

Caitlin Cloyd, M.Ed.

Professional Learning Systems ♦ Leadership Development ♦ Instructional Design
caitlincloyd@gmail.com ♦ (281) 382-2720 ♦ LinkedIn.com/in/CaitlinCloyd

Professional Learning Support Plan

Fort Bend ISD | Organizational Development

Written Task Response • Specialist, Professional Learning T2

What the Audit Is Telling Us

The four audit findings **point in one direction**. Campus professional learning varies widely because it is **designed by individuals working alone**, with no structured point where anyone else sees it before delivery. Leaders rely on one-time workshops because **nothing in the current system asks what happens after the session ends**. Teachers report limited feedback because giving instructional feedback is **a practice their supervisors have never been developed in or held to**.

The fourth finding is the most useful one. When leaders say teachers just need fun sessions that interest them, they are describing what professional learning has been in their own experience: *an event to get through*. That belief is **not a reason to work around leaders**. It is **the clearest evidence that the leadership practices surrounding professional learning are the thing to change**.

THE PREMISE OF THIS PLAN

This plan **does not add sessions**. It builds a small number of structures that change how professional learning is **designed, delivered, supported, and studied** on every campus, and it asks **leaders to move through those structures themselves before asking teachers to**.

Components of the Plan

Six components, led by Organizational Development in partnership with principals. Each one produces something specific.

Component	What It Is	Led By	What It Produces
1. Yearlong Campus Professional Learning Plan	One plan per campus, co-built with the principal and aligned to the campus improvement plan and district instructional priorities. Names the practices to be changed, the evidence behind them, the learning sequence, and the follow-up cycle.	Principal, with OD	One plan per campus on a common template, reviewed twice a year
2. Design Review (Brain Trust)	A structured review of a session while it is still in draft. Strengthens the identified need, the outcomes, the adult-learning design, and the follow-through before materials are finalized.	Trained campus facilitator	Documented revisions and a readiness status before delivery
3. Delivery Rehearsal (Demo Day)	A structured rehearsal with an authentic audience before the session goes live. Improves facilitation, pacing, clarity of directions, and participant experience.	Trained campus facilitator	Two or three priority revisions and a readiness determination
4. Leader Follow-Through Cycle	The named set of leader actions that follow every session: learning-focused walkthroughs, written instructional feedback within a set window, and PLC follow-up on the target practice.	Principal and assistant principals	Feedback artifacts and walkthrough evidence tied to the campus plan
5. Campus Professional Learning Lead Network	A monthly working session for campus professional learning leads, instructional coaches, and technology leads. Builds facilitation and coaching capacity so campuses run the process without OD in every room. Also serves as the review point for shared resources and materials ahead of procurement.	OD	A trained facilitator and reviewer pool on every campus
6. Evidence and Refinement Cycle	A twice-yearly review of process, quality, and impact evidence with each principal. Determines what is repeated, revised, extended, or retired.	OD with campus leadership	A short evidence summary per campus that feeds the next year's plan

How the Components Work Together

These are **not six initiatives. They are one cycle:** *identify the need, design the learning, review the design, revise, rehearse the delivery, deliver, support implementation, study the impact, and refine.* **Component 1** sets what a campus is trying to change and why, so that every session traces back to evidence rather than to a topic someone liked. **Components 2 and 3** protect quality at the two points where it is actually decided, since a session unclear about the behavior it is meant to change cannot be rescued by good facilitation, and a well-designed session can still lose a room in the first fifteen minutes. **Component 4** is the piece the audit shows is missing entirely, and it is where *a session becomes a practice*. **Component 5** builds the capacity for campuses to run all of this themselves, because a process that requires an OD staff member in every room will reach a handful of campuses and be experienced as central office approval. **Component 6** closes the loop so that next year's plan is built from what the evidence showed rather than from a fresh survey.

The key information in every campus plan is the same **four things**: the practice we are working to change, the evidence that it needs changing, what leaders will do to support it after the session, and how we will know whether it moved. **A plan that cannot answer those four questions is a calendar of events.** This is also the direct answer to the belief that teachers need sessions that interest them. **Interest is not the problem to solve.** A session built around a real instructional problem, with time to practice and a supervisor who follows up, is usually *more* engaging than one designed to be enjoyable, because it treats teachers as **professionals with a problem worth solving.**

Supporting protocols

Two of the six components have full protocols developed for this plan. Both are written so that **a campus leader, coach, or teacher leader who has never participated in one could run it without additional explanation.**

- ⇒ **Brain Trust Protocol** — design review, tiered requirements, timed agendas, feedback rubric, forms, and a worked example
- ⇒ **Demo Day Protocol** — delivery rehearsal, three rehearsal formats, observation rubric, psychological-safety guardrails, forms, and a worked example

Brain Trusts improve the design. Demo Days improve the delivery. Reviewing only one leaves half the quality question unexamined.

Leadership Practices That Must Change

Four shifts. Each one is a leader behavior, stated so that **someone could observe whether it is happening.**

Current Practice	Practice to Develop	How I Would Build It
Scheduling professional learning	Designing it from evidence. The leader names the instructional practice to be changed and the evidence that it needs changing, <i>before</i> choosing a topic or a presenter.	The campus plan template requires the practice, the evidence, and the observable behavior change. I would co-build the first plan with each principal rather than sending a template and a deadline.
Delivering a session and moving on	Owning a follow-through cycle. Every session has named walkthroughs, feedback, and PLC follow-up attached to it, with a person responsible.	Follow-up is a required field in the campus plan, not an optional one. I would ask area superintendents to review feedback artifacts during regular principal check-ins so the expectation has somewhere to land.
Giving feedback that is infrequent and evaluative	Giving instructional feedback that is specific and regular, and that is about the teaching rather than the rating.	A leadership sequence built around real practice: leaders script feedback from video, deliver it to a peer, and revise it. Peer partners exchange notes between sessions, and leaders bring their own feedback to be reviewed.
Exempting their own sessions from the process	Modeling the practice they require. Leaders run their own faculty meetings and leadership sessions through the same design review and rehearsal.	OD pilots both protocols on its own sessions first. Principals complete a Brain Trust and Demo Day <i>as presenters</i> during the pilot phase, before any campus-wide expectation is set.

