

Next Generation Summer Science Symposium  
Results from Three Feedback Surveys

for  
Title IV, Part A Project  
Student Support and Academic Enrichment Program



*Submitted October 18, 2018 by  
New Directions, New Ideas LLC*

## Next Generation Summer Science Symposium (NGSSS) Feedback Surveys

### Table of Contents

Introduction: NGSSS Feedback Surveys.....	3
NGSSS District Contact (for science education) Survey Results.....	3
District Contacts: Challenges Regarding NGSSS.....	7
District Contacts: Major Benefit of the NGSSS.....	8
District Contacts: Additional Comments for T4A Staff.....	9
NGSSS Partner Survey Results.....	10
Partners: Challenges Regarding NGSSS.....	12
Partners: Suggestions for Improvement.....	12
Partners: Major Benefits of Involvement with NGSSS.....	12
NGSSS Support Staff Survey Results.....	14
Support Staff: Schedule for NGSSS.....	14
Support Staff: Pace and Timing of NGSSS.....	16
Support Staff: Format of NGSSS.....	17
Support Staff: Suggestions for Improvement of Promotion and Recruitment.....	20
Support Staff: Additional Comments.....	21

### Tables

Table 1: Job Titles of District Contact Survey Respondents.....	4
Table 2: Follow-up Meetings.....	5
Table 3: NGSSS Attendees' Ability to Enhance Science Education.....	5
Table 4: Teacher Stipends Paid.....	6
Table 5: Recruitment Process for NGSSS.....	6
Table 6: District Support for Participant Registration Fee.....	7
Table 7: Rating Scores for Support for Partners.....	11
Table 8: Support Staff Categories of Respondents.....	14
Table 9: Schedule for the NGSSS.....	14
Table 10: Lunchtime Preferences.....	15
Table 11: Ranking for NGSSS Weeks.....	16
Table 12: Pace of NGSSS Schedule.....	16
Table 13: Format of NGSSS for Collaboration.....	17

## Introduction: NGSSS Feedback Surveys

In July 2018 the first Next Generation Summer Science Symposia (NGSSS) were held in Bay, Flagler, and Lee counties. The symposia were supported by Title IV, Part A (T4A) funding and staff in partnership with Florida Department of Education (FDOE) staff from the Bureau of Standards and Instructional Support. During the last week of August 2018, a survey request was sent to those who were involved with planning, promotion, recruitment, and support for the NGSSS. Three different surveys were developed and distributed to school district contacts for science education, partners (vendors and FDOE staff), and NGSSS support staff, which included facilitators, volunteers, and FDOE staff. Results from these three surveys are presented in this report.

## NGSSS District Contact (for science education) Survey Results

All district contacts who were involved in recruitment for the NGSSS were sent a survey request and 34 contacts responded.

- 38% of survey respondents attended the NGSSS
- 61% attended with 3 or more people from their district
- 23% attended with 1 other person from their district
- 16% attended with 2 other people from their district

Survey responses were received from the following school districts and one high school.

Baker
Bay
Bradford (n=2)
Brevard (n=2)
Clay (n=2)
Collier
Columbia
Flagler
Gulf
Hillsborough (n=2)
LaBele High School
Lee
Madison
Marion

Miami-Dade
Monroe
Nassau
Okeechobee
Orange (n=2)
Palm Beach (n=2)
Pinellas
Sarasota
Seminole
St. Lucie (n=2)
St. Johns
Suwanee
Walton

Table 1 displays a wide variety of survey respondent job titles for district contacts.

<b>Table 1 Job Titles of District Contact Survey Respondents</b>	
<b>Job Titles</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
Science Curriculum Director/Specialist	5
Elementary Science Content/Curriculum Specialist	3
Director of Teaching and Learning	2
Secondary Science Coordinator	2
Coordinator of Science and Environmental Ed.	2
Elem./Middle Science Program Planner	2
Coordinator of District Technology	1
Coordinator of Instructional Support Services	1
Assistant Superintendent	1
District Level Supervisor	1
Assistant Supt. for Instruction	1
Senior Admin.	1
Senior Administrator K-5 Science	1
Supervisor, Secondary Science	1
Elementary Science Supervisor	1
STEM Administrator	1
Science Program Specialist	1
Curriculum Support Colleague-data and Instructional Technology	1
Science Curriculum Developer	1
Science Program Specialist	1
Principal	1
Teacher	1
Middle School Science Teacher	1
Secondary Science Resource Teacher	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>34</b>

Twenty out of 29 district contacts indicated they had met by phone or in-person with those who attended the NGSSS and another six contacts plan to meet in the future.

