

UNC Center for School Leadership Development

Seventh Annual Report On Professional Development

Submitted to

The North Carolina State Board of Education

By

The University of North Carolina Board of Governors

July 2007 through June 2008

UNC Center for School Leadership Development
140 Friday Center Drive
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27517

UNC Center for School Leadership Development

Seventh Annual Report on Professional Development July 2007 through June 2008

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Since 2001 the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina—as required by G.S. 116-11(12a) and G.S. 115C-12(26), which were enacted in 2001 and amended in 2005—has approved and presented to the North Carolina State Board of Education an annual report of the professional development activities of the programs comprising the UNC Center for School Leadership Development (CSLD). The CSLD has implemented President Bowles’ and the NC Legislature’s requirements for the consolidation of the CSLD’s programs and budgets. It is now operating as a fully integrated Center for delivery of services, and budget allocations are based on priority of needs. Because the brand names of the Center programs are so well known, the report will utilize those entities for its organization.

These are the units consolidated:

- NC Teachers of Excellence for All Children (NC TEACH)
- Model Teacher Education Consortium (MTEC)
- Principal Fellows Program (PFP)
- NC Mathematics and Science Education Network (NC-MSEN)
- NC State Improvement Project in Special Education (NC SIP)
- Principals’ Executive Program (PEP)
- NC Quality Educators through Staff Development and Training (NC QUEST)

The first three above sponsor pre-licensure training and support activities for aspiring public school teachers and school-based leaders. The last four above provide in-service professional development to teachers, school leaders, and administrators currently employed in North Carolina’s public schools. The reach of these programs in North Carolina is very extensive:

Program	Participants*	Contact Hours
NC TEACH Licensure Credit**	3,331	156,444
Advisement/Counseling	9,255	4,627
Other	2,905	9,493
MTEC Licensure Credit**	2,441	173,310
Other	881	10,222
PFP Licensure Credit**	112	41,147
Other	278	1,528
NC-MSEN	6,718	109,757
NC SIP	2,921	54,735
PEP	471	35,780
NC QUEST	236	24,491
CSLD TURNAROUND TRAINING	342	20,729
Totals	29,891	642,263

*duplicated counts; **1 semester hour = 10 contact hours

These participants are drawn from school districts and charter schools in North Carolina. Appendix A documents participation by school systems in each of the program areas. The full report contains information and data from the seven programs listed above. Section 1 of the report contains qualitative information consisting of each program's response to a series of eight questions/prompts. In this narrative section each program addresses successes, least effective activities, priorities, overall impact, issues, and costs for 2007-2008, as well as adjustments for 2008-09. A list of LEA's served in 2007-08 is found in Appendix A.

Section 2 of the report contains quantitative data regarding the activities of the seven programs, presented in table format with a table for each program. During the period July 2007 through June 2008, the seven programs provided professional development activities to 29,891 participants. These individuals engaged in 642,263 contact hours of professional development. The participants included current employees from the 115 local school systems and 97 charter schools throughout North Carolina as well as individuals enrolled in pre-licensure teacher and administrator training through Center programs. The locations of these professional development activities were spread across the state and included the CSLD building, rented venues, school system facilities, and the campuses of public and private colleges and universities as well as community college campuses. Some of the professional development activities were conducted or taught by personnel from public university campuses while being facilitated or coordinated by CSLD personnel, with the cost of such activities being included in the campus budget as opposed to the CSLD budget.

This report is presented to the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina for approval. Upon approval it will be forwarded to the North Carolina State Board of Education for review and comment.

The expenditures for the operation of the Center for School Leadership Development, by source, are as follows:

Program	State Appropriation				Other Sources		
	Operating Cost	Salaries & Benefits	Central Support Allocation	Total State Spending	Grant / Trust Funds	Central Support Allocation	Total Other Spending
NC TEACH	\$246,678	\$226,895	\$69,518	\$543,091	\$403,055	\$22,528	\$425,583
NC MTEC	\$2,451,445	\$330,837	\$408,424	\$3,190,706	\$1,133,220	\$63,340	\$1,196,560
PPF	\$25,573	\$152,601	\$26,155	\$204,329	\$0	\$0	\$0
NC MSEN	\$62,546	\$314,842	\$55,399	\$432,787	\$1,730,474	\$96,723	\$1,827,197
NC SIP	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$257,054	\$14,368	\$271,422
PEP	\$387,165	\$767,375	\$169,480	\$1,324,020	\$323,109	\$18,060	\$341,169
NC QUEST	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,537,911	\$85,960	\$1,623,871
Turnaround Training	\$410,046	\$0	\$60,193	\$470,239	\$427,682	\$23,904	\$451,586
Total Spending	\$3,583,453	\$1,792,550	\$789,169	\$6,165,172	\$5,812,505	\$324,883	\$6,137,388

UNC Center for School Leadership Development

Report on Professional Development July 2007 – June 2008

SEVENTH ANNUAL REPORT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Executive Summary	1
Table of Contents	3
Introduction	4
UNC Center for School Leadership Development	
Mission	4
History	5
The Report	6
Section 1 – Qualitative Information	
NC TEACH	9
MTEC	14
PFP	16
NC-MSEN	18
NC SIP	31
PEP	33
NC QUEST	36
TURNAROUND SCHOOL TRAINING	38
Section 2 – Quantitative Data	
NC TEACH	41
MTEC	43
PFP	46
NC-MSEN	48
NC SIP	53
PEP	61
NC QUEST	62
TURNAROUND SCHOOL TRAINING	63
Appendix A– School Systems Served by Center Programs in 2007-2008	

UNC Center for School Leadership Development

Report on Professional Development July 2007 – June 2008

SEVENTH ANNUAL REPORT

Introduction

Since 2001 the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina has compiled and presented an annual report of the professional development activities of the programs comprising the UNC Center for School Leadership Development, as required by G.S. 115C-12(26) and G. S. 116-11(12a). These statutes, as amended in August 2005 require that, “The Board of Governors of The University of North Carolina shall implement, administer, and revise programs for meaningful professional development for professional public school employees based upon the evaluations and recommendations made by the State Board of Education under G.S. 115C-12(26). The programs shall be aligned with State education goals and directed toward improving student academic achievement. The Board of Governors shall submit to the State Board of Education an annual report evaluating the professional development programs administered by the Board of Governors.” Further, “The State Board of Education, in collaboration with the Board of Governors of The University of North Carolina, shall identify and make recommendations regarding meaningful professional development programs for professional public school employees. The programs shall be aligned with State education goals and directed toward improving student academic achievement. The State Board shall annually evaluate and, after consultation with the Board of Governors, make recommendations regarding professional development programs based upon reports submitted by the Board of Governors under G.S. 116-11(12a).”

This document is the annual report of the professional development programs offered through the seven programs operating as the UNC Center for School Leadership Development for the period July 2007 through August 2008.

UNC Center for School Leadership Development – Mission

The UNC Board of Governors created the University of North Carolina Center for School Leadership Development (CSLD) in 1997. The Center was created in order to extend the resources of higher education to the public schools by offering a comprehensive selection of professional development opportunities designed for educators, ranging from aspiring and novice teachers to veteran administrators and teacher-leaders. Professional development programs conducted within the Center are aligned with the State Board of Education goals that incorporate the belief that every student is entitled to competent, caring administrators and teachers.

The UNC Center for School Leadership Development’s mission, in alignment with the strategic priorities of the University and the public schools, is to promote a community of individual and collective learners who meet the leadership challenges of advancing student and school success

in North Carolina. We do this through the design and delivery of premier professional development for public school educators and contribute to school-based research providing evidence of best practices.

UNC Center for School Leadership Development – History

In 1993 the legislative Educational Leadership Task Force recommended the creation of a state Leadership Academy to serve the needs of all school administrators statewide. In 1995 the State Board of Education (SBE) adopted a resolution urging the General Assembly to enact appropriate legislation to support the full list of recommendations from the Educational Leadership Task Force. The SBE also recommended the creation of a Leadership Academy that would incorporate the Principals' Executive Program. In 1995 the General Assembly passed legislation (House Bill 29) requiring the UNC Board of Governors to conduct a study and to develop a plan for ongoing professional development and continuing education for all public school teachers and administrators. Two of the current programs which comprise the UNC Center for School Leadership Development were identified to be part of the plan developed by the Board of Governors: the Principals' Executive Program and the NC Mathematics-Science Education Network.

In 1997, the president of the University of North Carolina recommended to the University Committee on Educational Planning, Policies and Programs the establishment of an inter-institutional center, the UNC Center for School Leadership Development. The Center was to be established by March 30, 1997 and included the following programs: an Executive Academy for superintendents, the Principals' Executive Program, the Principal Fellows Program, the NC Center for the Advancement of Teaching, the NC Center for the Prevention of School Violence, the NC Mathematics-Science Education Network and the NC Teacher Academy. In subsequent years the NC Model Teacher Education Consortium, NC Teachers of Excellence for All Children, and NC State Improvement Project/NC Restructuring Initiative in Special Education and NC Quality Educators through Staff Development and Training were added to the roster of programs under the umbrella of the UNC-CSLD. The Executive Academy has not been developed. The NC Center for the Prevention of School Violence was transferred from the Center to the Department of Juvenile Justice in 2000. NCCAT and the NCTA were removed from the CSLD umbrella in 2006. The operation of the NC SIP was returned to the Department of Public Instruction in 2008.

In October 2001 a new UNC-CSLD facility was completed and opened for business. Along with the UNC Vice-President for University-School Programs and the Professional Development Coordinator, the facility initially housed a number of programs, and in 2007-2008 was home to seven programs: the North Carolina Mathematics and Science Education Network (NC-MSEN), North Carolina Teachers of Excellence for All Children (NC TEACH), Principals' Executive Program (PEP), Principal Fellows Program (PFP), the North Carolina State Improvement Project (NC SIP), Model Teacher Education Consortium (MTEC), and the federally-funded North Carolina Quality Educators through Staff Development and Training (NC QUEST).

The CSLD facility also houses LEARN NC. This organization is an affiliated partner of the CSLD, but is not included in the seven programs that operate as part of the CSLD.

Additional information, including links to all of the Center's programs and affiliated partners, can be accessed through the CSLD web site at csld.northcarolina.edu.

The Report

The following pages detail the professional development provided statewide by the seven programs comprising the UNC-CSLD during 2007-08.

Section 1 contains qualitative information consisting of each program's response to a series of eight questions/prompts:

1. What was your major success in 2007-08?
2. What aspects of your program were least effective?
3. What areas received your highest priority?
4. Summarize the impact of your program.
5. What major issues did you confront in the course of the year?
6. What was the total cost (including support services and indirect costs) of providing the activities reported in the quantitative sections?
7. In 2008-09, what adjustments will you make to target new areas and/or increase the effectiveness of your program?
8. List the LEA's that were served by your program in 2007-08.

Section 2 contains quantitative data regarding the activities of the seven programs presented in table format with a table for each program. Each table includes a descriptive name/title of each activity, the type of activity by code, the number of contact hours involved in each activity, the number of participants, the total number of contact hours, the number of LEA's served, and the beginning and ending dates of the activity. The codes for type of activity are:

- A – non-residential, one-day activity
- B – non-residential, multiple-day activity
- C – residential, one-day activity
- D – residential, multiple-day activity.

The following table summarizes this data:

Program	Participants*	Contact Hours
NC TEACH Licensure Credit**	3,331	156,444
Advisement/Counseling	9,255	4,627
Other	2,905	9,493
MTEC Licensure Credit**	2,441	173,310
Other	881	10,222
PFP Licensure Credit**	112	41,147
Other	278	1,528
NC-MSEN	6,718	109,757
NC SIP	2,921	54,735
PEP	471	35,780
NC QUEST	236	24,491
CSLD TURNAROUND TRAINING	342	20,729
Totals	29,891	642,263

*duplicated counts; **1 semester hour = 10 contact hours

The expenditures for the operation of The Center for School Leadership Development, by source, are as follows:

Program	State Appropriation					Other Sources		
	Operating Cost	Salaries & Benefits	Central Support Allocation	Total State Spending		Grant / Trust Funds	Central Support Allocation	Total Other Spending
NC TEACH	\$246,678	\$226,895	\$69,518	\$543,091		\$403,055	\$22,528	\$425,583
NC MTEC	\$2,451,445	\$330,837	\$408,424	\$3,190,706		\$1,133,220	\$63,340	\$1,196,560
PFP	\$25,573	\$152,601	\$26,155	\$204,329		\$0	\$0	\$0
NC MSEN	\$62,546	\$314,842	\$55,399	\$432,787		\$1,730,474	\$96,723	\$1,827,197
NC SIP	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		\$257,054	\$14,368	\$271,422
PEP	\$387,165	\$767,375	\$169,480	\$1,324,020		\$323,109	\$18,060	\$341,169
NC QUEST	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		\$1,537,911	\$85,960	\$1,623,871
Turnaround Training	\$410,046	\$0	\$60,193	\$470,239		\$427,682	\$23,904	\$451,586
Total Spending	\$3,583,453	\$1,792,550	\$789,169	\$6,165,172		\$5,812,505	\$324,883	\$6,137,388

QUALITATIVE INFORMATION

UNC Center for School Leadership Development
Professional Development Report
July 2007– June 2008
Qualitative Information

North Carolina Teachers of Excellence for All Children (NC TEACH)


About NC TEACH







The UNC CSLD Educator Recruitment and Pre-Service Training of New Teachers category of services includes the North Carolina Teachers of Excellence for All Children (NC TEACH) program. This is a statewide lateral entry teacher preparation program for mid-career professionals, developed jointly by the NC State Board of Education and the UNC Board of Governors. Initially funded from Title II of the Higher Education Act, it is currently supported through state funds. The program recruits, trains, advises, and supports highly skilled mid-career professionals who seek to enter the teaching profession. Licensure areas include middle grades (6-9) mathematics, science, language arts, and social studies; secondary grades (9-12) mathematics, science, social studies and English; K-12 Second Language (Spanish, French); K-12 Special Populations, Elementary Education, and many others. Program components include recruitment, advisement, orientation, summer institute, fall and spring semester courses, PRAXIS content exam preparation, mentoring, and employment assistance. The face-to-face program is currently hosted at twelve university host site locations. Four universities host NC TEACH Online. All UNCC fast track and MAT programs are NC TEACH Affiliate Programs.

