

Local Systemic Change through Teacher Enhancement

Year Three Cross-Site Report

By

Iris R. Weiss
Diana L. Montgomery
Carolyn J. Ridgway
Sally L. Bond

December 1998

Horizon Research, Inc.

111 Cloister Court - Suite 220
Chapel Hill, NC 27514-2296

The *Local Systemic Change through Teacher Enhancement: Year Three Cross-Site Report* was prepared with support from the National Science Foundation under contract number RED-9255369. These writings do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.

Table of Contents

	<i>Page</i>
List of Figures	iv
List of Tables	vi
List of Boxes	vii
Acknowledgments.....	viii
Chapter One: Introduction to the Local Systemic Change Initiative.....	1
An Overview of Cohorts 1, 2, and 3.....	2
Description of Core Evaluation Data Collection and Analysis.....	6
Chapter Two: Participation in LSC Activities.....	9
Teacher Involvement in LSC Professional Development.....	9
School Involvement in LSC Activities.....	11
Issues for Full Involvement in LSC	12
Summary	14
Chapter Three: Quality of LSC Professional Development Sessions.....	15
Description of LSC Professional Development Sessions.....	15
Observer Ratings of Session Components	21
Overall Assessment of Observed Professional Development Sessions	27
Summary	30
Chapter Four: Quality of LSC Professional Development Programs	31
Teacher Ratings of LSC Professional Development Programs	31
Evaluators' Assessment of LSC Professional Development Activities.....	37
Evaluators' Overall Program Ratings	48
Summary	49
Chapter Five: Quality of Leadership Components of LSC Projects	51
Leadership Content in Observed Professional Development Sessions	51
Evaluators' Overall Assessment of Leadership Content	53
Summary	58

Chapter Six: Current Status of Teachers’ Beliefs and Practices	61
Description of Targeted Teachers’ Beliefs and Practices	61
Observers’ Descriptions of Classroom Practice	68
Summary	72
Chapter Seven: Impact of Local Systemic Change Activities	73
Impact From the Teachers’ Point of View: Questionnaire Composites	73
Principals’ Impressions of Impact.....	81
Impact as Measured by Classroom Observers.....	82
Lead Evaluators’ Analyses of Impact	83
Comparison of Impact Data	84
Summary	85
Chapter Eight: Supportiveness of Context.....	87
Strategies to Increase Stakeholder Support	87
Evidence of the Impact of the LSC on Stakeholder Support.....	89
Status of District Policies and Practices.....	89
Overall Ratings of Supportiveness.....	91
Summary	92
Chapter Nine: Sustainability of Reform.....	93
Elements of Sustainability	93
Overall Ratings of Sustainability	94
Summary	95
Chapter Ten: Summary and Recommendations.....	97
Quality of Professional Development	97
Leadership Development.....	99
Impact on Teachers and Teaching.....	99
Supporting and Sustaining Local Systemic Reform	100
Appendix Tables	
Year-Three (1997) Composites by Cohort	
Year-Three (1997) Composites by Treatment	
Comparison of 1996 and 1997 Composites for Cohort 1	
Comparison of 1996 and 1997 Composites for Cohort 2	

List of Figures

	<i>Page</i>
1. Percentage of LSC Schools in Various Types of Communities	2
2. Race/Ethnicity of Students to be Impacted by the LSC Projects	3
3. Involvement of School Personnel in Addition to Classroom Teachers.....	5
4. Involvement of Non-School Personnel	5
5. Number of Hours of Participation in LSC Professional Development	9
6. LSC Professional Development Sessions Including Each Category as a Presenter/Facilitator	16
7. Race/Ethnicity of Presenters/Facilitators	16
8. Content Areas of K–8 Science Professional Development Sessions	18
9. Content Areas of K–8 Mathematics Professional Development Sessions	19
10. Content Areas of 7–12 Mathematics Professional Development Sessions	20
11. Professional Development Session Ratings: Design.....	22
12. Professional Development Session Ratings: Implementation.....	23
13. Professional Development Session Ratings: Disciplinary Content	24
14. Professional Development Session Ratings: Pedagogical Content.....	25
15. Professional Development Session Ratings: Classroom Culture.....	26
16. Observers’ Overall “Capsule Ratings” of Professional Development Sessions.....	28
17. Composite: Quality of Professional Development.....	33
18. Comparison of LSC and Non-LSC Professional Development for Cohort 2 Teachers	34
19. Teachers Rating LSC Professional Development Excellent or Very Good by Subject and Extent of Participation.....	35
20. Interviewed Teachers with Highly Positive Opinions about LSC Professional Development.....	36
21. Professional Development Session Ratings: Leadership Content.....	52
22. Component Ratings for Professional Development Programs	53
23. LSC Teachers Reporting that They Are Well Informed about National Standards	62
24. Teachers Supporting Ability Grouping	63
25. Average Number of Days of Instruction in Each Subject in the Last Five School Days	67
26. Non-White Enrollment in Observed Classes	68
27. Purpose of Observed Lessons	69
28. Composite: Attitudes Toward Teaching by Extent of Participation in LSC Professional Development.....	74
29. Composite: Pedagogical Preparedness by Extent of Participation in LSC Professional Development.....	75
30. Composite: Science Content Preparedness by Extent of Participation in LSC Professional Development.....	76
31. Composite: Mathematics Content Preparedness by Extent of Participation in LSC Professional Development.....	76

