

Local Systemic Change through Teacher Enhancement

Year Four Cross-Site Report

By

Iris R. Weiss
Gail B. Gellatly
Diana L. Montgomery
Carolyn J. Ridgway
Claudia D. Templeton
Dawayne Whittington

December 1999

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

The Local Systemic Change through Teacher Enhancement: Year Four 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
Acknowledgments.....	vii
I. Introduction to the Local Systemic Change Initiative.....	1
A. An Overview of LSC Projects in Cohorts 1–4	2
B. Characteristics of LSC Professional Development	4
C. Description of Core Evaluation Data Collection and Analysis	6
II. Quality of LSC Professional Development.....	9
A. Introduction.....	9
B. Quality of LSC Professional Development Sessions.....	11
C. Professional Development Providers.....	25
D. Establishing a Professional Development Culture Conducive to Teacher Learning...	36
E. Deepening Teacher Mathematics and Science Content Knowledge	40
F. Preparing Teachers to Implement Exemplary Instructional Materials.....	48
G. Support for Teachers as They Implement the Instructional Materials	61
H. Evaluator Ratings of the Quality of LSC Professional Development Programs.....	68
I. Teacher Perceptions of the Overall Quality of LSC Professional Development Programs	69
III. Providing Professional Development to All Targeted Teachers.....	73
A. Introduction.....	73
B. Strategies to Ensure Full Participation	73
C. Changes in Teacher Populations	75
D. The Need for More Teacher Leaders.....	76
IV. Impact of the LSC on Teacher Preparedness, Attitudes, and Beliefs	77
A. Introduction.....	77
B. Views on Student Learning	77
C. Attitudes toward Mathematics/Science Instruction	80
D. Teacher Perceptions of Their Preparedness	82
E. Concerns About the Appropriateness of the Instructional Materials	89
F. Too Many Demands, Not Enough Time.....	91

V. Impact of the LSC on Classroom Practice	93
A. Introduction	93
B. Increased Emphasis on Science Instruction.....	93
C. Introduction of New Content into the Mathematics and Science Curriculum.....	97
D. Implementation of Exemplary Instructional Materials	98
E. Quality of Instruction	102
F. Changes in Assessment Practices	110
G. Broader Impact.....	113
VI. Summary and Recommendations.....	115
A. Summary	115
B. Recommendations	117

Appendix Tables

- A-1. Average Number of Days of Instruction in Each Subject in the Last Five Schools Days, by Extent of Participation in LSC K–8 Science Professional Development
- A-2. Average Number of Days of Instruction in Each Subject in the Last Five Schools Days, by Extent of Participation in LSC K–8 Mathematics Professional Development
- A-3. K–8 Teachers Feeling Well Prepared to Teach each Subject, by Level of Treatment
- A-4. Summary of the Impact of LSC Professional Development on Teacher Perceptions of Their Preparedness and Teaching

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. LSC Professional Development Sessions Including Each Category as a Presenter/Facilitator	12
6. Race/Ethnicity of Presenters/Facilitators	12
7. Content Areas of K–8 Science Professional Development Sessions	14
8. Content Areas of K–8 Mathematics Professional Development Sessions	15
9. Content Areas of 6–12 Mathematics Professional Development Sessions	16
10. Professional Development Session Ratings: Design.....	18
11. Professional Development Session Ratings: Implementation.....	19
12. Professional Development Session Ratings: Session Culture.....	20
13. Professional Development Session Ratings: Disciplinary Content	21
14. Professional Development Session Ratings: Pedagogical Content.....	22
15. Observers’ Overall “Capsule Ratings” of Professional Development Sessions.....	23
16. Professional Development Session Ratings: Leadership Content.....	31
17. Evaluator Ratings of Preparedness of Professional Development Providers	35
18. Evaluator Ratings of Professional Development Culture.....	39
19. Evaluator Ratings of the Quality of Treatment of Disciplinary Content.....	48
20. Evaluator Ratings of the Quality of Treatment of Pedagogical Content	60
21. Evaluator Ratings of Support for Teachers During Implementation.....	67
22. Comparison of LSC and Non-LSC Professional Development for Cohort 2 Teachers	69
23. Teachers Rating LSC Professional Development Excellent or Very Good, by Subject and Extent of Participation.....	70
24. Composite: Teacher Perceptions of Quality of LSC Professional Development, by Extent of Participation	71
25. Teachers Supporting Ability Grouping, by Extent of Participation in LSC Professional Development.....	79
26. Composite: Teacher Attitudes Toward Teaching.....	81
27. K–8 Science Teachers Feeling at Least Fairly Well-Prepared to Teach Science.....	82
28. K–8 Mathematics Teachers Feeling Very Well-Prepared to Teach Mathematics	83
29. Composite: Teacher Perceptions of Their Science Content Preparedness, by Extent of Participation in LSC Professional Development.....	85
30. Composite: Teacher Perceptions of Their Mathematics Content Preparedness, by Extent of Participation in LSC Professional Development.....	85

31.	Teachers Indicating They Are Well-Informed about National Standards, by Extent of Participation in LSC Professional Development.....	88
32.	Composite: Teacher Perceptions of Their Pedagogical Preparedness, by Extent of Participation I LSC Professional Development	88
33.	Average Number of Days of Instruction in Science in the Last Five School Days, by Extent of Participation in LSC K–8 Science Professional Development.....	94
34.	Elementary Classrooms Spending More than 150 Minutes per Week in Science, by Extent of Participation in LSC Science Professional Development.....	95
35.	Elementary Classrooms Addressing Six or More Science Units Each Year, by Extent of Participation in LSC Science Professional Development.....	95
36.	Elementary Classrooms Where Science Units Are Typically More than Four Weeks in Length, by Extent of Participation in LSC Science Professional Development.....	96
37.	Lessons Using LSC-Designated Instructional Materials.....	98
38.	Highly-Rated Lessons, by Use of LSC-Designated Materials and Treatment	99
39.	Highly-Rated Observed Lessons, by Adherence to LSC-Designated Materials.....	101
40.	Highly-Rated Lessons in Each Area, by Extent of Participation in LSC Professional Development.....	107
41.	Composite: Investigative Culture in Science/Mathematics Classes, by Extent of Teacher Participation in LSC Professional Development.....	108
42.	Composite: Investigative Practices in Science/Mathematics Classes, by Extent of Teacher Participation in LSC Professional Development.....	109
43.	Lessons Likely to Have a Positive Impact on Students, by Teacher Participation in LSC Professional Development.....	112

List of Tables

	<i>Page</i>
1. Professional Development Providers in LSC Projects	4
2. Major Intended Purposes of LSC Professional Development Sessions	13
3. Major Activities of LSC Professional Development Sessions	17
4. Indicators that Distinguished Between Highly Effective and Less Effective Professional Development Sessions	24
5. Continuum Ratings for Quality of LSC Professional Development	68
6. Teacher Ratings of LSC Professional Development Programs Overall	70
7. K–8 Science Teachers Feeling at Least Fairly Well-Prepared to Teach Each Topic, by Extent of Involvement in LSC	84
8. Mathematics Teachers Feeling at Least Fairly Well-Prepared to Teach Each Topic, by Extent of Involvement in LSC	84

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, Elizabeth Hammond, Scott Hanrath, Susan Hudson, Ben Kurgat, Joan Pasley, Sheila Richmond, Sean Smith, and Eugene Soar 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 evaluators, whose work formed the basis for the analyses presented here. And special thanks are due to the thousands of teachers throughout the 327 participating districts who took time from their busy schedules to provide information about their mathematics and science teaching.