The NC TEACH II Transition to Teaching federal grant project, receiving \$2.7 million over five years, neared completion of its Year II activities in 2007. Offered at UNCP, UNC-CH, WCU, ECU, and UNCW, NC TEACH II recruits and prepares teachers of core licensure areas with a special emphasis on mathematics, science, and special populations for high need school districts in North Carolina.

NC TEACH includes a pre-service preparation phase and ongoing courses and mentoring support through the first and second year of teaching. Program phases include: recruitment/selection; preparation; induction/support/mentoring; and career development/placement/retention of teachers. NC TEACH is unique in that it is a comprehensive, cohort based program that offers support and advisement that begins with the recruitment of the prospective teacher, and extends through all program courses and activities through the licensure process. Participants do not “just take a bunch of courses” but participate in a supportive university-based learning community around a comprehensive, high quality series of modules/courses, activities, and support that are appropriate to the development of a beginning teacher through his/her first and second year in the classroom.

1. What was your major success in 2007-08?

-  NC TEACH recruited and enrolled more than 600 participants in its face to face, online, and blended pre-service training programs for lateral entry teachers across the state.

-  NC TEACH II, focused on the recruitment, preparation, and retention of teachers for identified high need school districts in North Carolina, completed its second year of operation with 132 (42 Year I; 87 Year II) participants at five host sites. UNC Pembroke, newly established for this project in its first year, along with ECU, WCU, and UNC-CH, are all designed to strengthen current services for lateral entry teachers. UNCW was added as a fifth host site for this program during 2007-08. NC TEACH II participants received stipends and laptops for their participation in the program and a three year commitment to teach in a high need school in North Carolina.
-  Recruitment activities based on predetermined goals (Noel Levitz funnel approach) continue to be more focused and strengthened to include more collaboration with universities, community colleges, college of arts and sciences, military bases, LEAs, Troops to Teachers; conferences; information sessions; job fairs; targeted mailings; collaborative mailings with other CSLD programs; linked websites; e-recruitment strategies; expanded sponsorships with television, radio, and advertising firms; and local outreach via word of mouth and presentations by existing program participants. Three university host sites (WCU, ECU, and NCSU) enrolled more than 140 NC TEACHERs per site as a result of these efforts.
-  The NC TEACH Online program at four host sites were expanded and now offer multiple start dates (summer, fall, winter, and spring). Models include completely online and blended courses.
-  Work was completed on a completely new website for the program in 2007. New content, more efficient recruitment and referral components and an online registration system was developed for the new site. New sections include information for LEAs, teacher resources, licensure information, FAQs sections, and the NC TEACHER feature that highlights a variety of program participants and their new careers in teaching.
-  NC A & T University was added as a host site and now offers a lateral entry elementary education program for mid-career professionals who wish to become teachers in NC. Almost 40 participants enrolled in the online program in 2007.
-  During this time period the program continued to evolve to provide participants the following: 1) more time to find teaching positions, 2) alternative schedules and start dates 3) increased access during weekends and evenings 4) increased access regardless of geographic location (completely or blended online delivery models), 5) an opportunity to transfer credits to an MAT program, 6) expanded licensure offerings; and 7) a one-stop shop that helps reduce the confusion and barriers to becoming a licensed teacher in NC.

2. What aspects of your program were least effective?

- Supporting online course faculty developers from our central office uses a considerable amount of resources and steps have been taken to decentralize portions of this function and secure the necessary resources at local campuses.

3. What areas received your highest priority?

- Working closely with 12 NC TEACH host sites to provide expanded recruitment, pre-service training, and support services for new lateral entry teachers in North Carolina.
- Developing, expanding, and strengthening the five NC TEACH II host sites focused on recruiting and training qualified math, science, special populations, and other core licensure area teachers for identified high need school districts in North Carolina.
- Developing new partner LEAs to support recruitment efforts and success of the NC TEACH II program.
- Collaborating with UNC initiatives around teacher recruitment (Noel Levitz), mathematics and science online content course development (UNC-Community College 2 + 2 Initiative).
- Collaborating with UNC Online with regards to NC TEACH Online program offerings and access.
- Collaborating with other UNC CSLD programs in recruitment and pre-service training activities.
- Developing a new website aimed at strengthening recruitment and referral services for potential lateral entry teachers and a better distribution of program information for new teachers and hiring LEAs.

4. Summarize the impact of your program.

To date, almost 3,000 NC TEACHERs have been employed in more than 100 school systems in NC. The retention rate for NC TEACHERs after the first year of teaching is over 80%. The third year retention rate for the 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003 cohorts is 74%. NC TEACHERs who obtained the NC lateral entry, clear initial, or continuing teaching license: Cohort 2000: 98.2%; Cohort 2001: 91.4%; Cohort 2002: 94.5%; Cohort 2004: 91.7%; Cohort 2005 92%. Over eighty percent of NC TEACHERs in cohorts 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003 obtained their clear initial or continuing license (requires three years of teaching experience).

The name NC TEACH is strongly branded, and teachers prepared through the program are highly respected by school administrators and educators across NC. Its comprehensive, multi-media statewide marketing and public relations campaign resulted in increased enrollment by almost 400% in the first four years of the program's operation. Applications increased from 198

to almost 1,500 during that time. In year five, the federal grant funds for NC TEACH ended (reducing program funds by about 60%) and the NC DPI established three alternative regional licensing centers in NC, which in effect, offered a “short cut to licensure,” and siphoned off a large number of NC TEACH candidates. Despite these factors, NC TEACH has continued to recruit and enroll 350 - 450 new teachers per year. In year five (2004 – 05), 368 participants enrolled in the face-to-face and online programs, and 967 were enrolled in NC TEACH affiliate programs at constituent UNC campuses. In 2005 – 06 (year six), 418 participants enrolled in the face to face and online programs, and over 1,500 were enrolled in NC TEACH Affiliate Programs. 548 participants enrolled in NC TEACH during 2006 – 2007 (year seven). 42 participants enrolled in the NC TEACH II program in 2007 and an additional 87 in 2008. Diversity in participants increased from 14% to over 30% from 1999 to 2006 and continues to be over 28%. NC TEACH distributes information about its affiliate programs at informational sessions for lateral entry and potential teachers at local school districts upon request. The number of requests for these sessions (50 – 150 attendees per session) has increased by over 200% since 2004. NC TEACH II awarded stipends and laptops in the amount of \$261,000 to 87 new teachers in 2007-08 who committed to teach a high need subject at an identified high needs district for at least three years.

5. What major issues did you confront in the course of the year?

Lack of resources: As more host sites increase the number of participants to over 100, additional funds for operating costs for the program will be needed. Additional funds for advertising and collaborative recruitment activities with UNC campuses are needed.

Technology: Challenges were faced in regards to developing, replicating and transferring Blackboard online courses among universities. It was difficult to set up course revision and transfer protocols, solve problems related to different versions of courseware, and successfully meet multiple deadlines for the various projects within tight time constraints.

6. What was the total cost (including support services and indirect costs) of providing the activities reported in the quantitative sections?

Refer to the Table on page 2 of the Executive Summary or the Table on page 7 of the Report.

7. In 2008-09, what adjustments will you make to target new areas and/or increase the effectiveness of your program?

- Work more closely with UNC GA on University of North Carolina System initiatives with regard to teacher recruitment and accountability. I.e. overall UNC recruitment plan, individual campus based recruitment plans, focused growth campuses, and other related initiatives.
- Work more closely with UNC Teacher Recruitment Coordinators and associated network.
- Continue work with UNC-Community Colleges 2 + 2 Initiative on the development of online mathematics and science content courses for lateral-entry teachers.

- Work closely with other UNC CSLD programs (especially NCMTEC and PFP) in further strengthening and delivering educator recruitment and pre-service training services for new teachers in North Carolina and on related UNC GA initiatives.
- Work closely with the new UNC CSLD research director in developing a better evaluation method for NC TEACH and NC TEACH II services.
- Increase the total number of participants of NC TEACH, NC TEACH II, and NC TEACHing Communities to 700 per year, including 100 specifically for high need districts.
- Increase the number (100 per year) of highly qualified teachers (math, science, special populations, other core high need areas) in selected high need school districts in North Carolina through targeted recruitment and enhanced partnerships.
- Provide increased/expanded access to NC TEACH OnLine for individuals of high need school districts seeking licensure in mathematics, science, special populations, and other identified core licensure areas.
- Provide increased access to NC TEACH face to face programs by working with LEAs to set up on site host sites.
- Continue to strengthen new website recruitment and referral components and maximize capacity for online application and data tracking.
- Provide online program and course evaluations.
- Develop data tracking system for NC TEACHERs.
- Develop better online program materials and e-recruitment strategies including quarterly e-newsletters, online ads and e-messaging via list serves.
- Complete development of online diversity module for new teachers and further explore development of online pre-service and induction materials.

8. List the LEA's that were served by your program in 2007-08.

See Appendix A.

UNC Center for School Leadership Development
Professional Development Report
July 2007 – June 2008
Qualitative Information

Model Teacher Education Consortium (MTEC)

1. What was your major success in 2007-08?
 - We developed criteria for LEA membership, defined our mission and ranked our school systems based upon need in order to determine how to deliver services.
2. What aspects of your program were least effective?
 - We were least effective in managing our budget because we did not limit the number and size of graduate cohorts, did not put caps on the number of seats in courses sponsored at our private partnering colleges and universities and because we sponsored courses at our private partnering colleges and universities that could have been sponsored at a lower cost at our public universities.
3. What areas received your highest priority?
 - Outreach, meaning being accessible to employees of our partnering school systems by making presentations, responding promptly to emails and telephone calls and providing information about our services was our highest priority.
4. Summarize the impact of your program.
 - We continue to provide a vital service to employees of our partnering school systems. In addition to helping Lateral Entry teachers clear their teaching license, we are experiencing growth in assisting school systems to “grow their own” teachers. During 2007-2008, we sponsored through reduced tuition assistance, 4305 seats in courses for 1751 employees of our partnering school systems working on an initial teacher license, clearing a teacher license or seeking a graduate degree in a teaching area. Of the 1751 employees, 306 were working to receive an initial license in a teaching area.
5. What major issues did you confront in the course of the year?
 - Our major challenge was our inability to predict how many clients would request tuition assistance during a semester. Our inability to predict how many courses we would assist with was a major barrier to our being able to manage our budget.
6. What was the total direct cost of providing the activities reported in the quantitative sections?

Refer to the Table on page 2 of the Executive Summary or the Table on page 7 of the Report.

7. In 2008-09, what adjustments will you make to target new areas and/or increase the effectiveness of your program?
 - Change the way that graduate services are offered by phasing out all open graduate cohorts and by establishing closed graduate cohorts that target high needs certification areas and our needier school systems.
 - Comparison price classes offered at private and public universities in order to get the most cost effective classes.
 - In order to better manage the budget and to track each program's expenditures, each Regional Director has been give their program' allocation and is responsible for monitoring expenditures related to their program.
8. List the LEA's that were served by your program in 2007-08.

See Appendix A.

UNC Center for School Leadership Development
Professional Development Report
July 2007 – June 2008
Qualitative Information

Principal Fellows Program (PFP)

1. What was your major success in 2007-08?

Due to increased communication between the PFP office and the school systems, the number of PFP applicants increased from 72 for the 07-08 admit year to 93 for the 08-09 admit year. This is the beginning of an upswing in applicants compared to recent years.

2. What aspects of your program were least effective?

While there was an increase in applicants, the number of applicants is still a far cry from the 176 applicants in Class 8, seven classes prior to the 08-09 class. Efforts still need to be made to increase the number of applicants to the program.

3. What areas received your highest priority?

Diversifying and increasing recruitment efforts through developing a new brochure, scheduling more recruitment meetings, and utilizing radio advertisements was a major priority. The other major priority was continuing the quality of orientation, fall, and spring enrichment seminars by scheduling meaningful speakers with pertinent messages for the Fellows.

4. Summarize the impact of your program.

54 Class 13 Principal Fellows provided excellent leadership and assistance in 31 LEA's throughout the state via their 10-month internship placements. In addition, 37 of these same Fellows have already been hired as assistant principals or principals in a North Carolina public school for the 08-09 school year.

5. What major issues did you confront in the course of the year?

Trying to provide relevant and meaningful enrichment seminars with a limited budget was a challenge. To provide Fellows with experienced speakers and time to learn from them is a financial challenge given the current budget. In addition, attempting to diversify advertisement of the program proved challenging with the current budget.

6. What was the total direct cost of providing the activities reported in the quantitative sections.

Refer to the Table on page 2 of the Executive Summary or the Table on page 7 of the Report.

7. In 2008-09, what adjustments will you make to target new areas and/or increase the effectiveness of your program?

In an effort to diversify and increase the amount of advertisement, a public television spot has been purchased, targeted minority recruitment meetings are planned, and additional meetings with personnel administrators across the state will be scheduled during their regional meetings throughout the fall.

Plans are underway to activate an alumni group for the purposes of recruiting future Fellows, and for creating a more organized professional support group among program graduates. An organizational meeting will be held in the fall of 2008.

Plans are underway to study the feasibility of an international experience for current Fellows. Conversations have already begun with The Center for International Understanding as a possible partner.

Official conversations have occurred with ECSU and UNCP regarding becoming Principal Fellows campuses. Their partnership will bring the program to the far Northeastern and South Central part of the state. Each campus has been invited to submit a proposal to be considered at the fall 2008 Principal Fellows Commission meeting.

8. List the LEA's that were served by your program in 2007-08.

See Appendix A.

UNC Center for School Leadership Development
Professional Development Report
July 2007 – June 2008
Qualitative Information

North Carolina Mathematics and Science Education Network (NC-MSEN)

1. What was your major success in 2007-08?

In 2007-2008, the major statewide success for the North Carolina Mathematics and Science Education Network (NC-MSEN) remains its *Statewide Institute for Teaching Excellence (SITE)*. The SITE includes several different programs, as shown below.

SITE Program and Grade Level(s)	Purpose	Development / Implementation Year
Advanced Functions and Modeling (AFM) [<i>High School</i>]	UNC admissions requirement	2003-2004 / 2004-2005
Biology [<i>High School</i>]	Supports graduation requirement	2006-2007
Content Area Reading in Science and Mathematics (CARSAM) [<i>Middle and High School</i>]	Support for content area reading	2006-2007
Geometry [<i>Middle and High School</i>]	Specific support for better mathematics teaching related to graduation requirements	2006-2007 / 2007-2008
K-2 Science	Improve K-8 teachers' science content knowledge and pedagogy	2007-2008 / 2008-2009
3-5 Science		2005-2006 / 2006-2007
6-8 Science		2006-2007 / 2007-2008

The focus of the entire SITE initiative continues to be on improving the content and pedagogical content knowledge of PK-12 teachers through standards- and research-based professional development opportunities that are aligned with the *North Carolina Standard Course of Study* (NCSCOS) and national standards. The SITE programs also address areas that were cited by the State Board of Education (June 2007) as either “needing continued / on-going professional development” or “needing specific support (based on increased graduation requirements).” SITE: Advanced Functions and Modeling (AFM), SITE: Biology and SITE: Geometry development and implementation grew out of collaboration between the NC-MSEN and the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (NCDPI).

