During that time, considerable educational research has also emerged in the field of education about what constitutes good professional development that positively affects student achievement and learning. The school division has tried many models, including as few as four full day P.D. days a year (two compulsory by the School Act for the A.T.A. annual teacher convention), to as many as one P.D. day per month. There have also been periods of early dismissal for staff meetings, P.D. half-day Wednesday afternoons on a monthly basis, and, more recently, P.D. embedded on Monday afternoons.

A significant change in the Division P.D. focus began in 2003 with the formation of a Division-wide Professional Development Committee. This committee was jointly funded by the school division and the local A.T.A. #80. This group developed a mandate for quality P.D. and increased the awareness of Division staff on the topic of P.D. The committee was co-chaired by the Supervisor of Learning Services and the A.T.A. Local #80 Professional Development Chairperson. The committee included professional development representatives from each school, senior administration, the Central Alberta Regional Consortium, and the Professional Development Executive Staff Officers from Barnett House – (Provincial A.T.A. headquarters). The group focused on the following main areas:

- a. Collecting research-based information on effective P.D.;
- b. Training committee members on how to set up effective school P.D.;
- c. Providing a one-day Division-wide P.D. day (called the Instructional Improvement Symposium);
- d. Collection of data on student achievement and P.D. to guide committee work;
- e. Explicitly narrowing the focus of all school P.D. to topics that directly addressed professional teacher instructional improvement;
- f. Public promotion campaign to inform educators of the need to change P.D. practice, expectations; and
- g. Begin the development of comprehensive school professional development plans.

The committee had a wide mandate and a treasure of educators who were very enthusiastic for changes to P.D., and who were very committed to acting on research and evidence to positively impact P.D. in the school division. The first two committee chairpersons focused their Masters' Degree studies on the topic of professional development, and their contributions in vision for the committee assisted in moving the Division to examine critically the large and complex study of teacher professional development.

The committee collected data from teachers for three years and adjusted committee activities based on the findings. When Alberta Education instituted the Accountability Pillar mandates which included questions regarding teacher P.D., the Division expanded the opportunity to collect more data on Division P.D. by adding six questions to the annual Schollie Survey on the levels of satisfaction of school and Division P.D. Data from surveys about P.D. and data on Division student achievement continued to guide committee work.

In 2006, the committee worked with senior administration, the A.T.A. Local, and school administration to consider a three-year pilot project of embedded P.D., a proposal strongly supported with rich educational research as well as research from the school division. The intent of the pilot project was that there would be one hour of EPD each Monday and students would be dismissed 30 minutes earlier than regular dismissal each Monday. Teachers agreed to dedicating 60 minutes beyond their instructional day on Mondays to implement professional development at each school site. Participants were accountable to school principals that the time was spent on quality P.D. that was entirely directed at student achievement. EPD also provided regular opportunities for teachers to collaborate in small professional learning communities or cohorts to address strategies that would positively impact student learning in their classes.

When the pilot came to an end, the A.T.A. Local made strong recommendations that the pilot study had not been authentic embedded PD and that there was strong association support for EPD, but that it needed to be fully embedded in the school operational day. This recommendation created considerable conversation among stakeholder groups. On the Board's direction, the Superintendent encouraged all schools to engage their parents in discussions regarding a possible expanded model of EPD. Principals took responsibility to work with parent groups and obtain feedback on parent support for various possible EPD options. Each school addressed this initiative differently and brought back results indicating strong parent support for the expanded (70 minutes early Monday dismissal) proposal.

During the three-year pilot, principals reported very few concerns from parents about EPD. There were isolated occasions when parents forgot about the early dismissal, but these were generally well handled by Division staff. The A.T.A carried out a process of gathering information from teacher stakeholders through meetings and a survey.

