

Oakland Unified School District Teaching American History Project

First Year Evaluation Report July 1, 2004 – June 30, 2005

Contacts:	Oakland Unified School District 314 East 10th Street Oakland, CA 94606	Center for Evaluation and Research, LLC 3200 Marlene Ave. Redding, CA 96002
Email	Stan.Pesick@ousd.k12.ca.us	research@snowcrest.net
Phone:	510.879.8497	530.224.7704
Fax:	510.879.0229	530.224.7706

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
Introduction	3
Program Implementation	3
Program Context	3
Program Goals	4
Evaluation Methods	4
Selected Instruments	6
Evaluation Reporting	7
No Child Left Behind Statute	7
Progress Toward Meeting Objectives	8
Objective One	8
Objective Two	12
Objective Three	13
Conclusions and Recommendations	16
Attachments	A1-C3

Executive Summary

The Oakland Unified School District Teaching American History Project has successfully completed its first year of implementation. The purpose of the grant is to improve both teacher content knowledge and instruction in American History. The project served 35 teachers in grades 5, 8, and 11 during this first year.

The project first year's emphasis was on the use of biography to demonstrate how individuals can illuminate and shape student understanding of American history. The project's professional development program consisted of regular full and half-day meetings during the 2004-2005 school year and a one-week summer institute which took place during the last week in June of 2005. These sessions provided teachers the opportunity to focus on history content, pedagogy, and resources. During these sessions the project provided 16 different lectures by visiting historians.

All project teachers collaborated on lesson planning and evaluation using the lesson study methodology. Lesson Study is a structured process in which a group of teachers identify an instruction problem, plan a lesson using primary resources, teach the lesson, evaluate and revise the lesson and share the results with other teachers. By collaboration and an emphasis on lesson revision, the insights of several teachers are brought to bear on the issues surrounding the effective teaching of history.

The project's evaluation consists of both process and impact components. The project's process evaluation component provided performance feedback to the project staff to assist in the examination of the effectiveness of the project's implementation. The summative evaluation component measured the impact of the program services specific to teacher competencies and student achievement. Initial summative evaluation results include: a) teachers stated they have gained both content knowledge and important instructional skills; and b) students in project teachers' classrooms demonstrated significantly higher ($p < .01$) historical thinking skills through higher standardized test writing scores than students in non-project history teachers' classrooms.

Findings

The project has successfully implemented all of its components. The project is perceived as beneficial by participating teachers.

Professional Development - Objective 1 is in the process of being achieved. Data from the American History Teacher Survey: Teaching the California Content Standards, teacher writing samples, classroom observations, and focus group interviews indicate that teachers are increasing their professional knowledge and qualifications related to working in teaching history.

Student Academic Achievement – Objectives 2 and 3 have been achieved. Eleventh grade students in participating teachers' classrooms scored significantly higher ($p < .01$) than students in classrooms of non-participating teachers on this year's CST history and English subtests and on local writing samples even when controlling for some key background factors.

Introduction

The Oakland Unified School District's Teaching American History Grant (TAHG) has completed its first year of implementation. The project targeted fifth, eighth, and eleventh grade teachers of American history serving in Oakland's ethnically and linguistically diverse elementary, middle, and high schools. The project provided the following activities to promote both teacher content knowledge and quality instruction in American History.

1. Ongoing half and full-day professional development days: This included nine part and full-day workshops consisting of lectures by visiting scholars, readings, and activities dealing with history content and pedagogy with a special focus on bibliography. The guiding question that focused this year's trainings was: How can studying the lives of individuals illuminate and shape our understanding of American history?
2. One-week summer institute: The summer institute continued the year one theme with five full-day workshops.
3. Project website: The project maintains a website that includes audio-tapes of historian lectures, instructional resources that support the translation of the lectures into classroom practice, participant resources, and links to online resources. The website is at: <http://www.teachingamericanhistory.us>.
4. Resources: The project provides teachers with professional and historical texts, and other teaching materials at each of the professional development sessions.
5. In-classroom support including lesson study: The project staff provided both one-to-one classroom supports when requested and facilitated lesson study groups among grade level peers. Using the lesson study process, teachers identified an instruction problem, planned a lesson using primary resources, taught the lesson, and then evaluated and revised the lesson.

