

Kathryn Orr

Differentiation Development Proposal

Michigan State University

### **Idea**

This program plan is for a workshop to help teachers learn how to incorporate a differentiated approach to help students who did not pass the first administration of the required Texas STAAR tests in the 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> grades at my current school. Students in Texas take STAAR tests in Math, Reading, Science, and Writing in the 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> grades to determine their readiness for the following year. If they do not pass the first administration, they need to take a second administration in order to advance without summer school.

The plan for this program was developed from past quantitative passage rates, as well as a communicated need from the current principal. Ronald Cervero and Arthur Wilson stated that a “needs-assessment should always be based on collecting empirical evidence” (2006, pg. 108). Therefore, I also observed other teachers in my school to determine their approach to tutorials. Since many within the school setting have expressed desire for proper training and resources regarding differentiation, I have decided to plan a program that will help my coworkers better utilize the benefits of differentiated instruction.

### **Support**

In order to move ahead with the planning of this program, support should be established from the current principal and the classroom teachers. The program’s presentation is intended to be during a mandatory in-house professional development day in August 2019 prior to the start of the school year, so attendance will be easily achieved.

#### **Immediate Supervisor Support**

The first level of support that needs to be established is the current principal, since “support from participants’ immediate supervisors is crucial at all points in the educational cycle” (Caffarella & Daffron, 2013, pg. 110). This support will not be difficult based on his

communicated need regarding training staff on this matter. The principal's promotion of the workshop will be encouraged due to anticipated mixed responses from intended participants.

### **Intended Participants Support**

Considering the culture and size of the school, the most beneficial way to obtain support from classroom teachers is through verbal communication, since they tend to value verbal interactions more than written communication. There are also only thirteen classroom teachers at the school, so attempting to gain support for the proposal over lunch, prior to staff meetings, or in passing in the hallway would be easily accomplished. Support from all may be difficult to achieve based on the fact that some have previously expressed disdain at suggestions of incorporating new methods of teaching. This is also the reason for face-to-face communication and offering to incorporate them into the planning process.

## **Internal Environment**

### **Goals and Values Subsystem**

The school in which the workshop will take place is a small 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> grade elementary school in southern Texas. Looking at the "goals and values subsystem" (Rothwell & Cookson, 1997, pg. 109), a shared goal amongst staff is striving for continual growth and improvement. Since the workshop is intended to promote a beneficial method of instruction that ideally would enhance teaching and learning, interest for the program should be high.

### **Technical Subsystem**

However, after comparing that subsystem to the "technical subsystem" (Rothwell & Cookson, 1997, pg. 109) of the school, there seems to be a discrepancy between the goals of the organization and of individual teachers. The range of teaching experience at my school is 2-27 years. Due to this wide range, some teachers are eager to learn and grow their craft, and some are

set in their ways and looking to retire. The disinterest amongst participants nearing the end of their career needs to be taken into account moving forward with the program.

### **Psychosocial Subsystem**

Finally, after analyzing the “psychosocial subsystem” (Rothwell & Cookson, 1997, pg. 110), it can be determined that because teachers share students, a problem that may arise will be partner teachers not collaborating properly in order to fully utilize the benefits of differentiation. This will hinder the attainment of the workshop goals if not anticipated properly.

### **External Environment**

In order to fully prepare the differentiation program, I also analyzed the political and economic environments in which the program is being planned and executed, since those influences will impact the program the most (Boyle, 1981; Caffarella & Daffron, 2013).

#### **Political Environment**

One aspect of the external environment that will benefit the program is the recent push for more differentiation in classrooms from the Texas Department of Education. In the most updated version of the rubric for evaluating teachers in Texas, there is an entire strand encouraging the use of differentiation (T-TESS Rubric, 2016).

#### **Economic Environment**

While the current political environment will benefit the program, the current economic environment of the district will not. Hurricane Harvey recently impacted the area and there is not a lot of money remaining in the budget for professional development. Teachers also do not have a lot of extra money to spend on resources that differentiation sometimes requires. Therefore, planning a cost-friendly program, as well as providing affordable resources, will be critical to the program’s success and lasting impact.

