

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

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



**ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT 1**  
**CFDA # 84.215X**  
**PR/Award # U215X080141**  
**Budget Period # 1**  
**Report Type: AdHoc 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 - 3	e5
3. Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A - 4	e7
4. Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A - 6	e9
5. Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A - 2	e11
6. Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A - 5	e13
7. Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A - 7	e14
8. Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A - 8	e16
9. Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A - 9	e22
10. Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section B & C	e24
Thorp TPP Budget 524B	e25
11. Grant Performance Report Cover Sheet (ED 524B) - Revised 2008	e27
Thorp TPP Exec Summary	e29

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 #: **U215X080141**

**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 Measures

This 2008 project has elected to utilize the new GPRAs.

(Measures related to the original application GPRAs objectives are reported in A-1.1 and A-8.b.)

1.1. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The average percentage change in the scores (on a pre-post assessment of American History) of participants who complete at least 75% of the pro-fessional development hours offered by the project. The test or measure will be aligned with the TAH project and at least 50% of the questions will come from a validated test of American history. (Objective 4) Target reported is the mean pretest score in year 1. Actual performance on posttest is not available yet.	GPRAs	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			22 / 43	51		999 / 999	100
1.2. Performance Measure	Measure	Quantitative Data					

The percentage of TAH participants who complete 75% or more of the total hours of professional development offered.	Type	Target			Actual Performance Data		
	GPRA	Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
				72 / 90	80		22 / 23

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

1.1.

Research Question: 1.) To what extent did teachers increase their knowledge of U.S. history content after participating in TPPOF?

Performance Measure: The actual performance in 1.1 is not reported because the teachers have not yet taken a posttest. The target entry is the actual mean score for Year 1 completers on the teacher knowledge pretest.

RMC Research is utilizing a quasi-experimental research study to address this research question. The hypothesis is that teachers participating in TPPOF will significantly improve their historical content knowledge scores from pretest to posttest. In this design each teacher completes a pretest prior to the first professional development workshop, a posttest at the end of the final professional development, and a second posttest 3 months after the final professional development. If TPPOF has an impact on the teachers, their scores will significantly increase from the pretest to the first posttest, and no change will be observed between the 2 posttests.

Instrument Development

The teacher content assessment measures teachers' knowledge of U.S. history. To create the middle school teacher assessment the Grant Director and the Grant Administrator selected from the Educational Testing Service's Praxis II subject assessment items that corresponded to the content presented in the professional development workshops. The Grant Director rated the 129 items on a scale from 1 (easy for teachers to answer) to 3 (difficult for teachers to answer) and identified which of the 4 time periods (i.e., 1400-1650, 1651-1780, 1781-1800, 1801-1865) each item addressed. RMC Research created 3 comparable versions of the teacher content assessment by distributing the items so that each version included an equal number at the various difficulty levels and time periods. A different version of the assessment is administered at each data collection point to ensure that any increases from pre- to posttest are due to increases in content knowledge and not due to teachers learning to take one version of the test. This process will be repeated in Year 2 for the high school teachers and in Year 3 for the elementary teachers. RMC Research, the Grant Director, and the Grant Administrator also developed a survey the teachers use to self-report their historical content knowledge gains.

## Data Collection

The teacher content assessment and the teacher survey will be administered online to all participating teachers at 3 points in time. Middle school teachers (n = 22) completed a pretest in September 2008 prior to the first professional development workshop and will complete a first posttest in August 2009 at the end of their participation in the project and a second posttest in November 2009 approximately 3 months after the end of their participation in the project. To complete the tests the teachers access a website created by RMC Research and log on with a username and password to protect the confidentiality of the data. High school and elementary teachers will follow a similar pattern during their participating year.

## Analysis

RMC Research conducted tests to confirm that the 3 versions of the middle school teacher content assessment were the same level of difficulty. Differences between the pretest scores on the 3 versions were evident. The average score on Version 1 was 20.86, the average score on Version 2 was 20.88 and the average score on Version 3 was nearly 4 points higher (24.14). Due to these differences the scores on all pre and posttests will be adjusted by adding 1.052 to Version 1, adding 1.0341 to Version 2, and subtracting 2.2338 from Version 3.

## Findings

At this time only the middle school teachers' pretest data are available. On average the teachers answered half of the pretest questions correctly; of 43 possible points the average score was 22. The scores ranged widely from a low of 3 questions answered correctly and to a high of 33. The teacher survey respondents rated their knowledge on a scale of 1 (no knowledge) to 10 (a lot of knowledge) for the 4 time periods covered by TPPOF. Teachers reported having some knowledge of the 4 time periods: the average score for 1400-1650 was 4.68, the average score for 1651-1780 was 5.32, the average score for 1781-1800 was 5.73, and the average score for 1801-1865 was 5.95. Pre- and posttest comparisons will be available after the middle school teachers have completed the first posttest.

### 1.2.

Performance Measure: The actual performance ratio in 1.2 is reported as 22/23 because 22 teachers are defined as project completers by the U.S. Department of Education (i.e., completed 75% of the 56 professional development hours offered) and 23 participated in Year 1 of the project. The project anticipates recruiting 90 teachers (i.e., 25 middle school teachers Year 1, 25 high school teachers Year 2, 40 elementary teachers Year 3) and achieving a completion rate of 72 teachers or 80%; past experience suggests an attrition rate of approximately 20% is to be expected.