Program Implementation

Program Context

The project collaborated with the University of California Berkeley, Department of History, the University of California History-Social Science Project, the Oakland Museum of California, the University of California Berkeley's Interactive University, and professional historians from several universities with the goal of engaging 5th, 8th, and 11th grade teachers in intensive, content rich, staff development.

Oakland Unified School District serves over 48,000 students in over 100 ethnically-diverse, urban elementary, middle, and high schools. Forty-eight teachers from 33 of these schools participated in the project during its first year. These participating teachers included 25 fifth grade teachers, 13 eighth grade teachers, and 10 eleventh grade teachers.

Program Goals

The project has the following five goals:

1. Measurable improvement in teacher knowledge and understanding of traditional American History
2. Measurable improvement in teacher knowledge and understanding of how to use historical inquiry and historical thinking to deepen student knowledge and understanding of traditional American History
3. Measurable improvement in teacher knowledge of how to integrate reading, writing, and history in lessons designed to improve student academic and historical literacy skills
4. Opportunities for teachers to develop and analyze lessons that translate increased content and pedagogical knowledge into effective classroom history instruction
5. Support the induction of new teachers as they take on the responsibility of teaching American history.

The project has three principal objectives which were developed to measure the project's project toward meeting these five goals. A detailed analysis of each of these objectives begins on page 8.

Evaluation Methods

The project's evaluation was a cooperative undertaking by project staff, district personnel, partner agencies, and an external evaluation group. The Oakland Unified School District contracted with the Center for Evaluation and Research LLC (C.E.R.) from the project's outset to facilitate the evaluation of the Teaching American History Project. C.E.R. coordinated local evaluation efforts to furnish process and summative information to the project staff with the goal of validating successful practices and providing for evidence-based decision-making.

A local evaluation plan was implemented and consisted of an outline of general evaluation activities that were to be accomplished each year. The plan served as a general guide that directed evaluation efforts. The project evaluation team developed the following logic model that provides a graphic representation between program activities and proposed outcomes:

Table 1: Oakland Unified School District Teaching American History Project – Logic Model

Target Populations	Inputs – Project Activities			Intermediate Outcomes	Summative Outcomes
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3		
Beginning Teachers	Varies according to grade level (see next three rows)			This standard requires new teachers to gain core academic content by attending at least four workshops connected to their subject matter per year.	Same as below
5 th grade history and social studies teachers (Target 25 teachers)	Biography: In-depth Examinations of Significant Men and Women in American History	The Road to the Constitution	Enhancing Content For Critical Reading of Historical Fiction	-Changes in teacher knowledge and behavior -Continuing education units completed by participating teachers	-Increased understanding of American History by students in classrooms of project teachers as measured by performance on the California Standards test in American history
8 th grade history and social studies teachers (Target 10-12 teachers) 11 th grade history and social studies teachers (Target 10-13 teachers)	Biography: In-depth Examinations of Significant Men and Women in American History	The Constitution: Interpretation and Conflict	Foreign Policy: The History of America's Changing Role in World Affairs	-Participation of teachers in leadership activities -Additional higher quality lesson studies	-Changes in 8 th and 11 th grade students' ability to write about selected topics in American history (students demonstrate ability to engage in historical thinking)
5 th , 8 th , and 11 th Grade Teachers – All participating teachers	-School year professional development program (ongoing) -“Research Lessons” support for teachers working collaboratively -Instructional resources (general) - The Oakland Museum of California instructional resources - The Interactive University instructional resources - University of California History-Social Studies Project (UCCHSSP) summer literacy institutes in 2005 and 2006 (twenty-five teachers each summer)			-Increased fidelity to the scope and sequence of state-mandated course of study (i.e.: 11 th grade teachers cover the entire 20 th century) -Increased attention paid by teachers to the district's historical thinking strands (chronology, evidence, diversity, interpretation, and historical significance)	

Selected Instruments

The project evaluation utilized a variety of instruments to gather information on program processes and impacts. Data collection methods included surveys, workshop evaluation forms, telephone questionnaires, observation protocols, one-to-one interviews, and focus groups. Evaluators, project staff, and teachers collected the data.