During the three-year pilot, the school division received many accolades from the provincial Alberta Teachers' Association and Alberta Education for the professional development model that was in place. Our school division was often used as an exemplar by the A.T.A., the Central Alberta Regional Consortium, and the province for other jurisdictions to examine. Many other jurisdictions have followed our lead by implementing embedded PD similar to our model. The Division PD leaders have been invited to speak at provincial conferences about the model. Division leaders have also served as mentors to other school divisions and the A.T.A. in the establishment of an EPD model (eg. Clearwater, Christ the Redeemer). Our Division was featured in provincial publications for the promotional documents that the Division PD committee created titled "Taking Charge of Professional Development".

h. Expectations for Teacher Professional Development

- i. Alberta Education
- ii. Alberta Teachers' Association
- iii. Red Deer Catholic Regional Schools

All three organizations listed above have expectations in place that teachers must participate in professional development, although specific direction is not mandated from any of the groups. However, there is a common understanding that the role of the teacher has changed considerably in the last ten years, and that curriculum changes and the impact of educational technology and the increased duties of teachers all point towards a need for consistent, research-based, regularly scheduled teacher professional development.

**4. Committee Actions**

a. Goal:

To investigate the possibilities for an embedded professional development model that would best meet the needs of Division students, educators, parents and other stakeholder groups.

b. Guiding Principles:

- i. Students first;
- ii. Committee Members speak on behalf of the stakeholder group they are representing (and not from a personal perspective).

c. Rules for Collaboration:

A committee process was developed to ensure all stakeholder groups were given equal opportunity to voice perspectives.

d. Education and Awareness Phase:

- i. Critical value of knowledge about effective professional development;

- ii. Essential facts regarding the Professional Development story in RDCRD
- iii. Understanding of linkages between student learning, teacher learning, and student achievement;
- iv. Powerful role of current and authentic educational research on teacher professional development;
- v. National, provincial, zone and Division P.D. trends; and
- vi. RDCRD data/evidence informing P.D. decisions.

Highlights: A large amount of information was shared along with many readings and data about embedded P.D. and the realities in the RDCRD. Committee members voiced appreciation for the effort taken to bring them up to date on research about P.D.

Challenges: Committee members voiced concern about various myths and misinformation about professional development which were present in the division among stakeholder groups. The provincial regulations surrounding instructional hours and the boundaries for change as they related to the A.T.A. collective agreement are two examples where misinformation was common among parents and other individuals in the various stakeholder groups. Explaining that hours of student instruction were not affected by the hours teachers spent in embedded PD was a difficult concept to make clear.

## **5. Determination of Committee Process**

- a) Explore multiple embedded PD possibilities
- b) Debate strength and limitations of suggestions
- c) Determine communication approaches to get information to stakeholder groups, and receive input from these stakeholder groups.

The committee talked about many possible approaches to EPD that would honor government regulations, Association practices and the positive culture of our Catholic school division. After much deliberation the committee reduced the options to seven possible EPD choices and, after extensive discussion about the potential and pitfalls of each option, decided to reduce the number from seven to the two most viable options. The two recommendations were rolled out to the stakeholder groups for reaction and feedback.

## **6. Identification of Embedded PD Possibilities**

- a) Explore reasonable initiatives
- b) Gap analysis of top seven initiatives
- c) Dotmocracy and reduction to two alternatives to explore further
- d) Recognition that all proposals would pose challenges that the committee would further investigate and address.

The committee analyzed the short list of seven reasonable alternatives. Next, each member was given opportunity to identify their priorities through a dotmocracy process.

The results of this process were to forward two options for feedback from stakeholders and to invite suggestions to address challenges posed by EPD.

OPTION ONE: Early dismissal each Monday by 70 minutes

OPTION TWO: Early dismissal each Thursday by 70 minutes

Highlights: Every option had strengths and limitations, but the committee believed that the two selected options had limitations that would be the easiest to overcome. There was hope that when the options went to stakeholder groups that there may be some creative solutions to address some of the gaps that were evident.

## **7. Dissemination of Information to Stakeholder Groups**

- a. Honoring role of committee members
- b. Honoring role of school principals and individual School Councils
- c. Honoring all individuals in all stakeholder groups to have opportunity to provide suggestions, address challenges and provide additional perspectives or information to the committee.

