

**TEACHER PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT BY STATE HIGHER EDUCATION AGENCIES
SUPPORTED BY THE EISENHOWER PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM (1984 AND 1994)
AND BY TITLE II A SUBPART 3 OF *NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND ACT OF 2001***

The federal government has supported professional development for elementary and secondary school teachers through various mechanisms for more than twenty years. Following the *Nation at Risk* report, the Eisenhower Mathematics and Science Education Program was created in 1984 and was continued as the Eisenhower Professional Development Program in 1994. While *No Child Left Behind* in 2001 eliminated the Eisenhower Professional Development Program, it continued (in Title II A, subpart 3) one aspect of the Eisenhower program found to be unusually effective by external evaluators, teacher professional development grant programs administered by state higher education agencies.

In 1994, State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO) and the P-16 professional development coordinators in state agencies formed a national network in order to promote and foster interstate sharing and dissemination of innovative and successful professional development programs being developed in the states. The SHEEO P-16 Professional Development Collaborative currently provides assistance through an electronic mail sharing service, a website, and annual workshops. This link to the SHEEO website http://www.sheeo.org/links/links_results.asp?regionID=1®ionID=53®ionID=54&issueID=22 provides access to information on activities supported by these grants in all of the states.

The state higher education P-16 professional development grant programs support intensive, content-focused summer and school-year professional development programs and the development of curriculum resources that are shared among many teachers. *It is especially effective in building partnerships between higher education faculty and local school district teachers.*

For example, State Higher Education Agency grant programs have:

- helped beginning teachers,
- improved middle school mathematics instruction,
- increased the success of minority students in math and science,
- aligned professional development with standards-based school reform, and
- helped teachers use technology in the classroom.

Although a systematic evaluation of these programs has not been completed since the 2001 reauthorization, the state higher education agency grants were continued in *No Child Left Behind* due to highly favorable external evaluations of their work through the Eisenhower teacher development programs. Excerpts from three national evaluations pertaining to the state higher education agency programs follow as Appendix A. Appendix B indicates the amount of funding provided to each state through this program in Fiscal Year 2006.

**SHEEO RECOMMENDATIONS AND RATIONALE
FOR THE REAUTHORIZATION OF
TITLE II A, SUBPART 3 IMPROVING TEACHER QUALITY (ITQ) STATE GRANTS PROGRAM**

1. State Higher Education Agency professional development grant programs should be reauthorized, with substantially the same provisions of the existing law.
 - a. This program has promoted effective partnerships between local schools and colleges and universities; such partnerships should be expanded wherever possible.
 - b. This program encourages greater state higher education agency involvement in improving teacher preparation and teacher professional development programs.
 - c. The specific professional development activities supported through this program have been very favorably evaluated by both participants and external evaluators.

2. Funding for State Higher Education Agency professional development programs should be increased, either by modestly modifying the percentage allocations in the law or by increasing annual appropriations for Improving Teacher Quality State Grants.
 - a. The current allocation of 2.5% for State Higher Education Agency grants generates \$70 million from a total appropriation of \$2.8 billion. The total appropriation and the allocation for these activities have not been increased materially over the past five years.

 - b. In view of the need for strengthening teacher capacity, especially in high need schools and shortage areas, effective professional development programs should be expanded, not gradually eroded due to unfunded inflation.

3. A few of the definitions and provisions in the existing law, while appropriate in intent, have proved to be cumbersome and difficult in practice. These especially include the definition of a “high need district” and the rule limiting any one grant recipient to 50% of a grant. SHEEO invites discussion of ways to improve these provisions.

For more information contact:

Paul E. Lingenfelter
President, SHEEO
(303) 541-1605 plingenfelter@sheeo.org

Or

Sharmila Basu Conger
Policy Analyst, SHEEO
(303) 541-1602 sconger@sheeo.org

APPENDIX A
EXCERPTS FROM EVALUATIONS OF THE EISENHOWER PROGRAM

Michael S. Knapp, Andrew A. Zucker, Nancy E. Adelman, Mark St. John, *The Eisenhower Mathematics and Science Education Program: An Enabling Resource for Reform*, Menlo Park, CA: SRI International, February 1991