Of the 82 local education agencies (LEAs) that had teachers participating in 2007-2008 SITE programs, 62% were low-wealth; another 62% were rural. Analyses of teacher demographic and enrollment data, as well as Institute evaluations are in process. Centers cite success through “healthy” teacher enrollments, active teacher engagement, increases in content knowledge, use of what teachers learned in their classrooms and the value of the experiences for their colleagues.

The SITE: K-2 Science, SITE: 3-5 Science and SITE: 6-8 Science programs were among the June 2008 professional development offerings of The Collaborative Project (TCP), a three-year joint project of the North Carolina Science, Mathematics, and Technology (SMT) Education Center and the Public School Forum of North Carolina. Funded by the North Carolina General Assembly, TCP serves teachers in the Counties of Caswell, Greene, Mitchell, Warren, and

Washington. A curriculum development grant from the Burroughs Wellcome Fund through the SMT Center supported the development of the curricula for the referenced SITE programs.

In addition to the SITE, successful non-statewide programs cited by NC-MSEN Centers include grant-funded initiatives that:

1. strengthen the partnerships among the NC-MSEN Center, University campus and the local education agencies (LEAs) / school districts
2. provide opportunities for the Centers to increase the number of teachers served over a sustained period of time
3. increase resources available to teachers
4. engage university STEM faculty in the delivery of content instruction.

In return, teachers become more attuned and committed to professional development and renewal that result in expanded learning opportunities for students. Examples of successful grant-funded initiatives follow.

❖ **Mathematics and Science Partnership (MSP)** initiatives listed below are supported by US Department of Education (USDE) Teacher Quality grant funds to NCDPI.

1. *Quality Teaching and Learning in Grades 7-8 Science* serves teachers from the Counties of Cleveland, McDowell, and Rutherford.
2. *The Mountain Valley Partnership (MVP) for Elementary Mathematics* serves teachers from the Counties of Alleghany, Ashe, Catawba, Wilkes and Yadkin, as well as the Cities of Elkin and Hickory.
3. *Partnership for Improving Mathematics Understanding of Students and Teachers* serves teachers in Columbus County Schools. It is important to note that this initiative is modeled, in part, after the work of the North Carolina Partnership for Improving Mathematics and Science (NC-PIMS).
4. *Making Geometric Thinking Happen* includes all of Person County Schools' middle and high school mathematics teachers, as well as selected mathematics teacher leaders in grades 3-5.
5. *Preparing Geometry Teachers in the Southern Piedmont* serves teachers from Union County Schools.

❖ **Big Ideas in Science: Teachers as Scientists and Leaders** serves teachers in the Counties of Beaufort, Hyde and Pamlico. This initiative is supported by US Department of Education Title II-A *Improving Teacher Quality* funds to the University of North Carolina-General Administration for NC QUEST (North Carolina **Q**uality Educators through Staff Development and Training) projects.

❖ The **Introductory Biotechnology** workshop, funded by the North Carolina Biotechnology Center, served teachers from the Counties of Cabarrus, Columbus, Davidson, Edgecombe, Guilford, Lenoir, New Hanover, Onslow, Pender, Randolph, Sampson, and Wake.

❖ The **North Carolina Partnership for Improving Mathematics and Science (NC-PIMS)**, a comprehensive mathematics-focused MSP initiative, entered its no-cost extension year (Year 6; October 1, 2007 – September 30, 2008) during this

reporting period. All of the professional development activities designed and implemented by this initiative have been determined successful by formal evaluation analyses. Specific successes are cited below.

1. The *Lenses on Learning* (LOL) course for K-8 principals has continued to be very popular. This course is set to prepare instructional leaders to think more constructively about mathematics teaching and learning. It leads to changes in practices attendant to classroom observations and teacher supervision. Brunswick County Schools' began the LOL course in August 2007 for all of its K-8 principals and the Central Office curriculum specialists and completed it in May 2008. Brunswick County's participation brought the total number of LOL participants (K-8 principals and Central Office curriculum specialists) to 149, representing about 63% of the schools in the Partnership.
2. The 12-hour mathematics workshops for all teachers of mathematics in the partner districts were conducted by Lead Teachers without the monitoring and tutelage of NC-PIMS Facilitators. In nine of the 12 school districts, Lead Teachers have continued to provide the mathematics professional development for which they had been prepared during the project's final implementation year (2006-2007). Approximately 4000 teachers participated in the workshops -- *Measuring in One and Two Dimensions* for K-5 teachers and *Mathematical Modeling* for 6-12 teachers.
3. Regional Lead Teachers were prepared to develop and deliver the 12-hour mathematics professional development workshops in their and other school districts.
4. Two hundred forty-four (244) Lead Teachers completed instructional leadership development in preparation for their mathematics leadership roles during 2007-2008.

The success of the NC-PIMS initiative has led to programs like TCP using the initiative's curricula for their mathematics professional development program, including LOL.

Non-grant-funded programs that were deemed a success include:

- ❖ **Mathematics Education Leadership Training (MELT) Program**, a university / NC-MSEN professional development center partnership, continues to offer eight mathematics courses for high school teachers each summer. This highly successful program offers graduate credits to teachers who are working on master's degrees in mathematics education and awards license renewal credits to others. MELT is another example of what happens when teachers are committed to their professional development; they pursue all that is available to them.
- ❖ The **Project Learning Tree (PLT) PreK-8 Science Workshop** provided an opportunity for pre-service and in-service teachers to work together on hands-on activities that explored topics ranging from communication to economics, government and history to energy and fuels, geology, recycling, watersheds, and wildlife. The guidance for these workshops is correlated with the NCSCOS.

- ❖ **Summer Advanced Placement (AP) Workshops**, as shown in the quantitative data report section, cover a variety of disciplines. These workshops are well received by teachers, thereby resulting in high attendance year after year.
- ❖ **Science and Mathematics Resource Rooms** are well-stocked and heavily used by pre- and in-service teachers. In-service teachers check out materials to help with their classroom teaching. Pre-service teachers use the resource room to prepare lesson plans and also to check out materials to use in demonstration classes or in their teaching internships.

2. *What aspects of your program were least effective?*

Success has been cited for the NC-MSEN SITE programs and grant-funded initiatives. Centers offer an array of professional development opportunities that school district personnel indicate are needed by their teachers. NC-MSEN Center Directors agree that the following drawbacks still impact the programs' effectiveness:

- ❖ Low enrollments / participation make the offerings much less cost-effective. Extenuating factors beyond the Centers' control include:
 1. the focus of state and national testing on reading / language arts
 2. high registration fee requirements because Centers' budgets are insufficient to cover workshop instructors' salaries and workshop supplies
 3. insufficient funds from LEAs to pay teachers' registration fees
 4. lack of funds for stipends to compensate teachers' time and travel expenses.
- ❖ The level of program evaluation that is essential for assessing true program effectiveness remains insufficient. Intensive efforts are underway to change evaluation from reporting demographic statistics to conducting more in-depth program analyses in order to understand better effectiveness and impact along with the factors involved.

Evaluation is an expensive process. The NC-MSEN Central Office budget continues to be insufficient to support efforts that could have led to some improvements in the current evaluation process. These improvements could have included online registration, improved evaluation instruments, and evaluation system design.

It is anticipated that the staff of the new UNC CSLD Assessment, Research, and Evaluation (ARE) Unit and the recently appointed Program Evaluation Coordinator at the Center for Research in Mathematics and Science Education (CRMSE) will work together with NC-MSEN Centers and NC-MSEN Central Office staff to establish an evaluation program / system that ultimately identifies areas where the NC-MSEN programs are least effective.

- ❖ There is the need for a re-examination of how to integrate more instructional strategies into NC-MSEN programs in order to address the challenges presented by student populations in low-performing schools / school districts.

3. *What areas received your highest priority?*

The following represent the highest priorities among the NC-MSEN professional development centers:

- ❖ **The Statewide Institute for Teaching Excellence (SITE).** The design / development and full implementation of the SITE programs remained the top priority for the entire NC-MSEN. It is through this connected statewide effort that

NC-MSEN seeks to improve the content and pedagogical content knowledge, as well as assessment skills / knowledge, of PK-12 teachers of mathematics and science. Each SITE program will continue to address the state's professional development needs, with special attention to the needs of low-performing school districts, as well as low-performing and hard-to-staff schools. Whether end-of-course (EOC) and end-of-grade (EOG) assessments increase or decrease, classroom teachers need to have much deeper content knowledge, excellent instructional skills that benefit diverse students, and knowledge of appropriate classroom assessments.

- ❖ **Improvement of Teacher Content and Pedagogical Content Knowledge.** In addition to the SITE programs, prime importance was assigned to this goal throughout NC-MSEN programming. Some Centers focused on upper elementary and /or middle grades teachers of mathematics and science. Science testing at the fifth and eighth grades places an added emphasis on the need for professional development for teachers at these grade levels. Instructional methods that can be used with students in the classroom are modeled in order to learn about how these methods can be adapted for different groups of students. In addition, teachers were trained to be leaders through opportunities to serve as mentors, designers, planners, and facilitators for science teaching and learning.

- ❖ **Continued Collaboration with NCDPI.** This vital relationship has led to the development of SITE and other professional development programs, as well as to joint efforts focused on NCDPI workshops and leadership institutes. The NCDPI knowledge and support of NC-MSEN programs will help to ensure that:

1. the State Board of Education's priorities in mathematics and science are addressed programmatically
2. there are larger teacher enrollments in the NC-MSEN professional development programs that are designed to address those priorities.

- ❖ **K-16 Partnerships.** These include professional development partnerships established by individual NC-MSEN Centers on and off campus. These are indispensable for helping Centers "stretch" their limited resources. Highest priority also was given to:

1. developing a cadre of Regional Lead Teachers (RLTs) to implement 12-hour K-12 mathematics professional development workshops across the 12 partner NC-PIMS school districts.
2. providing leadership development for 244 Lead Teachers.
3. sustaining adaptable elements of the NC-PIMS, *i.e.* the Cascade Model of Professional Development, professional development (*Lenses on Learning*) of

K-8 principals, and community-based student encouragement / parental involvement programs.

4. using lessons learned from partnerships to improve NC-MSEN programs, *e.g.* the use of university STEM faculty to develop and review program curriculum and to serve as program instructors.

- ❖ **Extramural Funding.** Considerable attention was given to developing grant proposals in order to support and extend professional development opportunities.
- ❖ **Mathematics and Science Resource Rooms.** Teachers (pre- and in-service) must continue to benefit from having mathematics and science materials available for use in classrooms and other venues.

4. *Summarize the impact of your program.*

The NC-MSEN programs are diverse in subject matter, applicable grade levels, and geographic locations. The Quantitative Data Report exhibits teacher numbers, number of LEAs involved, professional development contact hours, and the specific programs in which teachers (and some principals) have participated. This report indicates that the NC-MSEN standards- / research-based programs, which use best practices, are attracting teachers from most of the state's LEAs. Even when resources are available to assess effectiveness and impact, it is difficult, at best, to know the impact of any professional development program because there are numerous intervening factors over which professional development providers have no control. The full impact (benefits) of professional development can accrue long after programs have taken place. Absent tracking cohorts of teachers over a definite period of time, being able to conduct classroom observations, examining student test scores lined to teachers; and other, the accrued benefits of professional development programs escape the provider.

Highly encouraging actions and changes were noted among the ten professional development centers during 2007-2008. They are summarized below.

- ❖ Changes in teachers' professional growth continues to be shown through their:
 1. enrollment numbers in professional development programs
 2. successful matriculation in master's degree programs
 3. earned credits for initial licensure
 4. license renewal credits
 5. attendance at meetings of professional organizations, including the North Carolina Science Teachers Association (NCSTA) and the North Carolina Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCCTM). Some teachers had never attended such meetings. They are now becoming sufficiently confident to attend and make presentations at meetings of national organizations.
 6. emerging school leadership roles

7. continued participation in one or more of the following programs:
 - a. North Carolina Partnership for Improving Mathematics and Science
 - b. Mathematics Education Leadership Training Program
 - c. Person County MSP, *Making Geometric Thinking Happen*.
- ❖ Teacher professional development in SITE: Advanced Functions and Modeling (AFM) and Discrete Mathematics continue to result in students' being prepared to meet the fourth mathematics requirement for admission to UNC campuses.
- ❖ It is reasonable to assume that, in 2007-2008, a considerably larger number of students in Grades 3-8 spent more time learning science than they would have without the science professional development programs, especially SITE: 3-5 Science and SITE: 6-8 Science. With more time spent studying science through inquiry methods, it also is reasonable to assume that they deepened their knowledge of science content and became more interested in science. Self-reports from teachers indicate that they are teaching science and sharing their new knowledge with colleagues.
- ❖ There is greater involvement of university STEM faculty in the work of the professional development centers' in-service education, as well as in pre-service education, whether teacher preparation or other.
- ❖ Mathematics and science resource rooms are beneficial for teachers from LEAs with limited resources. Teachers are able to borrow materials for use in their classrooms, thereby ensuring that teaching and learning are improved. Likewise, this resource is value-added for pre-service teachers, including those classified as lateral-entry.
- ❖ The NC-PIMS Cascade Model of professional development,

Facilitators → Lead Teachers → Classroom Teachers

with collateral support from *Lenses on Learning* for K-8 principals, remained the over-arching professional development program that has been *most* successful in bringing about improved standards-based instructional practice in mathematics classrooms. Although funding for the Partnership ends September 30, 2008, the foundation laid by the initiative has had an impact on its partner school districts and University Hubs [NC-MSEN Centers at East Carolina University, Fayetteville State University, and University of North Carolina Wilmington].

1. District- and school-level Lead Teachers implemented professional development workshops for their colleague teachers without the assistance of NC-PIMS Facilitators.
2. Regional Lead Teachers continued to develop and implement mathematics professional development workshops.
3. The work of NC-PIMS has a high potential to lead to improved student achievement in mathematics.