32.	Composite: Investigative Culture by Extent of Participation in LSC Professional Development.....	77
33.	Composite: Investigative Practices by Extent of Participation in LSC Professional Development.....	78
34.	Composite: Use of Calculators and Computers by Extent of Participation in LSC Professional Development.....	79
35.	Highly Rated Lessons in Each Area by Cohort.....	82
36.	Principal Support for Science/Mathematics Education Reform.....	89
37.	Teacher Reports of Barriers to Effective Mathematics and Science Instruction.....	90
38.	Overall Continuum Ratings of Supportiveness of Context.....	91
39.	Overall Continuum Ratings for Sustainability of Reform.....	95

List of Tables

	<i>Page</i>
1. Professional Development Providers in LSC Projects	4
2. Demographic Characteristics of LSC Teachers.....	10
3. Demographic Characteristics of LSC Teachers' Schools	12
4. Principal Involvement with the LSC.....	12
5. Major Intended Purposes of LSC Professional Development Sessions.....	17
6. Major Activities of LSC Professional Development Sessions.....	21
7. Indicators that Distinguished Between Highly Effective and Less Effective Professional Development Sessions	29
8. Teacher Ratings of Characteristics of LSC Professional Development Programs	32
9. Teacher Ratings of Characteristics of LSC Professional Development Programs by Hours of Participation	32
10. Teacher Ratings of LSC Professional Development Programs Overall.....	35
11. Evaluator Ratings of Aspects of LSC Professional Development Programs	37
12. Continuum Ratings for Quality of LSC Professional Development	49
13. Teacher Opinions about Science/Mathematics Teaching.....	61
14. Teachers Rating Each Factor Very Important for Effective Instruction.....	63
15. Teachers Considering Themselves at Least Fairly Well-Prepared to Implement Each Instructional Strategy	64
16. K-8 Teachers Feeling Well-Prepared to Teach Each Subject.....	65
17. Mathematics Teachers Feeling Well-Prepared to Teach Each Topic	65
18. Science Teachers Feeling Well-Prepared to Teach Each Topic	66
19. Instructional Activities in Observed Classes	71
20. Summary of the Impact of LSC Professional Development on Teachers and Teaching	80
21. Teachers Reporting Extensive Positive Impacts of the LSC in Each Area by Level of Involvement in LSC Professional Development	80

List of Boxes

	<i>Page</i>
LSC Core Evaluation Questions	6
An Evaluator Reports How School Constraints Affected the LSC Professional Development Plans	13
Linking Professional Development to Classroom Practice.....	40
Multi-Tiered Professional Development Programs	43
Strategies for Leadership Development	56
The Classroom Observation Process.....	66

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, Eric Banilower, Alison Bowes, Gail Gellatly, Elizabeth Hammond, Scott Hanrath, Susan Hudson, Ben Kurgat, Joan Pasley, Sheila Richmond, Sean Smith, Eugene Soar, and Claudia Templeton were responsible for various tasks essential to the production of this report, from instrument design, to data processing and analysis, to report production. David Flora and Abigail Panter of the L.L. Thurstone Psychometric Lab at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill assisted in the data analysis.

Most notably, this report would not have been possible without the efforts of the LSC project evaluators, whose work formed the basis for the analyses presented here. And special thanks are due to the thousands of teachers throughout the 263 participating districts who took time from their busy schedules to provide information about their mathematics and science teaching.