

APPENDIX H

SUPPLEMENT FOR CHAPTER 6

This appendix provides supplementary information for the analyses reported in Chapter 6. Each Exhibit in the appendix corresponds to an Exhibit of the same number in Chapter 6. The boxes at the bottom of each Exhibit refer to SAHE-grantee Project Director Telephone Survey item numbers or composite variables on which the exhibit is based. Eisenhower Project Director Survey item numbers begin with the letter “E,” followed by the section of the survey (part A or B) and the item involved. For example, item numbers “EA069_1, EA069_2, and EA069_3” refer to the Project Director Survey part A, item 69_1, 2, and 3. (Item 69_1 is shown on printed copies of the survey as 69a, 69_2 is shown as 69b, etc.) All items referred to in the chapter appear in Exhibit 6.26d. Composite variables, which appear in all capital letters (for example, PDIRT), are defined in Exhibit 6.26b.

EXHIBIT H.6.2

Percent of Teachers Participating in SAHE-grantee Projects with Primary Activities that Cover Mathematics, Science, and Other Subject Areas (n=92)

Subject Areas	Percent of Teachers Participating in SAHE-grantee Activities
Mathematics Only	27.1
Science Only	18.5
Mathematics/Science	18.3
Mathematics/Science/Other	28.2
Other Only	8.0

Source: Telephone Survey of SAHE-grantee Project Directors, Spring 1998.
Variables: EA069_1—EA069_3

EXHIBIT H.6.3

Percent of Teachers Participating in SAHE-grantee Projects that Offer “Traditional” Activities (n=92)

Types of “Traditional” Activities	Offer Activity	Offer Activity as Primary Focus
College course	38.0	26.1
Workshops	76.3	55.3

Source: Telephone Survey of SAHE-grantee Project Directors, Spring 1998.
Variables: EA067, EB005, EB008, EB011

EXHIBIT H.6.4

Percent of Teachers Participating in SAHE-grantee Projects that Offer "Reform" Activities (n=92)

Types of "Reform" Activities	Offer Activity	Offer Activity as Primary Focus
Study Group	25.1	4.0
Teacher Networking	43.0	8.9
Mentoring	40.6	1.6
Committee or Task Force	15.4	0.0
Internship	6.8	0.0
Individual Research	11.9	0.0
Resource Center	32.0	0.0

Source: Telephone Survey of SAHE-grantee Project Directors, Spring 1998.
Variables: Responses combine primary activity (EA067_5 -- EA067_11) and other activities (B014, B016, B018, B020, B022, B024, B026) stud_all, stud_pri, net_all, net_pri, ment_all, ment_pri, comm_all, comm_pri, intn_all, intn_pri, proj_all, proj_pri, reso_all, reso_pri

EXHIBIT H.6.5

SAHE-grantees' Support for "Reform" Types of Activities, Overall and by Institution Type and Departmental Affiliation (n=92)

	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Significant Tukey Pairwise Contrasts (where p ≤ .05)</i>		
IHE Overall	13.85	(35.00)	86						
Institutional Type				2.72	1.80	.10			
Research	9.88	(33.77)	31						
Other	16.97	(35.70)	55						
Dept. Affiliation				3.73	2.80	.02	Math/Science	Education	Other
Math/Science	1.96	(13.93)	42						
Education	22.09	(45.16)	30				X		
Other	31.94	(43.94)	14				X		
Inst*Dept				1.11	2.80	.33			
NPO Overall	27.62	(43.37)	6						

Source: Telephone Survey of SAHE-grantee Project Directors, Spring 1998.
Variables: NET_REF

EXHIBIT H.6.6a

Percent of Teachers Participating in SAHE-grantee Projects, by Contact Hours of Primary Activity (n=92)

Number of Hours of Primary Activity	Percent of Teachers Participating in SAHE-grantee Activities
Less than 4	1.48
4 to 8	9.5
9 to 40	31.52
40 or more	57.5

Source: Telephone Survey of SAHE-grantee Project Directors, Spring 1998.
Variables: Amount-(=EA080)

EXHIBIT H.6.6b

Contact Hours of SAHE-grantees' Primary Activity, Overall and by Institution Type and Departmental Affiliation (n=92)

	Mean	SD	n	F	df	p	Significant Tukey Pairwise Contrasts (where $p \leq .05$)		
IHE Overall	64.11	95.14	86						
Institutional Type				1.15	1, 80	.28			
Research	82.32	(151.26)	31						
Other	49.78	(33.41)	55						
Dept. Affiliation				3.71	2, 80	.02	Math/Science	Education	Other
Math/Science	44.74	(36.32)	42						
Education	98.36	(148.53)	30						
Other	31.53	(23.94)	14						
Inst*Dept				4.45	2, 80	.01			
NPO Overall	27.37	(15.48)	6						

Source: Telephone Survey of SAHE-grantee Project Directors, Spring 1998.
Scale Definition: amount_j=ea080
Variables: EA080

EXHIBIT H.6.6c

Contact Hours of SAHE-grantees' Primary Activity, Interaction of Institution Type and Departmental Affiliation (n=86)

Departmental Affiliation	Research/Doctoral	SD	Other	SD
Math/Science	26.45	(29.71)	58.36	(34.28)
Education	140.37	(198.81)	56.19	(34.71)
Other	49.48	(35.14)	26.77	(17.51)

Source: Telephone Survey of SAHE-grantee Project Directors, Spring 1998.