The following is a brief description of the instruments used by the project:

- American History Teacher Survey: Teaching the California Content Standards: A locally developed instrument comprised of several items designed to measure teacher knowledge, beliefs, and behaviors related to history instruction was developed by local evaluators. The complete two-part survey was administered in November of 2004 with a follow-up administration of some items in July of 2005.
- Teacher interviews and classroom observations: The project evaluators performed selected focus group and individual teacher interviews to gather additional information on project activities from a teacher perspective. The focus groups took place during the Summer Institute, were analyzed by the evaluator, and the findings were shared with project staff. An evaluation consultant also observed three lesson study groups. The information garnered from the interviews and observations was analyzed and used to develop three small case studies.
- Workshop evaluation form: The evaluators provided analysis of teacher and parent workshops throughout the implementation of the project. The information shared by these reports was discussed with staff.
- Student writing samples from OUSD American History Assessment, Spring Semester, 2005: Teachers were asked to provide one-class student writing from this assessment. The samples were of student writing to a history prompt that required students to read and consider a variety of primary source documents as they developed their response to the assessment question. These student writings were read by at least two project staff, teachers, or evaluators. The project also collected class sets of student writing to this prompt from OUSD 11th grade American history that were not history grant project participants. These papers were by read and scored the evaluator and the evaluation staff.
- Student standardized tests: California Standards English and History Subtests (CST) were used to measure impact of the project on eleventh-grade student achievement. Students in eighth and fifth grade classrooms will be measured next year when availability of individual item analysis

becomes available. Evaluation activities included sampling of project and non-project students and subsequent between groups comparisons using appropriate statistical analysis.

Evaluation Reporting

The project stakeholders met regularly with evaluators to plan and discuss evaluation findings. The evaluators also maintained a comprehensive web presence with regular updates. The website includes the evaluation plan, reports, and surveys, and can be accessed at:

<http://californiaschools.net/americanhistory/index.html>

No Child Left Behind Statute

The evaluation took seriously the changes in the federal legislation particularly in regards to the utilization of more rigorous “scientifically based research” methods. In response to this the project adopted a quasi-experimental approach to analyze student academic and technology proficiency. This approach met the definition of scientifically based research, as defined in Title IX of the reauthorized Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Specifically, the evaluation met all of the following six criteria:

1. Employs systematic, empirical methods that draw on observation and experiment;
2. Involves rigorous data analyses that are adequate to test the stated questions and provide a justification for the general conclusions drawn;
3. Relies on measurements that are reliable and valid;
4. Utilizes a quasi-experimental design with appropriate controls; and
5. Activities are sufficiently detailed to be replicated.

Progress Toward Meeting Objectives

The following is the progress made by the project during the first year in meeting the revised objectives as stated in the annual performance report.

Objective 1. 90% of the teachers will demonstrate increases in professional knowledge and qualifications related to working in teaching history and social science as demonstrated by teacher changes in the American History Teacher Survey: Teaching the California Content Standards.

This objective is being achieved as determined by preliminary results garnered from the American History Teacher Survey: Teaching the California Content Standards, teacher writing samples, classroom observations, and focus group interviews.

American History Teacher Survey: Teaching the California Content Standards:

In November of 2004, the evaluators and staff developed a survey that was administered during the winter of 2004 and again (section 1 only) in July of 2005. The goal of the survey was to provide important information to be used in the planning and evaluation of the project. The survey consisted of three sections. The first section contained general questions about teaching history/social studies. The second section of the survey was designed to elicit information about teaching and student learning as it relates to specific state content standards. The third section asked teachers to list any major history/social studies units being taught that are not part of the standards for their grade level.

