

Annual Performance Report (2010-2011)
for
Turning Points in American History
South Burlington School District, South Burlington, Vermont

A Teaching American History Grant Program sponsored
by the US Department of Education

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In August 2011, *Turning Points in American History*, a professional development program managed by South Burlington School District of Vermont, completed its first year of service to American history educators in grades 3-12. The program began in September 2010 by offering workshops to the pre-service and in-service educators in three counties in northwestern Vermont who work within public and private schools. Half way through the academic year, Turning Points was granted permission to open its programming up to all Vermont pre-service and in-service American history educators in grades 3-12.

Turning Points offered six types of professional development programming during the past year. The projected number of participants was 75 educators; however, due to our late start the actual number of participants was 73 educators. Forty-five of these educators (62% of participants) are “completers,” having attended 30 or more hours of professional development. Turning Points’ participants teach American history at the elementary (17 participants), middle (23 participants), and high school (33 participants) levels and work at 31 local education agencies (24 public school districts and 7 independent schools) throughout Vermont. A core set of eighteen educators has emerged as a cohort as a result of their high level of participation throughout year one. This cohort is continuing into year two as suggested by their recent enrollment in upcoming workshops.

Educators customize their professional development training by selecting those Turning Points’ components of most interest and importance to them. During the past year, Turning Points offered a participant retreat and fifteen educator workshops consisting of six different types (i.e., scholar-led and educator-led seminars, primary source and book study groups, national and local field studies). The program also offered three educator initiative options (i.e., teacher leadership, museum internships, and self-designed professional development opportunities) for professional development credit hours. The year’s primary source and book study groups, national field study, and a local field study focused on historical thinking pedagogy using content from the history of the Revolutionary War era. Other Turning Points’ program components, including two scholar-led seminars and six local field studies, addressed the breadth of American history: Early Republic, Civil War, Victorian era, early twentieth century, and Cold War. The Turning Points program made available a total of 616 hours of professional development experiences from which educators could select (416 hours from formal group events and 200 hours from independent internships and teacher leader work). In addition to professional development hours, 15 participants chose, for a modest fee, to obtain one to six graduate credits for select program components through the Education Department at Saint Michael’s College. Turning Points’ project directors were the professors for these classes.

Throughout the year, evaluation instruments were used to document the effectiveness of Turning Points offerings at reaching the program’s primary objectives, which are to: 1) increase educator content knowledge in American history, 2) increase educator pedagogical skills in historical thinking processes, and 3) foster a learning community for educators studying and

teaching American history. The evaluation measures chosen involve scored and self-reported data, including attendance records, pre-test and post-test participant surveys, workshop-specific evaluation forms, participant reflections, and the development of new lesson plans that support student historical thinking and independent interpretations. Char Associates designed and implemented the method by which the quantitative and qualitative survey data were used to monitor the program's success. Project staff assumed major responsibility for implementing and reviewing the work and evaluation products designed for specific professional development sessions (e.g., attendance records, workshop-specific evaluation forms, and reflective essays and lesson plans generated by participants for some of the program components.)

The scored survey data includes pre- and post-tests featuring multiple choice questions taken from NAEP (National Assessment of Educational Progress), New York State Regents United States History, and US History Advanced Placement exams. The pre-test was administered to educators before attending their first Turning Points workshop and the post-test was administered after completing their last event of the year. Lesson plans completed by participants as part of select sessions were scored twice, using a project rubric, by one of the project directors and the project historian. Participant surveys, workshop evaluations, and participant reflections requested that participants provide a self-assessment regarding their skills and classroom practices concerning teaching history content, historical thinking processes, and historical writing skills; their attitudes toward teaching history; and the level of collegiality and peer connections with other history professionals.

Fully completed post-program surveys were collected from thirty educators who had completed at least 30 hours of program activities (66% of the completers). Frequencies and other descriptive statistics were calculated for these educators for a range of self-reported survey items assessing the impact of program participation on their content knowledge, pedagogical skills, and relationships with other American history educators. In addition, twenty-three of these educators also answered the content knowledge questions on both the pre and post program surveys. Evaluators determined the number and percentage of these educators with matched scores who had answered more questions correctly on the post-test than on the pre-test.

In addition to meeting our primary project objectives, the actual project expenses for the first year compared favorably with the proposed expenses. Surpluses were incurred in several budget categories including personnel, supplies, other, and training stipends. This surplus was due to a slightly lower enrollment than expected and fewer participants than expected taking the opportunities of training stipends, grants, and internships. Turning Points was granted permission to use some of this extra funding to increase the number of participants in its national field study summer program and permit a third person in our team to attend the annual Teaching American History conference in Washington, DC. Most of the remaining surplus funding from the first year will be used in year two according to its original intended use. Some of the funding, however, will be used to cover the costs for additional participants in our upcoming national field study in 2012.

SECTION A: PROGRESS STATUS

Project Objective #1. Increase teacher content knowledge and understanding of the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) historical eras and themes.

| 1.a. Performance Measure | Measure Type | Quantitative Data % (n) | |
|--|--------------|-------------------------------|--------|
| <p>The average percentage change in the scores (on a pre-post assessment of American history) of participants who complete at least 75% of the professional development hours required by the project (30 hours).</p> <p><i>All participants*</i> <i>average pre-test score (out of 14 items): 11.50 items</i> <i>average post-test (out of 14 items): 11.60 items</i> <i>Positive + .10 score change;</i> <i>+ .008% change</i></p> <p><i>Participants who completed pre-test version 1 (n = 7)</i> <i>average pre-test score (out of 14 items): 12.29 items</i> <i>average post-test (out of 14 items): 12.14 items</i> <i>Negative - .14 score change;</i> <i>- 1% change</i></p> <p><i>Participants* who completed pre-test version 2 (n = 13*)</i> <i>Average pre-test score (out of 14 items): 11.08 items</i> <i>average post-test (out of 14 items): 11.31 items</i> <i>Positive +.23 score change;</i> <i>+ 2% change</i></p> <p><i>*Excludes 3 participants who answered all questions correctly on both pre- and post-tests</i></p> | GPRA 1.1 | Target | Actual |
| | | | 1% |
| | | | -1% |
| | 2% | | |

Further Explanation

The analysis of content knowledge items (total of 14 multiple choice items), using a percentage change score, revealed basically no difference between pre- and post-test performance. The evaluator believes this may be due to a number of factors:

a) Given the timing of the grant award (August 2010), the pre-test needed to be designed and finalized in the first month of the project (September 2010), in order to be administered to participants newly registering for the project's professional development offerings, starting in October 2010. This was in advance of the project staff being able to fully plan the year's professional development activities, many of which were done in conjunction with the project's multiple organizational partners. Thus, the content knowledge test could not be carefully aligned to upcoming topics that would be covered in the Year 1 program.

b) Despite careful screening of the pre-test content items by project directors and the evaluation team, and strict adherence to feature content knowledge items that were identical to those presented in valid test instruments (e.g., NAEP, NY Regents Exams, AP history), early results from the pre-test indicated that the content knowledge items were generally quite easy for participants, resulting in a "ceiling effect" of the pre-test. The pre-test was then revised slightly, by replacing some easy detractor items with ones that were more difficult, but could not be significantly altered since the two versions needed to be sufficiently similar to allow the combining of data sets (data from pre-test Versions 1 and 2.) In Year 2, we have made changes to ensure that the pre-test is more difficult, by featuring items that each have 5 response options (rather than 4), featuring only items that the co-directors have deemed difficult or moderately difficult, and by piloting the instrument with non-Vermont teachers, in order to finalize the pre-test instrument. Early results from the pre-test this month confirms that the Year 2 pre-test is indeed more challenging, and allows for the possibility of increased performance on the post-test.

c) The minor decrease in scores for those taking pre-test version 1 could be explained by the very small number of participants ($n = 7$), which allows lower scores from only one or two individuals to bring down the average change score.

Other Evaluation Results

Note that performance measure 1.b. provides additional information about content knowledge gains of participants and is a better reflection of actual change.

| 1.b. Performance Measure | Measure Type | Quantitative Data % (n) | |
|--|--|-------------------------------|----------------|
| Participants who complete 30 or more hours of program professional development will demonstrate increased knowledge of American history, as measured by an annual post-test of American history knowledge. <i>All participants</i> <i>Participants who completed pre-test version 1 :</i> <i>Participants who completed pre-test version 2:</i> | Project | Target | Actual |
| | | 60% | 40% (8/20*) |
| | | 60% (4/7) | 30% (2/7) |
| 60% (10/16) | 46% (6/13*) <i>*excludes 3 participants who answered all questions correctly on both pre- and post-tests</i> | | |

Further Explanation

The pre- and post-program surveys contained a section that was a content knowledge test, consisting of a set of 14 multiple choice items primarily centered on the Revolutionary Era, which was the era focused on in Turning Points' Year 1 professional development.

Of those educators who completed both pre- and post-program surveys and took the annual pre- and post- test of American history knowledge (and thus formed the "matched sample"), two-fifths (40%) of educators demonstrated an increased *knowledge of American history* (i.e., increase of at least one more correct item on the post-test, out of a set of 14 multiple choice items.). This sample excludes the small number of educators (3) who received perfect scores on both pre-test and post-test. If these "perfect scorers" are included in the sample, this proportion decreases to about a third of educators (35%).

Thus, the analysis of content knowledge items revealed modest gains between pre- and post-test performance for participants. The evaluator believes this may be due to several factors:

a) Given the timing of the grant award (August 2010), the pre-test needed to be designed and finalized in the first month of the project (September 2010), in order to be administered to participants newly registering for the project's professional development offerings, starting in October 2010. This was in advance of the project staff being able to fully plan the year's professional development activities, many of which were done in conjunction with the project's multiple organizational partners. Thus, the content knowledge test could not be as carefully aligned as it could be to upcoming topics that would be covered in the Year 1 program.

b) Despite careful screening of the pre-test content items by project directors and the evaluation team, and strict adherence to feature content knowledge items that were identical to those presented in valid test instruments (e.g., NAEP, NY Regents Exams, AP history), early results from the pre-test indicated that the content knowledge items were generally quite easy for participants, resulting in a "ceiling effect." The pre-test was then revised slightly, by replacing some easy detractor items with ones that were more difficult, but could not be significantly altered since the two versions needed to be sufficiently similar to allow the combining of data sets (data from pre-test versions 1 and 2.) In Year 2, we have made changes to ensure that the pre-test is more difficult, by featuring items that each have 5 response options (rather than 4), only featuring items that the co-directors have deemed difficult or moderately difficult, and by piloting the instrument with non-Vermont educators, before finalizing the pre-test instrument. Early results from the August 2011 pre-test piloting, and results from our first round of Year 2 pre-tests in September 2011 (n = 27) confirms that the set of Year 2 pre-test content knowledge items is indeed more challenging, and allows for the possibility of increased participant performance on the post-test.

Other Evaluation Results

The post-program survey asked participants whether or not they thought the program had increased their breadth and depth of content knowledge of American history.

In contrast to the more minimal learning gains detected by the content knowledge test, almost all of the participants (90%; 27 out of 30) reported that Turning Points had increased their *breadth and depth of content knowledge of American history* this past year, with almost half (47%) indicating that their content knowledge had increased "a lot."

To what extent has the Turning Points Program increased your breadth and depth of content knowledge of American history?

| Participants reporting no increase % (n) "0" | Participants reporting "a little" increase % (n) "1" | Participants reporting "a fair amount" of increase % (n) "2" | Participants reporting "a lot" of increase % (n) "3" |
|--|--|--|--|
| 0% (0) | 10% (3) | 43.3% (13) | 46.7% (14) |

(n = 30) Mean = 2.37 (on a scale of 0-3); SD = .596

The post program survey included an open-ended response item that asked participants to describe how their understanding of American history had improved, if at all. Participants most frequently described ways in which their knowledge of the American Revolution had deepened, and how they had gained a greater understanding and appreciation of multiple perspectives and viewpoints in history.

"Turning Points furthered my understanding of American history by providing resources based upon multiple perspectives. The perspectives were not the traditional standards that typically pass as a different perspective. Rather, Turning Points provided unique perspectives from a variety of sources that challenged our knowledge and framework of understanding. Excellent scholarship opportunity."

"I had studied the American Revolution [before] but in a piecemeal manner; the TP program helped connect it all together and gave me structure and context to the war, its causes and conduct."

"I have a much deeper understanding of the material, especially military strategies during the Revolutionary War, and the different viewpoints of the war by loyalists, patriots and minorities."

"I didn't know much about the American Revolution before taking the course. Now I know how the revolution impacted a variety of groups and individuals, the chronology of the war, its battles, and military leaders, and the role that the Vermont militia played in the war."

"The readings, artifacts, primary sources, and historic places featured in lessons and events allowed me to view historical events from a variety of perspectives, including that of the

'bystanders' who traditionally don't get much attention in the history books, but whose experience is so intricately tied to events, a critical piece of the story."

