

Turning Points in American History

Formative Evaluation Report

Prepared for
Oregon Public Broadcasting
7140 SW Macadam Avenue
Portland, OR 97219

Prepared by
RMC Research Corporation
522 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 1407
Portland, OR 97204

February 2005

Turning Points in American History

Formative Evaluation Report

Prepared for

**Meighan Maloney
Catherine Stimac**

Oregon Public Broadcasting
7140 SW Macadam Avenue
Portland, OR 97219

Prepared by

Chandra K. Lewis

RMC Research Corporation
522 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 1407
Portland, OR 97204

February 2005

Contents

Exhibits.....	v
Introduction	1
Evaluation Description	2
Data Collection Instruments	3
Teacher Survey	3
Facilitator Survey.....	4
Observer Protocol.....	5
Participants	5
Results	7
General Satisfaction.....	7
Grant Goals	10
Content.....	11
Multimedia Approach	15
Print Materials.....	16
Print Material Improvements.....	17
Video.....	18
Video Improvements.....	18
Activities.....	19
Activity Improvements	20
Course Guide.....	21
Discussion.....	23

- Appendix A Teacher Closed-Ended Responses
- Appendix B Teacher Open-Ended Responses
- Appendix C Facilitator Closed-Ended Responses
- Appendix D Facilitator Open-Ended Responses
- Appendix E Observer Protocol and Responses

Exhibits

Exhibit 1	Teachers' Responses Regarding Grant Goals	11
Exhibit 2	Key Concepts Historians Use to Think About This Period	12
Exhibit 3	Key Facts to Understanding This Period.....	13
Exhibit 4	Comparison of Facts That Are Review for Participants and Others.....	14
Exhibit 5	Allocation of Time for Activities	20
Exhibit 6	Facilitators Responses Regarding the Unit Course Guide.....	22

Introduction

A consortium of education service agencies, including Southern Oregon Education Service District (ESD), Multnomah County ESD (Oregon), Grant Wood Area Education Agency (AEA; Iowa), and Riverside County Office of Education (California), in partnership with the National Center for History in the Schools (NCHS), Annenberg/CPB, the Organization of American Historians, and Oregon Public Broadcasting (OPB), received a grant from the U.S. Department of Education in 2004. to develop and test Turning Points in American History. Turning Points in American History is a professional development workshop series that offers teachers rich content—based on the first 5 eras of American history as outlined by NCHS—to develop their own sense of history and an appropriate context for effective teaching. The objective is to offer a multimedia professional development workshop series that helps teachers understand the lives, roles, and impact of individuals in American history; learn more about the events that have shaped American history; develop an appreciation for the use of primary source materials in these studies; and secure credits towards achieving “highly qualified” teaching status. As a result of this series, teachers will improve their knowledge, understanding, and appreciation of traditional American history; better instruct the students in their classrooms; and raise student achievement.

After the consortium partners received the Turning Points in American History grant they collaborated to create 1 test workshop in the series. The workshop included 3 main components: print materials to provide core content to the teachers, a video to introduce the content, and several activities to deepen the teachers’ knowledge. The workshop series will have the 3 main components in each workshop because the consortium of partners wanted to optimize learning by providing teachers with an opportunity to hear the material, see visual aids, discuss the material, and do something with the information they learn. RMC Research Corporation conducted a formative evaluation of the test workshop to provide critical feedback to inform the development of the entire series. After the consortium creates all of the workshops in the series RMC Research

will conduct a controlled, randomized research study of the effectiveness of the series in terms of improving teachers' content knowledge.

Evaluation Description

The formative evaluation had several purposes: assessing the participants' satisfaction with the workshop, examining how well the workshop addressed the goals of the Turning Points in American History grant, examining the multimedia approach of the workshop, evaluating the individual components of the workshop (i.e., print materials, video, activities), and soliciting from the facilitators feedback on the Unit Course Guide and suggestions for future implementation of the workshop. RMC Research, Oregon Public Broadcasting, and the Turning Points in American History Advisory Board and Steering Team collaborated on the formative evaluation. RMC Research was responsible for directing the formative evaluation and providing feedback to inform the development of the workshop series. Oregon Public Broadcasting was responsible for creating all of the multimedia components. The Advisory Board, which included a variety of members from the partner organizations, was responsible for workshop content development. The Steering Team, under the direction of Southern Oregon ESD, was responsible for managing the overall effort. In November 2004 these partners determined that the most useful data for the formative evaluation would be obtained by implementing an actual Turning Points in American History workshop and collecting evaluation data.

