

Dwight D. Eisenhower Professional Development--Federal Activities Program (CFDA No. 84.168)

I. Legislation

Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 as amended by Title II Part A of the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994 (20 U.S.C. 6621) (expires September 30, 1999).

II. Funding History

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Appropriation</u>	<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Appropriation</u>
1985	\$9,900,000	1991	\$11,711,000
1986	3,875,000	1992	16,000,000
1987	7,200,000	1993	15,872,000
1988	10,771,000	1994	16,072,000
1989	8,892,000	1995	21,356,000
1990	8,781,000	1996	17,984,000

III. Analysis of Program Performance

A. Goals and Objectives

This program provides support for projects of national significance designed to improve the quality of teaching and instruction in the core academic subjects. The program serves public and private elementary and secondary school students, teachers, and related education personnel, through grants to state and local education agencies, state agencies for higher education, educational service agencies, institutions of higher education, and public and private, nonprofit organizations.

B. Strategies to Achieve the Goals

Services Supported

The Eisenhower Federal Activities Program provides support for a wide range of projects designed to improve the quality of teaching and instruction in the core academic subjects in the nation's schools.

The program supports:

- A National Clearinghouse for Mathematics and Science Education, operated through a contract with Ohio State University for FYs 1992-1997, to collect and disseminate instructional materials for elementary and secondary schools through print, CD-ROM, and on-line access, in coordination with other databases of mathematics and science curriculum and instructional materials;

Chapter 614-2

- The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS);
- Statewide alignment of teacher preparation, licensing, and induction, through three-year grants called the Initial Teacher Professional Development (ITPD) grants to nine projects. (The last year of funding for these grants is FY 1997); and
- A variety of professional development projects, relating to the uses of technology, environmental education, and female and minority issues.

C. Program Performance—Indicators of Impact and Effectiveness

The performance indicators for the Eisenhower Federal Activities Program are still under development. In August 1996 the Department awarded a contract to assist the Eisenhower Program in the development of performance indicators for the Eisenhower Federal Activities and Regional Consortia Programs. Final indicators will be established in the summer or fall of 1997.

IV. Planned Studies

During FY 1993 the Department of Education awarded a contract for an evaluation of the State Curriculum Frameworks Projects--projects funded with grants from the Eisenhower Federal Activities Program. The purpose of the evaluation is to examine the extent to which the State Curriculum Frameworks Projects are contributing to systemic reform in mathematics and science education, how they relate to other reform efforts, and how lessons learned can benefit future reform efforts. The first report, *Evaluation of the Dwight D. Eisenhower Mathematics and Science State Curriculum Frameworks Projects: First Interim Report*, was released in 1996 (V.2.). The final report will be available in late 1997.

This study is part of a larger evaluation effort by the Department to examine the contributions of both the Eisenhower Mathematics and Science Education State Curriculum Frameworks Projects and the Eisenhower Regional Consortia Program to systemic reform and improvement in math and science education. The Eisenhower evaluation is being conducted in collaboration with the National Science Foundation's evaluation of its Statewide Systemic Initiatives (SSI) Program and the study of State curriculum frameworks in math and science by the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO). The purpose of this collaboration is to develop a more comprehensive perspective across education reform efforts, as well as to avoid duplication of efforts.

Under the Eisenhower National Program, the Department awarded state curriculum framework grants for 1992-95 to the District of Columbia, Florida, Nebraska, New Jersey, New York, and Rhode Island. The Department awarded grants for 1993-96 to Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Delaware, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Oregon, and Wisconsin. The grantee states were charged with four tasks:

1. To develop curriculum framework documents that would provide guidelines for the content of the curriculum and for the organization and presentation of that content;
2. To develop model guidelines for effective approaches to teacher education and certification based on world-class standards and the state curriculum frameworks tied to those standards;
3. To develop criteria for teacher recertification; and

4. To design and pilot-test a model, cost-effective in-service professional development program for teachers based on world-class standards and the state curriculum frameworks tied to those standards.

To examine results of the Eisenhower State Curriculum Frameworks Projects, the four-year evaluation continues beyond the end of the second cohort of grants. The *First Interim Report* documented the following findings with regard to the development of curriculum frameworks; teacher education, licensing, and professional development; and collaboration across reform efforts:

Results regarding development of curriculum frameworks. In the *First Interim Report (V.2.)* the researchers noted that the projects had made substantial progress in developing curriculum frameworks. Typically, state departments of education led the planning of the project--consulting with key stakeholders and, getting thousands of teachers, other professionals, and the public involved in discussions about what students should know and be able to do. Grantee states conceptualized the frameworks as a bridge between national standards and local classroom practice to help educators improve content and instruction aligned with national standards.

Because of local control, Oregon was a notable exception to the more common pattern of framework development. Instead of adopting a single state framework, Oregon was supporting the development of individual frameworks by 14 school districts. The state planned to collect portfolios from each of the 14 projects and place them on CD-ROM for distribution throughout Oregon.

