

THE UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Dissertation Abstract

A Study of Professional Development in Catholic Secondary Schools Compared
to National Staff Development Council Standards

There is a growing consensus that the accelerating pace of economic, social, and technological change coupled with the deepening knowledge base on teaching and learning require the redesign of many aspects of the contemporary Catholic secondary school. The explicit expectation that Catholic secondary schools assist students in achieving graduation outcomes that prepare them to be self-directed learners, productive members of learning communities, emotionally and socially mature, religiously literate, and spiritually wise adults has accentuated the need for dynamic professional development cultures. The problem is that the design of these schools did not anticipate the need for continual learning by teachers and administrators.

This study, through survey and interview, investigated the perceptions of administrators and teachers of the professional development programs and practices in their schools compared to the National Staff Development Council's (NSDC) 2001 standards for staff development. A total of 105 teachers and administrators from a random sample of 10 of the 112 Catholic secondary schools in California, and 5 of the 46 Jesuit secondary schools in the United States were surveyed. Interviews were also conducted with 10 teachers and 10 administrators from these two populations to further investigate obstacles to professional development and strategies educators used to overcome them .

The findings of this study indicated that California Catholic and Jesuit secondary schools do not currently possess sufficient knowledge, organizational structures, and expertise to quickly meet all of the NSDC (2001) standards for staff development. The data determined that while the large majority of leaders in these schools value staff development, their schools do not meet 6 of the 12 standards. The fact that they partially met five and fully met one of the standards is a hopeful sign that in the future the schools in this study could develop the capacity to fully achieve the NSDC (2001) standards. These conclusions are supported by the data and literature calling for major professional development initiatives to assist American educational institutions to meet the needs of all students in the complex world of the 21st century.

Stephen Phelps, Author

Note: This study is 270 pages. This packet contains only 57 pages of this work.

Chapter 1 of the Study: This chapter outlines the problem that generated the study, the purpose of the study, its theoretical rationale, limitations, significance and the research questions.

Chapter 5, Conclusions: This chapter contains the conclusions, implications and recommendations of this study.

Appendix A: The 2001 NSDC Standards

Appendix C: The Survey used in the study

Appendix J: Results of Questions 1-36 of survey.

Appendix L: Results of Questions 37 of survey, Obstacles.

If you would like to the Literature Review (Chapter 2), Methodology (Chapter 3), or the Results in detail (Chapter 4) or disaggregated data for each question along with *t* tests for differences between groups, please contact me at sphelps@siprep.org or call me at 415-731-7500 # 268.

CHAPTER I

THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

Statement of the Problem

There is a growing consensus that the accelerating pace of economic, social, and technological change coupled with the deepening knowledge base on teaching and learning require the redesign of many aspects of the contemporary school (Darling-Hammond & Sykes, 1999; Hallinan, 2000; Schlechty, 2001; Senge, 2000; Sergiovanni, 2000). “Efforts to restructure America’s schools for the demands of a postindustrial, knowledge-based economy are redefining the mission of schooling and the job of teaching” (Darling-Hammond, & Sikes, 1999, p. 191).

This need to redesign schools to meet the educational expectations of the 21st century poses unique problems for Catholic secondary schools. These schools, like their public and independent counterparts, are products of the industrial age, designed for teachers to transmit information in separate disciplines to students who are required to learn at a uniform rate or be labeled as slow or disabled (Egol, 2000; Senge, 2000). Senge declared, “I do not see that private schools, the primary competition for public education among wealthier U.S. families, break significantly from the industrial-age views of learning. Many seem even more stressed and conformist than their public school counterparts” (p. 33).

Teachers and administrators are expected to advance their expertise in learning theory, pedagogy, curriculum, and leadership. Educators in Catholic secondary schools are committed to assisting students in achieving graduation outcomes that prepare them

to be self-directed learners, productive members of learning communities, emotionally and socially mature, religiously literate, and spiritually wise adults (Egol, 2000; Hallinan, 2000; Senge, 2000; Shimabukuro, 2000). In analyzing the task of these schools to adapt to changing educational expectations Hallinan (2000) wrote, “The accelerated rate of change that characterizes today’s society requires that Catholic schools accommodate quickly to a new and different environment and that they take on challenges not confronted earlier in their history” (p. 201).

The explicit expectation, that schools conceived in the industrial age respond more effectively to the needs of the Information Age, has accentuated the need for professional development in all schools. In the forward to Guskey’s *Evaluating Professional Development* (2000), Dennis Sparks wrote, “If teachers are to successfully teach all students to high standards, virtually everyone who affects student learning must be learning virtually all of the time” (p. ix). The problem is that the design of industrial-age schools did not anticipate the need for continual learning by teachers and administrators. The increasing demands on all educators to provide schools that meet the needs of 21st century students have generated new educational research on how to improve and engineer schools. Guskey (2000) maintained that the “one constant finding in the research literature is that notable improvements in education almost never take place in the absence of professional development” (p. 4). Catholic secondary schools must incorporate high-quality professional development into their cultures if they are to achieve their missions in the 21st century.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to investigate the professional development programs and practices in Catholic secondary schools as perceived by administrators and teachers. This research compared the characteristics of professional development in these schools with the National Staff Development Council's (NSDC) 2001 revised standards for staff development. The degree to which professional development in Catholic secondary schools met the NSDC's Context Standards, Process Standards, and Content Standards was surveyed. Finally, a select group of administrators and teachers was interviewed to explore obstacles to meeting these standards in their schools and any strategies they may have developed to overcome these obstacles.

Background and Need for the Study

There are 1,226 Roman Catholic secondary schools in the United States that enroll 627,000 students at an average tuition of \$4,300 per student (National Catholic Education Association (NCEA), 2001). These schools, although sharing many similarities with public secondary schools, are markedly different in governance and missions. Bryk, Lee, and Holland (1993) have noted that these schools enjoy a decentralized governance structure and give teachers considerably more influence over teaching, curriculum, and student life than do their public-school counterparts. These schools are not bound by state standards and high-stakes testing. They are free, within the confines of their missions and college preparatory curriculums, to focus their efforts

on helping students achieve graduation outcomes without attention to high-stakes exit exams. Catholic secondary schools also have considerable control over their budgets, admissions processes, and individual missions. Their principals function as chief administrative officers and have responsibilities that are equivalent to those of public-school principals and superintendents (Gagne, 1999).

Youniss and Convey (2000) asserted that administratively there is no single official governing structure responsible for American Catholic schools. Catholic bishops in the 174 dioceses in the United States employ superintendents and staff who provide services and leadership, but only loosely govern these high schools. Religious orders such as the Dominicans and Jesuits own and operate hundreds of schools that are affiliated with diocesan education offices but not administered by them. Local control and authority are a reality for Catholic schools. Youniss and Convey (2000) concluded:

There is only a dim parallel between a public school superintendent and school board and a diocesan superintendent. The former have the authority to hire, fire, determine curriculum, and the like. The latter have the right to persuade parish and private schools and the responsibility to support them in whatever ways are feasible. The Catholic school system symbolizes a unifying philosophy and history, but does not imply uniform, coherent, hierarchical governance. (p. 6)

Neither Gagne (1999) nor this researcher was able to find more than one study that examined the staff development practices of Catholic secondary schools in the United States. There has been no research to determine if Catholic schools use their autonomy to provide the professional development their staffs need to facilitate student achievement of their academic, extracurricular, and religious graduation outcomes. Bryk

et al. (1993) wrote that “instruction in the Catholic high schools we visited was generally quite ordinary. Classroom work was largely textbook-driven and lecturing was a common mode of delivery” (p. 309). They reported that there was little time and scant resources set aside for professional growth for teachers and administrators, especially in urban schools, but that the Catholic school emphasis on the moral dimension of teaching anchored in shared beliefs and norms may have increased the effectiveness of Catholic school teaching. Bryk et al. asserted that enhancing the academic skills and professionalism of Catholic school teachers “would certainly enrich their students’ intellectual experiences” (p.309).

