

# **U.S. Department of Education**

**Washington, D.C. 20202-5335**



**ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT 3**  
**CFDA # 84.215X**  
**PR/Award # U215X060051**  
**Budget Period # 1**  
**Report Type: Interim Performance**

# **\*\*Table of Contents\*\***

## **Forms**

1. Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A - 1	_____	e1
2. Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A - 2	_____	e3
3. Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A - 3	_____	e6
4. Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A - 4	_____	e9
5. Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section B & C	_____	e10
TAH_Section B_JeffCoKY	_____	e11
TAH_SectionC_JeffCoKY	_____	e13
6. Grant Performance Report Cover Sheet (ED 524B) - Revised 2008	_____	e20
TAH_Executive Summary_JeffCoKy	_____	e22

This report was generated using the PDF functionality. The PDF functionality automatically numbers the pages in this report. Some pages/sections of this report may contain 2 sets of page numbers, one set created by the applicant and the other set created by e-Report's PDF functionality. Page numbers created by the e-Report PDF functionality will be preceded by the letter e (for example, e1, e2, e3, etc.).



**U.S. Department of Education  
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)  
Project Status Chart**

PR/Award #: **U215X060051**

**SECTION A - Project Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data** (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

**1 . Project Objective**     Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

GPRAS

1a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Students in experimental and quasi-experimental studies of educational effectiveness of Teaching American History projects will demonstrate higher achievement on statewide U.S. history assessments than students in a comparison group.	GPRAS	<b>Target</b>			<b>Actual Performance Data</b>		
		<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>
			1142 / 1523	75		/	
1b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
At least 75% of participating teachers will demonstrate an increased understanding of American history through the use of nationally validated tests of American history that can be directly linked to their participation in the Teaching American History program.	GPRAS	<b>Target</b>			<b>Actual Performance Data</b>		
		<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>
			23 / 30	77		27 / 30	90

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

1a. The timing of the release of our state-mandated assessments (KCCT) test scores is typically in September of the following school year. Students were administered the KCCT test in Social Studies in April/May 2009 and their individual scores are expected to be released to the district in mid-September. Thus, an addendum to the report will be sent when this data becomes available. The target score of 75% of students scoring at grade-level or above is set for the students of participating teachers. Overall, there were 1,523 students in the classrooms of participating (treatment) teachers and 1,113 students in the classrooms of non-participating (comparison) teachers.

1b. A pre- and post- knowledge test was given to teachers based on released items from the Advanced Placement U.S. History exam. The items were selected to be directly linked to the period of time covered during the Summer Institute. The knowledge test covered America's New Deal and World War II, including the Depression and politics in the 1930s, New Deal legislation, and the U.S. role in World War II. The average pre-test score (percent correct) was 69% and the average post-test score was 81%. The average Summer Institute participant increased their percent correct by 12%. Utilizing a paired sample t-tests showed that the increase in score was statistically significant,  $t(29) = 7.99, p < .001$ .



**U.S. Department of Education  
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)  
Project Status Chart**

PR/Award #: **U215X060051**

**SECTION A - Project Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data** (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

**2 . Project Objective**  Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.  
Build a network of American history teachers committed to professional growth.

2a. Performance Measure	<b>Measure Type</b>	<b>Quantitative Data</b>					
All JCPS high school teachers of American history will be encouraged to join an American History Teacher Alliance and to participate in project activities.	PROJ	<b>Target</b>			<b>Actual Performance Data</b>		
		<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>
		83	/		83	/	
2b. Performance Measure	<b>Measure Type</b>	<b>Quantitative Data</b>					
A total of 30 Alliance members will be chosen each year to form a cohort that participates in the Summer Institute.	PROJ	<b>Target</b>			<b>Actual Performance Data</b>		
		<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>
		30	/		30	/	

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

2a. All 83 JCPS high school teachers of American history were contacted to participate in American History Teacher Alliance activities. All teachers received e-mails related to Alliance activities and other information related to American History

Strand One-Core Program: During the 2008-2009 school year, there were nine Alliance professional development activities, comprised of 64 total possible professional development hours. A Summer Institute follow-up activity was held in November 2008 and was attended by 22 teachers. Two book study seminars were held; one was held in October 2008 and attended by 19 teachers and one was held in February 2009 and was attended by 20 teachers. A seminar on World War II was held in March and attended by 31 teachers, and a seminar on The Great Depression was held in April and was attended by 28 teachers. The Summer Institute, America's New Deal and World War II was held in June 2009 and attended by 30 teachers. In total, 50 different American History teachers attended at least one of the Alliance events during the 2008-2009 school year, resulting in a 7% increase in participation over the previous year.

Strand Two-Transition Program: During the Summer of 2008, the Transition Program, comprised of 18 hours of professional development, was provided. Twenty-six (26) teachers participated and 25 completed 75% of the program hours.

