

Local Systemic Change through Teacher Enhancement

Year Two Cross-Site Report

By

Iris R. Weiss
Kathleen A. Rapp
Diana L. Montgomery

October 1997

Horizon Research, Inc.
111 Cloister Court - Suite 220
Chapel Hill, NC 27514-2296

Table of Contents

	<i>Page</i>
List of Figures	iv
List of Tables	vi
List of Boxes	vii
Acknowledgments	viii
Chapter One: Introduction.....	1
Description of Core Evaluation Data Collection Activities.....	1
An Overview of Cohort 1 and 2 Projects	4
Chapter Two: Results	
Core Evaluation Question I: Quality of Professional Development.....	9
Teacher Ratings of District-Provided Professional Development	9
Description of LSC Professional Development Activities	11
Teacher Ratings of the Quality of LSC Professional Development.....	23
Ratings of Individual Professional Development Sessions	24
Summary.....	34
Core Evaluation Question II: Involvement in LSC.....	36
Teacher Participation	36
School Involvement in Reform	37
Core Evaluation Question III: Teacher Attitudes, Beliefs, and Preparation..	39
Teacher Attitudes and Beliefs about Science and Mathematics Education.....	40
Teacher Perceptions of Their Preparedness	43
Summary.....	55
Core Evaluation Question IV: Classroom Practice.....	56
Teacher Descriptions of Classroom Practice.....	56
Evaluator Descriptions of Classroom Practice	61
An Evaluative Look at Classrooms	66
Summary.....	74
A First Look at the Impact of LSC Professional Development	76
Teacher Perceptions of the Impact of the LSC.....	76
Changes in Cohort 1 Science Instruction: Year One to Year Two.....	77
Comparison of Results by Level of Involvement in Professional Development	79
Summary.....	85

Core Evaluation Question V: Supportive Context for Reform	86
Teachers Perceptions of Support for Reform	86
Principal Views on Science and Mathematics Reform	90
Teacher and Principal Views on the Policy Environment for Reform	91
Evaluator Ratings of Support for Reform	94
Core Evaluation Question VI: Sustainability of the Professional Development System	98
Chapter Three: Summary and Conclusions	101

List of Figures

	<i>Page</i>
1. Community Type for Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 Schools	5
2. Student Race/Ethnicity for Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 Schools	6
3. Characteristics of Students in LSC Schools.....	7
4. Involvement of School Personnel in Addition to Classroom Teachers.....	8
5. Outreach to Groups External to the School	8
6. Composite: Quality of District Professional Development	10
7. Participants in Observed LSC Professional Development Activities.....	12
8. Major Disciplinary Content Areas of Observed Science Professional Development Activities.....	14
9. Major Disciplinary Content Areas of Observed Mathematics Professional Development Activities.....	14
10. Pedagogical Content Areas of Observed LSC Professional Development Activities...	15
11. Components of Professional Development System	17
12. Teachers’ Assessment of LSC Professional Development Activities	24
13. Professional Development Session Ratings-Design.....	26
14. Professional Development Session Ratings-Implementation	26
15. Professional Development Session Ratings-Disciplinary Content	27
16. Professional Development Session Ratings-Pedagogical Content.....	27
17. Professional Development Session Ratings-Classroom Culture.....	28
18. Professional Development Session Ratings-Capacity for Exemplary Instruction	29
19. Professional Development Session Ratings-Leadership Capacity	30
20. Professional Development Capsule Ratings of Observed Sessions	31
21. Schools Heavily Involved in Reform in Each Subject	37
22. Schools “well-along” in Improving their Program.....	38
23. Composite: Attitudes Toward Teaching	40
24. “I enjoy teaching science/mathematics”	41
25. “Students learn science/mathematics best with students of similar abilities”	42
26. Importance of Various Alternative Assessment Techniques	42
27. Level of Preparedness to Teach Science/Mathematics.....	44
28. “I am Well-Informed About National Standards in Science/Mathematics”	44
29. Composite: Preparation-Knowledge of Science/Mathematics Topics	45
30. Principal Concerns: Effect of Teacher Preparation on Science/Mathematics Instruction	47
31. Composite: Preparation-Pedagogical Content	49
32. Composite: Preparation-Instructional Strategies.....	49
33. Pedagogical Strategies: Comparison of Teachers Responding “Very Important” and “Very Well Prepared” to Use Various Strategies.....	51
34. Instructional Strategies: Comparison of Teachers Responding “Very Important” and “Very Well Prepared” to Use Various Strategies.....	52
35. Assessment Strategies: Comparison of Teachers Responding “Very Important” and “Very Well Prepared” to Use Various Strategies.....	53