Schaub (2000) disaggregated data from the United States Department of Education’s Schools and Staffing Survey, 1993-94 (SASS) as reported in Table 1. Her research documented that Catholic secondary school teachers had significantly fewer “Credentials” which, in Table 1, is a composite of four indicators of professionalization:

1. Full standard state certification in field to be taught
2. Graduation from a state-approved teacher education program
3. College major or minor in field to be taught
4. Passage of a national, state, or local teachers’ examination as reported by school administrators. (p. 79)

Data measuring involvement in professional development indicated that Catholic secondary teachers reported about 10% less participation in professional development activities than their public school counterparts. While this may not be a significant difference, what is unclear is how much of this professional development is devoted to

the religious dimensions of the schools and how much to subject content, instruction, and curriculum development. Other indicators of teacher professionalization as indicated in Table 1 show little variation between the two groups.

Table 1

Measures of Average Secondary Teachers' Professionalization, 1993-94

| | Total Public | Total Catholic |
|--|-----------------|-------------------|
| Credentials (Mean count of Professional Requirements) ^a | 2.91 | 1.89 |
| Induction (Participation in Mentor Program) | 26% | 29% |
| Receiving Continuing Education Support | 21% | 25% |
| Involved in Professional Development | 66% | 57% |
| Specializing in Field They Teach | 84% | 83% |

Source. Schools and Staffing Survey, 1993-94 as reported by Schaub (2000).

^aA composite of four measures of teacher professionalization: state certification in teaching field, graduation from a state-approved education program, college major or minor in subjects taught, and passage of local, state, and national teacher's exams.

Table 2 presents a comparison between Catholic and public school teachers in their levels of certification, years of experiences, and mean salary. While lack of certification in a teaching field does not indicate whether these requirements have been completed or whether these teachers are effective subject area specialists, it does suggest the need for further study of whether these teachers are able to obtain the professional

development needed to be content experts and certified in their fields. Compared with public school teachers, Catholic school teachers are less likely to be state-certified in their teaching field or in any field.

Table 2

Demographic Profiles of Teachers, 1993-94

| | Public | | Catholic | |
|----------------------------|--------|--------|----------|--------|
| | Elem. | Sec. | Elem. | Sec. |
| Holding master's degrees | 44% | 50% | 24% | 51% |
| Certified in main field | 92% | 93% | 67% | 64% |
| Certified in any field | 94% | 95% | 71% | 67% |
| Mean years' experience | 14.8 | 15.9 | 12.4 | 14.4 |
| Mean salary (1993 dollars) | 33,116 | 34,387 | 17,926 | 25,105 |

Source. Schools and Staffing Survey, 1993-94 as reported by Schaub (2000).

Gagne (1999) reported that her review of *Dissertation Abstracts International* revealed a number of studies related to professional development that had been conducted on samples of public schools during the 1990s. She was unable to find any studies on the specific topic of professional development in Catholic schools. This researcher's similar review in 2002 could not find any new dissertations on professional development in Catholic schools. The researcher also surveyed workshop topics at the annual National Catholic Education Association convention in 2001 and 2002. He could find only one

workshop on the topic of how to conduct, evaluate, or establish professional development programs (NCEA Programs 2001, 2002). Bryk et al. (1993) reported that Catholic school instruction was “ordinary” with “more emphasis on testing and homework than appears to be the case in public high schools” (p. 99).

Adding to the need for professional development is the expectation outlined in Catholic school mission statements that faculty will provide students with a three-tiered focus on academic excellence, religious and spiritual development, and personal, emotional, and social development (Bryk et al. 1993; Moore, 2000; Traviss, 2000). These comprehensive missions place unique demands and stresses on administrators and teachers to not only provide academic preparation for college and work but also emotional, social, personal, and spiritual growth through participation in extensive extracurricular activities and campus ministry programs. Gagne’s (1999) research on the content of staff development in Catholic secondary schools indicated that efforts to enhance technological competence was the most frequent inservice topic followed by faith formation of the faculty, study of the Catholic identity/mission of the school, and by efforts to improve cooperative learning and classroom management.

Schaub (2000) reported that the most profound change in Catholic secondary schools in the last 30 years has been the decline of religious staffing from 48% to less than 10%, forcing Catholic schools to train lay people in the former roles of religious. She predicted that “If this trend continues, and current estimates of the overall decline of people in religious orders strongly suggest that it will (Hoge & Davidson, 1989), by the early 2000s a significant proportion of Catholic schools will operate without any

religious teachers at all” (p. 74).

The use by Catholic schools of professional growth activities for technology training and to respond to the changing religious staffing environments and the need for faith formation of faculty and students suggests that the Catholic secondary schools value staff development. The less frequent staff development emphasis on teaching, learning, and curriculum development may be an indicator that these schools would profit from the study of how their levels of professional development compared to the 2001 NSDC standards for professional development.

Current educational literature and national studies (Darling-Hammond & Sykes 1999; Joyce & Showers, 1995; Marzano, Pickering, & Pollock, 2001; *National Research Council*, 1999) reported that pedagogical skill, depth of subject knowledge, and teachers’ evolving conceptions of learning are the most critical factors in student learning. According to Guskey (2000) there is a clear consensus that “Never before in the history of education has greater importance been attached to the professional development of educators” (p.3).

The core work of any school is teaching and learning. A good Catholic school must first be a good school. It requires a consistent emphasis on effective instruction and leadership by the principal. Then it can effectively teach Catholic values upon a foundation of competent instructional leadership (Jacobs, 2001). “To be effective, schools must concentrate on their fundamental mission of teaching and learning. And they must do it for all children. That must be the overarching goal of schools for the

twenty-first century” (Ravitch, 2000, p. 467). The effectiveness of teaching and curriculum must be one of the overarching goals of Catholic secondary schools if they are to fulfill all aspects of their evolving missions in the 21st century.

Comparing professional growth programs for teachers and administrators in Catholic secondary schools to NSDC standards will assist in the integration of knowledge on teaching and learning into the existing school culture. At the same time, this study may offer valuable insights to public and independent secondary schools about the obstacles to the professional growth of their own teachers and administrators. The unique leadership styles of Catholic schools may assist them in meeting the evolving educational, social, and religious needs of their graduates. These same leadership characteristics may also serve as models for public and independent secondary schools as they seek new ways to meet their students’ evolving needs.

Theoretical Rationale

The theoretical rationale for this study is Schlechty’s (2001) framework designed to assist schools in understanding and adapting to the swirling changes around them. He called it “Working on the Work” (WOW), or coming to a realization that the work of schools is to create the tasks, student activities, and assignments that motivate students to engage in the interactions with content and processes they must master to be evaluated as well educated. “The key questions for schools to focus on concern what students are expected *to do* in order to learn whatever is expected they will learn” (p. 53).

“The WOW Framework has utility for a disciplined approach to the design, and delivery of professional development experiences for teachers and administrators” (p. 130).

According to the literature that will be reviewed in chapter 2, one of the catalysts of rapid change in American society has been the profound shift in the core functions of schooling: the creation, gathering, storage, dissemination, organization, processing and transmission of new knowledge and information (Ackoff, 2000; Drucker et al. 1997; Schlechty, 2001; Senge, 2000; Vail, 1996). Schlechty (2001) asserted that “American society, the external environment for U.S. schools, has been experiencing dramatic shifts in structure over the past half century” (p. 1). It is the inability of schools to adapt curriculum and instruction, organizational models, and technologies of the Information Age to competently prepare all students for the 21st century that explains much of the criticism and dissatisfaction with modern schools.