- The great majority of projects [funded through grants to institutions of higher education] provide inservice teacher education, while a small percentage (12%) concentrate on, or include, preservice preparation of teachers (p. iv)
- By comparison with district-sponsored activities, these [higher education sponsored] projects are typically more intensive, averaging 60 hours per participating teacher, pay more attention to content in addition to pedagogy, and are more frequently focused on the needs of underrepresented groups (women and minorities).(p. v)
- The program’s funds should be allocated differently among the three components. A better balance can be struck by proportionally increasing the share allocated to the state leadership activities and grants to institutions of higher education. (p. vi-vii)
- The study data show that these projects [funded by grants to institutions of higher education] play quite a different role for teachers than do typical district-supported activities. Higher education projects offer teachers many more hours of exposure to content and pedagogy, averaging 60 hours per participating teacher. More frequently than in districts, the higher education projects take place during the summer, involving perhaps 35 teachers at a time in a several-weeks-long “institute” or course, often offering graduate-level credits. Like the district-supported activities, the higher education projects blend a focus on particular science and mathematics content with an emphasis on pedagogy. However, taken as a group, they have a greater content focus, and often more of a focus on leadership training, than typical activities supported by flow-through funds to districts. (p. 17)
- Rather than being based in schools of education, more than half of the higher education project directors are faculty members in mathematics, science or similar departments. The data suggest that many of these directors have not been involved in similar activities before, in part because there have been few comparable sources of support available to tap. (p. 19)
- The [Eisenhower] program’s biggest contribution is to help move the state of practice toward the vision of excellent science and mathematics teaching that has been articulated by many groups. It does this three ways: by expanding the base of informed teachers, by empowering subject-area leaders (especially at the state and district levels) and by encouraging different sectors of the education system to work together on improving K-12 mathematics and science education. (p. 27)

- The findings reviewed in this report suggest that the experiment is largely successful. The program is providing a key enabling resource in support of attempts to reform mathematics and science education. As such, the program puts in place necessary conditions for the spread of new content and teaching approaches. At the same time, its contributions are not sufficient, in and of themselves, to promote sustained change in teaching practice. Furthermore, the program does not provide direction for reform; rather, it depends on the surrounding context of reform activities for a vision of good practice toward educators should strive. In a phrase, the program is an *implementation resource*, not a vehicle for redefining what is taught or how to do it. (p. 31)
- But what the program offers will not – and cannot – revolutionize classroom practice on its own. For one thing, by themselves, Title II/Eisenhower funds are insufficient to support fully even the current array of training activities that benefit from the funds – typically, the program pays for part of a training event; other sources of funding or in-kind contributions pick up the rest. For another, intensive training experiences are needed on a wider scale than this program alone can support. (p. 35)
- Although it makes good sense to divide the Eisenhower funds among the three components, the balance of funding among the three is not optimal. The thrust of analysis in this report points to reversing the priorities, or, at the least, altering them in subsequent allocation formulas so that a better balance is struck between leadership (especially state leadership), intensive training (mostly through IHE projects) and generally nonintensive discretionary resources put at the disposal of LEAs. (p. 36-7)

The American Institutes for Research, *Designing Effective Professional Development: Lessons from the Eisenhower Program*, Washington D.C. U.S. Department of Education, October 1999

- When asked directly, many teachers in SAHE[state agency for higher education]-grantee activities report that participation in Eisenhower-assisted professional development led to enhanced knowledge and skills and changes in their classroom teaching practice. Somewhat fewer teachers in districts report that participation in Eisenhower-assisted activities led to these positive teacher outcomes. (p. 5)
- 48% of teachers in district activities and 68% of teachers in SAHE-supported activities report enhanced in-depth knowledge of mathematics or science; and 63% of teachers in district activities and 79% of teachers in SAHE-supported activities report enhanced knowledge of instructional methods. (p. 5)
- On average, SAHE-grantee activities give more emphasis than do district activities to the last three dimensions of quality – content focus, active learning and coherence. (p. 9)

- Two-thirds of teachers participating in SAHE-supported Eisenhower activities participate in activities that place a major emphasis on content The percentage of teachers reporting a major emphasis on each of 18 separate indicators of active learning is higher for SAHE grantees than for districts. Teachers in both district and SAHE-grantee activities report that the activities have elements that promote coherence with other aspects of their professional experiences. (p. 9)
- The results also show that activities of longer duration and activities that encourage collective participation of teachers tend to place more emphasis on content than other activities, provide more opportunities for active learning and provide more coherent professional development. These features in turn promote positive teacher outcomes. (p. 11)
- Our analysis show that the difference between districts and SAHE grantees in reported enhancement of knowledge and skills and reported change in teaching practice is explained almost entirely by the fact that SAHE grantees place a greater emphasis upon duration, subject-matter content, active learning and coherence. (p. 11)
- One reason SAHE-grantee professional development is, on average, of higher quality than district professional development may be that SAHE grantees have to compete for funds. (p. 20)