2b. All Alliance members who applied for the Summer Institute were accepted to participate in the Summer Program. To examine the demographic and attitudinal characteristics of teachers who participated in the program and those who did not participate in the program, a questionnaire was distributed to all American History teachers. A total of 65 of the 83 U.S. History teachers returned the survey for a response rate of 78%. Table 1 in Section C depicts the characteristics of the teachers who participated in the program and those who did not. For categorical variables (education, race, gender), Chi-Square analyses were conducted to test for group differences. For continuous variables, t-tests and multivariate tests were conducted to test for differences between Summer Institute teachers and non-Summer Institute teachers. Summer Institute teachers did not differ in education level or in experience teaching U.S. History or experience teaching high school than non-Institute teachers. Teachers also did not statistically differ in their self-efficacy scores, their appreciation of U.S. History, or ratings of student engagement. Teachers rated their utilization of different classroom practices including use of primary source documents and independent work for students. Their ratings of classroom practice yielded two significant differences. Summer Institute teachers reported having more independent activities for students than non-Summer Institute teachers,  $t(62) = -2.75, p < .01$ . Summer Institute teachers also reported utilizing primary sources more in the classroom than non-Summer Institute teachers,  $t(63) = -2.35, p < .05$ . In terms of their networking with other U.S. History teachers, Summer Institute teachers reported knowing more U.S. History teachers in the district, having more correspondences via e-mail with other history teachers, and having more phone calls with other history teachers than non-Summer Institute teachers,  $F(4,63) = 5.59, p < .001$ . It is important to note that the majority of Summer Institute teachers in this cohort had participated in the Summer Institute in the prior year and thus, the pre-Institute differences could be attributed to their participation in the previous Institute.





**U.S. Department of Education  
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)  
Project Status Chart**

PR/Award #: **U215X060051**

**SECTION A - Project Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data** (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

**3 . Project Objective**  Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.  
 Increase teachers' knowledge of traditional American history and improve pedagogical practices, including the teachers' ability to teach with primary source documents and engage students in acquiring historical knowledge through disciplined inquiry

3a. Performance Measure	<b>Measure Type</b>	<b>Quantitative Data</b>					
At least 75% of teachers who participated in the Summer Institute will report increased knowledge in American history.	PROJ	<b>Target</b>			<b>Actual Performance Data</b>		
		<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>
			20 / 27	74		26 / 27	96
3b. Performance Measure	<b>Measure Type</b>	<b>Quantitative Data</b>					
At least 75% of teachers who participated in the Summer Institute will report an increase in their ability to teach with primary source documents.	PROJ	<b>Target</b>			<b>Actual Performance Data</b>		
		<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>
			20 / 27	74		24 / 27	89
3c. Performance Measure	<b>Measure Type</b>	<b>Quantitative Data</b>					
At least 75% teachers who participated in the Summer	PROJ	<b>Target</b>			<b>Actual Performance Data</b>		

Institute will demonstrate their ability to teach with primary source documents.	<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>
		18 / 24	75		19 / 23	83

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

3a. A total of 27 participants out of the 30 completed the survey (90% return rate). Participants were asked to rate the impact of the Institute on their knowledge of American history, and almost all of the teachers (96%) strongly agreed that the Institute increased their knowledge of American history.

3b. Participants were asked to rate the impact of the Institute on their ability to teach with primary source documents, and 89% of teachers strongly agreed that the Institute increased their ability to teach with primary source documents.

3c. Observations were collected from 2008 Summer Institute participants between November 2008 and January 2009. The observation window was selected in order to coordinate the period covered in the Summer Institute and the core content being covered in the classroom. In 2008, a total of 24 teachers participated in the Summer Institute. Of the 24 teachers, 23 were observed during the 2008-2009 school year. One teacher (4%) was not observed because of a medical leave of absence. Of the 24 teachers who participated in the 2008 Summer Institute, 18 teachers (75%) had participated in the 2007 Summer Institute.

Observations were collected using the America in Transition Classroom Observation Measure by two observers, including the project evaluator, from the Dept. of Accountability, Research, and Planning, JCPS. Five of the 23 teachers observed were not teaching U.S. History in 2008-2009, but were utilizing strategies/materials from the Summer Institute in their classes. The observation measure was developed to assess specific areas related to teaching U.S. History (e.g., use of primary sources) as well as general classroom contextual areas (e.g. partner work, classroom climate) and student engagement. The two observers established inter-rater reliability on 15% of observations (n = 3) in 2007-2008 order to ensure consistency of interpretation on the observation measure. The mean weighted kappa yielded an acceptable inter-rater reliability of 0.74. Two observations were conducted by the same two observers in 2008-2009 in order to re-test reliability and the mean weighted kappa yielded an acceptable inter-rater reliability of 0.63.

All teachers observed applied at least one pedagogical strategy discussed during the Summer Institute. Almost all teachers were observed utilizing primary source materials during the class period (83%). Most teachers (74%) were observed promoting reading strategies and many teachers were observed using geographic tools (39%) and promoting visual literacy through the use of political cartoons and/or photographs (48%). About one-third (35%) of teachers connected their lesson in some way to a historical place. On average, teachers utilized 3 pedagogical strategies related to the summer institute during the period observed.