Scale Definition: amount_i=ea080

Variables: EA080

EXHIBIT H.6.7a

Percent of Teachers Participating in SAHE-grantee Projects, by Time Span of Primary Activity (n=92)

Span of Primary Activities	Percent of Teachers Participating in SAHE-grantee Activities
1 day	6.94
2-7 days	7.69
8 days to 1 month	6.54
1 month to 1 year	52.27
>1 year	26.57

Source: Telephone Survey of SAHE-grantee Project Directors, Spring 1998.

Variables: EA077 (# span_i)

EXHIBIT H.6.7b

Span of SAHE-grantees' Primary Activity, Overall and by Institution Type and Departmental Affiliation (n=92)

	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Significant Tukey Pairwise Contrasts (where $p \leq .05$)</i>		
IHE Overall	3.83	(1.14)	86						
Institutional Type				0.83	1, 80	0.37			
Research	3.96	(1.40)	31						
Other	3.73	(0.97)	55						
Dept. Affiliation				7.24	2, 80	0.00	Math/Science	Education	Other
Math/Science	3.38	(1.43)	42						
Education	4.31	(0.55)	30				X		
Other	4.04	(0.38)	14						
Inst*Dept				.84	2, 80	.43			
NPO Overall	3.88	(0.53)	6						

Source: Telephone Survey of SAHE-grantee Project Directors, Spring 1998.

Variables: EA077 (=span_i)

EXHIBIT H.6.8a

Percent of Teachers Participating in SAHE-grantee Projects Whose Primary Activity Involves Collective Participation (n=92)

<i>Types of Participants</i>	<i>Percent</i>
All teachers in a school	14.34
All teachers in department or grade	15.24

Source: Telephone Survey of SAHE-grantee Project Directors, Spring 1998.

Variables: EA097_3, EA097_4

EXHIBIT H.6.8b

Collective Participation in SAHE-grantee Projects, Overall and by Institution Type and Departmental Affiliation (n=92)

	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Significant Tukey Pairwise Contrasts (where p ≤ .05)</i>
IHE Overall	0.15	(0.34)	86				
Institutional Type				8.09	1, 80	.00	
Research	0.24	(0.40)	31				
Other	0.08	(0.23)	55				
Dept. Affiliation				3.21	2, 80	.04	Math/Science Education Other
Math/Science	0.12	(0.32)	42				
Education	0.14	(0.34)	30				
Other	0.31	(0.42)	14				
Inst*Dept				0.90	2, 80	.41	
NPO Overall	0.00	(0.00)	6				

Source: Telephone Survey of SAHE-grantee Project Directors, Spring 1998.

Scale Definition: SCH_BS_I= mean(EA097_3, EA097_4)

Scale Reliability: .76

Variables: SCH_BS_I

EXHIBIT H.6.9a

Percent of Teachers Participating in SAHE-grantee Projects Whose Primary Activity Focuses on Content Knowledge (n=92)

<u>Extent of Content Knowledge Focus</u>	<u>Percent</u>
No emphasis	5.30
Some emphasis	23.02
Strong emphasis	71.68

Source: Telephone Survey of SAHE-grantee Project Directors, Spring 1998.

Variables: content_I

EXHIBIT H.6.9b

Extent of Content Knowledge Focus in SAHE-grantees' Primary Activity, Overall and by Institution Type and Departmental Affiliation (n=92)

	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Significant Tukey Pairwise Contrasts (where $p \leq .05$)</i>		
IHE Overall	2.67	(0.56)	86						
Institutional Type				3.28	1, 80	.07			
Research	2.78	(0.64)	31						
Other	2.58	(0.50)	55						
Dept. Affiliation				.58	2, 80	.56	Math/Science	Education	Other
Math/Science	2.74	(0.61)	42						
Education	2.62	(0.52)	30						
Other	2.52	(0.47)	14						
Inst*Dept				5.55	2, 80	.00			
NPO Overall	2.52	(0.80)	6						

Source: Telephone Survey of SAHE-grantee Project Directors, Spring 1998.

Variables: Content I

EXHIBIT H.6.9c

Extent of Content Knowledge Focus in SAHE-grantees' Primary Activity, by Institution Type and Departmental Affiliation (n=86)

Departmental Affiliation	Research/Doctoral	Other
Math/Science	2.63 (.95)	2.83 (.42)
Education	2.91 (.32)	2.29 (.48)
Other	2.84 (.32)	2.44 (.50)

Source: Telephone Survey of SAHE-grantee Project Directors, Spring 1998.