Consequently, these partners collaborated to conduct 5 professional development workshops across the United States, presenting Unit 2: Three Worlds Meet of the Turing Points in American History workshop series. Of the 10 units, Unit 2 was developed by the consortium partners because they believed it would best serve as a prototype for the development of Units 3 through 9. Units 1 and 10 are different from the others because they introduce and end the series.

The workshop was conducted in each of the following cities in January 2005: New Haven, Connecticut; Norco, California; Portland, Oregon; Medford, Oregon; and Cedar Rapids, Iowa. These cities were chosen because the middle school history teachers on

the Advisory Board taught in these cities and were therefore able to coordinate, observe, and videotape the workshops. In addition, the Steering Team members, who facilitated the workshops, resided near these cities.

RMC Research, the Advisory Board, and the Steering Team coordinated the efforts to recruit teachers to attend the 5 workshops. The recruitment methods utilized included direct mailings, districtwide emails, fliers posted in the schools, and personal referral. RMC Research outlined the roles and responsibilities of the teachers attending the workshops, screened teachers for eligibility, and registered the participants. Teachers were eligible to attend the workshop if they taught social studies at the middle school level, possessed a Bachelor's degree or state teaching credential, were able to attend the workshop, could spend 1½ hours reading the workshop materials, and were willing to provide honest, constructive feedback on evaluation forms following the workshop. Each teacher received \$75 for attending the workshop and completing an evaluation form.

Data Collection Instruments

In collaboration with the Advisory Board and Oregon Public Broadcasting, RMC Research developed 3 data collection instruments to solicit the information most useful to the consortium partners charged with developing the remaining units in the workshop series: a teacher survey, a facilitator survey, and an observation protocol. The teacher survey and facilitator survey were completed at the conclusion of the workshop. The observation protocol was filled out by the observer while observing the workshop. Appendixes A through E include all of the data collection instruments and the participants' responses.

Teacher Survey

The teacher survey assessed the participants' general satisfaction with the workshop, their perceptions regarding its most and least valuable aspects, and their suggestions for improving the workshop. The teacher survey asked participants several questions regarding the individual components of the unit (i.e. print materials, video, and activities)

including how well each component met its intended purpose and how the components might be improved. The survey asked if the multimedia approach effectively helped them learn the content presented and how the approach could be improved. Lastly, the teacher survey directly addressed the 5 goals of the workshop series:

- Help teachers gain a greater understanding of the lives, roles, and impact of individuals in American history.
- Increase the teachers' appreciation for the use of primary source materials to learn about history.
- Advance the teachers' content knowledge.
- Help teachers gain a deeper understanding of American history.
- Improve the teachers' appreciation of American history.

These goals are for teachers who attend the entire workshop series—not for a teacher who attends only 1 of the 10 workshops. This limitation should be considered when interpreting the results related to the grant goals.

Facilitator Survey

The facilitator survey asked several of the same questions as the teacher survey. For example, the facilitator survey assessed the facilitators' general satisfaction with the workshop, their perceptions regarding its most and least valuable aspects, and their suggestions for improving the workshop. The facilitator survey asked questions regarding the individual components of the unit (i.e. print materials, video, and activities) including how well each component met its intended purpose and how the components might be improved.

The facilitator survey also included questions that were not on the teacher survey. The facilitator survey asked facilitators if the level of content was appropriate for the intended audience, if the workshop appeared to advance the content knowledge of the teachers, and if there was a good balance of old and new information for the teachers. The survey asked facilitators if the multimedia approach was an effective approach for

leading a content based workshop and how the approach could be improved. The survey asked facilitators how the Unit Course Guide, the guide to leading the workshop, could be improved. Finally, the facilitators were asked to indicate what suggestions they would give facilitators leading the workshop in the future.