### **Aims/Goals**

The goal of the professional development workshop on differentiation is to provide classroom teachers the resources and knowledge to effectively incorporate differentiated instruction in classrooms between the first and second administration of the STAAR tests. Teachers should leave the workshop with resources to use when planning differentiated instruction, as well as with examples of how other teachers have utilized differentiation. Teachers participating will also be given a structured time during the workshop to plan a way to incorporate differentiation into one specific aspect of their student intervention plan using tools and resources provided to them by the workshop presenter.

### **Goodness of Fit**

Since teachers are accustomed to going through professional development workshops to enhance their abilities, the workshop context is the most appropriate way to put forth a plan for developing the skills of planning and utilizing differentiated instruction between the first and second administrations of the STAAR tests. The school where this program will take place has a low passage rate for the second administration of the STAAR tests, indicating that some help planning for targeted student needs is necessary. Therefore, the focus of the workshop fits well with the specific needs of the school.

Since this program is intended to benefit a specific set of teachers at the school, utilizing them in the creation of the goals and objectives of the program will bring in the human element of planning and offset negative moods regarding new teaching methods (Caffarella & Daffron, 2013). While a formal needs assessment will not be utilized, a combination of observations, interviews, and job/task analysis will be the methods of identifying needs and creating goals (Caffarella & Daffron, 2013). Obtaining student input as to how they learn best and what they

believe would be beneficial between the two administrations of the STAAR tests would significantly help the program also, since “planners should bring as many different stakeholders as possible to the table to assess educational needs” (Cervero & Wilson, 2006, pg. 113).

Since we will be operating under the traditionalist perspective by identifying felt needs, a committee made up of teachers at the school and the principal will meet to qualitatively determine which needs must be addressed in the program (Pearce, 1998; Caffarella & Daffron, 2013). From there, specific objectives will be created in order to best meet the identified needs and an evaluation of the achievement of the needs will be established. This process will be the most efficient, easily achievable, and most beneficial for the program within the current context.

### **Statement of Goals and Objectives**

In Texas, students are measured each year on their readiness for the next grade by taking standardized assessments, STAAR tests, that give two scores: the number of correct answers and the growth exhibited from the previous year’s test. The two weeks between obtaining the results of the first administration and administering the second round is intended to tutor students that did not pass initially. The participating school district does not have a high passage or growth rate between the two administrations of the tests.

Therefore, the purpose of this program is to increase student growth and pass rates between the first two administrations of the STAAR tests by equipping teachers with knowledge and skills that will enhance the quality and increase the quantity of differentiated instruction they offer in their classrooms. Using Mager’s approach (Sork, 1998), three learning objectives were created: classroom teachers will analyze data from already administered mock STAAR tests in a case study manor and determine specific struggles and strengths for each student based on each TEK; group students based on TEK-

based struggles and strengths; and plan specific ways/times to re-teach, reinforce, or enrich each TEK for each group, depending on need.

### **Format**

This program will be presented as a workshop for classroom teachers in one southern Texas elementary school. It will be on a volunteer basis in order to effectively evaluate the program against those not participating in the program. The initial workshop will be presented during a built-in professional development day in February after initial mock STAAR tests are administered to students so that actual data can be used in a case-study manor. Workshops are ideal for this program because the “emphasis is placed on participants being able to use what they have learned in different situations such as in their workplaces” (Caffarella & Daffron, 2013, pg. 263).

Then, between obtaining the first round results and administering the second round of testing, participants will engage in weekly professional development meetings to discuss their effectiveness of planning and implementing differentiation into their tutorials, as well as reevaluate and adjust ineffective methods attempted. This “continued support for the new way of doing things back in the home or work situation” (Fellenz, 1998, pg. 362) is helpful to ensuring the transfer of learning from the initial workshop.

### **Instructional Plans**

The initial workshop will begin as an interactive lecture for the instructor to demonstrate locations of student data, as well as share research regarding the benefits of differentiation in STAAR tutorials and valuable resources that can be used. Prior to the workshop, participating teachers will be pre-assessed in order to understand the typical approach taken between STAAR administrations and the quantity of differentiation

occurring. This will be done in order to have “the instructors ...know what the participants know and can do and how they feel about the content to be presented” (Caffarella & Daffron, 2013, pg. 193). Based on the participants’ pre-assessment, the length and detail of this portion will be adjusted. Participants will be encouraged to follow along to a pre-shared presentation on their individual computers.