The two committee members from each stakeholder team decided on a process to get necessary information to members of the group they represented. This process was to validate the role served by the committee members and to honor their role on the committee while ensuring that the stakeholder groups they represented used a process for communication that worked best for that group. A file of support documentation was available to assist members of stakeholder groups in providing accurate information regarding EPD.

## **8. Communication**

- a. Notification by principals
  - i. Communication packages on embedded P.D. were distributed
  - ii. Superintendent directed principals to meet with School Council Chairs to determine most effective method to gather feedback from parents in each school. (School newsletters, telephone dial-outs, parent council meetings, and/or posting to school websites were some of the communication methods used by schools.)
- b. Red Deer Catholic Teachers' Association Local #80  
Information was shared at the Meeting of the Council of School Representatives (CSR) and at an A.T.A. Professional Development Committee meeting. The CSR

representatives, in collaboration with the principal from their school, presented the information to their staffs for discussion and feedback.

c. School Board Trustees

An update on the committee developments was shared at each monthly school board meeting.

**9. Other Information and Communication activities**

- a. Phone calls to principals, central office, trustees, parents, A.T.A.
- b. School Meetings (2) – At the request of Holy Family and Camille J. Lerouge school councils, committee representatives attended one school parent council meeting at each school to share information and answer questions about the committee work.
- c. Joint Parent Council Meeting – one meeting was held where an overview of the embedded PD committee was presented
- d. Supportive readings, documentation, data and research were posted on the school division website for public access.
- e. Input and Information meeting – In December it became evident that there were parents who had concerns and that there was misinformation about both the facts about EPD and the process used by the committee. When this was brought to the attention of the Superintendent, a decision was made to hold one final Input and Information meeting to ensure that stakeholders were given an opportunity to express concerns, ask questions, ensure that the work of the committee was transparent, suggest other possible scenarios, and that no recommendation had been finalized or submitted to the Board for consideration.

This meeting was held on February 9, in three school sites. Thirty-two people attended in the Montfort board room, 4 by video conference (VC) at Mother Teresa and 36 by VC (with interpreters present) at St. Patrick's School. A two-hour meeting reviewed the committee work and provided opportunity for questions and concerns to be discussed.

Highlights: The committee voiced that the feedback continued to be generally supportive for Option One. They recognized that the matter of student safety was an essential factor to ensure parent support and satisfaction. Although other concerns were identified, most parent concerns seemed to be connected to the general concern of student safety. Committee members acknowledged that any recommendation to the Board would have student safety considerations and expectations.

The St. Patrick's parents expressed thanks to the committee for having the opportunity to have the concept of EPD explained fully to them via a Spanish translator. Their principal reported that the group voted and was unanimous in the Option One proposal being considered. The Mother Teresa site indicated support for Option One. At the Montfort site, there was considerable discussion including: concern for safety of children

with early dismissal, opposition to the way teachers obtain P.D. during the operational work day, comparison to other professions that do P.D. differently, preferences for early dismissal on Friday afternoons, half-day PD, and comparison between rural and urban schools in the levels of absenteeism on early dismissal days.

This meeting gave parents further opportunity to voice their opinions and share their concerns about embedded PD. All voices were heard. Various new perspectives were welcomed and discussed, and the information gathered, along with all other feedback provided previously, was used to inform the committee's final recommendation.

#### **10. Committee Meeting – February 23**

One additional recommendation (EPD mid-day) was brought forward to the committee to consider in addition to Option One. This recommendation was an attempt to balance the concerns of the parents with the needs of the teaching community. The committee seriously reviewed the proposal and concluded that it was not a viable option. No other recommendations were brought forward to the committee from any of the stakeholder representatives.

#### **11. Closing Summary**

The committee believes they have been transparent in the process and have done an adequate job of informing stakeholders and providing opportunities for feedback. They believe they have been transparent in sharing stakeholder feedback with the committee and that the recommendation that they are supporting is well informed and in the best interests of the students of RDCRD. They also recognize that any decision will not have unanimous support of all stakeholder members and that there is a large silent majority who are very supportive of the work of the Division (eg. High parent satisfaction annual survey results). Committee members also noted that, if they were able to improve the committee process, it may have been preferable to have made it more clear to parents and teachers, during the first invitation for feedback, that the committee was open to exploring other reasonable options forwarded by stakeholders to the committee. A sub-committee of the embedded PD committee, made up of teachers, principals, and senior administration, has agreed to meet to discuss the details of the framework and structure of the EPD and address teacher concerns in this area. They are hopeful that their genuine work on the committee is seriously considered by the Board and that any challenges posed by the embedded P.D. option can be reasonably addressed by intervention processes at the school level.