"[My understanding] has become more inclusive. By this I mean that I have become more aware of the broader complexities of the Revolutionary War period and its effects on the variety of participants in the War."

| 1.c. Performance Measure | Measure Type | Quantitative Data | |
|---|--------------|-------------------|----------------|
| | | Target | Actual |
| <p>Participants who complete 30 or more hours of program professional development will report increased reading, listening, and discussions of historical content materials compared with the previous year.</p> <p><i>Participants who reported increased reading and discussion of historical materials:</i></p> <p><i>Participants who reported increased attendance at lectures and discussions with American history scholars:</i></p> | Project | 60% (18/30) | 97% (29/30) |
| | | 60% (18/30) | 90% (27/30) |

Further Explanation

Several questions on the post-program survey asked participants to self-assess their level of activity this past year in several program initiatives (e.g., scholar-led seminar, book study group, national field study) designed to promote participants' content knowledge: reading and discussion of historical materials, and attending lectures and discussions.

The vast majority of participants reported clear increases this past year in *reading and discussion of historical materials* (97%) and *attendance at lectures and discussions with American history scholars* (90%), as compared with last year, with roughly two-thirds reporting that this activity had increased "a lot more."

Compared with last year, how would you rate your personal level for the year of reading and discussion of historical materials?

| Participants reporting “a lot less” % (n) | Participants reporting “somewhat less” % (n) | Participants reporting “about the same” % (n) | Participants reporting “somewhat more” % (n) | Participants reporting “a lot more” % (n) |
|--|---|--|---|--|
| 0% | 0% | 3% | 30% | 67% |

(n = 30) Mean=1.63 (on a scale of 0-2); SD=.556

Compared with last year, how would you rate your personal level for the year of attending lectures and discussions with American history scholars?

| Participants reporting “a lot less” % (n) | Participants reporting “somewhat less” % (n) | Participants reporting “about the same” % (n) | Participants reporting “somewhat more” % (n) | Participants reporting “a lot more” % (n) |
|--|---|--|---|--|
| 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 10% (3) | 27% (8) | 63% (19) |

(n = 30) Mean=1.53 (on a scale of 0-2); SD=.681

Other Evaluation Results

In the post-program survey, participants were given an open-ended question that asked them to describe ways in which they had found the Turning Points sessions valuable, or conversely, not useful. A number of participants wrote about the value of being able to hear and discuss history with scholars in the field.

"I loved the scholar-led seminars on the Civil War and WWII. The discussions/Socratic circles and lectures were very useful and engaging. I loved the freedom to ask clarifying questions to an expert in the field. I even had [one of the WWII veterans who spoke] come to my class following the WWII seminar to discuss his involvement and experiences in WWII."

"Turning Points provided an invaluable opportunity to discuss and interact with teachers and professors. Listening to a college professor is a very special treat, one that reinvigorates me and provides a breath of fresh air for teachers who generally have little contact with professionals beyond their own departments wherein the minutia of administrative requirements too often takes precedence."

"I thoroughly enjoyed and appreciated the opportunity to discuss and listen to fantastic lectures in my field. You don't actually have to learn something new to gain from intellectual

interaction. As a teacher, there is a fairly small group of people with whom I have any opportunity to exchange ideas and discuss historical issues. It was reassuring to have experts in the field reaffirm my approach and provide confirmation to the emphases I place on given issues, while highlighting concepts that I might possibly have shortchanged."

| 1.d. Performance Measure | Measure Type | Quantitative Data % (n) | |
|--|--------------|-------------------------------|--------------|
| The percentage of TAH participants who complete 75% or more of the total hours of professional development required. | GPRA 1.2 | Target | Actual |
| | | N/A | 62% 45/73 |

| 1.e. Performance Measure | Measure Type | Quantitative Data % (n) | |
|---|--------------|-------------------------------|--------------|
| Year 1, 40% of participants will attend at least 40 hours of professional development programming aimed at increasing teaching knowledge of American history. | Project | Target | Actual |
| | | 40% 29/73 | 60% 43/73 |

1.d. and 1.e. Further Explanation

One of the distinctive features of Turning Points is its choice approach to professional development. This model allows teachers to customize their own professional development program by selecting from Turning Points’ components. Turning Points offers six different program components (i.e., scholar-led and educator-led seminars, primary source and book study groups, national and local field studies), which provide participants with 416 hours professional development hours to choose from. The number of professional development hours is based upon face-to-face classroom hours, online classroom hours, and hours necessary to complete homework assignments. Turning Points also offers three educator initiative options (i.e., teacher leadership, museum internships, mini grants), which provide participants with 200 hours of professional development opportunities to choose from.

We encourage and desire to have participants engage in 40 or more hours of Turning Points’ professional development opportunities. This 40-hour target of yearly participation is based on professional development research indicating 40 hours as the minimum number of hours required to change an educator’s practice. Therefore by the US Department of Education’s definition, those educators who reach 30 hours, or 75% of the desired hours, are considered “completers.”

Project Objective #2. Increase teachers' pedagogical skills in historical thinking processes.

| 2.a. Performance Measure | Measure Type | Quantitative Data | |
|--|--------------|-------------------|----------------|
| | | % (n) | |
| | | Target | Actual |
| Participants who complete 30 or more hours of program professional development will report increased facility with historical thinking processes, as measured by a retrospective pre-post assessment of American history pedagogy. | Project | | |
| <i>Participants who reported increased skill level with using various history teaching techniques with students:</i> | | 60% (18/30) | 57% (17/30) |
| <i>Participants who reported increased ability to foster various historical thinking skills with students:</i> | | 60% (18/30) | 63% (19/30) |

Further Explanation

A major portion of the post-program survey was designed to assess participants' acquisition of pedagogical skills in teaching history. To determine the increase in pedagogical skills for *historical teaching techniques*, participants on the post-program survey were presented with 5 different types of historical teaching techniques (based on standards identified by the National Center for History in the Schools) and were asked to what extent the program had improved their skills in each of these areas. Each possible response was assigned a value as follows: had "not changed for me" = 0; "improved a little" = 1, "improved quite a bit" = 2; and "been a major improvement" = 3.

An individual mean was calculated for each participant's responses to all 5 items in order to ascertain an individual's overall mean response pertaining to potential increase in pedagogical skills. Participants who rated themselves with a mean of 1.5 or greater were considered to have met the performance measure.

Close to two-fifths (57%) of the participants (17 out of 30) reported a mean increase of pedagogical skills for historical teaching techniques of 1.5 or greater.

Further analysis of individual items for historical teaching techniques revealed four out of the five areas where participants had noted improvement (mean greater than 1.5). These items were: *having students examine events from multiple perspectives* (mean = 1.97, SD .93); *helping students collect, analyze and interpret historical data from a variety of sources* (mean = 1.77, SD .73); *using local historical resources to make connections to national events* (mean = 1.60, SD .78); and *engaging students in inquiry-based history projects* (mean = 1.53, SD .82).

Similarly, to determine the increase in *ability to foster students' historical thinking skills*, participants were to rate themselves on the extent to which the program had improved their teaching abilities in each of four areas (based on standards identified by the National Center for History in the Schools), using the same values as described for historical teaching techniques above. An individual's mean was calculated based on responses to all 4 items. Participants with a mean of 1.5 or greater were considered to have met the performance measure.

Close to two-thirds (63%) of the participants (19 out of 30) reported a mean increase of pedagogical skills in fostering students' historical thinking skills of 1.5 or greater.

Further analysis of individual items for historical teaching techniques revealed that participants had noted improvement in all four areas (mean greater than 1.5). These items were: *promoting students' historical analysis and interpretation* (mean = 1.70, SD .84); *having students grapple with historical issues* (mean = 1.63, SD .81), *having students create historical products* (mean = 1.57, SD .78), and *enhancing students' historical comprehension* (mean = 1.53, SD .82).

Thus, on both pedagogical performance measures, Turning Points participants came quite close to, or exceeded, the target goals.

Historical Teaching Techniques: *Being part of the Turning Points has helped me with...*

| Skill | Participants reporting 'not changed for me' % (n) "0" | Participants reporting "improved a little" % (n) "1" | Participants reporting "improved quite a bit" % (n) "2" | Participants reporting "been a major improvement" % (n) "3" | Mean | SD |
|--|--|---|--|--|-------------|-----------|
| a. Helping students collect, analyze and interpret historical data from a variety of sources | 3% (1) | 30% (9) | 53% (16) | 13% (4) | 1.77 | .728 |
| b. Using local historical resources to make connections to national events | 7% (2) | 37% (11) | 47% (14) | 10% (3) | 1.60 | .770 |
| c. Having students examine events from multiple perspectives | 7% (2) | 23% (7) | 37% (11) | 33% (10) | 1.97 | .928 |
| d. Engaging students in inquiry-based history projects | 7% (2) | 47% (14) | 33% (10) | 13% (4) | 1.53 | .819 |
| e. Engaging students in writing activities to learn American history content | 13% (4) | 40% (12) | 40% (12) | 7% (2) | 1.40 | .814 |

Fostering Students' Historical Thinking: *Being part of the Turning Points has helped me with...*

| Skill | Participants reporting 'not changed for me' % (n) "0" | Participants reporting "improved a little" % (n) "1" | Participants reporting "improved quite a bit" % (n) "2" | Participants reporting "been a major improvement" % (n) "3" | Mean | SD |
|---|---|--|---|---|------|------|
| a. Enhancing students' historical comprehension | 7% (2) | 47% (14) | 33% (10) | 13% (4) | 1.53 | .819 |
| b. Promoting students' historical analysis and interpretation | 7% (2) | 33% (10) | 43% (13) | 17% (5) | 1.70 | .837 |
| c. Having students grapple with historical issues | 7% (2) | 37% (11) | 43% (13) | 13% (4) | 1.63 | .809 |
| d. Having students create historical products | 7% (2) | 40% (12) | 43% (13) | 10% (3) | 1.57 | .774 |

Other Evaluation Results

The post-program survey also contained a survey item that asked participants to self-assess their understanding of innovative and effective approaches for teaching history. Most participants (87%; 26 out of 30) reported that Turning Points had increased their *understanding of innovative and effective approaches for understanding the teaching of history* this past year, with almost half (47%) indicating that their knowledge had increased "a lot."

To what extent has the Turning Points Program increased your understanding of innovative and effective approaches for teaching history?

| Participants reporting no increase % (n) | Participants reporting "a little" increase % (n) | Participants reporting "a fair amount" of increase % (n) | Participants reporting "a lot" of increase % (n) |
|--|--|--|--|
| 0% (0) | 13% (4) | 40% (12) | 47% (14) |

(n = 30) Mean=2.33 (on scale of 0-3); SD=.711

| 2.b. Performance Measure | Measure Type | Quantitative Data | |
|--|--------------|-------------------|----------------|
| | | % | |
| | | (n) | |
| | | Target | Actual |
| Participants who complete 30 or more hours of program professional development will report increased use of primary sources in their classroom. <i>Participants who reported greater use of primary sources in their classrooms:</i> <i>Participants who reported an increase in their skill level in having students collect, analyze, and interpret historical data from a variety of historical sources:</i> <i>Participants who reported an increase in their skill level in using local historical resources to make connections to national events:</i> | Project | 60% (18/30) | 73% (22/30) |
| | | 60% (18/30) | 67% (20/30) |
| | | 60% (18/30) | 57% (17/30) |

Further Explanation

A number of the Turning Points' components (e.g., primary source study group, educator-led seminars, national field study, and local field studies) emphasized the use of primary sources with students. The post-program survey contained an item asking participants to report on their level of use of primary sources, as well as several items assessing their use of a range of historical sources and use of local historical resources.

Almost three-fourths (73%) of participants reported greater use of primary sources in their classrooms, while two-thirds (67%) reported an increase in their skill level in having students work with historical data from a variety of historical sources. Over half (57%) also reported an increase in their skill level in using local historical resources to make connections to national events.

Completer participants who reported greater use of primary sources.

| |
|---|
| Participants reporting greater use of primary sources % (n) |
| 73% (30) |

Being part of the Turning Points has helped me with...

| Skill | Participants reporting 'not changed for me' % (n) "0" | Participants reporting "improved a little" % (n) "1" | Participants reporting "improved quite a bit" % (n) "2" | Participants reporting "been a major improvement" % (n) "3" | Mean (scale 0-3) | SD |
|--|---|--|---|---|------------------|------|
| a. Helping students collect, analyze and interpret historical data from a variety of sources | 3% (1) | 30% (9) | 53% (16) | 13% (4) | 1.77 | .728 |
| b. Using local historical resources to make connections to national events | 7% (2) | 37% (11) | 47% (14) | 10% (3) | 1.60 | .770 |

(n = 30)

Other Evaluation Results

The post-program survey included several open-ended items that asked participants to describe how their understanding of American history had improved, if at all, as well as what they had found particularly valuable about Turning Points' programs.