Observer Protocol

The observer protocol asked observers to comment on several aspects of the workshop. The protocol asked observers to note if the participants seemed satisfied with the workshop including when the participants seemed particularly engaged in the material or disinterested. The protocol asked observers what they thought was the most valuable and least valuable aspects of the workshop. The protocol asked observers to comment on the delivery of the multimedia approach and if some of the information would be better covered in the print materials, video, or during the activities. Observers were asked to comment if the teachers seemed comfortable with the level of content presented and how the teachers responded to the print materials, video, and activities. Lastly, observers were asked to comment if the teachers gave any indication that the information they learned would be useful for them as a teacher.

Participants

There were 41 participants in the formative evaluation. The recruitment goal for teacher participants was a minimum of 5 teachers (or a maximum of 10) for each workshop. The recruitment goal was met; 38 teachers were recruited to attend the workshops and 32 teachers attended the workshops and completed a survey (9 in Portland, 7 in Norco, 6 in Cedar Rapids, 5 in New Haven, and 5 in Medford). Each facilitator that attended the workshop completed a survey, and 4 of the 5 observers submitted their observation protocol.

The formative evaluation focused on examining the participants' satisfaction with the workshop, how well the workshop addressed the grant goals, the multimedia approach of the workshop, the individual components of the workshop (i.e., print materials, video, activities), and the facilitators' feedback on the Unit Course Guide and suggestions for leading the workshop. The formative evaluation featured a teacher survey, a facilitator survey, and an observation protocol.

General Satisfaction

Each type of respondent (i.e., facilitator, teacher, observer) indicated the teachers expressed satisfaction with the workshop. On a scale from 1 (*poor*) to 5 (*excellent*), 95% of the teachers gave the workshop an overall rating of 4 or 5, and 84% gave the overall organization of the workshop a rating of 4 or 5. Additionally, 45% of the teachers indicated “to a great extent” that the workshop provided them with information they wanted to know about this period in history. All of the facilitators indicated that the workshop was received “very well” (the highest rating on the scale) by the teachers. The observers' responses to an open-ended question all indicated that the workshop was well received by the teachers, as evidenced by their engagement in the workshop.

The teacher survey asked how, if at all, this workshop differed from other professional development workshops they had attended. Every teacher described at least one way in which this workshop differed from others they had attended. The most common response was that this workshop stimulated quality group interaction ($n = 10$) that allowed the teachers to learn different viewpoints and give their own opinions. For many teachers ($n = 8$) the quality group interaction resulted from the opportunity to work with a small group of teachers. Respondents also appreciated that the workshop was content driven rather than theory driven ($n = 8$) and enhanced their knowledge rather than seeking to change the way they teach ($n = 1$). Some teachers ($n = 6$) noted that this workshop was different because it focused specifically on the topic of history they teach and that appealed to them.

Respondents ($n = 3$) also indicated that the multimedia approach distinguished the workshop from lecture-driven workshops they had attended. The teachers reported that this workshop engaged them in activities ($n = 4$) and they expressed appreciation for the opportunity to read and ponder the materials ahead of time ($n = 2$). Three teachers noted this workshop was different because it focused on the use of primary source materials and this focus helped them connect historical events. A few respondents ($n = 3$) explained that this workshop was different because the format modeled how they could lead their own classes, and 2 teachers reported that evaluating the workshop and providing feedback differentiated the workshop.

The teacher survey asked the teachers if any part of the workshop made them want to learn more and 100% answered affirmatively. When asked to explain which part of the workshop made them want to learn more, some teachers did not provide a specific answer but many ($n = 24$) stated that learning about a particular topic, concept, or person stimulated their interest and made them want to learn more about that particular topic. A wide variety of topics, concepts, and people inspired teachers to want to learn more, but the most frequently mentioned were the Columbian Exchange ($n = 5$), Lasalle ($n = 3$), and Esteban ($n = 3$). Another aspect of the workshop that made teachers want to learn more was the utilization of primary source materials during the workshop; some teachers ($n = 5$) were reminded of the benefits of using primary source materials to expand upon basic materials. The remaining responses varied greatly (see Appendix B).