<b>Table 2 Follow-up Meetings</b>		
<b>Responses</b>	<b>Response Count</b>	<b>Response Percent</b>
Yes, we met	20	69%
No, we have not met	3	10%
We plan to meet in the future	6	21%

Additional comments included the following:

- They presented to teachers on our in-service day and will also present on district training days for Biology and 8th Grade teachers.
- Secondary presented their favorite activities on our in-service day. Our communication has been via email.
- No one was sent by our District.
- We were not able to attend.

District contacts were asked, “In hindsight, did you send the right person(s) to the NGSSS, to be able to enhance science education in your district?” The results shown in Table 3 show a majority (56%) believe they sent the right person(s) from their district.

<b>Table 3 NGSSS Attendees’ Ability to Enhance Science Education</b>		
<b>Responses</b>	<b>Response Count</b>	<b>Response Percent</b>
Yes	18	56%
Time will tell	10	31%
Not sure	3	10%
No	1	3%

While two district contacts reported they plan to take action regarding science education in their district, ten district contacts reported actions have already been taken since the NGSSS event and those actions are described below. (It should be noted that 28 respondents skipped this question.)

- Provided additional resources for science teachers. (n=3)
- Recommended use of CPALMS to science teachers. (n=3)
- Created a PLC for science teachers. (n=1)

- Scheduled PD day(s) for science teachers. (n=1)
- Vertical alignment mapping for curriculum. (n=1)
- Science Coach was hired. (n=1)

A large majority (72%) of district contacts reported they did not pay stipends to NGSSS attendees, while others paid teacher stipends as an incentive or due to contract requirements.

<b>Table 4 Teacher Stipends Paid</b>		
<b>Years</b>	<b>Response Count</b>	<b>Response Percent</b>
Yes, as required by contract	4	14%
Yes, as an incentive	4	14%
No	21	72%

Additional comments were as follows:

- Unsure
- No - I was told they were getting paid through DOE, and that is their expectation.

The timeframe to recruit staff to attend the NGSSS was short for the first year. District contacts were asked what length of time they would prefer to have for recruitment and the responses were nearly evenly divided, with slightly more respondents (n=12) asking for 3 months.

<b>Table 5 Recruitment Process for NGSSS</b>		
<b>Years</b>	<b>Response Count</b>	<b>Response Percent</b>
1 month	7	21.2%
2 months	7	21.2%
3 months	12	36.4%
More than 3 months	7	21.2%

In order to get an idea of future support from the district level for the NGSSS, respondents were asked if they thought their district would pay a registration fee for participants. The results in Table 6 show nearly equal numbers for both “no” and “yes.”

<b>Table 6</b>		
<b>District Support for Participant Registration Fee</b>		
<b>Responses</b>	<b>Response Count</b>	<b>Response Percent</b>
Yes	43%	14
No	57%	19

Additional comments were as follows:

- Not sure (n=2)
- \$100
- \$200
- \$250 per person.
- Speaking for secondary (7 - 12) only, less than \$50 per person.
- It depends on funding and if the district deems the training worthwhile.

### **District Contacts: Challenges Regarding NGSSS**

For future planning purposes, district contacts were asked to describe the “biggest challenge regarding the NGSSS.” Twenty-nine responses were categorized into five different topic areas.

#### **Teacher Recruitment/Commitment (n=9, 31%)**

- Last days of Summer was a tough time for teachers to come to an event with no stipend.
- Turnaround on recruitment.
- Giving up 3 days right before school started.
- Being away from home for 3 days.
- Finding the right teachers who were willing to attend.
- Shortage of qualified science teachers to send.
- Teacher commitment. They want to be paid for training during the summer.
- Making sure the people nominated actually attended. Too much lead time = opportunities to make other plans, change their minds.
- Timing. I had two back out at the last second. I think June is better.