- ❖ The Collaborative Project (administered by SMT and the Public School Forum of North Carolina) used curricula that emanated from the work of the NC-PIMS initiative. In 2008, TCP used K-8 mathematics courses and LOL for the professional development of teachers and principals, respectively, from the Counties of Caswell, Greene, Mitchell, Warren, and Washington.
- ❖ Increased interactions are occurring among pre-service teachers, in-service teachers, and university STEM and education faculty through NC-MSEN institutes / workshops / courses. These interactions result from the Centers serving as conduits for K-12 teachers and students to connect with the respective universities and for university faculty to connect with schools.

5. *What major issues did you confront in the course of the year?*

The major issues cited in the 2006-2007 report continued in 2007-2008. They concern funding, which includes costs attendant to providing excellent professional development / learning opportunities; diverse school calendars (professional development schedules); and program evaluation. In addition, adequate space for NC-MSEN operations has become a serious issue.

As indicated in earlier reports, North Carolina lacks the means for supporting large scale professional development programs that would strengthen the implementation of the NCSCOS. This constrains the development and implementation of statewide initiatives, *e.g.* SITE, that are needed to help teachers (and ultimately students) meet the challenges of teaching and learning expected under *No Child Left Behind* and the state's accountability system. The needs continue to outweigh available resources, particularly in providing preferred on-site professional development that encourages participation by the entire teaching faculty of schools.

NC-MSEN Centers have examined their offerings, eliminated those that have not worked, and redirected resources to the ones that work and are cost-effective. However, the problems discussed below did not improve during the year; they worsened. There is a keen awareness, as noted in another section of this report, that there are extenuating circumstances over which neither the professional development centers nor the Central Office has control.

- ❖ **Funding.** Insufficient funding remains at the top of the list of major issues that the NC-MSEN confronted as it worked to fulfill its mission. There is full realization that funding alone does not make the indispensable difference. However, the adjustments and choices that undergird the intensive work to make a difference remain supported at the barest minimum. The funding pattern for the entire NC-MSEN (Professional Development Centers and the Central Office) is inadequate to:
 1. make high-quality professional development programs equally available to all teachers of mathematics and science. In order to offer statewide programs and most individual center programs, teachers are charged costly program / registration fees. Centers are unable to provide "free" professional development programs. Therefore, the fee structure limits teacher participation as most school districts continue to indicate that funds are unavailable to support professional development of their teachers, *i.e.* registration, materials, stipends, and travel. Teachers indicate that they are unable to pay the necessary fees.

An important / essential role of the NC-MSEN Central Office is coordination of statewide activities of the network of ten (10) professional development centers and key activities of the Center for Research in Mathematics and Science Education. However, the Central Office's budget is too meager to meet what should be a prime obligation. That obligation involves providing vital "seed" funding for key aspects of strong statewide programs, *i.e.* development, instructional and teacher materials, instructors' development, instructional costs, etc. The only real opportunity to provide some minimal support in this arena has come through "released time" funds from federal grants. That, of course, represents an inconsistent source of revenue.

University-level cuts to some Centers' instructional and operating budgets also continue to influence this issue, thereby limiting the number of opportunities that can be offered to schools and school districts. This ultimately creates / produces an inequity in the quality of education students across the state receive.

This dilemma points, not only, to a perennial issue but also to the absence of a tenable resolution. NC-MSEN is still expected to address the effectiveness and impact of its programs as if all the pieces of the puzzle are in place and functioning well. There looms a vicious cycle that transcends whether LEAs and their teachers are committed to ongoing, connected, research-based content-rich mathematics and science professional development with strong pedagogy and assessment components.

2. provide preferred on-site teacher professional development in order to ensure the participation of greater numbers of teachers, especially in the larger geographic regions. Travel costs are a major issue in light of limited operating budgets.
3. provide teacher stipends, teacher workshop / institute materials, classroom materials, etc. Some LEAs have funds to support teacher professional development (program fees for instructional costs, stipends, instructional materials, etc.) while others indicate a lack of funds. NC-MSEN alternatively seeks grant funding; however, obtaining grant funds for large-scale statewide initiatives continues to present a major challenge. Funding agencies rarely support such expensive efforts.
4. offer competitive salaries to university STEM faculty who work with the Centers to develop and review professional development curriculum materials, as well as to provide instruction for institutes and other professional development programs.
5. sustain initiatives that have grown out of projects supported by extramural funding. Examples include *Lenses on Learning* for K-8 principals and Lead Teacher development and renewal. The external investment in these programs helps teachers, schools, and districts move forward. The lack of support when federal or foundation funding ends moves the Network-based efforts to improve mathematics and science teaching and learning backward. The ultimate results are discouraged teachers and missed opportunities to affect, at any real level of significance, teacher retention and student performance in low-performing schools and school districts.

6. fill position vacancies. There is a real challenge to find funds to offer a competitive salary to knowledgeable competent educators. Critical vacancies have a negative impact on Centers' programs.

- ❖ **Diversity of School Calendars.** Diverse school calendars, the rapid growth of year-round schools, and the reduction in the number of hours available for professional development make it difficult for universities to schedule professional development programs that can reach all teachers within a broad region.
- ❖ **Program Evaluation.** NC-MSEN is far from being unique in that it neither has the staff nor the funds to conduct evaluations that would tie teacher professional development to student performance – the preferred standard for assessing impact. However, the collection of quantitative data, whether or not it reaches down to the level of student performance, is essential. Classroom observations and longitudinal studies of teachers are examples of evaluation measures that will “speak” to program effectiveness and impact. Currently, the measure of effectiveness is relegated to demographic statistics and teacher self-report data because there are insufficient evaluation resources (personnel and financial) available to the NC-MSEN Central Office, as well as CRMSE, to do more. The challenging questions are:

1. “How do you know it works?”
2. “Have your efforts made a real difference?”

Sufficient funds are available for the evaluation components of NC-MSEN grant initiatives such that, depending on expected outcomes and measures used, much more can be indicated about aspects of program effectiveness. Very often though, program activities and their evaluation need to continue over an extended period of time (well beyond project funding) in order to “speak” with any certainty about aspects of program effectiveness, including impact.

- ❖ **Space.** Inadequate laboratory space, office space, and space for resource rooms for pre-service and in-service teachers became increasingly problematic and critical during this reporting period. This issue has a negative impact on the productivity of the entire NC-MSEN.

6. *What was the total direct cost of providing the activities reported in the quantitative section?*

Refer to the Table on page 2 of the Executive Summary or the Table on page 7 of the Report.

7. *In 2008-09, what adjustments will you make to target new areas and/or increase the effectiveness of your program?*

The following represent targeted adjustments from across the entire NC-MSEN:

- ❖ Cancel low-enrollment programs and reallocate the funds to programs that are more cost-effective.
- ❖ Partner with other NC-MSEN Centers, depending on location(s), to offer professional development activities when participant numbers are less than ten (10) in order to reduce cancellations and / or the use of independent study to accommodate teachers with an expressed need.
- ❖ Focus on setting up a structure for an evaluation program that addresses effectiveness and impact of NC-MSEN statewide programs and provides guidance for individual NC-MSEN professional development centers. It is anticipated that this will occur in collaboration with the Program Evaluation Coordinator, CRMSE, and the Director and staff of the UNC CSLD Assessment, Research and Evaluation Unit.
- ❖ Design and begin to implement distance education programs for teachers.
- ❖ Develop and implement school-based programs with expert / master teachers as facilitators, based on assessed needs.
- ❖ Continue to work together as a unit (and with NCDPI, as appropriate) to develop and expand the SITE programs. This effort will make use of curricular materials, when appropriate, developed through externally funded grant initiatives, *e.g.* NC-PIMS. The goal is to make these programs available to all the state's teachers of mathematics and science.
- ❖ Examine the current structure of the nine-day SITE professional programs to determine the most effective way to better meet teachers' schedule and learning needs, as well as reduce registration fees.
- ❖ Explore new cost structures for professional development programs, including SITE, and work with school districts to identify / designate funds and set up contracts for mathematics and science teacher professional development, as well as seek external funding to reduce the costs of the institutes, workshops, and courses.
- ❖ Deliver the professional development program at locations, whether university campuses or selected school districts, that reduce teacher expenses.
- ❖ Develop a new registration and recruitment system.
- ❖ Expand local advisory boards to ensure broad representation that includes business and industry, university STEM faculty, and school administrators.
- ❖ Ensure greater involvement of the NC-MSEN Statewide Advisory Board in efforts to fulfill this agency's mission.

- ❖ Form K-16 partnerships that focus on:
 1. identified teacher professional development needs
 2. professional development projects, *i.e.* mathematics for elementary teachers, that meet the specific needs of certain partner school districts
 3. increased university arts and sciences and education faculty involvement in the development, review, and delivery of teacher professional development.
 - ❖ Increase collaboration with university STEM faculty to provide professional learning opportunities for teachers.
 - ❖ Collaborate / work closely with TCP to provide mathematics and science professional development opportunities for their teachers.
 - ❖ Collaborate with the SMT (Burroughs Wellcome Fund) and participating school districts on LASER (Leadership and Assistance for Science Education Reform), with a focus on local districts' strategic plans for science.
 - ❖ Work more closely with school districts / LEAs to examine and begin to resolve issues that concern mathematics and science teacher professional development, *e.g.* areas of greatest needs and impediments to teacher participation.
 - ❖ Use the Centers' Web sites as more effective marketing tools and to register program participants, as appropriate.
 - ❖ Collaborate with Regional Education Services Agencies (RESAs) to help ameliorate costs that are involved with the delivery of professional development programs.
 - ❖ Continue RLT meetings that began with the NC-PIMS initiative and expand RLT membership to include all the school districts in the service region, as well as university faculty with experience and interest in K-12 mathematics and science program networks and collaborative efforts.
 - ❖ Apply for external grant funds to support professional development and evaluation.
 - ❖ Study the NC-PIMS *Cascade Model* of professional development to determine how the NC-MSEN might continue to develop teacher leaders and involve them in the professional development of their teacher colleagues.
 - ❖ Work closely with the Principal's Executive Program (PEP) and other entities to launch an iteration of the LOL program for K-8 and high school principals. This includes finding sources of funds for training additional LOL facilitator teams at the Education Development Center in order to serve more principals.

8. *List the LEAs that were served by your program in 2007-08.*

See Appendix A.

UNC Center for School Leadership Development
Professional Development Report
July 2007 – June 2008
Qualitative Information

North Carolina State Improvement Project (NC SIP)

1. What was your major success in 2007-08?

Improving reading instruction leading to significant gains in the reading performance of students with disabilities continues to be one the project's most successful components, as an overwhelming majority of our Professional Development Events were devoted to improving reading instruction for students with disabilities. In addition, the project was able to complete the development of the Math Foundations Training program and successfully deliver it to all twenty NC SIP II Mathematics Best Practices Centers and Sites.

2. What aspects of your program were least effective?

The NCSIP II professional development system for improving writing instruction for students with disabilities has not developed as rapidly as anticipated. While the past year has seen the completion of a Writing Instruction Training Program based on the successful training model used in our Reading Foundations program, the Writing Training will not be presented until the end of July, 2008. Additional training sessions are planned for the central region of the state in the fall of 2008, and in the western region of the state for the spring of 2009.

3. What areas received your highest priority?

Improving reading instruction leading to significant gains in reading performance of students with disabilities continues to be the largest and most successful component of the project. However, an additional priority was given this past year to the development and implementation of a Math Foundations Training program across the NC SIP II network.

4. Summarize the impact of your program.

Student performance data continue to indicate that students with disabilities receiving instruction from teachers participating in the NC SIP II professional development activities demonstrate average yearly AYP gains in reading at almost seven times greater than students with disabilities statewide. Additionally, initial analysis of the gains made by students with disabilities in mathematics receiving instruction from teachers participating in the NC SIP II professional development activities demonstrate average yearly AYP gains in math at a rate of more than three times greater than students with disabilities statewide.

5. What major issues did you confront in the course of the year?

As we indicated last year, traditional personnel development in the form of formal training sessions without on-site follow through with additional personnel development will not have the desired outcomes in terms of improved instruction and student gains in reading proficiency. Accordingly, we continue to focus on more emphasis being given to two our major follow-through components; (a) Activities to support long term sustainability including the use of a refined and comprehensive fidelity observation system, and (b) Expanding the personnel development program to assure that all schools have installed research-based instructional programs for students with disabilities with appropriately trained teachers in all schools in North Carolina. These components are being implemented in our reading/writing projects with continued consistency and success, and we have focused this year on the best way to establish similar follow-through components in our mathematics sites.

6. What was the total direct cost of providing the activities reported in the quantitative section?

. Refer to the Table on page 2 of the Executive Summary or the Table on page 7 of the Report.

7. In 2008-09, what adjustments will you make to target new areas and/or increase the effectiveness of your program?

Due to recent personnel changes and budgetary restrictions, our program will focus on expanding the work done with existing Reading/Writing and Mathematics sites, including (a) continued emphasis on the comprehensive fidelity observation systems in place to assure teachers are delivering instruction using the same research-based procedures that have been proven to be effective, (b) increasing the number of instructional coaches/trainers in each system and/or school, and (c) providing technical assistance for school leadership staff to increase knowledge about the use of research-based instruction for students with disabilities and strategies for sustaining and expanding effective instructional programs.

8. List the LEAs that were served by your program in 2007-08.

See Appendix A.