It is often asserted that public schools are change resistant. This is not so. There is in fact so much change occurring in schools that teachers and school administrators rightly feel overwhelmed by it. However, this change is seldom accompanied by clear improvements in performance. Schools are change prone, but they are also change inept. (Schlechty, p. 39)

The world in which Catholic secondary schools exists “is in a state of dramatic change” (Hallinan, 2000, p. 201). Both the social structures in which Catholic school graduates will live and work and the core technologies of information creation, synthesis and access have changed. The WOW framework posits that the work of schools in such fluid conditions is to design school environments where students find the curriculum and teaching to be consistently engaging, meaningful, important to their lives, authentic,

novel, and focused on worthwhile products. Schlechty (2001), Darling-Hammond and Sykes (1999), and Guskey (2000) have all asserted that schools cannot achieve these goals without a major emphasis on professional development.

Catholic secondary schools, like public and independent schools, are challenged to facilitate academic and personal growth for students through improved pedagogy, greater depth of subject knowledge, and the continual redesign of curriculum. None of this is possible without the establishment of a vision and culture that support continual adult learning through a significant increase in the time, resources, and support dedicated to professional development for teachers and administrators. (Darling-Hammond & Sykes, 1999; Senge, 2000, Schlechty, 2001). Catholic schools have the additional task of mission-driven religious and spiritual development for their students (Bryk et al., 1993; Hallinan, 2000; Meirose, 1994; Rogus & Wildenhaus, 2000; Wallace, 2000).

Limitations

This study investigated the degree to which the professional development programs in Catholic secondary schools in the United States met the National Staff Development Council's (NSDC) 2001 revised standards for staff development. It also investigated obstacles to professional development in these schools and the strategies administrators and teachers have developed to overcome them. The researcher selected a random sample of Catholic secondary schools in California and a random sample of Jesuit secondary schools in the United States for the study. Neither of these

populations were representative of the geographical and cultural diversity of Catholic secondary schools in the United States. The survey was taken by a random sample of full time teachers in these schools and by the principal and the administrator in charge of professional development.

Teachers and administrators interviewed by telephone were randomly selected from volunteers who had already taken the survey. This researcher interviewed five administrators and five teachers from the Catholic secondary schools in California and a similar number of administrators and teachers from the Jesuit secondary schools in America. These factors limited the ability to generalize the interview findings to other types of schools. The topic of this research, the nature of professional development in Catholic secondary schools, and the obstacles to it could be considered a delimitation since these findings will apply only to Catholic secondary schools in California and Jesuit high schools in the United States.

The opinions of these educators about professional development in their schools was not necessarily an objective measure of these programs. Teachers and administrators may have sought to portray professional development in their schools in a more positive or negative fashion than an objective observer. In addition, they may not have been familiar with professional development in other schools.

Several other limitations may have affected this study. Both the survey and the interview process required self-reporting, which may have threatened internal validity of the results. Because the survey was based on a set of ideal standards for professional

development, bias may have been present because some of the participants may have had a vested interest in how their school and Catholic schools in general appeared in the survey. Some questions may have been threatening to administrators who were asked to rate the degree to which professional development which they lead, conformed to the national standards.

The researcher's decision to request only minimal demographic information from the respondents meant that little was known about the gender, years of experience, professional development backgrounds, or ethnicity of the respondents. Even though the researcher provided directions to the site administrator about random selection of volunteers for the survey, the fact that they were volunteers was a limitation to the study. The interview portion of the study may have been limited by the confidence the respondents had in the confidentiality of the results. If the respondent was not confident with this aspect, the answers about obstacles and strategies to professional development may not have been entirely candid. In addition, the researcher's background and expertise in the field of professional development may have been known to the interviewees and biased the results of the interview.

Educational Significance

This study is significant because inadequate staff development of Catholic school staffs is likely to affect the ability of these schools to prepare their students for a rapidly changing world. Such a failure may eventually result in the demise of Catholic secondary schools. "When the rate of change outside and organization is greater than the rate inside, the continuing existence of that organization is threatened" (Schlechty, 2001, p. 1).

In many ways American society in the year 2002 is less like the world of 1950 than the world of 1950 was like the world of 1850. Yet while the world outside of schools has undergone breathtaking change, the schools of 2002 are much more like the schools of 1950 than the schools of 1950 were like the schools of 1850 (Schlechty, 2001). As the demands of the Information Age require an ever greater proportion of workers to function at levels previously required only of the elite (Darling-Hammond & Sykes, 1999), schools are being called upon to provide historically unprecedented levels of education for all young people (Egol, 2000). At the same time, there has been a quiet but profound growth of new knowledge about effective teaching and learning (Guskey, 2000; Meier, 2000; National Research Council, 2000).

Roman Catholic secondary schools, while remaining effective in achieving their missions, have often been slow to adopt the new knowledge base about teaching and learning (Bryk et al., 1993). Even in public schools, teaching practices have not changed significantly in the 1990s (Cuban, 1993; Senge, 2000). A new consensus on effective professional development calls upon schools to become learning communities (Guskey, 2000). Teaching in many Catholic schools occurs primarily behind closed doors with little or no sharing among colleagues. In addition, teachers in these schools are expected to dedicate significant portions of their days and evenings to student extracurricular and campus ministry activities (Bryk et al., 1993).

There is a growing awareness that Roman Catholic secondary schools must move rapidly toward a much greater investment in staff development. Recent Jesuit Secondary

Education Association (JSEA, 2001, 2002) documents on the future of Jesuit schools and the increasing number of breakout sessions on professional development in the National Catholic Education Association (NCEA) convention's program in 2001 and 2002, indicated a burgeoning interest in professional growth in Catholic schools that is more broadly defined than in the public schools. Andrew Greeley (2000) referred to aspects of this broader definition of education as a communal style that brings greater community support and personalism to these schools. He wrote that "The Catholic communal style shapes the kind of education Catholics provide in their schools" (p. 135).

Schaub (2000) observed that Catholic school teachers, while being more satisfied with their jobs than public school teachers, received less training and education and were less likely to be certified than public school teachers. Hallinan (2000), in commenting on findings suggested:

Professional standards that govern the licensing of public school teachers should be enforced by administrators of Catholic schools as well. Improved professional training for Catholic school teachers may lead students in Catholic schools to attain even higher levels of academic achievement. (p. 209)

There is a call for new and enhanced forms of staff development because of the evolving nature of these schools and the need to incorporate positive aspects of the world into Catholic education. The immediate future requires a focus on forming Catholic school personnel who are discerning moral leaders who can transform Catholic schools into places of learning more than places for teaching while embedding risk-taking, problem solving, empathy, and Catholic imagination into the curriculum (JSEA, 2001).

This study examined in detail both the current state of professional development in Catholic secondary schools and through survey and interview, the obstacles to professional growth for Catholic secondary school educators. It is hoped that this research may allow Catholic school administrators to develop robust professional growth programs in all areas of school life.

Research Questions

The research questions that were addressed in this study are as follows:

- 1) What are the recommended practices in the research and literature for effective professional development?
- 2) To what extent are the NSDC recommended staff development context areas present in Catholic secondary schools?
- 3) To what extent are the NSDC recommended staff development process areas present in Catholic secondary schools?
- 4) To what extent are the NSDC recommended staff development content areas present in Catholic secondary schools?
- 5) What obstacles to their professional growth can teachers and administrators identify that originate from school organization, policies, and culture?
- 6) What strategies do teachers and administrators employ to overcome obstacles to their professional growth that originate from school organization, policies, and culture?

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study, the following definitions will apply:

1) Catholic secondary school:

A Catholic secondary school is a coed or single-sex high school comprised of grades 9-12. It is under the auspices of the Catholic Church which is represented by an archdiocese or diocese. The primary objective of these schools is to form well educated students who live the Gospel message.