The survey asked teachers, "What do you think was the most valuable aspect of the workshop? Why?" Three answers to this question were common: the opportunity to discuss history with peers ($n = 7$), the opportunity to learn different perspectives through the workshop materials and discussions with other teachers ($n = 7$), and the activities because they engaged the teachers and provided ideas for their classes ($n = 7$). Many teachers ($n = 6$) believed the most useful aspect of the workshop was learning new content. Other teachers ($n = 6$) reported that the video was the most valuable aspect because it was informative and the medium was helpful for visual learners. A few teachers ($n = 3$) believed the workshop was valuable because it reminded them to go

beyond the textbook and use primary source materials, which can stimulate critical thinking. The other responses substantially varied and appear in Appendix B.

The survey included 2 questions asking the teachers to identify any confusing parts of the workshop and share how they felt the workshop could be improved. Forty-seven percent of the teachers reported that parts of the workshop were confusing or difficult to understand. Of these responses, 1 was illegible and 4 concerned the activities but these teachers had received the first drafts of the activities. Two versions of the activities were used in the 5 workshops. Two of the workshops used the first drafts and 3 used later drafts revised by the Advisory Board. The Advisory Board, Oregon Public Broadcasting, and RMC Research decided to present only the survey results derived from the 3 workshops that offered the revised activities unless otherwise appropriate. Teachers' comments ($n=5$) indicated they were confused with the overall purpose of the workshop (i.e. the content was not useful because it didn't fit within their state's standards or the activities were too advanced for middle school students) and did not understand the primary purpose of the workshop was to increase their knowledge of the history content. The remaining comments did not include enough detail to provide useful feedback on which parts of the workshop were confusing or how these parts could be clarified (See Appendix B).

The teachers' suggestions for improving the workshop also varied widely. Some comments related to the implementation of the workshop and not the quality of the materials. These comments included: change the time at which the workshop is offered ($n = 3$), provide material for them to use in their classes ($n = 3$), increase the number of workshop participants ($n = 3$), speed up certain parts of the workshop ($n = 1$), or monitor who is talking or providing their comments in order to keep the pace of the workshop moving smoothly ($n = 1$). Only 2 comments related to the materials including: the Timeline Activity was the least valuable aspect of the workshop ($n= 1$) and the Timeline Activity needed a global map ($n= 1$). Teachers ($n= 2$) again indicated through their responses that they were confused regarding the purpose of the workshop because they indicated they would not be able to use the information from the workshop because

it did not fit within their state's standards. The remaining responses appear in Appendix B.

The facilitator survey also asked about the most valuable aspects of the workshop. The facilitators cited the high-quality resources and the use of multiple sources of information ($n = 2$), the in-depth discussions ($n = 2$), the new concepts the teachers learned ($n = 2$), the well-paced workshop outline ($n = 1$), the emphasis on content and methodology ($n = 1$), the hands-on nature of the activities ($n = 1$), the discussion on Esteban ($n = 1$), and the opportunity to work in small groups ($n = 1$). When asked how the workshop could be improved, the facilitators primarily offered advice to future workshop facilitators. They noted ($n = 3$) how important it is to thoroughly prepare to lead the workshop by reading and reviewing all of the materials and becoming familiar with the workshop methods. Three of the 5 facilitators indicated that there is too much material to cover in the amount of time allotted. One facilitator suggested eliminating the reflective pieces or to allot more time for the workshop. Another facilitator remarked that facilitators should have the flexibility to read their audience and determine how to best engage and instruct the participants.

The observers noted what they believed to be the most useful aspects of the workshops and whether the teachers seemed to enjoy the workshops. The 4 observers who submitted protocols cited the opportunity for the teachers to discuss ideas with each other as the most valuable aspect of the workshop. The observers reported that the teachers seemed satisfied with the workshop because the teachers indicated plans to use the information and activities from the workshop in their own classrooms ($n = 3$) and expressed a desire to attend the entire workshop series ($n = 2$).

Grant Goals

The teacher survey included 5 questions that addressed the goals of the workshop series. As Exhibit 1 shows, the teachers rated the workshop highly for each of the 5 goals. The 2 highest rated goals were improving the teachers' appreciation of American history (47% answered "to a great extent") and increasing teachers' appreciation for the use of primary source materials to learn about history (47% answered "to a great

extent”). When the teachers were asked to what extent the workshop had improved their content knowledge, only 41% indicated “to a great extent” whereas 63% indicated the workshop would advance the content knowledge of their peers to a great extent.