The utilization of primary sources was further analyzed to assess the depth of primary source analysis, the historical context, and key issues. The scale consisted of 1-Limited Use, 3- Key Part of the Lesson, and 5- Extensive Use. In the utilization of primary sources, most teachers analyzed primary sources as a key part of the lesson (68%). Four teachers (21%) analyzed primary sources in a limited manner, and two teachers (11%) analyzed primary sources extensively during the class period. In terms of discussing the historical context of the primary source, 63% of teachers discussed the historical context as a key part of the lesson while 32% of teachers minimally discussed the historical context and 5% discussed the historical context extensively. Finally in terms of presenting key ideas from the primary source, 53% of teachers presented at least two main ideas, 21% presented more than two main ideas, and 26% of teachers presented one main idea.



**U.S. Department of Education  
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)  
Project Status Chart**

PR/Award #: **U215X060051**

**SECTION A - Project Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data** (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

**4. Project Objective**  Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

To improve the level of student achievement in participating schools on the American history portion of the state-mandated assessment and on the Advanced Placement U.S. History exam

4a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Students in experimental and quasi-experimental studies of educational effectiveness of Teaching American History projects will demonstrate higher achievement on AP History assessments than students in a comparison group.	PROJ	<b>Target</b>			<b>Actual Performance Data</b>		
		<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>
			36 / 240	15		49 / 240	20

**Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)**

4a. A quasi-experimental analysis of student achievement in history using treatment and control groups was conducted. In Spring of 2009, 240 students from the classrooms of participating teachers and 247 students from the classrooms of non-participating teachers took the AP U.S. History test. A goal of a 15% passing rate was set for the treatment group. The goal was set based on the most recent `AP Report to the Nation? (released in February 2009) which reported that 15% of the graduating students in the U.S. had received at least a 3 or above on at least one AP exam. A total of 49 students (20.4%) of the 240 students from classrooms of participating teachers passed the AP U.S. History exam compared to 19.8% of the 247 students from classrooms of non-participating teachers. Though this difference did not reach statistical significance, the percent of students that passed the test was slightly higher for the treatment group than the control group.



**U.S. Department of Education  
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)  
Project Status Chart**

PR/Award #: **U215X060051**

**SECTION B - Budget Information** (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

Title : TAH\_Section B\_JeffCoKY

File : C:\Documents and

Settings\lcliffo1.JEFFERSON\Desktop\2 Budget524BSection TAH JeffCoKy 09.doc

**SECTION C - Additional Information** (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

Title : TAH\_SectionC\_JeffCoKY

File : C:\Documents and Settings\fchang1\Desktop\TAH\_JeffCountyKY\_SECTION C2009.doc



**U.S. Department of Education  
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)  
Project Status Chart**

OMB No. 1890 - 0004  
Expiration: 10-31-2007

PR/Award :  
U215X060051A

**SECTION B - Budget Information** *(See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)*

**Year Three (July 1, 2008 – June 30, 2009) Budget Information**

Budget Categories	Three Year Appropriation	Allocated for Project Year 3	Actual Spent Project Year 3 (as of 6/30/09)	Carryover from Project Year 3
Personnel	114,232	39,122	37,804	1,318
Fringe Benefits	18,438	6,313	5,525	788
Travel	43,575	14,525	13,528	997
Equipment	0	0	0	0
Supplies	93,143	27,450	29,598	-2,148
Contractual	309,447	80,579	115,643	-35,064
Construction	0	0	0	0
Other	7,440	2,480	2,492	-12
<b>Total Direct Costs</b>	<b>586,275</b>	<b>170,469</b>	<b>204,590</b>	<b>-34,121</b>
Indirect Costs	51,458	12,397	4,541	7,856
Training Stipends	119,596	36,887	46,121	-9,234
<b>Total Costs</b>	<b>757,329</b>	<b>219,753</b>	<b>255,252</b>	<b>-35,499</b>

**Explanation of Year Three Budget:**

A three-day workshop projected to be in the year two budget actually took place in July, 2008; therefore the expenditures are recorded in the year three budget. This resulted in a negative balance for year three, but not for the total budget as shown below.

**July 1, 2006 – June 30, 2009 Budget Overview**

	Three Year Appropriation	Actual Spent Project Year 1	Actual Spent Project Year 2	Actual Spent Project Year 3 (as of 6/30/09)	Total Carryover
Personnel	114,232	18,391	20,042	37,804	37,995
Fringe Benefits	18,438	2,756	3,018	5,525	7,139
Travel	43,575	1,661	5,040	13,528	23,346
Equipment	0	0	0	0	0
Supplies	93,143	16,831	19,440	29,598	27,274
Contractual	309,447	86,468	33,385	115,643	73,951
Construction	0	0	0	0	0
Other	7,440	480	1,717	2,492	2,751

Total Direct Costs	586,275	126,587	82,643	204,590	172,455
Indirect Costs	51,458	9,308	3,951	4,541	33,658
Training Stipends	119,596	16,521	22,678	46,121	34,276
Total Costs	757,329	152,417	109,271	255,252	240,389

Explanation of Budget:

Several project activities took place in the summer of 2009, but because the budget reporting period ended on June 30, 2009 some activities and expenses are not reflected. By August, 2009 additional funding of approximately \$70,000 had been expended or encumbered.