2) Disaggregated data:

Data that has been sorted so as to apply to specific subgroups of the population studied in this research. For example, to sort data from the entire population studied into the responses of teachers, administrators.

3) Information Age:

The period that began in the mid-1980s characterized by the increasing ability of ordinary people to create, publish, process, access, and synthesize large amounts of information that is now viewed as the world's most valuable commodity.

4) Professional Development:

Any experience that enhances the knowledge, skills, or understanding of teachers and administrators. Synonymous with staff development.

5) Religious Order Catholic Secondary Schools:

Coed or single-sex Catholic high schools comprised of grades 9-12. These schools, while affiliated with the archdiocese or diocese in which they are located, are independently owned and administered by religious communities such as Dominicans and Jesuits.

6) Research-based professional development:

Staff development models derived from recent research outlining the most effective forms of staff development.

7) Staff development:

The means by which educators acquire or enhance their knowledge, skills, attitudes, and beliefs necessary to create high levels of learning for all students. Synonymous with professional development.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Overview

Catholic secondary schools, designed in the Industrial Age to transmit a fixed body of information, find themselves in the midst of a historical shift. They are being transformed by powerful changes in the core technologies of schools: information storage and access, information processing and exchange, learning and teaching, and a rapidly evolving definition of their social and religious missions. School leaders have utilized some professional development programs and processes to assist their faculties in making this transformation. This study gathered data to compare the context, processes, and content of these staff development programs to the newly revised national standards for staff development developed in 2001 by the National Staff Development Council (NSDC). It also sought to determine common obstacles to professional development in these schools and the strategies educators used to overcome them.

A total of 105 teachers and administrators from a random sample of 10 of the 112 Catholic secondary schools in California, and 5 of the 46 Jesuit secondary schools in the United States were surveyed. Interviews were also conducted with 10 teachers and 10 administrators from these two populations to further investigate obstacles to professional development and strategies educators used to overcome them. The immediate return of 95 of the 105 surveys (90%) indicated a strong interest in this subject by Catholic educators and made it possible to generalize the findings to the 158 secondary schools in the populations represented in this study.

Major Conclusions

Although the findings were enumerated in chapter 4, the data from surveys and interviews in this study supported the following 11 major conclusions:

1. Catholic secondary schools in this study have been slowly integrating elements of the robust knowledge base of human learning and teaching, leadership, information processing, and collaborative organizational structures into their cultures. This knowledge base is foundational to establishing a felt need for the level of staff development outlined in the NSDC (2001) staff development standards.
2. While Catholic secondary school educators in this study were supportive of staff development and recognized it as a key strategy for achieving school goals, they were often unfamiliar with the context, processes, and content of effective professional development.
3. Catholic secondary schools as a group met some elements of the NSDC's three context standards for supporting staff development. The first standard's requirement that faculty be organized into small learning communities and meet regularly was not attained on a consistent basis, but there was some experimentation that was beginning to address this standard. The second standard, that leaders guide continuous instructional improvement, was partially realized in the majority of schools. The third standard, that schools provide sufficient resources to adult

learning and collaboration, was generally not met in the area of time or overall budget for staff development, but was attained in some instances in financial support for attendance at classes, workshops, and conferences and especially for technology training.

4. Staff development in the schools in this study did not meet the first three (NSDC, 2001) process standards. Generally staff development did not use disaggregated student data to determine adult learning priorities, nor did it use multiple sources of evidence to guide improvement and measure its impact, nor did it prepare educators to apply research to decision making.
5. Educators in California Catholic secondary schools and Jesuit high schools reported that staff development partially met the fourth process standard which was the use of learning strategies appropriate to the intended goal. Staff development generally did not attain the fifth standard, the application of knowledge about human learning and change to improve learning for all students. The sixth process standard, staff development that provided adults with the knowledge and skills to collaborate, was partially achieved. The majority of schools did prepare faculty to use technology to collaborate but did not prepare them to be skillful group members.
6. Staff development programs in the schools in this study met the first content standard which was to prepare educators to respect all students, create a safe, orderly, and supportive learning environment, and to hold high expectations for all

students. The second content standard, staff development that deepened educators' content knowledge and the use of research-based instructional strategies to improve the learning of all students, was partially achieved. The third content standard, staff development that provided educators with knowledge to involve families and other stakeholders appropriately, was also partially attained.

7. The results of survey question 37 (Table 21) identified numerous built-in obstacles to effective professional development in Catholic secondary schools. These obstacles originated in cultures still largely informed by knowledge bases, work schedules, organizational structures, and leadership models conceived for the Industrial Age. Data suggested that these obstacles will remain until the mental models and organizational structures that support them are replaced with those more supportive of schools as learning communities for adults and children.
8. The interviews revealed that strategies to overcome identified obstacles were sometimes effective in meeting the needs of individual educators, but that these strategies were unable to support coherent, robust staff development programs for entire school communities. New research-based strategies would have to be employed to produce school cultures capable of sustaining ongoing staff development programs that meet NSDC (2001) standards.
9. The results of the survey indicated that Jesuit secondary schools in the study were less likely to meet the NSDC (2001) standards than California Catholic high schools. Surveys and interviews (Phelps, 2003) taken together suggested that

Jesuit schools have been slightly more successful than California Catholic secondary schools in the use of technology to support adult learning and in the integration of spiritual values into the faculty culture.

10. Interviews (Phelps, 2003) revealed that none of the schools in this study had created an administrative position for the development and administration of professional development programs and only one school had a faculty committee whose major task was to guide staff development. They also indicated that administrators lacked both the time and expertise to guide staff development that met NSDC (2001) standards. Every aspect of this research suggested that the capacity of the Catholic secondary schools in this study to achieve their missions in the 21st century would be enhanced by the establishment of an administrative position and faculty committee who “owned” staff development.
11. The sum of this research suggested that individual schools lacked the capacity and resources to provide the needed staff development. Schools may wish to join together and create formal and informal structures that will facilitate the interactions and behaviors that support dynamic growth. Together these schools can provide shared vision and support to develop the new capacities for learning and reflective practice that no school can create alone.

The conclusions of this research are that the primary forces driving the need for staff development are the changing nature of work and the workplace, the knowledge explosion, rapidly evolving information technologies and the specific growing knowledge

base on teaching and learning. Catholic secondary schools individually do not possess sufficient expertise in the development of organizational structures and leadership cultures to establish and maintain staff development programs foundational to full achievement of their missions in the first two decades of the 21st century. The complex skills now required of all high school graduates requires that educators develop greater capacities to engage all students in learning what is required of them to attain each schools' increasingly challenging graduation outcomes. Research-based professional development is necessary for teachers and administrators to develop greater capacities to shape school cultures (Guskey, 2000).

Implications of Findings

A number of implications can be drawn from the findings of this study. Little or no research has been done on either the content or effectiveness of staff development in Catholic secondary schools in the United States. Nor has the degree to which Catholic educators perceive the need for ongoing staff development been studied. This researcher has sought to contribute to the body of knowledge about professional development in Catholic education by analyzing the results of this research to discern its serious implications for Catholic secondary schools.

The first implication derived from the data suggests that Catholic secondary schools in this study must find ways to more rapidly integrate the growing knowledge

base on teaching, learning, leadership, and staff development into their cultures in order to create the skilled adult learning cultures measured by the NSDC (2001) standards for staff development. Interviews (Phelps, 2003) indicated that the Catholic secondary schools in this study were interested in improving adult learning, but often unaware of the research-based staff development proposed by the new NSDC (2001) standards. Some school cultures discouraged new learning and innovation either because of the presence of faculty and administrators who were unfamiliar with research-based teaching and staff development or because the high socioeconomic status and test scores of their students mediated against a felt need for change and growth. Schools with department chairs, assistant principals, and principals who were skilled, knowledgeable leaders encouraged the development of new adult learning capacities in the areas of their leadership.