Variables: EA092

EXHIBIT H.6.10a

Percent of Teachers Participating in SAHE-grantee Projects that Provide Each of Sixteen Types of Opportunities for Active Learning in Primary Activity (n=92)

Types of active learning	Percent
Score Assessments	22.03
Participant Leads Whole Group Discussion	45.35
Participants Observe Others Teaching	46.56
Review Student Work	47.99
Participants Simulate Practice	56.50
Participants Receive Coaching	56.56
Leader Observes Participants Teaching	61.45
Participant Develops Curriculum	63.44
Participant Gives Lecture	65.04
Participants Write Paper	67.59
Informal Meetings	69.57
Participant Leads Small Discussion	70.74
Participant Conducts Demonstration	70.82
Communication with Teacher	78.91
Participants Discuss Implementation	81.64
Participants Share Work	82.68

Source: Telephone Survey of SAHE-grantee Project Directors, Spring 1998.

Variables: EA075_1-9, EA108_5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, and 13

EXHIBIT H.6.10b

Number of Types of Opportunities for Active Learning in SAHE-grantees' Primary Activity, Overall and by Institution Type and Departmental Affiliation (n=92)

	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Significant Tukey Pairwise Contrasts (where $p \leq .05$)</i>		
IHE Overall	9.8	(3.49)	86						
Institutional Type				.09	1, 80	0.77			
Research	9.71	(4.26)	31						
Other	9.94	(3.00)	55						
Dept. Affiliation				5.70	2, 80	.00	Math/Science	Education	Other
Math/Science	8.64	(3.62)	42						
Education	10.8	(3.35)	30						
Other	11.23	(2.08)	14						
Inst*Dept				7.28	2, 80	.00	<i>Significant interaction effects</i>		
NPO Overall	10.32	(4.55)	6						

Source: Telephone Survey of SAHE-grantee Project Directors, Spring 1998.

Scale Definition: ACTIVE_I= sum(EA075_1,EA075_2,EA075_3,EA075_4,EA075_5,EA075_6,EA075_7,EA075_8, EA075_9, EA108_5,EA108_6,EA108_7, EA108_8, EA108_10, EA108_12, EA108_13)

Scale Reliability: .77

Variables: ACTIVE_I

EXHIBIT H.6.10c

Number of Types of Opportunities for Active Learning in SAHE-grantees' Primary Activity, Interaction of Institution Type and Departmental Affiliation (n=86)

Departmental Affiliation	Research/Doctoral	SD	Other	SD
Math/Science	7.1	(4.55)	9.8	(2.85)
Education	12.1	(2.32)	9.3	(3.61)
Other	10.5	(2.09)	11.4	(2.15)

Source: Telephone Survey of SAHE-grantee Project Directors, Spring 1998.

Variables: ACTIVE_I

EXHIBIT H.6.11

Percent of Teachers Participating in SAHE-grantee Projects Whose Directors Report Placing No, Some, or a Strong Emphasis on Recruiting Teachers of Special Student Populations (n=92)

Teachers by Type of School or Type of Students	Strong Emphasis	Some Emphasis	No Emphasis
Title I Schools	18.37	36.74	44.89
Special Education	3.84	27.29	68.87
Limited English	3.59	24.73	71.67
Low Achievement	41.69	28.55	29.76
High Poverty	41.72	29.74	28.54

Source: Telephone Survey of SAHE-grantee Project Directors, Spring 1998.
Variables: EB036 EB037 EB038 EB039 EB040

EXHIBIT H.6.12

Percent of Teachers Participating in SAHE-grantee Projects, According to How Teachers Come to Participate (n=92)

Types of Participation	Percent
Volunteer	78.43
Principal selected	20.05
Provider selected	1.55
Rotation	.34
Other	.42

Source: Telephone Survey of SAHE-grantee Project Directors, Spring 1998.
Variables: EB031_1 – EB031_5

EXHIBIT H.6.13

Percent of Teachers Participating in SAHE-grantee Projects That Use Various Strategies to Increase Participation (n=92)

Strategies	Percent
Publicize Activities	82.62
Tailor Focus	50.40
Use Incentives	50.82
Other	18.11

Source: Telephone Survey of SAHE-grantee Project Directors, Spring 1998.
Variables: EB043_1 – EB043_4

EXHIBIT H.6.14a

Percent of Teachers Participating in SAHE-grantee Projects in which State and District Standards and Assessments Play a Role in Project Design (n=92)

Types of "Reform" Activities	Standards Play a Role	Assessments Play a Role
State	92.21	57.31
District	61.64	39.80

Source: Telephone Survey of SAHE-grantee Project Directors, Spring 1998.
Variables: EA032, EA033, EA034, EA035

EXHIBIT H.6.14b

Degree of Alignment between SAHE-grantees' Eisenhower Project and State and District Standards and Assessments, Overall and by Institution Type and Departmental Affiliation (n=92)

	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Significant Tukey Pairwise Contrasts (where $p \leq .05$)</i>		
IHE Overall	2.50	(1.32)	86						
Institutional Type				7.66	1, 80	.00			
Research	2.05	(1.57)	31						
Other	2.86	(1.06)	55						
Dept. Affiliation				1.52	2, 80	.22	Math/Science	Education	Other
Math/Science	2.29	(1.42)	42						
Education	2.69	(1.28)	30						
Other	2.72	(1.09)	14						
Inst*Dept				2.08	2, 80	.13			
NPO Overall	2.56	(1.14)	6						

Source: Telephone Survey of SAHE-grantee Project Directors, Spring 1998.