UNC Center for School Leadership Development
Professional Development Report
July 2007 – June 2008
Qualitative Information

Principals' Executive Program (PEP)

1. What was your major success in 2007-08?
PEP's major success was delivering leadership training and short-term skill focused institutes to 471 administrators across North Carolina.
 - a. 3 Leadership Programs for Aspiring Principals, 12 days per program, 82 participants in a core research-based curriculum. The program required both the principal's and superintendent's recommendation. Individuals often wait up to two years to be admitted into the program.
 - b. 1 Leadership Program for New Principals and 1 Leadership Program for Experienced Principals, 12 days per program, 92 participants in a core research-based curriculum aligned with national standards for school executives
 - c. 1 Survival School Program New Principals, 6 days, 31 participants focused on crucial knowledge for day to day operations. Superintendents reserved slots for participants ahead of time in anticipation of naming new principals.
 - d. 8 Short-term Institutes, School Administrators as Instructional Leaders, 4 days per program, 273 participants developed skills to use classroom walkthroughs to assess and influence teacher performance in the classroom
 - e. 1 Leadership Program for Future Superintendents, 24 days, 19 participants in the only professional knowledge and skills program for a district's top administrator. Five participants were in interim positions or appointed superintendent during the program.
2. What aspects of your program were least effective?
Both the Leadership Program for New Principals and Experienced Principals are broad spectrum programs and lack time to explore in depth many skills required to implement a particular initiative or strategy (example, Professional Learning Communities).
3. What areas received your highest priority?
Each program in PEP has areas of priority:
 - a. The Leadership Program for New Principals emphasizes resource management.
 - b. The Leadership Program for Experienced Principals emphasizes curriculum and instruction.
 - c. The School Administrators as Instructional Leaders emphasizes the research, process, and techniques to conduct classroom walkthroughs.
 - d. The Leadership Programs for Future Superintendents emphasizes board/superintendent relations, financial management, and human resources.
4. Summarize the impact of your program.
In 2007-08, PEP served more than 471 principals, assistant principals, and other school leaders in traditional public schools, public charter schools, federal schools, and North Carolina government agencies such as the Department of Juvenile Justice and

Delinquency Prevention Data from a 2008 survey of PEP participants show 95% or more of respondents acquired information and skills to improve the conditions of teaching and learning in their schools, utilized this information and skills, and believe student learning improved as a result of their participation in PEP programs. Via anonymous, narrative comments, respondents also indicated overwhelming enthusiasm about the impact of PEP services and interest in future programs. Listed below are a few representative quotes:

- “I cannot express how important PEP has been in my development as a school leader. I really can’t imagine being successful without PEP. Participation in PEP should be a mandatory.”
- “The program for assistant principals was the most valuable experience in my professional life, including my Master’s program for educational leadership. It changed my entire mindset. I strongly encourage anyone interested in advancing their career as a principal to attend.”
- “Just finished my program for experienced principals and believe it was a life-changing experience.”

5. What major issues did you confront in the course of the year?

PEP’s major issue was and continues to be funding for the program. Though PEP presented its report in April, 2008 to the General Assembly’s Joint Appropriations Subcommittee on Education delineating plans to include a new evaluation model, changes in admission policy, and a plan to provide input on PEP priorities, the General Assembly took no action to return PEP to recurring funding. State funding for PEP ends June 30, 2009 in the midst of a time of great demand for school leaders and their ongoing need for professional learning opportunities. Our clients want to know why this has happened and what can they do to reinstate PEP’s funding.

Internal to PEP, it’s full time director left and a part-time director was hired under a limited-time contract. Both the program manager and a program director left mid-year necessitating an extended period of temporary help and the shift of program responsibilities to other directors. A general air of uncertainty and concern exists among all staff.

6. What was the total direct cost of providing the activities reported in the quantitative section?

Refer to the Table on page 2 of the Executive Summary or the Table on page 7 of the Report.

7. In 2008-09, what adjustments will you make to target new areas and/or increase the effectiveness of your program?

The issues of PEP funding and the direction of a full-time leader overshadow all of PEP’s work. Though it is difficult to work in this environment, we are proceeding with many positive changes to include:

- a. PEP is developing an evaluation model to link PEP’s impact on the conditions of teaching and learning based on Thomas Guskey’s work and with the assistance of new research staff at the Center for School Leadership Development.

- b. PEP programs are aligned with the content of the new Performance Standards for School Principals.
 - c. PEP in partnership with the North Carolina Public Virtual School is providing Leadership Program participants a basic overview and the operational guidelines for NCPVS and Learn and Earn online programs. A two-day short-term institute is also being jointly planned and will be open to all school leaders.
 - d. PEP has increased the number of participants in its two Leadership Programs for Aspiring Principals, is adding a third program, and is including more information from and interaction with practicing administrators.
 - e. The Leadership Programs for New Principals and Experienced Principals are shortening their schedules from four 2.5 days session to four 2 days session with an evening meeting on the first day of each session.
 - f. The Leadership Program for Future Superintendents will be offered on an alternating year basis.
 - g. Four new short-term institutes ,Data-driven Decision Making Using EVAAS, are being offered in partnership with support staff from SAS, Inc. State-sponsored training has not been previously available plus it is line with the needs of secondary-level administrators who are interested in short-term skill- based learning.
 - h. Four new short-term institutes, Professional Learning Communities, are being offered as a key component of the new state Performance Standards. This institute is in line with the above-mentioned needs of secondary-level administrator.
 - i. One short-term institute, Resource Management, is offered to all school leaders as an area of limited professional preparation and the need for ongoing attention to changes in both federal and state rules and regulations.
 - j. The short-term institute, School Administrators as Instructional Leaders, is changing from 8 programs per year to 4 due to continued staffing shortages and the demand to add other programs.
8. List the LEA's that were not served by your program in 2007-08.

See Appendix A.

UNC Center for School Leadership Development
Professional Development Report
July 2007 – June 2008
Qualitative Information

**North Carolina Quality Educators through Staff Development and Training
(NC QUEST)**

1. What was your major success in 2007-08?

The Cycle IV RFP process yielded quality proposals from eight partnerships, of which three were continuation proposals from highly successful Cycle III projects. This enabled NC QUEST to continue outstanding work already in process as well as initiate five new projects.

2. What aspects of your program were least effective?

The RFP process yielded one proposal from a private college, partnered with a charter school. This type of partnership is desired by NC QUEST. However, the quality of the proposal was significantly below the standards required for award.

3. What areas received your highest priority?

The Cycle IV projects targeted teacher professional development in the areas of literacy, science or mathematics.

4. Summarize the impact of your program.

The Cycle IV projects provided an intense professional development experience for a relatively small number of teachers (and principals) over an eighteen month period (twelve months of which were in 2006-07). 236 teachers and principals were engaged in an average of more than 100 contact hours of professional development. These teachers and principals work in high-need school districts.

5. What major issues did you confront in the course of the year?

The teacher turnover rate in participating school districts makes it difficult to retain a core of teachers for the duration of a long-term professional development experience. The tight timeline at the end of the projects leaves no latitude for adjusting budgets and utilizing unspent funds resulting, in part, from participant attrition.

6. What was the total cost (including support services and indirect costs) of providing the activities reported in the quantitative section?

Refer to the Table on page 2 of the Executive Summary or the Table on page 7 of the Report.

7. In 2007-08, what adjustments will you make to target new areas and/or increase the effectiveness of your program?

NC QUEST will propose to the Office of Grants and Sponsored Programs at UNC GA that a FIFO (first in, first out) approach to distributing funding be utilized.

8. List the LEA's that were served by your program in 2006-07.

See Appendix A.

UNC Center for School Leadership Development
Professional Development Report
July 2007 – June 2008
Qualitative Information

Turnaround School Training

1. What was your major success in 2007-08?

In the previous year, Turnaround Schools Leadership Training involved teams from 35 high schools. In 2007-08, the CSLD was invited by DPI to provide training for leadership teams from 88 high, middle and elementary schools. In a relatively short period of time we planned and delivered a program that tripled the scope of the training and more than doubled the number of participants.

2. What aspects of your program were least effective?

In planning and delivering the training, we were unable to identify a significant number of schools in North Carolina that reflected the demographics of the Turnaround Schools yet were experiencing academic success. Throughout the training, the participants asked for examples of schools similar to theirs that could provide models for change.

3. What areas received your highest priority?

The expansion of the scope of the training to include middle and elementary schools, as well as high schools, and coordinating the training with other support mechanisms being provided the participant schools by the Department of Public Instruction.

4. Summarize the impact of your program.

Three-person leadership teams from 88 of the lowest-performing high, middle and elementary schools participated in 61 to 88 contact hours of intense training designed to re-focus the schools on the teaching and learning process. In conjunction, each team developed a strategic plan to accomplish re-focusing at their school, with an emphasis on factors research has proven to be critical to high-performing schools.

5. What major issues did you confront in the course of the year?

The training for middle and elementary schools was developed in a very short period of time, yet was skillfully designed. Teams from a significant number of the participant schools came to the training with an “I don’t need to be here” attitude, yet eventually acknowledged the value of their participation.

6. What was the total direct cost of providing the activities reported in the quantitative section.

Refer to the Table on page 2 of the Executive Summary or the Table on page 7 of the Report.

7. In 2008-09, what adjustments will you make to target new areas and/or increase the effectiveness of your program?

Unfortunately, the Department of Public Instruction, citing budget reductions, was unable to continue the contract with the CSLD to provide follow-up training for leadership teams from Turnaround Schools. Contributing to this decision was the failure of the General Assembly to continue the special appropriation to the University and the CSLD for this purpose. Had we been able to continue the training, the focus would have been on the implementation of each school's improvement plan.

8. List the LEA's that were served by your program in 2007-08.

See Appendix A.

QUANTITATIVE DATA

(1) Descriptive Name/Title of Activity	(2) Type of Activity	(3) Contact Hours	(4) Number of Participants	(5) Total Contact Hours	(6) Number of LEAs Served	(7) Begin Month- Year	(8) End Month- Year
Lateral Entry Sessions UNCW	A	3.00	112	336	6	Sep-07	Sep-07
Lateral Entry Session NC-aeyc Conference	A	1.00	223	223	8	Sep-07	Sep-07
Lateral Entry Sessions NCCU	A	3.00	67	201	7	Feb-08	Feb-08
Lateral Entry Sessions UNCG	A	6.00	200	1,200	8	Feb-08	Mar-08
Lateral Entry Sessions-EDUC 101 ECU NCSU	A	3.00	320	960	12	Feb-08	Mar-08
Lateral Entry Sessions LRC	A	3.00	45	135	8	Oct-07	Oct-07
Lateral Entry Sessions FSU	A	3.00	112	336	12	Oct-07	Oct-07
Orange County Schools Closing the Gap Minority Recruit/Reten.	A	7.00	75	525	1	Nov-07	Nov-07
Lateral Entry Sessions WCU	A	3.00	120	360	14	Mar-08	Mar-08
Lateral Entry Sessions ECU	A	3.00	125	375	16	Apr-08	Apr-08
Orange County Schools Job Fair	A	3.00	150	450	1	Apr-08	Apr-08
Teaching as a Second Career seminars Ft. Bragg	A	3.00	130	390	6	May-08	May-08
Wake County Public Schools Job and Lateral Entry Fair	A	3.00	245	735	1	Jan-08	Jan-08
Troops to Teachers Information Sessions	A	3.00	225	675	NA	Sep-07	May-08
Spring Personnel Administrators of NC Conference Lateral Entry (PANC)	A	3.00	175	525	117	Apr-08	Apr-08
Lateral Entry Support and Advisement Sessions Across NC	A	3.00	545	1,635	56	Mar-08	Jun-08
Advisement/Counseling Lateral Entry via email	A	0.50	4255	2,127	NA	Jul-07	Jun-08
Advisement/Counseling Lateral Entry via phone	A	0.50	5000	2,500	NA	Jul-07	Jun-08
UNCP- Online Orientation Lateral Entry Session	D	6.00	18	108	4	Nov-07	Nov-07
Online Course Support for Participants	D	18.00	18	324	4	Dec-07	May-08
20			12,160	14,120			

UNC Center for School Leadership Development
Professional Development Report
July 2007 – June 2008
Pre-Service Professional Development Data

North Carolina Teachers of Excellence for All Children (NC TEACH)

Category: Spring Orientation/Orientation

- Total Number of Participants – 668
- Total Number of Contact Hours by All Participants (actual hours in the face-to-face orientation) – 12 hours per participant = 7,944 total contact hours
- Total Number of LEAs Served – NA

Category: Summer/Pre-service Institute

- Total Number of Participants – 693
- Total Number of Semester Hours (varies depending upon host site attended)
Earned by All Participants – 3,689
- Total Number of LEAs Served – 108

Category: Fall Semester Courses

- Total Number of Participants – 587
- Total Number of Semester Hours (varies depending upon host site attended)
Earned by All Participants – 3,259
- Total Number of LEAs Served – 10

Category: Spring Semester Courses

- Total Number of Participants – 650
- Total Number of Semester Hours (varies depending upon host site attended)
Earned by All Participants – 3,395
- Total Number of LEAs Served – 108

Category: Summer Courses and Summer Start-up Programs

- Total Number of Participants – 733
- Total Number of Semester Hours (varies depending upon host site attended)
Earned by All Participants – 4,507
- Total Number of LEAs Served – 108

(1) Descriptive Name/Title of Activity	(2) Type of Activity	(3) Contact Hours	(4) Number of Participants	(5) Total Contact Hours	(6) Number of LEAs Served	(7) Begin Month- Year	(8) End Month- Year
Praxis I Seminar Math Tutorial	A	8.00	29	232	20	Jul-07	Jul-07
Praxis I Seminar Reading Tutorial	A	8.00	30	240	17	Jul-07	Jul-07
Praxis I Seminar Writing Tutorial	A	8.00	19	152	12	Jul-07	Jul-07
Praxis II Seminar Art	A	8.00	1	8	1	Jul-07	Jul-07
Praxis II Seminar Business	A	8.00	4	32	4	Jul-07	Jul-07
Praxis II Seminar Candidate Readiness	A	6.00	93	558	34	Jul-07	Jul-07
Praxis II Seminar Elementary Education	A	8.00	45	360	24	Jul-07	Jul-07
Praxis II Seminar English as a Second Language	A	8.00	4	32	4	Jul-07	Jul-07
Praxis II Seminar Exceptional Children: Adapted Curriculum	A	8.00	1	8	1	Jul-07	Jul-07
Praxis II Seminar Exceptional Children: General Curriculum	A	8.00	5	40	5	Jul-07	Jul-07
Praxis II Seminar Exceptional Children: Learning Disabilities	A	8.00	2	16	2	Jul-07	Jul-07
Praxis II Seminar Family and Consumer Science	A	8.00	1	8	1	Jul-07	Jul-07
Praxis II Seminar Guidance and Counseling	A	8.00	5	40	4	Jul-07	Jul-07
Praxis II Seminar High School Social Studies	A	8.00	4	32	4	Jul-07	Jul-07
Praxis II Seminar Media	A	8.00	5	40	3	Jul-07	Jul-07
Praxis II Seminar Middle Grades Language Arts	A	8.00	2	16	2	Jul-07	Jul-07
Praxis II Seminar Middle Grades Science	A	8.00	4	32	4	Jul-07	Jul-07
Praxis II Seminar Music	A	8.00	3	24	3	Jul-07	Jul-07
Praxis II Seminar Physical Education	A	8.00	6	48	5	Jul-07	Jul-07
Praxis II Seminar Comprehensive Science - Physical Science	A	8.00	1	8	1	Jul-07	Jul-07
Praxis I Seminar Reading Tutorial	A	8.00	1	8	1	Nov-07	Nov-07
Praxis I Seminar Math Tutorial	A	8.00	11	88	10	Dec-07	Dec-07
Praxis I Seminar Reading Tutorial	A	8.00	4	32	4	Dec-07	Dec-07
Praxis II Seminar Elementary Education	A	8.00	23	184	13	Dec-07	Dec-07
Praxis II Seminar Exceptional Children: General Curriculum	A	8.00	10	80	8	Dec-07	Dec-07
Praxis II Seminar Guidance and Counseling	A	8.00	1	8	1	Dec-07	Dec-07
Praxis I Seminar Math Tutorial	A	8.00	13	104	13	Feb-08	Feb-08
Praxis I Seminar Reading Tutorial	A	8.00	9	72	7	Feb-08	Feb-08