**Exhibit 1
Teachers’ Responses Regarding Grant Goals**

Survey Question	To a Great Extent	To Some Extent	Not Very Much	Not at All
Did the workshop help you gain a greater understanding of the lives, roles, and impact of individuals in American history?	45%	48%	6%	0%
To what extent did the workshop advance your content knowledge?	41%	52%	7%	0%
To what extent do you feel the unit would advance the content knowledge of your peers?	63%	37%	0%	0%
Did the workshop increase your appreciation for the use of primary source materials to learn about history?	47%	41%	13%	0%
After attending this workshop do you feel you gained a deeper understanding of American history?	39%	55%	6%	0%
Did the workshop improve your appreciation of American history?	47%	44%	9%	0%

Content

The teacher survey included 10 questions that specifically addressed the content presented during the workshop. These questions asked teachers if the content was review or new information for them and if they felt the content would be review or new information for their peers. Teachers answered these questions using a scale from 1 (the information was new) to 5 (the information was review).

There were 2 questions about key concepts historians use to think about the period. As shown in Exhibit 2 the majority of the teachers felt the concepts were review for them: 61% rated Initial Encounters as a 4 or 5 and 50% rated Columbian Exchange as a 4 or 5. The teachers felt, however, that both of these concepts would be new information for other teachers: 45% rated Initial Encounters as a 1 or 2 for other teachers and 55% rated Columbian Exchange as a 1 or 2 for other teachers. Despite the fact that the majority of teachers characterized the 2 key concepts as review for them, in response to the 2 (of 10) content-based questions a substantial number of teachers indicated that

this content was new information for them (28% for Columbian Exchange and 19% for Encounters). In response to the other questions regarding content, 10% of the teachers or fewer indicated that the information was new for them (see Appendix A).

Exhibit 2
Key Concepts Historians Use to Think About This Period

Key Concepts	To What Extent Was it Familiar to YOU?					To What Extent Would it be Likely to be Familiar to OTHER Teachers?				
	It Was New to Me			It Was Review for Me		Will be New to Other Teachers			Will be Review to Other Teachers	
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
a. Initial Encounters	0%	19%	19%	35%	26%	0%	45%	24%	21%	10%
b. Columbian Exchange	9%	19%	22%	28%	22%	7%	48%	28%	14%	3%

The teacher survey also included 6 questions about key facts essential to understanding the period of history addressed in the workshop. As shown in Exhibit 3 for all of these questions except one, 10% or fewer indicated that the information was new for them or for other teachers. The 1 exception was the fact “Initial encounters occurred over vast areas including Alaska, Hawaii, and the interior of what is now the United States, as well as on the East Coast” where 26% of the teachers felt this information would be new information for other teachers.

Exhibit 3
Key Facts to Understanding This Period

Key Facts to Understanding This Period	To What Extent Was it Familiar to YOU?					To What Extent Would it be Likely to be Familiar to OTHER Teachers?				
	It Was New to Me		It Was Review for Me			Will be New to Other Teachers			Will be Review to Other Teachers	
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
1. Extensive trade existed among Native Americans prior to encounters with Europeans.	0%	0%	22%	28%	50%	0%	10%	40%	37%	13%
2. Extensive trade existed between Africa, Asia, Europe prior to encounters in the Americas.	0%	3%	9%	34%	53%	0%	10%	37%	30%	23%
3. Many different Native American tribes were involved in initial encounters.	0%	3%	16%	31%	50%	0%	10%	41%	41%	7%
4. Many different European nations were involved in initial encounters.	0%	3%	10%	19%	68%	0%	3%	37%	33%	27%
5. Initial encounters occurred over vast areas including Alaska, Hawaii, and the interior of what is now the United States, as well as on the East Coast.	0%	7%	37%	33%	23%	3%	23%	33%	30%	10%
6. Initial encounters occurred over a period from 1492 through the early 1800s.	0%	9%	13%	41%	38%	0%	10%	30%	40%	20%

An interesting finding was that although the teachers typically characterized the same facts as review for themselves and for other teachers, they consistently reported being more familiar with the material than their peers. For example, 87% said they were familiar with the fact that many different European nations were involved in initial encounters, but only 60% believed that this fact was review for other teachers. Exhibit 4

demonstrates how teachers consistently reported being more familiar with the key facts than their peers.

