

Dwight D. Eisenhower Professional Development Program Part B--State and Local Activities (CFDA No. 84.164)

I. Legislation

Title II, Part B of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended (Dwight D. Eisenhower Professional Development Program) (20 U.S.C. 6641) (expires September 30, 1999).

The program began in 1985, first authorized in 1984 under Title II of the Education for Economic Security Act, and was reauthorized as the Dwight D. Eisenhower Mathematics and Science Education Program in Title II, Part A, of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended in 1988. The program became the Dwight D. Eisenhower Professional Development Program under Title II, Part B, in the 1994 reauthorization of ESEA.

II. Funding History

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Appropriation</u>	<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Appropriation</u>
1984	0	1991	\$202,011,000
1985	\$90,100,000	1992	240,000,000
1986	39,182,000	1993	246,016,000
1987	72,800,000	1994	250,998,000
1988	108,904,000	1995	251,298,000
1989	128,440,000	1996	275,000,000
1990	126,837,000		

III. Analysis of Program Performance

A. Goals and Objectives

The goals of the Eisenhower Professional Development Program are to provide financial assistance to state and local education agencies and to institutions of higher education to support sustained and intensive high-quality professional development, and to ensure that all teachers will provide challenging learning experiences for their students in elementary and secondary schools. The program also focuses attention on meeting the educational needs of diverse student populations, including females, minorities, individuals with disabilities, individuals with limited English proficiency (LEP), and economically disadvantaged individuals, to give all students the opportunity to achieve to challenging state standards.

B. Strategies to Achieve the Goals

The Eisenhower Professional Development Program primarily supports in-service professional development for teachers. According to Department analyses of state performance reports (V.1), 93 percent of all districts and over 1,300 institutions of higher education participated in the Eisenhower Program in the 1993-94 school year. (Note: Data for the 1993-94 school year describe the Eisenhower Mathematics and Science Program, the program before the 1994 reauthorization. The 1995-96 school year was the first year affected by the 1994 reauthorization. As of the spring of 1997, state performance report data for the 1994-95 school year were being analyzed and summarized. State

annual performance reports on the 1995-96 school year are due to the Department at the end of May 1997.)

Administered through state education agencies (SEAs), formula grant funds to districts during the 1993-94 school year supported activities that served over 1 million participants, 93 percent of whom were in-service teachers. During this same period, grants to institutions of higher education, administered through state agencies for higher education (SAHEs) and equal to about one-third the total amount of formula grant funds to districts, supported activities that served over 100,000 participants, 88 percent of whom were in-service teachers. (Note: These figures may count some participants more than once because some teachers may have participated in more than one activity.)

The federal government made significant changes in the Eisenhower State Grant Program to overcome weaknesses identified in the past and to strengthen the capacity of professional development to support systemic educational reform efforts. The 1994 reauthorizing legislation goes beyond the previous focus on improving the skills of teachers and the quality of instruction to a new focus on improving teaching and learning as part of comprehensive educational reforms.

As reauthorized in 1994, Part B of the Eisenhower Program supports state and local efforts to provide sustained and intensive, high-quality professional development as part of comprehensive planning by states and local districts to give teachers the knowledge and skills needed to provide to all students the opportunity to meet challenging state content and student performance standards in the core academic subjects. Consistent with this emphasis on comprehensive planning, the 1994 legislation encourages coordination of activities funded by Title II with other professional development activities, Goals 2000, Title I and other ESEA programs, and other federal and state programs.

Reauthorization also expanded the program, at state and local option, to include all core subjects (instead of only math and science). This change provides states and local districts with the flexibility to coordinate professional development activities with the introduction and implementation of state content and performance standards. At the same time, the program ensures continued support for mathematics and science by requiring that state and local shares of the first \$250 million in appropriated funds be devoted to professional development in those areas. However, some states and districts have requested waivers of that requirement.

C. Program Performance--Indicators of Impact and Effectiveness

The U.S. Department of Education has developed a performance indicator system to use in monitoring, evaluating, and managing the Eisenhower Program. (The indicator system was developed through consultation with the Eisenhower state coordinators and the National Science Foundation.) The Department also has made the Eisenhower performance indicators available for states to share with their districts and to draw on, if they wish, in developing their own performance indicators for professional development.