The project successfully provided 8 professional development workshops to 22 middle school teachers. To recruit teachers for TPPOF the Grant Director secured support from 16 school districts to commit a total of 90 teachers to participate in the grant. Eligible teachers teach full time in Grades 5-12 and deliver U.S. history units. The Grant Director created a brochure and PowerPoint presentation that described the grant proposal and the benefits of participation. The Grant Director personally distributed the materials to each school superintendent or district representative in the summer of 2007 and gathered from each district a written commitment to participate in the grant. The Grant Director contacted the district

representatives via email and telephone to obtain the contact information for each eligible teacher and provided information about the grant directly to the teachers in summer 2008 via email and telephone. The teachers verbally committed to participate in the project. The Grant Director visited each school to meet every middle school teacher prior to the first professional development workshop in September 2008. The Grant Director will follow the same procedure to recruit the high school and elementary school teachers.

The project met its recruitment and participation goals for Year 1: 25 middle school teachers were recruited, 23 participated all year in the project, and 22 qualify as project completers as defined by the U.S. Department of Education (i.e., completed 75% of the 56 professional development hours offered). Of the 23 project participants 52% were male, 78% were Caucasian, 13% were Hispanic, and 9% were American Indian. The majority of participants (70%) had a Master's degree, though few had had a major (30%) or minor (17%) in history. Only 65% of participants were certified to teach history. Approximately half of the teachers (52%) taught history as a stand-alone course and most (74%) taught in a school identified for correction under No Child Left Behind legislation. In Year 2 the project will serve 25 high school teachers; 20 have been recruited thus far. In Year 3 the project will serve at least 40 elementary school teachers.



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

PR/Award #: **U215X080141**

**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.  
To Preserve and Protect Our Future will observe teacher classrooms to record workshop information, observe new pedagogy, and mentor delivery of both. (Objective 2)

3.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
To Preserve and Protect Our Future will observe participant teacher classrooms 4 times during their year of participation to record workshop information, observe new pedagogy, and mentor delivery of both.	PROJ	Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		92	/		101	/	

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

Research Question: 1.) How successful was the project in terms of conducting classroom observations?

Performance Measure: The actual performance number is reported as 101 because the Grant Director completed 101 classroom observations of participating teachers. The target performance number is 92 in Year 1 because the project anticipates completing 4 observations for each participant each year.

In Year 1 the Grant Director exceeded the project goal of 92 classroom observations (i.e., 4 observations of 23 teachers) by completing 101 classroom observations of 23 middle school teachers. Of these 23 teachers, 11 were observed 5 times, 10 were observed 4 times, and 2 were observed 3 times.

For detailed information on the observation data collected, please see Chart A -8.



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

PR/Award #: **U215X080141**

**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.  
Teachers will attend other professional development activities including site visits. (Objective 3)

4.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
80% of participating teachers will fulfill requirements to receive funding of other professional development, which will be completed and reimbursed by 8/31 of the school year of participation.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			72 / 90	80		999 / 999	100

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

Research Question: 1.) How successful was the project in terms of providing 72 teachers with professional development funds to purchase additional professional development activities?

Performance Measure: The actual performance ratio is reported as 999/999 because all 23 of the middle school teacher participants have earned their professional development funds, but they have until 8/31/09 to complete their approved activities. The target ratio is 72/90 because the project anticipates that 72 of 90 teachers will complete the project and receive additional funds to purchase professional development activities.

The project expects to meet its professional development funds goal for Year 1 by August 31. The participating teachers have access to reimbursement of \$650 spent on additional professional development activities by that date. Teachers who participate in the quasi-experimental research study receive an additional \$350. To date all of the middle school teachers (n = 23) have earned their professional development funds by meeting expectations for classroom follow-up. The number

completing their activities and receiving reimbursement is not yet available because most planned their activities to occur during the summer months. Descriptive information regarding the professional development purchased by the teachers will be available after the middle school teachers complete the first posttest in August 2009.



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

PR/Award #: **U215X080141**

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

**6 . Project Objective**  Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.  
To Preserve and Protect Our Future will train teachers in Classroom Based Assessment (CBA). (Objective 6)

6.a. Performance Measure	<b>Measure Type</b>	<b>Quantitative Data</b>					
80% of participants will complete at least 75% of the CBA training hours offered.	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>
			72 / 90	80		21 / 23	91
6.b. Performance Measure	<b>Measure Type</b>	<b>Quantitative Data</b>					
80% of participants will self-report an increase in ability to administer and score the CBA.	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>
			72 / 90	80		999 / 999	100

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

Research Question: 1.) How successful was the project in terms of training teachers to administer CBAs?

Performance Measure 6.a: The actual performance ratio in 6.a is reported as 21/23 because 21 of 23 teachers in Year 1 completed 75% the CBA training sessions offered. The target performance ratio is 72/90 because the project anticipates that

72 teachers will complete the training to improve their ability to administer and score CBAs.

Performance Measure 6.b: The actual performance ratio in 6.b is reported as 999/999 because none of the 23 middle school teachers have completed the first posttest. The target performance ratio is 72/90 because the project anticipates that 72 teachers will self-report an increase in their ability to administer and score CBAs.

Two methods are used to measure the success of training in CBAs. First, 21 of 23 Year 1 middle school teachers attended at least 75% the CBA training sessions provided. Second, all teachers are required to complete the teacher survey, which measures their self-reported ability to administer and score the CBAs. On the pretest few of the middle school teachers reported being very well prepared (9%) or well prepared (17%) to administer the CBAs, whereas most reported being somewhat prepared (57%) or not well prepared (17%). On the pretest few of the middle school teachers reported being very well prepared (4%) to score the CBAs, whereas most reported being somewhat prepared (61%) or not well prepared (35%). Pre- and posttest comparisons will be available after the middle school teachers complete the first posttest in August 2009.

CBAs were also used in a quasi-experimental study related to the TPPOF Goal 3: Increase student achievement in U.S. History. The study is discussed in Project Status Chart A-8.