During the presentation, the instructor will introduce teachers to various methods of instruction that lend themselves to differentiation. Some examples of these methods are incorporating learning centers for each subject, assessing students using a variety of question styles and difficulty depending on individual instructional levels, and altering existing assignments to increase comprehension among students with language barriers or learning disabilities. Participants will also be encouraged to share any methods that they currently use to differentiate with other participants.

Then, teachers will engage in a case study using data from their students’ mock STAAR tests. Utilizing actual data will make the content of the program more relevant and, hopefully, increase motivation. Time will also be given to work independently to group and plan differentiated learning plans for students since it is important to provide guided, supported time in the work day to practice new skills. In order to provide adequate support to participants, various models of differentiated lesson plans created by other teachers will be shared as examples of how to incorporate differentiation. The instructor will also be circulating the room offering guidance and support throughout the work time.

Finally, once initial scores are obtained, participants will meet up again to begin grouping students based on struggle and planning a differentiated tutorial approach obtained in the first workshop. From there, teachers will be asked to keep a journal to



document their planning and implementation. This journal will be a reflective exercise for participants to monitor their own progress, as well as hold them accountable for transferring the learning from the workshop to their work environment. Participants will be asked to share from this journal during the weekly meetings, but the journal will not formally be turned over for review. In this way, participants are encouraged to come to the weekly meetings prepared with notes regarding their progress.

### **Resources**

For this program, the main resources will be ones already used and provided by the school district. The program will take place in the school's library, which is equipped with a projection monitor to display a computer screen to participants. A presentation will be projected to participants during the lecture portion of the program and an anchor chart will be used showing evidence of differentiation working to bridge learning gaps. Along with that, hands-on tools for tested subjects will be discussed and displayed as options for differentiated instruction, including fraction strips, a four square for writing, base-10 blocks, science models, and vocab flashcards. Including all of these specific resources in the presentation will require looking into and providing appropriate copyright permissions prior to the program (Caffarella & Daffron, 1993).

Another "real [resource]" (Caffarella & Daffron, 1993, pg. 192) that each participant will need is their school-issued laptop in order to access the program's presentation and required district websites, like DMAC, for data analysis (Software for Texas Educators-DMAC Solutions-Region 7 Education). They will also be asked to bring required curriculum, a list of current teaching materials, and a list of ways they already differentiate. After the

program, participants will be asked to use existing resources to finish planning and examine the goodness of fit of the new resources presented in the program.

### **Transfer of Learning**

The learning from the workshop should be applied in between receiving scores from the first round of testing and the second administration of the STAAR tests. During the planning stages in this time period, participants will be asked to group their students and plan differentiated tutorial approaches using methods and strategies that should have been learned in the initial workshop. Adequate application of learning will be apparent if participants are able to incorporate the new resources and teaching methods into their existing classroom environments and use actual student data to tailor instruction to individual student needs. This will hopefully lead to an eventual increase in student growth rates and a reduction of learning gaps in the second round STAAR scores.

Throughout this process, participants will be keeping a learning journal, which will help the instructor evaluate future necessary actions to increase success of the differentiated planning (Caffarella & Daffron, 1993). The learning journal being a way to hold participants accountable for taking action following the workshop will hopefully raise motivation to not fall back on familiar tutorials. The campus administrator will also be asked to monitor and check-in on participants in order to offer guidance and support. In order to make this monitoring as smooth and effective as possible, the campus administrator will be asked to guide and assist participants during all stages of this program (Caffarella & Daffron, 1993).

The other way that transfer of learning will be promoted is in the timing of the workshop. Since the intention is to hold the initial workshop in February, two months

before the STAAR results are released, the information will be easier to translate into action as opposed to if the workshop was in August prior to the start of school. This immediate application will increase the likelihood that transfer of learning will be successful (Caffarella & Daffron, 1993).