Participants frequently described ways in which they acquired new knowledge and techniques regarding the use of primary sources with students.

"In addition to specific content, Turning Points helped me a great deal to better understand how I can use primary sources to help children understand historic events from different

perspectives. Hearing 'all the voices' in historic events is critical to getting an unbiased view and a fuller understanding of what happened."

"I have never been a huge fan of history, in general. It was a challenging subject for me in school since I am not keen on associating dates with facts. Turning Points has helped me to value the importance of a personal perspective in history much, much more. I now LOVE using primary source materials as a means of helping students to relive various time periods."

| 2.c. Performance Measure | Measure Type | Quantitative Data | |
|--|--------------|-------------------|-------------|
| | | % (n) | |
| Participants who complete 30 or more hours of program professional development will report increased interest and engagement among their students when studying American history. <i>Participants who reported increased interest and engagement among their students when studying American history:</i> | Project | Target | Actual |
| | | 60% (18/30) | 93% (28/30) |

Further Explanation

The post-program survey featured an item that asked participants to self-assess their students' level of interest when learning American history. Almost all the participants (93%; 28 out of 30) reported that Turning Points had enabled them *to increase their students' level of interest and engagement when learning American history* this past year, with over a third (37%) indicating that their knowledge had increased "a lot."

To what extent has Turning Points enabled you to increase your students' level of interest and engagement when learning American history?

| Participants reporting no increase % (n) "0" | Participants reporting "a little" increase % (n) "1" | Participants reporting "a fair amount" of increase % (n) "2" | Participants reporting "a lot" of increase % (n) "3" |
|--|--|--|--|
| -- | 7% (2) | 57% (17) | 37% (11) |

(n = 30) Mean = 2.30 (on a scale of 0-3); SD = .596

Other Evaluation Results

The post-program survey included an open-ended item that asked participants to describe a specific way that Turning Points had benefited their students and their students' learning.

Participants described a wide array of new classroom practices and techniques, inspired by various program sessions offered by Turning Points.

"I brought different primary sources in the form of letters and advertisements to the classroom and had the students analyze the text and drawings. I also love using political cartoons in class as they contain a wealth of information and details about cultural opinions."

"I have always used primary sources in class. My participation in the Primary Source Study Group allowed me to better understand HOW to make better use of documents, artifacts, images, buildings, etc. In a recent lesson using a political cartoon, I incorporated group work that was modeled in class and structured the assignment to focus on one issue with a range of perspectives."

"I now use more writing exercises where students write from a particular perspective and share with each other to understand multiple perspectives on historical issues."

"I used the tools I learned about in the computer seminar to craft better web quests and to enable my students to become better historical researchers."

"I am putting more emphasis on primary documents, having been introduced to the on-line National Archives at a Turning Points' seminar. I've begun using this with my students. It really increased their interest in research."

"I have been using the Quest model [from the Poetics of Place educator-led seminar] for students to begin to look at creating independent projects that have meaning and value to them."

"We are now looking at a partnership with the Old Stone House [a museum in Vermont] to perform some document analysis as well as many distance learning field trips."

| 2.d. Performance Measure | Measure Type | Quantitative Data % (n) | |
|---|--------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| At least 60% each year will write new lessons that reflect teacher strategies to support student historical thinking. | Project | Target | Actual |
| | | 60% | 67% 22 lessons/33 people |

| 2.e. Performance Measure | Measure Type | Quantitative Data % (n) | |
|--|--------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| At least 60% each year will write new lessons that encourage students to construct and write their own historical interpretations. | Project | Target | Actual |
| | | 60% | 91% 30 lessons/33 people |

2.d. and 2.e.

We received 35 new lessons/units from 33 people in our Primary Source Study Groups, National Field Studies, teacher leaders and graduate students. (Three people participated in more than one type of session and therefore submitted more than one lesson; two people collaborated on one large curriculum project.) The project coordinator divided the lessons among the two project directors, Dr. Elise Guyette and Dr. Scott McLaughlin, and the project historian, Dr. Susan Ouellette, so that each lesson was read and scored twice for content and pedagogy.

We used a project-created rubric to assess the lessons/units. One section scored the types of resources used and the historical analysis asked of the students. The criteria included: 1) Uses of primary sources from varied perspectives; 2) Uses of close reading and critical evaluation of evidence and data (artifacts, maps, photographs, documents, landscapes, etc.) to interpret historical events / issues; 3) Requirements of students to construct, write, and (perhaps) draw interpretations using evidence; 4) Inclusion of strategies for teaching and supporting students' historical thinking (modeling, graphic organizers, etc.) in order to make thinking visual.

We scored each criterion on a 3-point scale: Often, sometimes, or little evidence. For the 17 teachers (51%) who scored "little evidence" on one or more criteria, a project director worked with them to produce a second draft. Those on the National Field Study needed to use

“landscape” or geography as one of their sources (criteria #2) in a Teaching with Historic Places lesson or were asked to rewrite. Dr. Guyette rescored all second drafts. By the end of the year, 30 lessons written by 33 people (91%) asked students to write and defend their own historical interpretations using primary sources (criteria 1, 2, and 3). Twenty-two lessons written by 33 people (67%) supported students’ historical thinking/analysis of primary sources by modeling and/or using graphic organizers to help students see the type of thinking involved in making interpretations (criterion #4).

We offered stipends for people who submitted lessons/units that met all of our criteria (at least a “sometimes”). Those who chose to not to resubmit their lessons or submitted ones that did not reach our standards received no stipend.

Project Objective #3. Foster a learning community for teachers’ learning of American history, with peers, fellow history educators and historians.

| 3.a. Performance Measure | Measure Type | Quantitative Data % (n) | |
|--|----------------|-------------------------------|----------------|
| <p>Participants who complete 30 or more hours of program professional development will indicate an increase in the number of Vermont colleagues with whom they discuss their teaching of American history, face to face, or digitally, to discuss history content and pedagogy</p> <p><i>Participants who listed an increased number of Vermont colleagues with whom they had had discussions as measured by comparison of pre and post survey responses:</i></p> <p><i>Participants who reported that the number of Vermont educators with whom they had discussions had increased:</i></p> <p><i>Participants who reported that the program had enabled them to work collaboratively with history educators in other schools, museums, and/or cultural institutions to a greater extent:</i></p> | Project | Target | Actual |
| | | 60% (13/21) | 71% (15/21) |
| | | 60% (18/30) | 93% (28/30) |
| 60% (18/30) | 80% (24/30) | | |

Further Explanation

The pre- and post-program surveys contained an item that asked participants to indicate the number of fellow educators in Vermont with whom they regularly discuss American history (range level choices = 0, 1-3, 4-6, 7-10, 11-15, 16-20, 21-25). Individual responses for the pre-versus post-test were compared for the matched sample, to see whether their post-program response had decreased, remained the same, or increased.

Almost three-fourths (71%) of the participants reported an increase number of Vermont colleagues with whom they had discussions of American history.

Pre-post comparison of number of fellow educators in Vermont with whom participants regularly discuss American history.

| Frequency | Participants % (N=21) |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Decrease 1 range level | 5% (1) |
| Remained at same range | 24% (5) |
| Increased 1 range level | 48% (10) |
| Increase 2 range levels | 19% (4) |
| Increase 6 range levels | 5% (1) |

Median and Mode=Increased 1 range level

The post-program survey contained items that asked participants to assess the level of contact they had this year with Vermont educators to discuss American history, and the level of working collaboratively with history educators in other schools and institutions.

Almost all (93%) reported that they had increased the number of Vermont educators with whom they had discussed the content and teaching of American history, with over half (53%) indicating that the number had increased "a lot more." Most (80%) reported that Turning Points had enabled them to work more collaboratively with history educators in other schools, museums, and cultural heritage institutions.

Compared with last year, how would you rate the number of Vermont educators with whom you discuss (either face to face, or on-line) the content and teaching of American history for this year?

| Participants reporting "a lot less" % (n) | Participants reporting "somewhat less" % (n) | Participants reporting "about the same" % (n) | Participants reporting "somewhat more" % (n) | Participants reporting "a lot more" % (n) |
|--|---|--|---|--|
| 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 7% (2) | 40% (12) | 53% (16) |

(n = 30) Mean=1.47 (on a scale of 0-2); SD=.629

Most (80%) reported that Turning Points had enabled them to work more collaboratively with history educators in other schools, museums, and cultural heritage institutions, with over a fourth (27%) indicating that it had increased "a lot."

To what extent has the Turning Points Program enabled you to work collaboratively with history educators in other schools, museums and/or cultural heritage institutions?

| Participants reporting no increase % (n) "0" | Participants reporting "a little" increase % (n) "1" | Participants reporting "a fair amount" of increase % (n) "2" | Participants reporting "a lot" of increase % (n) "3" |
|--|--|--|--|
| 0% (0) | 20% (6) | 53% (16) | 27% (8) |

(n = 30) Mean=2.07 (on a scale of 0-3); SD=.691

Other Evaluation Results

The post-program survey included one open-ended response item that asked participants to describe features of the Turning Points' program they had found most useful. A number described how valuable it had been for them to establish professional relationships with educators in other schools and institutions.

"I found the discussion with other teachers to be most helpful. I think it is vital to learn from our peers. There are many ways to teach a particular topic and it has been nice to see the various ways that people teach in their classroom."

"I especially valued being able to work with and discuss with other teachers, as I am a department of one. Access to my professors throughout this program and the vast amount of resources provided for teachers was amazing, of outstanding quality, and really impressive."

"Wonderful in its helping to network with other teachers, including [the two co-directors.] I haven't taught [American history] in a while, and the program helped me reconnect with why I love this profession."

"I loved the way Turning Points stressed connections with local historical societies. Those connections were invaluable."

| 3.b. Performance Measure | Measure Type | Quantitative Data | |
|--|--------------|-------------------|----------------|
| | | % | |
| | | (n) | |
| | | Target | Actual |
| Participants who complete 30 or more hours of program professional development will indicate an increase in their contact with museum educators with whom they discuss their teaching of American history. | Project | | |
| <i>Participants who reported that their contact with museum educators and awareness of resources at museums and historical societies had increased:</i> | | 60% (18/30) | 83% (25/30) |

Further Explanation

On the post-program survey, participants were asked to rate their personal level of contact with museum educators and their awareness of resources at museums and historical societies.

Most (83%) participants indicated that compared with last year, their personal level of contact with museum educators and awareness of resources at museums and historical societies had increased, with over half (53%) indicating that this year's level of contact and awareness was "a lot more."

Compared with last year, how would you rate your personal level of contact this year with museum educators and awareness of resources at museums and historical societies?

| Participants reporting "a lot less" % (n) | Participants reporting "about the same" % (n) | Participants reporting "about the same" % (n) | Participants reporting "somewhat more" % (n) | Participants reporting "a lot more" % (n) |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 17% (5) | 30% (9) | 53% (16) |

(n = 30) Mean= 1.37 (on a scale of 0-2); SD= .765;

Other Evaluation Results

The post-program survey included several open-ended response items that asked participants to describe elements of the Turning Points' program they had found most valuable. A number of participants described the value of connecting with museum educators and resources at local

museum and historical societies, and the anticipated impact that would have on their classroom practice.

"I found the field study extremely valuable, as it made me more fully aware of the crisis that our historic sites are facing and has encouraged me to use more place-based learning in my own classroom."

[What I found useful were] the excellent speakers and presenters, the variety of museum and historical sites we visited, the exciting living history presentations, and the interesting techniques and strategies for capturing students' attention. These things increased my historical knowledge and gave me new ideas to use in my class."

"Turning Points did a great job of emphasizing local history and Vermont history for me. As someone who grew up in Vermont, I was shocked to learn about some of the really interesting nuggets, even locally, that I was not aware of. The cars of Plattsburgh, the trains of Saint Albans, the missiles in Alburgh and Swanton...all really neat things that can be used in the classroom."

"In the Civil War [scholar-led] seminar, I had never heard about the Confederate bank robbery in St. Albans (Vermont) - my knowledge of local history improved."

"The day-long [scholar-led] seminar on World War II gave me a lot of information, some new, about our involvement in this conflict. It also provided some specific material dealing with the role of Vermonters played, particularly in the Mountain Division, which will be of great interest to my students."