The Department has developed new state performance report forms aligned with the Eisenhower performance indicator system; the forms also reflect key aspects of the program as described in the 1994 reauthorizing legislation. The Department will use information from the state performance reports to monitor progress toward program objectives and to identify needs for technical assistance.

It can be very challenging to gather valid data on the effects of professional development programs. As one comprehensive review of in-service professional development programs in math and science

concluded, evaluative information is scarce, information on outcomes is especially rare, and much of the information that does exist relies on self-reporting by teachers (V.3).

Information currently available on the antecedent Eisenhower Mathematics and Science Program provides some information on how the program performed in 1993-94. As of the spring of 1997, the Department is completing the summary and analysis of the 1994-95 state performance reports. In addition, in February 1997, the Department launched a three-year evaluation that will assess the program's contribution toward systemic educational reform. The evaluation will also provide data for some of the program's performance indicators.

Eisenhower Professional Development Program — DRAFT			
Goal: Improve the quality of classroom teaching through professional development.			
Objectives	Indicators	Source and Next Update	Strategies
1. Classroom instruction is improved through effective professional development.	1.1 Teachers' skills and classroom instruction. By 1998, over 50% of a sample of teachers will show evidence that participation in Eisenhower-assisted professional development has resulted in an improvement in their knowledge and skills, and by 1999 in an improvement in classroom instruction.	1.1 National Eisenhower (Ike) Evaluation, 1998; related information from annual state performance reports, 1997	
2. High-quality professional development and state policy are aligned with high state content and student performance standards.	2.1 District-level professional development. By 1998, over 50% of district-level Eisenhower-assisted professional development activities will be aligned with high state content and student performance standards	2.1 National Ike Evaluation, 1998; related information from annual state performance reports, 1997 and ED integrated review team visits, 1997	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work with professional organizations such as the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM) to develop strategies for encouraging states to link professional development to high state standards.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disseminate information at national meetings of SEA state coordinators on aligning professional development activities with high state content and student performance standards. • Disseminate lessons learned from the Third International Math and Science Study (TIMSS).
	2.2 Higher education professional development. By 1998, over 50% of Eisenhower-assisted higher education professional development activities will be aligned with high state content and student performance standards.	2.2 National Ike Evaluation, 1998; related information from annual state performance reports, 1997 and ED integrated review team visits, 1997	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make presentations at national meetings of state agencies of higher education (SAHE) coordinators on aligning Eisenhower-assisted professional development activities with high state content and student performance standards.

Eisenhower Professional Development Program — DRAFT			
Goal: Improve the quality of classroom teaching through professional development.			
Objectives	Indicators	Source and Next Update	Strategies
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eisenhower program has developed a communications network with the State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO) that serves as a vehicle for the delivery of technical assistance to SAHE coordinators. • Disseminate lessons learned from the Third International Math and Science Study (TIMSS).
	<p>2.3 Context (not limited to any single program). Licensure. By 1997, 75 percent of the states will review state licensing standards for teachers. At least 50 percent of the states will make progress in aligning and raising teacher licensing standards tied to high state content and student performance standards.</p>	<p>2.3 Surveys by national organizations such as the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE), and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage state coordinators to use a part of their Eisenhower funding to improve state licensing and certification standards. • Work closely with OERI's Eisenhower National Programs (Part A) to help states to improve their licensure and certification standards for teachers.
	<p><i>Baseline: From 15-20 states are actively involved in reforming teacher education licensure. Sources: American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education Survey, 1995; personal communication with AACTE, 1996.</i></p>		

Eisenhower Professional Development Program — DRAFT			
Goal: Improve the quality of classroom teaching through professional development.			
Objectives	Indicators	Source and Next Update	Strategies
<p>3. Professional development is sustained, intensive, and high-quality and has a lasting impact on classroom instruction.</p>	<p>3.1 High quality. By 1998, over 50% of district-level, Eisenhower-assisted professional development activities will reflect best practices, including a focus on continuous improvement.</p>	<p>3.1 National Ike Evaluation, 1998; related information from annual state performance reports, 1997 and ED integrated review team visits, 1997</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Develop and promulgate principles of effective professional development to improve accountability. ● Implement a pilot project to develop math and science instructional modules in 1997. Incorporate lessons learned from TIMSS. The modules will be distributed to all Eisenhower SEA and SAHE coordinators. ● Produce and disseminate a publication on exemplary models for professional development programs that receive Eisenhower funding. ● Continue to work with the National Science Foundation (NSF) to share information on best practices.
	<p>3.2 Intensity. By 1998, 35% of district-level Eisenhower-assisted activities will be a component of professional development that extends over the school year; by 2000, over 50%.</p>	<p>3.2 National Ike Evaluation, 1998; related information from annual state performance reports, 1997 and ED integrated review team (IRT) visits, 1997</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Through technical assistance workshops, program guidance, and ED's integrated review team (IRT) visits, the states are encouraged to adopt and report on strategies that promote professional development activities that extend over the school year and assist in reaching the states' reform efforts.

