

Archived Information

EISENHOWER PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Goal: To improve the quality of classroom teaching through professional development.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: The Eisenhower Professional Development Program supports Objective 1.4 (a talented and dedicated teacher is in every classroom in America) and Objective 2.3 (every eighth-grader masters challenging mathematics, including the foundations of algebra and geometry) by supporting grants to states, districts, institutions of higher education, and nonprofit organizations for standards-based professional development. The program places a priority on math and science professional development.

FY 2000—\$335,000,000

FY 2001—Funds for the Eisenhower Professional Development Program are being requested under the Teaching to High Standards State Grants program.

Total FY 2001 request is \$690,000,000.

OBJECTIVE 1: CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION IS IMPROVED THROUGH EFFECTIVE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT.

Indicator 1.1 Teachers' knowledge and skills: Increasing percentages of teachers will show evidence that participation in Eisenhower-assisted professional development improved their knowledge and skills.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>Subject Area Content</i>			<p>Status: No 1999 data on knowledge and skills. Target for 1998 was met or close to being met for half the knowledge and skill areas.</p> <p>Explanation: The program has met the target or is close to the target for areas emphasized in the legislation: math and science content, instructional methods, and curriculum. The grantees of the State Agency for Higher Education (SAHE) place a greater emphasis on content knowledge and offer longer activities with more opportunities to observe and practice new instructional methods. SAHE grantees also spend an average of \$512 per participant whereas districts spend an average of \$185 of Eisenhower funds per participant.</p>	<p>Source: Designing Effective Professional Development: Lessons from the Eisenhower Program (National Evaluation of the Eisenhower Program Report), 1999. (data collected in 1998.) <i>Frequency:</i> Biannually. <i>Next Update:</i> 2000.</p> <p>Validation Procedure: Verified by Department of Education attestation process.</p> <p>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: The data on effects on knowledge and skills are self-reported by participants.</p>	
Year	Actual Performance				Performance Targets
	Districts	SAHE Grantees			
1998:	48%	68%			50%
1999:	No data available				Continuous increase
2000:					60% for districts; 80% for SAHE grantees
2001:					Continuous increase
<i>Instructional Methods</i>					
Year	Actual Performance				Performance Targets
	Districts	SAHE Grantees			
1998:	63%	79%			50%
1999:	No data available				Continuous increase
2000:					66% for districts; 83% for SAHE grantees
2001:			Continuous increase		
<i>Curriculum</i>					
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets		
	Districts	SAHE Grantees			
1998:	56%	64%	50%		
1999:	No data available		Continuous increase		
2000:			60% for districts; 68% for SAHE grantees		
2001:			Continuous increase		

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>Approaches to Assessment</i>					
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets		
	Districts	SAHE Grantees			
1998:	46%	48%	50%		
1999:	No data available		Continuous increase		
2000:			60% for districts and SAHE grantees		
2001:			Continuous increase		
<i>Use of Technology</i>					
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets		
	Districts	SAHE Grantees			
1998:	24%	50%	50%		
1999:	No data available		Continuous increase		
2000:			60% for districts and SAHE grantees		
2001:			Continuous increase		
<i>Approaches to Diversity</i>					
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets		
	Districts	SAHE Grantees			
1998:	26%	35%	50%		
1999:	No data available		Continuous increase		
2000:			60% for districts and SAHE grantees		
2001:			Continuous increase		

Indicator 1.2 Teachers' classroom instruction: Increasing percentages of teachers in selected sites will show evidence that participation in Eisenhower-assisted professional development improved their classroom instruction.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>Professional development focused on having students recite or drill orally</i>					
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	<p>Status: 1999 target not met.</p> <p>Explanation: According to preliminary data from the evaluation, the program did not meet the performance target for any of the areas of practice. For example, over the period 1996-97 to 1998-99, 40 percent of teachers who participated in any professional development that focused on having students recite or drill orally demonstrated an increase in the use of such methods.</p>	
	Districts	SAHE Grantees			
1998:	No data available				
1999:	40%	No SAHE data	50%		
2000:			Continuous increase		
2001:			Continuous increase		
<i>Professional development focused on having students engage in paper-and-pencil exercises</i>					
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets		
	Districts	SAHE Grantees			
1998:	No data available				
1999:	22%	No SAHE data	50%		
2000:			Continuous increase		
2001:			Continuous increase		
				<p>Source: Unpublished data from the National Evaluation of the Eisenhower Professional Development Program. Data to be published in a report due out in 2000.</p> <p>Frequency: One time.</p> <p>Next Update: 2000.</p> <p>Validation Procedure: Data collected before ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data were developed.</p> <p>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: The data on effects on classroom instruction are self-reported by participants.</p>	

OBJECTIVE 2: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT IS SUSTAINED, INTENSIVE, AND HIGH QUALITY AND HAS A LASTING IMPACT ON CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION.