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

PR/Award #: **U215X080141**

**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.

To Preserve and Protect Our Future will present eight workshops per year for content training in U.S. History with methodology. (Objective 1)

2.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
To Preserve and Protect Our Future will present eight workshops per year for content training in U.S. History with methodology.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		8	/		8	/	

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

Research Question: 1.) How successful was the project in terms of providing 72 teachers with 8 professional development workshops?

Performance Measure: The actual performance number in 2.a is reported as 8 because 8 full day professional development workshops were conducted in Year 1. The project anticipates conducting 8 workshops each school year.

The success of the workshops was also measured as follows:

Instrument Development, Data Collection, and Analysis

Educational Service District (ESD) 105 in Yakima, Washington, developed a survey to assess the professional development provided within the ESD, and this survey was used to assess the 8 workshops. The survey included questions regarding the quality of TPPOF and 2 open-ended questions that allowed teachers to suggest improvements to TPPOF. The Grant Administrator administered the survey at the conclusion of each workshop. To maintain the confidentiality of the data, a

designated teacher collected the surveys, placed them in an envelope, and sealed the envelope. The Grant Administrator mailed the sealed envelope to RMC Research. The responses to the quality questions were analyzed using descriptive statistics and the responses to the open-ended questions were analyzed for themes.

### Findings

The middle school teachers rated the 15 professional development sessions delivered during the 8 workshops on a scale from 1 (poor) to 4 (excellent) with regard to the quality of the written materials; the adequacy of the physical facility; and the presenter's skills in terms of organization, knowledge, and audience engagement. Most of the sessions received high ratings. For sessions 1, 2, and 8 all of the teachers rated all of the session components a 3 or a 4. For sessions 3, 7, 10, 13, and 16 at least 90% of the teachers rated all of session components a 3 or a 4; and for sessions 4, 5, 6, 11, 12, and 14 at least 80% of the teachers rated all of the session components a 3 or a 4. Session 15 received some lower ratings; only 67% of the teachers rated all of the session components a 3 or a 4. (Session 9 was dropped from the original schedule.)

The project made several changes based on the formative survey findings and informal feedback from the teachers. First, the location was changed because teachers reported a higher level of professionalism when the workshops were held at a university or other prestigious location rather than the local ESD. Second, in response to the enthusiasm the teachers demonstrated during the classroom observation visits, upon request the Grant Director observed and mentored teachers 5 times throughout the year rather than 4. The following changes will be implemented in Years 2 and 3: historians who do not receive an acceptable rating will not be asked to return in subsequent years; to provide additional opportunities for informal networking additional time will be dedicated to small group work; to provide additional opportunities for formal networking some teachers will be required to give a presentation on their pedagogical techniques during the workshops.



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

PR/Award #: **U215X080141**

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

**5 . Project Objective**  Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.  
To Preserve and Protect Our Future will improve teachers' historical inquiry methodology skills. (Objective 5)

5.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
80 % of participants will self-report an increase in preparedness for using historical inquiry skills.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			72 / 90	80		999 / 999	100

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

Research Question: 1.) How successful was the project in terms of improving teachers' historical inquiry skills?

Performance Measure: The actual performance ratio is reported as 999/999 because none of the 23 middle school teachers have completed the first posttest. The target performance ratio is 72/90 because the project anticipates that 72 teachers will complete the project and improve their historical inquiry skills.

All teachers are required to complete the teacher survey, which measures their self-reported level of preparedness to integrate historical inquiry skills into their lesson plans. On the pretest few of the middle school teachers reported being very well prepared (4%) or well prepared (4%) to include historical inquiry skills in their lesson plans, whereas most reported being somewhat prepared (65%) or not well prepared (26%). Pre- and posttest comparisons will be available after the middle school teachers complete the first posttest in August 2009.

For detailed information on the observation data collected, please see Chart A -8.



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

PR/Award #: **U215X080141**

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

**7. Project Objective**  Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.  
To Preserve and Protect Our Future will train teachers in conducting oral histories. (Objective 7)

7.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
10 middle school / high school teachers will do a professionally video-taped oral history interview.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		10	/		3	/	
7.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
80% of Year 1 and Year 2 participants will self-report an increase in oral history skills.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			40 / 50	80		999 / 999	100

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

Research Questions: 1.) How successful was the project in terms of teachers conducting oral histories? 2.) How successful was the project in terms of improving teachers' oral history skills?

Performance Measure 7.a: The actual performance number in 7.a is reported as 3 because 3 of the 5 middle school teachers

who volunteered to record oral history interviews have completed the task to date. The target performance number is 10 because the project plans to professionally record oral history interviews by 10 middle school and high school teachers by September 2010. The project will not train elementary school teachers to conduct oral history projects.

Performance Measure 7.b: The actual performance ratio in 7.b is reported as 999/999 because none of the 23 middle school teachers have completed the first posttest. The target performance ratio is 40/50 because the project anticipates that 40 of the 50 participating middle school and high school teachers will self-report an increase in their oral history skills. The project will not train elementary school teachers to conduct oral history projects.

Two methods are used to measure the success of training in conducting oral histories. First, the project plans to recruit 10 middle school and high school teachers to conduct oral history interviews for American Moments: Community Heroes Oral History Project. The interviews will be professionally video-recorded by September 2010 and archived at the Kittitas County Historical Museum where they will be available for public use. They will also be edited and compiled in one DVD which can be used for presentations. To date, 3 interviews are completed and archived, and 2 are scheduled in August 2009.