Exhibit 4

Comparison of Facts That Are Review for Participants and Others

Fact	Percent of Teachers Who Rated Fact as Review^A	
	Themselves	Other Teachers
Many different European nations were involved in initial encounters.	87%	60%
Extensive trade existed between Africa, Asia, and Europe prior to encounters in the Americas.	87%	53%
Many different Native American tribes were involved in initial encounters.	81%	48%
Initial encounters occurred over a period from 1492 though the early 1800s.	79%	60%
Extensive trade existed among Native Americans prior to encounters with Europeans.	78%	50%
Initial encounters occurred over vast areas including Alaska, Hawaii, and the interior of what is now the United States, as well as on the East Coast.	56%	40%

^aRating of 4 or 5.

The teachers' responses to the 2 questions regarding key methods historians use to study the period followed a similar pattern. Forty-eight percent of the teachers felt the use of material sources (dolls, artwork, archaeological findings ect.) was review for them (rated a 5) and 44% felt the use of oral history was review for them (rated a 5). In contrast, 21% felt use of material sources was review for other teachers (rated a 5), and 21% felt the use of oral history was review for other teachers (rated a 5).

The survey asked teachers if the workshop had changed their perceptions about something they already knew and 63% responded affirmatively. Several teachers ($n = 8$) explained that they learned more about the Columbian Exchange, and some reported being surprised to learn about both the positive and negative impacts of the exchange, to learn how Europe was impacted, and to learn specifically what was being traded. Some teachers ($n = 3$) stated that the workshop had changed their perceptions by reminding them to consider the experiences of more than just those people in power.

The other responses ranged from changing perspectives on forced labor to viewing artifacts in a different way (see Appendix B).

All of the teacher reported that the content they had learned would be useful to them professionally. Numerous teachers ($n = 9$) indicated that the workshop gave them more knowledge about the content of the time period, which in turn increased their confidence with the material and their ability to discuss the time period. Teachers stated that the information they had learned would make them better teachers because they could enhance their curricula ($n = 4$), incorporate primary sources ($n = 4$), and use the activities in their classes ($n = 2$). Teachers stated how the workshop format reminded them to be critical thinkers with respect to source materials ($n = 3$) and provided a more balanced perspective of historical events ($n = 4$). Three teachers explained that although the particular time period in this workshop was not directly applicable to what their teaching, the information could serve as supplemental materials for their classes.

The facilitators and observers were each asked questions regarding the content of the workshop. Sixty percent of the facilitators reported that the content was “about the right level” and 40% reported that “the content was challenging but doable” for the teachers. All of the facilitators agreed that the workshop appeared to provide the teachers with a good balance of old and new information and all of the facilitators indicated that the teachers’ content knowledge increased “to some extent” through their participation in the workshop. The observers noted that the teachers seemed comfortable with the level of content because they were engaged in the workshops.

Multimedia Approach

Teachers were asked if a multimedia approach (i.e., using a combination of the print materials, video, and activities) is an effective method to increase teachers’ content knowledge in American history, and 97% answered affirmatively. Their explanations ($n = 19$) underscored the concept that the multimedia approach addresses various learning styles (i.e., oral, visual), which helped them absorb the material. The teachers ($n = 10$) also explained that they liked transitioning between the various components in the workshop—for example, from the video to an activity—because these shifts kept

their attention and interest in the workshop. One teacher remarked that the workshop's multimedia approach served as a good model for classroom instruction.

The facilitator survey asked the respondents to indicate whether they believed the multimedia approach is an effective workshop format and how it compares to other professional development formats they had used. Four of the 5 facilitators indicated that the multimedia approach was similar to what they had used in other professional development workshops. They explained that the multimedia approach works well, is an effective way to present material, keeps the participants' attention, and addresses different learning styles.

