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Executive Summary

The following evaluation report represents the efforts of the SRM Evaluation Group in evaluating the summer professional development institute on *Europe, Eurasia, and the World* that the Center for European and Eurasian Studies (CEES) offered in Summer 2010. Beginning in March 2010, evaluators worked with CEES and the UCLA Center X History-Geography Project staff to design and carry out this evaluation.

This report elaborates on the program’s description and its goals; the evaluation questions, design, methods, and findings; and points for further consideration. This executive summary briefly describes the program’s goals, methods used in the evaluation, and main learnings that resulted from the evaluation. Learnings are then summarized by specific evaluation questions and reference pages of the report where more in-depth discussions can be found.

About the Program and Its Goals

The UCLA Center for European and Eurasian Studies was established in 1993 to foster the development of innovative teaching and research on Europe and Eurasia. This year, CEES and the UCLA Center X History-Geography Project partnered to jointly offer a summer professional development (PD) program to middle school world history teachers in the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD). The PD covered Europe, Eurasia, and the World, and emphasized curriculum development and ongoing teacher training. The PD was administered with the intent of achieving several long- and short-term goals primarily relating to increasing content knowledge, enhancing pedagogical strategies, and developing and maintaining contacts with their peers and the UCLA community. *(See pgs. 1 to 2)*

Evaluation Design and Methods

To conduct this evaluation, the SRM Evaluation Group drew on evaluation approaches that emphasize evaluation use and stakeholder participation. The evaluation was conducted using a pre-post, descriptive (non-control) design. Twenty-one social studies teachers participated in the evaluation. Respondents answered both closed- and open-ended questions on the pre- and post-surveys that covered a range of topics designed to directly address the evaluation questions that appear below. *(See pgs. 3 to 4)*

Evaluation Questions & Findings

The SRM Evaluation group was contracted by UCLA CEES to conduct an evaluation of the CEES 2010 Summer Institute. Overall, the 2010 cohort of teacher participants reported having positive experiences with the professional development institute that UCLA CEES and Center X offered. Generally, participants expected to gain relevant content knowledge and to acquire new resources and skills for teaching their respective content areas. Pre- and post-survey data suggest that most of teachers’ expectations were met, particularly around the purpose of the program and
the way in which it was organized. However, survey data and teachers’ open-ended responses suggest that the program may benefit from a few adjustments the next time it is offered. Key findings, organized by evaluation question, appear below. (See pgs. 2 and 4 to 17)

1. What motivated participants to attend the institute? (See pgs. 4 to 5)
   - Teachers indicated that the top two motivating factors for attending included the desire to increase their content knowledge and the chance to reinvigorate their curriculum/lesson plans.
   - The third motivating factor was equally attributed to the opportunity to further develop their pedagogical skills, to obtain quality resources/materials, and to explore ways in which they can incorporate primary sources into their teaching.
   - Teachers also indicated that they chose to participate in the PD because of their “love of history” and it gave them the chance to be “intellectually stimulated.”

2. To what extent did participants feel sufficiently informed about the institute’s format and content? (See pgs. 5 to 6)
   - Participants generally felt that the program’s objectives were clear before attending the institute.
   - Teachers also reported satisfaction with clarity of details that they received in advance of the institute.

3. What were participants’ expectations of the institute? (See pgs. 6 to 9)
   - When asked about their general expectations of the program, this year’s data suggest that program delivery seemed to be consistent with most participants’ expectations.
   - Many teachers expected that they would gain new lesson plan ideas and have opportunities to learn new pedagogical skills.
   - Moreover, when asked about the extent to which participants expected the institute to address content that would be relevant to their teaching, teachers’ responses suggested that this was quite an important feature of the program.

4. To what extent were participants satisfied with each of the institute’s components? (See pgs. 10 to 11)
   - The data suggest that most teachers were satisfied with the program activities in which they engaged.
   - Teachers indicated greatest satisfaction with materials/resources that they received and the “Grade-Alike” groups.
   - While teachers greatly enjoyed activities from which they could easily extract skills and tools to apply in their classes, they also would have liked more time to conduct independent research, to plan their lessons, and to engage in conversations with their colleagues about the material and content presented.
5. What are some barriers that participants perceive or anticipate will hinder them from implementing their lesson plan? (See pgs. 11 to 13)
   - Teachers perceived the tools and materials that they acquired during the institute as relevant, useful, and possible to implement.
   - Nonetheless, there remain other contextual, and often school-site specific, factors that will pose challenges for their work, including time and resource/material limitations and differential skills sets among students.
   - Other possible barriers were also mentioned and are described in the body of the report.

6. What suggestions do participants have for increasing attendance for future institutes? (See pgs. 13 to 14)
   - The majority of participants learned of the institute through e-mail announcements and their local districts.
   - Alternative advertising methods suggested by teachers to improve the institute’s visibility included: providing mailings directly to schools, principals, and teachers along with maintaining electronic advertising methods such as e-mail listservs and the institute website.

7. To what extent do participants think the program is reaching its short- and long-term goals? (See pgs. 14 to 16)
   - Teachers shared a common expectation with program staff that they would reach these short- and long-term goals by participating in the institute.
   - Of note was the fact that teachers did not give any of these goals less than 4 points on the 5-point agreement scale.

8. Were there other themes that arose through the evaluation? If so, what were they? (See pgs. 16 to 17)
   - Teachers’ shared concerns about pedagogy and the content covered in the PD.
   - Specifically, they would have liked more experience or lectures about hands-on, project based learning and adapting lessons to meet needs of special populations and/or unmotivated students.
   - Regarding the content, teachers expressed wanting to learn more about the different interactions between the civilizations discussed (e.g., Asian and European).
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Introduction

The UCLA Center for European and Eurasian Studies (CEES) was established in 1993 to foster the development of innovative teaching and research on Europe and Eurasia. One of the ways in which CEES accomplishes this task is by supporting and providing teachers at the K-12 and post-secondary levels with year-round professional development (PD) training in the form of workshops, seminars, and programs. In the past, CEES has offered PD sessions that covered topics not limited to: Food in World History and Cultures (Summer 2009); Monks, Merchants, and Millworkers (Summer 2008); and Middle Eastern-European Intersection (Summer 2007).1

This year, CEES and the UCLA Center X History-Geography have partnered to jointly offer a summer PD on Europe, Eurasia, and the World.2 This PD program was offered to middle school world history teachers in the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) and emphasized curriculum development and ongoing teacher training.