#### **Registration Opportunities (n=7, 24%)**

- We had a key teacher drop out at the last minute, and we didn't have time to replace her.
- We did not have that many available slots for teachers.
- Only 1 teacher could attend when so many were interested and willing to go.
- The ability to substitute another name when the original teacher could not attend.
- Opportunity to attend.
- Limited number we could send and a conflict with local PD we had planned since April.

- My teachers did not get in, all travel has to be board approved and it was difficult to do that before the open registration started. Because of that I lost my 3 spots and my teachers were denied.

**General (n=6, 21%)**

- Time to teach the standards. Science always gets cut short in all grade levels.
- Pedagogy skills for high schools. Content for elementary & middle.
- Teachers understanding and effectively implementing standards based instruction.
- Creating the content and working with other team members at a distance and in a short time.
- Teachers truly understanding the intent of the standards so that students can show mastery of that benchmark.
- Getting and keeping certified teachers.

**Logistics (n=5, 17%)**

- The time each day ended.
- The USF paperwork.
- It was too close to the start of the school year.
- It occurred during our county's PD conference, so our science supervisors could not attend.
- The location (3 hours away.)

**Communication (n=2, 7%)**

- Communication was very last minute and difficult, instructions sent to my teachers were not shared with me so I had trouble supporting them.
- Getting information.

**District Contacts: Major Benefit of the NGSSS**

As a measure of interest, district contacts were asked to describe the “major benefit of the NGSSS for their district.” Twenty-eight responses were categorized into four topic areas.

**Knowledge Gains (n=11, 39%)**

- This was one of the best trainings I have ever been to!! I love the way it was structured, as well as the learning that took place.
- Increased standards awareness and knowledge.
- It re-emphasized what we have been providing to our teachers. 5E framework, importance of the item specifications when planning, hands-on learning.
- Immediate improvements to pacing guides and plans for activities and assessment. A renewed interest in science fair participation.
- Teacher came back with lots of knowledge and will be sharing with teachers at a PD.
- Getting insight to standards based instruction aligned to the EOC and SSA.
- More people aware of standards and identifying high flyers.
- Standards based instructional help.
- Teachers gained content knowledge, and common message was reinforced.

- Focus on the 5 E model and standard based instruction.
- Digging deeper into Science Standards, strategies and concepts.

**Resources/Activities (n=7, 25%)**

- Protocols, hands-on activities, literacy activities we will implement in PD.
- Many great resources, collaboration, new ideas, looking at standards.
- Additional resources.
- Resources for standards-aligned rigorous student tasks (lessons, activities, questions)
- The fabulous hands on resources.
- Education and resources, collaboration with other districts.
- Organization of teaching activities within the scope and sequence.

**Networking/Collaboration (n=6, 22%)**

- My teachers were able to collaborate with teachers from other districts.
- Teachers collaborating with others and getting additional resources.
- Allow more teacher leaders to share information.
- Improving collaboration and standards based instruction.
- Networking.
- All the activities that teachers were able to return and share.

**General (n=4, 14%)**

- Still evaluating, but looking forward to sharing all of the information.
- Time will tell - we have PD planned.
- Structure.
- The teachers got to hear from experts in the field of science education.

**District Contacts: Additional Comments to T4A Staff**

The last survey question was designed to collect any additional information district contacts wanted to provide to T4A staff. The sixteen comments were either a compliment, a general statement, or suggestions for the future.

**Compliments (n=8, 50%)**

- Thank you for this valuable training.
- My science lead teachers came back really excited and full of new ideas for instructional strategies. Listening to the conversation, I heard a great deal more discussion about using hands-on activities to introduce or teach science concept instead of lectures and PowerPoints.
- We all appreciate your willingness to support science education. I know that the process has been challenging for all involved (including me), but it was well worth it!
- Great job putting on this event. The feedback from the teachers was outstanding.
- Feedback-Great symposium.
- You guys did a fantastic job and spent the Title IV funds very wisely!
- Thank you for this experience.

- Please provide dates earlier. Thank you so much for providing this amazing PD opportunity. Our teachers raved about it and still are so excited they were selected to attend.