Contractual – Some costs were overestimated and others had not been billed by June 30, 2009.

(1) The District’s primary partner, the University of Louisville McConnell Center was able to provide services, including the services of some university personnel, for less than anticipated, and in some cases for free. Because the summer institute was the third week of June a portion of the contracted services costing \$29,961 was billed and processed in July and an additional \$30,561 is encumbered.

(3) The project evaluator’s work in June was not billed until August and additional work will be billed for July and August.

Personnel – The project director worked additional days in July and August on project activities, planning, budget, and program evaluation.

Indirect Costs – Rates were overestimated based on the state rate for indirect costs. Funding not needed for the indirect costs will be expended for additional project activities.

Training Stipends – Additional funds were expended for training stipends in the summer of 2009 after the end of the reporting period. Also, in some instances, teachers chose to take professional development service credit instead of stipends.

## **America in Transition (TAH II): Results from 2008-2009 Observations and Interviews**

### **Methodology**

Observations were collected from 2008 Summer Institute participants between November 2008 and January 2009. The observation window was selected in order to coordinate the period covered in the Summer Institute and the core content being covered in the classroom. In 2008, a total of 24 teachers participated in the Summer Institute. Of the 24 teachers, 23 were observed during the 2008-2009 school year. One teacher (4%) was not observed because of a medical leave of absence. Of the 24 teachers who participated in the 2008 Summer Institute, 18 teachers (75%) had participated in the 2007 Summer Institute.

Observations were collected using the America in Transition Classroom Observation Measure by two observers, including the project evaluator, from the Dept. of Accountability, Research, and Planning, JCPS. Five of the 23 teachers observed were not teaching U.S. History in 2008-2009, but were utilizing strategies/materials from the Summer Institute in their classes. The observation measure was developed to assess specific areas related to teaching U.S. History (e.g., use of primary sources) as well as general classroom contextual areas (e.g. partner work, classroom climate) and student engagement. The two observers established inter-rater reliability on 15% of observations (n = 3) in 2007-2008 order to ensure consistency of interpretation on the observation measure. The mean weighted kappa yielded an acceptable inter-rater reliability of 0.74. Two observations were conducted by the same two observers in 2008-2009 in order to re-test reliability and the mean weighted kappa yielded an acceptable inter-rater reliability of 0.63.

### **Results**

Length of Observations: Each observation was approximately the length of one school period. The average length of an observation was 60 minutes with a range of 30 minutes to 75 minutes.

Number of Students: The average number of students in a classroom was 24 with a range of 7 students to 31 students.

Topic of Lessons Observed: The majority of the lessons observed (n = 10; 43%) were related to World War I. Two classes were on the Spanish-American War (9%).

Instructional Orientation: During the observation period, the most frequent instructional orientation was direct instruction (whole class lecture). Approximately 60% of the classes had direct instruction for more than half the period observed. Approximately, 35% had direct instruction for more than 75% of the period. More than half the classes (61%) utilized small group/collaborative work and 88% of classes had independent work.

Pedagogy: All teachers observed applied at least one pedagogical strategy discussed during the Summer Institute. Almost all teachers were observed utilizing primary source materials during the class period (83%). Most teachers (74%) were observed promoting reading strategies and many teachers were observed using geographic tools (39%) and promoting visual literacy through the use of political cartoons and/or photographs (48%). About one-third (35%) of teachers connected their lesson in some way to a historical place. On average, teachers utilized 3 pedagogical strategies related to the summer institute during the period observed.

The utilization of primary sources was further analyzed to assess the depth of primary source analysis, the historical context, and key issues. The scale consisted of 1-Limited Use, 3- Key Part of the Lesson, and 5- Extensive Use. In the utilization of primary sources, most teachers analyzed primary sources as a key part of the lesson (68%). Four teachers

(21%) analyzed primary sources in a limited manner, and two teachers (11%) analyzed primary sources extensively during the class period. In terms of discussing the historical context of the primary source, 63% of teachers discussed the historical context as a key part of the lesson while 32% of teachers minimally discussed the historical context and 5% discussed the historical context extensively. Finally in terms of presenting key ideas from the primary source, 53% of teachers presented at least two main ideas, 21% presented more than two main ideas, and 26% of teachers presented one main idea.

Instructional Components: Teachers were observed for general instructional components. The chart below depicts the percentage of teachers who were rated on each of the instructional components. Overall, teachers showed a high level of instructor/student dialogue, a high level of enthusiasm for the topic, and classrooms had a positive atmosphere. Teachers were not as high on communicating verbally or in writing the goals of the lesson and in connecting students' past knowledge or previous experiences to the observed lesson.