Scale Definition: Align_i = sum(EA032,EA033,EA034,EA035)

Scale Reliability: .59

Variables: ALIGN_I

EXHIBIT H.6.15

Percent of Teachers Participating in SAHE-grantee Projects That have Ongoing Feedback Mechanisms with Districts (n=92)

Feedback Mechanisms	Percent
Regularly Required Reports	14.17
Professional Development Evaluation	17.96

Source: Telephone Survey of SAHE-grantee Project Directors, Spring 1998.

Variables: EB059_3, EB059_4

EXHIBIT H.6.16

Percent of Teachers Participating in SAHE-grantee Projects That Support and Coordinate with District Professional Development Activities and Programs (n=92)

Type of SAHE-grantee Coordination with Districts	Percent
Support or Extend District Activities	73.76
Coordinate with District Programs	24.24

Source: Telephone Survey of SAHE-grantee Project Directors, Spring 1998.
Variables: EA025, EA062

EXHIBIT H.6.17

Percent of Teachers Participating in SAHE-grantee Projects That Work with Districts in Different Ways (n=92)

Ways SAHE Grantees Work with Districts	Percent
Participate in District Planning	52.95
Communicate with Staff	90.07
Use District Needs Assessment	70.80
Regular District Visits	37.66
Other Ways	64.46

Source: Telephone Survey of SAHE-grantee Project Directors, Spring 1998.
Variables: EA024_1—EA024_4, EB059_1

EXHIBIT H.6.18

Percent of Teachers Participating in SAHE-grantee Projects in Which District Staff Are Involved in Planning, Implementing, or Monitoring Eisenhower-assisted Activities (n=92)

Types of People With Whom SAHE Grantees Work	Percent
District Eisenhower Coordinators	23.84
Other District Administrators	52.64

Source: Telephone Survey of SAHE-grantee Project Directors, Spring 1998.
Variables: peopinvi = EA030_1N, EA030_2N

EXHIBIT H.6.19

Percent of Teachers Participating in SAHE-grantee Projects That Co-fund and/or Work Closely with Other Federal Programs (When the Program Operates in the District) (n=92)

Federal Programs	Operates in state/district	Supports professional development	Co-funds with	Works closely with
SSI	28.2	90.7	27.2	45.9
USI	7.0	80.6	15.0	61.5
RSI	3.4	90.0	0	80.9
LSC	3.5	100.0	61.4	76.0
Title I, Part A	63.5	83.3	37.4	22.4

Source: Telephone Survey of SAHE-grantee Project Directors, Spring 1998.
Variables: work closely: EA040 EA044 EA048 EA052 EA056; Co-fund: EA039 EA043 EA047

EXHIBIT H.6.20

Number of Types of Coordination of SAHE-grantee Projects with Districts, Overall and by Institution Type and Departmental Affiliation (n=92)

	Mean	SD	n	F	df	p	Significant Tukey Pairwise Contrasts (where $p \leq .05$)		
IHE Overall	5.52	(2.44)	86						
Institutional Type				2.80	1, 80	.09			
Research	5.03	(3.32)	31						
Other	5.90	(1.73)	55						
Dept. Affiliation				6.74	2, 80	0.00	Math/Science	Education	Other
Math/Science	4.82	(2.30)	42						
Education	6.51	(2.54)	30				X		
Other	5.07	(1.90)	14						
Inst*Dept					2, 80				
NPO Overall	5.50	(1.84)	6						

Source: Telephone Survey of SAHE-grantee Project Directors, Spring 1998.
Variables: COORDI

EXHIBIT H.6.21

Percent of Teachers Participating in SAHE-grantee Projects, by Status and Effect of District and State Performance Indicators on the Project (n=92)

Status of State and District Performance Indicators	Percent
State Has Performance Indicators	49.6
Given State Indicators, Effect on Eisenhower	76.5
District Developed at Least Some Performance Indicators	39.6
Given District Indicators, Effect on Eisenhower	21.5

Source: Telephone Survey of SAHE-grantee Project Directors, Spring 1998.
Variables: EB049 EB051 EB052 EB055

EXHIBIT H.6.22

Percent of Teachers Participating in SAHE-grantee Projects That Use Different Strategies to Assess Teachers' Professional Development Needs (n=92)

Needs Assessment Methods	Percent
Teacher Survey	50.7
Teacher Representative Meeting	40.7
Principal Survey	19.2
Measure Student Performance	23.6
Informal Conversation	50.0

Source: Telephone Survey of SAHE-grantee Project Directors, Spring 1998.
Variables: EB046_1 – EB046_5

EXHIBIT H.6.23

Percent of Teachers Participating in SAHE-grantee Projects That Use Different Methods for Evaluating Activities (n=92)

Evaluation Methods	Percent
Teacher Participation	61.1
Teacher Survey	91.9
Observe Teachers	59.3
Student Achievement	30.6

Source: Telephone Survey of SAHE-grantee Project Directors, Spring 1998.
Variables: EB048_1 – EB048_4

EXHIBIT H.6.24

Extent of SAHE-grantee Continuous Improvement Efforts, Overall and by Institution Type and Departmental Affiliation (n=92)

	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Significant Tukey Pairwise Contrasts (where $p \leq .05$)</i>		
IHE Overall	1.38	(0.80)	86						
Institutional Type				8.79	1, 80	0.00			
Research	1.17	(0.87)	31						
Other	1.55	(0.73)	55						
Dept. Affiliation				20.77	2, 80	0.00	Math/Science	Education	Other
Math/Science	0.91	(0.50)	42						
Education	1.83	(0.73)	30				X		
Other	1.71	(0.93)	14				X		
Inst*Dept				.88	2, 80	.42			
NPO Overall	1.76	(0.64)	6						

Source: Telephone Survey of SAHE-grantee Project Directors, Spring 1998.