Second, all middle school and high school teachers receive training in oral history methods, which they can later use in the classroom. They are required to complete the teacher survey, which measures their self-reported oral history skills and documents whether they conducted an oral history. On the pretest few of the middle school teachers reported being well prepared (4%) to conduct an oral history, whereas most reported being somewhat prepared (61%) or not well prepared (35%). Pre- and posttest comparisons and the number of teachers who completed oral history projects will be available after the middle school teachers complete the first posttest in August 2009.



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

PR/Award #: **U215X080141**

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

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

Goal 3. Increase student achievement in U.S. History:

Teachers will deliver workshop content to students. (Objective 8)

8.a. Performance Measure	<b>Measure Type</b>	<b>Quantitative Data</b>					
80% of participants will implement workshop content and methodology in their classroom.	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>
			72 / 90	80		23 / 23	100
8.b. Performance Measure	<b>Measure Type</b>	<b>Quantitative Data</b>					
Students in quasi-experimental studies of educational effectiveness of this Teaching American History project will demonstrate higher achievement on course content measures than students in comparison groups. (Quasi-experimental study--Goal 3)	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>
		6	/		999	/	
8.c. Performance Measure	<b>Measure Type</b>	<b>Quantitative Data</b>					

Students of participating teachers each year will demonstrate higher achievement on history unit content assessment posttest than pretest.	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>
			69 / 69	100		69 / 69	100

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

8.a.

Research Question: 1.) How successful was the project in terms of teachers implementing workshop content and methodology in their classrooms?

Performance Measure 8.a: The actual performance ratio in 8.a is reported as 23/23 because all 23 middle school teachers have implemented the workshop content and methodology in their classroom. The target performance ratio is 72/90 because the project anticipates 80% of all participants will implement workshop content and methodology in their classroom.

Instrument Development

Three methods are to be used to measure the extent to which teachers implement the workshop content and methodology in their classroom. First, RMC Research, the Grant Director, and the Grant Administrator developed a classroom observation protocol, a standardized form the Grant Director uses to record the number of times the teachers mention historical content covered in the workshops and whether the teacher or students utilize 21 possible historical inquiry skills. Second, the teacher survey asks respondents to report on their use of historical inquiry skills and historical content from the workshops in their classroom. Third, teachers develop student assessments that utilize workshop content.

Data Collection

The Grant Director observes each participating teacher at least 4 times, and 101 classroom observations have been completed thus far. After each observation the Grant Director submits the completed classroom observation protocol to RMC Research. All of the 23 middle school teachers have completed the first teacher survey, developed and administered student assessments that utilized workshop content, and submitted the student assessment data to RMC Research.

Analysis

RMC Research uses descriptive statistics to characterize the classroom observation data, teacher survey data, and number of student assessments submitted. The analysis included classroom observation data only from the 21 teachers who were observed at least 4 times.

Findings

From Observations: The data indicate that although the project was successful in terms of teachers implementing workshop content and methodology in their classrooms, some hypotheses were not supported by the data. Each participating middle school teacher did develop and administer student assessments that utilized workshop content. In addition, the classroom observation data indicate that 100% of the teachers implemented workshop content in their classroom, 100% used history inquiry skills themselves, 100% had students use historical inquiry skills, and 100% used historical inquiry skills when presenting a primary source document to their students. Teachers incorporated the content from 1650-1780 the most frequently, mentioning this content an average of 15.65 times during an observation, followed by the periods 1781-1800 (M = 11.33), 1400-1650 (M = 6.82), and 1800-1865 (M = 5.97). Teachers were more likely to model historical inquiry skills themselves rather than ask students to use historical inquiry skills. On average, the teachers modeled 12 skills during an observation and exhibited the use of 2 skills to analyze primary source documents compared to the use of an average of 5 skills by students and the use of few (M < 1) primary source document analysis skills.

The project made 5 hypotheses regarding the classroom observations. The first hypothesis was that teachers would implement more historical content during subsequent observations compared to prior observations. This hypothesis was partially supported; teachers mentioned the content more times in the second observation (M = 49) than the first (M = 37), but they did not mention more content in the third (M = 43) or fourth (M = 30) observations. This finding might be due to the fact that according to the Grant Director, in 85% of the observations the teachers covered the content in great depth but only for a few topics. Second, the project hypothesized that teachers would model more historical inquiry skills during subsequent observations compared to prior observations. This hypothesis was partially supported: on average teachers modeled more historical inquiry skills in the second observation (M = 13) than the first (M = 12), but they did not model more skills in the third (M = 12) or fourth observations (M = 11). Third, the project hypothesized that teachers would require their students to use more historical inquiry skills during subsequent observations compared to prior observations. This hypothesis was not supported: students used an average of 6 skills during the first observation, 4 in the second, and 5 in the third and fourth. Fourth, the project hypothesized that teachers would model more historical inquiry skills to analyze primary source documents during subsequent observations compared to prior observations. This hypothesis was partially supported; on average teachers modeled more skills in the second observation (M = 2) compared to the first (M = 1), but they did not model more skills in the third (M = 1) or fourth observations (M = 2). Fifth, the project hypothesized that teachers would require students to use more historical inquiry skills to analyze primary source documents during subsequent observations compared to prior observations. This hypothesis was not supported; on average students did not use these skills during any of the observations (M < 1).

From Surveys: To date only the teacher survey pretest data are available. In terms of historical inquiry skills, the teachers reported being most likely to at least weekly ask their students to reconstruct the literal meaning of a historical event and analyze cause and effect relationships. They reported that at least once a month their students determine when events occurred and in what order, interpret data presented in timelines, establish patterns for how historical developments unfolded and how these patterns affect current events, identify the characteristics of a particular time period, describe the historical context in which historical events unfolded, differentiate between historical facts and historical interpretations, draw

comparisons across eras and regions to define enduring themes, formulate historical questions, and formulate subquestions to guide their investigation into a topic. The teachers were less likely to report their students supporting a position with historical evidence and discussing or writing about past events that have affected contemporary issues; use of these skills occurred only once every few months. As for utilizing historical inquiry skills when analyzing primary source documents, the teachers reported that once every few months their students identify the vital theme of the document and approximately once a year their students examine the author's credentials and corroborate the information presented with other documents and examine the author's motivations, describe the past through the perspective of the author, examine events at the time the document was written, and assess the audience for whom the document was intended. Pre- and posttest teacher survey comparisons will be available after the teachers take the posttest.