<b>Instructional Components</b>	<b>Low</b>	<b>Somewhat Low</b>	<b>Moderate</b>	<b>Somewhat High</b>	<b>High</b>
Communicates to students what they are to learn as a result of the lesson, either written or verbally	4%	17%	26%	35%	17%
Connects to students' past knowledge or previous experiences	4%	17%	48%	22%	9%
Utilizes higher level questioning	0%	9%	44%	44%	4%
Provides opportunities for interactive instructor/student dialogue	4%	0%	57%	26%	13%
Provides opportunities for interactive students/student dialogue	22%	9%	26%	39%	4%
Uses praise and/or reinforcements	0%	13%	44%	39%	4%
Positive atmosphere among students	0%	4%	13%	61%	22%
Enthusiastic instruction conveyed by the instructor	0%	9%	39%	44%	9%

Student engagement: Generally, there was a high level of student engagement with 82% of classrooms showing very high levels of attentiveness to the teacher and engagement with activities. Students were more likely to answer questions than ask questions as indicated by the finding that 61% of classes had the majority of students answering at least one teacher-directed question while 13% of classes had the majority of students asking at least one question.

## Interview Results

All 24 teachers who participated in the Summer Institute were interviewed. The project coordinator interviewed teachers several months following the Summer Institute in order to collect reflective thoughts from the Summer Institute. Interviews were in a semi-structured open-response format. The tables below depict the emerging themes from the interviews, along with the percentage of participants who expressed each of the common themes.

### *Participants' Open Responses-*

<b>Question 1: Which content topics, information, ideas, or understandings from the Summer Institute will be the most helpful or valuable as you plan your American history instruction?</b>	
<b>Themes</b>	<b>Percent of Participants</b>
World War I	71% Sample Comment: "WWI – because it had not dawned on me – I didn't realize that those who came just one generation later had been taught so little about the recent war"
Progressivism	58% Sample Comment: "Progressive Politics was very good because I didn't know as much about it and tended to skim over it in class; this topic added more realism to the era"
Expansionism	48% Sample Comment: "Liked Harrison's discussion of some of changes in how he teaches expansionism so that it's closer to the truth"
<b>Question 2: Will you, or have you used any of the instructional strategies?</b>	
<b>Themes</b>	<b>Percent of Participants</b>
Photos/Visual Analysis	75% Sample Comment: "Photos are great for all levels/ used Immigrants and WWI/ comprehensive program students really give a lot more input when using these; every group sees something different; they see things that they might miss otherwise. The students have so much to say [when using the photos]."
Primary Sources	58% Sample Comment: "Has many new resources that are helpful because of the TAH program"
DVD/Online/CD	57%

	<p>Sample Comment: “Used the suffrage photos with her suffrage lesson...knows that there are lots of resources out there, like these suffrage photos, but there often isn’t enough time to find them so it helped to have them on the CD” (provided by the TAH grant)</p>
Maps	<p>29% Sample Comment: “Loved using the Pacific centered map – First thing the students asked was “What’s wrong with this map?”</p>
<b>Question 3: In what ways did your field study experience influence and/or enhance your historical perspective and instructional planning</b>	
<b>Themes</b>	<b>Percent of Participants</b>
Gold Coast Walking Tour	<p>63% Sample Comment: “Neighborhood tour [Gold Coast] really showed the detail from the Gilded Age”</p>
Hull House	<p>54%: Sample Comment: “Talking about the Hull House and having a personal photo with the teacher in it helps”</p>
Chicago History Museum	<p>38% Sample Comment: “Loved the Chicago History Museum because it’s more “history” than some museums and really about the development of the city”</p>
<b>Question 4: What are some of the primary sources you have used, or will use this school year?</b>	
Photos	<p>79% Sample Comment: “Jackdaw photos [from TAH program] are very helpful. History is a story and stories need pictures. Having these really big pictures in front of them really helps the students think about the learning. Later when they are taking a test with open response items I tell them to “think about the pictures in your mind” and think this has really helped them.”</p>
Books/Readers	<p>75%: Sample Comment: “Perspectives on History – has used lots of exact quotes [primary source excerpts] from these books which fit right into group work. Used the ones from the sinking of the Lusitania that were demonstrated in the follow-up session. These really spur discussion and each group gets to be an “expert” on their area”</p>