Variables: CONIMP_I

EXHIBIT H.6.25a

Relationship of SAHE-grantee Implementation to Design and Characteristics of Professional Development

	Dependent Variables ^a								
	Align	Coordinate	Reform	Continuous Improvement	Time Span	Contact Hours	Collective Participation	Active Learning	Targeting
Non-research/Doctoral Institution	.26*	.21	.09	.26**	-.25*	-.26*	-.35**	-.07	.05
	.68	1.03	.08	.40	-.51	-49.80	-.24	-.43	.04
	(.29)	(.53)	(.09)	(.15)	(.22)	(19.33)	(.08)	(.67)	(.10)
NPO	.07	.12	.03	.08	-.11	-.12	-.35**	-.09	.02
	.37	1.24	.05	.25	-.47	-51.81	-.53	-1.19	.05
	(.72)	(1.31)	(.22)	(.36)	(.53)	(45.40)	(.18)	(1.57)	(.24)
Mathematics/Science Department	-.08	.01	-.16	-.48***	-.13	.14	-.29	-.15	.18
	-.21	.07	-.13	-.74	-.26	26.40	-.20	-.93	.17
	(.42)	(.77)	(.14)	(.21)	(.33)	(28.62)	(.12)	(.99)	(.15)
Education Department	.03	.35*	.09	.07	.15	.12	-.45**	.02	.17
	.08	1.78	.07	.11	.32	23.75	-.32	.12	.16
	(.44)	(.81)	(.14)	(.22)	(.33)	(28.83)	(.12)	(1.00)	(.15)
Alignment			.10		.15	-.14	-.18	.06	.05
			.03		.11	-10.52	-.05	.14	.02
			(.04)		(.09)	(7.83)	(.03)	(.27)	(.04)
Coordination			-.27*		-.30*	.48***	.32*	.07	.13
			-.04		-.13	18.89	.05	.09	.02
			(.02)		(.05)	(4.51)	(.02)	(.16)	(.02)
Continuous Improvement			.21		.24	.20	.08	.34**	.39**
			.11		.33	24.96	.04	1.39	.24
			(.07)		(.17)	(14.68)	(.06)	(.51)	(.08)
R ²	6.7	12.1	13.5	31.7	22.9	34.7	20.6	25.0	24.5

Note: ^a For each dependent variable, standardized regression coefficient (β) is shown on the first line; unstandardized regression coefficient (b) on the second line; standard error (in parentheses) on the third line.

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

EXHIBIT H.6.25b

Variable Definitions

Variables	Symbol	Coding
Non-research/doctoral institution		Based on EA006, dummy coded: research or doctoral institution=0, all others=1
NPO	A005	NPO=1, institution of higher education=0
Mathematics/science department		Based on EA007, dummy coded: math or science department=1, all others=0
Education department		Based on EA007, dummy coded: education school or department=1, all others=0
Alignment	ALIGN_I	EA032+EA033+EA034+EA035 Reliability=.59
Coordination	COORD_I	Sum of five scales: COFUND_I, REQUIRE_I, SUPEXT_I, WORKWD_I, AND PEOPINVI, defined as follows, with each variable dummy coded: COFUND_I=EA039+EA043+EA047+EA051+EA055 REQUIRE_I = EB059_3+EB059_4 SUPEXT_I=EA025+EA062 WORKWD_I=EA024_1+EA024_2+EA024_3+EA024_4+EB059_1 PEOPINVI=EA030_1+EA030_2 Reliability=.48
Reform vs Traditional	REFM_PRI	Percent of support for reform-type activities
Continuous Improvement	CONIMP_I	
Time Span	EA077	Coded one day=1 through more than one year=5
Contact Hours	EA080	Coded in hours
Collective Participation	SCH_BS_I	(EA097_3+EA097_4)/2, with each variable dummy coded
Active learning	ACTIVE_I	Sum of EA075_1 – EA075_9 and ea108_5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, and 13, each dummy coded
Targeting		(EB036+EB037+EB038+EB039+EB040)/5, with each item coded 1=no emphasis, 2=some emphasis, 3=strong emphasis