How I Would Approach the Change

- ⇒ **Lead with evidence rather than argument.** Rather than debating whether teachers need sessions that interest them, I would sit with each principal and put their campus's teacher feedback data next to their own walkthrough logs. **The gap between the two makes the case more effectively than I can.**
- ⇒ **Make the new practice easier than the old one.** Templates, a trained reviewer pool, a shared calendar, and ready-made follow-up structures. If the new way costs a principal more time with no support attached, *it will not survive October.*
- ⇒ **Go first.** Organizational Development would run its own sessions through both protocols before asking a single campus to. When I built districtwide professional learning systems in Klein ISD serving 7,000+ employees, **the structures that held were the ones campuses could eventually run without me in the room.** The ones that failed were the ones I introduced before building the capacity to sustain them.
- ⇒ **Start with volunteers.** Pilot with principals who want in, then use their campuses and their evidence as the case for expansion. *A mandate issued in August produces compliance artifacts by November.*
- ⇒ **Protect the person.** Brain Trust and Demo Day records are **design documents, not appraisal evidence.** The first time a rehearsal shows up in someone's evaluation, honest rehearsal ends districtwide.
- ⇒ **Change one practice at a time.** A campus plan that names six target practices **will move none of them.** One or two, supported all year, is the version that produces something a walkthrough can see.

WHAT THIS ASKS OF LEADERS

The shift is from professional learning as **something leaders arrange for teachers** to professional learning as **something leaders participate in, design carefully, and follow through on.** That is a *change in role, not a change in calendar*, and it is why this plan front-loads modeling and volunteers rather than expectations.

Implementation Roadmap

One year, four phases, aligned to the school calendar. Year two builds from year one evidence.

Phase	Timeframe	Key Actions	Milestone
Phase 1 Ground the work in evidence	June – August	- Build the campus plan template, both protocols, and facilitator training - Meet with each principal to review campus teacher feedback alongside walkthrough evidence - Recruit 8 to 10 volunteer pilot campuses across elementary, middle, and high school	Every campus has a yearlong professional learning plan naming one to two target practices and a follow-up cycle Pilot cohort confirmed
Phase 2 Pilot and build capacity	September – December	- Train campus professional learning leads and coaches as Brain Trust and Demo Day facilitators OD runs its own sessions through both protocols - Launch the monthly Professional Learning Lead Network - Begin the leadership feedback sequence with pilot principals	- Each pilot campus has completed at least two full design and rehearsal cycles A trained facilitator and reviewer pool at each pilot campus Mid-year evidence check completed
Phase 3 Expand	January – May	- Extend design review and rehearsal expectations to all campuses for substantial professional learning - Embed review and rehearsal dates into campus calendars when sessions are scheduled, not afterward - Expand the leadership feedback sequence to all principals and assistant principals - Convene the resource review point ahead of spring procurement	All campuses using the process for campus-level and districtwide learning Walkthrough and feedback frequency measured districtwide
Phase 4 Study and sustain	May – August	- Review process, quality, and impact evidence with each principal - Revise the protocols and template based on what campuses actually used, and cut what they did not - Recognize effective facilitators and build the internal facilitator pipeline	An evidence summary for every campus - Year two campus plans built from year one results rather than from a new survey

How We Will Know It Is Working

Three levels. **Process** tells us whether the structures are being used. **Quality** tells us whether the learning improved. **Impact** tells us whether practice changed.

Process

- ⇒ **Campus plans** complete, current, and tied to campus improvement goals
- ⇒ **Substantial sessions** completing design review and delivery rehearsal
- ⇒ **Walkthrough and written feedback frequency** by supervisor, by campus
- ⇒ **Leaders who have completed** a Brain Trust or Demo Day *as a presenter*

Quality

- ⇒ **Participant reports** of relevance, clarity of directions, and time spent practicing rather than listening
- ⇒ **Consistency of design quality** across campuses, measured against the shared rubric
- ⇒ **Facilitator readiness** across rehearsal cycles

Impact

- ⇒ **Presence of the target instructional practice** in walkthrough evidence
- ⇒ **Teacher reports** of how often they receive feedback and how useful it is
- ⇒ **Movement on the campus improvement goal** the learning was built to serve

ONE NOTE ON MEASUREMENT

Satisfaction surveys measure whether people **enjoyed** a session. They do not measure whether **practice changed**. Satisfaction data would inform revision, but *it would not serve as the measure of whether this plan worked*.

Assumptions

- ⇒ **Campus improvement plans and district instructional priorities are already established**, so professional learning plans align to them rather than replacing them.
- ⇒ **Most campuses have a professional learning lead, instructional coach, or technology lead** with some protected time who can be developed as a facilitator.
- ⇒ **Area superintendents are willing to make campus plans and leader follow-through part of regular principal check-ins**. Without that, the plan depends on voluntary follow-through and *will hold on some campuses and not others*.

Referenced Documents

Both protocols were developed for this plan as **proposed sample documents**. Neither represents current Fort Bend ISD policy, and each carries that disclaimer.

- ⇒ [FBISD Professional Learning Brain Trust Protocol](#) *[insert link]*
- ⇒ [FBISD Professional Learning Demo Day Protocol](#) *[insert link]*