In collaboration with CCSSO's study of frameworks, funded by the National Science Foundation, the evaluation assembled a joint working group of nationally recognized experts to establish criteria and review the 23 state curriculum framework documents available, including six from Eisenhower grantee states. Some findings from the expert review of the 23 frameworks provided in the evaluation report (V.2.) are as follows:

- State frameworks included vision statements that supported high-quality mathematics and science education for all students, emphasizing higher-order skills.
- State frameworks generally included a statement on the need for greater equity in their rationale or vision statement, but consistently lacked strategies to promote equity.
- In general, the frameworks recommended alternative assessment strategies for classrooms consistent with content standards, but did not provide a strong link to reform of state assessment programs.

Teacher education, licensing, and professional development. In contrast to the development of curriculum frameworks by Eisenhower grantees, the evaluation found that during the first two years of the grant period, there was little progress in the development of guidelines for teacher education and certification, criteria for recertification, and model in-service professional development. States expressed the need for more time, up to an additional two years, to complete the Eisenhower projects. Progress varied across projects, depending on the status of state reforms at the start of the project; extensiveness of participation in the development and review processes; extent to which new approaches, such as integration of disciplines, were used; and other factors.

Collaboration across reform efforts. The evaluation examined collaboration between the Eisenhower frameworks projects and related reform efforts. In almost all of the 10 states with both Eisenhower state curriculum frameworks and SSI grants, the evaluation found regular communication between the Eisenhower projects and SSI, sometimes through formal coordinating committees or overlapping leadership. The very process of preparing an SSI grant application had helped states form coalitions and develop direction and strategies for reform.

The Eisenhower Regional Consortia contributed to framework development in many grantee states, as well as in states without Eisenhower curriculum framework projects. Linkages with the Eisenhower State Grant Program were only beginning to emerge during the initial phase of the evaluation. In general, however, Eisenhower state coordinators were involved in the framework projects and expected the frameworks to help guide their own Eisenhower programs.

The final report will be available in late 1997. Preliminary findings indicate the following (V.4.):

Progress in development of curriculum frameworks. As of spring 1997, 15 of the 16 project states had completed frameworks. In 7 of the 16 states, the projects sought official validation of the frameworks from the state board of education or the legislature.

Each of the states had three common concerns in developing frameworks:

1. **Quality.** The desire to produce high-quality frameworks;
2. **Consensus.** The desire to produce frameworks that are supported by teachers and the public; and
3. **Effective Implementation.** The desire to influence educational policy and practice with the new frameworks.

In each state, one of the three concerns was usually more important than the others because of the context of educational reform and practice of the state. For example, one state's framework was designed to force a rethinking of the traditional boundaries among math, science, and technology. Therefore, in that state the project team decided that an extensive review process would be needed to build the necessary consensus among the public and teachers. Likewise, in another state the project team decided that the only document that would be influential in local communities was one that was written exclusively by teachers.

The development of related products and activities. The framework documents received much more attention and resources than did the other products. In addition, each of the states followed very different development strategies for the other products. The strategies can be classified as follows:

- Drafting a document that recommends particular courses of action in the areas of teacher certification, recertification, and professional development;
- Implementing a set of activities such as framework-based workshops;

- Working with or handing off to an existing task force or project the responsibility for addressing one of these issue areas; and
- Choosing not to address particularly difficult issues like teacher recertification.

The final report from the evaluation of the Curriculum Frameworks Projects will be available in late 1997.

In addition to the evaluation of the Curriculum Frameworks Projects, each of the Initial Teacher Professional Development (ITPD) projects is required to submit an annual performance report and a final report to the Department's Office of Educational Research and Improvement. The final report is due 90 days after the end of the current grant period, December 1998. Finally, the Eisenhower National Clearinghouse is conducting an evaluation of its activities; the evaluation report will be available at the end of September 1997.

V. Sources of Information

1. Program files and program abstracts.
2. Daniel C. Humphrey, Patrick M. Shields, Lee Anderson, with the assistance of Kelly Colopy, M. Bruce Haslam, Camille Marder, Ellen M. Pechman, and Brenda Turnbull, Evaluation of the Dwight D. Eisenhower Mathematics and Science State Curriculum Frameworks Projects: First Interim Report (Washington, D.C.: Policy Studies Associates and SRI International, 1996).
3. R. K. Blank and E. M. Pechman, State Curriculum Frameworks in Mathematics and Science: How Are They Changing Across the States?, (Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers, 1995).
4. Daniel C. Humphrey, Patrick M. Shields, Lee Anderson, Camille Marder, with the assistance of Nancy Adelman, Ellen M. Pechman, Rolf Blank, Julia McMillan, Amy Spiegel, Laura Collins and Judi Powell, Dwight D. Eisenhower Mathematics and Science State Curriculum Frameworks Projects: Final Evaluation Report, (Washington, D.C.: Policy Studies Associates and SRI International forthcoming).

VI. Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Patricia Ross, (202) 219-2169

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