**Suggestions for the Future (n=5, 31%)**

- Feedback from our teachers who attended: A shorter day by reducing the break time. Letting teachers leave for lunch (duty free). More hands-on activities.
- Allowing for more teachers to participate would be great, maybe if more sites were offered, it wouldn't require hotel and travel and could cut down on costs and allow more to attend. I am excited and thankful the state started this and is supporting teachers with PD.
- The staff I worked with at the FLDOE has been flexible, organized, and just completely amazing. There needs to be some criteria for facilitators in order to be recruited or maybe a short training to ensure professionalism.
- I hope that in the future we can discuss specific standards that are less clearly described in the test item specs regarding content limits. As a county with common assessments for Biology teachers, we occasionally struggle with interpretation of content limits for certain standards.
- This training should be part of the FASS meeting. Every supervisor should have been there this summer! We all need this type of training in our districts. Instead of competing against other districts, we should be doing things like this to share and build each other up as a state to compete against other states. I was truly impressed by the professionalism, knowledge, and preparedness of the presenters. I hope this is done again and would love to participate in either planning, presenting and/or participating. I cannot wait to share all of this knowledge with my teachers! I only wish there were a way to attend all three sessions (5, 8, and Bio)!

**General Comments (n=3, 19%)**

- No, but we will be talking about Title IV in future meetings.
- Reimbursement procedures were complicated and confusing. But I think you know that and already have plans to fix it.
- I was a content writer and reviewer, but not a facilitator and I did not attend any sessions. Communication is the largest point I can stress. It was very delayed, and I didn't get everything that was sent to participants. Also, we were under the impression that we should be sending our "rock star" teacher leaders who could share PD upon return. My understanding is that message was not heard across the state equally, so my teachers were often feeling way ahead of the others and were frustrated with the pacing being slow.

Overall, district contacts were satisfied with the NGSSS and this survey offered “food for thought” in the planning process for future events.

## NGSSS Partner Survey Results

A survey request was sent to those who served as partners to the NGSSS. The list below shows the type of partners who responded to the survey.

- Vendor (n=4)
- FDOE Personnel (n=1)
- Professional Organizations (n=1)
- Grant support (n=1)
- NEFEC Staff (n=1)
- State Science and Engineering Fair of Florida (n=1)
- CPALMS (n=1)

When asked if the support they received from T4A staff and NGSSS support staff met their expectations, the results showed nearly all reported the support “exceeded expectations.”

<b>Table 7 Rating Scores for Support for Partners</b>		
<b>Responses</b>	<b>Met Expectations</b>	<b>Exceeded Expectations</b>
Support from T4A staff	1	10
Support from NGSSS support staff	0	11
Overall experience with NGSSS	0	11

Additional comments included the following:

- Working with ALL the dedicated people for this program was outstanding.
- PJ Duncan’s vision and leadership on this were outstanding.
- Absolutely one of the best seminars, symposiums, meetings, whatever you choose to call it, that I have been associated with on the State Level.
- I left the one planning meeting and north and central symposia with a renewed sense of optimism about science teaching and learning in Florida. Planners, group leaders, DOE support, and coordination were wonderful.

Seven out of eleven partners reported they “definitely” felt like a valuable member of the NGSSS event and one reported they felt “somewhat” valuable to the event. Three others offered the following comments.

- I appreciate the opportunity to work with the science educator leaders in Florida.
- We felt as if we were a part of the staff and team, more-so than "just" a vendor.
- Definitely. I had opportunities to teach and learn throughout the process. Networking with others was a valuable and rewarding experience.

## Partners: Challenges Regarding NGSSS

Six partners provided a description of the challenges they faced regarding the NGSSS.

- We could technically support teachers from our service area. PJ came up with a good approach, but we can fine tune next year.
- Just the logistics of trying to be at two places at once :) Would have liked to have a tad bit more time to share our work.
- Challenges were very few, the biggest obstacle we encountered was having enough time, during breaks and lunch, to speak with everyone as long as they would have liked us to.
- The length of the instructional day was long, though I fully understand the necessity. (I was impressed with the stamina of the group leaders and facilitator that I worked with.) As with any group activity, whether with students or adults, some individuals seem to dominate discussions and monopolize group dynamics. It takes remarkable leadership skills to make sure everyone has an opportunity to participate.
- Splitting the team between 2 venues the 2nd week.
- It would be great if we can have CPALMS sessions instead of a table. Participants only had few minutes and it was apparent that there was a lot of interest in learning more about CPALMS and what we have for teachers/students.