Thirty-two of 47 teachers (68%) from fourteen elementary, six middle, and six high schools (26 schools total) completed a baseline survey from November 2004 through January 2005. Some items from section 1 were given in a follow-up survey administered that was also administered to 32 teachers in July of 2005. A second administration of all of the second sections of the survey is planned for May of 2005. Of the 32 teachers taking the baseline survey, 53.1% currently taught grade five, 25.0% currently teach grade eight, and 21.9% currently teach grade eleven. The following are two samples of the baseline results (refer to the attached full report for a breakdown of individual grade levels):

Sample 1: American History Teacher Survey: Teaching the California Content Standards Items on Knowledge and Ability – Baseline Administration - November 2005

Respondents Rated Their Knowledge and Ability N=32

- 1) Standards – Nineteen of 32 respondents (59.4%) rated their knowledge as either good or expert;
- 2) Content – Twenty-two of 32 teachers (68.8%) rated their knowledge as good or expert;
- 3) Primary Sources – Twelve of 32 respondents (37.5%) rated their knowledge as adequate; and
- 4) Curriculum – Twenty of 32 (62.5%) rated their knowledge as either adequate or good.

Sample 2: American History Teacher Survey: Teaching the California Content Standards, Items on Knowledge and Ability – Baseline Administration - November 2005

Respondents Rated Their "Ability To" In Eight History/Social Studies Categories N=32

- 1) Promote chronological/spatial thinking – Over 85% rated their ability as either adequate or good;
- 2) Engage in the examination of evidence – Seventeen of 32 (53.1%) rated their ability as good;
- 3) Provide diverse perspectives – Slightly over half (51.6%) rated their ability as good;
- 4) Promote student interpretation – Half of all respondents (50.0%) rated their ability as good;
- 5) Assist in determining significance – Twenty of 32 (62.6%) rated their ability as either good (56.3%) or expert (6.3%);
- 6) Use biographies – Results were mixed; 31.3% rated their ability as very limited or limited, 40.6% as adequate, and 28.1% as good;
- 7) Use technology – Results were mixed; 35.5% rated their ability as very limited or limited, 29.0% as adequate, and 35.5% as good or expert; and
- 8) Use multiple assessments - Overall, 75.1% of all respondents rated their ability as either adequate (31.3%) or good (43.8%).

The two samples are representative of the baseline results. Teachers self-reported a mixed response in terms of their knowledge and ability related to teaching American history. The results were used by the project staff for program planning purposes. The baseline results will be compared to follow-up results in the spring of 2006.

Teacher Writing Samples: Teachers were asked to do reflective writing throughout the year. The project evaluators did a content analysis of this writing. The results showed a consensus that the project was beneficial. The following is a sample of teacher responses that are reflective of the general consensus that the project is having a beneficial impact on teacher content knowledge and instructional practice.

Sample 3: Teacher Reflective Writing - 2004-2005

Teacher Writing Samples – 45 Teachers

- *I can't enumerate all the many ways I have grown as a person and a teacher this year. This grant is a haven for me to think and grow.*
- *One of the biggest "aha's" I had this week was getting a better sense of where 5^h graders are developmentally in thinking about history.*
- *Thank you for the writing scaffold. I feel that writing is my weakest area as a teacher. This makes it a clear sequential process.*
- *I will continue to use biography in the class. One thing that I need to do is clarify for myself and my students how the person's life tells us about a particular time in history.*
- *In powerful ways; the different lives we examined were central to understanding the issues, conflicts, emphases of the historical periods in which they lived.*
- *Teaching biography within the context of the historical period in which the person lives is essential. Also, making sure facts are correct and work on helping students develop a more critical analysis of the person writing. Writing by just stating the facts doesn't teach. Students must use analytical thinking and make inferences; draw conclusions compare and contrast, develop and present their own point of view.*
- *Biography when used effectively can help students develop their knowledge of historical periods and of the values, laws, etc. of that time period.*
- *The speakers were very interesting and informative. They opened up different avenues of thought and how we process information we are given, so that we may teach history accurately and without bias.*
- *I especially like his talk about biography being a wonderful way of teaching history, using Douglas. Take the life of an historical figure, put it in context, and make comparisons.*

Classroom Observations of Teachers: The project did not use a formal classroom observation measure to determine changes in teachers' instructional approaches, but rather used informal observations by staff and peers to share with teachers how lessons could be improved to increase student understanding. All of the project teachers were observed by staff or their peers through the lesson study process.