Eisenhower Professional Development Program — DRAFT			
Goal: Improve the quality of classroom teaching through professional development.			
Objectives	Indicators	Source and Next Update	Strategies
	<p>3.3 Context (not limited to any single program). Surveys of teachers will show larger percentages engaged in intensive, sustained professional development that is designed to enable them to teach to high standards.</p>	<p>3.3 National Center for Education Statistics' (NCES) Schools & Staffing Survey, 1994; NCES Fast Response Survey, 1997</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Use survey results to provide base line data to determine if larger percentages of teachers engage in professional development activities of longer duration.
	<p>3.4 Context (not limited to any single program): Teacher networks. By 1998, the percentage of teachers will increase who report that teacher networks have been effective in helping them understand or use comprehensive reform strategies.</p>	<p>3.4 Fast Response Survey 1996-1998; surveys by professional organizations, including SHEEO, NCTM, NSTA, NEA AACTE, ASCD, and others</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Meet with organizations such as the State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO), National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM), National Science Teachers Association, (NSTA), National Education Association (NEA), American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE), American Society for Curriculum Development (ASCD), and others to develop strategies for expanding teacher networks for Eisenhower participants.

Eisenhower Professional Development Program — DRAFT			
Goal: Improve the quality of classroom teaching through professional development.			
Objectives	Indicators	Source and Next Update	Strategies
4. High-quality professional development is provided to target populations.	4.1 Underrepresented populations. The proportion of teachers participating in Eisenhower-assisted activities who are from historically underrepresented populations will exceed the proportion of the national teacher pool from historically underrepresented populations.	4.1 National Ike Evaluation, 1998; related information from annual state performance reports, 1997 and ED integrated review team visits, 1997	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to promote the critical need to involve teachers from historically underrepresentative populations. • Review need assessment plans required of each local education agency to ensure that teachers from underrepresentative groups are included in long term, sustained and intensive professional development. • Work with teacher preparation groups to enhance their recruitment efforts.
	4.2 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.	4.2 National Ike Evaluation, 1998; related information from annual state performance reports, 1997 and ED integrated review team visits, 1997	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as 3.1
	4.3 Context (not limited to any single program): Teachers. Teachers in high-poverty schools will participate in intensive, sustained, high quality professional development at rates comparable to or higher than the rates for teachers in other schools.	4.3 NCES' Schools & Staffing Survey 1994; NCES Fast Response Survey 1996-1998	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as 3.1.

Eisenhower Professional Development Program — DRAFT			
Goal: Improve the quality of classroom teaching through professional development.			
Objectives	Indicators	Source and Next Update	Strategies
	<i>Baseline: According to the Schools & Staffing Survey 1994, 36% of teachers in public schools with high concentrations (75% of more) of students receiving Chapter 1 services participated in programs focusing on in-depth study in their subject field, compared to 30% for teachers in public schools with low concentrations (less than 25%) of students receiving Chapter 1 services. 37% of the teachers in high poverty schools participating in these programs reported that they lasted 8 hours or less, compared to 49% in low-poverty schools.</i>		
	4.4 Context (not limited to any single program): Para-professionals. The number of paraprofessionals, especially those who work with Title I students, who participate in high-quality professional development activities will increase annually.	4.4 Longitudinal Evaluation of School Change and Performance, 1998; survey by International Reading Association, 1998	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work with Title I to increase professional development activities for teachers.
5. Effective management of the Eisenhower Program supports systemic reform at the federal, state, and local levels.	5.1 Integrated federal planning and collaboration. ED will implement a plan to integrate professional development across Departmental programs by the end of 1997, and across key federal agencies, including NSF, by the end of 1998. The plan will include core performance indicators for professional development and joint data collection.	5.1 Reports by ED’s Professional Development Team to ED’s Executive Management Council, 1997	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work closely with ED’s Professional Development team and Executive Management Council to develop and implement a federal integrated plan for professional development.