SECTION B: BUDGET REPORTING INFORMATION

| Budget Categories | Project Year 1 funds approved | Project Year 1 expended | Carry over funds |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1. Personnel | 135,431 | 124,013 | 11,418 |
| 2. Fringe Benefits | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3. Travel | 2,700 | 4,649 | 0 |
| 4. Equipment | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5. Supplies | 45,300 | 41,278 | 4,022 |
| 6. Contractual | 100,000 | 120,043 | 0 |
| 7. Construction | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8. Other | 15,900 | 8,502 | 7,398 |
| 9. Total Indirect Costs (lines 1-8) | 299,331 | 298,485 | 22,838 |
| 10. Indirect Costs | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11. Training Stipends | 44,000 | 10,000 | 12,008 |
| 12. Total Costs (lines 9-11) | 343,331 | 308,485 | 34,846 |

1. Personnel – The carryover funds in this budget category are the result of the late hire of the project coordinator in October 2010 as well as fewer school districts taking the opportunity of substitute reimbursements for educators participating in Turning Points’ events. The surplus funds in this category (\$11,418) will be reallocated to potential over expenditures in the area of program supplies provided to program participants during year two.

3. Travel – In year one, Turning Points was eligible to send three people to the Teaching American History Conference in Washington, DC. We had budgeted for two individuals but decided to use surplus funds from our training stipends budget category to send a third participant. The additional expense was \$1,949.

5. Supplies – Some money from this budget category (\$4,022) will be carried over from year one to year two as a result of lower than expected enrollments in Turning Points’ programming. This residual funding will remain in the supply budget for use in year two of the program.

6. Contractual – With permission, we intentionally exceeded our proposed contractual budget when a larger than expected number of Vermont educators expressed a desire to attend our eight-day national field study, which occurred in July 2011. We used surplus funding from our indirect costs budget categories to cover the additional cost of increasing the number of national field study participants from 12 to 26. This additional expense was \$20,043.

8. Other – This budget category consists of food for program workshops, seminars, and meetings; mini grants for educators; a cohort retreat; and summer museum internship stipends

for educators. The expenditures for food, mini grants, and internships were less than expected so a surplus (\$7,398) is available for over expenditures in these areas during year two of the program when we expect greater enrollments and interest in the mini grants and internship opportunities.

11. Training stipends – With fewer enrollments than expected and fewer participants desiring to apply for training stipends, the program was left with a large surplus (\$34,000) in stipend funds. Much of this extra money was used to cover the cost of increasing the number of participants eligible to attend our national field study program (\$20,043) and to cover the cost of sending a third person to the Teaching American History Conference in Washington, DC (\$1,949). The remaining funds (\$12,008) in this budget category will be expended on the program's 2012 national field study.

Section C: Additional Information

Successful Practices

A design element central to Turning Points is providing participants with a variety of pedagogical skills and a breadth and depth to American history within our annual programming. The objective has been to create a suite of opportunities that allows participants to select those workshops that best match the educator's professional development goals. Turning Points' staff and partners have designed several workshop models (i.e., scholar-led seminars, educator-led seminars, primary source study groups, book study groups, national field studies, local field studies, internship opportunities) that will remain important components in its future programming. These professional development opportunities effectively bring educators from different grade levels together to share experiences, knowledge, and challenges to teaching American history. The grade level spread of participants for year one and their satisfaction with our professional development model demonstrates its effectiveness at providing for the needs of Vermont's educators.

Major Changes to the Project

During the first year, the designs of Turning Points' programming, administration, and target participants were modified from that described in the grant proposal. These changes were the result of the timing of the release of grant funds, increased interest in programming by educators throughout Vermont, and necessary changes in personnel and advisors due to a host of issues (e.g., time commitment, illness, retirement, alternative job opportunities).

1. Several changes in Turning Points' personnel and advisors occurred throughout the year, including Turning Points' program coordinator (i.e., Megan Bridges to Wendy Hallock), the superintendent of South Burlington School District (i.e., John Everitt to David Young), and advisory committee members (Allyn McDonald and Janet Bossange to Jane Williamson and Lisa Italiano).
2. Two book study groups were scheduled to be hosted during the fall of 2010. Turning Points' staff did not feel participants had sufficient time to prepare for the fall book groups so they were postponed until the spring of 2011. Enrollment was lower than expected so only one book study group was conducted.
3. The primary source study group enrollment was lower than expected so only one workshop was held during the spring of 2011.

4. Throughout the first six months of Turning Points' programming, educators from throughout Vermont requested permission to take our workshops. However, the project's mission was to provide professional development experiences for American history educators in Chittenden, Franklin, and Grand Isle counties. In the spring of 2011, permission was granted to allow Turning Points to open its programming up to all of Vermont's American history educators. As a result, Turning Points' staff expanded its marketing of the program's summer workshops for 2011 and future workshops to be held in year two.

Problems Encountered and Solutions

During the first year of the project, several unanticipated challenges were encountered and involved issues such as promoting Turning Points' programs, evaluating participants' American history content knowledge, working with multiple project partners, and teaching participants how to support student thinking and how to develop Teaching with Historic Places lessons.

1. Developing and administering a short pre- and post-test was a complex and difficult task. The annual pre- and post-test is to be administered to all participants no matter when they take their first workshop, how many workshops they anticipate taking, or which workshops they enroll in during the year. This open enrollment and breadth of experiences offered by our programming creates problems in designing tests that capture meaningful data about the changes observed in participant's content knowledge and pedagogical skills. Participants might not enroll in a workshop that focuses on a particular question or series of questions which might appear on the test. Despite the difficulties in designing the tests, the co-directors and evaluation staff created tests that address the major issues, events, and themes they believed were stressed by many of the year's workshops. We accept that the tests are not the best reflection of participant learning and therefore requested that participants complete workshop evaluations and reflective essays on Turning Points' programming. This information appears to be a better indicator of the impact of each workshop upon the participants' content knowledge in American history and pedagogical skills. We are also considering designing a pre- and post- survey for select program components (i.e., primary source study group, national field study, local field studies) that will assess the skills and content knowledge acquired during each professional development event. This will not replace the annual pre- and post-surveys given to participants but instead supplement this evaluation measure.

2. Turning Points' staff anticipated relying on the curriculum coordinators within each public school district and private school to disseminate information to their American history educators. Electronic and paper fliers were issued during September of 2010. Few educators either received or took notice of Turning Points' programming announcements disseminated through curriculum coordinators in the early fall of 2010. Turning Points' staff undertook alternative methods to get the word out about the upcoming workshops. We contacted educators directly via email and

phone; gave material to teacher, superintendent, and principal associations for distribution; attended school social studies department meetings to promote Turning Points' events; and set up a Turning Points' booth at statewide education conferences. These efforts will continue into subsequent years of the project because of their positive impact on workshop enrollments.

3. One of the major objectives of Turning Points' programming is to expose participants to the vast resources held by local heritage institutions and the educational opportunities they hold for students. As a result, Turning Points staff works annually with a large number of museum and historical society partners to design and facilitate its workshops. To ensure the quality and consistency of these workshops in meeting our project goals, Turning Points' staff designed a list of goals and responsibilities for facilitators and works closely with them throughout the entire process of preparation, design, and execution of the workshops.

4. One of the goals of the national and local field studies was to demonstrate for participants the value of teaching with historic places and the methods necessary to develop lessons or curricula around place-based education themes. Although we provided examples of what a teaching with historic places (TwHP) lesson entails, we did not provide enough time to discuss the TwHP elements. When asked to write a TwHP lesson, some participants were very successful at using the models we provided; however, many were unsuccessful at providing the geographic context or geographic emphasis that is so essential to teaching with historic places. As a result, we spent a lot of time providing comments to first drafts of lessons and requesting additional drafts of their work. Next year, we will spend more time explicitly analyzing and discussing the principles of using historic places during the field studies. This step will better prepare the participants to write successful TwHP lesson plans.

5. Participants of the primary source study group and national field study were asked to write lesson plans as a culminating project. One element of the lesson plan, which participants were asked to include, was the task of having students create their own historical interpretations. Not all participants were successful in including this important pedagogical method. Approximately 14% of participants (5 out of 35) offered a "right" interpretation and asked students to defend it. In the future, we will be more careful to provide various examples of student exercises that are more open-ended – asking for student interpretations backed up by evidence.

6. The lessons provided by the participants of the primary source study group and national field study were also asked to support their students' historical thinking and analysis of primary sources. In their lessons, participants did a better job at providing opportunities for their students to analyze primary sources and create their own interpretations (91%; 30 out of 33) than they did at providing support for their students' new ways of thinking (67%; 22 out of 33). Our solution is to model and discuss in upcoming workshops ways that support student historical thinking. We have a number of graphic organizers and other techniques that help make different types of

thinking processes visual and relevant for students. That is a step we missed in our previous workshops because the participants are generally good thinkers and can analyze, make inferences, support suppositions, and the like without much trouble. However, educators need to explicitly teach these tasks to students who do not have as much experience thinking in these ways. Therefore, these critical steps will be included in our upcoming workshops.

**Turning Points in American History: Knowledge Understanding, and Perspectives
A Teaching American History Grant at the
South Burlington (Vermont) School District**

Year 1 Evaluation

Executive Summary

**Cynthia Char, Julie Friesner, and Jennifer Lazar
Char Associates
December 2011**

The Turning Points in American History: Knowledge, Understanding, and Perspectives project is a federally-funded professional development program for pre-service and in-service educators throughout Vermont. Funded through a Teaching American History (TAH) grant through the U.S. Department of Education, the three-year project, managed by the South Burlington School District of Vermont, commenced in the fall of 2010 and recently completed its first project year. Char Associates, an independent evaluation firm based in Montpelier, Vermont, is serving as the external evaluator for Turning Points. This report presents the findings of the evaluation of Turning Points in its first year (September 2010 - August 2011).

The project's three primary objectives are to:

- 1) increase teachers' content knowledge in American history;
- 2) increase teachers' pedagogical skills in historical thinking processes, and
- 3) foster a learning community for teachers' learning of American history.

The project's distinctive choice approach to professional development allows teachers to customize their own professional development program by selecting program components of the most interest and importance for them. Each year, the Turning Points project offers *six different program components* (scholar-led and educator-led seminars; primary source and book study groups; national and local field studies) as well as *four teacher initiative options* (teacher leadership, mini-grants, teacher mentoring, museum internships.) Participants are also given the option of obtaining graduate credit for the program components.

Methodology and Sample: As required by the TAH grant, the primary data collection method utilized in Year 1 centered on the use of pre-program and post-program teacher surveys. The surveys were designed to assess the project's three primary objectives concerning teachers' content knowledge and pedagogical skills, and fostering learning community for teachers of American history.

A total of 73 educators participated in the Turning Points (TP) program during Year 1. According to project records, these participants teach American history at the elementary (17 participants), middle (23 participants), and high school (33 participants) levels and

work at 31 local education agencies (24 public school districts and 7 independent schools) throughout Vermont.

Forty-five participants (62%) attended 30 or more hours of professional development programming and thus were classified as "completers", as defined by the TP program. Of these 45 completers, 30 submitted both a pre- and a post-program survey, and thus constituted the matched sample focused on in the evaluation. In addition, analysis was conducted on the full set of 42 post-program surveys collected, which also included data from 12 participants who took fewer than 30 hours of TP programming.

MAJOR FINDINGS

Major findings from the Year 1 Evaluation are presented below.

Teachers' Content Knowledge in American History

- Participants' performance on a multiple choice content knowledge test revealed modest gains between pre- and post-test. Two-fifths (40%) of educators demonstrated a slight increase in knowledge of American history.
- In contrast to the more minimal learning gains detected by the content knowledge test, almost all participants (90%) reported that Turning Points had increased their breadth and depth of content knowledge of American history this past year, with almost half (47%) indicating that their content knowledge had increased "a lot."
- Almost all participants reported clear increases this past year in their reading and discussion of historical materials (97%), and attendance at lectures and discussions with American history scholars (90%) as compared to last year, with roughly two-thirds reporting that these activities had increased "a lot more."
- In their open-ended responses to survey questions, participants frequently described ways in which their knowledge of the American Revolution had deepened, and how they had gained a greater understanding and appreciation of multiple perspectives and viewpoints in history. A number also commented on the value of being able to hear and discuss history with scholars in the field.

Teachers' Pedagogical Skills in Historical Thinking Processes

- Close to two-fifths (57%) of the participants reported an increase in their skills in using various history teaching techniques with students. Gains were reported in four areas of teaching techniques: having students examine events from multiple perspectives; helping students collect, analyze and interpret historical data from a variety of sources; using local historical resources to make connections to national events; and engaging students in inquiry-based history projects.
- Roughly two-thirds (63%) of the participants reported an increase of their pedagogical

skills in fostering students' historical thinking skills. Gains were reported for four types of historical thinking skills: historical analysis and interpretation; grappling with historical issues; creation of historical products; and historical comprehension.