*Table 1. Demographic Profile of American History Teachers (N = 65)*

<b>Characteristics</b>	<b>Summer Institute Teachers (n = 29)</b>	<b>Non-Summer Institute Teachers (n = 36)</b>
<b>Education Level</b>		
Bachelor's degree	3% (n = 1)	12% (n = 4)
Master's degree	41% (n = 12)	47% (n = 17)
At least one year beyond Master's	52% (n = 15)	39% (n = 14)
Doctoral degree	3% (n = 1)	3% (n = 1)
<b>Race</b>		
Caucasian	86% (n = 25)	83% (n = 29)
African-American	3% (n = 1)	11% (n = 4)
Other	11% (n = 3)	0% (n = 0)
<b>Gender</b>		
Male	52% (n = 15)	71% (n = 25)
Female	48% (n = 14)	29% (n = 10)
<b>Years of Experience Teaching U.S. History</b>		
0-1 year	10% (n = 3)	8% (n = 3)
2-5 years	24% (n = 7)	39% (n = 14)
6-10 years	35% (n = 10)	17% (n = 6)
11-15 years	21% (n = 6)	22% (n = 8)
16+ years	10% (n = 3)	14% (n = 5)
<b>Years of Experience Teaching High School</b>		
0-1 year	0% (n = 0)	0% (n = 0)
2-5 years	14% (n = 4)	31% (n = 11)
6-10 years	38% (n = 11)	22% (n = 8)
11-15 years	24% (n = 7)	28% (n = 10)
16+ years	24% (n = 7)	19% (n = 7)

**Survey: The Civil War and Reconstruction Workshop  
Summer 2008**

Of the 26 participants who participated in the Civil War and Reconstruction workshop, 24 participants completed the evaluation survey for a total response rate of 92%. The results of the survey are shown below. Of the 24 participants who completed the survey, 7 (29%) were teaching at the middle school level and 17 (71%) were teaching at the high school level.

First, participants were asked to rate their skills/knowledge on a 1-5 scale (1= No skills/No knowledge to 5= Highly skilled/Highly knowledgeable) in specific areas before and after the workshop. Each area showed a statistically significant increase, as depicted in the table below.

	<b>Before Workshop</b>	<b>After Workshop</b>	<b>Change*</b>
1. Knowledge about political, economic, and social causes of the Civil War	3.42	4.46	+1.04
2. Multiple perspectives of the Civil War	3.46	4.25	+0.79
3. Analysis of the Reconstruction plans and their outcomes	2.91	4.00	+1.09
4. Finding appropriate primary source materials related to Civil War and Reconstruction	3.12	4.46	+1.34
5. Ability to analyze primary source materials to better understand the Civil War and Reconstruction	3.43	4.39	+0.96
6. Knowledge about teaching using primary source materials related to Civil War and Reconstruction	3.29	4.46	+1.17

All changes were statistically significant at .001 level using paired-sample t-tests.

Next, participants were asked to rate their opinions on specific statements related to the workshop.

	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>
7. I am satisfied with the overall quality of instruction in The Civil War and Reconstruction Workshop.	0%	0%	16.7%	83.3%
8. The <b>Civil War and Reconstruction Workshop</b> made me more aware of the key historical understandings necessary for the content transition between 8 <sup>th</sup> to 11 <sup>th</sup> grade.	4.2	0%	37.5%	58.3%
9. I believe the transition between 8 <sup>th</sup> and 11 <sup>th</sup> grade U.S. History is difficult for students.	0%	4.2	58.3%	37.5%
10. I believe the transition between 8 <sup>th</sup> and 11 <sup>th</sup> grade U.S. History is difficult for teachers.	0%	12.5%	54.2%	33.3%
11. The Civil War and Reconstruction Workshop was relevant to my professional needs.	0%	0%	16.7%	83.3%

12. I believe my participation in The Civil War and Reconstruction Workshop will help prepare me to better transition my students from 8 <sup>th</sup> grade U.S History to 11 <sup>th</sup> grade U.S. History.	0%	0%	41.7%	58.3%
13. <b>The Civil War and Reconstruction Workshop</b> is a high quality workshop.	0%	0%	8.3%	91.7%



9. Indirect Costs

a. Are you claiming indirect costs under this grant?  Yes  
 No

b. If yes, do you have an Indirect Cost Rate Agreement approved by the Federal government?  Yes  
 No

c. If yes, provide the following information:

Period Covered by the Indirect Cost Rate Agreement: From: To:  
(mm/dd/yyyy)

Approving Federal agency:  ED  Other (Please specify):

Type of Rate (For Final Performance Reports Only):  Provisional  Final  Other  
(Please specify):

d. For Restricted Rate Programs (check one) -- Are you using a restricted indirect cost rate that :

Is included in your approved Indirect Cost Rate Agreement?

Complies with 34 CFR 76.564(c)(2)?

**Human Subjects (Annual Institutional Review Board (IRB) Certification) (See instructions.)**

10. Is the annual certification of Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval attached?  Yes  
 No  N/A

**Performance Measures Status and Certification (See instructions.)**

11. Performance Measures Status

a. Are complete data on performance measures for the current budget period included in the Project Status Chart?  Yes  No

b. If no, when will the data be available and submitted to the Department? 11/30/2009  
(mm/dd/yyyy)

12. To the best of my knowledge and belief, all data in this performance report are true and correct and the report fully discloses all known weaknesses concerning the accuracy, reliability, and completeness of the data.

