



*Using Data Protocols to Inform
Teacher Preparation Curriculum*

Andrea Lachance and Angela Pagano
SUNY Cortland

Beginnings...

- C-TEN conversations
 - Led by Dennis Farnsworth
- Consultation with BOCES Partners
 - Jeff Craig: OCM BOCES
 - Heather Sheridan-Thomas: TST BOCES
- Resulted in examination of Professional Learning Team Model

At the same time...

Collegial inquiry work through
TLQP grant and NYSUT
Education Learning Trust (ELT)

- Districts wanted leadership training for teachers
- Worked with ELT to come up with a model for teachers leading collegial inquiry groups/professional learning teams

Collegial Inquiry Groups: Training Model

- ELT did two full days of PD with local teacher leaders around the use of protocols in discussion.
- Workshop used real data/issues as part of training with protocols.
- Follow-up session occurred after participants leaders tested the model in their schools with their colleagues.
- Protocol use got high praise.

Merging Ideas

Based on advice from BOCES as well as success with Collegial Inquiry Group model, came up with a plan to create similar groups in nine teacher prep programs on our campus. Groups included: Childhood, Early Childhood, Special Education, Literacy, Math, Science, Social Studies, Modern Languages, Physical Education.

Format/Structure

- Named: Professional Learning Teams (PLT)
- Strategically selected leaders for each PLT
- Leaders got to select additional members for the team.
- One team member had to be from P-12 settings.

Professional Development

- Outside facilitator was hired to do PD for full day on PLT's with all team members.
- Part of workshop was devoted to exploring data in teams.
- PLT Leaders got additional training in leading a PLT using protocols.

Protocols

- Structured format for examining an issue or concern.
- Provides for specific roles and format for a meeting.
- Various types of protocols can be used.
- Most groups found protocols to be useful.

PLT Work

- PLT Groups have been working for summer/fall to analyze data and make recommendations to revision for programs.
- Second full day of PD will take place in January and PLT's will present their findings.

Secondary Science PLT

- Members = department chairs in biology, chemistry, geology & a high school biology teacher
- Attended summer workshop & have met twice to examine data

Type of data influences response...

- 1st meeting – most recent certification exam data
- 2nd meeting – long term data including GPA & course grades

Sample Outcomes

- Analysis & discussion of CST data in earth science found:
 - 28 candidates passed on first attempt, and 3 passed on second attempt. This gives an overall pass rate of 91%.
- Using a score of 220/300 (73%) as "passing", the pass rates for the sub-areas are:
 - 1: Foundations of Scientific Inquiry = 91%
 - 2: Space Systems = 74%
 - 3: Atmospheric Systems = 82%
 - 4: Geological Systems = 91%
 - 5: Water Systems = 77%
 - 6: Geological Systems Constructed Response = 74%
- Interpretation: we should look to improve our teaching in subareas 2, 5, and 6, and perhaps 3 as well.

Lessons Learned

- Data is compelling – especially for A&S faculty.
- P-12 constituents are more positive about protocols than higher ed constituents.
- But all agree setting time aside with multiple stakeholders to have these discussions is valuable and beneficial to the programs.