## Partners: Suggestions for Improvement

Seven partners provided suggestions for improvement.

- I hope you keep doing it!
- Preplanning teacher media recognition in each county. We did a major effort with Keystone and could have done more this time.
- Possibly opening up breakout sessions for presentations.
- Perhaps having more Principals at the meeting since they are the decision makers most times. Looking forward to it!
- Not really, just use this year's program and build on that by adding more participants, especially Science Supervisors, and Coordinators and by teaching all the participants how to more readily apply for the Funds.
- I know this is one of the most critical questions for planners. Unfortunately, I have little to offer in suggestions for improvement as this was one of the finest professional learning experiences I have ever been part of.
- Reimburse districts for lodging. Order materials earlier to get packing done. Create checklist to load trucks. Include an office supply box for the site.

## Partners: Major Benefits of Involvement with NGSSS

Nine partners provided a description of the major benefits to being involved with NGSSS.

- Networking with science leadership.
- Learning from each other and sharing experiences!

- The event was comprised of like-minded educators with the goal of improving their craft.
- I believe that more teachers in our state are more aware of instructional strategies that will effectively help our students embrace the content and discoveries that science offers. Networking with others about successes and challenges was also most helpful. The teamwork and synergy that produced such a high quality experience for teachers.
- Helps support strong science education across our whole enterprise. Great visibility with the education community.
- Great way to connect to leaders in the schools. Able to identify schools looking for an evidence-based nutrition program and hopefully navigate the logistics for connecting them to their Title IV Part A District colleague.
- We were able to present our "hands on" STEM related rocks and minerals program to so many Science Supervisors, Coordinators and Teachers and they got to experience first - hand exactly what we bring to the students when they perform our On Site Educational Experience.
- Having access to teachers in particular from rural districts around the state.
- Having the shirts for the team. The wonderful feedback from the happy customers.

Overall, the partners expressed high levels of satisfaction with the NGSSS, as represented by the fact that all eleven partners reported they would partner with the NGSSS again in the future.

## NGSSS Support Staff Survey Results

All those who participated in the NGSSS as either a facilitator, FDOE staff, or as a volunteer, were sent a survey request. The survey was designed to capture opinions regarding the format and content of the NGSSS. The results in Table 8 show the number of responses received from each type of support staff.

<b>Table 8 Support Staff Categories of Respondents</b>		
<b>Years</b>	<b>Response Count</b>	<b>Response Percent</b>
Facilitator	14	54%
FDOE Staff	9	35%
Volunteer	3	11%
<b>Total</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Support Staff: Schedule for NGSSS

The event was held for three days this year. Ten out of 26 respondents thought three days was good, they just wanted shorter hours. Seven respondents thought it was “just right.”

<b>Table 9 Schedule for the NGSSS</b>		
<b>Responses</b>	<b>Response Count</b>	<b>Response Percent</b>
Shorter hours, 3 days	10	39%
Just right	7	27%
Shorter hours, 4 days	6	23%
Other (please specify)	3	11%
<b>Total</b>		

Additional comments were as follows:

- I suggest limiting the instructional contact to 300 minutes each day. The number of should be determined by the content design team.
- 2 days from 8-5. Many participants were antsy to get out on the 3rd day, and many were tired from 2 8-5 sessions. Some participants left early on day 3, and did not complete the 3rd session. One did not come at all.
- Suggestion: shorter lunch period and an earlier release on the last day.

The lunchtime period was scheduled for one hour this year. Nearly an equal number thought one hour was good, while the other half suggested a half hour lunch would be their preference.

<b>Table 10 Lunchtime Preferences</b>		
<b>Responses</b>	<b>Response Count</b>	<b>Response Percent</b>
Yes, 1 hour lunch	12	44.4%
No ½ hour	11	40.7%
Other (please specify)	4	14.8%

Additional comments were as follows:

- 45 minutes
- Depends on length of the day
- 1/2 hour is fine as long as the length of the day is shorter.
- If we go to shorter days then I think a shorter lunch would work. If we are together the same then keep lunch an hour.