(1) Descriptive Name/Title of Activity	(2) Type of Activity	(3) Contact Hours	(4) Number of Participants	(5) Total Contact Hours	(6) Number of LEAs Served	(7) Begin Month- Year	(8) End Month- Year
Praxis I Seminar Writing Tutorial	A	8.00	6	48	4	Mar-08	Mar-08
Praxis I Seminar Math Tutorial	A	8.00	1	8	1	Jun-08	Jun-08
Praxis I Seminar Writing Tutorial	A	8.00	1	8	1	Feb-08	Feb-08
Praxis II Seminar Art	A	8.00	4	32	4	Feb-08	Feb-08
Praxis II Seminar Elementary Education	A	8.00	58	464	24	Feb-08	Mar-08
Praxis II Seminar English as a Second Language	A	8.00	6	48	4	Feb-08	Feb-08
Praxis II Seminar Exceptional Children: Content Knowledge	A	8.00	19	152	9	Feb-08	Feb-08
Praxis II Seminar Exceptional Children: Mild to Moderate Disabilities	A	8.00	11	88	7	Feb-08	Feb-08
Praxis II Seminar Guidance and Counseling	A	8.00	9	72	5	Feb-08	Feb-08
Praxis II Seminar High School Social Studies	A	8.00	6	48	5	Feb-08	Feb-08
Praxis II Seminar Middle Grades Science	A	8.00	4	32	3	May-08	May-08
Instructional Institute for Lateral Entry and Inexperienced Teachers	B	16.00	420	6,720	46	Jun-08	Jun-08
40			881	10,222			

UNC Center for School Leadership Development
Professional Development Report
July 2007 – June 2008

Pre-Service Professional Development Data

Model Teacher Education Consortium (MTEC)

Category: Courses Taken to Secure Initial License

- Total Number of Participants – 822
- Total Number of Semester Hours Earned by All Participants – 6094
- Total Number of LEAs Served – 66

Category: Courses Taken to Clear License

- Total Number of Participants – 1155
- Total Number of Semester Hours Earned by All Participants – 6621
- Total Number of LEAs Served – 59

Category: Courses Taken to Earn Masters Level License

- Total Number of Participants – 464
- Total Number of Semester Hours Earned by All Participants – 4616
- Total Number of LEAs Served – 47

(1) Descriptive Name/Title of Activity	(2) Type of Activity	(3) Contact Hours	(4) Number of Participants	(5) Total Contact Hours	(6) Number of LEAs Served	(7) Begin Month-Year	(8) End Month-Year
NC PFP Class 14 Orientation	D	20.00	54	1,080	22	Aug-07	Aug-07
NC PFP Fall 2007 Enrichment Seminar - "The Intangibles of Leadership for an Effective Principalship"	A	2.00	112	224	42	Oct-07	Oct-07
NC PFP Spring 2008 Enrichment Seminar - "Global Trends Impacting American Education"	A	2.00	112	224	42	Feb-08	Feb-08
3			278	1,528			

UNC Center for School Leadership Development
Professional Development Report
July 2007 – June 2008
Pre-Service Professional Development Data

Principal Fellows Program (PFP)

Category: University MSA Program Coursework

- Total Number of Participants – 112
- Total Number of Semester Hours Earned by All Participants – 1,968

(1) Descriptive Name/Title of Activity	(2) Type of Activity	(3) Contact Hours	(4) Number of Participants	(5) Total Contact Hours	(6) Number of LEAs Served	(7) Begin Month- Year	(8) End Month- Year
Big Ideas in Science Summer 2007	B	30.00	27	810	3	Jul-07	Aug-07
Big Ideas in Science 2007-2008 Follow-Up	B	54.00	24	1,296	3	Sep-07	Apr-08
Global Positioning System (GPS) Geo-Caching	B	24.00	31	744	12	Aug-07	Aug-07
Marine Science for Elementary School	B	10.00	12	120	5	Feb-08	Feb-08
K-8 Science Online Modules	B	12.00	12	144	6	Jun-07	Jul-07
9-12 Science Online Modules	B	12.00	2	24	2	Jun-07	Jul-07
K-3 Science Workshop	B	30.00	4	120	2	Jul-07	Jul-07
Select Topics in Physical Science for Teachers	B	45.00	6	270	4	Jul-07	Aug-07
Quality Teaching and Learning in Grades 7-8 Science	B	30.00	34	1,020	3	Aug-06	Aug-07
Secondary Science Methods, Pre-Service	A	2.00	21	42	N/A	Aug-07	Jan-08
MSEC and Secondary Science Methods, In-Service Teachers	A	2.00	15	30	1	Aug-07	Aug-07
Seminars on the Environment and Sustainable Development	B	16.00	33	528	4	Oct-07	Mar-08
Elementary Science Methods, Pre-Service	A	6.00	124	744	N/A	Sep-07	Mar-08
Elementary Science Notebooks Workshop	B	30.00	13	390	6	Feb-08	Apr-08
Middle School Science Notebooks Workshop	B	30.00	8	240	4	Feb-08	Apr-08
WestEd Learning Science for Teaching (LSFT)	B	24.00	5	120	3	Sep-07	Dec-07
WestEd LSFT	B	26.00	7	182	3	Jan-08	Mar-08
WestEd LSFT	B	24.00	5	120	1	Jun-08	Jun-08
Special Topics in Biology: The Cell	B	12.00	12	144	5	Feb-08	Feb-08
Mountain Biodiversity	B	30.00	4	120	4	Jun-08	Jun-08
SITE: K-2 Science Instructors' Training	B	10.00	9	90	4	Apr-08	Apr-08
R.O.B.O.T.S. Teacher Professional Development	A	36.00	24	864	14	Sep-08	Jun-08
Selected Topics in Earth Science for Teachers	B	45.00	6	270	4	Aug-07	Dec-07
North Carolina Biotechnology Center Workshop for High School Science Teachers	D	30.00	22	660	13	Jun-08	Jun-08
Introductory Biotechnology	D	30.00	20	600	17	Jun-08	Jun-08
Earth System Science Institute for Educators	B	40.00	25	1,000	6	Jun-08	Jun-08
SITE: Biology Curriculum Review	B	12.00	6	72	3	Mar-08	Mar-08

(1) Descriptive Name/Title of Activity	(2) Type of Activity	(3) Contact Hours	(4) Number of Participants	(5) Total Contact Hours	(6) Number of LEAs Served	(7) Begin Month- Year	(8) End Month- Year
Advanced Placement (AP) Review Sessions (Science)	A	4.00	187	748	6	Apr-08	Apr-08
Project Learning Tree	A	6.00	17	102	2	Mar-08	Mar-08
Project Learning Tree PreK-8 Science Workshop	A	10.00	27	270	5	Nov-07	Nov-07
SITE: 3-5 Science Instructors' Training	B	10.00	7	70	5	Apr-08	Apr-08
Modeling Physics	B	30.00	4	120	2	Jul-07	Jul-07
Hydrology	B	60.00	5	300	2	Jul-07	Jul-07
Physics and Sports	B	60.00	4	240	3	Jul-07	Aug-07
Environmental Education (EE): Morrow Mountain	A	10.00	6	60	5	Oct-07	Oct-07
EE: Leopold	A	10.00	11	110	4	Dec-07	Dec-07
EE: Aquatic WILD	A	10.00	8	80	4	Jan-08	Jan-08
EE: Air Quality	A	10.00	11	110	5	Apr-08	Apr-08
EE: Project WET	A	10.00	12	120	3	May-08	May-08
EE: Neotropical Birds	A	10.00	6	60	6	May-08	May-08
Field Botany	B	60.00	3	180	3	Jun-08	Jun-08
Global Learning and Observations to Benefit the Environment (GLOBE)	D	30.00	20	600	1	Jun-08	Jun-08
GLOBE, Grades 5-12	B	10.00	9	90	5	Oct-07	Oct-07
Middle Mathematics Summer Institutes	B	12.00	47	564	21	Jul-07	Jul-07
Middle Mathematics Summer Institutes	B	12.00	57	684	18	Jun-08	Jun-08
Integrating Middle School Mathematics	D	30.00	7	210	6	Jun-08	Jun-08
Teaching Integrated Mathematics I and II	D	30.00	7	210	6	Jun-08	Jun-08
SITE: CARSAM Instructors' Training	B	10.00	10	100	6	Feb-08	Mar-08
Problem Solving Workshop	B	18.00	24	432	1	Mar-08	Apr-08
Making Geometric Thinking Happen (Person County Partnership)	B	60.00	45	2,700	1	Aug-07	Jun-08
Advanced Studies in Teaching Mathematics	B	45.00	5	225	2	Jul-07	Aug-07
6-8 Geometry Workshop	A	6.00	50	300	1	Feb-08	Feb-08
Current Trends in Mathematics Education	B	45.00	4	180	2	Jan-08	May-08
Texas Instruments Teacher Short Course Workshop	B	15.00	23	345	5	Apr-08	Apr-08

(1) Descriptive Name/Title of Activity	(2) Type of Activity	(3) Contact Hours	(4) Number of Participants	(5) Total Contact Hours	(6) Number of LEAs Served	(7) Begin Month- Year	(8) End Month- Year
Columbus County K-2 Mathematics Planning	A	3.00	11	33	1	Aug-07	Aug-07
Columbus County 3-5 Mathematics Planning	A	3.00	8	24	1	Aug-07	Aug-07
AP Review Sessions (Mathematics)	A	4.00	190	760	6	Apr-08	Apr-08
Geometry and Measurement (Grades 4-8)	B	10.00	25	250	3	Jul-07	Jul-07
Family Mathematics Training for Teachers	A	2.00	81	162	1	Feb-08	Feb-08
Science and Mathematics Workshop for GAMSEC Lead Teachers	A	3.00	4	12	1	Jan-08	Jan-08
Teaching for Meaning Workshop	A	12.00	10	120	1	Sep-07	Jan-08
Mathematics Workshop for Algebra II and Geometry Teachers	A	6.00	7	42	7	Feb-08	Feb-08
SWIM: Discrete Mathematics	B	60.00	13	780	1	Jul-07	Jul-07
SWIM: Calculus for Middle Grades Teachers	B	60.00	14	840	1	Jul-07	Jul-07
NC DPI Middle Grades	A	30.00	17	510	6	Jul-07	Jul-07
Technical Mathematics	D	30.00	6	180	3	Jul-07	Jul-07
Discrete Mathematics	D	30.00	8	240	4	Jul-07	Jul-07
Mathematics Manipulatives for Middle School	B	5.00	24	120	1	Feb-08	Feb-08
Mountain Valley Partnership (MVP) K-5 Mathematics	B	30.00	258	7,740	7	Oct-07	May-08
Exploring Mathematics with TI-Nspire	B	30.00	6	180	5	Jun-08	Jun-08
Calculator Workshop for Elementary School Teachers	A	3.00	10	30	1	Jan-08	Jan-08
Calculator Workshop for Secondary Teachers	A	3.00	17	51	1	Feb-08	Feb-08
TI-Nspire Calculator Workshop	A	2.00	21	42	3	Mar-08	Mar-08
TI-Nspire Calculator Workshop	A	10.00	25	250	6	Nov-07	Nov-07
TI-Nspire Calculator Workshop	A	3.50	29	102	6	Dec-07	Dec-07
AP Summer Institute (APSI): Environmental Science	D	30.00	24	720	16	Jul-07	Jul-07
APSI: English Literature and Composition	D	30.00	23	690	16	Jul-07	Jul-07
APSI: Computer Science Case Studies	D	15.00	11	165	11	Jul-07	Jul-07
APSI: English Literature and Composition	D	15.00	14	210	12	Jul-07	Jul-07
APSI: Chemistry	D	30.00	25	750	22	Jul-07	Jul-07
APSI: English Literature and Composition	D	30.00	23	690	13	Jul-07	Jul-07

(1) Descriptive Name/Title of Activity	(2) Type of Activity	(3) Contact Hours	(4) Number of Participants	(5) Total Contact Hours	(6) Number of LEAs Served	(7) Begin Month- Year	(8) End Month- Year
APSI: US Government	D	30.00	24	720	12	Jul-07	Jul-07
APSI: World History	D	30.00	22	660	13	Jul-07	Jul-07
APSI: Psychology	D	30.00	25	750	10	Jul-07	Jul-07
APSI: English Language	D	30.00	25	750	14	Jul-07	Jul-07
APSI: Compute Science (Level A)	D	30.00	25	750	8	Jul-07	Jul-07
APSI: Biology	D	30.00	25	750	17	Jul-07	Jul-07
APSI: Calculus AB	D	30.00	25	750	18	Jul-07	Jul-07
APSI: Statistics	D	30.00	25	750	18	Jul-07	Jul-07
APSI: US History	D	30.00	25	750	8	Jul-07	Jul-07
APSI: English Language	D	30.00	25	750	13	Jul-07	Aug-07
Success 101 Day	A	2.00	45	90	1	Dec-07	Dec-07
FSU-RISE (Research Initiative for Scientific Enhancement) Colloquium	A	6.00	15	90	1	Mar-08	Mar-08
2008 STEM Educator Conference	B	15.00	30	450	1	Jun-08	Jun-08
Differentiated Learning Staff Development Session	A	3.00	57	171	1	Dec-07	Dec-07
				0			
NC-PIMS: Mathematical Modeling (graduate credit)	B	45.00	35	1,575	10	Jun-07	Jul-07
NC-PIMS: Regional Lead Teachers' Training	B	132.00	11	1,452	5	May-07	Jul-07
NC-PIMS: Mathematics Instructional Leadership (Lead Teachers)	B	18.00	247	4,446	10	Jul-07	Jul-07
NC-PIMS: Measurement in 1-2 Dimensions	B	12.00	2614	31,368	9	Sep-07	Apr-08
NC-PIMS: Mathematical Modeling (Lead Teachers)	B	12.00	629	7,548	9	Sep-07	Apr-08
NC-PIMS: Lenses on Learning (Principals)	B	30.00	30	900	1	Aug-07	May-08
Adventures with S.A.M.	A	10.00	25	250	1	Jan-08	Jan-08
SITE: K-2 Science	D	30.00	14	420	7	Jun-08	Jun-08
SITE: 3-5 Science	D	30.00	13	390	11	Jun-08	Jun-08
SITE: 6-8 Science	D	30.00	13	390	8	Jun-08	Jun-08
SITE: Geometry	B	30.00	99	2,970	22	Jul-07	Jun-08
SITE: Biology	B	30.00	102	3,060	46	Jul-07	Jun-08