Name of Authorized Representative: Sheldon H Berman	Title: Superintendent
Signature:	Date:

**Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Executive Summary Attachment:**

Title : TAH\_Executive Summary\_JeffCoKy  
File : C:\Documents and Settings\lcliffo1.JEFFERSON\Desktop\ED524BExecSummary TAH\_JeffCoKy\_09.doc



**U.S. Department of Education  
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)  
Executive Summary**

OMB No. 1890 - 0004  
Expiration: 10-31-2007

PR/Award #: U215X060051

**America in Transition – Challenges and Achievements** serves **one LEA**, the **Jefferson County Public Schools (JCPS)**, and partners with the University of Louisville (UL), and the Gilder Lehrman Institute of American History (GLI). The three-year project deepens the content knowledge and enhances the related teaching skills of **high school teachers** of American History. During the third year of the program (2008-2009) project participants included those from **nine (9) high-need high schools**. Historic periods covered included **N.A.E.P U.S. History categories 5, 6, and 7**.

To meet the goals of the *America in Transition – Challenges and Achievements* project, the objectives are to: 1) build a network of American history teachers committed to professional growth; 2) increase teachers’ knowledge of traditional American history and improve pedagogical practices, including the teachers’ ability to teach with primary source documents and engage students in acquiring historical knowledge through disciplined inquiry; and 3) improve the level of student achievement in participating schools on the American history portion of the state-mandated assessment, the Kentucky Core Content Test (KCCT) and on the Advanced Placement United States History Exam. (Note: In the Performance Report Project Status Charts these objectives are reported at Project Objectives 2, 3, and 4 because the GPRA Project Objectives are reported as Project Objective 1.)

Strategies for addressing the objectives of the project include the formation of an American History Alliance, summer institutes, workshops, visiting scholar seminars, book study seminars, participation in professional history conferences, and provision of corresponding educational materials.

Two strands of professional development were offered during the third year of the program. Strand one, the *Core Program*, was offered to all high school teachers of American History. Strand two, the *Transition Program*, brought together high school and middle school teachers of American History. In the *Core Program* **64 hours** of professional development was provided. **Fifty (50) teachers** participated in the *Core Program* and **twenty-three (23) completed 75%** or more of the professional development hours provided. In the second strand, the *Transition Program*, **18 hours** of professional development was provided. **Twenty-six (26) teachers** participated and **twenty-five (25) completed 75%** of the program hours.

Strand 1 – Core Program	
Professional development hours offered	64
Number of participants	50
Number of participants completing 75% or more of PD hours	23

Strand 2 – Transition Program	
Professional development hours offered	18
Number of participants	26
Number of participants completing 75% or more of PD hours	25

Fourteen high school teachers participated in both the Core Program and the Transition Program.

A total of **\$255,252** was expended during this performance period. Details are provided in Section B – Budget Information.

Objectives of the *America in Transition* project were met through the following activities:

**Objective 1: Build a network of American history teachers committed to professional growth.**

All Jefferson County teachers of high school American history (approximately 80) were registered as members of the American History Alliance and notified of grant activities through print and electronic communications. In addition, middle school teachers of American history were invited to participate in the *Transition Program* which focused on improving content transitions from 8<sup>th</sup> to 11<sup>th</sup> grade American history.

Surveys, interviews, and observations provide evidence that the program has been very successful in building a network of teachers of American history who enjoy working together and who share professional ideas and information on an ongoing basis.

**Objective 2: Increase teachers' knowledge of traditional American history and improve pedagogical practices, including the teachers' ability to teach with primary source documents and engage students in acquiring historical knowledge through disciplined inquiry.**

In July of 2008 twenty-six teachers and one resource teacher participated in the *Transition Program*, a three-day workshop on the Civil War and Reconstruction. Participants focused on the content that forms the transition between middle and high school American history programs. Gilder Lehrman (GLI) staffed the program with history scholar, Dr. Steven Hahn, and an education coordinator, and provided program materials. Survey data following the workshop showed that teachers significantly rated their knowledge about teaching with primary source materials from the Civil War and Reconstruction periods higher after participation in the workshop (see Section C for more information).

Book Study Seminars continued during the 2008-2009 school year. All members of the American History Alliance were invited to participate. Teachers and project personnel met to discuss *Summer for the Gods* by Edward J. Larson; *Henry Ford and the Jews* by Neil Baldwin; and *No Ordinary Time* by Doris Kearns Goodwin. Book Study participants selected the books to be read and the project director developed discussion questions. In addition to discussing the books in a seminar setting, participants submitted written responses to the questions. Project staff again observed excellent preparation and enthusiasm on the part of participating teachers.

The cadre of teachers who participated in the 2008 Summer Institute met for a follow-up in November, 2008 to share reflections, knowledge, and insights from the summer institute and to discuss instructional plans. Additional examples of pedagogy using primary source readings were demonstrated. Project data was shared and classroom visits planned.