From Student Assessments: See discussion under 8.c.

8.b.

Research Questions: 1.) To what extent did students whose teacher participated in To Preserve and Protect Our Future (TPPOF) demonstrate higher achievement on Washington State Classroom Based Assessments (CBAs) than students whose teachers had not yet participated in TPPOF? 2.) To what extent did subsequent treatment groups demonstrate significantly higher achievement on CBAs compared to prior treatment groups?

Performance Measure 8.b: The actual performance number in 8.b is reported as 999 because only the baseline data have been gathered. The target is 6 because the project goal is to have all 6 student treatment groups demonstrate a higher percent proficient on CBAs after their teacher completes CBA training. The study will not be completed until all data for Year 2 and Year 3 are collected.

RMC Research is utilizing a quasi-experimental research study to address these research questions.

#### Instrument Development

The quasi-experimental research study utilizes state assessments, the CBAs, to assess student knowledge of U.S. history. The Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction in Olympia, Washington, developed the CBAs to fill the need for rigorous, research-based social studies assessments that are aligned with state standards. Each CBA is scored on a 4 point scale (1 = minimal, 4 = excellent) in 4 areas including position, background, reasoning, and citing. Students receive a proficient score if they receive at least a 3 in all of these areas. The CBAs are blindly scored by pairs of teachers (i.e., the names of the students and the treatment or comparison group status are hidden). This strategy ensures that the scoring teams do not unintentionally inflate the scores of the treatment group. To ensure the rigor of the study, teachers are not allowed to score their own students' CBAs. To ensure reliability, RMC Research runs a report from the project website that shows any discrepancies between the scores, and the CBAs with discrepant scores are returned to the teachers for rescoring (reaching consensus).

### Data Collection

At least 9 teachers (3 elementary, 3 middle, and 3 high school) will administer the CBAs and obtain their students' WASL scores as part of the quasi-experimental research study; to date 3 elementary, 4 middle, and 4 high school teachers are participating. The grant application indicated that the teachers would administer the CBAs as pre- and posttests each year. Instead, these teachers administer the CBAs once a year between December and March in the 2008-2009, 2009-2010, and 2010-2011 school years. Students are in the treatment group if their teacher has participated in TPPOF and the comparison group if their teacher has not yet participated in TPPOF: middle school teachers participate in Year 1, high school teachers participate in Year 2, and elementary school teachers participate in Year 3. Students will be allowed to complete the CBAs only once--revisions will not be allowed. To date 72 middle school students have completed the CBAs (i.e., first treatment group), 67 elementary students have completed the CBAs (i.e., first comparison group), and 97 high school students have completed the CBAs (i.e., first comparison group). All but 58 high school CBAs have been scored; these CBAs will be scored in a follow-up scoring session in summer 2009.

### Findings

At this time only the pretest data are available for the quasi-experimental research study. Approximately 40% of the middle school students (the first treatment group) received proficient CBA scores. Students received the highest scores on background (M = 3.18) and position (M = 3.11) and lower scores on reasoning (M = 2.82) and citing (M = 2.72). The hypotheses are that as the middle school teachers refine the teaching strategies they acquire through TPPOF participation, subsequent treatment groups (i.e., students in the 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 school years) will demonstrate significantly higher rates of CBA proficiency and achieve higher CBA scores than the treatment groups in prior years. For this study, 10% of the high school students, whose CBAs have been scored to date, (the first comparison group) received proficient CBA scores. High school students received the highest scores on citing (M = 2.36) followed by background (M = 2.28), position (M = 2.08), and reasoning (M = 1.87). The hypotheses are that when the high school teachers participate in TPPOF significantly more students in the treatment group (i.e., students in the 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 school years) will demonstrate higher rates of CBA proficiency and achieve higher CBA scores than students in the comparison group (i.e., students in the 2008-2009 school year) and the subsequent treatment group (i.e., students in the 2010-2011 school year) will demonstrate significantly higher rates of CBA proficiency and achieve higher CBA scores than the treatment group in the prior year (i.e., 2009-2010). For this study, 0% of the elementary school students (the first comparison group) received proficient CBA scores. Students received the highest scores on position (M = 2.87) and background (M = 2.39) and lower scores on reasoning (M = 1.90) and citing (M = 1.00). The hypotheses are that when the elementary school teachers participate in TPPOF significantly more students in the treatment group (i.e., students in the 2010-2011 school year) will demonstrate higher rates of CBA proficiency and achieve higher CBA scores than students in the comparison groups (i.e., students in the 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 school years).

8.c.

Research Question: 1.) To what extent did students whose teacher participated in TPPOF demonstrate increased achievement on history assessments?

Performance Measure 8.c: The actual performance ratio in 8.c is reported as 69 of 69 because middle school students demonstrated a statistically significant increase from pre to posttest on 69 content assessments (i.e., 3 assessments per 23 teachers). The target ratio is 69 of 69 because the project goal is to have 23 teachers administer 3 student assessments as pre- and posttests to their students for a total of 69 assessments in Year 1.

RMC Research is using a non-experimental research study to address this research question.

