

“When external forces pressure us to perform and meet expectations, there is a tendency in education, as in other fields, to look for quick fixes and convenient interventions. The assumption is that if teachers have new knowledge, then surely student achievement will increase. If principals know more about instructional leadership, then student achievement will increase. If a program has worked somewhere else, then it will probably work in our school as well. These assumptions may be faulty. ***Knowing*** does not automatically mean ***doing***.”

Joellen Killion, *Assessing Impact: Evaluating Staff Development*, National Staff Development Council, 2002.

“Instead of continuing to create unused evaluations, we must regard evaluations as dynamic tools that inform decisions, improve practices and policies, and contribute to the knowledge base of their respective fields. To change static evaluations to dynamic evaluations begins with clarifying the purposes and users of the evaluations.”

Joellen Killion, *Assessing Impact: Evaluating Staff Development*, National Staff Development Council, 2002.

“If we cannot simply install programs and expect long-term, deep change, then what are schools whose students dramatically below grade level to do? Merely doing what can be squeezed into the available time and budget has not produced the results we seek. Instead, the answer lies in adopting an inquiry perspective about our work. That is, we must actively seek to examine the impact of our work.”

Joellen Killion, *Assessing Impact: Evaluating Staff Development*, National Staff Development Council, 2002.

“Instead of *finding* the answer, we must be committed to *creating* the answer that works best in our context. We have an obligation to contribute to the field of staff development by sharing our practices and the evidence of their success and offering others opportunities to learn from and with us. We should approach evaluation with the simultaneous goals of assessing the impact of our work and constructing and sharing knowledge about our work.”

Joellen Killion, *Assessing Impact: Evaluating Staff Development*, National Staff Development Council, 2002.

“To trust that we are making the best possible use of staff development for improving student achievement, we seek more evaluation. We do this less to pass judgment about people, programs, or service and more to have information necessary to produce intended results...Rather than fear evaluations, we must embrace them, participate in them actively, and adopt “evaluation think” to generate the information necessary to make sound decisions about professional learning.”

Joellen Killion, *Assessing Impact: Evaluating Staff Development*, National Staff Development Council, 2002.

“Schools and districts face two types of problems. One issue is that they do not know how to evaluate their staff development programs to determine if their efforts impact student achievement. And secondly, *what* they are trying to evaluate is not sufficiently powerful in its design to generate any dramatic, long-term change in teacher or principal practice and ultimately in student achievement.”

Joellen Killion, *Assessing Impact: Evaluating Staff Development*, National Staff Development Council, 2002.

“The mental models educators hold influence their actions related to staff development and increased student achievement. If we believe we cannot measure the impact of staff development on student achievement, then we will not plan the data to do so. Few staff development programs even attempt to evaluate the nature and extent of implementation. We need to move away from using “smiley sheets” as end-of-course evaluations of participant reactions to learning experiences and move toward an authentic process for demonstrating impact on student learning.”

Joellen Killion, *Assessing Impact: Evaluating Staff Development*, National Staff Development Council, 2002.

