

Evaluation of Goals for Project Bright IDEA
A Jacob Javits Research Program funded by the US Department of Education
Submitted by Ron Tzur, Ph.D., Research Professor – External Evaluator

Rachael Kenney, Ph.D. Professor, Mathematics, Purdue University – Research
Assistant – 2004-2010

I. Goal of Outside Evaluation

To serve as the External Evaluator for Project Bright IDEA 2 funded by the Javits Award from the U.S. Department of Education.

II. Purpose:

To provide formative and summative information about the:

1) project goals; 2) nature/quality of project activities; and 3) goal accomplishments

A. Overarching Project Goal: Create a model program for closing achievement gap among AIG students. [Importance: Conceptualizing notion of ‘model’ program for preparing teachers.]

Five Questions

1) Are project goals comprehensive and focused enough? [Compare with literature; Use expert focus group.]

2) Are project goals well grounded? [Compare with literature; Examine need assessment.]

3) To what extent are project goals unique and scalable? [Compare with similar projects and with literature.]

4) How do project personnel and participants understand/interpret the goals? [Questionnaire (every participating teacher) by end of each summer institute; Semi-structured interviews (project personnel, administrators, teachers)]

5) To what extent do personnel/ participants adhere to the goals? [Participant observation (project staff meetings, summer institute, classrooms)]

B. Project Activities: Crucial regardless of goal accomplishment. [No one-to-one correspondence, e.g., time needed for change]

At issue: Are activities consistent with project’s goals? How do administrators impact teachers’ learning/implementation?

Three Questions

1) Why are specific activities selected? Focus-Group Interviews. [Summer institute instructors]

2) What is the nature and quality of institutes for teacher enhancement? [Participant Observation (day/institute); Artifacts (handouts, teachers' work); End-of-Institute Questionnaire; Semi-Structured Interviews.]

3) What is the nature and quality of site visits? [Semi-Structured Interviews with personnel; Site Observations; Open-Ended Interviews with teachers.]

C, Project Outcomes: Focus on relationship: teacher learn → teacher implement → student change (stress – conceptual.

Two Questions

1) Is number of gifted students from underrepresented groups increased? Project instruments: Problem-Based Questionnaire/Head Count

2) Is this increase related to teacher understanding and implementation of the intervention program? Project instruments (above correlated with Teacher Disposition Questionnaire) and Qualitative data sets [entry interviews, class observations, interviews throughout the training, and consecutive class visits and exit interviews.]

D. Feedback and Report:

1. A Formative Evaluation to project personnel: 1) informal face-to-face, e-mail, phone; 2) four-hour meetings with co-investigators (2/year) and 3) written report by September 1.

2. A Summative Evaluation to funding agency/personnel with a written report (up to 90 days after project ends).

E. Instruments Developed and Validated

1) Educator Disposition Questionnaire - Administered November 2004 and June 2005 to First Cohort

2) Math Problem Based Questionnaire - To be administered in 2006

3) The Evaluator's Questionnaire: Developed and administered at the end of Summer Institute June 2005 and will be administered for each training session in school year 2005-2006.