Attached is a summary of the input gathered from three stakeholder groups: parents, teachers, and administrators. This summary followed the gathering of input from parents in November and December 2009.

# Embedded PD Survey Results

## 2009

	Total Replies	Monday PM Early Dismissal	Thursday PM Early Dismissal	Other suggestions
Parents	880/3650 24%	667 77 %	107 12%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Against embedded PD: 40 (4.5 %)</li> <li>• Friday PM early dismissal: 35 (4%)</li> <li>• All day Friday: 10 (1 %)</li> <li>• Don't care: 7 (0.8%)</li> <li>• Monday AM late start: 2 (0.2%)</li> <li>• ½ days, twice a month: 1 (0.1%)</li> <li>• Spoiled (0.1%)</li> </ul>
Teachers	264/ 400 66%	219 83%	45 17%	
Administrators	30/ 35 (included in teacher no. as well) 86%	25 83%	5 17%	

## Recommendation #1

Weekly Monday Afternoon Dismissal 70 minutes before regular dismissal time.  
(Permitting 10 minutes transition and 60 minutes embedded PD)

### Strengths

- \*regular/consistent
- \*familiar
- \*comfortable
- \*not Friday - maybe more productive
- \*short & sweet
- \*allows to go over time if get into it
- \*time to internalize/reflect
- \*teachers have already indicated a preference (previous surveys)
- \*good for parents - same time each week
- \*incorporate staff meetings
- \*don't have as many Mondays \*less time to shift

### Gaps/Concerns

- \*parental care afterschool better than in AM
- \*not long enough
- \*too often
- \*Difficult for parents to pick up children @2:20 if they work.
- \*time in between dismissal and extracurricular activities (supervision issues)
- \*Attendance is a concern - parents will extend the weekend.
- \*don't have as many Mondays
- \*less PD

VOTES - 85

**Recommendation #2**

Early Monday Dismissal every two weeks with dismissal set 130 minutes prior to regular dismissal

(To permit 120 minutes of PD twice a month and a 10 minute transition time)

**Strengths**

- \*More time to collaborate.
- \*Time to travel to other schools.
- \*Time to do more than 1 activity.
- \*Discuss 1st hour - collaborate the second.

**Gaps/Concerns**

- \*Parents will be confused as to when PD is.
- \*Too much time in between sessions.
- \*2 hours to fill on your own can be tough.
- \*Finding childcare for 2 hours is more difficult.
- \*Time tabling - do we have a class after lunch?
- \*Absentee rate might go up.
- \*Teachers have already voted against this.
- \*Need more food!

VOTES - 0

**Recommendation #3**

Early dismissal on Fridays by 70 minutes to permit ten minutes transition and 60 minutes weekly PD

**Strengths**

- \*regular time /continuous/scheduled
- \*Often kids or teams gone so not missing instruction both school based and non-school activities.
  
- \*Parents/kids have an earlier start for weekend activities.
- \*60 minutes is a good length; not too long - not too short re: teacher concentration.
  
- \*Staff have the weekend to look forward to, are in a good mood.
- \*All district on the same day – consistency.

**Gaps/Concerns**

- \*It's Friday - people are tired.
- \*Coaches miss PD.
  
- \*It's Friday - implementation lay over the weekend.
  
- \*If developing plan, 60 minutes may be too short.
  
- \*Will kids be more inclined to miss the whole day? (data from St. Dom's)
- \*Less likely to continue over allotted time because of weekend commitments.
- \*Too tired to get deep into things on a Friday.
  
- \*Not as beneficial to teachers, therefore not as beneficial to kids.
- \*Learning trumps weekend convenience.
- \*Teachers' minds may be on weekend activities.