The program unfolded over the course of five days and consisted of lectures, sessions on teaching strategies, model lessons, a field trip to the Getty Villa, time for participants to engage in lesson planning and conduct independent research, and networking and lesson sharing opportunities.

By the end of the program, teachers were expected to produce a lesson plan that:

- Incorporates a variety of materials presented during the PD;
- Encourages critical thinking about history; and
- Will help students continue to develop their writing skills.

In order to participate in the program, teachers completed an application, which was available online and in paper format. They were then invited to be a part of the program on a first-come, first-served basis. Teachers who did not meet the application deadline were waitlisted and admitted as space allowed.

Program Goals

By participating in the Institute, it is expected that teachers and their teaching will be influenced in several manners. In the short-term, program staff anticipate that teachers will:

- Learn about a new content area;
- Acquire new pedagogical tools;
- Begin to develop new teaching strategies;
- Create contacts with other teachers in their discipline;
- Create contacts with UCLA program staff; and

---

1 See UCLA Center for European and Eurasian Studies’ website (http://www.international.ucla.edu/euro/teachers/).
2 The Institute is funded by the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC; http://www.cpec.ca.gov/) and the UCLA CEES (http://www.international.ucla.edu/euro/teachers/).
• Maintain ongoing relationships with UCLA programs and program staff.

In the long-term, program staff expect that the Institute will enable teachers to:

• Introduce new content to all students;
• Use new strategies to foster critical thinking and better writing in their classrooms;
• Become a part of a larger learning community; and
• Be re-inspired, re-invigorated, and engaged and excited about teaching.

These program activities and goals have been summarized in a logic model that appears in Appendix 1.

About the Evaluation

UCLA CEES contacted the SRM Evaluation Group in March 2010 to commission an evaluation of its summer PD program. During the initial meeting with Jim Robbins (Administrative Director, UCLA CEES) and Emma Hipolito and Mary Miller (Co-Directors, UCLA Center X History-Geography Project), they had indicated that the primary purpose of the evaluation was to satisfy external reporting and funding requirements. They also noted that findings from the evaluation would be used in future grant applications to secure continued funding.

Additional meetings between the SRM Evaluation group and program staff afforded the evaluation team opportunities to determine and help program staff refine the questions that the evaluation would address. These questions appear below.

Evaluation Questions

1. What motivated participants to attend the institute?
2. To what extent did participants feel sufficiently informed about the institute’s format and content?
3. What were participants’ expectations of the institute?
4. To what extent were participants satisfied with each of the institute’s components?
5. What are some barriers that participants perceive or anticipate will hinder them from implementing their lesson plan?
6. What suggestions do participants have for increasing attendance for future institutes?
7. To what extent do participants think the program is reaching its short- and long-term goals?
8. Were there other themes that arose through the evaluation? If so, what were they?

Evaluation Approach

To conduct this evaluation, the SRM Evaluation Group drew on principles that are foundational to approaches that emphasize evaluation use and stakeholder participation; namely, utilization-
focused evaluation\textsuperscript{3} and practical participatory evaluation\textsuperscript{4}. This hybrid framework was selected after carefully considering the program’s context, which included the overarching purpose of the evaluation and intended use of findings. It is also important to note that these approaches were elected because they allowed the evaluation team to optimally respond to contextual issues that surfaced throughout the evaluation process, including the need to modify the data collection plan, without jeopardizing the rigor of the evaluation design or the credibility of findings.

Methods

Participants

Twenty-one social studies teachers (female: $n = 10$; male: $n = 11$) participated in the CEES 2010 Europe, Eurasia, and the World Summer Professional Development Institute. Participants primarily taught sixth ($n = 5$) and seventh ($n = 11$) grades and had an average class size of about 28 students. Five teachers indicated that they also taught Kindergarten through fifth or tenth through twelfth grades. Additionally, teachers reported having an average of 9.71 years of teaching experience ($SD = 6.33$) and had been teaching at their current school for about 6.81 years ($SD = 5.34$). Moreover, teachers from all age groups were represented. Most teachers (33%) indicated that they were 30-39 years old; 57% of teachers were equally distributed across the following age categories: less than 30, 40-49, and 50-59 years; and about 10% of teachers indicated that they were more than 60 years old. Lastly, it should be noted that of the 21 teachers who completed the pre-survey, three teachers indicated that they had previously attended a summer PD program offered by UCLA CEES and Center X.

Design

In light of the evaluation purpose and questions, along with other limiting factors, including the evaluation budget, the SRM Evaluation Group conducted this evaluation study using a pre-post, descriptive (non-control) design.

Instruments & Procedures

To address the evaluation questions that appear above, the SRM Evaluation Group developed and administered pre- and post-surveys to program participants. The pre-survey (see Appendix 2) contained both closed- and open-ended questions that asked about factors that led to participants’ involvement in the program; the extent to which they felt informed about the program prior to attending; their expectations of the program; the program’s visibility and ways in which it may be improved; and other comments that they would like to share with program staff. This survey was administered to teachers on Day 1 of the program before the institute officially began.


The post-survey (see Appendix 3) mirrored the pre-survey with respect to format and content. However, additional items were included to address the extent to which participants’ expectations of the program were met; to determine their level of satisfaction with various program activities; to gauge participants’ intent to use program materials and resources; as well as to identify what teachers perceive as possible barriers for lesson implementation. Teachers were asked to complete this survey after they shared their lesson plans with their colleagues, which was the last scheduled program activity.

Findings

This section contains findings from the analyzed data that were collected using the pre- and post-surveys that program participants completed. It is organized according to evaluation question.