Finally, barriers that the program will naturally eliminate are the issues of required planning time, participant motivation, and establishing internal campus support (Caffarella & Daffron, 1993). Since the program has built-in planning time and weekly check-in meetings, participants will get some practice and support in their planning, and therefore have to do less outside of their work hours. In order to increase motivation, participants will be rewarded by receiving priority when it comes to which classrooms get iPads for the year, as well as extra jeans days and catered lunches on days during the workshop and weekly meetings. This extrinsic motivation will hopefully keep morale positive through the longer workdays and extra effort required of this process. Internal campus support will be established early in the program because the principal will be attending and coworkers will be planning simultaneously. This will hopefully lead to higher motivation and more effective transfer of learning.

### **Formative Evaluation**

Throughout any good program, there should be various “checkpoints...to determine whether the journey is progressing in a way that meets the needs of the planners as well as of any others who are along” (Vella, Berardinelli, & Burrow, 1998, pg. 11). The approach to the program’s formative assessments will be based on ensuring the achievement of program goals and objectives (Caffarella & Daffron, 2013). The program planner, instructors, and campus administrators will be participating in the planning. The program planner and instructors would

be the experts on the program structure, objectives, and goals, and therefore the most knowledgeable on how to evaluate whether the program objectives have been met. The administrator would be the best person to make judgments “about [participants’] future effectiveness” (Vella, Berardinelli, & Burrow, 1998, pg. 13) because they have more knowledge about, and time spent with, the participants.

The formative evaluations will take place before and during the initial workshop, as well as during follow-up weekly meetings, so that data can be used to make changes along the way in a systematic way (Caffarella & Daffron, 2013). They will also use qualitative data and a mix of formal and informal methods. Qualitative data is better to use for the formative evaluation of this program because it typically serves as an “[indicator] that [relates] to changes in...skill levels as perceived by...the educators” (Vella, Berardinelli, & Burrow, 1998, pg. 4). Since the formative evaluations in this program are aiming to determine participants’ learning and future success, it will be the most beneficial. The instructor and campus administrator will be the main evaluators to adequately monitor and adjust instruction. However, participants will join them in evaluating their own learning and progress during the follow-up weekly meetings, since they are the most knowledgeable about themselves either struggling or succeeding in utilizing the new skills.

Prior to the workshop, participants will be asked to complete an open-ended formal survey to indicate their opinions, knowledge, and experience (Caffarella & Daffron, 2013) with differentiated instruction and their typical approach to tutoring between the first two rounds of STAAR testing. This survey will provide qualitative data to the instructor about participants’ knowledge and experience that will help him/her determine how much instruction is needed in the program, as well as provide a base line for evaluating participant growth. The participants

will range in knowledge and experience on this subject, and since application of the new skills will need to occur shortly after the workshop, this survey will help achieve the desired results.

During the workshop, participants will practice the newly acquired skills in a case-study format, which will be qualitatively observed by the instructor as a performance review, serving as an indicator or “demonstration of a specific skill...in...simulated... situations” (Caffarella & Daffron, 2013, pg. 246). This formal method of evaluating provides participants supported time to practice the new skills, but also function as an indicator to the instructor as to whether more or less instruction is necessary. The product produced by participants during the case study will be evaluated against the product produced by the instructor during the instructional portion of the workshop in order to decide if more instruction is needed. The instructor will also be making informal observations and conducting informal interviews (Caffarella & Daffron, 2013) with participants during the workshop to qualitatively judge what changes need to be made in order for participants to be successful. Given that the format of the program is an interactive workshop, observations and informal interviews make sense because each participant will need help, or clarification, with different things.

Finally, a learning journal kept by participants after the initial workshop will serve as a formal formative evaluation. The instructor can use what participants share from these journals to gauge understanding, transfer of learning, and guide the weekly meetings. This evaluation method fits with the program context because the participants are already used to monitoring their classroom approaches and formally keeping track of interventions made. Also, since the purpose of the weekly meetings is to provide support and ongoing help implementing the new skills, the journals allow for participants to come prepared and for instructors to truly evaluate participants’ growth and adequacy of instructor assistance.

Throughout the program, these evaluation results will be discussed between the instructor and the administrator regarding participants' growth and transfer of learning so that they are both adequately informed. Along with that, during the weekly meetings following the initial workshop, results will be shared and discussed with participants in order to encourage monitoring of their own learning and progress.