EXHIBIT H.6.25c

Correlations among SAHE-grantee Professional Development Variables

	Non-Research	NPO	Math/Sci Dept	Ed Dept	Align	Coordinate	Reform Type	Cont. Improve	Time Span	Contact Hours	Collective Participation	Active Learning	Targeting
Non-research/Doctoral Institution	1.00												
NPO	.25*	1.00											
Mathematics/Science Department	.08	-.21*	1.00										
Education Department	-.10	-.18	-.70***	1.00									
Alignment	.29**	.01	-.15	.11	1.00								
Coordination	.17	.00	-.26*	.32**	.53***	1.00							
Reform vs. Traditional Type	.07	.05	-.25*	.15	.06	-.05	1.00						
Continuous Improvement	.21*	.10	-.54***	.38***	.35***	.48***	.23*	1.00					
Time Span	-.10	.01	-.37***	.33**	.13	.03	.15	.28**	1.00				
Contact Hours	-.14	-.09	-.17	.30**	.11	.48***	-.10	.30**	.17	1.00			
Collective Participation	-.20	-.10	-.06	-.02	-.06	.17	-.16	.08	.20	.48***	1.00		
Active Learning	.02	.03	-.31**	.21*	.17	.28**	.17	.39***	.57**	.26*	.08	1.00	
Targeting	.14	-.02	-.17	.21*	.24*	.35***	.09*	.44***	.09	.36***	.23*	.19	1.00

Note: * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

EXHIBIT H.6.25d

Items from SAHE-Grantee Project Director Telephone Interview Used in Analyses Reported in Chapter 6

SAHE-GRANTEE PROJECT DIRECTOR TELEPHONE INTERVIEW

NOTE: The IHE/NPO Project Director Interview was administered as a Computer-Assisted form, and the items as administered appeared on a computer screen. The following printed items parallel the versions that appeared on the CATI screen, but some details have been changed.

PART A

Eisenhower project

5. Which best describes your organization. Is it an institution of higher education or another not-for-profit organization?
 1. Institution for higher education
 2. Other not-for-profit organization

6. What type of college or university do you work in? Do you work in:
 1. A research institution
 2. A doctoral granting institution
 3. An institution that primarily grants bachelor's and master's degrees
 4. A private liberal arts institution
 5. A public two-year institution
 6. Another type of institution. Please specify

7. Which department, school, or center are you affiliated with at your institution? Are you affiliated with:
 1. The math department
 2. The science department
 3. The education school or department
 4. A research center
 5. Another department or school

24. How do you work with the district? Do you:
 - a. Participate in district planning
 - b. Communicate periodically with district staff
 - c. Rely on district needs assessments to plan your project
 - d. Work with the district in other ways
 - e. Or do you not work very closely with the district

25. Is your professional development activity designed to support or extend other professional development activities in the district?
 1. Yes
 2. No

32. Did state standards and frameworks play a role in designing your project?
 1. Yes. If yes, how did they play a role?
 2. No

33. Did district standards and frameworks play a role in designing your project?
 1. Yes. If yes, how did they play a role?
 2. No

EXHIBIT H.6.25d (Continued)

Items from SAHE-grantee Project Director Telephone Interview Used in Analyses Reported in Chapter 6

34. Did state assessments play a role in designing your project?
 1. Yes. If yes, how did they play a role?
 2. No
35. Did district assessments play a role in designing your project?
 1. Yes. If yes, how did they play a role?
 2. No
37. Did a National Science Foundation State Systemic Initiative operate in the last year in the districts with which you work?
 1. Yes
 2. No (skip to 41)
 3. Don't know (skip to 41)
38. Did the program support professional development last year in the districts with which you work?
 1. Yes
 2. No (skip to 40)
39. Did the program co-fund professional development last year with your Eisenhower project?
 1. Yes
 2. No
40. Did program staff work closely with your Eisenhower project staff in the last year?
 1. Yes
 2. No
41. Did a National Science Foundation Urban Systemic Initiative operate in the last year in the districts with which you work?
 1. Yes
 2. No (skip to 45)
 3. Don't know (skip to 45)
42. Did the program support professional development last year in the districts with which you work?
 1. Yes
 2. No (skip to 44)
43. Did the program co-fund professional development last year with your Eisenhower project?
 1. Yes
 2. No
44. Did program staff work closely with your Eisenhower project staff in the last year?
 1. Yes
 2. No
45. Did a National Science Foundation Rural Systemic Initiative operate in the last year in the districts with which you work?
 1. Yes
 2. No (skip to 49)
 3. Don't know (skip to 49)

EXHIBIT H.6.25d (Continued)

Items from SAHE-grantee Project Director Telephone Interview Used in Analyses Reported in Chapter 6

46. Did the program support professional development last year in the districts with which you work?
 1. Yes
 2. No (skip to 48)
47. Did the program co-fund professional development last year with your Eisenhower project?
 1. Yes
 2. No
48. Did program staff work closely with your Eisenhower project staff in the last year?
 1. Yes
 2. No
49. Did a National Science Foundation Local Systemic Initiative operate in the last year in the districts with which you work?
 1. Yes
 2. No (skip to 53)
 3. Don't know (skip to 53)
50. Did the program support professional development last year in the districts with which you work?
 1. Yes
 2. No (skip to 52)
51. Did the program co-fund professional development last year with your Eisenhower project?
 1. Yes
 2. No
52. Did program staff work closely with your Eisenhower project staff in the last year?
 1. Yes
 2. No
53. Did Title I, Part A (Helping Disadvantaged Children) operate in the last year in the districts with which you work?
 1. Yes
 2. No (skip to 57)
 3. Don't know (skip to 57)
54. Did the program support professional development last year in the districts with which you work?
 1. Yes
 2. No (skip to 56)
55. Did the program co-fund professional development last year with your Eisenhower project?
 1. Yes
 2. No
56. Did program staff work closely with your Eisenhower project staff in the last year?
 1. Yes
 2. No

EXHIBIT H.6.25d (Continued)

Items from SAHE-grantee Project Director Telephone Interview Used in Analyses Reported in Chapter 6

CHARACTERISTICS OF EISENHOWER-SUPPORTED ACTIVITIES – PRIMARY ACTIVITY

I would like now to ask about the characteristics of your Eisenhower-supported activities.

