

CEO II Rank Change Program Review:

Comprehensive Quantitative & Qualitative Summative 3 Year Review Report

(2021 - 2024)

Program Overview

The University of Kentucky Center for Next Generation Leadership seeks to improve the professional learning of educators in the field. For teachers, UK has developed the ChangeMakers program as a rank change (CEO Option II EPSB-approved) pathway that combines the best of job-embedded, high-quality professional learning with the expertise of research-based Next Generation practices.

UK Next Generation ChangeMakers is designed to support participants and teams as they experience, reflect, and grow professionally over the course of a great year of teaching and leading. Over the course of one year, participants, known as ChangeMakers, explore multiple modules, including Student-Centered Learning, Learner Agency, Access and Engagement Opportunities, Inquiry Learning, Assessment for Learning, and Competency-Based Learning. Participants are able to plot their own learning path and set their own deadlines. They are supported by an experienced Crew Chief and Co-Pilot who coach and mentor ChangeMakers through the process. Learning is presented online synchronously and asynchronously. The modules are available in Canvas, a learning platform utilized by the University of Kentucky, and provide extensive resources in support of each module. An action research project (Capstone Action Project or CAP) is embedded in the curriculum, which allows teachers to measure if their changes in the classroom are having an impact in real-time.

Participants provide progress presentations and a final defense of their learning at the conclusion of the program. On-going program iterations have been responsive to participant and crew leader feedback to make annual adjustments to the learning program and structures. See included Appendix for more information.

Executive Summary By Participant Performance

Total Number successfully completing rank change: **175**

	<u>District(s) by County</u>	<u>Enrolled</u>	<u>Withdrawn*</u>	<u>Completed</u>
Cohort 1 2021-22	Jefferson, Shelby	51	4	47 (92%)
Cohort 2 2022-23	Fayette, Jefferson, Shelby	84	5 13 continued to C.3	66 (79%)
Cohort 3 2023-24	Bath, Boone, Bullitt, Fayette County, Henry, Jefferson, Lawrence, Nelson, Shelby, Walton-Verona	58 13 continued from C.2	2 6 continuing withdrew, 1 continuing into C.4	62 (88%)
3 YEAR DATA	10 Total	193	11	175 (91%)
Cohort 4 2024-25	JCPS +Barren, Boone, Boyle, Bullitt, Henderson, Henry, Hopkins, Lawrence, Ludlow Ind., Mason	66 1 continuing from C.3	In Progress	In Progress

* Notes and Reasons for withdrawal

1. Withdrawals prior to beginning the program are not reported.
2. The majority of withdrawals have occurred during the first half of the year due to personal family or work situations and are not reflective of a participant's inability to meet program criteria successfully
3. No participants who continuously engaged with the program failed to achieve rank change.
4. In Cohort #2, 13 participants were allowed to continue into Cohort #3, and five of those participants continued to completion in Cohort #3, six were withdrawn by JCPS for no activity and 2 withdrew themselves.
 - a. District and program agreements were clarified in Cohort #3, and only one participant continued into Cohort #4.

Program Highlights

Gleaned from annual surveys. [Most recent Cohort #3 Feedback linked here.](#)

Strengths noted by Participants

1. Professional Growth and Learning:

- Participants expressed excitement and satisfaction about learning new teaching strategies and approaches.
- They valued the opportunity for collaboration with colleagues and professional development that encouraged personal reflection and self-assessment.
- The program provided a framework for educators to step out of their comfort zones and facilitated growth despite some challenges.

“Thank you for allowing me this opportunity. I learned so much and I really enjoyed the action research. I can’t wait to take my new skills and use them next year. Lora Shields was a great leader. She responded to emails I sent in a timely manner & was always positive and gave great feedback.” ~Cohort #2 ChangeMaker

2. Impact on Classroom and Students:

- Positive changes in the classroom were noted, with improved learning experiences for both teachers and students.
- Increased academic data and the ability to make meaningful changes influenced student outcomes positively.
- Implementing program learnings led to increased student engagement and a stronger desire for learning among students.

“The ChangeMakers Program reinvigorated my teaching passion and encouraged me to push the boundaries of my instruction.” ~Cohort #3 ChangeMaker

3. Community and Collaboration:

- Collaboration with colleagues, both within their own school and through the program, was highlighted as valuable.
- Participants appreciated feedback from peers and mentors for its role in improving teaching practices.
- Working alongside partners from their Professional Learning Community (PLC) was crucial for success, providing support and guidance.

“I got help from an incredible crew chief who helped me make my research applicable to ME!”

