EISENHOWER PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Goal: To improve the quality of classroom teaching through professional development.	**Funding History** ($ in millions)			
	Fiscal Year	**Appropriation**	**Fiscal Year**	**Appropriation**
Legislation: Title II, Part B of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended (Dwight D. Eisenhower Professional Development Program) (20 U.S.C. 6601 et. seq.).	1985	$0	2000	$335
	1990	$0	2001	$485
	1995	$251	2002 (Requested)	$0

Program Description

The goals of the Eisenhower Professional Development State Grants Program are to provide financial assistance to state and local educational 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.

The Eisenhower Professional Development State Grants program is the largest Federal effort dedicated to supporting educator professional development. In 2000, the range of award amounts was $1,656,518 - $39,716,809 and the average state grant amount was approximately $6,352,000. The program provides funds to State educational agencies (SEAs), local educational agencies (LEAs), State agencies for higher education (SAHEs), institutions of higher education (IHEs), and qualified non-profit organizations (NPOs) to support sustained and intensive high-quality professional development for educators in the core academic subjects.

Of a State's total allocation, the SEA receives 84 percent and the SAHE 16 percent. The SEA distributes, by a formula similar to the initial Federal allocation, at least 90 percent of the funds that it receives to the LEAs within the State. The SAHE distributes at least 95 percent of its allocation in the form of competitive subgrants to IHEs and NPOs. Both the SEA and the SAHE may reserve up to five percent of their allocation for administration. The SEA may also reserve an additional five percent to carry out State-level professional development activities designed to ensure that educators are adequately prepared to assist students to meet challenging performance standards.

Each participating LEA must match every two dollars in Eisenhower funding with one dollar of its own resources, which can come from other Federal programs, such as Title I and Goals 2000, or from non-Federal sources. Of the total allocation, LEAs can retain up to 20 percent for district-wide activities and must use at least 80 percent for school-level activities determined by an assessment, which must include the active involvement of teachers, to determine local professional development needs.

While the Eisenhower program addresses professional development needs in all core academic subjects, it has a particular focus on the disciplines of mathematics and science. If the appropriation for all of Title II is below $250 million, all expenditures under the state Grants program must be used for professional development activities in mathematics and science. When the appropriation for Title II equals or exceeds $250 million, the first $250 million of appropriated funds must be expended on professional development activities in mathematics and science.

Program Performance

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

Subject Area Content

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets
	Districts	SAHE Grantees	
1998:	48%	68%	50%
1999:	No data available		Continuous increase
2000:	**No data available**		**60% for districts; 80% for SAHE grantees**
2001:			Continuous increase
2002:			Continuous increase

Instructional Methods

1998:	63%	79%	50%
1999:	No data available		Continuous increase
2000:	**No data available**		**66% for districts; 83% for SAHE grantees**
2001:			Continuous increase
2002:			Continuous increase

Curriculum

1998:	56%	64%	50%
1999:	No data available		Continuous increase
2000:	**No data available**		**60% for districts; 68% for SAHE grantees**
2001:			Continuous increase
2002:			Continuous increase

Approaches to Assessment

1998:	46%	48%	50%
1999:	No data available		Continuous increase
2000:	**No data available**		**60% for districts and SAHE grantees**
2001:			Continuous increase
2002:			Continuous increase

Use of Technology

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets
	Districts	SAHE Grantees	
1998:	24%	50%	50%
1999:	No data available		Continuous increase
2000:	**No data available**		**60% for districts and SAHE grantees**
2001:			Continuous increase
2002:			Continuous increase

Assessment of Progress

Status: No 2000 data. Unable to judge whether progress toward the 2000 target is likely.

Explanation: There is no data because the update to the 1999 study (which provided 1998 data) will not be collected and reported until fall, 2001.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: Update to Designing Effective Professional Development: Lessons from the Eisenhower Program (National Evaluation of the Eisenhower Program Report), 1999 (data collected in 1998).
Frequency: Biennially.
Next collection update: 2001.
Date to be reported: 2001.