### **Summative Evaluation**

Since the purpose of this program is to raise STAAR passage and growth rates from round 1 to round 2, this goal will be quantitatively assessed using official results obtained from the state of Texas two weeks after the second round administration and directly following the program's weekly meetings. These scores will be compared to round 1 scores and to scores from other teachers' students who did not benefit from the new instructional methods. Comparison across teachers within the school will occur since the program's participation is on a volunteer basis to measure the effectiveness of the workshop to raise test scores and growth rates. The state of Texas determines student passage and growth rates on the STAAR tests and the campus administrator will determine the desired amount of growth and percent of passage for individual participants. The administrator has more of a management objective (Cervero & Wilson, 2006) in regards to whether or not the school is performing up to state standards, and in comparison with surrounding schools, therefore he/she should have a role in determining what outcome would be most desired with this summative assessment.

This evaluation of how much students learned from their teachers using the new differentiated teaching model is a formal performance review (Caffarella & Daffron, 2013) of whether the program adequately taught teachers how to transfer their newly acquired knowledge into impact (Vella, Berardinelli, & Burrow, 1998). Participants in this workshop are used to

analyzing STAAR data and using it to measure their own teaching approaches, making this method of evaluation appropriate for the context, content, and participants of this program. Once official scores are received, it is then up to the participants and the administrator to analyze them. This analysis will be shared with the program planner and instructor for separate analysis of the program as a whole.

Another summative evaluation in this program is the use of a post-survey created by the program planner and completed by participants. This formal evaluation will focus on “opinions, perceptions, or beliefs” (Caffarella & Daffron, 2013, pg. 245) about the program as a whole, intended to guide the program planner in making adjustments and determining the program’s effectiveness. This evaluation type comes from the “levels of evaluation” (Caffarella & Daffron, 2013, pg. 243) approach, because participants are completing a “questionnaire indicating their reactions” (Caffarella & Daffron, 2013, pg. 243-244), specifically on how they would numerically rate the instructor, format, materials, relevance to daily work, and amount of time required. Along with this quantitative data, the survey will also qualitatively ask participants to offer improvement suggestions.

Mixing numerical ratings and open-ended questions in this post-survey will give all participants a chance to voice their opinions, since some will prefer numeric ratings and some will like to provide authentic feedback. The data will be provided to the program planner to adjust the program for the future, as well as to the instructor for feedback on their performance. The numerical part of the survey will be rating the various aspects out of 10. Any authentic data provided will be analyzed and evaluated qualitatively.

### **Assessment**

Finally, in order to assess the program as a whole, the post-survey will be assessed alongside the analysis of STAAR scores and informal observations. The program planner will be responsible for this assessment and will share the results with instructors and campus administrators. This combination of quantitative and qualitative data will provide a lot of evidence of program effectiveness. It will be through this final analysis by the program planner that the format, instructor, methods, and relevance will be assessed.

The program planner will compare data from both summative assessments and work to make changes to the program for the future, or decide that the program should not be done again based on undesirable evaluation results. The results of this assessment, and a revised program plan, will then be shared with participating campus administrators and program instructors.

### **Scheduling**

The differentiated instruction program needed to be scheduled taking into account the time of year, participants' schedules, and location access. The initial workshop, which will occur after the administration of mock STAAR tests but before the first round of STAAR testing, will be scheduled during a mandatory built-in professional development workday for teachers on President's Day. This is the last professional development workday before the first round of testing, and therefore the only option that does not conflict with participants' work and personal schedules. This initial workshop will run for three hours and take place in the library of the participating elementary school. The first hour of the workshop will consist of the instructor introducing the new differentiated method of teaching and grouping struggling students, showing data on differentiated instruction increasing test scores, introducing examples of student grouping and lesson plans, and distributing resources that participants can use. The final two



hours will be time for participants to practice the skill of grouping students and planning differentiated instruction. One fifteen minute break will be provided half way through the three hours. When the three hours are nearly over, a wrap up and question portion will occur in case anyone has questions or comments regarding the content. Also at this time, instructions will be provided to participants about necessary next steps, and the dates for follow-up meetings.