Q1. What motivated participants to attend the institute?

To determine what motivated participants to participate in the institute, they were asked to identify the top three motivating factors that led to their involvement. Teachers’ responses on this closed-ended question indicated that the top two motivating factors included the desire to increase their content knowledge and the chance to reinvigorate their curriculum/lesson plans. The third motivating factor was equally attributed to the opportunity to further develop their pedagogical skills, to obtain quality resources/materials, and to explore ways in which they can incorporate primary sources into their teaching (see Figure 1, below).

Figure 1.
In order to ensure representativeness of possible responses, teachers were also asked in an open-ended question to share what made the program attractive to them. Responses teachers provided revealed a key theme not captured by the previous question. Namely, of the teachers who indicated that they wanted to gain more content knowledge, 19% are interested in doing so because they will be teaching a grade level and material that they have not taught before. Several teachers also shared that this year’s institute addressed topics that were interesting to them. Moreover, teachers indicated that they chose to participate in the PD because of their “love of history” and it gave them the chance to be “intellectually stimulated.” The fact that the program was free contributed to the perception that the program fit their needs and interests.

Q2. To what extent did participants feel sufficiently informed about institute format and content?

As part of the evaluation effort, program staff were interested in determining the clarity and accuracy of the program materials used to inform participants of the institute’s format and content. Specifically, they wanted to know the extent to which participants felt these program materials accurately reflected the actual delivery of the program. To address this question, participants were asked to indicate their level of agreement (1 = Strongly Disagree; 5 = Strongly Agree) concerning the clarity of the institute’s objectives and the information that they received before participating in the program on the pre- and post-surveys.

According to Figure 2 (below), the data suggest that participants felt that the program’s objectives were quite clear before attending the institute. This was reflected with a mean rating value of 3.9. However, on the post-survey, teachers provided a slightly lower agreement rating, which averaged about 3.63 points on the 5-point Likert scale that was used.

A similar pattern was found with respect to the clarity of details that participants received in advance of the institute. Specifically, on average, teachers rated the clarity of program details .32 points higher before attending the institute.
Taken together, these data suggest that there may be a slight misalignment between participants’ expectations of the program and their actual experience of it. However, there is not enough information to conclude whether this misalignment was significant. To determine the cause of this potential mismatch, the ways in which information is communicated about the program in advance and program delivery must be carefully examined. While it is no longer feasible to examine program delivery for this year’s institute, program staff might consider seeking an implementation evaluation the next time it is offered.

**Figure 2.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clarity of Advanced Information Provided about the Institute by Pre-Post Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The EE&amp;W Summer Institute's objectives were clear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The information I received in advance about the details of the EE&amp;W Summer Institute was clear.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q3. What were participants’ expectations of the institute?**

One of the evaluation’s purposes was to identify the program’s strengths and areas for improvement to satisfy external reporting requirements. Therefore, participants’ attitudes and perceptions towards various program activities and components were solicited on the pre- and post-survey using both open- and closed-ended items. Questions were framed in terms of participants’ expectations on the pre-survey and the extent to which those expectations were met on the post-survey.

When asked about their general expectations of the program, for example, teachers provided a variety of responses. Many teachers, about 43%, expected that they would gain new lesson plan ideas. About the same amount of participants shared that they expected to have opportunities to learn new pedagogical skills that would enable them to present material in a manner that would “make the subject come alive for students.” One teacher, in particular, shared that s/he expected...
a “well-planned intellectual week of learning” while another (capturing the sentiments expressed by several teachers) indicated:

I expect this PD will at least provide content-based enhancing experience. I hope it will also provide an experience contextualized within the parameters of teaching in a pacing orientated, standard based driven…atmosphere.

Moreover, when asked about the extent to which participants expected the institute to address content that would be relevant to their teaching, teachers’ responses suggested that this was quite an important feature of the program. Specifically, they rated this feature about 4.38 points on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree; 5 = Strongly Agree) on the pre-survey. On the post-survey, this value increased by .3 points to 4.68 points on the same 5-point Likert scale. This observation suggested that the institute met teachers’ expectations in terms of its relevance to their daily work (see Table 1, below).

Additionally, development of a lesson plan was a key program activity. Teachers were expected to create a lesson plan based on the content presented during the institute by the time the program ended. Prior to the start of the program, teachers indicated that they anticipated receiving help during this process. When asked whether this expectation was met, their responses did not change by a significant amount (see Table 1, below).

Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what extent do you agree with the following statements?</th>
<th>Pre-Survey&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; Mean</th>
<th>Pre-Survey&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; SD</th>
<th>Post-Survey&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; Mean</th>
<th>Post-Survey&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; SD</th>
<th>Average Point Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The content covered in this summer’s PD is relevant to my daily teaching.</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>+.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will receive the help I need to develop my own lesson plan.</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> n = 21  
<sup>b</sup> n = 19

On the pre-survey, teachers were also asked to identify other areas concerning pedagogy and curriculum that they hoped the institute would address. Similar to responses that participants provided with respect to what motivated them to attend the institute, their expectations can be organized into the following main categories. Namely, teachers expected that participating in the program would:

1. Help them to make connections between curriculum content and CA state standards,  
2. Give them new ideas for how to improve their teaching,
3. Enable them to create better lesson plans for their students,
4. Increase their knowledge of content that is relevant to the grade that they will be teaching,
5. Help them break down the content in a manner that is appropriate for their students, and
6. Address topics that are of interest to them.

At the end of the institute, teachers were asked to provide feedback on the extent to which these areas were addressed. As presented in Table 2 (below) teachers rated these areas quite high on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree; 5 = Strongly Agree). All values were above 4 points (“Agree” on the scale). Of note was the fact that teachers mostly agreed about the program giving them ideas about how to improve their pedagogical skills, which was rated an average of 4.84 points. The two areas that were rated lowest in terms of agreement, at an average of 4.26 points, were teachers’ ability to: 1) make connections between curriculum content and state standards, and 2) deconstruct and present content in a manner that is appropriate for their students.