The project did three case studies of teachers involved in the lesson study process. The evidence used to develop the case studies included classroom observations, individual interviews, and written documents. The case studies (attached) show that teachers are indeed changing their instructional practice as a result of lesson study's collaborative planning, classroom observation, and feedback processes.

Focus Groups: Complementing the classroom observations were focus groups held also during the summer institute where teachers consistently stated their appreciation of the project and attributed to the project changes they have made in their instructional programs. The following is a sample of findings from the

focus group held in July of 2005 (quotations are actual teacher remarks used here as representative examples of teacher remarks):

Sample 4: Focus Group Findings - July 2005

Focus Group Findings – 45 Teachers

- Consensus of the value of the project
- Great appreciation for the project staff
- There was a consensus that there was improvement in their students' writing and some linked that improvement directly to the biography and the student's interest in the individual's life. Teachers appreciated the emphasis on biography and many of them used biography this past year to give a more personal look into time periods and transitions with individuals through different periods.
- Website was highly appreciated. "It is one of the best websites that I've visited", and "The full text lectures, you know, are just great!"
- There was an appreciation for the many materials, books, primary sources, and Internet sites and plan on implementing what they have gathered from the project in their classes.
- Teachers liked the format of the meetings: 50% lecture by historians and 50% lesson study. Teachers agreed that these topics were right in line with what they are to teach and had no real difficulties tying the information they've received into the mandatory standards they are to teach.
- Most teachers believed that this project helped their students' writing and overall understanding and comprehension. "I was thrilled when I saw Shawn's work... Because he had written about 5 lines on Christopher Columbus at the beginning of the year and his writing was now, so complete and so accurate and so well rounded. I definitely saw improvement... I think it was valuable to have them write at the beginning of the year and now... They now can go beyond the facts and what was going on, to what this person's contribution was. What makes them worth while to study? I'm really very pleased with the progress."
- Teachers would have liked to have more time with the speakers afterwards to ask questions and felt that the time with them was rushed and not adequate. They also wanted to know the background of the speakers a little more and the "school of thought" they come from.
- Teachers said they needed more time to apply and implement all the information and materials.
- The lesson study process was appreciated, especially the collaboration with colleagues.
- An improvement would be lectures/field trips for them with speakers at actual historical sites in the Bay Area, so that they can reference it and inspire students to go to the sites.
- Teachers in general thought the writing or analyzing history was too much to expect for 5th graders. They did like the idea of teaching their students how to write a history essay. They thought it would be good to explain to their students about rubrics and in general the essay writing process.

- It seemed that history or social studies are not as emphasized as it should be, or as much as the teachers wanted. In one case, as teacher confessed that they rarely, if ever teach Social Studies, due to the pressures from the district and the principal. " Social Studies was totally the step child. I mean, we had no time built into the day. We had to make it. It was really hard to make time for it. To be perfectly honest with you, but you know, I would always put it on my schedule, but then somehow it never happens."
- Teachers wished they would show how to implement it into their curriculum and lesson plans so that they would not have to do all the extra work. For example, "I would really like to receive a lesson plan for elementary style and take it back to the class." " Maybe websites", and "Maybe even references to the textbooks, so that they know what we need to cover..." and "Even, ideas for lesson plans, even a list of things that we might do for a lesson with that material... some helps of how to bring it into our classroom and transition would be a great help."

In aggregate, the data from the American History Teacher Survey: Teaching the California Content Standards, teacher writing samples, classroom observations, and focus group interviews provide evidence that teachers are improving their content knowledge and are adopting quality instructional practices.