~Cohort #1 ChangeMaker

4. Access and Engagement, Cultural Responsiveness, and Student Empowerment:

- Participants valued learning about equity and cultural responsiveness, recognizing the importance of creating equitable lessons that provide access and engagement and empower students.
- The program's emphasis on student inquiry and agency was praised for fostering stronger student discourse and promoting student ownership of learning.
- Implementing these concepts led to increased student engagement and a stronger desire for learning among students.

5. Resource Recommendations:

- Participants appreciated the program's recommendations for additional reading materials.
- These resources further enriched their teaching practices, contributing to their professional growth.

Role Supports

Crew Chiefs and CoPilots played a crucial role in providing support and guidance, helping participants feel well-supported and confident in their assignments.

- They were noted for delivering clear, actionable, and constructive feedback, though some participants experienced inconsistencies.
- Their availability and responsiveness were highly valued, with timely responses helping participants stay on track.
- Personalized support through one-on-one meetings was especially appreciated, aiding those facing specific challenges.
- Additionally, their ability to adjust meetings and provide flexible, individualized coaching contributed to a positive and effective learning environment.

“Our crew meetings were very relevant and laid back to provide us the guidance and help we needed.” ~Cohort #3 ChangeMaker

Content

1. Program Structure and Content:

- Flexibility in learning pace and relevant, immediately applicable module topics were praised.
- Participants found the program's content enriching and beneficial, with seminars and materials enhancing their practice.
- The program's adaptability and relevance across various subject areas, including music education, were noted.

2. Alignment with District Initiatives:

- Participants appreciated that the modules aligned with district work, providing confidence in their teaching practices.
- This alignment ensured that teachers did not deviate from established guidelines, reinforcing their practices.

Program Needs from Participant Feedback

1. Addressing Challenges and Providing Support:

- While personalized support was appreciated, participants facing specific challenges such as health issues or technological difficulties may require more tailored assistance.

2. Enhancing Flexibility and Adaptability:

- Although flexibility in learning pace was praised, there is a need to ensure that all participants can keep up with the program's demands.

3. Aligning Information Across Different Sources:

- Participants noted occasional discrepancies between guidance provided by Crew Chiefs and information presented in webinars or other program materials.

4. Enhancing Collaboration and Peer Feedback:

- Participants appreciated collaboration but indicated a need for more structured opportunities for peer feedback and collaboration.

Role Supports

1. Consistent and Specific Feedback:

- Some participants felt that feedback from certain individuals, particularly Crew Chiefs and CoPilots, was inconsistent or lacking.
- **Improved Meeting Structures:** Participants suggested that knowing the agenda ahead of time for meetings would help them prepare better and contribute more effectively.

Content

1. Strengthening Equity and Cultural Responsiveness:

- While learning about equity and cultural responsiveness was valued, there is a need for continued emphasis on these areas.

2. Increasing Accessibility to Resources:

- While additional reading materials were appreciated, ensuring that all recommended resources are easily accessible to all participants is important.

Closing/Conclusion

The highlights of program strengths reflect a program that effectively promotes professional development, collaboration, equity, and positive changes in teaching practices, aligning well with district initiatives and empowering educators to make meaningful impacts in their classrooms.

In summary, the initial years of the ChangeMakers teacher rank change model operated by the Center for Next Generation Leadership mark a successful beginning to this new format for teacher development. We are seeing a very high percentage of program completers (91% over three years). Participants appreciate our competency-based models, which provide flexibility supported by competency crew chiefs and co-pilots. The content developed in the modules is reported as both high quality and tightly related to their jobs as teachers. The tasks within the program are pushing teachers to grow outside of their comfort zones but to do so in collaborative and supported ways that frequently impact the larger school community. In short, the program is largely delivering on the initial vision and has managed to do so while upholding the high academic standards and rigor expected of any University of Kentucky program.

Our growth areas, as reported by participants, highlight a need for more consistent and specific feedback, improved meeting structures, enhanced flexibility and adaptability, alignment of information, continued emphasis on equity and cultural responsiveness, strengthened collaboration, and increased accessibility to resources. Addressing these needs can help enhance the overall effectiveness of the program and ensure that all participants receive the support and guidance they require. Specifically, ensuring that all information and guidance are aligned and consistent across different sources is essential to avoid confusion is key to program success and will be accomplished through ongoing

calibration processes. Efforts to streamline content and accessibility are underway. Additionally, providing more opportunities for participant discussion, along with increased peer feedback opportunities will be advantageous. Supporting pacing for accomplishing rank change within one year is another identified need we will continue to provide structure for.