Validation Procedure: N/A.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: The data on effects on knowledge and skills are self-reported by participants.

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Approaches to Diversity					
1998:	26%	35%	50%		
1999:	No data available		Continuous increase		
2000:	**No data available**		**60% for districts and SAHE grantees**		
2001:			Continuous increase		
2002:			Continuous increase		

Indicator 1.2 Teachers' classroom instruction: Teachers who receive high quality professional development focused on higher order teaching strategies are more likely to change their teaching practices.

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Teaching strategy: Use of calculators or computers to develop models				**Status:** 1999 is the first year for which data were available; thus, it is not yet possible to assess whether performance is improving. **Explanation:** The Eisenhower evaluation examined the effects of professional development in three areas of teaching designed to increase students' higher-order thinking: technology use, instructional methods, and approaches to assessing student work. In all three areas, the evaluation found that participation in professional development focused on specific higher-order teaching strategies in 1997-98 increased teachers' use of these strategies in 1998-99, controlling for teachers' use in 1996-97. The effect is even stronger when the professional development in which teachers participated has features of high quality (e.g., reform type, active learning, coherence, and collective participation.) Data are shown for three specific teaching strategies: use of calculators and computers to develop models, use of problems with no obvious solution, and use of science and mathematics projects to determine grades. For calculators and computers and problems with no obvious solutions, teachers employed the following scale to report the frequency of classroom use: 0=almost never used, 1=some lessons, 2=most lessons, 3=all lessons. For the use of science and mathematics projects to determine grades, teachers employed the following scale to report the importance of projects in grading: 0=not used, 1=minor importance, 2=moderate importance, 3=very important.	**Source:** *Does Professional Development Change Teaching Practice? Results from a three-year Study of Eisenhower and Other Professional Development*. (National Evaluation of the Eisenhower Program Report), 2000 (data collected in 1997-1999). *Frequency:* One time. *Next collection update:* N/A. *Date to be reported:* N/A. **Validation Procedure:** Data collected before ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data were developed. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** The data on the effects on classroom instruction are self-reported and are not nationally representative.
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**		
	Extent teachers who participated in professional development used teaching strategy in classroom	Extent teachers who did not participate in professional development used teaching strategy in classroom			
1998:	No data available				
1999:	0.9	0.5	50%		
2000:	**No data available**		**Continuous increase**		
2001:			Continuous increase		
2002:			Continuous increase		
Teaching strategy: Use of problems with no obvious solution					
1998:	No data available				
1999:	1.3	1.1	50%		
2000:	**No data available**		**Continuous increase**		
2001:			Continuous increase		
2002:			Continuous increase		
Teaching strategy: Use of mathematics and science projects to determine student grades					
1998:	No data available				
1999:	1.5	1.1			
2000:			**Continuous increase**		
2001:			Continuous increase		
2002:			Continuous increase		