The lack of a felt need to change was a recurrent theme in both Jesuit schools and California Catholic secondary schools. The interviews (Phelps, 2003) revealed that the presence of many veteran teachers and administrators who have spent much of their professional lives in school cultures that were minimally supportive of ongoing adult learning was especially problematic.

A second implication derived from the sum of the data is that because staff development takes place in the larger context of the school, the degree of the school's organizational support is critical to its success. Data from the surveys and interviews (Phelps, 2003) indicated that the current level of organizational support may be the chief obstacle to staff development that meets the NSDC (2001) standards. The foundation of

effective organizational support begins with skilled leadership and adult learning goals aligned with the missions of Catholic secondary schools. Next, school leadership needs to provide adequate time and funding, a collegial culture that supports experimentation, and relevant staff development programs that motivate teachers to engage in further learning. But even these organizational supports are not sufficient. Schools strengthen staff development when they reward and recognize adult learning and gather data on what students have actually learned. Professional development is most effective when evaluation focuses on teaching behaviors, student learning, curriculum, and the values and beliefs resulting from staff development. The implication is that school leadership at all levels, national, diocesan, religious order-assisted, and local, may want to begin to actively plan to assist secondary schools in the development of these supportive organizational structures.

The third implication is drawn from the specific finding that the lack of time for professional growth is the highest ranked obstacle for most educators. The provision of time for professional learning requires schools to restructure yearly, weekly, and daily schedules to give educators the opportunities to explore ways to improve teaching and learning, to plan lessons and curriculum collaboratively, and to gather data and examine student work. School leaders may want to ensure that the supportive structures, accountability, and evaluative feedback are in place to ensure that this time is wisely used. All of the schools in this study provided some additional time for staff development activities, but in almost every case they did not provide sufficient supportive structures

and accountability to ensure that this time was used as intended. The implication is that school leaders may find it essential not only to provide adequate time for adult learning, but also to shape school cultures and support and accountability mechanisms that result in greater student engagement and improved student outcomes as a result of additional time for adult learning.

A fourth implication developed from this research is the role of leadership in promoting ongoing adult learning cultures in every area of the school. Interviews (Phelps, 2003) revealed that many school administrators believed that many of their department chairs were ineffective leaders both from lack of training and because they were reluctant to challenge their peers. Principals and assistant principals were desirous of learning more effective leadership behaviors to advance the adult learning cultures in their schools and to improve staff development. What was problematic for the role of leadership in promoting staff development was the scarcity of proposals by these educators for the establishment of effective leadership training strategies. A clear implication of this research is the need for Catholic secondary schools to provide powerful leadership training for every level of leadership, from those leading small learning communities and academic departments to the chief administrators of the school.

A fifth implication that resulted from the research is the central role of data and evaluation in the design of staff development informed both by what educators have learned and by its effect on student outcomes. Interviews (Phelps, 2003) revealed that the schools in this study usually evaluated staff development to find out if teachers liked it. There was little effort to gather data on teacher behaviors resulting from the staff

development. In addition, schools collected and analyzed only student data provided by standardized tests such as the SAT and Advanced Placement exams as well as college admission statistics. Interviewees (Phelps, 2003) consistently admitted that they really did not know to what degree most students achieved course and school wide outcomes. At the same time they expressed their support for the need of this data and a strong desire to know what their students were really learning. The implication is the effect of the lack of data and evaluation on the capacity of each school to provide staff development that is matched to student outcomes. Effective staff development programs require not only ongoing data about what teachers have learned, but also data measuring student outcomes resulting from teacher professional development. This can come in the form of student portfolios, conventional testing, and other forms of alternative assessment. Fortunately, new technologies and web-based file sharing will make this data much easier to gather, store, and analyze in the future.

A sixth implication is the sum of the data suggesting that individual schools lack the capacity to provide the level of staff development needed to achieve their missions. Interviews (Phelps, 2003) contained a number of accounts of obstacles to professional development generated by well meaning, busy administrations. They sometimes planned workshops and staff development programs that were not matched to the needs and desires of teachers, nor designed according to adult learning needs or adequately supported by school organizational structures. To address the need for higher quality staff development some schools have joined together to plan professional growth programs. These were described in the interviews as of varying quality depending on the

level of expertise of the administrators who planned them. No where did anyone discuss whether these programs resulted in any real improvements in teaching and learning. The implication from this data is that schools need both staff development directors and faculty committees who own professional development. They need to join together wherever practical to pool resources and expertise in order to produce dynamic professional growth programs. However, individuals and committees charged with professional development must first acquire the knowledge base on effective staff development and be supported by school organizational structures.

The implications of this study are that staff development as outlined in the NSDC (2001) standards is critical not only to the future of California Catholic secondary schools and Jesuit high schools, but to all schools. Every change proposed for Catholic education, whether in the area of teaching, learning, curriculum, leadership, technology, or spiritual development requires staff development for implementation. This research challenges both the national and local leadership of Catholic secondary schools to establish research-based processes to develop the support structures essential to effective staff development in Catholic secondary schools.

Recommendations

Since the ability of Catholic secondary schools to achieve every aspect of their mission is dependent upon skilled staff development and the organizational support needed to nourish and support it, the results of this study should assist Catholic secondary schools in the establishment of dynamic, research-based staff development as

a vital part of every school's culture. It was encouraging that the data from this study indicated that Catholic secondary schools could substantially improve their abilities to achieve their missions by building the capacity to design and deliver staff development matched to the standards developed in 2001 by the National Staff Development Council. These recommendations are presented first to those holding national and regional leadership positions in the National Catholic Education Association (NCEA), the Jesuit Secondary Education Association (JSEA), institutes in colleges and universities who promote Catholic education, schools of education, and to diocesan superintendents and their assistants. They are also presented to the local leadership of these schools such as principals, presidents, and other administrators, and to those currently working in staff development positions within the Catholic school system.

Three types of recommendations are included: 1) recommendations for the leadership of Catholic education, 2) recommendations for teachers in Catholic schools, 3) recommendations for further research. It is hoped that this research, joined with the experience and diverse views of Catholic educational leaders, will make a contribution not only to the 625,000 plus students attending Catholic secondary schools in the United States, but to the Church and nation as a whole. It should also be noted that these recommendations may apply to colleagues in public, independent schools, and other religiously affiliated schools.

To the National Catholic Education Association (NCEA)

1. Because it is unlikely that Catholic educational leaders will develop a felt need for improvement without new knowledge, the NCEA may want to place a greater emphasis on national and regional programs dedicated to the study of the knowledge base on teaching, learning, staff development and leadership training both at the elementary and secondary levels.
2. The NCEA may want to convene a “think tank” or institute to study the changes that Catholic schools will be required to make within the next 20 years so that it can be proactive in providing leadership for the types of organizational support necessary for the creation of robust adult learning cultures in Catholic schools. The Jesuit Secondary Education Association (JSEA) has just completed such a study for Jesuit secondary schools (JSEA, 2020 Vision, 2002).
3. The NCEA may consider the importance of encouraging and even providing, where feasible, training for Catholic educational leaders in research-based staff development. The NCEA may also wish to encourage Catholic schools to establish staff development leadership positions. The NCEA could support staff development leaders by offering summer institutes for staff developers who work in diocesan offices, for religious orders, and for individual schools. It might also send staff developers to programs run by the National Staff Development Council and then convene these trained leaders to discuss how to apply this research to Catholic schools.