Indicator 2.1 High quality: Increasing percentages of teachers will participate in Eisenhower-assisted professional development activities that reflect best practices.					
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>Major emphasis on academic content</i>			<p>Status: No 1999 data. The 1998 target was met on only three dimensions of best practice by districts and on four dimensions of best practice by SAHE grantees.</p> <p>Explanation: Districts met the 1998 targets in academic content, follow-up with other activities, and planning classroom implementation. SAHE grantees met the 1998 targets in academic content, follow-up with activities; planning classroom implementation; and presenting, leading, and writing. The program is relatively strong in placing a major emphasis on academic content and in several other dimensions. However, there is some room for improvement on dimensions where target was met.</p> <p>Review of baseline data led ED to lower the performance targets so that they would be more realistic for the years 2000 and 2001. The original indicator had a target of 75 percent for year 2000.</p>	<p>Source: Designing Effective Professional Development: Lessons from the Eisenhower Program (National Evaluation of the Eisenhower Program Report), 1999. (Data were collected in 1998.)</p> <p><i>Frequency:</i> Biannually. <i>Next Update:</i> 2000.</p> <p>Validation Procedure: Data were verified through the Department of Education attestation process.</p>	
Year	Actual Performance				Performance Targets
	Districts	SAHE Grantees			
1998:	51%	68%			50%
1999:	No data available				Continuous improvement
2000:					56% for districts; 72% for SAHE grantees
2001:					Continuous improvement
<i>Involves all teachers in grade, department, or school</i>					
Year	Actual Performance				Performance Targets
	Districts	SAHE Grantees			
1998:	19%	11%			50%
1999:	No data available				Continuous improvement
2000:					56% for districts and SAHE grantees
2001:					Continuous improvement
<i>Is followed up with other activities</i>					
Year	Actual Performance				Performance Targets
	Districts	SAHE Grantees			
1998:	53%	70%			50%
1999:	No data available				Continuous improvement
2000:			56% for districts and 75% SAHE grantees		
2001:			Continuous improvement		

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Involves:</i>				
<i>a) Planning classroom implementation</i>				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Districts	SAHE Grantees		
1998:	66%	83%	50%	
1999:	No data available		Continuous improvement	
2000:			56% for districts; 86% for SAHE grantees	
2001:			Continuous improvement	
<i>b) Presenting, leading, and writing</i>				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Districts	SAHE Grantees		
1998:	40%	67%	50%	
1999:	No data available		Continuous improvement	
2000:			56% for districts; 70% for SAHE grantees	
2001:			Continuous improvement	
<i>c) Observing and being observed</i>				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Districts	SAHE Grantees		
1998:	19%	35%	50%	
1999:	No data available		Continuous improvement	
2000:			56% for districts and SAHE grantees	
2001:			Continuous improvement	
<i>d) Reviewing student work</i>				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Districts	SAHE Grantees		
1998:	30%	38%	50%	
1999:	No data available		Continuous improvement	
2000:			56% for districts and SAHE grantees	
2001:			Continuous improvement	

Indicator 2.2 Sustained professional development: Increasing percentages of teachers participating in Eisenhower-assisted activities will participate in activities that span 6 months or longer.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>Percentage of teachers in activities that span 6 months or longer</i>			<p>Status: No 1999 data, but 1998 data show that 1998 target was met by SAHE grantees but not by districts. Progress toward 1999 target is not likely for the districts.</p> <p>Explanation: SAHE grantees spend over twice as many Eisenhower dollars per participant per activity as the districts do; this may partly explain why the SAHE grantees offer activities that are longer in duration than do districts.</p>	<p>Source: Designing Effective Professional Development: Lessons from the Eisenhower Program (National Evaluation of the Eisenhower Program Report), 1999 (Data were collected in 1998).</p> <p><i>Frequency:</i> Biannually. <i>Next Update:</i> 2000.</p> <p>Validation Procedure: Data verified through the Department of Education attestation process.</p> <p>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: None.</p>	
Year	Actual Performance				Performance Targets
	Districts	SAHE Grantees			
1998:	20%	46%			35%
1999:	No data available				Continuous improvement
2000:			39% for districts; 50% for SAHE grantees		
2001:			Continuous improvement		

OBJECTIVE 3: HIGH-QUALITY PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT IS PROVIDED TO TEACHERS WHO WORK WITH DISADVANTAGED POPULATIONS.