Eisenhower Professional Development Program — DRAFT			
Goal: Improve the quality of classroom teaching through professional development.			
Objectives	Indicators	Source and Next Update	Strategies
	5.2 Federal guidance and assistance. The number of Eisenhower state coordinators who report that ED guidance and assistance are timely and helpful will increase.	5.2 Office of the Under Secretary's Planning and Evaluation Service (PES) Survey of State Federal Program Administrators, 1997	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop strategies to improve customer service to state and local sites.
	5.3 Integrated state planning and collaboration. By 1998, 35% of all states will have developed performance indicators for integrated professional development across programs to support systemic reform and will have data collection systems in place; by 2000, 75%.	5.3 National Ike Evaluation, 1998; related information from annual state performance reports, 1997; ED integrated review team visits, 1997; and ED review of consolidated state plans, 1997	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide technical assistance to states on preparation of performance indicators for state administration of the Eisenhower program.. • Ensure that ED's comprehensive technical assistance centers provide states' support and assistance.
	5.4 Integrated local planning and collaboration. By 1998, 35% of all districts will have developed performance indicators for integrated professional development across programs to support systemic reform and will have data collection systems in place; by 2000, 75%.	5.4 National Ike Evaluation, 1998; related information from annual state performance reports, 1997 and ED integrated review team visits, 1997	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide technical assistance to states on performance indicators for local programs.

Objective 1: Classroom instruction is improved through effective professional development.

In developing Eisenhower priorities, the ultimate measure of program success is a measure of whether Eisenhower-supported professional development leads to improvements in classroom instruction. The three-year evaluation of the program will provide information on this important objective.

Objective 2: High-quality professional development and State policy are aligned with high State content and student performance standards.

Alignment with overall state goals in mathematics and science was one of the most important considerations when developing objectives. Such alignment was cited by all but two states in 1993-94 reports (V.1). The three-year evaluation of the Eisenhower Program will provide information on alignment.

Objective 3: Professional development is sustained, intensive, and high-quality, and has a lasting impact on classroom instruction.

In 1994 the National Science and Technology Council (NSTC) began a study of teacher enhancement programs in science and technology supported by the Education Department, the U.S. Department of Energy, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, National Institutes of Health, National Science Foundation, and the Smithsonian Institution (V.4). The NSTC study included nine projects receiving funding from the Department's Eisenhower Program. Although the study began before changes from 1994 reauthorization were implemented, the quality of the selected Eisenhower projects compared favorably with professional development sponsored by the other federal agencies.

Documentation and onsite observation by researchers showed that six of the nine Eisenhower-assisted projects examined in the NSTC study (V.4) ranked above the overall mean score for best practices. The Eisenhower-assisted projects were found to be especially strong in incorporating follow-up activities that focused on classroom application, such as periodic workshops, opportunities for participants to share their experiences, school visits by professional development staff or mentors, continuing contact, and technical assistance. The Eisenhower projects also received high scores for using a systemic perspective, aligning the professional development with state or voluntary national standards in science education and with school or district strategic plans.

A national evaluation of the Title II Eisenhower Mathematics and Science Program was conducted for the Department in the 1988-89 school year (V.5). The national evaluation found many examples of workshops supported by this program that focused on the kinds of pedagogy needed for reform — pedagogy emphasizing hands-on, active learning and problem solving. Program funds sometimes supported the efforts of teachers who were revising district or school curricula. In contrast, the evaluation noted that, in many cases, professional development supported by the program was not part of a larger reform effort.

The national evaluation (V.5) showed that when the program supported professional development that was of sufficient duration and was part of a well-focused agenda for the improvement of teaching and learning, it could be used effectively to bring about needed changes in classroom practice. The study found that professional development supported by the Eisenhower Program was likely to lead to

changes in classroom practice under the following set of conditions (which characterized training in perhaps as many as a quarter of the districts):

- High-intensity training;
- Follow-up support;
- School-level support for implementation;
- State or district mandate for implementation, such as the adoption of a new curriculum;
- Teachers' participation in planning for the professional development;
- The opportunity during training to adapt what was learned to the teacher's classroom; and
- Sufficient incentives for teachers to participate.

