

# On-Demand Modules: Technology as a tool to Personalize Professional Development

Valerie Simmons

Brian Nethero

Ryen Borden

Sanford Inspire Program

Arizona State University

USA

[Valerie.Simmons@asu.edu](mailto:Valerie.Simmons@asu.edu)

[Brian.Nethero@asu.edu](mailto:Brian.Nethero@asu.edu)

[Ryen.Borden@asu.edu](mailto:Ryen.Borden@asu.edu)

**Abstract:** Personalized professional development does not have to be cumbersome with the addition of On-Demand Modules to a support and professional growth program. On-Demand Modules are free, research-based, online professional development that can be used to support teachers and teacher candidates. This showcase will provide space to 1) learn about On-Demand Module creation, 2) explore On-Demand Modules, 3) discuss how they may be used in your setting, and 4) brainstorm future topical design directions most needed.

## Corporate Showcase Proposal

Teacher preparation and evaluation is a regularly changing environment as both public opinion and government regulation move to hold not only colleges of education but also districts increasingly accountable for the quality of teacher they produce, hire and retain. Unfortunately, because of a lack of resources or time, professional development programs are often under-evaluated and one-size-fits-all. However, with advances in technology and online learning systems, the call for personalized professional development is being addressed through the creation of On-Demand Modules.

The purpose of this session is to provide space for attendees to consider how they might change the ways in which they have traditionally supported teachers and teacher candidates. The presentation will be informative with the first part covering what an On-Demand Module is and how it was created. It is essential for participants to have a basic understanding of the care and effort that goes into the research and creation of a module. Participants will then have space to explore On-Demand Modules and also engage with peers and presenters as they work through the module. After this, participants will be prompted to discuss a few key questions with presenters as feedback for future topical directions. Discussion prompts will include: how did you feel about the experience, what did you like or not like, how does this experience compare to what you currently use to support teachers and what topics would your program/school appreciate as support for teachers/teacher candidates. Finally, we will wrap up the session with a Poll Anywhere poll so we can follow-up with participants who would like more information.

Participants will:

- Receive a brief overview of the On-Demand Module creation process
- Access and explore an On-Demand Module and its components
- Debrief how the experience compares to their current professional development program
- Provide feedback on future topical development

## Supporting Research

CAEP. (2013, August 29). CAEP Accreditation Standards, as approved by the CAEP Board of Directors. Council for the Accreditation of Educator

Preparation. [http://caepnet.files.wordpress.com/2013/09/final\\_board\\_approved1.pdf](http://caepnet.files.wordpress.com/2013/09/final_board_approved1.pdf)

Fullan, M. G. (1992). *Successful School Improvement: The Implementation Perspective and Beyond. Modern Educational Thought*. Open University Press, 1900 Frost Road, Suite 101, Bristol, PA 19007-1598 (paperback: ISBN-0-335-09575-5; hardcover: ISBN-0-335-09576-3).

- Garet, M.S., Porter, A.C., Desimone, L., Birman, B.F., & Yoon, K.S. (2001). What makes professional development effective? Results from a national sample of teachers. *American Educational Research Journal*, 38(4), 915-945.
- Guskey, T.R. (1997). Research needs to link professional development and student learning. *Journal of Staff Development*, 18(2), 36-40
- Guskey, T.R., & Sparks, D. (1996). Exploring the relationship between staff development and improvements in student learning. *Journal of Staff Development*, 17(4), 34-38.
- Hill, H.C. (2009). Fixing teacher professional development. *Phi Delta Kappan*, March 2009, 470-476.
- Karabenick, S. A., & Conley, A. (2011). *Teacher Motivation for Professional Development*. Math and Science Partnership - Motivation Assessment Program, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109
- Kearney, M., Schuck, S., Burden, K., & Aubusson, P. (2012). Viewing mobile learning from a pedagogical perspective. *Research in Learning Technology*, 20.
- Kirkpatrick, D. L. (1994). *Evaluating training programs: the four levels*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler
- Loucks-Horsley, S., Stiles, K. E., Mundry, M. S. E., Love, N. B., & Hewson, P. W. (2009). *Designing professional development for teachers of science and mathematics*. Corwin Press.
- Naugle, K., Naugle, L., & Naugle, R. (2000). Kirkpatrick's evaluation model as a means of evaluating teacher performance. *Education*, 121(1), 135-144.
- Pachler, N., Bachmair, B. & Cook, J. (2009) *Mobile learning: structures, agency, practices*. Springer, New York.
- Traxler, J. (2007) 'Current state of mobile learning', *International Review on Research in Open and Distance learning*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 1\_10.
- The White House, (2014). *FACT SHEET: Taking Action to Improve Teacher Preparation*.