- Most (87%) reported that Turning Points had increased their understanding of innovative and effective approaches for understanding the teaching of history, with almost half (47%) indicating that their knowledge had increased "a lot."
- Almost three-fourths (73%) reported greater skills in using primary sources in their classrooms, while two-thirds (67%) reported an increase in their skill level in having students work with historical data from a variety of historical sources. Over half (57%) also reported an increase in their skills in using local historical resources to make connections to national events.
- 68% of respondents indicated that the teaching approaches presented through Turning Points were useful in their classrooms, with 39% reporting that they found the teaching approaches "extremely useful", key to their teaching. Participants described a wide array of new classroom practices and techniques, inspired by various program sessions offered by Turning Points.
- Most respondents indicated that because of their Turning Points experience, they were now using in their classrooms specific teaching techniques associated with higher student performance in history. These included employing greater use of primary sources (76%); exposing students to more historical perspectives, ideas and arguments (68%); and providing more opportunities for students to discuss the meaning of documents, ideas and arguments (63%).
- Almost all the participants (93%) reported that Turning Points had enabled them to increase their students' level of interest and engagement when learning American history this past year, with over a third (37%) indicating that their students' interest had increased "a lot."

Fostering a Learning Community around Teaching American History

- Almost all (93%) reported that they had increased the number of Vermont educators with whom they had discussed the content and teaching of American history, with over half (53%) indicating that the number had increased "a lot more."
- Most (80%) reported that Turning Points had enabled them to work more collaboratively with history educators in other schools, museums, and cultural heritage institutions. Many (83%) participants indicated that compared with last year, their personal level of contact with museum educators and awareness of resources at museums and historical societies had increased, with over half (53%) indicating that this year's level of contact and awareness was "a lot more."

- As a testament to the perceived value of the program, about three-fourths (76%) of the participants indicated that they were planning to sign up for more Turning Points sessions next year, while another 21% indicated that they might sign up. Almost all (97%) indicated that they would recommend Turning Points as a professional development program for colleagues teaching American history.

In summary, the Year 1 evaluation indicates that Turning Points in its first year of programming is affording professional development experiences that are viewed as valuable by participants, along a variety of dimensions. Participants report clear increases this past year in their reading of discussion of historical materials and attendance at lectures and discussions with American history scholars. While performance on a content knowledge test did not reveal widespread increases in content knowledge for teachers, almost all participants indicated that they have increased their breadth and depth of content knowledge of American history, and frequently described ways in which they had gained a deeper knowledge of the American Revolution era emphasized this past year, as well as greater understanding and appreciation of multiple perspectives and viewpoints in history.

Most participants reported that they had increased their understanding of innovative and effective approaches for the teaching of history, and that they were finding the teaching approaches presented through Turning Points useful to their classrooms. In particular, teachers indicated that they were now employing greater use of primary sources, and exposing students to more historical perspectives, ideas and arguments.

Participants also appreciated the ways in which Turning Points afforded a learning community for teachers in the teaching of American history. Almost all reported that they had increased the number of Vermont educators with whom they had discussed the content and teaching of American history, and were now in greater contact with museum educators and more aware of resources at museums and historical societies.

**Turning Points in American History: Knowledge Understanding, and Perspectives
A Teaching American History Grant at the
South Burlington (Vermont) School District**

Year 1 Evaluation Report

**Cynthia Char, Julie Friesner, and Jennifer Lazar
Char Associates
December 2011**

INTRODUCTION

The Turning Points in American History: Knowledge, Understanding, and Perspectives project is a federally-funded professional development program for pre-service and in-service educators throughout Vermont. Funded through a Teaching American History (TAH) grant through the U.S. Department of Education, the three-year project, managed by the South Burlington School District of Vermont, commenced in the fall of 2010 and recently completed its first project year. Char Associates, an independent evaluation firm based in Montpelier, Vermont, is serving as the external evaluator for Turning Points. This report presents the findings of the evaluation of Turning Points in its first year (September 2010 - August 2011).

The project's three primary objectives are to:

- 1) increase teachers' content knowledge in American history;
- 2) increase teachers' pedagogical skills in historical thinking processes, and
- 3) foster a learning community for teachers' learning of American history.

The project's distinctive choice approach to professional development allows teachers to customize their own professional development program by selecting program components of the most interest and importance for them. Each year, the Turning Points project offers *six different program components* (scholar-led and educator-led seminars; primary source and book study groups; national and local field studies) as well as *four teacher initiative options* (teacher leadership, mini-grants, teacher mentoring, museum internships.) Participants are also given the option of obtaining graduate credit for the program components.

Each program component addresses, in varying degrees, the project's three primary objectives, as shown in the following table.

Turning Points Components, by Project Objectives

| Program component | Professional dev. hours for participant | Increase history content knowledge | Increase pedagogical skills | Foster learning community |
|--|---|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|
| <i>Scholar-led seminar</i> (3 day-long events per year) | 8 -24 hours (8 hrs per event) | XXX | X | X |
| <i>Educator-led seminar</i> (2 day-long events per year) | 8-16 hours (8 hrs per event) | X | XXX | X |
| <i>Primary source study group</i> (5 monthly sessions) | 50 hours | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| <i>Book study group</i> (4 monthly sessions) | 50 hours | XXX | XX | X |
| <i>National field study</i> (week-long session in summer) | 80 hours | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| <i>Local field studies</i> (7 day-long Sat. events in summer) | 7 - 49 hours (7 hrs per event) | X | XX | XX |
| Teacher Initiatives | | | | |
| Teacher leadership | 100 hours | XX | XX | |
| Mini grants | Variable | XX | XX | |
| Teacher mentoring | Variable | X | XX | |
| Museum internship | 100 hours | XX | XX | XX |

The program is available to a wide range of participants involved in K-12 education, spanning both *pre-service* educators (i.e., undergraduate and graduate students, and those acquiring licensure) and *in-service* educators (i.e., substitute teachers, paraprofessionals, part-time and full-time teachers, museum educators and others desiring teacher certification credits and re-licensure).

In order to receive a teacher stipend for participation, the project requires the individual to engage in 40 or more hours of Turning Points professional development each year. The 40-hour target of yearly participation is based on professional development research indicating 40 hours as the minimum number of hours required to change teacher practice. Therefore, those who reach 30 hours, or 75% of the required hours, are considered program “completers,” a category of program participants defined by the US Department of Education's TAH grant guidelines.

Program impact is also assessed for participants attending fewer than 30 hours of professional development per year.

Description of Survey Instruments

The primary data collection method utilized in the Year 1 evaluation centered on the use of pre-program and post-program teacher surveys. The pre-program and post-program

surveys were designed to assess each of the project's three primary objectives, concerning teachers' content knowledge in American history; teachers' pedagogical skills in historical thinking processes, and a learning community for teachers' learning of American history.

The Year 1 **content knowledge assessment** primarily emphasized the specific historic era featured in the program this year (the Revolutionary Era), as well as other eras (the Civil War and Reconstruction Era and Modern Era), addressed in several Scholar-led seminars and Local Museum studies sessions. The Year 1 pre-test included 16 multiple choice items on American history content knowledge (8 Revolutionary; 3 Civil War; 3 Modern Era), and two 2-part short-constructed response items (1 Revolutionary; 1 Civil War). These items were drawn from valid test instruments, including NAEP (National Assessment of Educational Progress), the New York State Regents Exams, and the Advanced Placement (AP) History exam.

The pre-program survey also contained short sections focused on *pedagogy* (2 items on history teaching techniques, and promoting historical thinking skills (total of 16 sub-items), *collegiality* (2 items), and on *teacher background information* (5 items).

Early results from pre-program survey Version 1 in October 2010 revealed that despite the careful screening and review of potential content knowledge test items by project co-directors and the evaluation team, the instrument appeared too easy for the majority of respondents (most of whom were high school teachers), with respondents getting many of the 16 multiple choice items correct. Based on these early returns, the evaluation team modified the pre-test instrument to create a second version of the pre-test, by slightly adapting some response choices (e.g., changing one of the detractors to make the detractor less obviously wrong, creating new detractors), and removing a few of the easiest test items and replacing them with new items.

The post-program survey was structured similarly to the pre-program survey, with sections on **content knowledge** (14 multiple choice items, and one 2-part short-constructed response item; 1 rating scale; 1 open-ended response), **pedagogy** (8 items), and **collegiality** (2 items). In addition, there were also items to provide **formative feedback** on the program (8 items).

Program Participants, Survey Sample and Methodology

A total of 73 in-service and pre-service educators participated in the Turning Points (TP) program during Year 1 (September 2010 - August 2011). Forty-five of these educators (62% of participants) attended 30 or more hours of professional development programming and thus are classified as "completers", as defined by the TP program.

Every participant registering for a TP program was sent an electronic survey shortly after s/he registered. Since the project was one of "rolling admissions" (i.e., allowing individuals to register and participate at any point throughout the academic year), participants were sent an electronic survey anywhere from mid-October 2010 through mid-April 2011. No new registrants registering after mid-April were sent an electronic

pre-program survey, given the lateness in the project year and close temporal proximity to when the post-program survey would be administered (beginning in May 2011).

Of the 73 individuals participating in the TP program, 39 (53% of all participants) submitted a completed pre-program survey. Of these, 17 filled out a pre-program survey administered in September and October 2010 (Version 1), and 22 filled out a pre-program survey (Version 2) administered in November 2010 through April 2011.

All individuals who participated in at least 8 hours of TP professional development were sent an electronic post-program survey in Spring/Summer 2011. Post-program surveys were administered in multiple rounds, after an individual had completed his/her final TP session for the year. The initial round of post-program surveys was administered in mid-May 2011, to all those participants who were not taking TP programs during the summer. The second round of post-program surveys was administered in mid-July 2011, to those individuals who had participated in the July National Field Study program. Subsequent rounds of post-program surveys were administered in mid-July through mid-August 2011, to those who had taken Local Field Studies sessions in July and/or August.

Of the 56 TP participants who were sent a post-program survey, 40 (71%) submitted a completed post-program survey. Thirty of these respondents had filled a pre-program survey as well, thereby forming a "matched sample."

| | Pre-test Surveys Received (39 total) | Post-test Surveys Received (40 total) |
|---|---|--|
| Matched Sample (n = 30) | Version #1 (10) Version #2 (20) | (10) (20) |
| Unmatched Survey Sample (n = 19) | Version #1 (7) Version #2 (2) | (10) |

Of the 40 TP participants who submitted a post-program survey, 32 had participated in at least 30 hours of professional development, and thus were "completers". The remaining 8 respondents of the post-program survey were "non-completers", who had taken between 16 and 24 hours of professional development. Of the 30 respondents that formed the matched sample, 23 were completers and 7 were non-completers.

| | Post-test Surveys Received (40 total) | Matched Sample (30 total) |
|---|--|--------------------------------------|
| Completers (30+ hrs of PD) | 32 (80%) | 23 (77%) |
| Non-completers (< 30 hours) | 8 (20%) | 7 (23%) |

Patterns of Program Participation

The 32 completers who had submitted post-program surveys had participated in a wide cross-section of program components over the course of the year, with many taking part in multiple components, as illustrated in the following table.

| Program component | Scholar-led seminars | Educator-led Seminars | Primary Source Study Group | Book Study Group | National Field Study | Local Field Study |
|--------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|------------------|----------------------|-------------------|
| Completers participating | 14 (43.8%) | 8 (25%) | 13 (40.6%) | 3 (9.4%) | 19 (59.4%) | 6 (18.8%) |

| Leadership Opportunities | Mini-grants | Teacher Leadership | Museum Internships |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Completers participating | 3 (9.4%) | 1 (3.1%) | 2 (6.3%) |

(n = 32)

Roughly three-fifths of the completers (59.4%) had participated in the week-long National Field Study, while two-fifths (40.6%) had participated in the multi-session monthly primary source study groups. Accordingly, the number of TP professional development hours was quite extensive for completers, ranging from 40 hours to 182 hours (Mean = 91.5 hours, SD = 39.96). Close to three-fourths of the completers (72%) participated in more than 80 hours of professional development, with over a fourth (28%) involved in more than 100 hours.

| Program hours | 40-58 hrs | 66-68 hrs | 80 hrs | 87-88 hrs | 104-132 hrs | 140-182 hours |
|-------------------|--------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|--------------|---------------|
| Completers (n=32) | 6 (18.8%) | 3 (9.4%) | 11 (34.4%) | 3 (9.4%) | 5 (15.6%) | 4 (12.5%) |

It should be noted that submission of a post-program survey was a requirement to receive a project stipend or graduate credit. This may have caused the participation level of these more "serious" teachers reflected in the post-program sample to be slightly elevated.

Survey Analysis: Fully completed post-program surveys were collected from thirty teachers who were "completers" and had taken at least 30 hours of program PD activities (one teacher had partially filled out the survey and was included in the analysis where applicable). Frequencies and other descriptive statistics were calculated for these teachers for a range of teacher self-reports from the survey about the impact of program participation on their content knowledge base, pedagogical skills and relationships with other American history educators. In addition, twenty-three of these teachers had also answered the content knowledge questions on both the pre and post program surveys. Evaluators determined the number and percentage of these teachers with matched scores who had answered more questions correctly on the post test than on the pre tests. Content analysis was conducted for the open-ended prose items, to determine the major themes and issues that were raised by respondents.