To Religious Order Education Offices and Boards

1. In light of this research, the leaders of national education offices and boards such as those established by the Christian Brothers, Dominican Sisters, the Society of Jesus, the Congregation of Mary, and Sisters of Mercy may want to intensify their efforts to integrate the extensive knowledge base on teaching, learning, leadership training, and staff development into their own ministries and the professional development programs they sponsor.
2. Just as individual schools do not possess the full expertise and knowledge needed to meet all of their staff development needs, so too these groups of religious educators might consider joining together more frequently in shared planning to enhance the capacity of all.

To Superintendents and Their Assistants in Diocesan Offices

1. This research indicated that the high schools in this study did not look to diocesan offices of education for staff development because these offices have historically concentrated on staff development for elementary schools. Given the limited resources available to diocesan offices, superintendents might encourage high schools to join together in sponsoring collaborative professional development programs, many of which could be funded by the federal program, “No Child Left Behind Act” passed by Congress in 2001 (Teegarden, 2003). Such a policy would require the diocese or secondary schools to provide administrators with research-based training in staff development followed by the formation of diocesan-sponsored staff development councils that assessed common needs. The councils could plan and administer self-supporting programs on teaching and

learning, curriculum development, leadership training, adult spiritual development, technology, and staff development. These programs would bring high schools together to facilitate their sharing of resources and expertise. The result may be the development of a greater shared vision that could only strengthen Catholic education.

2. Administrators and teachers reported that diocesan offices had about the same level of awareness of research-based staff development as did high school leaders (Phelps, 2003). Superintendents and other diocesan administrators would benefit as much as individual schools from studying research-based staff development and then pooling their knowledge and resources with schools of education, other dioceses, and other educational professionals in order to meet the staff development needs of their schools.

To Principals, Assistant Principals, and Department Chairs

1. Administrators and teachers reported in surveys and interviews (Phelps, 2003) that Catholic school leaders recognized staff development as a key strategy for school growth. However, they also reported that the uneven levels of knowledge and expertise of these leaders in the areas of staff development, teaching and learning, and leadership were obstacles to professional growth in their schools. It is critical that school leaders from board members to department chairs, possess the required levels of knowledge and skill to lead and provide staff development that achieves school goals. This will require principals and other school leaders themselves to be learning consistently so they can provide the leadership and organizational support foundational to the establishment of dynamic adult learning communities within their schools.

To Teachers

1. While teachers were sometimes critical of administrators for their lack of knowledge and expertise, both administrators and teachers made note of veteran faculty in every school who were resistant to new, research-based teaching methods, curriculum changes, and the use of technology to improve student outcomes. While veteran faculty have an important role in preserving and maintaining the culture of a school from capricious change, seasoned faculty who are continually learning and sharing their wisdom and experience with younger teachers and school leaders are essential to the vitality of Catholic education. Learning communities are enriched only when veteran teachers are welcomed as valuable members who have much to contribute as these veterans use solid educational research, joined with their experience and wisdom to improve teaching and learning.

To Schools of Education and Institutes Supporting Catholic Education

1. The review of the literature and the data strongly support the idea that major school growth areas can be achieved only with effective staff development. The research further suggests that staff development matched to the NSDC (2001) standards requires cultural and organizational supports not presently found in most California Catholic secondary schools and in most Jesuit high schools in the United States. Schools of Education and especially institutes supporting Catholic education at Boston College, and at the Universities of Dayton and San Francisco might consider the development of new required courses that study staff development and the organizational supports required

to maintain it. These courses would offer school leaders direction, vision, and practical tools for developing school cultures that would support ongoing adult learning.

For Future Research

This study focused on the degree to which California Catholic secondary schools and Jesuit high schools across the United States achieved the NSDC's (2001) standards for staff development. It also researched obstacles to the attainment of these standards and the strategies educators used to overcome these obstacles. This investigation surfaced a number of questions that would be appropriate for future research. These recommendations deal with the following unanswered questions in the research and related topics for future research:

1. Replicate this study with Catholic secondary schools outside of California and the Jesuit system to determine if these findings apply to all Catholic secondary schools in the United States.
2. Replicate this study with public schools which are supported by dynamic staff development programs to learn what has been most helpful and most problematic in public schools. These lessons could then be applied to Catholic secondary schools where appropriate.
3. Replicate this study with affluent independent schools and then compare these results to those of Catholic schools to discover what Catholic secondary schools might learn from independent schools.

4. In a carefully controlled study in Catholic secondary schools, test two similar populations of students in the same or different schools where one group has teachers who participate in staff development and the other students do not. This will help researchers determine the effects of staff development on student outcomes.
5. Design a study that controls for student socioeconomic status and standardized admission test scores. Compare student outcomes in a population of Catholic secondary schools that meets NSDC (2001) staff development standards to student outcomes in Catholic secondary schools that do not. The results of such a study might provide an impetus for establishing effective staff development in Catholic secondary schools. Such a study might be undertaken by the NCEA or the JSEA or some other collaborative body able to obtain the grants to do this research.
6. Design a study that measures students' commitment to religious values and beliefs upon admission to their school, and their commitment to religious values and beliefs at graduation. Compare the religious beliefs and values of students who attend Catholic secondary schools that meet NSDC (2001) staff development standards to the values and beliefs of students who attend Catholic secondary schools that do not meet these standards. The results of such a study might provide information about the effect of staff development that meets NSDC (2001) standards on the ability of Catholic secondary schools to achieve their religious and spiritual goals.

Summary and Discussion of Findings

The findings of this study indicated that California Catholic and Jesuit secondary schools do not currently possess sufficient knowledge, organizational structures, and expertise in leadership to quickly meet all of the NSDC (2001) standards for staff development. The data determined that while the large majority of leaders in these schools value staff development, their schools do not meet 6 of the 12 standards. The fact that they partially met five and fully met one of the standards is a hopeful sign that in the future the schools in this study could develop the capacity to fully achieve the NSDC (2001) standards. These conclusions are supported by the data and literature calling for major professional development initiatives to assist American educational institutions to meet the needs of all students in the complex world of the 21st century.

These findings do not single out either California Catholic secondary schools or Jesuit high schools as less able to meet the NSDC (2001) standards than public or independent schools. On the contrary, the unique governance style and sense of community of these schools may give them an advantage in hastening needed staff development. However, the results of this study do suggest that the ability of Catholic secondary schools to achieve their missions is dependent on staff development that will facilitate the achievement of their missions.

APPENDIX C
SURVEY

Survey of Professional Development In Catholic Secondary Schools 181

Circle one: Teacher Administrator

Subject(s) Taught: (Optional) _____

Directions: With your school as the focus for your answers, indicate whether you agree or disagree with each statement by circling the corresponding number. Please use the attached glossary to assist with any unfamiliar terms. (This survey is adapted from the National Staff Development Council's *2001 Revised Standards for Staff Development* and is used with permission of the National Staff Development Council, 2002.)