Indicator 3.1 High-poverty schools: The proportion of teachers participating in Eisenhower-assisted activities who teach in high-poverty schools will exceed the proportion of the national teacher pool who teach in high-poverty schools.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>Percentage of Eisenhower participants who teach in high-poverty* schools</i>			<p>Status: No 1999 data, but 1998 data indicate that progress toward 1999 target is likely for district part of program and is unlikely for SAHE part of program.</p> <p>Explanation: Twenty-one percent of teachers in the nation teach in high-poverty schools; 23 percent of participants in Eisenhower district-level activities teach in high-poverty schools; and 13 percent of participants in Eisenhower activities sponsored by grantees of the SAHE teach in high-poverty schools. Both districts and SAHE grantees rely mostly on volunteers for participants, and neither does much targeting of whole schools of teachers. This may partly explain why the proportion of teachers from high-poverty schools is very low for the SAHE grantees.</p>	<p>Source: Designing Effective Professional Development: Lessons from the Eisenhower Program (National Evaluation of the Eisenhower Program Report), 1999.</p> <p><i>Frequency:</i> Biannually. <i>Next Update:</i> 2000.</p> <p>Validation Procedure: Verified through the Department of Education attestation process.</p> <p>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: None.</p>	
Year	Actual Performance				Performance Targets
	Districts	SAHE Grantees			For both districts and SAHE grantees**
1998:	23%	13%			23%
1999:	No data available				25%
2000:			27%		
2001:			29%		

*High-poverty schools are those where 50 percent or more of the students are eligible for free lunches.
 **In FY 1995-96, 21 percent of teachers in the Nation taught in high-poverty schools. Targets are based on this baseline.

OBJECTIVE 4: MEASUREMENT OF INTEGRATED PLANNING AND COLLABORATION.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	<p>Status: The 1999 target was slightly exceeded.</p> <p>Explanation: Although almost every state claims to have indicators, only 72 percent have demonstrated that they have actually adopted indicators, have a technical understanding of indicators, and have either data or plans to collect data for their indicators.</p>	<p>Source: An Analysis of Eisenhower Triennial Reports (Draft), AEL, Inc., 1999. <i>Frequency:</i> Triennially. <i>Next Update:</i> 2002.</p> <p>Validation Procedure: Data collected before ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data were developed. Other sources and experience corroborate these findings.</p> <p>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: The data summarized in the AEL report were submitted to ED by states. Not all states with indicators and data may actually be using them to manage the program.</p>
1998:	No data available	50%		
1999:	72%	70%		
2000:		90%		
2001:		100%		

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- ❖ To review performance-indicator information that states provide on Triennial Performance Reports and develop and provide technical assistance to states on indicators in accordance with that review. Promote ability of states to provide technical assistance to local education agencies in developing indicators tied to standards of such organizations as the National Council for Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM), the National Science Teachers Association (NSTA), and the National Research Council. (Example: Title II annual coordinators meeting. The program will work with PES to address funding for this activity.)
- ❖ To encourage states to adopt and report on strategies that promote professional development activities extending over the entire school year. (Example: The program's new professional development evaluation publication, Impact, and an upcoming (Feb. 2000) Web site will help address this issue.)
- ❖ To work with Eisenhower state agencies for higher education (SAHE) coordinators to encourage professional development collaboration with state education agencies (SEA) and with local education agencies. (Example: The program will feature a session at the Eisenhower summer conference that addresses this important need, and will seek to give space in Impact and on the Web site to practices worthy of emulation.)

New or Strengthened Strategies

- ❖ To promote effective professional development as described in the Department's Mission and Principles of High Quality Professional Development. The program will use four means to accomplish this: specific topics for seminars at the summer Eisenhower conference for State Education Agency (SEA) and State Agency for Higher Education (SAHE) coordinators; formal discussion at the Improving America's Schools Conferences late in 2000; and use of Impact and the upcoming evaluation Web site. Besides these, staff covering Title II on their integrated reviews will ensure the topic is on the onsite agenda.
- ❖ To help states use their indicator systems to promote needs-based plans that take into consideration professional development for teachers working with disadvantaged populations. The program will use integrated review team visits, an ideal medium for high-impact discussion, to bring home this important part of the statute. We will highlight the usefulness and availability of the program's Equity Assistance Centers as resources for states that seek help.
- ❖ The program stresses the need for Title II coordinators to work with Title I counterparts to greatly increase attention to the professional development needs of teachers from high-poverty schools and underrepresented populations. Program staff will engage in dialogue with their Title I counterparts to fashion collaborative activities, and integrated review staffs will extend this collaborative effort.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- ❖ The National Science Foundation, through its State Strategic Initiative, collaborates with Title II coordinators in many states to bring coherence to professional development activities in local education agencies. Funds are pooled to strengthen local efforts to provide sustained, high-quality, intensive, and aligned teacher training. Inadequate staffing impedes efforts to do more active programming. The program is preparing in the second quarter of FY 2000 to add two staff members who will have the responsibility to forge collaborations between such agencies as NASA, Department of Energy, Department of the Interior, Corporation for National Service, and others.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- ❖ In technical assistance visits to states and local school districts, program staff regularly encounter concerns about recruitment and retention of able teachers, including those from underrepresented groups. This reflects the general teacher-preparedness situation nationwide.
- ❖ Staff members see the need for greater efforts to communicate promising practices in professional development. Many universities are working to narrow the gap that exists between the findings of research and applications to the needs of schools. In addition, the program is close to inauguration of a professional development and evaluation Web site (due second quarter, FY 2000).
- ❖ The program notes a consistent inability to directly attribute gains in student achievement to professional development without controlling for other factors that affect achievement.
- ❖ Although districts and SAHE grantees report that they make an effort to reach teachers of special populations, teachers from high-poverty schools do not participate at very high rates. It is a challenge to help districts and SAHE grantees improve their targeting of such teachers.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted

- ❖ Indicator 3.1 was modified to make the target more realistic. The year 2000 target was lowered from over 75 percent to 56 percent.
- ❖ Indicator 3.2 was modified in scope and target; see explanation below on “change in last year’s Indicator 3.2.” The target was also changed because the 1999 target was not likely to be met. The target now looks at professional development that extends beyond 6 months, with a year 2000 target of 39 percent.
- ❖ Target 5.2 was changed as described below under “small change to last year’s indicator 6.1.”

Dropped

- ❖ Indicators 4.2 and 5.1 were dropped as discussed below.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year’s)

Adjusted

- ❖ The targets that were mentioned in the text of the indicators have been moved to the target column so the actual indicators read “increasing percentages:” Indicator 1.1 (now 1.1 and 1.2); Indicators 3.1 and 3.2 (now 2.1 and 2.2); Indicator 6.2 (now 4.2).
- ❖ Indicator 3.1: The indicator had said “district-level Eisenhower-assisted activities,” but ED decided that this was an important indicator for both districts and SAHE grantees, so the “district-level” modifier was deleted.
- ❖ Indicator 3.2 (now Indicator 2.2): The old indicator read, “By 1998, 35 percent of teachers participating in district-level Eisenhower-assisted activities will participate in activities that are a component of professional development that extends over the school year.” In a national survey, it is difficult to measure the extent to which Eisenhower activities are truly “components” of other activities and also to collect extensive information on the time span of those other activities. In addition, it is important to encourage grantees to increase the time span of Eisenhower activities. In addition, although most states claim to have indicators, a better measure is whether states demonstrate technical understanding of indicators and whether states have concrete plans to collect data for their indicators. Therefore, ED changed the indicator accordingly.
- ❖ Indicator 6.1 (now Indicator 4.1): The old indicator said that at least 50 percent of states will have performance indicators for “integrated professional development across programs in order to support systemic reform.” Through ED’s contact with states, ED learned that some Eisenhower state coordinators could not force coordinators of other programs to jointly develop professional development performance indicators or to use a common set of indicators across programs. States also seemed to be having a difficult time with the technical aspects of developing and using indicators. In addition, although most states claim to have indicators, a better measure is whether states demonstrate technical understanding of indicators and whether states have concrete plans to collect data for their indicators. Therefore, ED changed the indicator accordingly.

INDICATOR CHANGES (CONTINUED)

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Dropped

- ❖ Indicator 2.1: “By 1998, over 50 percent of teachers participating in district-level or higher education Eisenhower-assisted professional development will participate in activities that are aligned with high standards. By 2000, over 75 percent will.” This indicator was deleted for several reasons: First, the existing data indicated that the program was doing very well on this indicator, and so program staff felt that it was less important to track improvements over time. (eighty percent of teachers who participated in district-administered Eisenhower activities indicated that the activities were aligned with state or district standards.) Second, it would be more valuable to do an independent assessment of the alignment, but this would be too costly to do on a national scale.
- ❖ Indicator 4.2: “Teachers in high-poverty schools will participate in intensive, sustained, high-quality professional development at rates comparable with, or higher than, the rates for teachers in other schools.” Data from 1994 and 1999 showed that this indicator was met or exceeded. In addition, because the indicator does not refer specifically to Eisenhower, but rather to all professional development, ED decided to delete it from the Eisenhower plan. Measures that are not program specific are more appropriate in Volume 1 of the Strategic Plan.
- ❖ Indicator 5.1: “The number of Eisenhower state coordinators who report that the Department’s guidance and assistance are timely and helpful will increase.” ED decided that it was important to track this for internal management purposes, but not necessary for submitting the plan to Congress.

New—None.