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
Major emphasis on academic content				**Status:** No 2000 data. Unable to judge whether progress toward the 2000 target is likely. **Explanation:** There is no data because the update to the 1999 study (which provided 1998 data) will not be collected and reported until fall, 2001.	**Source:** Update to Designing Effective Professional Development: Lessons from the Eisenhower Program (National Evaluation of the Eisenhower Program Report), 1999 (Data were collected in 1998). *Frequency:* Biennially *Next collection update:* 2001. *Date to be reported:* 2001. **Validation Procedure:** N/A. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** The data are self-reported by participants.
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**		
	Districts	SAHE Grantees			
1998:	51%	68%	50%		
1999:	No data available		Continuous improvement		
2000:	**No data available**		**56% for districts; 72% for SAHE grantees**		
2001:			Continuous improvement		
2002:			Continuous improvement		
Involves all teachers in grade, department, or school					
1998:	19%	11%	50%		
1999:	No data available		Continuous improvement		
2000:	**No data available**		**56% for districts and SAHE grantees**		
2001:			Continuous improvement		
2002:			Continuous improvement		
Is followed up with other activities					
1998:	53%	70%	50%		
1999:	No data available		Continuous increase		
2000:	**No data available**		**56% for districts and 75% SAHE grantees**		
2001:			Continuous increase		
2002:			Continuous increase		
Involves: *a) Planning classroom implementation*					
1998:	66%	83%	50%		
1999:	No data available		Continuous increase		
2000:	**No data available**		**56% for districts; 86% for SAHE grantees**		
2001:			Continuous increase		
2002:			Continuous increase		
b) Presenting, leading, and writing					
1998:	40%	67%	50%		
1999:	No data available		Continuous increase		
2000:	**No data available**		**56% for districts; 70% for SAHE grantees**		
2001:			Continuous increase		
2002:			Continuous improvement		

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
c) Observing and being observed					
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**		
	Districts	SAHE Grantees			
1998:	19%	35%	50%		
1999:	No data available		Continuous increase		
2000:	**No data available**		**56% for districts and SAHE grantees**		
2001:			Continuous increase		
2002:			Continuous increase		
d) Reviewing student work					
1998:	30%	38%	50%		
1999:	No data available		Continuous increase		
2000:	**No data available**		**56% for districts and SAHE grantees**		
2001:			Continuous increase		
2002:			Continuous increase		

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
Percentage of teachers in activities that span 6 months or longer				**Status:** No 2000 data. Unable to judge whether progress toward the 2000 target is likely. **Explanation:** There is no data because the update to the 1999 study (which provided 1998 data) will not be collected and reported until fall, 2001.	**Source:** Update to Designing Effective Professional Development: Lessons from the Eisenhower Program (National Evaluation of the Eisenhower Program Report), 1999 (Data were collected in 1998). *Frequency:* Biannually. *Next collection update:* 2001. *Date to be reported:* 2001. **Validation Procedure:** N/A. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Data are self-reported by participants.
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**		
	Districts	SAHE Grantees			
1998:	20%	46%	**35%**		
1999:	No data available		Continuous increase		
2000:	**No data available**		**39% for districts; 50% for SAHE grantees**		
2001:			Continuous increase		
2002:			Continuous increase		

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
Percentage of Eisenhower participants who teach in high-poverty schools*				**Status:** No 2000 data. Unable to judge whether progress toward the 2000 target is likely. **Explanation:** There is no data because the update to the 1999 study (which provided 1998 data) will not be collected and reported until fall, 2001.	**Source:** Update to Designing Effective Professional Development: Lessons from the Eisenhower Program (National Evaluation of the Eisenhower Program Report), 1999. *Frequency:* Biennially *Next collection update:* 2001. *Date to be reported:* 2001. **Validation Procedure:** N/A. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Data are self-reported by participants.
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**		
	Districts	SAHE Grantees	For both districts and SAHE grantees**		
1998:	23%	13%	23%		
1999:	No data available		25%		
2000:	**No data available**		**27%**		
2001:			29%		
2002:			31%		
*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.

Indicator 4.1 Increasing percentages of states will adopt performance indicators for professional development, demonstrate a technical understanding of such indicators, and have data (or plans to collect data) for their indicators.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** No 2000 data. Unable to judge whether progress toward the 2000 target is likely. **Explanation:** There is no data because the study that collects and reports this data is only conducted triennially.	**Source:** Update to An Analysis of Eisenhower Triennial Reports (Draft), AEL, Inc., 1999. *Frequency:* Triennially. *Next collection update:* 2002. *Date to be reported:* 2002. **Validation Procedure:** N/A. **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.
1998:	No data Available	50%		
1999:	72%	70%		
2000:	**No data available**	**90%**		
2001:		100%		
2002:		100%		