Table 2.

Participants’ experiences with the programa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The EE&amp;W Summer Institute…</th>
<th>Post-Surveyb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helped me to make connections between curriculum content and CA state standards.</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has given me new ideas for how to improve my teaching.</td>
<td>4.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will enable me to create better lesson plans for my students.</td>
<td>4.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has increased my knowledge of content that is relevant to the grade I will be teaching.</td>
<td>4.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will help me to break down the content in a manner that is appropriate for my students.</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressed topics that were of interest to me.</td>
<td>4.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a These items were only asked on the post-survey. They were developed based on the pre-survey data that were collected.

b n = 19

At the end of the program, teachers were asked to give a summary agreement rating about the extent to which the institute met their expectations overall. In general, it seems that the institute
met participants’ expectations, particularly given the 4.63-point\textsuperscript{5} agreement rating ($SD = .5; n = 19$) that they provided.

Further support for this learning can be obtained through examination of quality ratings. That is, to further clarify teachers’ experience of the week-long institute, they were asked to rate the institute’s quality to comparable PD programs that they previously attended. Of the 18 teachers who answered this question, about 44% indicated that the program was “significantly better than other PD programs that they have attended.” The remaining 56% of teachers indicated that the institute was “better than” (about 28%) and “about the same as other PD programs that they have attended” (about 28%). These values are summarized in Figure 3, below.

Figure 3.

Given the information above, it seems that teachers had a very positive experience with the program. This year’s data suggest that program delivery seemed to be consistent with most participants’ expectations.

\textsuperscript{5} Response was provided on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree; 5 = Strongly Agree).
Q4. To what extent were participants satisfied with each of the institute’s components?

In addition to determining participants’ expectations of the institute, program staff also wanted to learn the extent to which teachers were satisfied with various facets of the program, including program activities, organization, and delivery.

To address this question, teachers were asked to rate individual program activities on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Very Dissatisfied; 5 = Very Satisfied). The data suggest that most teachers were satisfied with the program activities in which they engaged (see Table 3, below). Program components/activities with which most teachers ($n = 16$) were satisfied included the: 1) materials/resources that they received and 2) the “Grade-Alike” groups. In fact, when teachers were asked to indicate what they found most helpful about the program, these initial trends were further substantiated. Specifically, several teachers expressed that they found time spent on discussing “teaching strategies geared towards history” and the “model lesson plans” were the most valuable aspects of the institute.

Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How satisfied were you with the following components?</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selection of presenters</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm-up activities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lectures</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching strategy sessions/Model lessons</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent research/Planning time</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field trip to the Getty Villa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials (readings, handouts, etc.) received</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade-Alike groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potluck</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$n = 19$

On the other hand, a small number of teachers indicated that they were dissatisfied with the lectures that were given ($n = 1$) and the amount of the time that was allocated for independent research and lesson planning ($n = 3$). Specifically, a few participants suggested that several lectures that were offered to 7th grade teachers were not very helpful. One lecture that was named in particular was about the “Heritage of Jews and Christians in the West”. Additionally, a few
teachers seemed to be frustrated with the amount of background information that was provided because they felt it was not completely relevant to the grade that they will be teaching. Three 7th grade teachers expressed similar feelings, which can be summarized as follows:

[We were most frustrated with] All of the background knowledge [that was] provided. For the most part, we are all knowledgeable of the content but could use more of the classroom implementation strategies.

Taken together, this information suggests that while teachers greatly enjoyed activities from which they could easily extract skills and tools to apply in their classes, they also would have liked more time to conduct independent research, to plan their lessons, and to engage in conversations with their colleagues about the material and content presented. These aspects of the program may warrant additional attention in future PD offerings and are summarized in Table 4, below.

Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants' satisfaction with the institute by pre- and post-survey</th>
<th>Pre-Survey(^a)</th>
<th>Post-Survey(^b)</th>
<th>Average Point Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance of the amount of time spent on lectures and curriculum.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to work collaboratively with fellow teachers when developing my own lesson plan.</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)\(n = 21\)  
\(^b\)\(n = 19\)

Nonetheless, the majority of participants indicated that they were quite pleased with the way in which the program was organized (\(n = 13\)) and how it was facilitated (\(n = 16\)). And, not only did teachers agree that they would participate in future PD programs that UCLA CEES offers (\(\mu = 4.83, SD = .38\)), they would also recommend it to fellow colleagues who were interested (\(\mu = 4.89, SD = .32\))\(^6\).

Q5. What are some barriers that participants perceive or anticipate will hinder them from implementing their lesson plan?

One of the main questions of interest that program staff had at the beginning of the evaluation cycle dealt with the usability of the content that was presented over the course of the week-long

---

\(^6\) These ratings were provided by 18 participants on a 5-point Likert scale where 1 = Strongly Disagree and 5 = Strongly Agree.
institute. Data obtained to address this question suggests ways in which the institute may be re-organized in future offerings to better meet participants’ needs.

Examination of responses that teachers provided on the closed-ended survey items pertaining to this question suggests that participants expected the material to be covered to be readily applicable in their classrooms. For example, when teachers were asked on the pre-survey to indicate the extent to which they agreed that they would be able to “implement what they will learn during the PD in their classrooms,” the average rating was about 4.33 points on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree; 5 = Strongly Agree). Likewise, when teachers were asked to indicate the extent to which they think it will be feasible to implement program materials into their teaching on the post-survey, participants provided an average agreement rating of 4.63 points on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Strong Disagree; 5 = Strongly Agree). These results are summarized in Table 5, below.