Objective 2. Annually, project students who participated in a project classroom in previous years will demonstrate statistically significantly ($p < .05$) higher scores in history and social science than non-participating school-age students as measured by the California Achievement Test (CST).

This objective has been achieved. Using a test of significance, eleventh grade students in both project teacher classrooms scored significantly higher ($p < .01$) than students in classrooms of non-participating teachers even when taking into account background factors including free/reduce lunch status, English language status, and scores on the previous year's CST history subtest.

Table 2: 2005 11th Grade Group CST History Subtest Scale Score Results – Comparison Non-Project vs. Project Students

CST History Scale Scores	Student Status	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
	Non-Project Students	1224	302.70	52.085	1.489
	Project Students	330	315.63	59.676	3.285

Students in project teachers' classrooms as a group scored approximately 13 scale score points higher than students of non-participating teachers.

Given the project's emphasis on writing and critical thinking, the project staff was interested in the difference between groups in regards to the CST English

subtest scores. Using a test of significance, eleventh grade students in both project teacher classrooms scored significantly higher ($p < .01$) than students in classrooms of non-participating teachers even when taking into account background factors including free/reduce lunch status and scores on the previous year's CST English subtest.

Table 3: 2005 11th Grade Group CST English Subtest Scale Score Results – Comparison Non-Project vs. Project Students

CST English Scale Scores	Student Status	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
	Non-Project Students	1297	295.27	62.399	1.733
	Project Students	342	309.51	54.497	2.947

In summary, students in participating teacher classrooms scored as a group significantly higher on both the CST history and English subtests that were administered at the end of the project's first year of implementation. It should be noted that the differences between groups may be the result of selection bias – that is, those teachers who selected to participate in the project may have been teachers who used more effective instructional approaches prior to their participation in the project.

Objective 3 - Annually, project students in 8th and 11th grade students who participated in a project classroom will demonstrate statistically significantly ($p < .05$) higher scores on district writing assessments than non-participating students.

This objective was achieved. The project assisted district staff in developing a newer version of a writing rubric to score these writing samples. The scoring criteria contained in the rubric consists of the following five categories scored using a Likert scale from 1 (low) to 4 (high):

1. Thesis: a) addresses the prompt, b) provides a map of the argument to be made
2. Knowledge: a) use chronological/spatial thinking, b) connect knowledge to argument, c) define and clarify essential terms
3. Use of Documents: a) understand the meaning and perspective of author, b) show relationship to argument
4. Analysis: a) make plausible inferences, b) draw rational conclusions, c) identify and prioritize significance, d) address multiple perspectives
5. Organization and clarity: a) thesis, topic sentences, evidence, analysis, and conclusion

The district collected a sample of writing assessment results from its students in the winter and spring of 2005. The winter student writing samples were used by the district and project staff as a "trial run" with results shared with project teachers to assist them in making improvements in their instructional programs. In June 2005 the district and project staff collected a second writing sample from most of the district's eleventh grade students. Evaluators scored the second writing sample by eleventh grade students.

The following analysis is of a group of 160 eleventh grade student papers from the classes of six project teachers and a group of 156 eleventh grade student papers from the classes of seven non-project history teachers. The project and non-project teachers were selected on the basis of their willingness to provide at least one entire class set of papers. The evaluators did not know which papers belonged to which group - project and non-project teachers - until after they were scored. No additional demographic information was provided the evaluators to ensure that the two groups were equivalent.

The following table shows the distribution of scores on the likert scale for both the control and comparison groups.