**Should a presentation be given during lunch?**

The majority said, “No.”

**Yes = 22% No = 78%**

Additional comments were as follows:

- Short ones.
- Does not matter.
- Not if lunch is ½ hour.
- Depends on the length of the day. If an hour, a short presentation-up to 15 minutes max.
- This may need to stay in order to draw sponsors. I don't think it is a big issue as long as held to time constraints.
- I understand those sponsoring want to speak, but our participants just had a whole morning of that even when we had them collaborate. I think it was overwhelming.
- If lunch is 30 minutes, no presentations during lunch. If lunch remains one hour, presentations during lunch is acceptable.

**Should breaks be required at specific times for all participants?**

The majority said, “No.”

**Yes = 30% No = 70%**

Additional “no” comments:

- Breaks should be provided at a time most convenient for instruction, if possible. The breaks might not coincide with the needs of elementary, middle, and Biology.
- As a facilitator, sometimes the breaks fell at a very inconvenient time. If we had a window of time, that would be better.
- I think a window of time is good so that bathrooms don't end up with lines.

- I would say that it is ok to have one break required, but not all of them.

Additional “yes” comments:

- Yes, it helps with the flow of the day and gives facilitators time to touch base with one another when needed.
- Having breaks at different times might encourage people to get out of current sessions, and hang out while teaching is going on.

**Were you satisfied with snacks and drinks provided during the breaks?**

All respondents said, “Yes.”

**Yes = 100% No = 0%**

Additional ideas were as follows:

- One idea is to have the hosting school do a fundraiser and have a snack stand. Participants could purchase snacks and beverages (soda, coffee, etc.).
- Sodas would be a nice addition.

**Support Staff: Pace and Timing of NGSSS**

This year the NGSSS in Bay County was scheduled for July 24-26 and the two other NGSSS in Flagler and Lee counties were scheduled for July 30-August 1, due to the tight timeframe for planning. Respondents were asked to rank order a two week period for next year and the period with the highest ranking score was June 15-June 30.

<b>Table 11 Ranking for NGSSS Weeks</b>	
<b>Responses</b>	<b>Weighted Ranking Score</b>
June 1-June 15	2.52
June 15-June 30	3.28
July 15-July 31	2.83
August 1-August 5	1.45

All 100% of respondents thought the pace of the NGSSS was “just right.”

<b>Table 12 Pace of NGSSS Schedule</b>		
<b>Responses</b>	<b>Response Count</b>	<b>Response Percent</b>
Needs to be faster	0	0%
Just right	25	100%
Needs to be slower	0	0%

## Support Staff: Format of NGSSS

Time for collaboration was an important to the stakeholders of the NGSSS. When asked if, participants needed more time for collaboration, the majority of respondents thought the format was “just right.”

<b>Responses</b>	<b>Response Count</b>	<b>Response Percent</b>
More time	10	40%
Just right	15	60%
Less time	0	0%

Additional comments were as follows:

- Thought it was a natural part of the day.
- They wanted more time...but it was to work with teachers at their school, not to work with other teachers.
- It was perfect in our sessions. Content reviewers should look out and make sure this time is built into the workshop. It could be added to the rubric for explicit noting.

### **If possible next year, would you recommend groups be differentiated by level of teaching experience?**

A large majority said, “No.”

**Yes = 30% No = 70%**

Additional comments were as follows:

- Many teachers who taught many years didn't feel like they had to participate in the work and do some of the activities.
- This is a tough call. Even experienced teachers may lack experience in science, STEM content/pedagogy. We could offer a level for novice and one for science leaders. This may guide participants to tracks.
- Perhaps and also consider grade levels taught.
- I think this would depend on the content being presented. I enjoyed the conversations between participants with more and fewer experience. Also, think this would be a difficult measure to determine.
- No. New and veteran teachers benefit from each other.