#### Instrument Development

To assess student knowledge of U.S. history for the non-experimental research study, RMC Research is utilizing 3 student content assessments developed by the participating teachers. Each year of the project teachers work in small groups to develop 3 student assessments based on the content covered during the TPPOF workshops. The assessments, worth 10 points each, comprise multiple choice, short answer, and true false historical content questions.

#### Data Collection

All participating teachers administer the student content assessments as pre- and posttests in November, January, and March. The teachers score the assessments and enter the scores into a website developed by Thorp School District that automatically emails the scores to RMC Research. In Year 1, all 23 teachers administered 3 assessments (n=69). 510 middle school students have completed the first assessment, 504 middle school students have completed the second assessment, and 499 middle school students have completed the third assessment. The high school and elementary school students will complete the assessments during their teachers' participating year.

#### Analysis

Paired t tests will be used for pre- and posttests comparisons in the non-experimental research study.

#### Findings

The data support the hypothesis: the middle school students significantly improved their historical content knowledge scores from pretest to posttest. The first assessment mean posttest score (M = 7.55, SD = 2.05) was significantly higher than the pretest score [(M = 3.05, SD = 1.93), t (509)=-41.02, p = .00], the second assessment mean posttest score (M = 7.62, SD = 2.08) was significantly higher than the pretest score [(M = 3.73, SD = 2.11), t (503)=-32.78, p = .00], and the third assessment mean posttest score (M = 7.86, SD = 2.17) was significantly higher than the pretest score [(M = 3.36, SD = 2.35), t (498)=-37.88, p = .00].



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

PR/Award #: **U215X080141**

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

**9. Project Objective**  Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.  
To Preserve and Protect Our Future will create professional development materials (Objective 9) and disseminate professional development materials. (Objective 10)

9.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
Project staff will report on progress of creation of sustainability materials, distribution of sustainability materials and provide copies of or web addresses of sustainability materials.	PROJ	Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		3	/		3	/	

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

Research Question: 1.) How successful was the project in terms of producing a sustainable professional development model?

Performance Measure: The actual performance number in 9.a is reported as 3 because project staff have reported to RMC Research on the 3 sustainability measures (i.e., creation of sustainability materials, the distribution of sustainability materials, and copies of or web addresses for the sustainability materials).

As part of the process evaluation, project staff are required to provide RMC Research with updates regarding the creation of the project website, interactive educational website, and culminating DVD. In addition, project staff are to send to RMC Research the project websites' URLs and a copy of the culminating DVD. To date the project is on schedule regarding these items. The project website has been available to teachers since September 2009 and is located at

www.preserveandprotect.us. The website is updated monthly and has information for current participants including but not limited to grant news, links to previous grant websites, reviews of the workshops, and PowerPoint presentations from the workshops. The interactive educational website, Moments in American History (MIAH), located at www.momentsinamericanhistory.com, has been available to participating teachers since May 2009. This website, developed with funding from a prior Teaching American History grant, contains all of the video clips that were produced in the prior 2 Teaching American History grants and will include the video clips created for this project as they are completed. To date, all 7 of the Year 1 historians were interviewed on the 10 topics covered during the Year 1 workshops; 6 clips have been completed, and 2 more will be developed in summer 2009 for a total of 8 clips in Year 1. Additional interviews will be conducted in Years 2 and 3. The website also has a multiple choice 'Test Your Knowledge' section for visitors, and project staff plan to add a system for teachers to monitor student use and progress on the Test Your Knowledge questions. Project staff decided not to develop a culminating interactive DVD for TPPOF because it is more cost effective and user friendly to post this information directly to the MIAH website. An additional sustainability activity planned by the Grant Director is an oral history DVD compilation, American Moments: Community Heroes Oral History Project. For this DVD, 5 oral history interviews will be professionally recorded by Year 1 participants, 5 additional interviews will be recorded by Year 2 participants and the DVD will be completed in Year 3 after all of the interviews been compiled; the original interviews are being archived and available for public use.

As part of the process evaluation project staff are also required to provide RMC Research with updates regarding distribution activities related to sustainability. The project is on target regarding this item. Project staff have engaged in ongoing efforts to use email to publicize the MIAH website among history professors at colleges across the country, administrators at all 50 state public instruction offices, and all Washington school districts and ESDs. To date project staff have sent 858 emails to colleges in all 50 states. Project staff will continue to send notifications to history and social studies contacts in all the state public instruction offices, asking them to disseminate the information to the K-12 districts in their state. This process is time consuming because project staff are targeting individuals with a stated interest in American history rather than large groups. Project staff plan to mail flyers to individuals whose email address cannot be obtained. In addition, 3 television stations have received the 5 completed video clips, which they air as public interest spots.



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

PR/Award #: **U215X080141**

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

Title : Thorp TPP Budget 524B

File : C:\Documents and Settings\johnsonc\My Documents\TPP\APR\Thorp budget  
524BSectionBC.doc

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

Title :

File :



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

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

PR/Award #:  
U215X080141

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

<b>Budget Category</b>	<b>Approved</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Carryover</b>
Personnel	\$138,000	\$116,950	\$21,050
Fringe	\$30,470	\$34,840	(\$4,370)
Travel	\$7,200	\$19,423	(\$12,223)
Equipment	0	0	0
Supplies	\$3,250	\$4,257	(\$1,007)
Contractual	\$92,793	\$86,491	\$6,302
Construction	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0
<b>Total Direct Costs</b>	<b>\$271,713</b>	<b>\$261,960</b>	<b>\$9,753</b>
Indirect costs	\$15,536	\$14,478	\$1,058
Training stipends	\$39,000	\$27,599	\$11,401
<b>Total Costs</b>	<b>\$326,249</b>	<b>\$304,037</b>	<b>\$22,212</b>

Explanation of Budget:

The unexpended funds for Personnel resulted because the Grant fiscal year started before staff started full time in September. Those savings in Year 1 were reduced due to higher than expected benefits costs (30% vs planned 22 %), and the carryover will be used to cover benefits in Year 2 and Year 3. The carryover in the stipends category resulted because only 30% of Year 1 individual participants' professional development funds were spent by June as many of the participants intended to complete their professional development during the summer. Therefore the carryover of \$11,400 to Year 2 will increase the Year 2 budget in this category, but will be spent by September 2009.