36. Composite: Preparation-Equity and Diversity	54
37. Level of Preparedness to Involve Parents.....	54
38. Teachers Reporting Instruction in Each Subject on All 5 of the Last 5 days	57
39. Composite: Use of Student Centered Strategies	58
40. Composite: Investigative Culture.....	58
41. Composite: Use of Assessment Strategies.....	60
42. Class Size.....	61
43. Minority Enrollment in Observed Classes.....	62
44. Purposes of Science and Mathematics Lessons	63
45. Focus of Science Lessons	64
46. Focus of Cohort 2 Mathematics Lessons.....	64
47. Lessons with High Ratings For Design	67
48. Lessons with High Ratings for Implementation.....	68
49. Lessons with High Ratings for Content.....	69
50. Lessons with High Ratings for Classroom Culture.....	70
51. Lessons with High Ratings for Likely to Enhance Student Ability	71
52. Cohort 1 Teachers Feeling At Least Fairly Well Prepared.....	78
53. Cohort 1 Science Classes Engaged in Hands-on Activities At Least Once a Week.....	78
54. 1996 LSC Science Composites by Extent of Teacher Participation in Professional Development.....	79
55. 1996 LSC Mathematics Composites by Extent of Teacher Participation in Professional Development.....	80
56. Teachers Feeling Very Well Prepared to Teach Mathematics Topic.....	80
57. Teachers Feeling Very Well Prepared to Teach Each Science Topic.....	81
58. Teachers Feeling Very Well Prepared For Each Activity-Science.....	82
59. Teachers Feeling Very Well Prepared For Each Activity-Mathematics	82
60. Teachers Feeling Very Well Prepared in Aspects of Equity and Diversity-Science	83
61. Teachers Feeling Very Well Prepared in Aspects of Equity and Diversity -Mathematics.....	83
62. Instructional Strategies in Science Classes.....	84
63. Instructional Strategies in Mathematics Classes	85
64. Teacher Perceptions of Support from Colleagues.....	87
65. Composite: Administrative Support.....	88
66. Composite: Parent Support	88
67. Principal Knowledge of National Standards.....	91
68. Composite: Alignment of District Policies	91
69. Teachers Labeling Each a Major Problem.....	92
70. Principals Labeling each a Major Problem.....	93
71. Support for LSC Reform.....	94
72. Percent of Projects Where Evaluators Report Each Factor Facilitates Reform.....	95
73. Capacity to Implement High-Quality Professional Development	99
74. Resources to Support On-Going Professional Development.....	100
75. Structures for Sustaining High-Quality Professional Development	100

List of Tables

	<i>Page</i>
1. Professional Development Providers in LSC Projects	7
2. Teacher Descriptions of District Professional Development.....	11
3. Major Intended Purposed of Observed LSC Professional Development Sessions	13
4. Major Activities at Observed LSC Professional Development Sessions	16
5. Continuum Ratings for Quality of LSC Professional Development	16
6. Teachers Reporting Participation in Various Types of Professional Development Activities in the Past 12 Months	36
7. Teacher Participation in Various Numbers of Hours of Structured Professional Development.....	37
8. Teachers Indicating Each Strategy is “Very Important” for Effective Instruction	41
9. Level of Preparedness Reported by Teachers in Various Science Content Areas	46
10. Level of Preparedness Reported by Cohort 2 Mathematics Teachers in Various Mathematics Content Areas	46
11. Teacher Perceptions of Their Preparation to Implement Standards-Based Instruction.....	50
12. Classes Participating in Each Activity at Least Once a Week	58
13. Activities Ever Occurring in Science and Mathematics Classes.....	59
14. Instructional Strategies Used at Least Once a Week.....	59
15. Assessment Activities in Science and Mathematics Classes Using Each Type of Assessment at Least Once a Month	60
16. Instructional Activities in Observed Classes.....	65
17. Lessons Rated 4 or 5 on Design Indicators.....	66
18. Lessons Rated 4 or 5 on Implementation Indicators	67
19. Lessons Rated 4 or 5 on Content Indicators	69
20. Lessons Rated 4 or 5 on Classroom Culture Indicators.....	70
21. Lessons Rated 4 or 5 on Indicators of Enhancing Student Ability.....	71
22. Overall Ratings of Observed Classes	72
23. Cohort 1 Science Teachers’ Opinions About Science Instruction	77
24. Teachers’ Perceptions of Principal Support for Science and Mathematics Reform ...	89
25. Principal Ratings of Importance of Various Instructional Strategies for Effective Instruction.....	90
26. Continuum Rating for Supportiveness of Context	96
27. Continuum Rating for Sustainability	98

List of Boxes

	<i>Page</i>
Professional Development Session #1: “Learning Through Kit-Based Activities”	31
Professional Development Session #2: “Study Groups: Classroom Observation and Discussion”	32
Professional Development Session #3: “Exploring Student Assessments”	33
Professional Development Session #4: “Learning the Kit”	34
Lesson #1: Ineffective Science Instruction—Passive “Learning”	72
Lesson #2: Ineffective Mathematics Instruction—Activity for Activity’s Sake	73
Lesson #3: Beginning Stages of Effective Mathematics Instruction	73
Lesson #4: Effective Science Instruction	73
Lesson #5: Effective Mathematics Instruction	74

Acknowledgments

The core evaluation of the Local Systemic Change Initiative requires the energy, efforts, and insights of a very large number of people.

Conrad Katzenmeyer in the National Science Foundation's (NSF) Division of Research, Evaluation, and Communication; Joyce Evans, Susan Snyder, and Diane Spresser in NSF's Division of Elementary, Secondary, and Informal Education (ESIE); and Joy Frechtling of Westat, Inc. were instrumental in the design and implementation of the core evaluation system. Numerous other NSF/ESIE program officers provided valuable assistance throughout the process, as well.

Within HRI, in addition to the authors of this report, Joan Pasley, Ruth Pershing, Ben Kurgat, Eugene Soar, Scott Hanrath, Jarrod Jenzano, Alison Schaff, Carol McDonald, Susan Hudson, Claudia Templeton, and John Supovitz were responsible for various tasks essential to the production of this report, from instrument design, to data processing and analysis, to report production.

Most notably, this report would not have been possible without the efforts of the LSC project lead evaluators, who persevered as we attempted to fine-tune the core evaluation system. And special thanks are due to the thousands of teachers throughout the 121 participating districts who took time from their busy schedules to provide information about their science and mathematics teaching.