For our purposes, we have defined a single activity as an event with a common group of participants. For example, if four different groups of teachers attended the same workshop on four separate occasions, this would count as four activities. But if one group of teachers attended a workshop and a follow-up event, this would count as one activity.

64. Using this definition, how many Eisenhower-supported professional development activities did you lead from July 1 through December 1997.

In the following questions, we will ask you to describe a professional development activity you provided using Eisenhower funds. If you provided more than one Eisenhower-supported activity, please pick your primary activity.

66. What is the name of your primary activity?

67. Which of the following best describes the activity? **Choose only one response.** If more than one response fits your activity, pick the response that best describes the aspect of the activity in which participants spend the most time.

- a. In-district workshop or institute
- b. Out-of-district workshop or institute
- c. Out-of-district conference
- d. College course
- e. Teacher collaborative or network
- f. Internship or immersion activity
- g. Mentoring, coaching, observation
- h. Teacher resource center
- i. Teacher committee or task force
- j. Teacher study group
- k. Individual research project
- l. Other (please specify)

69. On what subject areas did the activity focus? Did it focus on

- a. Mathematics
- b. Science
- c. Other subjects (specify)

74. As part of the professional development activity, including preliminary and follow-up sessions, did participants have the opportunity to try out what they learned in their classroom and obtain feedback?

1. Yes
2. No (skip to 77)

EXHIBIT H.6.25d (Continued)

Items from SAHE-grantee Project Director Telephone Interview Used in Analyses Reported in Chapter 6

75. How did this activity help participants use new skills in their classroom? (Circle all that apply.)
- Participants practiced under simulated conditions, with feedback
 - Participants received coaching or mentoring in the classroom
 - Participants met formally with other activity participants to discuss classroom implementation
 - You or other activity leaders observed participants' teaching and provide feedback
 - Participants' teaching was observed by other participants and feedback was provided
 - Participants communicated with you concerning classroom implementation
 - Participants shared their students' work which you or other participants reviewed
 - Participants met informally with other participants to discuss classroom implementation
 - Participants developed curricula or lesson plans, which you or other participants reviewed
 - Other (specify) _____
77. Over what period of time was the activity spread, including the main activity and any formal preliminary or follow-up sessions?
- One day or less
 - More than one day but less than one week
 - More than one week but less than one month
 - More than one month but less than one year, or
 - More than one year
80. How many hours did the typical participant engage in as part of this activity? Include the main activity as well as any preliminary or formal follow-up sessions.
92. How much emphasis did the activity give to deepening content knowledge?
- No emphasis
 - Some emphasis, or
 - Strong emphasis
97. Which of the following groups participated in the activity? Did... (Circle all that apply)
- Teachers as individuals
 - Teachers as representatives of their department, grade level, or school
 - All teachers in department or grade-level groupings
 - All teachers in a school or set of schools
 - Other configurations (specify) _____

EXHIBIT H.6.25d (Continued)

Items from SAHE-grantee Project Director Telephone Interview Used in Analyses Reported in Chapter 6

108. Which of the following did participants engage in during the activity? Did they... (Circle all that apply)
- a. Listen to a lecture
 - b. Observe a demonstration of a lesson or unit
 - c. Participate in a whole-group discussion
 - d. Participate in a small-group discussion
 - e. Give a lecture or presentation
 - f. Conduct a demonstration of a lesson or unit
 - g. Lead a whole-group discussion
 - h. Lead a small-group discussion
 - i. Engage in extended problem solving
 - j. Write a paper, report or plan
 - k. Develop or review materials
 - l. Reviewed student work
 - m. Score assessments
 - n. Collaborate as a colleague with mathematicians or scientists
 - o. Use technology (computers, calculators, or the internet)
 - p. Complete paper-and-pencil problems or exercises
 - q. Assess other participants' knowledge or skills
 - r. Engage in anything else? What else did participants engage in during the activity?

PART B

OTHER EISENHOWER-ASSISTED ACTIVITIES

4. Other than the activity you have been describing, did you support any other activities over the period from July 1, 1997 through December 31 using Eisenhower funds?
 1. Yes
 2. No (skip to 30)
5. Did you support in-district workshops or institutes (that is, workshops intended for teachers from a single district?)
 1. Yes
 2. No (skip to 8)
7. About how many teachers participated in these in-district workshops or institutes?
8. Did you support out-of-district workshops or conferences (that is, workshops intended for teachers from a multiple districts?)
 1. Yes
 2. No (skip to 11)
10. About how many teachers participated in these out-of-district workshops or conferences?
11. Did you support college courses for credit?
 1. Yes
 2. No (skip to 14)
13. About how many teachers participated in these college courses?