It is important to note that some expenses were classified as contractual on the original application but when the LEA set up budget line items, changes were made. Most notably, vehicle expense was charged under Travel rather than Contractual. This contributed to the apparent overspending in Travel and savings in Contractual. An additional factor in the Travel category was that the vehicle expense, which was \$12,000 budgeted across three years of the grant, was actually paid entirely in Year 1, saving about \$1700 in fees.

Unanticipated expenses included a midyear increase in the mileage reimbursement rate and over \$2,600 required for a federal single audit.

None of the changes in the budget result from modification of project activities, nor do they affect our ability to achieve our project objectives. The carryover funds have been added to Year 2 and Year 3 budgets mainly in the categories of Fringe Benefits and Training Stipends as

described above and detailed in the following Budget Overview provided for Department approval.

Thorp Teaching American History Grant - U215X080141  
**Budget Overview**  
*To Preserve and Protect Our Future*

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Subtotal	TOTAL
	<b>Actual</b>				
Personnel					
Salaries	116,950	138,000	138,000		392,950
Fringe benefits	34,840	41,383	41,383		117,606
				510,556	
Travel					
Grant staff travel to Conferences	1,168	1,000	1,000		3,168
Vehicle	10,139	-	-		10,139
Grant staff mileage/fuel	1,304	800	1,000		3,104
All workshops	6,416	5,000	7,000		18,416
Historian lodging	395	396	396		1,187
				36,015	
Equipment	-	-	-		-
Supplies					
Workshop expenses/lunches	3,559	2,200	3,700		9,459
Office supplies and materials	698	1,000	1,000		2,698
				12,157	
Contractual					
Media Productions (CWU)	32,506	43,342	43,341		119,189
Historians stipends	5,500	5,500	5,000		16,000
Federal Audit	2,649	-	-		2,649
Oral Historian stipend	500	500	-		1,000
Kittitas Co. Museum (Lead Partner)	5,000	-	-		5,000
Workshop Facility rentals	348	-	-		348
Evaluation (RMC, scorers)	32,527	32,446	39,969		104,942
Webmaster	4,000	4,000	4,000		12,000
Consultant - setup	2,500	-	-		2,500
Other	962	-	-		962
				264,589	
Construction	-	-	-		-
Other	-	-	-		-
<b>Total Direct costs</b>	<b>261,960</b>	<b>275,567</b>	<b>285,789</b>		<b>823,316</b>
Indirect costs	14,478	16,002	17,139		47,619
				47,619	
Training stipends					
School year substitutes	22,709	20,000	35,000		77,709
Prof. Devel. Funds	4,890	24,466	22,000		51,356
				129,065	
<b>Total costs</b>	<b>304,037</b>	<b>336,035</b>	<b>359,928</b>		<b>1,000,000</b>



- 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: 9/1/2007 To: 8/31/2011 (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? (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: Jim Hainer	Title: Superintendent
Signature:	Date:

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

Title : Thorp TPP Exec Summary  
 File : C:\Documents and Settings\johnsonc\My Documents\TPP\APR\Thorp  
 524BExecSummary.doc



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

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

PR/Award #: U215X080141

## Executive Summary

August, 2009; Year One

### *“To Preserve and Protect Our Future”*

The “*To Preserve and Protect Our Future*” TAH Grant provided a successful professional development program to 23 middle school teachers in year one. In year one (2008-2009), the project spent **\$304,037** to meet the four goals:

1. Provide professional development that includes content training in U.S. History and historical inquiry methodology
2. Improve teaching of U.S. History
3. Increase student achievement in U.S. History
4. Produce a sustainable professional development model

Of these **23 participating teachers** from **13 school districts** in Central Washington (Cle Elum/Roslyn, East Valley, Easton, Ellensburg, Grandview, Highland, Mt. Adams, Royal, Thorp, Toppenish, Union Gap, Wapato, and Yakima) **22 were completers** (95.6% completer rate) for the **8 full day workshops** during the 2008-2009 school year. The Grant goal is to recruit a total of 90 teachers with 80% completer rate over three years. The teachers in Year 1 represent **13 high need middle schools** located within 11 districts.

The new GPRA measures (FY 2008 and beyond) are addressed in Project Status Chart A-1. Our other objectives and performance measures are addressed in Charts A-2 through A-9. In the following discussion, objectives are as stated in our original grant proposal. In the objective title they will be referenced to the objectives as numbered in the Project Status Charts.

#### **Objective 1: Present 8 workshops per year for content training in U.S. History with methodology (Chart A-2)**

This objective was successfully achieved. Content in the following topics was presented at workshops: “Explorers,” “Formation of Colonies,” “Colonies to Revolution,” “Revolutionary War,” “Forming a Constitution,” “The U.S. Constitution,” “Manifest Destiny,” “Early Industrial Revolution,” “Civil War,” “Women in America: Colonial – 1850.” The **NAEP U.S. History periods covered at the workshops were (1), (2), (3), (4), and (5)**, the eras covered in the districts’ middle school curricula. The content was delivered by 7 historians from 5 universities (Seattle Pacific University, Central Washington University, University of Idaho, Lewis and Clark Law School, and Gonzaga University).