VOTES - 2

#### **Recommendation #4**

Late start Monday morning by 70 minutes to permit 60 minutes PD and ten minutes transition to classes once students arrive.

#### **Strengths**

- \* Fresh for staff?
- \*Students can sleep in.
- \*irregular/scheduled
- \*Has an end time.
- \*Good build up for the week.
- \*Middle school students don't learn as well in the morning.
- \*Little kids would love to sleep in.
- \*Students will be in bed - are less likely to get into trouble.
- \*Teachers can implement new ideas immediately?  
-public perception

#### **Gaps/Concerns**

- \*Parents must find a way to get into work later and/or arrange child care in AM.
- \*Supervision responsibility in AM for kids dropped off early.
- \*Doesn't give teacher time to internalize/reflect.
- \*May replace and/or derail teacher preparedness for day/classes.
- \*Ends productive discussion.
- \*Bus driver implications re: late for other job.
- \*It is a shift in routine for parents.
- \*Getting ready for school, too important - parents can't miss it.
- \*Can you trust your kid to go to school on time?

VOTES - 14

## **Recommendation #5**

### **Weekly - 1/2 day Wednesday**

#### **Strengths**

- \* allows to bring in speaker
- \* mid week less absentee
- \* Teachers would be able to accomplish many things during this time, instead of focusing on only one idea during an hour PD session.
  
- \* build in staff meeting
  
- \* Students would be dismissed at the same time each Wednesday.
- \* This would allow for greater collaboration between schools, because one hour does not allow for travel time.
- \* Teachers can go for lunch and then come back for some PD.

#### **Gaps/Concerns**

- \* We would lose full day PD, and some of those days are non-negotiable. For example, Faith Day, ATA PD day, Opening Mass, Teacher's Convention.
- \* Due to the reduction in instructional time on Wednesdays, it may be that we will have to either increase the other four days in the week by 30 minutes to dismiss at 4:00, or increase teacher days to 200. Our membership would be unhappy with either option. (This is a reality in high school - semester one.)
  
- \* There are some instances when full day PD is absolutely necessary. For example, our rural schools with smaller numbers need the opportunity to meet with other teachers in their grade level or subject area in the division. Personally, I know that my students benefit most when I can meet with other high school English teachers at Notre Dame to collaborate. I am the only teacher in Rocky teaching all the 20 and 30 level English.
  
- \* Some might feel a half-day is too long.
- \* Absentee rate will rise.
  
- \* Child care - students have more time on their hands; supervision issues at the school. (Support staff misses PD because they're supervising.)
  
- \* Bus drivers - most leave their other work early.
- \* Perception of teachers - 4 -1/2 day work week?
- \* 1/2 day a week is maybe too much of a good thing???
- \* We reach our stride mid week.
- \* If not effective or relevant, teachers lose 1/2 day vs. 1 hr.
- \* Likely to end up more directed therefore less tailored to individual teachers' needs.
- \* Harder to plan 1/2 day rather than 1 hour.

VOTES - 0

Recommendation #6

Options 1, 2, or 4 but on a day midweek (neither Monday or Friday)

**Strengths**

- \*Monday is a prime teaching day - we need it to be a full day.
- \*Students are fresh.
- \*Middle of the week teachers are in stride so Wednesday a lot of things can be discussed.
- \*Less absentees in the middle of the week.

**Gaps/Concerns**

- \*Parent concern about mid week child care.
- \*Parents enjoy extending weekend on school time.
- \*More Wednesdays than Mondays - where do we make up the time?
- \*Most school meetings occur on Wednesday (PTI's, Meet The Teacher, etc.) so then Wednesday becomes a marathon day.
- \*Students are in stride on Wednesday.

VOTES - 2

**Recommendation #7**

Monday 70 minutes every other week dismissal time same

**Strengths**

There was misunderstanding by group members on how this recommendation would work, therefore the input from the small group sessions did not accurately reflect input recorded.

The proposal with an explanation on implementation will be reviewed at the next meeting.

**Gaps/Concerns**