FINDINGS

OBJECTIVES AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

1. Content Knowledge

Project Objective #1. Increase teacher content knowledge and understanding of the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) historical eras and themes.

Performance Measure 1a. (GPRA Measure #1.1) *The average percentage change in the scores (on a pre-post assessment of American history) of participants who complete at least 75% of the professional development hours* required by the project (30 hours).*

Performance Measure 1b. *Of the completers, 60% in Year 1 will demonstrate increased knowledge of American History, as measured by an annual post-test of American history knowledge.*

The pre- and post-program surveys contained a section that was a content knowledge test, consisting of a set of 14 multiple choice items primarily centered on the Revolutionary Era, which was the era focused on in Turning Points' Year 1 professional development.

The project's Year 1 target goal was that at least 60% of completers will demonstrate increased knowledge of American history.

Of those educators who completed both pre- and post-program surveys and took the annual pre- and post-test of American history knowledge (and thus formed the "matched sample"), two-fifths (40%; 8 out of 20) of educators demonstrated an increased knowledge of American history (i.e., increase of at least one more correct item on the post-test, out of a set of 14 multiple choice items.) This sample excludes the small number of educators (3) who received perfect scores on both the pre- and post-tests.

| <i>Performance Measure 1a (GPRA Measure 1.1)</i> | Target | Actual |
|---|----------------|------------------|
| All participants | 60% (12/20) | 40% (8/20*) |
| Participants completing pre-test Version #1 | 60% (4/7) | 29.6% (2/7) |
| Participants completing pre-test Version #2 | 60% (10/16) | 46.2% (6/13*) |

*excludes 3 participants with perfect scores on both pre- and post-tests

Thus, the analysis of content knowledge items revealed modest gains between pre- and post-test performance for participants.

The evaluator believes this may be partially due to several factors. First, given the timing of the grant award (August 2010), the pre-test needed to be designed and finalized in the

first month of the project (September 2010), in order to be administered to participants newly registering for the project's professional development offerings, starting in October 2010. This was in advance of the project staff being able to fully plan the year's PD activities, many of which were done in conjunction with the project's multiple organizational partners. Thus, the content knowledge test could not be as carefully aligned as it could be to upcoming topics that would be covered in the Year 1 program.

Second, despite careful screening of the pre-test content items by project directors and the evaluation team, and strict adherence to feature content knowledge items that were identical to those presented in valid test instruments (e.g., NAEP, AP history), early results from the pre-test indicated that the content knowledge items were generally quite easy for some participants, resulting in a "ceiling effect." While the pre-test was then revised slightly, by replacing some easy detractor items with ones that were more difficult, it could not be significantly altered since the two versions needed to be sufficiently similar to allow the combining of data sets (data from pre-test versions 1 and 2), and to form the basis for the construction of a single post-test instrument.

Moving forward, we have made changes to ensure that the Year 2 pre-test is more difficult, by featuring test items for which each item has five response options (rather than four), only featuring items that we have deemed difficult or moderately difficult, and by piloting the instrument with non-Vermont educators before finalizing the pre-test instrument. Early results from the August 2011 pre-test piloting, along with results from our initial rounds of Year 2 pre-tests in September and October 2011 (n = 52) confirms that the set of Year 2 pre-test content knowledge items is indeed more challenging, and allows for the possibility of increased participant performance on the post-test.

Third, the relatively small sample size of Year 1 pre-tests received (n = 39; 53% return rate) put some clear constraints on the maximum size of the eventual matched sample (n = 30), whereby the negative performances from a few individuals could dramatically affect the overall project percentages and outcomes. In Year 2, the project has already attracted a greater number of program participants, as well as has more rigorous processes in place to ensure a high return rate on surveys. As of late November 2011, we already have received pre-tests from 59 respondents, for close to a 97% return rate. Thus, we are confident that Year 2 will yield a much greater pool of participants in our survey sample, allowing us to derive more sound findings and conclusions in our evaluation.

Additional Indicators of Increased Content Knowledge

In addition to the set of content knowledge items drawn from valid test instruments, the post-program survey also asked participants whether or not they thought the program had increased the breadth and depth of content knowledge of American history.

In contrast to the more minimal learning gains detected by the content knowledge test, almost all of the participants (90%, 27 out of 30) reported that Turning Points had increased their breadth and depth of content knowledge of American history at least a fair

amount this past year, with almost half (47%) indicating that their content knowledge had increased "a lot."

To what extent has the Turning Points Program increased your breadth and depth of content knowledge of American history?

| “No increase” % (n) | “A little” % (n) | “A fair amount” % (n) | “A lot” % (n) |
|------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|------------------|
| 0% (0) | 10% (3) | 43.4% (13) | 46.7% (14) |

(n = 30) Mean=2.37 (on a scale of 0-3); SD=.596

The post program survey included an open-ended response item that asked participants to describe how their understanding of American history had improved, if at all.

Participants most frequently described ways in which their knowledge of the American Revolution had deepened, and how they had gained a greater understanding and appreciation of multiple perspectives and viewpoints in history.

"Turning Points furthered my understanding of American history by providing resources based upon multiple perspectives. The perspectives were not the traditional standards that typically pass as a different perspective. Rather, Turning Points provided unique perspectives from a variety of sources that challenged our knowledge and framework of understanding. Excellent scholarship opportunity."

"I had studied the American Revolution [before] but in a piecemeal manner; the TP program helped connect it all together and gave me structure and context to the war, its causes and conduct."

"I have a much deeper understanding of the material, especially military strategies during the Revolutionary War, and the different viewpoints of the war by loyalists, patriots and minorities."

"I didn't know much about the American Revolution before taking the course. Now I know how the revolution impacted a variety of groups and individuals, the chronology of the war, its battles, and military leaders, and the role that the Vermont militia played in the war."

"The readings, artifacts, primary sources, and historic places featured in lessons and events allowed me to view historical events from a variety of perspectives, including that of the "bystanders" who traditionally don't get much attention in the history books, but whose experience is so intricately tied to events, a critical piece of the story."

"[My understanding] has become more inclusive. By this I mean that I have become more aware of the broader complexities of the Revolutionary War period and its effects on the variety of participants in the War."

Performance Measure 1c. *Each year, at least 60% of new program participants will report increased reading, listening, and discussions of historical content materials compared with the previous year.*

Another project goal was that at least 60% of completers will report increased reading, listening and discussions of historical content materials compared with the previous year.

Several questions on the post-program survey asked participants to self-assess their activity level this past year regarding activities designed to promote content knowledge: reading and discussion of historical materials, and attending lectures and discussions with American history scholars.

The vast majority of participants reported clear increases this past year in reading and discussion of historical materials (96.7%), and attendance at lectures and discussions with American history scholars (90%) as compared to last year, with roughly two-thirds reporting that this activity had increased "a lot more."

| <i>Performance Measure 1c</i> | <i>Target</i> | <i>Actual</i> |
|---|----------------|------------------|
| Participants who reported increased reading and discussion of historical materials | 60% (18/30) | 96.7% (29/30) |
| Participants who reported increased attendance at lectures and discussions with American history scholars | 60% (18/30) | 90.0% (27/30) |

Compared with last year, how would you rate your personal level for the year of reading and discussion of historical materials?

| "A lot less" % (n) | "Somewhat less" % (n) | "About the same" % (n) | "Somewhat more" % (n) | "A lot more" % (n) |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 3.3% (1) | 30.0% (9) | 66.7% (20) |

(n = 30) Mean=1.63 (on a scale of 0-2); SD=.556

Compared with last year, how would you rate your personal level for the year of attending lectures and discussions with American history scholars?

| "A lot less" % (n) | "Somewhat less" % (n) | "About the same" % (n) | "Somewhat more" % (n) | "A lot more" % (n) |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 10% (3) | 26.7% (8) | 63.3% (19) |

(n = 30) Mean=1.53 (on a scale of 0-2); SD=.681

In the post-program survey, participants were given an open-ended question that asked them to describe ways in which they had found the Turning Points sessions valuable, or

conversely, not useful. A number of participants wrote about the value of being able to hear and discuss history with scholars in the field.

"I loved the scholar-led seminars on post-Civil War and WWII. The discussions/Socratic circles and lectures were very useful and engaging. I loved the freedom to ask clarifying questions to an expert in the field. I even had [one of the WWII veterans who spoke] come to my class following the WWII seminar to discuss his involvement and experiences in WWII."

"Turning Points provided an invaluable opportunity to discuss and interact with teachers and professors. Listening to a college professor is a very special treat, one that reinvigorates me and provides a breath of fresh air for teachers who generally have little contact with professionals beyond their own departments wherein the minutia of administrative requirements too often takes precedence."

"I thoroughly enjoyed and appreciated the opportunity to discuss and listen to fantastic lectures in my field. You don't actually have to learn something new to gain from intellectual interaction. As a teacher, there is a fairly small group of people with whom I have any opportunity to exchange ideas and discuss historical issues. It was reassuring to have experts in the field reaffirm my approach and provide confirmation to the emphases I place on given issues, while highlighting concepts that I might possibly have shortchanged."

Performance Measure 1d. *The percentage of TAH participants who complete 75% or more of the total hours of professional development required. (GPR 1.2)*

Performance Measure 1e. *In Year 1, 40% of participants will attend at least 40 hours of professional development programming aimed at increasing teaching knowledge of American history.*

Two performance measures assessed the level of program participation and attendance demonstrated by the participants. According to records kept by project staff, 62% (54 out of 73) of participants completed 75% or more of the total hours of professional development required (i.e., 30 hours.). 60% (43 out of 73) attended at least 40 hours of professional development programming, thereby successfully exceeding the target goal of 40% for Year 1.

| <i>Performance Measures 1d and 1e</i> | <i>Target</i> | <i>Actual</i> |
|---|----------------|----------------|
| The percentage of TAH participants who complete 75% or more of the total hours of professional development required. (GPR 1.2) | NA | 62% (54/73) |
| Year 1, 40% of participants will attend at least 40 hours of professional development programming aimed at increasing teaching knowledge of American history. | 40% (29/73) | 60% (43/73) |

2. Pedagogical Skills in Teaching History

Project Objective #2. Increase teachers' pedagogical skills in historical thinking processes.

Performance Measure 2a. *Of the completers, at least 60% will report increased facility with historical thinking processes, by the end of each program year.*

| Performance Measure 2a | Target | Actual |
|--|----------------|----------------|
| Participants who reported increased skill level with using various history teaching techniques with students | 60% (18/30) | 57% (17/30) |
| Participants who reported increased ability to foster various historical thinking skills with students | 60% (18/30) | 63% (19/30) |

A major portion of the post-program survey was designed to assess participants' acquisition of pedagogical skills in teaching history. To determine the increase in pedagogical skills for *historical teaching techniques*, participants on the post-program survey were presented with five different types of historical teaching techniques (based on standards identified by the National Center for History in the Schools). Teachers were asked what they perceived as their skill levels concerning various historical teaching techniques, prior to taking part in Turning Points, as well as the extent to which the program had improved their skills in these areas.

Respondents felt that, prior to taking Turning Points, they were relatively skilled (either an "area of definite strength" or "strength with room for improvement") at having students *examine events from multiple perspectives* (84%), and *engage in writing activities to learn American history content* (68%). Slightly more than half felt that they were generally skilled at engaging students in *inquiry-based history projects* (58%) and in having them *collect, analyze and interpret historical data from a variety of sources* (55%). Less than two-fifths (37%) felt that were skillful in *using local historical resources to make connections to national events*.

Rate your skill level for using the following history teaching techniques with students. Before I started Turning Points this was...

| | An area of definite strength for me | A strength, w/ room for improvement | Not an area of particular strength | One of my weaker areas | NA, I have not worked w/ students |
|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Having students collect, analyze & interpret historical data from a variety of sources | 10.5% (4) | 44.7% (17) | 26.3% (10) | 15.8% (6) | 2.6% (1) |
| Using local historical resources to make connections to national events | 15.8% (6) | 21.0% (8) | 44.7% (17) | 15.8% (6) | 2.6% (1) |
| Having students examine | 26.3% (10) | 57.9% (22) | 10.5% (4) | 5% (2) | 0% (0) |

| | | | | | |
|---|-----------|------------|------------|-----------|----------|
| events from multiple perspectives | | | | | |
| Engaging students in inquiry-based history projects | 21.0% (8) | 36.8% (14) | 31.5% (12) | 7.9% (3) | 2.6% (1) |
| Engaging students in writing activities to learn American history content | 21.0% (8) | 47.4% (18) | 15.8% (6) | 10.5% (4) | 5% (2) |

(n = 38)

Participants were then asked to what extent the program had improved their skills in each of these areas. Each of the possible responses was assigned a value as follows: had "not changed for me" = 0; "improved a little"=1, "improved quite a bit" =2; and "been a major improvement" = 3. An individual mean was calculated for each participant's responses to all five items in order to ascertain an individual's overall mean response pertaining to potential increase in pedagogical skills. Participants who rated themselves with a mean of 1.5 or greater were considered to have met the performance measure.