UK Center for Next Generation Leadership continues to commit to iterative cycles of feedback and improvement for program growth, as evidenced in reported **Program Iteration and Continuous Improvement** efforts in the [Appendix](#).

Appendix :

As stated in our original application, as planned, we have continuously made programmatic changes and improvements both within a cohort year, as well as following annual reviews. Following, please find the current state of improvements and program iterations we have made:

Program Iteration and Continuous Improvement

Iterations and program improvements identified and implemented through on-going, continuous improvement focus:

1. Original: “Participants will be identified in collaboration with school district partners”
Current Iteration: “Participants will be identified through an application process which determines readiness and opportunity for learning as a ChangeMaker.”
 - a. We maintain collaboration with school district partners and establish MOAs only when districts are providing direct resources for cohorts.
 - b. Individual teachers can join at their own discretion outside of district approval/collaboration. Care is taken to ascertain that the teacher will have autonomy to engage with the program content in their context.
2. Original: “...we will limit enrollment to no more than 50 CEO participants and no fewer than 20.”
Current Iteration: Our financial analysis says that we need enrollment of least 60 to break even and we can easily scale to as many as 200 per cohort.
 - a. We have consistently had an average enrollment of 61.
 - b. We can easily scale to 200 and even more if there is demand.
3. Original: “Further, program “advisors” will be employed to lead specific content components of the program. These advisors include national and Kentucky experts on the content knowledge provided in the program and serve as providers of feedback to CEO participants as they implement the ideas in their own classrooms or schools. In addition, each student is assigned an expert “mentor” who is still a practicing teacher or leader in the partner district that has already been identified as possessing expertise in Next Generation teaching and learning. Finally, officials within the central offices of both districts, as part of the partner MOA, will provide specific expertise and assessment feedback to students in the CEO program.”

Current Iteration: There is a Seminar System where national and state leaders share expertise and offer coaching to ChangeMakers in monthly seminars. There is a Crew system where Crew Chiefs come from those with leadership and coaching experience in Competency Based Systems and CoPilots come from our ChangeMakers Fellows pool or other experienced coaches from competency based schools, with a preference for prior successful experience in the ChangeMakers program. The crew leaders offer planning support, feedback and needed assistance to ChangeMakers crew members. Likewise, MOA districts have support through a crew system. Crew Leader feedback is monitored for calibrated, consistent feedback and feedback and training is provided if inconsistency is noted.

4. Original: CAP/AR: Stated target outcomes for Student/Teacher learning: “efficacy”

Current Iteration: Focus on increases in student agency, deeper learning, transformation in assessment, achievement

5. Original: Competency Maps named: “One required capstone artifact for all participants will be the development of competency maps in their discipline developed to the level of student learning targets.”

Current Iteration: Capstone artifact requires evidence of shifts in assessment for deeper learning, including measuring progress toward Portrait of a Learner skills associated with existing district or state learning progressions or performance indicators.

6. Original: Publication of AR/CAP: “However, as all students in the program will be employees of a school district, the partner school districts will provide publication, dissemination, and sharing opportunities for the CEO students with others in their districts, thus minimizing potential issues of student privacy. Specifically, JCPS commits to using its district website, as well as publishing candidate work as a part of their annual Deeper Learning Symposium and with various networked groups within the district, such as the Academic Instructional Coaches (AIC)”

Current Iteration: Publication using IRB denied by JCPS currently, with only in form of sharing in exhibition and defense, at professional learning events

7. Original: “Both the capstone and the portfolio artifacts will be uploaded into Tote, a digital, standards-based portfolio tool developed at the UK College of Education by Dr. Gerry Swan and used in all other UK College of Education practitioner programs. Tote allows for assessment of evidence to the predetermined rubric (below) across multiple categories each aligned to multiple standards.”

Current Iteration: Scoring is now via single point rubric (proficiency level). Crew Leaders use scoring to double blind score and calibrate practice and feedback.

8. Original: Alignment of needs

Current Iteration: Based only on JCPS/SCPS District Goals, now based on similarly aligned Kentucky [Portrait of a Learner](#) and [KUWL](#) statewide initiatives.

9. Original: Credit by Examination in approved plan, not currently an option

Current Iteration: Currently exploring options through College of Education for possibilities of credit for prior learning.

10. Original: “Finally, a summative, graded assessment will be required of each participant based on a combination of uploaded artifacts into their digital portfolio as well as an oral defense of their work throughout the CEO model and the impact of their practice during the year on student efficacy (as examined through the action research project”

Current Iteration: Final Defense of Learning with evidence submitted, with evidence additional to complete/scored module submissions and CAP poster.