Not Sure Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree A Little Agree Strongly Agree

Learning Communities

- | | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. In this school, small learning teams are a primary component of the staff development plan. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. In this school, all teachers are part of ongoing school-based learning teams that meet two or more times a week to plan instruction, examine student work, and/or solve problems. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. In this school faculty, administrators, and learning teams focus on school goals. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Leadership

- | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4. In this school, collective bargaining agreements (teacher contracts), calendars, daily schedules, and incentive systems support staff development. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. In this school, leaders recognize staff development as a key strategy for supporting significant improvements. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. In this school, administrators and teacher leaders develop knowledge and skills necessary to be staff development leaders. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Resources

- | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 7. In this school, staff development occurs primarily during the school day. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8. In this school, at least 10% of the school's budget is dedicated to staff development. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9. In this school, 25% of an educator's workday is used for staff development. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

| | Not Sure | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Agree A Little | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|---|----------|-------------------|----------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Data-Driven | | | | | | |
| 10. In this school, data on student learning provide focus for staff development efforts. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11. In this school, teachers gather evidence of improvements in student learning in their classrooms to determine the effects of their staff development on their students. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 12. In this school, data are disaggregated to ensure equitable treatment of all subgroups of students. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Evaluation | | | | | | |
| 13. In this school, various types of evidence are used to improve the quality of staff development (formative evaluation). | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 14. In this school, various types of evidence are used to determine whether staff development achieved its intended outcomes (summative evaluation). | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 15. In this school, the evaluation of staff development consistently includes all of the following: data concerning knowledge gained by participants, level of implementation, and changes in student learning. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Research-Based | | | | | | |
| 16. In this school, staff development prepares educators to be skillful users of educational research. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 17. In this school, teams of teachers and administrators methodically study research before adopting improvement strategies. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 18. In this school, pilot studies and action research are used when appropriate to test the effectiveness of new approaches when research is contradictory or does not exist. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

| | Not Sure | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Agree A Little | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|--|----------|-------------------|----------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Design | | | | | | |
| 19. In this school, educators participate in a variety of learning strategies to achieve staff development goals. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 20. In this school, technology supports educators' individual learning. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 21. In this school, a variety of follow-up activities follows every major change initiative. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Learning | | | | | | |
| 22. In this school, staff development learning methods mirror, as closely as possible, the methods teachers are expected to use with their students. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 23. In this school, staff development regularly offers opportunities to practice teaching skills and receive feedback on the performance of those skills | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 24. In this school, staff development leaders gather and use information about individuals' concerns about staff development initiatives to design interventions and follow-up strategies. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Collaboration | | | | | | |
| 25. In this school staff development prepares educators to be skillful members of various groups (for instance, school improvement committees, grade-level teams), | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 26. In this school, staff development provides educators with the skills necessary to surface and productively manage conflict. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 27. In this school, staff development prepares educators to use technology to collaborate. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

| | Not Sure | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Agree A Little | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|--|----------|-------------------|----------|----------------|-------|----------------|
|--|----------|-------------------|----------|----------------|-------|----------------|

Equity

- | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 28. In this school, educators learn how to create schoolwide practices that convey respect for students, their families, and students' diverse cultural backgrounds. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 29. In this school staff development prepares educators to establish learning environments that communicate high expectations for the academic achievement of all students. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 30. In this school educators learn how to adjust instruction and assessment to match the learning requirements of individual students. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Quality Teaching

- | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 31. In this school teachers have many opportunities to develop deep knowledge of their content. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 32. In this school, staff development expands teachers' instructional methods appropriate to specific content areas. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 33. In this school, staff development teaches classroom assessment skills that allow teachers to regularly monitor gains in student learning. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Family Involvement

- | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 34. In this school staff development prepares leaders to build consensus among educators and community members concerning the overall mission and goals for staff development. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 35. In this school, staff development prepares educators to create relationships with parents to support student learning. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 36. In this school, technology is used to communicate with parents and the community. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Obstacles to Professional Development

37. Below are 13 categories that normally support staff development followed by brief explanations of how deficiencies in each area may serve as potential obstacles.

- Please place a small check mark in the “ If Applies” box for any category that is deficient or absent in your school.
- Leave blank any category that you do not consider deficient or absent in your school.
- Rank order the top five categories you checked as deficient. Assign the number “1” to your greatest obstacle, “2” to your second greatest obstacle, up to five.
- You may add obstacles in the blank table space below and include them in your ranking of the top five.

Categories of Potential Obstacles

**If Rank
Applies Order**

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| Learning Community: In this school, obstacles to professional development may arise from cultural norms that encourage teachers to work alone in planning instruction, examining student work, and solving problems. | | |
| Leadership: In this school, obstacles to professional development may arise from the lack of knowledgeable leadership for staff development. | | |
| Central Office: In this school, obstacles to professional development may arise either from the lack leadership and/or support from the office of the superintendent of Catholic Schools. | | |
| Resources: In this school, obstacles to professional development may arise from the lack of funds to assist teachers and administrators in the areas of content knowledge, instruction, and/or leadership. | | |
| Time: In this school, obstacles to professional development may arise from the lack of time for staff development due to teacher and administrator workload and/or the scheduling of teacher time. | | |
| Data-Driven: In this school, obstacles to professional development may arise from inadequate data about the learning of all levels of students. | | |
| Evaluation: In this school, obstacles to professional development may arise from the inadequate evaluation of the effect of staff development on teacher and student learning. | | |
| Research-Based: In this school, obstacles to professional development may arise from the lack of knowledge about current educational research about instruction, curriculum, and adult and student learning. | | |
| Design: In this school, obstacles to professional development may arise from a design that does not incorporate a variety of follow-up activities, technology to support staff development, and the involvement of parents in student learning. | | |
| Quality Teaching: In this school, obstacles to professional development may arise from the lack of focus on the aspects of quality teaching. | | |
| Reward: In this school, obstacles to professional development may arise from lack of staff development support by the reward/recognition systems. | | |
| Past Experiences with Staff Development: In this school, obstacles to professional development may arise from the belief among some faculty and administration that staff development is not needed or effective. | | |
| Mediocrity: In this school, obstacles to professional development may arise from attitudes of faculty and administration that tolerate mediocrity in curriculum and instruction. | | |
| Additional Obstacles: | | |

GLOSSARY OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT TERMS

Directions: These terms will be found in the order in which they appear in the survey.

Staff Development The means by which educators acquire or enhance the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and beliefs necessary to create high levels of learning for all students. Synonymous with Professional Development.

Questions 1-3
Learning
Communities Ongoing teams of two or more educators who meet on a regular basis, preferably several times a week, for the purposes of learning, joint lesson planning, and problem solving.

Question 6
Knowledge for
Staff Development
Leadership Having the knowledge, ideas, personal skills, and ability to produce results and to lead groups of educators or whole schools in effective staff development.

Questions 10-12
Data Any information gathered on student learning from standardized tests, school or district-made tests, student work, portfolios, and other sources.

Question 12
Disaggregate As used in question 12, to separate out some data from larger blocks of data. For example, to separate out information about student ability to do word problems in a comprehensive mathematics achievement test.

Question 13
Formative
Evaluation To evaluate one portion or one section of something. For example, in education a formative evaluation could be a written evaluation of how you taught one class.

Questions 14
Summative
Evaluation To pool together all of the data on a student or teacher and then write an evaluation that sums up the totality of all the existing evaluations.

APPENDIX J

MEAN SCORES OF QUESTIONS 1-36 BY TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS
IN CALIFORNIA AND JESUIT SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Table 23

Mean Scores of Questions 1-12 by Teachers and Administrators in California and Jesuit High Schools. (95 Surveys scored)

| Question Number with Summary of Question | Means of Disaggregated Data | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| | Cal Tea | Cal Adm | Jes Tea | Jes Adm | Cal Tot | Jes Tot |
| 1. Learning teams are part of staff development plan. | 2.90 | 2.32 | 2.09 | 2.67 | 2.72 | 2.26 |
| 2. Teachers are members of learning teams. | 1.81 | 1.79 | 1.61 | 1.33 | 1.81 | 1.53 |
| 3. Faculty and administrators focus on school goals. | 3.83 | 3.53 | 3.27 | 3.22 | 3.74 | 3.26 |
| 4. Contracts and schedules support staff development. | 3.28 | 3.56 | 3.14 | 3.00 | 3.36 | 3.10 |
| 5. Leaders recognize staff development as key strategy. | 4.00 | 4.26 | 3.78* | 4.44* | 4.08 | 3.97 |
| 6. Leaders develop knowledge to be staff development leaders. | 3.46 | 3.79 | 3.14 | 3.78 | 3.57 | 3.33 |
| 7. Staff development occurs primarily during school day. | 3.00 | 3.58 | 3.17 | 3.67 | 3.18 | 3.31 |
| 8. 10% of school budget goes to staff development. | 2.88 | 2.40 | 2.22 | 1.43 | 2.66* | 1.88* |
| 9. 25% of educator's workday is used for staff development. | 1.62 | 1.63 | 1.41 | 1.22 | 1.62 | 1.35 |
| 10. Data provides focus for staff development. | 3.00 | 3.47 | 2.83 | 2.63 | 3.16 | 2.77 |
| 11. Teachers gather evidence for student learning to determine effects of staff development. | 3.27 | 3.16 | 2.59 | 2.38 | 3.23** | 2.53** |
| 12. Data disaggregated to ensure equitable treatment of all subgroups of students. | 2.74 | 2.89 | 2.41 | 2.25 | 2.79 | 2.36 |

Note: Means for questions 1-12, "Survey of Professional Development in Catholic Secondary Schools."