The evaluation also found that the impact of the program on classroom practice was mixed, and noted that, in many cases, professional development supported by the program was not linked to what happened in the classroom (V.5).

The national evaluation indicated that much of the professional development supported by the Title II Eisenhower Program during the 1988-89 school year was relatively brief, not sustained, and not part of a comprehensive plan for educational reform. In most states, allocations to districts amounted to an average of just \$30 per teacher. As a result, districts typically did not support high-intensity training. The median amount of training supported by the program through districts was only 6 hours per participating teacher, although 15 percent of participants received more than 18 hours of training. Higher education projects typically offered teachers many more hours of training than did district-sponsored activities, with a median of 60 hours per participating teacher.

Subsequent Department analysis (V.1) of state performance reports for the 1993-94 school year indicated that 56 percent of activities funded through Eisenhower Mathematics and Science Program formula grants to districts lasted one day or less, compared with only 3 percent for higher education projects. Some 32 percent of Eisenhower Program formula grant activities lasted for one week or less, compared with 30 percent for higher education projects. Twelve percent of Eisenhower formula grant activities lasted more than one week, compared with 69 percent for higher education projects.

Department analysis (V.1) of state performance reports for the 1993-94 school year also indicated that the provision of training to new and emerging mathematics and science content and instructional areas was states' top priority under the Eisenhower Program. The state reports also explored the emphases for higher education projects, which most often were described as focusing on hands-on activities (27 percent of Eisenhower Program grantees) and integration of higher-order thinking skills (20 percent of Eisenhower Program grantees) as primary teaching strategies.

A study of the Eisenhower State Grant Program by the General Accounting Office (V.6) in 1992 noted that the Eisenhower Program could enhance teachers' awareness of new knowledge and teaching methods, and that it provided flexibility for districts to match training to the needs of their teachers. The GAO study (V.6) of the program concluded that "the predominantly short-term math and science training provided by the Eisenhower State Grant Program at the district level may not contribute significantly to achieving the national goal. Experts believe major changes in curriculums, instructional methods, and teacher expertise in math and science will be necessary to achieve that goal."

The three-year evaluation of the current Eisenhower Program that began in February 1997 will provide additional information on the ability of the program to meet Objective 3.

Objective 4: High-quality professional development is provided to target populations.

Analysis of States performance reports for the Eisenhower Mathematics and Science Education Program for 1993-94 (V.1) indicates that the proportion of teachers from minority populations was greater for participants in the Eisenhower Program than among the teacher population as a whole. For higher education projects, 26 percent of participants in Eisenhower-sponsored activities were minorities (12 percent black/non-Hispanic, 10 percent Hispanic, 2 percent Asian/Pacific Islander, and 2 percent American Indian/Alaska native). For formula grant activities, 19 percent of participants in Eisenhower-sponsored activities were minorities (10 percent black/non-Hispanic, 6 percent Hispanic, 2 percent Asian/Pacific Islander, and 1 percent American Indian/Alaska native). In comparison, the teacher population in public elementary and secondary schools across the nation was 13 percent minority (8 percent black/non-Hispanic, 3 percent Hispanic, 1 percent Asian/Pacific Islander, and 1 percent American Indian/Alaska native).

According to analysis of state performance reports for the Eisenhower Program in 1993-94 (V.1), 65 percent of state agencies for higher education (SAHEs) and 43 percent of state education agencies (SEAs) identified “recruiting minority teachers into mathematics and science teaching positions” as among their priorities under the program. Seventy-nine percent of SEAs and 52 percent of SAHEs identified “encouraging more participation in mathematics and science of underserved/underrepresented groups” as among their priorities under the program.

When asked how they addressed the needs of underrepresented/underserved groups in their priorities for the Eisenhower Program for the 1993-94 school year (V.1):

- 89 percent of SEAs and 83 percent of SAHEs responded that “sensitivity to the needs of underrepresented/underserved groups underlies the state’s priorities”
- 85 percent of SAHEs and 55 percent of SEAs said that “the needs of underrepresented/underserved groups are a direct focus of one or more of the state’s priorities”
- 67 percent of SAHEs and 58 percent of SEAs reported that “services provided were specifically geared toward teachers of students from underrepresented groups.”