Table 5.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Pre-Survey&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Post-Survey&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Average Point Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It will be feasible to implement what I learn during this PD in the classroom.</td>
<td>4.33 .73</td>
<td>4.63 .50</td>
<td>+.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will use the lesson I develop with my students in the upcoming school year.</td>
<td>4.33 .80</td>
<td>4.74 .56</td>
<td>+.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> n = 21  
<sup>b</sup> n = 19

However, when teachers’ post-survey open-ended responses were considered, approximately 32% of teachers expressed that they do not foresee any potential implementation barriers. While about 16% of participants elected to not answer the question, the remaining teachers suggested the following as challenges that they may encounter during the school year:

1. Lack of additional resources/materials at the school sites (n = 3),
2. Lack of time (n = 3),
3. Student behavioral issues (n = 2),
4. Students lacking the necessary reading, writing, and analytical skills (n = 2), and
5. Not teaching the course for which they are currently receiving PD (n = 1).

These results suggest that teachers perceive the tools and materials that they acquired during the institute as relevant, useful, and possible to implement. Nonetheless, there remain other contextual, and often school-site specific, factors that will pose challenges for their work. While UCLA CEES and Center X program staff do not have control over these site-specific issues,
perhaps more explicitly addressing some of the ways in which teachers can work around these potential barriers might be a worthwhile consideration for next year’s institute. For example, what are some possible ways in which teachers can adapt lesson plans to meet the needs of students who have IEPs (individualized education programs) while maintaining the integrity of the lesson’s content to meet state standards? Additionally, what are some exercises or activities that teachers can integrate into their lesson that might be adaptable to students who have varying reading, writing, and analytical skills?

Q6. What suggestions do participants have for increasing attendance for future institutes?

Another evaluation question dealt with the institute’s visibility and the ways in which it may be improved. Prior to the start of the evaluation, UCLA CEES and Center X program staff explicitly noted that this information would be used for future recruitment and program planning purposes, including how funds may be allocated for advertising. To address this question, program participants were asked to indicate all of the possible ways in which they may have found out about the institute.

According to Figure 4, below, it appears that the majority of participants learned of the institute through e-mail announcements and their local districts. This data suggest that continued advertising using these two methods may be beneficial, at least in the next offering of the program.

Figure 4.
In addition, teachers were asked to suggest alternative advertising methods that they think may improve the institute’s visibility on an open-ended survey item. Responses that participants provided included the following:

1. Provide mailings directly to schools and principals \((n=5)\),
2. Provide mailings directly to teachers \((n=4)\),
3. Maintain electronic advertising methods, including e-mail and institute website \((n=4)\),
4. Place ads with UTLA papers \((n=2)\),
5. Use social networking sites such as Facebook and MySpace \((n=2)\),
6. Network with LAUSD local districts \((n=1)\), and
7. Network with non-LAUSD schools and school districts \((n=1)\).

As a whole, results from these survey items suggest that teachers who participated in this year’s institute relied heavily on being connected to the institute’s e-mail listerv and to their local districts and school administrators for information. In light of this observation, perhaps teachers’ recommendations to continue maintaining electronic means of communication alongside directly connecting with school administrators and local districts may be worthwhile. Doing so, however, would also mean that UCLA CEES and Center X program staff would have to consider costs related to printing and mailing literature as well as the human resources needed to maintain and sustain the institute’s listerv.

**Q7. To what extent do participants think the program is reaching its short- and long-term goals?**

To begin understanding the institute’s impact on teachers, program staff wanted to know the extent to which participants believe the program is accomplishing its short- and long-term goals. UCLA CEES and Center X program staff jointly articulated these goals. Participating in the institute was expected to:

1. Reinvigorate the methods teachers use to teach students to become critical thinkers,
2. Reinvigorate the way in which teachers teach students to become better writers,
3. Enable teachers to better incorporate primary source materials into their teaching,
4. Enhance teachers’ knowledge of content standards,
5. Enable teachers to use different teaching formats in the classroom more creatively,
6. Enable teachers to become part of a larger learning community,
7. Get teachers excited about teaching, and
8. Enable teachers to find more ways of integrating material related to museums and art into their teaching.

These goals were discussed in this report’s introduction and are being revisited again, here, for the purpose of addressing this particular evaluation question. Specifically, initial examination of the pre-survey data suggest that teachers shared a common expectation with program staff that they would reach these short- and long-term goals by participating in the institute. Of note was the fact that teachers did not give any of these goals less than 4 points on the 5-point agreement scale (1 = Strongly Disagree; 5 = Strongly Agree; see Table 6, below).

Table 6.

Participants' expectations for the institute by pre- and post-survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participating in the Institute…</th>
<th>Pre-Survey&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Post-Survey&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Average Point Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. reinvigorate the methods used to teach students to become critical thinkers.</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>4.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. reinvigorate the way I teach students to become better writers.</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>4.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. better incorporate primary source materials into my teaching.</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>4.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. enhance my knowledge of content standards.</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>4.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. use different teaching formats in the classroom more creatively.</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>4.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. enable me to become part of a larger learning community.</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. get me excited about teaching.</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>4.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. find more ways of integrating material related to museums and art into my teaching.</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>4.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> n = 21
<sup>b</sup> n = 19
However, comparison of pre- to post-survey results shows small average point differences for each of these goals. Specifically, the goal with the slightest point gain was Goal 4 (average gain of +.04 points). On the other hand, the goals that exhibited a moderate difference between pre- and post-survey administrations were:

1. Goal 1: average gain of +.22 points,
2. Goal 3: average gain of +.28 points,
3. Goal 6: average gain of +.68 points,
4. Goal 7: average gain of +.58 points, and
5. Goal 8: average gain of +.30 points.

Additionally, teachers indicated that the program goals that required more attention were Goals 2 and 5, which decreased an average of -.01 and -.05 points, respectively, on the pre-post surveys. The generally high scores across items and the somewhat large standard deviations may render these differences insignificant. That is, ratings that teachers provided on the pre- and post-surveys may not actually be different. Rather, the slight variation in scores could have been due to differences in the number of surveys that were completed at the beginning of the program (n = 21) compared to when the program ended (n = 19). Nonetheless, they could be considered further, particularly within the context of: 1) teachers’ perceptions of the extent to which they thought the program was reaching its objectives, and 2) the possibility that teachers were not fully aware of the explicit connections between these goals and the program to start. These findings are summarized in Table 6, above.