When first round STAAR scores are released, typically the last week of April, the first follow-up meeting will occur to allow participants to regroup and plan in another structured environment. This meeting, and all other follow-up meetings, will take place in the school library directly after school at 3:30pm and run for approximately 45 minutes to an hour. The end of the workday for teachers is 4:15pm, while the end of the school day is 3:30pm, meaning participants do not have to give up much, if any, of their personal time for these meetings. During this initial meeting, the instructor will begin by reminding participants of their work in the workshop and provide any necessary duplicate resources that participants would have received at the workshop. Then, participants will plan together and regroup their students, having the option to have assistance from the instructor, campus administrator, and co-workers.

After the initial follow-up meeting, participants will all meet up with the program instructor two more times during the first two weeks of May while they are implementing the new teaching. During these meetings, participants will first have an opportunity to share how things are going and discuss successes and struggles, then have time to work together to improve their approaches and set specific goals for the following week. Finally, the Friday before round two of STAAR testing, which is three days before testing, the final follow-up meeting will occur to discuss any last minute approaches to try or to answer any final questions participants have. During this meeting, accomplishment of goals will also be discussed.

It was very important when scheduling this program, or any other, to take into account participants' work and personal schedules (Caffarella & Daffron, 2013). That is why the dates, times, and location for this program were chosen. If this program were to ever expand, then personal and professional job schedules, time zones, travel time, and administration expectations would all need to be taken into account as well (Caffarella & Daffron, 2013).

### **Staffing**

In an effort to reduce cost associated with this program, in-house staffing will be utilized. I will be the program planner, instructional staff member, program evaluator, and program coordinator (Caffarella & Daffron, 2013) for the initial implementation of this program. I will be the instructor because I have a high content knowledge, know the participants well, understand the context of the program, possess high enthusiasm and optimism regarding the program, and possess the knowledge required to operate the technology during the program (Caffarella & Daffron, 2013). If this program were to expand to other schools, then instructors would be chosen by the program planner and coordinator, if they are not the same person, based on the above qualifications and could potentially be a past program participant. If the program planner and coordinator are not the same person, the program planner will choose the coordinator each time the program is run. Ideally, the program coordinator will have a lot of knowledge about the campus in which the program is being implemented.

The program planner and coordinator will need to begin assuming responsibilities of planning the logistics and marketing the program well before the initial workshop. The instructor will need to assume his/her responsibilities of planning an engaging way to present the content to participants shortly before the initial workshop. The program evaluator will need to be working with the program planner and instructor, and monitoring the program, as soon as the program

begins and continue working after it is complete to analyze the results. Throughout the program, the campus administrator will be present to assist the program planner and instructor by performing formative evaluations of participants and providing necessary context to the planner to increase success of the program. The technical support staff (Caffarella & Daffron, 2013) will consist of district-hired technology staff that are already on-site and can be consulted regarding the use of technology, as well as help ensure the program runs smoothly.

### **Marketing**

Due to the fact that “[educators] often need to market their programs to ensure participation” (Cervero & Wilson, 2006, pg. 198), and participation for this program is on a volunteer basis, marketing will be important. Therefore, taking this into account, as well as the fact that there is no competition in this area from pre-existing programs, the primary goal of this program’s marketing will be to attract participants. In order to effectively do this, the program will first be introduced by the program planner at a staff meeting a few weeks prior to the initial workshop. This will allow the planner to gauge interest immediately and answer any questions potential participants may have. During this introduction, the goal of the program, as well as why the program will benefit participants, will be verbalized because “[communicating] messages that education and training programs are useful and meaningful to potential participants is critical to ensuring program participation” (Caffarella & Daffron, 2013, pg. 314). Incentives for participating, as well as the fact that meetings will not conflict with participants’ personal or professional time, will be heavily stressed to hopefully increase participation. Directly following this introduction, an email will be sent out to potential participants including details of the program.