We are fine-tuning elements of the project based on teacher feedback via workshop evaluations, as noted in Chart A-2.

**Objective 2: Observe teacher classrooms to record workshop content, observe new pedagogy, and mentor (Chart A-3 and A-8)**

This objective was successfully achieved. The goal was to make 92 classroom visits (4 per teacher); the actual number of classroom visits performed was 101. The same observation protocol form was used for each visit and sent to our evaluation team for data analysis. The protocol sheet allowed for recording the number of times workshop content was presented to students and in which era, methodologies used, primary source use, CBA instruction to students, and mentoring explanations. Analysis of observations is discussed in Chart A-8.

**Objective 3: Teachers attend other professional development activities (Chart A-4)**

This objective is partially achieved and ongoing until 8/31/09. Each teacher was allowed to spend \$650 for other professional activities if they completed their responsibilities of taking the quasi-experimental pre test (100% did so), giving students the state standard test (100% did so), and giving their students workshop content and 3 pre/post tests (100% did so). To date, 11 of the 23 teachers have used their monies for other professional development activities.

**Objective 4: Increase teacher knowledge of U.S. History Content (Chart A-1)**

This objective is in progress on schedule. This objective is addressed as the new **GPRA measure #1.1**. A quasi-experimental research study is being used to evaluate increase in teacher knowledge using Praxis II questions. Baseline data have been collected for the middle school teacher group. Twenty-three teachers have been pre tested and will take 2 more tests by December 2009 to obtain comparative data and determine any significant increase in teacher knowledge of U.S. History content. Similar data will be collected from the high school and Grade 5 teacher groups.

**Objective 5: Improve teachers' historical inquiry methodology skills (Chart A-5 and A-8)**

This objective is in progress on schedule. Baseline survey data have been collected for Year 1 participants. Posttest data will be collected by September 2009. Data gathered through observations is reported in Chart A-8.

Modifications need to be made in order to demonstrate success on this objective. The intent was to show an increase in skills through the 101 classroom visits and observation protocol form data: more skills would be demonstrated in each successive observation. This system of measurement was found not to be adequate because teachers spend more time on in depth inquiry rather than increasing the numbers of historical inquiries as their skill is perfected. Thus, quantitative data of numbers of inquiries does not measure the increased skill that was obvious during the later observations. At this time, a survey is being used to measure self-

reported historical inquiry skill level and we are working with our evaluator on possible revisions to the observation protocol form that will show this growth.

**Objective 6: Train teachers in Classroom Based Assessments (Chart A-6 and A-8)**

This objective was successfully achieved. Of the total workshop time, 10.75 hours were spent on CBA training, and 21 of 23 teachers (91%) completed more than 8 hours or 75% of the training. All 23 teachers gave the CBA to their students in “Civics” and a total of 438 students completed the CBA.

**Objective 7: Train teachers in Oral Histories (Chart A-7)**

This objective is partially achieved for Year 1. Our intent was to give all 23 teachers training and have 5 teachers volunteer to do an actual video- taped oral history in the summer of 2009. We succeeded in both intents; 4.25 hours of training was given to all teachers, with 2 additional hours given to the 5 teachers volunteering to do the actual oral history interviews. To date, 3 of the 5 oral histories are complete. We are planning for 5 more oral histories in Year 2.

**Objective 8: Teachers deliver workshop content to students (Chart A-8)**

This objective was successfully achieved on two measures. All of the Year 1 participants (23 of 23) implemented workshop content and methodology in their classroom. Further, 23 of 23 teachers developed and gave a pre test, delivered workshop content, and gave a post test on three different workshop topics. A total of 69 pre/post test assessments were given to students (totaling 1,513 student data sets) on workshop content, demonstrating significantly improved content knowledge scores. Also, 438 students took a CBA in “Civics.”

The third measure is in progress on schedule. A 3 year quasi-experimental study is being used to measure whether student performance increases following teacher training. So far 11 randomly selected teachers have provided the first year student CBAs for this study. Findings are very preliminary, but suggest that we will demonstrate the efficacy of this professional development model.

**Objectives 9 and 10: Create (9) and disseminate (10) professional development materials (Chart A-9)**

These objectives are successfully being met.

Throughout 2008-2009, the following materials were created:

- Grant website.....[www.preserveandprotect.us](http://www.preserveandprotect.us)  
The website contains reviews and questions and answers from each workshop; power points used by historians; a page for each teacher participant; teacher forms; schedules; upcoming events; and website

materials from 2 previous grants: “*America’s Past Kindles Our Future*” and “*Teaching Our Past for the Future.*”

- 7 DVDs of workshop presentations
- 8 video clips of interviews with historian presenters (6 completed, 2 currently in production)
- 3 oral histories completed to date
- Continuation and supplementation of an interactive website now containing 60 video clips, with “Test Your Knowledge” questions, titled *Moments in American History* at [www.momentsinamericanhistory.com](http://www.momentsinamericanhistory.com)

Throughout 2008-2009, the following were disseminated:

- Each teacher received a copy of all 7 workshop DVDs
- 6 of the 8 video clips of historian interviews were distributed to 3 public television stations for airing (ECTV in Ellensburg, WA; MVTV/M PACT in Toppenish, WA; and YCTV in Yakima, WA)
- 3 oral histories (through Thorp Grant program “*American Moments: Community Heroes Oral History Program*”) have been distributed to Kittitas County Museum in Ellensburg, WA for archiving, distribution to other museums in Washington State, and public use
- 858 e-mail brochures advertising the [www.momentsinamericanhistory.com](http://www.momentsinamericanhistory.com) website were sent to college and university history departments throughout the United States