**Q8. Were there other themes that arose through the evaluation?**

In addition to addressing the evaluation questions, above, the UCLA CEES and Center X program staff also wanted to learn if there may be other concerns or issues that were equally salient and meaningful for future program planning, but may not have been addressed with the survey items already described. To address this concern, the SRM Evaluation Group used an open-ended survey item on both the pre- and post-survey that asked participants to share any additional comments that they think program staff would find useful. This section will discuss these additional findings and organize them into the following main themes:

1. Teachers’ Pedagogical Concerns
2. Content Covered During the Institute

*Teachers’ Pedagogical Concerns*

With respect to “Teachers’ Pedagogical Concerns,” several teachers from both the 6th and 7th grades indicated that they hoped participating in the program would shed light on ways in which they could present material for their grade level in engaging and stimulating manners. Specifically, participants wanted to learn how they could “break down” content that was often
dense “within the context of…a standards-based, pacing-oriented environment”. Teachers mentioned that they would have liked to see more emphasis on new ideas related to:

1. Hands-on, project-based learning,
2. Ways in which they could motivate unmotivated students,
3. How they might teach reading and writing to English language learners from a social studies perspective,
4. Various methods for integrating technology such as videos and music into their teaching, which they differentiated from use of the Internet.

Content Covered During the Institute

With respect to participants’ comments concerning the content covered during the institute, many expressed wanting to learn more about the different interactions between the civilizations discussed (e.g., Asian and European). For example, a few 6th grade teachers indicated that when teaching about Asian civilization in particular, they would have liked to further understand the relationship between Chinese, Indian, and Mongolian societies along with the religions that dominated these regions, including Buddhism, Hinduism, and Islam. Additionally, a subset of 6th grade and 7th grade teachers shared that concerning lessons on European civilization, they would have liked to engage in more discussions about, as well receive materials on, topics specifically related to technological developments (i.e., Roman engineering and architecture) and its role in the expansion of the Roman empire.

Because the evaluation relied heavily on pre- and post-surveys as the primary data collection tools, the extent to which these pedagogical concerns were addressed during the institute remains unclear. However, program staff may consider revisiting these issues when planning for the next institute that will be offered.

Summary & Conclusion

In summary, the 2010 cohort of teacher participants reported having positive experiences with the professional development institute that UCLA CEES and Center X offered. Generally, participants expected to gain relevant content knowledge and to acquire new resources and skills for teaching their respective content areas. Pre- and post-survey data suggest that most of teachers’ expectations were met, particularly around the purpose of the program and the way in which it was organized. However, survey data and teachers’ open-ended responses suggest that the program may benefit from a few adjustments the next time it is offered. That is, participants suggested that there be greater emphasis on practical ways in which they may adapt content and pedagogical strategies for non-traditional students, including English Language Learners and students with learning disabilities, while not compromising the lesson’s alignment with state standards.
Moreover, teachers expressed that they greatly enjoyed the model lessons and the GradeAlike groups. Specifically, they indicated that the resources to which they had been exposed could easily be implemented. Nonetheless, participants identified a few issues that may make using their lesson plans and implementing what they have learned in their respective classrooms difficult. These issues include concerns about how they might best approach teaching reading, writing, and critical analysis to students with differential skills sets, particularly because they are Social Studies teachers and not English teachers. Participants indicated that they would have liked to engage in more conversations about this issue. Additionally, teachers indicated that they would have liked the presentations to more explicitly address the connections and relationships that existed between Asian and European societies (i.e., what were some of the ways in which Chinese technology influenced Roman technology, how did this interaction contribute to or hinder the expansion of the Roman empire, etc.). These are issues that program staff may consider when planning future institutes.

With respect to the program’s goals, data from the 2010 cohort suggest that the institute is making progress towards reaching its short- and long-term goals. While not all of the goals were met with confidence (see pgs. 15-17), several were promising, including the program’s ability to excite teachers about teaching and to help them become members of a larger learning community. Results concerning program goals, in particular, suggest several possible next steps for program staff, including further refinement of goals so that they can be more accurately measured.

Overall, teachers who participated in the 2010 summer PD on Europe, Eurasia, and the World indicated that their experience was quite useful and relevant to their work. Their willingness to recommend the program to fellow colleagues and their interest in participating in future PD programs supports this observation. Lastly, teachers’ reflections of their experiences with the program provide suggestions that may improve the program’s future design and functioning.

Points for Future Consideration

In light of the findings presented above, what follows are a few questions for UCLA CEES and Center X program staff to consider when planning next year’s institute. It should be noted that the following questions are intended to foster new thinking about ways in which the program may be improved. They do not represent the SRM Evaluation Group’s recommendations or stances towards next steps that should be taken. Because UCLA CEES and Center X staff are program experts, the final decision with respect to how to proceed rests solely with them.

1. Might it be possible to integrate additional pedagogical strategies related to lesson adaptation into next year’s summer institute?
   a. If so, what resources are needed to do so?
   b. How can lessons be adapted while maintaining the integrity of the content to meet state standards?
c. In what ways does this addition contribute to or take away from the institute’s goals?

2. In what ways might opening the summer PD program up to educators who do not work strictly in the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) change the program’s operation?
   a. What are some potential unintended consequences that enrolling a broader spectrum of educators may bring about?
   b. Does the summer PD program have a specific intended audience due to the external funding that it receives?

3. In what ways does the institute currently address writing, and provide teachers with the needed tools to help students improve their writing?
   a. Could this aspect of the program be strengthened? If so, how?
Appendix 1

Europe, Eurasia, and the World Logic Model (draft)

**Inputs**
- Facilities:
  - Bunche center
  - Getty Villa
- Personnel:
  - Center X Staff
  - CEES Staff
  - Lecturers
  - Workshop Facilitators
  - Learning Coaches
- Budget:
  - Funding from CPEC
  - Funding from CEES
- Materials:
  - Handouts
  - Presentation slides
  - Book developed by Center X

**Activities**
- Participants will attend a week-long institute including:
  - Lectures
  - Teaching strategy sessions
  - Model lessons
  - Field trip to the Getty Villa
  - Independent research/lesson planning time
- Participants will have opportunities to:
  - Network
  - Share lesson plans

**Outputs**
- Participants will produce a lesson plan that:
  - Uses a variety of materials
  - Encourages critical/historical thinking
  - Develops writing skills
  - Introduces new skills and content materials
- Participants will share their lesson plan with fellow attendees.