The majority of NGSSS participants were veterans in education with more than 10 years of experience. **Listed below are comments providing additional feedback regarding the experience level of participants.**

**Support for Mixed Levels (n=10, 56%)**

- It would be good to have as mixed a grouping as possible.
- All levels appropriate.
- I think some variability in experience is important. We can always learn from new and experienced alike.
- Some of the veteran teachers did provide some insight into the activities, or how they may modify it based on the needs of their students, however, some felt like they knew a lot of these strategies, so going through some of these strategies was redundant.
- I think it would be great to have mentor-mentee teams attending--then they have someone to work with to implement. The vets get a booster shot of enthusiasm and the newbies have the voice of experience to help them.
- Again, I found even veteran teachers lacked confidence in content. Also, it should be noted that some said they were well versed, but found some challenges when presented with certain tasks. We are all forever learning:)
- Should be more diverse to learn from each other.
- I think the level of experience led to lots of collaboration and sharing of ideas. This was true especially for what has worked and hasn't worked in an actual classroom setting.
- Even though they had that level of teaching experience, it was definitely needed for them! Their knowledge level was lacking in both pedagogy and content. I think that we should allow any teacher who feels like they need the training, attend.
- I believe a mix of participants would be beneficial.

**Support for New Teachers (n=5, 28%)**

- If we are doing another "year 1" it should be teachers with little experience.
- We geared the training more for new teachers or those needing content support and many teachers did not need this.
- Either we help those that are novices, or we bring in creative new ideas. The lessons were really the tried and true, which experienced teachers already were familiar with. We need to know the audience before we can design creative, engaging, and on target activities.
- I think many schools wanted to send veterans that are also school leaders to bring back the information. But I think new teachers appreciated the insight.
- I thought it was a great mix because experienced could share with inexperienced.

**Other Suggestions (n=3, 16%)**

- The teachers selected were leaders in their district, not the new teachers we were expecting. Could there be 2 different tracks?
- The experienced educators provided a rich experience in collaboration with the newer teachers. However, they probably did not gain as much. Grouping by ability and teaching experience would help in this case.
- Interesting. If this is the case, then they should be REQUIRED to provide evidence of how they are communicating their learning to their colleagues back home.

**If possible next year, would you recommend breakout sessions where middle level teachers could choose a Life Science, Physical Science, or Earth Science track?**

The majority said “Yes.”

**Yes = 69% No = 31%**

**Additional comments were as follows:**

- No, because the content and processes of all three disciplines, are important and they are evaluated.
- Not sure what you mean by "middle level"?
- I'm elementary.
- Tough call. We still are split through the state when it comes to content specific and comprehensive at the M/S level.
- Possibly, however my district is comprehensive in the middle grades.
- I think incorporating more choice for participants is always great! Would be more difficult on the developers and staff to prepare materials and determine where everyone will go.
- That's a good idea, but would require ENORMOUS amounts of work on the part of the middle school content development team. In addition, teachers tend to choose topics they LIKE versus topics they NEED.

**Do you think it is a good idea to provide a Google folder/classroom during the event? to foster additional collaboration?**

A large majority said, “Yes.”

**Yes = 89% No = 11%**

**Additional comments were as follows:**

- Only if they are using it AS we are working with them. For example, we complete a unit, then they all have a digital chat about how they could use it or other ideas. Then everyone has a record of it for afterwards.
- Tough call, collaboration is great, but resources shouldn't be shared unless they are vetted for accuracy. It could spread more misconceptions.
- I think this would depend on how content developers and facilitators would use this resource.
- Yes, but communicate this ahead of time so teachers whose work email is not Google based can create a free Gmail account.

**Do you think it is a good idea to provide more strategies for using technology?**

A large majority said, “Yes.”

**Yes = 81% No = 19%**

**Additional comments were as follows:**

- If a district is not capable to have technology in the classroom, it may not be a good idea. Therefore, having an even split would be more beneficial.
- This depends on district needs. The biggest request related to student chrome book applications.

- Not all schools are one to one so a balance between analog and digital is perfect.
- If it correlates to the content being facilitated, then absolutely. I also think incorporating technology strategies for engagement is great.
- Only if it's free to all. So much variation in the levels of technology available in districts.