A few days later, fliers (Havercamp, 1998) will be distributed in teacher boxes in the lounge that will be eye-catching, include the times and dates, promote the program as working towards achieving higher STAAR scores, and introduce participation incentives. Posters (Havercamp, 1998) will also be put up in the lounge that remind potential participants about the incentives of participating. The flier and posters will need to display the information in an eye-catching way because “packaging of the product will be seen by the potential consumer and appraised in less than 30 seconds” (Caffarella & Daffron, 2013, pg. 312). The dates and method to volunteer for the program will be put on a whiteboard in the lounge, which relays information to teachers, to increase exposure to program details. Since this final method of marketing is campus-specific, if the program is to be expanded in the future to other campuses, the program coordinator will most likely need to conduct a target audience analysis (Caffarella & Daffron, 2013) to determine the most beneficial and efficient marketing strategies.

### **Budget**

In order to effectively and thoroughly plan this program, critical details need to be addressed, such as “estimating costs, creating contingency plans, conducting cost-benefit analyses, and managing budgets” (Cervero & Wilson, 2006, pg. 192). For this specific program, direct costs (Watkins & Sechrest, 1998) are minimal. Since the program planner will initially be the same person as the program instructor, coordinator, and evaluator, no additional salaries will need to be paid. Additionally, because I am an employee of the campus in which the program will take place, a payment for operating this program is not required. Therefore, the costs associated with this program will only include materials for the presentation, which include poster boards and copies of resources, journals for participants, and snacks and refreshments for the workshop and meetings to help keep participants happy. The total cost of this should be

estimated around \$100. One benefit of using materials such as poster board and journals is that those materials can be found on the campus already. Approving the budget for this program will need to go through the school and district administration since the primary funding will be through Title II funds.

A contingency plan should also be in place in case problems arise. Therefore, if the copier is down on campus, having money to go to an outside organization to produce the needed copies will be necessary. Also, relying on the school to have journals will not be wise, so coming prepared with pre-bought journals will help to ensure the smooth execution of the program. Having money budgeted as an option just in case the instructor cannot be there and an outside instructor needs to be hired would be a safe thing to do as well. With all of this being said, the safest thing to do would be to budget slightly more money for the program than originally anticipated just in case (Caffarella & Daffron, 2013).

### References

- Boyle, P.G. (1981). Chapter 10: Situational Analysis. In *Planning better programs*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Caffarella, R.S., & Daffron, S.R. (2013). *Planning programs for adult learners: a practical guide*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Cervero, R.M. & Wilson, A.L. (2006). *Working the planning table: negotiating democratically for adult, continuing, and workplace education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Fellenz, R.A. (1998). Chapter 14: Selecting formats for learning. In P. S. Cookson (Author), *Program planning for the training and continuing education of adults: north american perspectives*. Malabar, FL: Krieger Publishing Company.
- Havercamp, M.J. (1998). Chapter 15: Program Promotion and Marketing. In P. S. Cookson (Author), *Program planning for the training and continuing education of adults: north american perspectives*. Malabar, FL: Krieger Publishing Company.
- Pearce, S. (1998). Chapter 10: Determining Program Needs. In P.S. Cookson (Author), *Program planning for the training and continuing education of adults: north american perspectives*. Malabar, FL: Krieger Publishing Company.
- Rothwell, W.J., & Cookson, P.S. (1997). Chapter 8: Appraising the Organization's Internal Environment. In *Beyond instruction: comprehensive program planning for business and education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Software for Texas Educators-DMAC Solutions-Region 7 Education. (n.d.) Retrieved March 28, 2018, from <https://www.dmac-solutions.net/>.

Sork, T.J. (1998). Chapter 11: Program Priorities, Purposes, and Objectives. In P. S. Cookson (Author), *Program planning for the training and continuing education of adults: north american perspectives*. Malabar, FL: Krieger Publishing Company.

T-TESS Rubric. (2016, November 17). Retrieved February 25, 2018, from [https://teachfortexas.org/Resource\\_Files/Guides/T-TESS\\_Rubric.pdf](https://teachfortexas.org/Resource_Files/Guides/T-TESS_Rubric.pdf).

Vella, J., Berardinelli, P., & Burrow, J. (1998). *How do they know they know?: evaluating adult learning*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Watkins, K.E. & Sechrest, T.L. (1998). Chapter 17: Adding Value: Program Financing for Program Planners. In P. S. Cookson (Author), *Program planning for the training and continuing education of adults: north american perspectives*. Malabar, FL: Krieger Publishing Company.