Print Materials

The teachers were asked 8 questions regarding their satisfaction with the print materials and their suggestions for improving the print materials. On average, the teachers felt it would take a teacher 1½ hours to read the print materials in preparation for the workshop and the majority of the teachers responded positively to the materials. The teachers reported, for example, that the print materials:

- Had “about the right amount of depth/detail” (78%).
- Were “very useful” in preparing them for the workshop (75%).
- Were “very interesting” (72%).
- “Clearly explained the information presented” (61%).
- Helped them understand the concepts addressed in the entire workshop “to a great extent” (61%).

Teachers did not rate the order of print materials as highly. For all other questions at least 61% of the teachers gave the print materials the highest rating; in contrast, only 56% of teachers gave the print materials the highest rating in terms of their order. In addition, although the print materials received high ratings in terms of depth and detail, a substantial number of teachers (18%) indicated that the print materials “could have used more depth and detail.”

The observers noted if the print materials appeared useful. The observers thought the teachers found the print materials useful because the teachers referred to them periodically ($n = 1$), they had highlighted information in the materials ($n = 1$), and had verbally stated that they had learned a lot from the materials ($n = 1$). Two observers commented that teachers had expressed enjoyment of the articles about chocolate.

Print Material Improvements

The respondents (teacher, observer) described various improvements to the format, content, and overall direction of the print materials, but no consistent themes emerged from the responses. In terms of format or organization, teachers suggested making the print materials more user friendly ($n = 2$) by making them more organized, “better organized-explanations of primary resources. More details or better user-friendly format (too bland)” making the materials less sporadic “a little sporadic so wasn’t sure where it all fit; now I understand after we discussed what the research was after” ($n = 1$), and providing summary questions at the end of each section ($n = 1$). An observer suggested numbering the pages for easy reference ($n = 1$).

Respondents (teacher, observer) provided a wide range of responses regarding the content of the print materials. Some teachers wanted more detail ($n = 3$), a better explanation for the primary sources ($n = 1$), and a more thorough explanation of the surrounding context ($n = 1$). One teacher was concerned that much of the terminology in the print materials would not be familiar to teachers and suggested providing a vocabulary list. One observer suggested the introduction to the print materials encourage teachers to make notations or highlight important information. One teacher suggested including more accounts of average citizens.

Two teachers who commented on the overall direction of the print materials had differing views. One teacher expressed the concern that the print materials were too open: “Some required assumptions or interpretations that young students probably would have difficulties with. Sometimes the questions were not really answered in the reading. I would suggest changing some or add that material information to the reading.” Another teacher thought parts of the print materials were too confining:

“Rewrite the overviews to make them less generalized and pro- the theme. I felt the overview was pushing me to accept a point of view as the only explanation which made me less receptive to comprehending new ideas. So much is not mentioned in the overview.”

Video

The teachers and facilitators were asked the same 3 questions about the video: whether the topics were covered in sufficient detail, whether the information was clearly presented, and the introduction to the content was appealing. Most of the teachers (72%) and all of the facilitators agreed that the topics in the video were covered in “about the right amount of depth and detail.” The teachers and facilitators agreed, on the appeal of the video: 66% of the teachers and 60% of the facilitators indicated the video was “very appealing,” and 28% of the teachers and 40% indicated the video was “somewhat appealing.” The teachers and the facilitators disagreed, however, regarding the presentation of the information: 81% of the teachers reported that it was “very clearly” explained, but only 40% of the facilitators felt this way.

Video Improvements

Although 66% of the teachers rated the video as “very appealing”, of the 3 questions on the survey regarding the video, teachers rated the video lowest with regard to it providing an appealing introduction to the material, which was its primary purpose. The answers to the open-ended questions may provide insight into how the appeal of the video could be enhanced for more teachers. Some teachers ($n = 4$) reported that too much of the video focused on historians who were bland, unenthusiastic, and ineloquent in their responses. Some ($n = 4$) asserted that the video needed more depth and detail which may suggest the teachers thought the primary purpose of the video was to convey content. The teachers suggested more examples ($n = 2$) and visuals ($n = 2$), less fact time and more scenes ($n = 1$), and more reenacting ($n = 1$). Teachers also suggested that the video could be more made more exciting by editing ($n = 1$) or improving the music and speeding up the shots ($n = 1$). One teacher commented that the video segments needed to be more congruent with the overall direction of the

workshop and another teacher disagreed with the content, remarking that the video suggests massive violence happened in only North America after 1492.