Table 4: 2005 11th Grade Students – Spring 2005 Project and Non-Project Writing Samples – Score Distributions

Scores on Papers		Students		Total
		Non-Project	Project	
1.00 Below Basic	Number of Students	42	20	62
	% within Group Control/Treatment	26.9%	12.5%	19.6%
2.00 Basic	Number of Students	94	95	189
	% within Group Control/Treatment	60.3%	59.4%	59.8%
3.00 Proficient	Number of Students	18	33	51
	% within Group Control/Treatment	11.5%	20.6%	16.1%
4.00 Above Proficient	Number of Students	2	12	14
	% within Group Control/Treatment	1.3%	7.5%	4.4%
Total	Number of Students	156	160	316
	% within Group Control/Treatment	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 5 demonstrates that student in classrooms of project teachers significantly outperformed students in non-project teacher classrooms ($p < .01$) as determined by the use of a non-parametric test.

Table 5: 2005 11th Grade Students – Spring 2005 Project and Non-Project Writing Samples – Statistics

Student Status	N	Median	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
			Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Non-Project	156	2.00	1.7690	1.9746	1.00	4.00
Project	160	2.00	2.1122	2.3503	1.00	4.00
Total	316	2.00	1.9729	2.1346	1.00	4.00

In summary, students in participating teacher classrooms scored as a group significantly higher on the district writing sample that was administered at the end of the project's first year of implementation. Again, it should be emphasized that the differences between groups may be the result of selection bias – that is, those teachers who selected to participate in the project may have been teachers who used more effective instructional approaches prior to their participation in the project.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The project has successfully implemented all of its components and is perceived as very beneficial by participating teachers. Of the 47 American history teachers who participated during the 2004-2005 school year, 38 have continued during the 2005-2006 school year to teach American history in the school district. Also, all of those 38 teachers are continuing their participation with the project during the 2005-2006 school year. Of the nine 2004-2005 teachers no longer participating in the project, five left the district, one retired, and three have new teaching assignments that do not include American history. In addition to the 38 teachers who will continue their participation, another 18 applied to the project and will participate during the 2005-2006 school year. It is important to note, that although 2004-2005 teachers were asked to commit to the project for three years, the project staff has no way of enforcing that commitment. The continued participation of teachers in the project is evidence that the project is meeting specific instructional and professional needs. Project staff considers this retention rate, which enables it to engage with teachers in long-term, ongoing professional development, as a key indicator of its potential to positively impact the teaching and learning of American history within the OUSD.

The project achieved two of its three objectives by the end of the first year. Objective 1 is in the process of being achieved. Data from the American History Teacher Survey: Teaching the California Content Standards, teacher writing samples, classroom observations, and focus group interviews indicate that teachers are increasing their professional knowledge and qualifications related to working in teaching history.

Objectives 2 and 3 have been achieved. Eleventh grade students in participating teacher classrooms scored significantly higher ($p < .01$) than students in classrooms of non-participating teachers on this year's CST history and English subtests and on local writing samples even when controlling for some key background factors.

Recommendations and Next Steps

1. Project teachers as a group showed significantly higher student writing scores than non-project teachers. An individual teacher-by-teacher analysis of project teachers shows an extremely large difference in student scores among certain project teachers even after controlling for English language and free/reduced lunch status. In other words, students in certain teachers' classroom score much higher than students in other project teachers' classrooms. It is recommended that project staff investigate what these higher performing students are doing to prepare themselves for these writing examinations. The project may want to have the teachers with higher performing students provide trainings for other teachers on what they do to prepare their students. Lastly, it is recommended

that the staff provide additional training to their teachers on approaches they can use to prepare their students to analyze source documentation and prepare written arguments based on that analysis.

2. What is the relationship between CST history and English results and student writing scores? To answer this question, the project staff will need to gather student writing samples with some type of unique identifier to allow for a correlation analysis. The project may also want to gather more than one writing sample to determine the strength of the relationship and the extent to which student writing improves during the year. The project staff may even want to share the initial writing results and scoring process and discuss with teachers strategies for improving student writing.

3. It is recommended that during the second year of implementation that the project staff takes the opportunity to collect CST history results by each test item for eighth grade students. Currently the CST for eighth grader measures a variety of history concepts some of which are not related to the scope of the Teaching American History Grant. The ability to collect item level information will allow the project evaluation to determine, to some degree, the project's impact on eighth grade students.