EXHIBIT H.6.25d (Continued)

Items from SAHE-grantee Project Director Telephone Interview Used in Analyses Reported in Chapter 6

14. Did you support teacher collaboratives or networks?
 1. Yes
 2. No (skip to 16)
15. About how many teachers participated in these teacher collaboratives or networks?
16. Did you support internships or immersion activities?
 1. Yes
 2. No (skip to 18)
17. About how many teachers participated in these internship or immersion activities?
18. Did you support mentoring, coaching, or observation?
 1. Yes
 2. No (skip to 20)
19. About how many teachers participated in these mentoring, coaching, or observation activities?
20. Did you support a teacher resource center?
 1. Yes
 2. No (skip to 22)
21. About how many teachers used this resource center?
22. Did you support teacher communities or task forces?
 1. Yes
 2. No (skip to 24)
23. About how many teachers participated in these committees or task forces?
24. Did you support teacher study groups?
 1. Yes
 2. No (skip to 26)
25. About how many teachers participated in these teacher study groups?
26. Did you support teacher or other school staff in conducting individual research projects?
 1. Yes
 2. No (skip to 28)
27. About how many teachers or other school staff participated in these individual research projects?
28. Did you support any other activities?
 1. Yes
 2. No (skip to 30)
29. About how many teachers participated in these other activities?

EXHIBIT H.6.25d (Continued)

Items from SAHE-grantee Project Director Telephone Interview Used in Analyses Reported in Chapter 6

Targeting and recruitment

31. Of the teachers in your Eisenhower activities, what percent come to participate in each of the following ways?
 - a What percent volunteer?
 - b What percent are selected by their principal or other administrator?
 - c What percent participate by rotation?
 - d What percent come to participate in other ways?

35. Do you try to increase the participation of either teachers from historically under represented populations or teachers from specific types of schools (for example, teachers of low-income, limited English proficiency, or racial/ethnic minority students)?

36. How much emphasis do you give to recruiting Title I teachers for your activities?
 1. No particular emphasis
 2. Some emphasis, or
 3. Strong emphasis

37. How much emphasis do you give to recruiting special education teachers for your activities?
 1. No particular emphasis
 2. Some emphasis, or
 3. Strong emphasis

38. How much emphasis do you give to recruiting teachers of limited English proficiency students for your activities?
 1. No particular emphasis
 2. Some emphasis, or
 3. Strong emphasis

39. How much emphasis do you give to recruiting teachers from schools with low achievement levels for your activities?
 1. No particular emphasis
 2. Some emphasis, or
 3. Strong emphasis

40. How much emphasis do you give to recruiting teachers from high poverty schools (50 percent or more students eligible for free and reduced lunch) for your activities?
 1. No particular emphasis
 2. Some emphasis, or
 3. Strong emphasis

41. How much emphasis do you give to recruiting paraprofessionals for your activities?
 1. No particular emphasis
 2. Some emphasis, or
 3. Strong emphasis

EXHIBIT H.6.25d (Continued)

Items from SAHE-grantee Project Director Telephone Interview Used in Analyses Reported in Chapter 6

43. In which of the following ways do you try to increase the participation of teachers, paraprofessionals, or other populations? (Circle all that apply)

Do you....

- a. Publicize activities
- c. Use incentives
- c. Tailor the focus of professional development towards the needs of special populations
- d. Do you use other strategies?

Processes and procedures

46. In which of the following ways are teachers' needs for professional development assessed? (Circle all that apply)

- a. With a survey of teachers
- b. With meetings of teacher representatives
- c. With a survey of principals or department chairs
- d. With measures of student performance
- e. With informal conversations
- f. Are teachers' needs assessed in other ways (please specify)

47. Do you evaluate Eisenhower-supported professional development?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No (skip to 49)

48. In which of the following ways do you evaluate Eisenhower-supported professional development? (Circle all that apply)

- a. By number of teachers participating in professional development
- b. With a teacher satisfaction survey
- c. With observations of teachers
- d. With student achievement scores
- e. In other ways (please specify)

49. Are you aware of any performance indicators for professional development set by the state?

1. Yes
2. No (skip to 52)

51. Have they affected your Eisenhower project?

1. Yes. How have they affected your Eisenhower project?
2. No

52. Have the districts you work with developed performance indicators for professional development?

1. All have (skip to 54)
2. Most have (skip to 54)
3. Some have (skip to 54)
4. None have
5. Don't know

EXHIBIT H.6.25d (Continued)

Items from SAHE-grantee Project Director Telephone Interview Used in Analyses Reported in Chapter 6

53. Are the districts you are working with developing performance indicators for professional development?
1. All are (skip to 56)
 2. Most are (skip to 56)
 3. Some are (skip to 56)
 4. None are (skip to 56)
 5. Don't know (skip to 56)
55. Have they affected your Eisenhower project?
1. Yes. How have they affected your Eisenhower project?
 2. No
59. Do any of the following ongoing feedback mechanisms exist between you and the district?
- a. Regular visits and observations of professional development activities by the district
 - b. Telephone calls
 - c. Regular required reports
 - d. Required evaluations of professional development activities
 - e. Other feedback mechanisms
 - f. No ongoing feedback