During the 2008-2009 school year project evaluators visited schools and observed the classroom lessons of 23 teachers from the 2008 summer institute cadre. Findings, reported in Performance Measure 3c and elaborated on in Section C, show that 19 (83%) of the teachers were observed

utilized primary source materials in their classroom lessons and 15 (79%) of the teachers analyzed primary sources as a key or extensive part of the lesson. The project director also visited the classrooms of all teachers in the cadre and conducted interviews with each teacher. Additional information in Section C provides details about the classroom observations including lesson topics, instructional orientation, and student engagement, as well as interview results by the project director.

All JCPS teachers of American history were invited to the American History Alliance meeting and Visiting Scholars Program on Teaching World War II presented by Dr. James H. Madison of Indiana University, on March 4, 2009\*. (\*Originally scheduled for January, the program had to be moved because of inclement weather.) The program was held at the Filson Historical Society and curator, James J. Holmberg provided packets of historical material that teachers can use to connect the experiences of local community members to the national experience during WWII.

In March, 2009 seven teachers of U.S. history and the Project Director attended the National Council for History Education annual conference. One project teacher attended the annual conference of the Organization of American Historians in April and received the 2009 OAH Tachau Teacher of the Year Award. Three project teachers participated in a local conference, *The Forgotten Founders*, in September, 2008.

Thirty teachers were selected in February to participate in the summer institute. Pre-institute readings were distributed to teachers. A pre-institute workshop held in April focused on the topic *Causes of the Great Depression*, presented by visiting scholar, Dr. Tracy K Meyer. Participants completed the summer institute pre-test, an overview of the summer program was provided, and institute participants were given a pre-institute website review assignment.

Thirty teachers and the JCPS and UL staff members participated in the six day summer institute which took place June 15-20, 2009. The theme for the institute was *America's New Deal and World War II* and seminar topics included *Depression and Politics to 1933*, *The First New Deal*, *The Second New Deal and Its Dissents*, *American Foreign Policy in the 1930s*, *America's Role in WW II – The European Theatre and America's Role in WWII – The Asian Theatre*. During the three days of seminars professors of American history from the UL and two additional universities provided daily lectures on content topics and education specialists (JCPS/UL) demonstrated sample instructional strategies (pedagogy) that the teachers could use to present the content to students. The pedagogy focused on using a variety of types of primary source materials for instruction. A collection of historical materials pertaining to this era was also provided for each participant.

The field study portion of the summer institute took place in Washington DC. Emphasis was placed on learning from primary source materials and sites related to the content of the summer institute. The program included a workshop at the National Archives. The teachers also examined *The Price of Freedom* at the National Museum of American History, viewed exhibits at the Smithsonian National Portrait Gallery, examined the New Deal art exhibit at the American Art Museum, toured the Holocaust Museum, and participated in a historian guided tour of the FDR and the WWII monuments on the national mall as well as other national monuments.

The UL and JCPS project personnel prepared a pre-institute/post-institute content knowledge test, based on released items from AP U.S. history exams that could be linked to the content of the summer institute. Thirty institute teachers took both tests and 27 of the participants showed an increase in content knowledge (**GPRA**). The average increase in content knowledge on the institute pre/post test was 12% and was statistically significant.

**Objective 3: Improve the level of student achievement in participating schools on the American history portion of the state-mandated assessment, the Kentucky Core Content Test (KCCT) and on the Advanced Placement United States History Exam.**

The timing of the release of our state-mandated assessments (KCCT) test scores is typically in September of the following school year. Students were administered the KCCT test in Social Studies in April/May 2009 and their individual scores are expected to be released to the district in mid-September. Thus, an addendum to the report will be sent when this data becomes available.

The Advanced Placement U.S. History Exam results were available. A quasi-experimental analysis of student achievement in history using treatment and control groups was conducted. In Spring of 2009, 240 students from the classrooms of participating teachers and 247 students from the classrooms of non-participating teachers took the AP U.S. History test. A goal of a 15% passing rate was set for the treatment group (based on the most recent 'AP Report to the Nation' released in February 2009). While 20.4% of the students from classrooms of participating teachers passed the AP U.S. History exam, 19.8% of the students from classrooms of non-participating teachers passed. Though this difference did not reach statistical significance, the percent of students that passed the test was slightly higher for the treatment group than the control group.

**Problem(s) Encountered:**

In this project, activities were designed to bring in teachers at different levels of participation, and a cadre of teachers, composed of teachers who may or may not have participated the previous year, was chosen for each summer institute. For this reason participants and completers are reported for a one year period. Also, because the 2008-2009 program had two unique components, program officer, Naveed Malik suggested reporting two strands of professional development. The GPRAS reported in the data are based on the teachers completing the summer institute in the Core Program.

**Extension Request:**

Upon review of project activities and outcomes, the project steering committee determined that an additional year was needed to fully carry out the goals and objectives outlined in the grant proposal. A no-cost extension of the grant period to June 30, 2010 was requested and approved.

Activities in the extension period will include (1) four or more additional professional development workshops including one at the Frazier International History Museum, (2) one or more additional book study seminars, (3) project staff support for classroom implementation, (4) teacher participation in history conferences, and (5) additional project evaluation.