**Outcomes**
- Intermediate
  - Participants will learn:
    - About a new content area
    - New pedagogical tools
    - New teaching strategies
- Long-term
  - Participants will create contacts with:
    - Other teachers in their discipline
    - UCLA program staff
  - Participants will maintain ongoing relationships with UCLA.
  - Participants will be able to introduce new content to all students.
  - Participants will use new strategies to encourage critical thinking and better writing in their classrooms.
  - Participants will become part of a larger learning community.
  - Participants will be re-inspired, reinvigorated, engaged and excited about teaching.

**Assumptions:** Effective professional development includes introduction of new content combined with pedagogical strategies. Teachers learn best when they are given opportunities to collaborate with peers as they learn. Having time away from the pressures of daily school life to focus on lesson planning will allow teachers to be productive.

**External Factors:** school administrative support, school culture of collaboration, barriers to lesson implementation.
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Europe, Eurasia, & the World
Center for European & Eurasian Studies
UCLA History-Geography Project

June 28, 2010 – July 2, 2010

Your feedback on the Europe, Eurasia, & the World Summer Institute (EE&W Summer Institute) is important to us! Please take a few minutes to answer the questions below (and on the back side of this page) and return this form to the facilitator before you leave. The survey is anonymous and, of course, completely optional. Please rest assured, however, that all responses will be pooled so that confidentiality is maintained. Finally, the questionnaire should take less than 15 minutes to complete. If you have any questions or concerns regarding this questionnaire, please contact Anne Vo (annevo@ucla.edu).

A. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Please tell us about yourself:
Note: This information will be used to describe respondents’ characteristics. All responses will be kept confidential.

A1 What grade(s) do you teach? (please ✓ all that apply) ☐ 6th ☐ 7th ☐ Other: _____________
A2 How long have you been a teacher? _____ Number of years (round up).
A3 How long have you been teaching at your school? _____ Number of years (round up)
A4 What is your average class size? _____ Number of students (round up).
A5 What is your gender? ☐ Female ☐ Male
A6 Please indicate your age category: ☐ < 30 ☐ 30-39 ☐ 40-49 ☐ 50-59 ☐ 60+

B. ABOUT THE EE&W SUMMER INSTITUTE

B1 Have you previously attended a summer institute offered by UCLA? ☐ Yes ☐ No
B2 If YES, in what year(s) did you previously attend:
B3 If YES, what was the topic/theme that was covered:
B4 How did you hear about the 2010 EE&W SUMMER INSTITUTE? (please ✓ all that apply)

☐ By word of mouth ☐ E-mail announcements
☐ Through my local district ☐ Listserv messages
☐ California Council for Social Studies ☐ Flyers/Brochures
☐ California Geographic Alliance Newsletter ☐ Other literature
☐ Center for European & Eurasian Studies website ☐ Other: ________________________________
☐ UCLA History-Geography Project website

B5 What attracted you to the 2010 EE&W SUMMER INSTITUTE?
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
B6 Do you have any suggestions for how we can improve the visibility of future summer institutes?
_______________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________

C. EXPECTATIONS FOR THE EE&W SUMMER INSTITUTE

C1 Please describe your general expectations for your professional development (PD) experience in the EE&W Summer Institute at UCLA.
_______________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________

C2 Which aspect(s) of this summer PD program are you most looking forward to?
_______________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________

C3 Once accepted into the EE&W Summer Institute, what were your top three motivations for attending? (Please indicate your top three motivations in order from 1 to 3 – 1 being your top motivation.)

____ Network/Collaborate with colleagues with similar interests
____ Make contacts at UCLA
____ Previous good experience with UCLA professional development institutes
____ Further develop pedagogical skills
____ Further develop literacy instructional strategies
____ Increase my content knowledge
____ Obtain quality resources/materials
____ Reinvigorate my curriculum/lesson plans
____ Explore ways to integrate technology into the classroom
____ Explore ways to integrate primary source materials into the classroom
____ Receive stipend from my school or district
____ Maintain good standing/relationship with my school or district
____ Satisfy a requirement
____ Other: _______________________

To what extent do you AGREE with the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C4 The information that I received in advance about the details of the EE&amp;W Summer Institute was clear.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5 The EE&amp;W Summer Institute’s objectives are clear.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I expect that...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C6 the content covered in this summer’s PD will be relevant to my daily teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I expect that...

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C7</td>
<td>it will be feasible to implement what I learn during this PD in the classroom.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C8</td>
<td>the amount of time spent on lectures and curriculum sessions will be well-balanced.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C9</td>
<td>I will receive the help I need to develop my own lesson plan.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C10</td>
<td>I will use the lesson I develop with my students in the upcoming school year.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C11</td>
<td>I will have the opportunity to work collaboratively with fellow teachers when developing my own lesson plan.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C12</td>
<td>I will have the opportunity to share my finished lesson plan with my peers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I expect that participating in the EE&W Summer Institute will...

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C13</td>
<td>inspire me to reinvigorate the methods I use to teach my students to become critical thinkers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C14</td>
<td>inspire me to reinvigorate the way in which I teach my students to become better writers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C15</td>
<td>enable me to better incorporate primary source materials into my teaching.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C16</td>
<td>enhance my knowledge of content standards.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C17</td>
<td>enable me to use different teaching formats in the classroom more creatively.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C18</td>
<td>enable me to become part of a larger learning community.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C19</td>
<td>get me excited about teaching.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C20</td>
<td>enable me to find more ways of integrating material related to museums and art into my teaching.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C21 I hope this year’s EE&W Summer Institute will address the following topics/issues:

1.