### **Would you like to see a PLC created for NGSSS participants?**

A large majority said, "Yes."      **Yes = 85%    No = 15%**

#### **Additional comments were as follows:**

- Good idea. PLCs could be initiated at state and district levels as more and more participants are trained.
- I think it would be difficult if you have a PLC for all the NGSSS participants due to the different levels of teachers.(i.e. elementary, middle and biology.) .
- It might be very cumbersome to have so many in it.
- Yes, but who would facilitate groups? This would be a HUGE undertaking if folks are overseeing multiple groups.
- Another great idea. But who will monitor/contribute?

### **Support Staff: Suggestions for Improvement of NGSSS Promotion and Recruitment**

Respondents were asked if they had suggestions for how promotion of the NGSSS and recruitment of participants could be improved. Sixteen responses were received and they were categorized into three topic areas.

#### **Recruitment (n=7, 44%)**

- Perhaps a specification that a district needs to send both a new and veteran teacher?
- Teachers who are new to teaching science, or w/in the first two or three years should be targeted.
- Utilize year one participants.
- Love the way the state handled it. Like how our district had participants submit an application so we knew who really wanted to be there.
- Giveaways or stipend if possible.
- Please leave it in the hands of the district to select their participants.
- Require a standardized procedure to be followed by all districts for recruiting/nominating teachers. Some had specific procedures whereas others had a free for all.

#### **Promotion (n=7, 44%)**

- As part of the Bureau of School Improvement, I would love to assist in recruitment from our DA schools as an opportunity to build content knowledge of those instructing in our low-performing schools. I think this would be an ideal collaboration between Bureaus!

- More direct information provided to teachers.
- I believe the model used this year was ideal. I would more broadly publicize with principals so that they could send school personnel too.
- Announced at FOIL and FASS, another email from Chancellor, advertising campaign through communications specialist in each district.
- In school districts, more time, not just by invitation.
- More advanced notice so teachers can plan around vacation and other professional development. AVID summer institutes are Tampa June 25-28 and Orlando July 1-3. This might overlap with those wanting to go to that training.
- Updated communication with those signed up to remind them as well as let them know any details. Even if it is a just a reminder it would be great to keep it in front of them so they know what a big deal it is! PR PR PR

### **General Comments (n=2, 12%)**

- I was not as involved in this process last year, so I do not have comments.
- They need to keep the negative Nellie's at home!

### **Support Staff: Additional Comments**

Respondents were given an option to provide any additional comments and seven offered compliments and four offered suggestions for improvement.

### **Compliments (n=7, 64%)**

- Loved being part of the process and I hope that I get to continue to work on this in the future. I think this was incredibly valuable for the teachers we worked with and it would be great to see it expand!
- Thanks for providing the training opportunity for our teachers.
- Michelle Gaines is AWESOME!
- This was a terrific 1st experience! This met a lot of needs of teachers.
- I think the NGSSS was a great event and have heard wonderful comments about it from various participants. I have even heard comments about how this needs to be created for mathematics and other subject areas.
- The time and planning that went into the PD was clear. Very well structured with a clear purpose.
- I loved this program. It was awesome to meet fellow science nerds! Thank you for involving me!

### **Suggestions for Improvement (n=4, 36%)**

- Targeting new teachers in the field may be a lot more effective. They would be able to integrate these skills in their classrooms, and their follow-up would be a lot more meaningful as they put these skills / lesson in their "tool box".
- Facilitators did not get much opportunity to review the content. It was not yet up to standard by the time we received it and we weren't really allowed to make any significant changes. The facilitators should have some input in what will be presented so we can have some experience with the content.
- Please reinforce the need for facilitators to stick with the content developers' vision. The state spent thousands developing it.

- Something for ESE points would be fantastic!

Overall, for most of the survey questions, a large majority of respondents either agreed or disagreed with questions regarding timing and format of the NGSSS. For the NGSSS schedule, mixed results were found. These survey results from NGSSS support staff can provide valuable information for planning purposes.

**In conclusion, New Directions, New Ideas, LLC would like to thank the staff from the FDOE and all those who responded to the survey for their assistance with the evaluation process and to also thank you for having the opportunity to evaluate the impact of the NGSSS.**

If you have any questions about this report, please call Shannon at (850) 228-0973 or send an email to [Shannon@newdirectionsnewideas.com](mailto:Shannon@newdirectionsnewideas.com).