Close to two-fifths (57%) of the participants (17 out of 30) reported a mean increase of pedagogical skills for historical teaching techniques of 1.5 or greater, thereby closely approaching the target goal of 60% of participants.

**Historical Teaching Techniques:
*Being part of the Turning Points has helped me with...***

| Skill | "Not changed for me" % (n) "0" | "Improved a little" % (n) "1" | "Improved quite a bit" % (n) "2" | "Been a major improvement" % (n) "3" | Mean (SD) |
|---|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|--|-------------|
| Helping students collect, analyze and interpret historical data from a variety of sources | 3.3% (1) | 30% (9) | 53.3% (16) | 13.3% (4) | 1.77 (.728) |
| Using local historical resources to make connections to national events | 6.7% (2) | 36.7% (11) | 46.7% (14) | 10% (3) | 1.60 (.770) |
| Having students examine events from multiple perspectives | 6.7% (2) | 23.3% (7) | 36.7% (11) | 33.3% (10) | 1.97 (.928) |
| Engaging students in inquiry-based history projects | 6.7% (2) | 46.7% (14) | 33.3% (10) | 13.3% (4) | 1.53 (.819) |
| Engaging students in writing activities to learn American history content | 13.3% (4) | 40.0% (12) | 40.0% (12) | 6.7% (2) | 1.40 (.814) |

Further analysis of individual items for historical teaching techniques revealed four out of

the five areas where participants had noted improvement (mean greater than 1.5). These items were: *having students examine events from multiple perspectives* (mean = 1.97, SD .93); *helping students collect, analyze and interpret historical data from a variety of sources* (mean = 1.77, SD .73); *using local historical resources to make connections to national events* (mean = 1.60, SD .78); and *engaging students in inquiry-based history projects* (mean = 1.53, SD .82).

To determine the increase in *ability to foster students' historical thinking skills*, participants were to rate themselves on their teaching skill levels, prior to taking Turning Points, in each of four areas (based on standards identified by the National Center for History in the Schools). Respondents felt that they were relatively strong (either a "definite strength" or "a strength with room for improvement") in their prior skills in promoting students' *historical analysis and interpretation* (74%), with about two thirds felt they were reasonably strong at enhancing students' *historical comprehension* (66%), *having students grapple with historical issues - analysis and decision-making* (66%), and *having students create historical products* (63%).

***Rate yourself on your ability to foster various historical thinking skills with students.
Before I started Turning Points this was...***

| | An area of definite strength for me | A strength, w/ room for improvement | Not an area of particular strength | One of my weaker areas | NA, I have not worked w/ students |
|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Enhancing students' historical comprehension | 21% (8) | 44.7% (17) | 63.2% (24) | 7.9% (3) | 2.6% (1) |
| Promoting students' historical analysis & interpretation | 18.4% (7) | 55% (21) | 15.8% (6) | 7.9% (3) | 2.6% (1) |
| Having students grapple with historical issues (analysis and decision-making) | 13.2% (5) | 52.6% (20) | 21% (8) | 10.5% (4) | 2.6% (1) |
| Having students create historical products | 23.7% (9) | 39.5% (15) | 21% (8) | 13.2% (5) | 2.6% (1) |

(n = 38)

Participants were then asked to rate themselves on the extent to which the program had improved their teaching abilities in each of these four areas, using the same values as described for historical teaching techniques above. An individual's mean was calculated based on responses to all 4 items. Participants with a mean of 1.5 or greater were considered to have met the performance measure.

Close to two-thirds (63%) of the participants (19 out of 30) reported a mean increase of pedagogical skills in fostering students' historical thinking skills of 1.5 or greater, thereby meeting the Year 1 target goal of 60% of participants.

**Fostering Students' Historical Thinking:
Being part of the Turning Points has helped me with...**

| Skill | "Not changed for me" % (n) "0" | "Improved a little" % (n) "1" | "Improved quite a bit" % (n) "2" | "Been a major improvement" % (n) "3" | Mean (SD) |
|--|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|--|-------------|
| Enhancing students' historical comprehension | 6.7% (2) | 46.7% (14) | 33.3% (10) | 13.3% (4) | 1.53 (.819) |
| Promoting students' historical analysis and interpretation | 6.7% (2) | 33.3% (10) | 43.3% (13) | 16.7% (5) | 1.70 (.837) |
| Having students grapple with historical issues | 6.7% (2) | 36.7% (11) | 43.3% (13) | 13.3% (4) | 1.63 (.809) |
| Having students create historical products | 6.7% (2) | 40% (12) | 43.3% (13) | 10% (3) | 1.57 (.774) |

Further analysis of individual items for historical teaching techniques revealed that participants had noted improvement in all four areas (mean greater than 1.5). These items were: *promoting students' historical analysis and interpretation* (mean = 1.70, SD .84); *having students grapple with historical issues* (mean= 1.63, SD .81), *having students create historical products* (mean = 1.57, SD .78), and *enhancing students' historical comprehension* (mean = 1.53, SD .82).

Thus, on both pedagogical performance measures, Turning Points participants came quite close to, or exceeded, the target goals.

Additional Indicator of Increased Pedagogical Skills

The post-program survey contained an item that asked participants to self-assess their understanding of innovative and effective approaches for teaching history. Most participants (86.6%; 26 out of 30) reported that Turning Points had increased their *understanding of innovative and effective approaches for understanding the teaching of history* this past year, with almost half (47%) indicating that their knowledge had increased "a lot."

To what extent has the Turning Points Program increased your understanding of innovative and effective approaches for teaching history?

| "No increase" % (n) | "A little" % (n) | "A fair amount" % (n) | "A lot" % (n) |
|------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|------------------|
| 0% (0) | 13.3% (4) | 40.0% (12) | 46.7% (14) |

(n = 30) Mean=2.33 (on scale of 0-3); SD=.711

Performance Measure 2b. *Of the completers, at least 60% of teacher participants each year will report increased use of primary sources in their classrooms.*

A number of the Turning Points' components (e.g., primary source study group, educator-led seminars, national field study, and local field studies) emphasized the use of primary sources with students. The post-program survey contained an item asking participants to report on their level of use of primary sources, as well as several items assessing their use of a range of historical sources and use of local historical resources.

Almost three-fourths (73.3%) of participants reported greater use of primary sources in their classrooms, while two-thirds (66.7%) reported an increase in their skill level in having students work with historical data from a variety of historical sources. Over half (56.7%) also reported an increase in their skill level in using local historical resources to make connections to national events.

| <i>Performance Measure 2b</i> | <i>Target</i> | <i>Actual</i> |
|--|----------------|------------------|
| Participants who reported greater use of primary sources in their classrooms: | 60% (18/30) | 73.3% (22/30) |
| Participants who reported an increase in their skill level in having students collect, analyze, and interpret historical data from a variety of historical sources | 60% (18/30) | 66.7% (20/30) |
| Participants who reported an increase in their skill level in using local historical resources to make connections to national events | 60% (18/30) | 56.7% (17/30) |

Being part of the Turning Points has helped me with...

| Skill | "Not changed for me" % (n) "0" | "Improved a little" % (n) "1" | "Improved quite a bit" % (n) "2" | "Been a major improvement" % (n) "3" | Mean (SD) |
|---|---|--|---|---|------------------|
| Helping students collect, analyze and interpret historical data from a variety of sources | 3.3% (1) | 30% (9) | 53.3% (16) | 13.3% (4) | 1.77 (.728) |
| Using local historical resources to make connections to national events | 6.7% (2) | 36.7% (11) | 46.7% (14) | 10% (3) | 1.60 (.770) |

(n = 30)

The post-program survey included several open-ended items that asked participants to describe how their understanding of American history had improved, if at all, as well as what they had found particularly valuable about Turning Points' programs.

Participants frequently described ways in which they acquired new knowledge and techniques regarding the use of primary sources with students.

"In addition to specific content, Turning Points helped me a great deal to better understand how I can use primary sources to help children understand historic events from different perspectives. Hearing 'all the voices' in historic events is critical to getting an unbiased view and a fuller understanding of what happened."

"I have never been a huge fan of history, in general. It was a challenging subject for me in school since I am not keen on associating dates with facts. Turning Points has helped me to value the importance of a personal perspective in history much, much more. I now LOVE using primary source materials as a means of helping students to relive various time periods."

Additional Indicators of Changes in Classroom Practice

Teachers were asked whether the teaching approaches they had learned about in Turning Points were ones they were finding useful in their classrooms. 68% of respondents indicated that the teaching approaches were useful in their classrooms: 39% reported that they found the teaching approaches "extremely useful (they are key to my teaching)", and 29% found them "useful (I use the approaches regularly)".

How useful in your classroom are the teaching approaches that you have learned about in Turning Points sessions?

| Usefulness Rating | Respondents % (#) |
|--|--------------------------|
| Not useful (I do not teach with the approaches discussed, or, they were nothing new to me) | 5% (2) |
| A little useful - I have taught with a few of the approaches | 20% (8) |
| Useful - I use the approaches regularly | 29% (12) |
| Extremely useful - they are key to my teaching | 39% (16) |
| Not applicable - I do not teach students | 7% (3) |

N = 41

Implementation of Teaching Techniques Learned

Teachers were also presented with a short list of specific teaching techniques associated with higher student performance in history, and were asked whether or not these techniques were becoming features in their classrooms partly due to their Turning Points experience. At least half of the respondents indicated that because of their Turning Points experience, there were specific teaching techniques associated with higher student performance in history that they were now using in their classrooms. 76% indicated that they were now employing *greater use of primary sources*. 68% reported exposing students to *more historical perspectives, ideas and arguments*, 63% reported providing *more opportunities for students to discuss the meaning of documents, ideas and arguments*, and 50% reported having a *greater focus on skills of decoding and interpreting sources*. 47% reported using *more effective balance between learning historical facts and developing historical explanations*. No respondents (0%) indicated that their classroom practice had not yet begun being affected by what they had learned through Turning Points.

The ultimate goal of Turning Points is to improve students' understanding of American history. The following things have been found to be associated with higher student performance in history. Which, if any, are becoming features of your classroom partly BECAUSE OF your Turning Points experience so far?

| Historical Teaching Technique | % (#) |
|---|--------------|
| Greater use of primary sources | 76% (29) |
| Exposure to more historical perspectives, ideas and arguments | 68% (26) |
| More opportunities for students to discuss the meaning of documents, ideas and arguments | 63% (24) |
| Greater focus on skills of decoding and interpreting sources | 50% (19) |
| More effective balance between learning historical facts and developing historical explanations | 47% (18) |
| None - Turning Points has not begun to affect my classroom teaching | 0% (0) |
| Not applicable - I do not currently work in the classroom with students | 10% (4) |

(n = 38)

Performance Measure 2c. *Of the completers, at least 60% of teacher participants each year will report increased interest and engagement among their students when studying American history.*

The post-program survey featured an item that asked participants to self-assess their students' level of interest when learning American history.

Almost all the participants (93.3%; 28 out of 30) reported that Turning Points had enabled them *to increase their students' level of interest and engagement when learning American history* this past year, with over a third (36.7%) indicating that their students' interest had increased "a lot."

| <i>Performance Measure 2c</i> | <i>Target</i> | <i>Actual</i> |
|---|----------------------|----------------------|
| Participants who reported increased interest and engagement among their students when studying American history | 60% (18/30) | 93.3% (28/30) |

To what extent has Turning Points enabled you to increase your students' level of interest and engagement when learning American history?

| "No increase" % (n) "0" | "A little" % (n) "1" | "A fair amount" % (n) "2" | "A lot" of increase % (n) "3" |
|--|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| -- | 6.7% (2) | 56.7% (17) | 36.7% (11) |

(n = 30) Mean = 2.30 (on a scale of 0-3); SD = .596

The post-program survey included an open-ended item that asked participants to describe a specific way that Turning Points had benefited their students and their students' learning. Participants described a wide array of new classroom practices and techniques, inspired by various program sessions offered by Turning Points.

"I brought different primary sources in the form of letters and advertisements to the classroom and had the students analyze the text and drawings. I also love using political cartoons in class as they contain a wealth of information and details about cultural opinions."

"I have always used primary sources in class. My participation in the Primary Source Study Group allowed me to better understand HOW to make better use of documents, artifacts, images, buildings, etc. In a recent lesson using a political cartoon, I incorporated group work that was modeled in class and structured the assignment to focus on one issue with a range of perspectives."

"I now use more writing exercises where students write from a particular perspective and share with each other to understand multiple perspectives on historical issues."