Objective 5: Effective management of the Eisenhower Program supports systemic reform at the federal, state, and local levels.

According to 1993-94 performance reports (V.1), SEAs reported that 76 percent of their districts integrated or coordinated Eisenhower with other resources or reform activities in 1993-94. Some district-level integration or coordination was reported with Eisenhower Program higher education projects (90 percent of states), Chapter 2 (81 percent), Chapter 1 (71 percent), local businesses (54 percent), the Eisenhower Regional Consortia (50 percent), and other programs.

SEAs and SAHEs coordinated the formula grant and higher education grant components of the Eisenhower Program with each other through integrated plans in three-fourths of the states, through joint review of grantee applications in two-thirds of the states, and through joint needs assessments in three-fifths of the states (V.I). Eighty-three percent of states also reported that the SEAs coordinated the Eisenhower Program with the Eisenhower Regional Consortia through formal meetings. Half the SEAs reported encountering major barriers to coordination, primarily lack of personnel (42 percent of

states) and time constraints (30 percent). (The average number of full-time equivalent [FTE] state education agency staff that worked on the Eisenhower Program was 2.4.)

According to 1993-94 performance reports (V.1), states used a variety of means to determine needs for the Eisenhower Program: professional input from curriculum specialists (81 percent for both the formula grant program and higher education projects), review of current literature on training needs in math and science (79 and 73 percent, respectively), informal discussions with teachers or other staff (77 percent for both) formal surveys of teachers or other staff (49 and 19 percent, respectively), state results of the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) (30 and 31 percent), and other state assessments (51 and 60 percent). Two-thirds of the states reported that teachers were involved in planning the Eisenhower Program, followed by district administrators (62 percent of SEAs and 46 percent of SAHEs) and school administrators (62 and 44 percent, respectively).

Methods of evaluation varied, according to 1993-94 reports (V.1). In four-fifths of the states, districts evaluated their own Eisenhower Program, and the same proportion of SEAs gathered evaluation information by informally discussing the program with participants or project coordinators. However, two-fifths of SEAs went further in their evaluation efforts, using state or other assessment program data. SEAs reported that the evaluations provided the basis for subsequent technical assistance to districts (72 percent), for developing local plans (60 percent) or developing SEAs' Eisenhower Program plans and priorities (53 percent).

IV. Planned Studies

In February 1997 the Department began a comprehensive evaluation of the Eisenhower Professional Development Program to assess the program's contribution toward systemic educational reform, using the Eisenhower performance indicator system as a framework. In addition, during FY 1993, the Department began evaluations of the Eisenhower State Curriculum Frameworks Projects and Regional Consortia Program. As part of the evaluations, the Department is examining the relationship of these programs with the Eisenhower Professional Development Program.

V. Sources of Information

1. Program files.
2. J. Frechtling, G. Silverstein, B. Donly, B. Gutmann, Report on a Preliminary Performance Indicator System for the Eisenhower Professional Development Program: State and Local Activities, unpublished Working Document (Rockville, MD: Westat, Inc., 1995). No ERIC Access Number.
3. J. Frechtling, L. Sharp, N. Carey, N. Vaden-Kiernan, Teacher Enhancement Program: A Perspective on the Last Four Decades, (Arlington, VA: National Science Foundation, 1995). No ERIC Access Number.
4. J. Ruskus and J. Luczak, Best Practice in Action: A Descriptive Analysis of Exemplary Teacher Enhancement Institutes in Science and Technology (Arlington, VA: National Science Foundation, 1995). No ERIC Access Number.

5. M. Knapp, A. Zucker, N. Adelman, M. St. John, The Eisenhower Mathematics and Science Education Program: An Enabling Resource for Reform (Washington, DC: SRI International and Policy Studies Associates, 1991). ERIC Access Number ED335225.
6. U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO), The Eisenhower Math and Science State Grant Program: Report to the Chairman, Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education, Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives (Washington, DC: Author, November 1992). ERIC Access Number ED355115.

VI. Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Arthur Cole, (202) 260-3693

Program Studies: Liz Eisner, (202) 401-3630