(1) Descriptive Name/Title of Activity	(2) Type of Activity	(3) Contact Hours	(4) Number of Participants	(5) Total Contact Hours	(6) Number of LEAs Served	(7) Begin Month- Year	(8) End Month- Year
SITE: CARSAM	B	30.00	17	510	8	Jul-07	Jun-08
SITE: K-2 Science	B	30.00	26	780	3	Jun-08	Jun-08
SITE: 3-5 Science	B	54.00	73	3,942	13	Jul-07	Jun-08
SITE: 6-8 Science	B	54.00	59	3,186	12	Jul-07	Jun-08
SITE: Advanced Functions and Modeling (AFM)	B	30.00	33	990	13	Jul-07	Jun-08
Summer Science and Technology Institute	A	30.00	8	240	3	Jun-07	Aug-08
Technology for Teachers	B	30.00	30	900	9	Aug-07	Aug-07
Professional Development for Saturday Academy Teachers	A	4.00	16	64	2	Oct-07	Mar-08
AP Alliance: Calculus	A	2.00	29	58	5	Nov-07	May-08
AP Alliance: Statistics	A	2.00	14	28	3	Nov-07	May-08
AP Alliance: Biology	A	2.00	10	20	5	Nov-07	May-08
AP Alliance: Chemistry	A	2.00	35	70	7	Nov-07	May-08
AP Alliance: Environmental Science	A	2.00	17	34	6	Nov-07	May-08
AP Alliance: Physics	A	2.00	7	14	4	Nov-07	May-08
AP Alliance: English Literature and Language	A	4.00	68	272	4	Nov-07	May-08
AP Alliance: Human Geography	A	2.00	2	4	2	Nov-07	May-08
AP Alliance: Psychology	A	2.00	6	12	3	Nov-07	May-08
AP Alliance: US History	A	2.00	8	16	3	Nov-07	May-08
125			6,718	109,757			

(1) Descriptive Name/Title of Activity	(2) Type of Activity	(3) Contact Hours	(4) Number of Participants	(5) Total Contact Hours	(6) Number of LEAs Served	(7) Begin Month- Year	(8) End Month- Year
Reading Foundations Training				0			
Alamance-Burlington	B	30.00	26	780	1	Sep-07	Dec-07
	B	30.00	18	540	1	Jan-08	Feb-08
Anson County	B	30.00	12	360	1	Jul-07	Sep-07
	B	30.00	16	480	1	Jan-08	Apr-08
Ashe County	B	30.00	12	360	1	Sep-07	Dec-07
	B	30.00	14	420	1	Jan-08	Apr-08
Alleghany County	B	30.00	25	750	1	Jul-07	Sep-07
Asheboro City Schools	B	30.00	20	600	1	Oct-07	Dec-07
Asheville City Schools	B	30.00	24	720	1	Aug-07	Nov-07
Avery County	B	30.00	29	870	1	Jun-08	Jun-08
Brunswick/Columbus	B	30.00	35	1,050	2	Jan-08	Apr-08
Buncombe County	B	30.00	10	300	1	Oct-07	Jan-08
	B	30.00	16	480	1	Jan-08	May-08
Cabarrus County	B	30.00	19	570	1	Sep-07	Dec-07
Caldwell County	B	30.00	21	630	1	Jan-08	May-08
Carteret County	B	30.00	25	750	1	Jan-08	Apr-08
Catawba County	B	30.00	20	600	1	Sep-07	Dec-07
	B	30.00	20	600	1	Jan-08	Apr-08
Charlotte-Meck.	B	30.00	25	750	1	Aug-07	Nov-07
Clay County	B	30.00	17	510	1	Jan-08	May-08
Cleveland County	B	30.00	23	690	1	Oct-07	Jan-08
Craven County	B	30.00	12	360	1	Oct-07	Jan-08
Currituck County	B	30.00	13	390	1	Sep-07	Dec-07
Durham County	B	30.00	21	630	1	Oct-07	Jan-08
Edenton-Chowan	B	30.00	14	420	1	Jan-08	Apr-08
Elizabeth City	B	30.00	9	270	1	Sep-07	Jan-08
Granville County	B	30.00	28	840	1	Sep-07	Dec-07
	B	30.00	19	570	1	Jun-08	Jun-08

(1) Descriptive Name/Title of Activity	(2) Type of Activity	(3) Contact Hours	(4) Number of Participants	(5) Total Contact Hours	(6) Number of LEAs Served	(7) Begin Month- Year	(8) End Month- Year
Guilford County	B	30.00	12	360	1	Oct-07	Jan-08
Halifax County	B	30.00	12	360	1	Jan-08	Apr-08
Hoke County	B	30.00	7	210	1	Jan-08	Feb-08
Iredell-Statesville	B	30.00	15	450	1	Jan-08	Apr-08
Jackson County	B	30.00	21	630	1	Sep-07	Dec-07
Lee County	B	30.00	12	360	1	Sep-07	Jan-08
Lenoir County	B	30.00	29	870	1	Oct-07	Dec-07
	B	30.00	23	690	1	Oct-07	Jan-08
Macon County	B	30.00	9	270	1	Feb-08	May-08
Martin County	B	30.00	12	360	1	Jan-08	May-08
	B	30.00	15	450	1	Oct-07	Dec-07
McDowell County	B	30.00	25	750	1	Oct-07	Jan-08
	B	30.00	16	480	1	Jan-08	May-08
Mitchell County	B	30.00	21	630	1	Oct-07	Dec-07
Montgomery County	B	30.00	12	360	1	Jan-08	May-08
Mooreville	B	30.00	21	630	1	Nov-07	Mar-08
Mountain Charter Discovery	B	30.00	21	630	1	Aug-07	Nov-07
New Hanover County	B	30.00	31	930	1	Nov-07	Feb-08
Onslow County	B	30.00	15	450	1	Dec-07	Mar-08
Pender County	B	30.00	15	450	1	Oct-07	Jan-08
Perquimans County	B	30.00	28	840	1	Jan-08	May-08
Pitt County	B	30.00	18	540	1	Oct-07	Mar-08
Randolph County	B	30.00	19	570	1	Sep-07	Dec-07
Richmond County	B	30.00	25	750	1	Sep-07	Nov-07
Rowan County	B	30.00	23	690	1	Sep-07	Jan-08
South Lexington School	B	30.00	26	780	1	Jul-07	Sep-07
Surry County	B	30.00	21	630	1	Sep-07	Nov-07
Stokes County	B	30.00	25	750	1	Jul-07	Nov-07
Transylvania County	B	30.00	29	870	1	Oct-07	Jan-08

(1) Descriptive Name/Title of Activity	(2) Type of Activity	(3) Contact Hours	(4) Number of Participants	(5) Total Contact Hours	(6) Number of LEAs Served	(7) Begin Month- Year	(8) End Month- Year
	B	30.00	39	1,170	1	Feb-08	May-08
Vance County	B	30.00	21	630	1	Aug-07	Nov-07
Wake County	B	30.00	19	570	1	Oct-07	Dec-07
	B	30.00	22	660	1	Jun-08	Jun-08
Watauga County	B	30.00	15	450	1	Mar-08	May-08
	B	30.00	10	300	1	Jun-08	Jun-08
Wilkes County	B	30.00	21	630	1	Sep-07	Dec-07
Yadkin County	B	30.00	5	150	1	Sep-07	Dec-07
	B	30.00	28	840	1	Nov-07	Feb-08
Yancey County	B	30.00	5	150	1	Sep-07	Jan-08
DIBELS Trainings				0			
Granville County	A	3.00	38	114	1	Oct-07	Oct-07
Johnston County	A	8.00	15	120	1	Aug-07	Aug-07
	A	8.00	8	64	1	Aug-07	Aug-07
	A	8.00	11	88	1	Nov-07	Nov-07
Wilkes County	A	8.00	17	136	1	Jul-07	Jul-07
Mathematics Trainings				0			
New Math Sites Meeting	A	8.00	15	120	15	Oct-07	Oct-07
Math Foundations Training	B	30.00	48	1,440	20	May-08	Jul-08
Onsow County Number Worlds Training	A	8.00	16	128	1	Oct-07	Oct-07
Reading/Writing Model Trainings				0			
Cabarrus Corrective Reading	A	8.00	20	160	1	Dec-07	Dec-07
Catawba Marilyn Friend	A	8.00	10	80	1	Aug-07	Aug-07
Elizabeth City Language for Thinking	A	8.00	9	72	1	Oct-07	Oct-07
Elizabeth City Language! Training	B	6.00	8	48	1	Sep-07	Sep-07
Foundations	B	8.00	30	240	10	Sep-07	Sep-07
Gaston Corrective Reading	B	12.00	36	432	1	Sep-07	Sep-07
Gaston Reading Initiative Meeting	A	6.00	7	42	1	Oct-07	Oct-07
Gaston Reading Mastery	B	12.00	25	300	1	Oct-07	Oct-07

(1) Descriptive Name/Title of Activity	(2) Type of Activity	(3) Contact Hours	(4) Number of Participants	(5) Total Contact Hours	(6) Number of LEAs Served	(7) Begin Month- Year	(8) End Month- Year
Gaston Reading Mastery I & II	B	12.00	26	312	1	Oct-07	Oct-07
Harnett Corrective Reading	B	12.00	12	144	1	Oct-07	Nov-07
Harnett Language!	B	12.00	8	96	1	Sep-07	Sep-07
Harnett Letterland	B	12.00	8	96	1	Aug-07	Aug-07
Harnett Reading Mastery	B	10.00	17	170	1	Sep-07	Sep-07
Harnett Corrective Reading	B	12.00	10	120	0	Sep-07	Sep-07
Harnett Language for Learning	A	6.00	8	48	1	Sep-07	Sep-07
Harnett Wilson Overview	A	6.00	7	42	1	Oct-07	Oct-07
Johnston Foundations	B	12.00	30	360	1	Nov-07	11/1007
Johnston Language! 2nd ed.	B	12.00	23	276	1	Nov-07	Nov-07
	B	12.00	7	84	1	Jul-07	Jul-07
Johnston Language! 3rd ed.	B	12.00	14	168	1	Aug-07	Aug-07
	B	12.00	19	228	1	Oct-07	Oct-07
Language! 3rd ed. - DPI	B	12.00	35	420	15	Sep-07	Sep-07
Letterland - Catawba	B	12.00	50	600	1	Oct-07	Oct-07
McDowell CR Training	A	6.00	2	12	1	Aug-07	Aug-07
McDowell Letterland	B	12.00	20	240	1	Aug-07	Aug-07
McDowell Reading Mastery	B	12.00	7	84	1	Aug-07	Aug-07
Reading Clusters - Wake	A	8.00	30	240	1	Sep-07	Sep-07
Wake CR Training	B	12.00	21	252	1	Aug-07	Aug-07
Wake CR Enhanced	A	6.00	5	30	1	Jul-07	Jul-07
Wake CR Fall	B	12.00	29	348	1	Sep-07	Oct-07
Wake CR for TAs	A	6.00	28	168	1	Sep-07	Oct-07
Wake CR Summer	B	12.00	15	180	1	Aug-07	Aug-07
Wake Wilson Intervention	A	6.00	16	96	1	Jul-07	Jul-07
Wake Edmark Training	A	6.00	10	60	1	Sep-07	Sep-07
Wake Edmark 2	A	6.00	11	66	1	Aug-07	Aug-07
Wake Great Leaps	B	12.00	25	300	1	Aug-07	Aug-07
Wake Great Leaps 2	B	12.00	8	96	1	Nov-07	Nov-07

(1) Descriptive Name/Title of Activity	(2) Type of Activity	(3) Contact Hours	(4) Number of Participants	(5) Total Contact Hours	(6) Number of LEAs Served	(7) Begin Month- Year	(8) End Month- Year
Wake Great Leaps for TA s	A	6.00	25	150	1	Sep-07	Sep-07
Wake Houghton-Mifflin	B	12.00	22	264	1	Aug-07	Aug-07
Wake Language Dev. Tas	A	6.00	14	84	1	Oct-07	Oct-07
Wake Language for Learning	B	12.00	21	252	1	Jul-07	Jul-07
Wake Language for Learning 2	B	12.00	9	108	1	Sep-07	Sep-07
Wake Language for Learning Tas	B	12.00	15	180	1	Oct-07	Oct-07
Wake Literacy Connections	A	6.00	14	84	1	Jul-07	Jul-07
Wake Literacy Connections 2	A	6.00	10	60	1	Sep-07	Sep-07
Wake Literacy Essentials	A	6.00	7	42	1	Sep-07	Sep-07
	A	6.00	10	60	1	Jul-07	Jul-07
Wake Reading Clusters expanded	A	6.00	31	186	1	Oct-07	Oct-07
	A	6.00	25	150	1	Jul-07	Jul-07
Wake Reading Mastery III/IV	B	12.00	8	96	1	Jul-07	Jul-07
Wake Wilson Intervention	A	6.00	16	96	1	Jul-07	Aug-07
Watauga Differentiation	A	6.00	11	66	1	Nov-07	Nov-07
Network Meetings				0			
Fall TOT Meeting	D	12.00	41	492	20	Oct-07	Oct-07
SIP New Reading Sites	A	6.00	33	198	15	Oct-07	Oct-07
SIP Spring Reading Network Meeting	D	14.00	151	2,114	60	Mar-08	Mar-08
Spring TOT Meeting	D	12.00	27	324	12	Apr-08	Apr-08
Spring Math Network Meeting	D	14.00	75	1,050	20	Mar-08	Mar-08
Fall CPC Meeting	D	12.00	18	216	NA	Nov-07	Nov-07
Central region FT Meeting	A	6.00	15	90	15	May-08	May-08
Preschool Demo Centers - Site Visits				0			
Cabarrus	A	4.00	4	16	1	Nov-07	Nov-07
Catawba	A	4.00	3	12	1	Nov-07	Nov-07
Avery County	A	4.00	3	12	1	Dec-07	Dec-07
Asheville City Schools	A	4.00	4	16	1	Dec-07	Dec-07
Edgecombe	A	4.00	3	12	1	Dec-07	Dec-07