"I used the tools I learned about in the computer seminar to craft better web quests and to enable my students to become better historical researchers."

"I am putting more emphasis on primary documents, having been introduced to the on-line National Archives at a Turning Points' seminar. I've begun using this with my students. It really increased their interest in research."

"I have been using the Quest model [from the Poetics of Place educator-led seminar] for students to begin to look at creating independent projects that have meaning and value to them."

"We are now looking at a partnership with the Old Stone House [a museum in Vermont] to perform some document analysis as well as many distance learning field trips."

3. Learning Communities for Teaching American History

Project Objective #3. Foster a learning community for teachers' learning of American history, with peers, fellow history educators and historians.

Performance Measure 3a. *Of the completers, 60% each year will indicate an increase in the number of Vermont colleagues with whom they discuss their teaching of American history, face to face or digitally, to discuss history content and pedagogy.*

The pre- and post-program surveys contained an item that asked participants to indicate the number of fellow educators in Vermont with whom they regularly discuss American history (range level choices = 0, 1-3, 4-6, 7-10, 11-15, 16-20, 21-25). Individual responses for the pre- versus post-test were compared for the matched sample, to see whether their post-program response had decreased, remained the same, or increased.

Almost three-fourths (71.4%) of the participants reported an increase number of Vermont colleagues with whom they had discussions of American history.

| <i>Performance Measure 3a</i> | <i>Target</i> | <i>Actual</i> |
|--|----------------|------------------|
| Participants who listed an increased number of Vermont colleagues with whom they had had discussions as measured by comparison of pre and post survey responses | 60% (13/21) | 71.4% (15/21) |
| Participants who reported that the number of Vermont educators with whom they had discussions had increased | 60% (18/30) | 93.3% (28/30) |
| Participants who reported that the program had enabled them to work collaboratively with history educators in other schools, museums, and/or cultural institutions to a greater extent | 60% (18/30) | 80% (24/30) |

Pre-post comparison of number of fellow educators in Vermont with whom participants regularly discuss American history.

| Frequency | Participants % |
|-------------------------|----------------|
| Decrease 1 range level | 4.8% (1) |
| Remained at same range | 23.8% (5) |
| Increased 1 range level | 47.6% (10) |
| Increase 2 range levels | 19% (4) |
| Increase 6 range levels | 4.8% (1) |

(n = 21) Median and Mode=Increased 1 range level

In their post-program surveys, over half (57%) indicated that the number of colleagues in their school with whom they regularly discussed their teaching of American history was between 1-3 colleagues, while an additional fourth (26%) reported that they discussed history with 4-6 teachers in their school. Only 5% reported that they had no colleagues at their school with whom they discussed American history

Regarding their discussing the teaching of American history with fellow educators in Vermont (outside of their school), about a third indicated that they regularly discussed history with 1-3 colleagues (31%), while an additional fourth (26%) said they discussed history with 4-6 colleagues. One fifth (19%) indicated that they regularly discussed history with 7-10 fellow Vermont educators. 14% still reported that they had no fellow Vermont educators with whom they had discussed the teaching of history.

What is the number of colleagues in your school/in Vermont with whom you regularly discuss your teaching of American history?

| # of Colleagues | In My School | In Vermont |
|-----------------|--------------|------------|
| 0 | 5% (2) | 14% (6) |
| 1-3 | 57% (24) | 31% (13) |
| 4-6 | 26% (11) | 26% (11) |
| 7-10 | 7% (3) | 19% (8) |
| 11-15 | 2.3% (1) | 5% (2) |
| 16-20 | 0 | 2.3% (1) |
| 21-25 | 2.3% (1) | 2.3% (1) |
| 26 or more | 0 | 0 |

(n = 42) "in my school" median and mode (1-3 colleagues);
 "in Vermont" median (4-6 colleagues); mode (1-3 colleagues)

The post-program survey also contained items that asked participants to assess the level of contact they had this year with Vermont educators to discuss American history, and the level of working collaboratively with history educators in other schools and institutions.

Almost all (93.3%) reported that they had increased the number of Vermont educators with whom they had discussed the content and teaching of American history, with over half (53.3%) indicating that the number had increased "a lot more."

Compared with last year, how would you rate the number of Vermont educators with whom you discuss (either face to face, or on-line) the content and teaching of American history for this year?

| "A lot less" % (n) | "Somewhat less" % (n) | "About the same" % (n) | "Somewhat more" % (n) | "A lot more" % (n) |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 6.7% (2) | 40% (12) | 53.3% (16) |

(n = 30) Mean=1.47 (on a scale of 0-2); SD=.629

Most (80%) reported that Turning Points had enabled them to work more collaboratively with history educators in other schools, museums, and cultural heritage institutions, with over a fourth (26.7%) indicating that it had increased "a lot."

To what extent has the Turning Points Program enabled you to work collaboratively with history educators in other schools, museums and/or cultural heritage institutions?

| "No increase" % (n) "0" | "A little" % (n) "1" | "A fair amount" % (n) "2" | "A lot" of increase % (n) "3" |
|--|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| 0% (0) | 20.0% (6) | 53.3% (16) | 26.7% (8) |

(n = 30) Mean=2.07 (on a scale of 0-3); SD=.691

The post-program survey included one open-ended response item that asked participants to describe features of the Turning Points' program they had found most useful. A number described how valuable it had been for them to establish professional relationships with educators in other schools and institutions.

"I found the discussion with other teachers to be most helpful. I think it is vital to learn from our peers. There are many ways to teach a particular topic and it has been nice to see the various ways that people teach in their classroom."

"I especially valued being able to work with and discuss with other teachers, as I am a department of one. Access to my professors throughout this program and the vast amount of resources provided for teachers was amazing, of outstanding quality, and really impressive."

"[The program was] Wonderful in its helping to network with other teachers, including [the two co-directors.] I haven't taught [American history] in a while, and the program helped me reconnect with why I love this profession."

"I loved the way Turning Points stressed connections with local historical societies. Those connections were invaluable."

Performance Measure 3b. *Of the completers (in years 2 & 3), 25% will indicate an increase in their contact with museum educators with whom they discuss their teaching of American history.*

On the post-program survey, participants were asked to rate their personal level of contact with museum educators and their awareness of resources at museums and historical societies.

Most (83.3%) participants indicated that compared with last year, their personal level of contact with museum educators and awareness of resources at museums and historical societies had increased, with over half (53.3%) indicating that this year's level of contact and awareness was "a lot more."

| <i>Performance Measure 3b</i> | <i>Target</i> | <i>Actual</i> |
|---|----------------------|----------------------|
| Participants who reported that their contact with museum educators and awareness of resources at museums and historical societies had increased | 60% (18/30) | 83.3% (25/30) |

Compared with last year, how would you rate your personal level of contact this year with museum educators and awareness of resources at museums and historical societies?

| “A lot less” % (n) | “Somewhat less” % (n) | “About the same” % (n) | “Somewhat more” % (n) | “A lot more” % (n) |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 16.7% (5) | 30% (9) | 53.3% (16) |

(n = 30) Mean= 1.37 (on a scale of 0-2); SD= .765

The post-program survey included several open-ended response items that asked participants to describe elements of the Turning Points’ program they had found most valuable. A number of participants described the value of connecting with museum educators and resources at local museum and historical societies, and the anticipated impact that would have on their classroom practice.

"I found the field study extremely valuable, as it made me more fully aware of the crisis that our historic sites are facing and has encouraged me to use more place-based learning in my own classroom."

[What I found useful were] the excellent speakers and presenters, the variety of museum and historical sites we visited, the exciting living history presentations, and the interesting techniques and strategies for capturing students' attention. These things increased my historical knowledge and gave me new ideas to use in my class."

"Turning Points did a great job of emphasizing local history and Vermont history for me. As someone who grew up in Vermont, I was shocked to learn about some of the really interesting nuggets, even locally, that I was not aware of. The cars of Plattsburgh, the trains of Saint Albans, the missiles in Alburgh and Swanton...all really neat things that can be used in the classroom."

"In the Civil War [scholar-led] seminar, I had never heard about the Confederate bank robbery in St. Albans (Vermont) - my knowledge of local history improved."

"The day-long [scholar-led] seminar on World War II gave me a lot of information, some new, about our involvement in this conflict. It also provided some specific material dealing with the role of Vermonters played, particularly in the Mountain Division, which will be of great interest to my students."

Interest in Continuing or Recommending Turning Points

As two other indicators assessing the value of Turning Points as a learning community for learning history, participants were asked whether or not they were planning to sign up for more Turning Points sessions next year, as well as whether they would recommend Turning Points to colleagues.

Roughly three-fourths (76%) indicated that they were planning to sign up for more Turning Points sessions next year, while 21% indicated that they might sign up. Only 8% indicated that they weren't signing up for sessions next year.

Almost all (97%) indicated that they would recommend Turning Points as a professional development program for colleagues teaching American history.

***Are you planning to sign up for more Turning Points sessions next year?
Would you recommend Turning Points as a professional development program
for colleagues teaching American history?***

| | Plan to sign up next year | Recommend to colleagues |
|--------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Yes | 76% (29) | 97% (37) |
| Maybe | 21% (8) | 3% (1) |
| No | 8% (3) | 0 |
| I don't know | 0 | 0 |

(n = 38)

CONCLUDING REMARKS

In summary, the Year 1 evaluation indicates that Turning Points in its first year of programming is affording professional development experiences that are viewed as valuable by participants, along a variety of dimensions. Participants report clear increases this past year in their reading of discussion of historical materials and attendance at lectures and discussions with American history scholars. While performance on a content knowledge test did not reveal widespread increases in content knowledge for teachers, almost all participants indicated that they have increased their breadth and depth of content knowledge of American history, and frequently described ways in which they had gained a deeper knowledge of the American Revolution era emphasized this past year, as well as greater understanding and appreciation of multiple perspectives and viewpoints in history.

Most participants reported that they had increased their understanding of innovative and effective approaches for the teaching of history, and that they were finding the teaching approaches presented through Turning Points useful to their classrooms. In particular, teachers indicated that they were now employing greater use of primary sources, and exposing students to more historical perspectives, ideas and arguments.

Participants also appreciated the ways in which Turning Points afforded a learning community for teachers in the teaching of American history. Almost all reported that they had increased the number of Vermont educators with whom they had discussed the content and teaching of American history, and were now in greater contact with museum educators and more aware of resources at museums and historical societies.

Acknowledgements

We wish to acknowledge the contributions of the following individuals for their insights, assistance, and support in this study: Turning Points colleagues, Elise Guyette, Scott McLaughlin, Megan Bridges, and Wendy Hallock, and Char Associates colleagues, Kate Flynn, Suenita Berube, Laura Clark, and Tim Smith. Special thanks also to research and history colleagues Bill Tally and Vic Henningsen.

Also, our deep appreciation to the participating teachers and educators in Vermont, who responded to our electronic surveys and shared their experiences and perspectives.

Cynthia A. Char, Ed.D.
Julie Friesner, M.P.A.
Jennifer Lazar, Ed.M.

For further information on the study, contact:

Dr. Cynthia Char
Char Associates
147 Connor Road
Montpelier, VT 05602
www.charassociates.com

Appendix A: Post-Program Survey Respondents' Attendance at Year 1 Program Sessions (2010-11)

| Program Component Type and Event | % (#) of respondents |
|---|-----------------------------|
| A. Scholar-led Seminar (w/ Museum Workshops) | |
| #1: Revolutionary War: Bryant, Lake Champlain Maritime Museum, Vermont Division for Historic Preservation | 29% (12) |
| #2: Civil War: Creighton, St. Albans Historical Museum, Rokeby Museum | 39% (16) |
| #3: Modern Era: Stoler, Sullivan Museum at Norwich University, Vermont Ski Museum | 34% (14) |
| B. Educator-Led Seminar | |
| #1 - Poetics of Place | 22% (9) |
| #2 - Ed Tech Teacher | 22% (9) |
| C. Study Groups | |
| Primary Source Study Group | 32% (13) |
| Book Study Group | 7% (3) |
| D. Field Studies | |
| National Field Study, Hudson-Champlain Valleys | 49% (20) |
| Local Museum Studies | |
| #1 - Lake Champlain Maritime Museum & Mount Independence | 12% (5) |
| #2 - Huntington and Jericho Historical Societies | 12% (5) |
| #3 - Hinesburg & Williston Historical Societies | 15% (6) |
| #4 - Sullivan Museum & Vermont Ski Museum | 7% (3) |
| #5 - Rokeby Museum & Charlotte Historical Society | 7% (3) |
| #6 - Saint Albans & Fairfield Historical Societies | 7% (3) |
| E. Leadership Opportunities | |
| Mini-grants | 7% (3) |
| Teacher Leadership | 2.4% (1) |
| Museum Internships | 5% (2) |

(n = 41)