2.

3.

D. COMMENTS

In this section, please indicate questions or concerns that you may have regarding this questionnaire, about the ISI, or anything else. You may also choose to elaborate on responses provided above where space was insufficient.

That’s the end of the questionnaire. Thank you for your time and feedback!
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Europe, Eurasia, & the World
Center for European & Eurasian Studies
UCLA History-Geography Project
June 28, 2010 – July 2, 2010

Your feedback on the Europe, Eurasia, & the World Summer Institute (EE&W Summer Institute) is important to us! Please take a few minutes to answer the questions below (and on the back side of this page) and return this form to the facilitator before you leave. The survey is anonymous and, of course, completely optional. Please rest assured, however, that all responses will be pooled so that confidentiality is maintained. Finally, the questionnaire should take less than 15 minutes to complete. If you have any questions or concerns regarding this questionnaire, please contact Anne Vo (annevo@ucla.edu).

A. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Please tell us about yourself:
Note: This information will be used to describe respondents’ characteristics. All responses will be kept confidential.

A1 What grade(s) do you teach? (please √ all that apply)  □ 6th  □ 7th  □ Other: _____________

A2 How long have you been a teacher? _______ Number of years (round up).

A3 How long have you been teaching at your school? _______ Number of years (round up).

A4 What is your average class size? _______ Number of students (round up).

A5 What is your gender? □ Female  □ Male

A6 Please indicate your age category: □ < 30  □ 30-39  □ 40-49  □ 50-59  □ 60+

B. ABOUT THE EE&W SUMMER INSTITUTE

To what extent do you AGREE with the following statements?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>The information that I received in advance about the details of the EE&amp;W Summer Institute was clear.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>The EE&amp;W Summer Institute’s objectives were clear.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B3 How would you compare the EE&W Summer Institute to other similar PD programs that you have attended? (please √ only one option)

The EE&W Summer Institute was: □ significantly better than other PD I have attended.
□ better than other PD I have attended.
□ about the same as other PD I have attended.
□ worse than other PD programs I have attended.
□ significantly worse than other PD programs I have attended.
To what extent are you SATISFIED with the following aspects of the Institute:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>Selection of presenters.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>Warm-up activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6</td>
<td>Discussions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7</td>
<td>Lectures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8</td>
<td>Teaching strategy sessions/Model lessons.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B9</td>
<td>Independent research/planning time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B10</td>
<td>Networking opportunities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B11</td>
<td>Field trip to the Getty Villa.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B12</td>
<td>Overall organization of the presentations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B13</td>
<td>Overall facilitation of the sessions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B14</td>
<td>Materials (readings, handouts, etc.) that you received.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B15</td>
<td>Grade-Alike groups (where you share your lesson plans).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B16</td>
<td>Potluck.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B17</td>
<td>Your experience with the EE&amp;W Summer Institute overall.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B18</td>
<td>Overall organization of the EE&amp;W Summer Institute.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19</td>
<td>Which aspects of this year’s EE&amp;W Summer Institute were MOST useful?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B20</td>
<td>Which aspects of this year’s EE&amp;W Summer Institute were LEAST useful?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. EXPECTATIONS FOR THE EE&W SUMMER INSTITUTE

To what extent do you AGREE with the following statements?

The EE&W Summer Institute…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>covered content that is relevant to my daily teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>balanced the amount of time spent on lectures and curriculum lessons well.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>provided the help that I needed to develop my own lesson plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>provided the opportunity to work collaboratively with fellow teachers when developing my own lesson plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To what extent do you **AGREE** with the following statements?

**The EE&W Summer Institute…**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C5  gave me the chance to share my finished lesson plan with my peers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6  helped me to make connections between curriculum content and CA state standards.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7  has given me new ideas for how to improve my teaching.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C8  will enable me to create better lesson plans for my students.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C9  has increased my knowledge of content that is relevant to the grade I will be teaching.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C10 will help me to break down the content in a manner that is appropriate for my students.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C11 addressed topics that were of interest to me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C12 met my expectations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C13 Is there anything (activities, presentations, etc.) that was **NOT** a part of this year’s institute that you think would have been useful to you?

To what extent do you **AGREE** with the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C14 I can feasibly implement what I learned in this summer’s PD in the classroom.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C15 I intend to use the lesson that I developed with my students in the upcoming school year.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C16 I was able to utilize material(s) from the EE&amp;W Summer Institute sessions when developing my lesson plan.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C17 What potential challenges or barriers do you think might make it difficult to implement the lesson plan that you have created?

To what extent do you **AGREE** with the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C18 has inspired me to reinvigorate the way in which I teach my students to become <strong>critical thinkers</strong>.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C19 has inspired me to reinvigorate the way in which I teach my students to become <strong>better writers</strong>.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C20 will enable me to better incorporate primary source materials into my teaching.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C21 enhanced my knowledge of content standards.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C22 will enable me to use different teaching formats in the classroom more creatively.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C23 enabled me to become part of a larger learning community.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participating in the EE&W Summer Institute...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C24</th>
<th>got me excited about teaching.</th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C25</td>
<td>has enabled me to find more ways of integrating material related to museums and art into my teaching.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C26</td>
<td>The EE&amp;W Summer Institute met its objectives.</td>
<td>1 Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5 Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. THINKING ABOUT THE FUTURE

D1 What are some general themes or topics that would interest you in a future PD on Europe, Eurasia, and the World?
1.
2.
3.

To what extent do you AGREE with the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D2</th>
<th>I intend to participate in future programs offered by the Center for European and Eurasian Studies.</th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td>If this EE&amp;W Summer Institute were to be offered again, I would recommend it to colleagues who are interested in participating.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D4 Do you have any suggestions for how we can improve the visibility of future summer institutes?
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

E. COMMENTS

In this section, please indicate questions or concerns that you may have regarding this questionnaire, about the EE&W Summer Institute, or anything else. You may also choose to elaborate on responses provided above where space was insufficient.

____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________

That’s the end of the questionnaire. Thank you for your time and feedback!