

**Teacher Professional Development by State Higher Education Agencies**

**Supported by:**

**the Eisenhower Professional Development Program  
(ESEA Reauthorizations of 1984 and 1994)**

**and Title II A, Subpart 3 of the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*  
(ESEA Reauthorization of 2001)**

---

The federal government has supported professional development for elementary and secondary school teachers through various mechanisms for more than twenty five 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, the national association of 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, a data survey, and annual workshops. The following link to the SHEEO website provides access to information on activities supported by these grants in all of the states:

[http://www.sheeo.org/links/links\\_results.asp?regionID=1&regionID=53&regionID=54&issueID=22](http://www.sheeo.org/links/links_results.asp?regionID=1&regionID=53&regionID=54&issueID=22).

The state higher education P-16 professional development grant programs support intensive, content-focused summer and school-year educator professional development programs and the development of curriculum resources that are shared among many teachers, school leaders, paraprofessionals, and higher education faculty. *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 2009.

**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 and strengthened.
  - a. This program has *promoted effective partnerships* between local schools and colleges and universities, which should be expanded wherever possible.
  - b. This program *encourages and reinforces state higher education agency involvement* in improving teacher preparation and teacher professional development programs. Greater attention to strengthening such programs is a critical priority.
  - c. The specific professional development activities supported through this program have been *very favorably evaluated* by both participants and external evaluators. The collective experience of the program administrators in managing competitive grant programs within states is a valuable asset for strengthening future efforts.
2. Funding for State Higher Education Agency professional development programs should be increased in the reauthorization of the law.
  - a. The current allocation of 2.5% for State Higher Education Agency grants in Title II A, Subpart 3 generates approximately \$70 million from a total appropriation of \$2.8 billion (see Appendix B). The total appropriation and the allocation for these activities have not been increased materially over the past ten years (SAHE appropriation, 2001: \$69.6 million; SAHE appropriation, 2009: \$68.7 million).
  - b. In view of the need for strengthening teacher capacity, especially in high need schools and shortage areas, these effective professional development programs should be expanded.
3. The reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is an opportunity to broadly reconsider current state, local, and federal approaches for enhancing educator capacities and the effectiveness of training and in-service professional development programs. While no existing programs should escape critical scrutiny, the most effective existing programs should be the foundation for future efforts. And systematic external evaluation for continuing improvement should be embedded in the design of future programs.
4. 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](mailto:plingenfelter@sheeo.org)

Or

Sharmila Basu Conger  
Policy Analyst, SHEEO  
(303) 541-1602 [sconger@sheeo.org](mailto: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 shows 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 program 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 2009**

<u>State or Other Area</u>	<u>2009 Appropriation</u>	<u>99% of Appropriation</u>	<u>2.5% of 99%</u>
	<b>SEA + SAHE + Administrative Funds</b>	<b>SEA + SAHE (For state use)</b>	<b>SAHE only (For HE only)</b>
Alabama	45,346,222	44,892,760	1,122,319
Alaska	13,436,727	13,302,360	332,559
Arizona	47,031,879	46,561,560	1,164,039
Arkansas	27,765,899	27,488,240	687,206
California	317,944,970	314,765,520	7,869,138
Colorado	32,087,152	31,766,280	794,157
Connecticut	25,664,444	25,407,800	635,195
Delaware	13,436,727	13,302,360	332,559
District of Columbia	13,436,727	13,302,360	332,559
Florida	128,249,576	126,967,080	3,174,177
Georgia	76,880,727	76,111,920	1,902,798
Hawaii	13,436,727	13,302,360	332,559
Idaho	13,436,727	13,302,360	332,559
Illinois	113,420,404	112,286,200	2,807,155
Indiana	48,498,101	48,013,120	1,200,328
Iowa	21,500,485	21,285,480	532,137
Kansas	21,613,414	21,397,280	534,932
Kentucky	43,500,808	43,065,800	1,076,645
Louisiana	62,126,788	61,505,520	1,537,638
Maine	13,163,515	13,031,880	325,797
Maryland	39,736,323	39,338,960	983,474
Massachusetts	49,829,859	49,331,560	1,233,289
Michigan	107,816,081	106,737,920	2,668,448
Minnesota	37,146,990	36,775,520	919,388
Mississippi	41,102,747	40,691,720	1,017,293
Missouri	48,848,727	48,360,240	1,209,006
Montana	13,436,727	13,302,360	332,559
Nebraska	13,699,636	13,562,640	339,066
Nevada	15,047,717	14,897,240	372,431
New Hampshire	13,436,727	13,302,360	332,559
New Jersey	62,715,758	62,088,600	1,552,215
New Mexico	22,095,394	21,874,440	546,861
New York	218,475,475	216,290,720	5,407,268

North Carolina	65,339,273	64,685,880	1,617,147
North Dakota	13,348,323	13,214,840	330,371
Ohio	103,732,000	102,694,680	2,567,367
Oklahoma	32,770,747	32,443,040	811,076
Oregon	27,645,778	27,369,320	684,233
Pennsylvania	110,550,465	109,444,960	2,736,124
Puerto Rico	88,862,707	87,974,080	2,199,352
Rhode Island	13,436,727	13,302,360	332,559
South Carolina	36,401,535	36,037,520	900,938
South Dakota	13,436,727	13,302,360	332,559
Tennessee	49,643,475	49,147,040	1,228,676
Texas	237,973,293	235,593,560	5,889,839
Utah	18,513,212	18,328,080	458,202
Vermont	13,436,727	13,302,360	332,559
Virginia	50,562,424	50,056,800	1,251,420
Washington	46,122,101	45,660,880	1,141,522
West Virginia	22,627,960	22,401,680	560,042
Wisconsin	44,780,970	44,333,160	1,108,329
Wyoming	13,436,727	13,302,360	332,559
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,777,987,354</b>	<b>2,750,207,480</b>	<b>68,755,187</b>