John R. Phillips and Marci Kanstoroom, , “Title II: Does Professional Development Work?,” in *New Directions: Federal Education Policy in the Twenty-first Century*, edited by Marci Kanstoroom and Chester E. Finn, Jr., The Fordham Foundation and the Manhattan Institute March 1999

- One way to boost the length and intensity of these activities might be to send more funds to SAHEs and less to LEAs. (p. 79)
- Use Eisenhower money only for practices and activities that can prove their effectiveness. (p. 85)
- School districts appear to be using their Eisenhower funds in reasonable but unimaginative ways. (p. 86)
- The Eisenhower has always been plagued by concerns about its ability to enhance teaching and learning. Congress has the opportunity to reverse this during the impending ESEA reauthorization, transforming the program . . . to an efficient and effective mechanism for elevating student achievement. (p. 87)

Appendix B
Department of Education
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants
FY 2006

State or Other Area	2006 Appropriation	99% of Appropriation	2.5% of 99%
	(SAE + SAHE + Administrative Funds)	(for state use: SAE + SAHE)	(for SAHE only)
Alabama	46,150,063	45,688,562	1,142,214
Alaska	13,751,559	13,614,043	340,351
Arizona	48,146,530	47,665,065	1,191,627
Arkansas	28,202,977	27,920,947	698,024
California	335,450,834	332,096,326	8,302,408
Colorado	32,311,959	31,988,839	799,721
Connecticut	26,178,855	25,917,066	647,927
Delaware	13,751,559	13,614,043	340,351
District of Columbia	13,751,559	13,614,043	340,351
Florida	134,652,749	133,306,222	3,332,656
Georgia	77,237,250	76,464,878	1,911,622
Hawaii	13,751,559	13,614,043	340,351
Idaho	13,751,559	13,614,043	340,351
Illinois	116,333,721	115,170,384	2,879,260
Indiana	47,998,159	47,518,177	1,187,954
Iowa	21,617,232	21,401,060	535,026
Kansas	22,208,802	21,986,714	549,668
Kentucky	44,227,881	43,785,602	1,094,640
Louisiana	64,349,542	63,706,047	1,592,651
Maine	13,751,559	13,614,043	340,351
Maryland	41,276,966	40,864,196	1,021,605
Massachusetts	50,504,870	49,999,821	1,249,996
Michigan	108,503,695	107,418,658	2,685,466
Minnesota	37,544,870	37,169,421	929,236
Mississippi	41,918,414	41,499,230	1,037,481
Missouri	49,119,202	48,628,010	1,215,700
Montana	13,751,559	13,614,043	340,351
Nebraska	14,028,502	13,888,217	347,205
Nevada	15,207,563	15,055,487	376,387
New Hampshire	13,751,559	13,614,043	340,351
New Jersey	64,456,697	63,812,130	1,595,303

New Mexico	23,006,672	22,776,605	569,415
New York	228,754,756	226,467,208	5,661,680
North Carolina	64,910,283	64,261,180	1,606,530
North Dakota	13,751,559	13,614,043	340,351
Ohio	103,564,208	102,528,566	2,563,214
Oklahoma	33,349,904	33,016,405	825,410
Oregon	28,259,227	27,976,635	699,416
Pennsylvania	112,879,535	111,750,740	2,793,768
Puerto Rico	91,727,440	90,810,166	2,270,254
Rhode Island	13,751,559	13,614,043	340,351
South Carolina	36,834,010	36,465,670	911,642
South Dakota	13,751,559	13,614,043	340,351
Tennessee	49,235,445	48,743,091	1,218,577
Texas	239,613,046	237,216,916	5,930,423
Utah	18,476,020	18,291,260	457,281
Vermont	13,751,559	13,614,043	340,351
Virginia	51,710,156	51,193,054	1,279,826
Washington	47,044,832	46,574,384	1,164,360
West Virginia	23,520,468	23,285,263	582,132
Wisconsin	44,988,136	44,538,255	1,113,456
Wyoming	13,751,559	13,614,043	340,351
Total	2,844,271,738	2,815,829,021	70,395,726