* The difference between the means is significant at the .05 level or lower.

** The difference between the means is significant at the .01 level or lower.

Table 24

Mean Scores of Questions 13-24 by Teachers and Administrators in California and Jesuit High Schools. (95 Surveys scored)

| Question Number with Summary of Question | Means of Disaggregated Data | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| | Cal Tea | Cal Adm | Jes Tea | Jes Adm | Cal Tot | Jes Tot |
| 13. Evidence is used to improve quality of staff development. | 3.38 | 3.32 | 3.05 | 2.88 | 3.36 | 3.00 |
| 14. Evidence is used to learn about staff development outcomes. | 3.27 | 3.44 | 2.39 | 2.63 | 3.32** | 2.46** |
| 15. Evaluation includes changes in student learning, and level of knowledge by participants. | 2.97 | 2.94 | 2.14 | 1.75 | 2.96** | 2.03** |
| 16. Educators learn to be skilled users of educational research. | 3.14 | 2.78 | 2.58 | 2.25 | 3.03* | 2.50* |
| 17. Study research when adopting improvement strategies. | 3.08 | 2.94 | 2.52 | 2.63 | 3.04 | 2.55 |
| 18. Action research & pilot studies used to test new approaches. | 2.76 | 2.75 | 1.95 | 2.50 | 2.76* | 2.11* |
| 19. Educators use variety of learning strategies to improve. | 3.62 | 3.58 | 3.23 | 3.22 | 3.61 | 3.23 |
| 20. Technology supports educators' learning. | 3.79 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 3.78 | 3.87 | 4.00 |
| 21. Variety of follow-up activities follows change initiatives. | 3.12 | 3.56 | 2.52 | 3.11 | 3.25* | 2.69* |
| 22. Staff development mirrors methods teachers will use. | 3.26 | 3.47 | 2.70 | 2.89 | 3.33* | 2.75* |
| 23. Staff development offers practice of teaching skill. | 2.79 | 3.26 | 2.42 | 2.56 | 2.93* | 2.45* |
| 24. Teacher concerns guide design of staff development. | 2.89 | 3.16 | 2.52 | 2.67 | 2.98 | 2.57 |

Note: Means for questions 13-24, "Survey of Professional Development in Catholic Secondary Schools."

* The difference between the means is significant at the .05 level or lower.

** The difference between the means is significant at the .01 level or lower.

Table 25

Mean Scores of Questions 25-36 by Teachers and Administrators in California and Jesuit High Schools. (95 Surveys scored)

| Question Number with Summary of Question | Means of Disaggregated Data | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| | Cal Tea | Cal Adm | Jes Tea | Jes Adm | Cal Tot | Jes Tot |
| 25. Prepared to be skillful members of various groups. | 2.83 | 3.00 | 2.39 | 2.67 | 2.89 | 2.47 |
| 26. Educators provided with skills to manage conflict. | 2.68 | 2.95 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.76** | 2.00** |
| 27. Educators use technology to collaborate. | 3.40 | 3.58 | 3.46 | 3.56 | 3.46 | 3.48 |
| 28. Educators create practices that respect students. | 4.05 | 3.95 | 3.52 | 3.44 | 4.02* | 3.50* |
| 29. Learn to create high academic expectations for all students. | 3.91 | 4.16 | 3.88 | 3.78 | 3.98 | 3.85 |
| 30. Learn instruction to match learning needs of all students. | 3.42 | 3.68 | 3.33 | 3.00 | 3.50 | 3.24 |
| 31. Teachers develop deep knowledge of content. | 3.57 | 3.74 | 3.46 | 3.56 | 3.62 | 3.48 |
| 32. Develop instructional methods for different content areas. | 3.45 | 3.68 | 3.00 | 3.44 | 3.52 | 3.12 |
| 33. Learn assessment skills to monitor student learning. | 3.19 | 3.47 | 2.96 | 2.67 | 3.28 | 2.88 |
| 34. Prepare leaders to build consensus of goals & mission of staff development. | 3.43 | 3.12 | 2.96 | 3.22 | 3.33 | 3.03 |
| 35. Create relationships with parents for student learning. | 3.51 | 3.28 | 2.88 | 2.89 | 3.44* | 2.88* |
| 36. Technology is used to communicate with parents. | 4.16 | 4.17 | 4.29 | 4.00 | 4.16 | 4.21 |

Note: Means for questions 25-36, "Survey of Professional Development in Catholic Secondary Schools."

* The difference between the means is significant at the .05 level or lower.

** The difference between the means is significant at the .01 level or lower.

APPENDIX L
OBSTACLES TO PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AS SCORES
FOR QUESTION 37

Table 47

How Teachers and Administrators Ranked Ordered Obstacles to Professional Development in Their Schools. (95 Surveys scored)

| Rank | Categories of Obstacles | Ranked Category of Responses | | | | | | Total Score* |
|------|--|------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--------------|
| | | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | 5th | 6th | |
| 1. | <u>Time</u> for staff development is inadequate due to workload. | 44 | 10 | 9 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 372 |
| 2. | <u>Past Experience</u> with staff development. | 11 | 13 | 14 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 206 |
| 3. | <u>Learning Communities</u> do not arise because teachers plan & work alone. | 7 | 12 | 7 | 6 | 8 | 5 | 169 |
| 4. | <u>Evaluation</u> of effects of staff development on learning is inadequate. | 1 | 5 | 12 | 12 | 10 | 7 | 147 |
| 5. | <u>Resources</u> are inadequate to fund learning for all educators. | 9 | 9 | 4 | 2 | 7 | 3 | 138 |
| 6. | <u>Mediocrity</u> is tolerated in curriculum and instruction. | 4 | 12 | 3 | 8 | 1 | 4 | 126 |
| 7. | <u>Research</u> about how adults and students learn is not known. | 0 | 2 | 9 | 12 | 7 | 7 | 103 |
| 8. | <u>Data</u> is not gathered about all levels of student learning. | 2 | 9 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 9 | 96 |
| 9. | <u>Reward/recognition</u> for support of staff development is lacking. | 3 | 2 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 85 |
| 10. | <u>Leadership</u> for effective staff development practices is lacking. | 4 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 83 |
| 11. | <u>Design</u> for staff development incorporates and inadequate design. | 1 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 76 |
| 12. | <u>Central Office</u> support/leadership for staff development is missing. | 3 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 56 |
| 13. | <u>Quality Teaching</u> is not a central focus of staff development. | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 9 | 49 |

Note: Total of obstacles rank ordered in question 37 of the “Survey of Professional Development in Catholic Secondary Schools.”

• 6 points were assigned to the greatest obstacle, 5 to the second greatest, 4 to the third, 3 to the fourth, 2 to the fifth and 1 to the sixth obstacle. Any obstacles ranked sixth or higher received 1 point. Thirty six surveys rank ordered fewer than five obstacles.