(1) Descriptive Name/Title of Activity	(2) Type of Activity	(3) Contact Hours	(4) Number of Participants	(5) Total Contact Hours	(6) Number of LEAs Served	(7) Begin Month- Year	(8) End Month- Year
Martin County	A	4.00	4	16	1	Dec-07	Dec-07
Asheboro City Schools	A	4.00	4	16	1	Dec-07	Dec-07
Martin County	A	4.00	3	12	1	May-08	May-08
Edgecombe	A	4.00	4	16	1	May-08	May-08
Catawba	A	4.00	3	12	1	May-08	May-08
Cabarrus	A	4.00	3	12	1	May-08	May-08
Wake	A	4.00	4	16	1	May-08	May-08
Asheville	A	4.00	3	12	1	Jun-08	Jun-08
Asheboro	A	4.00	3	12	1	Jun-08	Jun-08
Developmental Review - Reading Sites				0			
Wake	A	4.00	3	12	1	Apr-08	Apr-08
Guilford	A	4.00	3	12	1	May-08	May-08
Wilson	A	4.00	3	12	1	Mar-08	Mar-08
Harnett	A	4.00	4	16	1	Apr-08	Apr-08
Durham	A	4.00	4	16	1	Apr-08	Apr-08
Lee	A	4.00	5	20	1	May-08	May-08
Orange	A	4.00	3	12	1	May-08	May-08
Asheboro	A	4.00	4	16	1	May-08	May-08
Alamance-Burlington	A	4.00	4	16	1	Apr-08	Apr-08
Rockingham	A	4.00	3	12	1	May-08	May-08
Caswell	A	4.00	3	12	1	May-08	May-08
Johnston	A	4.00	4	16	1	May-08	May-08
River Mill Academy	A	4.00	5	20	1	Apr-08	Apr-08
Clover Garden Charter	A	4.00	3	12	1	Apr-08	Apr-08
Office of Ed. Services	A	4.00	3	12	1	Apr-08	Apr-08
Craven	A	4.00	4	16	1	May-08	May-08
Carteret	A	4.00	4	16	1	May-08	May-08
New Hanover	A	4.00	4	16	1	May-08	May-08
Onslow	A	4.00	4	16	1	May-08	May-08

(1) Descriptive Name/Title of Activity	(2) Type of Activity	(3) Contact Hours	(4) Number of Participants	(5) Total Contact Hours	(6) Number of LEAs Served	(7) Begin Month- Year	(8) End Month- Year
Bladen/Columbus	A	4.00	3	12	1	May-08	May-08
Brunswick	A	4.00	3	12	1	May-08	May-08
Lenoir	A	4.00	3	12	1	May-08	May-08
Greene	A	4.00	3	12	1	Jun-08	Jun-08
Pender	A	4.00	3	12	1	Jun-08	Jun-08
Duplin	A	4.00	3	12	1	Jun-08	Jun-08
Alleghany	A	4.00	3	12	1	Jun-08	Jun-08
Ashe	A	4.00	3	12	1	May-08	May-08
Avery	A	4.00	3	12	1	Jun-08	Jun-08
Burke	A	4.00	4	16	1	May-08	May-08
Caldwell	A	4.00	4	16	1	May-08	May-08
Catawba	A	4.00	4	16	1	May-08	May-08
WSFC	A	4.00	3	12	1	May-08	May-08
Iredell-Statesville	A	4.00	4	16	1	Apr-08	Apr-08
Lexington City	A	4.00	3	12	1	Apr-08	Apr-08
NCSD	A	4.00	3	12	1	Mar-08	Mar-08
Surry	A	4.00	3	12	1	May-08	May-08
Thomasville City Schools	A	4.00	3	12	1	Jun-08	Jun-08
Wilkes	A	4.00	4	16	1	Jun-08	Jun-08
Yadkin	A	4.00	3	12	1	Jun-08	Jun-08
Watauga	A	4.00	3	12	1	Jun-08	Jun-08
Charlotte-Meck	A	4.00	3	12	1	May-08	May-08
Scotland	A	4.00	3	12	1	May-08	May-08
Montgomery	A	4.00	4	16	1	May-08	May-08
Anson	A	4.00	4	16	1	May-08	May-08
Cleveland	A	4.00	4	16	1	May-08	May-08
Developmental Review - Math Sites				0			
Avery	A	3.00	3	9	1	Mar-08	Mar-08
Burke	A	3.00	3	9	1	Mar-08	Mar-08

(1) Descriptive Name/Title of Activity	(2) Type of Activity	(3) Contact Hours	(4) Number of Participants	(5) Total Contact Hours	(6) Number of LEAs Served	(7) Begin Month- Year	(8) End Month- Year
Haywood	A	3.00	3	9	1	Apr-08	Apr-08
Polk	A	3.00	3	9	1	Apr-08	Apr-08
McDowell	A	3.00	3	9	1	Apr-08	Apr-08
Rutherford	A	3.00	4	12	1	Apr-08	Apr-08
188			2,921	54,735			

(1) Descriptive Name/Title of Activity	(2) Type of Activity	(3) Contact Hours	(4) Number of Participants	(5) Total Contact Hours	(6) Number of LEAs Served	(7) Begin Month- Year	(8) End Month- Year
Leadership Program for Aspiring Principals (LPAP 46)	D	120	27	3240	17	8/15/2007	11/30/2007
Leadership Program for Aspiring Principals (LPAP 47)	D	120	27	3240	17	1/9/2008	4/16/2008
Leadership Program for Aspiring Principals (LPAP 48)	D	120	28	3360	24	6/19/2007	8/10/2007
Leadership Program for Experienced Principals (LPXP 03)	D	120	49	5880	28	9/11/2007	10/6/2007
Leadership Program for Future Superintendents (LPFS 03)	D	140	24	3360	20	9/25/2007	6/19/2008
Leadership Program for New Principals (LPNP 10)	D	120	43	5160	29	1/29/2008	5/1/2008
School Administrators as Instructional Leaders (SAIL 14)	B	40	30	1200	19	9/18/2007	11/14/2007
School Administrators as Instructional Leaders (SAIL 15)	B	40	31	1240	18	9/20/2007	11/16/2007
School Administrators as Instructional Leaders (SAIL 16)	B	40	31	1240	21	10/23/2007	11/28/2007
School Administrators as Instructional Leaders (SAIL 17)	B	40	32	1280	18	10/25/2007	11/30/2007
School Administrators as Instructional Leaders (SAIL 18)	B	40	28	1120	18	1/22/2008	3/12/2008
School Administrators as Instructional Leaders (SAIL 19)	B	40	29	1160	15	1/24/2008	3/14/2008
School Administrators as Instructional Leaders (SAIL 20)	B	40	30	1200	19	2/26/2008	5/7/2008
School Administrators as Instructional Leaders (SAIL 21)	B	40	31	1240	20	2/28/2008	5/9/2008
Survival School for New Principals (SSNP 02)	D	60	31	1860	18	8/1/2007	4/24/2008
15			471	35780			

(1) Descriptive Name/Title of Activity	(2) Type of Activity	(3) Contact Hours	(4) Number of Participants	(5) Total Contact Hours	(6) Number of LEAs Served	(7) Begin Month- Year	(8) End Month- Year
North Carolina A&T State University and Duplin County Schools Mentoring Teachers in Reading with Emphasis on Special Needs and ESL Learners	B	91.50	22	2,013	1	Jul-06	Jun-07
North Carolina Central University and Halifax County Schools Mathematics Empowerment of Teachers to Ensure Retention	B	196.00	23	4,508	1	Jul-06	Jun-07
UNC Charlotte and Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools Every Student Learns at School	B	92.00	13	1,196	1	Jul-06	Jun-07
UNC Pembroke and Hoke County and Scotland County Schools Strategic Teaming for Inclusive Learning Environments	B	124.50	38	4,731	2	Jul-06	Jun-07
UNC Wilmington and New Hanover, Pender and Brunswick County Schools Coalitions for Success II	B	36.00	31	1,116	3	Jul-06	Jun-07
Western Carolina University and Asheville City Schools Connected Coaching: Improving Reading Instruction in Secondary Schools	B	103.00	89	9,167	1	Jul-06	Jun-07
Western Carolina University and Alleghany County Schools	B	88.00	20	1,760	1	Jul-06	Jun-07
Winston-Salem State University and Thomasville City and Winston-Salem/Forsyth County Schools--Contact Hours Estimated	B	104.43	10	1,044	1	Jul-06	Jun-07
8			246	25,535			

(1) Descriptive Name/Title of Activity	(2) Type of Activity	(3) Contact Hours	(4) Number of Participants	(5) Total Contact Hours	(6) Number of LEAs Served	(7) Begin Month- Year	(8) End Month- Year
LTES-Cohort 1, Participants	D	72.00	58	4,176	16	Jan-08	Jun-08
LTES-Cohort 1, Leadership Facilitators	D	35.00	8	280		Jan-08	Jun-08
LTMS-Cohort 1A, Participants	D	61.00	51	3,111	6	Oct-07	Jun-08
LTMS-Cohort 1A, Leadership Facilitators & STN Coaches	D	30.00	35	1,050		Oct-07	Jun-08
LTMS-Cohort 1B, Participants	D	64.00	41	2,624	11	Oct-07	Jul-08
LTMS-Cohort 1B, Leadership Facilitators & STN Coaches	D	32.00	29	928		Oct-07	Jul-08
LTHS-Cohort 3A, Participants	D	88.00	43	3,784	11	Oct-07	May-08
LTHS-Cohort 3A, Leadership Facilitators	D	8.00	12	96		Oct-07	May-08
LTHS-Cohort 3B, Participants	D	88.00	52	4,576	11	Oct-07	May-08
LTHS-Cohort 3B, Leadership Facilitators	D	8.00	13	104		Oct-07	May-08
10			342	20,729			

**UNC Center for School Leadership Development
Professional Development Report
2007-2008**

Appendix A

School Systems Served by Center Programs in 2007-2008

	NC TEACH	MTEC	PFP	NC- MSEN	NC SIP	PEP	NC QUEST
Alamance-Burlington	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Alexander	X			X		X	
Alleghany	X			X	X		X
Anson	X			X	X		
Ashe	X			X	X	X	
Avery	X			X	X	X	
Beaufort	X	X		X	X	X	
Bertie	X	X		X	X		
Bladen	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Brunswick	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Buncombe	X		X	X	X	X	
Asheville	X			X	X		X
Burke	X			X	X	X	
Cabarrus	X		X	X	X	X	
Kannapolis				X	X		
Caldwell	X		X	X	X		
Camden		X			X	X	
Carteret	X		X	X	X	X	
Caswell	X			X	X		
Catawba	X		X	X	X	X	
Hickory	X			X	X	X	
Newton-Conover	X			X	X		
Chatham	X	X	X	X		X	
Cherokee	X					X	
Edenton-Chowan	X	X		X	X		
Clay	X				X		
Cleveland	X			X	X	X	
Columbus	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Whiteville	X	X		X			
Craven	X			X	X	X	
Cumberland	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Currituck	X					X	

	NC TEACH	MTEC	PFP	NC- MSEN	NC SIP	PEP	NC QUEST
Dare	X						
Davidson	X			X	X	X	
Lexington	X	X		X	X	X	
Thomasville	X			X	X	X	
Davie	X						
Duplin	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Durham	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Edgecombe	X	X		X	X	X	
Forsyth	X		X	X	X	X	
Franklin	X	X		X		X	
Gaston	X		X	X	X	X	
Gates	X	X		X			
Graham	X			X	X		
Granville	X	X		X	X	X	
Greene	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Guilford	X		X	X	X	X	
Halifax	X	X		X			X
Roanoke Rapids	X	X		X	X	X	
Weldon	X	X		X	X	X	
Harnett	X	X		X	X	X	
Haywood	X			X	X	X	
Henderson	X			X	X		
Hertford	X	X		X		X	
Hoke	X			X	X	X	X
Hyde	X	X	X	X	X		
Iredell- Statesville	X		X	X	X	X	
Mooreville					X	X	
Jackson	X			X	X	X	
Johnston	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Jones	X	X		X		X	
Lee	X			X	X	X	
Lenoir	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Lincoln	X			X	X	X	
Macon	X				X	X	
Madison	X				X		
Martin	X	X	X	X	X		
McDowell	X			X	X	X	
Mecklenburg	X		X	X	X	X	X
Mitchell	X			X	X		
Montgomery	X				X	X	
Moore	X			X	X		
Nash-Rocky Mount	X	X	X	X	X		

	NC TEACH	MTEC	PFP	NC- MSEN	NC SIP	PEP	NC QUEST
New Hanover	X		X	X	X	X	X
Northampton	X	X			X	X	
Onslow	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Orange	X		X	X	X	X	
Chapel Hill- Carrboro	X		X	X		X	
Pamlico		X		X		X	
Pasquotank	X	X	X	X	X		
Pender	X		X	X	X	X	X
Perquimans	X	X			X	X	
Person	X	X	X	X		X	
Pitt	X		X	X		X	
Polk	X		X	X	X		
Randolph	X	X		X	X	X	
Asheboro			X	X	X	X	
Richmond	X	X		X	X	X	
Robeson	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Rockingham	X			X	X	X	
Rowan- Salisbury	X			X		X	
Rutherford	X		X	X	X	X	
Sampson	X	X		X	X	X	
Clinton	X	X		X		X	
Scotland	X	X	X	X	X		X
Stanly	X		X	X		X	
Stokes	X				X		
Surry	X			X	X		
Elkin	X			X		X	
Mt. Airy	X			X		X	
Swain	X			X	X	X	
Transylvania	X			X	X	X	
Tyrrell	X	X				X	
Union	X		X	X		X	
Vance	X	X		X		X	
Wake	X		X	X	X	X	
Warren	X	X		X			
Washington		X		X	X		
Watauga	X			X	X	X	
Wayne	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Wilkes				X	X	X	
Wilson	X	X	X	X	X		
Yadkin	X			X	X	X	
Yancey	X	X		X	X		