The observers and facilitators provided few suggestions for improving the video. The observers only indicated that the teachers appeared to be engaged and interested in the videos. The 3 facilitators who provided comments regarding the video suggested highlighting the key points of the video ($n = 1$), strengthening the link between the video and the activities ($n = 1$), and decreasing the number of still photos ($n = 1$).

Activities

The teacher survey included 4 questions about the activities. The teachers provided strong ratings regarding the activities. For example, the percentage of teachers who:

- Rated the instructions as “very clear and easy to follow” was 79%.
- Rated the activities as “very interesting” was 72%.
- Rated the activities as “about the right level of difficulty” was 72%.
- Indicated that the activities deepened their understanding of the history content was 87%.

The survey asked teachers the open-ended question, “Did the activities deepen your understanding of the history content? If so, how?” For the open-ended questions, all responses (i.e., from participants in both the revised and original activities) are presented. One of the most common responses ($n = 7$) was that the teachers deepened their knowledge because the activities provided time to collaborate, discuss, and reflect with other teachers. Another common response ($n = 7$) was that the teachers gained a complete picture of the content and made connections with the materials because they were engaged as an active learner. Teachers also indicated that by participating in the activities they gained new insights ($n = 2$).

The facilitator survey included 8 questions about the activities. In terms of the clarity and ease of the activity instructions, 2 indicated that the instructions were “somewhat clear and easy to follow” and 1 reported that the instructions were “very clear and easy to

follow.” Two facilitators indicated that the activities were “very interesting” and 1 indicated that they were only “somewhat interesting.” All of facilitators agreed that the activities “to a great extent” helped the teachers better understand the concepts addressed in the workshop. In terms of appropriateness of the level of difficulty, 1 indicated “about the right level of difficulty” and 2 reported that activities were ‘challenging but doable.’ As Exhibit 5 shows, the facilitators tended to feel that the right amount of time was allocated for each activity.

**Exhibit 5
Allocation of Time for Activities**

Activity	Number of Respondents				
	Not Nearly Enough Time	Some-What Hurried	About Right	Some Idle Time	Way too Much Time
Warm Up	0	0	2	1	0
Historical Perspectives	1	0	2	0	0
Following Faces of America	0	1	2	0	0
Historians at Work	1	0	2	0	0

Activity Improvements

The facilitator survey included an open-ended question that asked how the activities could be improved. The facilitators’ responses primarily contained advice for facilitators leading future workshops. Four of the 5 facilitators emphasized the importance of preparing to lead the activities by planning the activities ahead of time, anticipating the pacing of the activities, rehearsing the activities, having the activity materials ready ahead of time, and thoroughly reading the materials to be able to dialogue with the participants. Other suggestions included allowing the facilitator the flexibility to adjust the activities to the energy level of the participants ($n = 1$), concluding activities by

asking participants to consider how the activities might be useful to them as teachers ($n = 1$), and conducting the activities with small groups ($n = 1$).

The observers most commonly reported that the Columbian Exchange Activity ($n = 3$) was best received by the teachers. This activity engaged the teachers and generated a lot of discussion. The observers ($n = 2$) noted that the Timeline Activity went well but the discussion afterwards was relatively flat. The observers remarked that the concept of looking at artifacts (for the Artifact Activity) was new to many teachers. One observer suggested providing more in this activity for the teachers to read and answer questions because the material was not fresh enough in the teachers' minds. Another observer noted the teachers did not seem as energized during this activity. Three of the observers felt the Artifact Activity needed to clearly state what the participants should be doing with the artifacts and why looking at artifacts is important (only 1 of these observers had observed the original activity). One observer suggested including a map in the print materials to enable the teachers to prepare for the activity.

Course Guide

The facilitators were asked 4 questions regarding the Unit Course Guide. These questions addressed the organization of the guide, the instructions, the level of information included, and the timeline. The majority of the facilitators (60%) agreed that the information provided in the guide was adequate to lead the workshop. Exhibit 6 shows that the facilitators differed when rating other aspects of the Unit Course Guide and tended to rate the guide in the middle of the response scales.

Three facilitators provided suggestions for the Unit Course Guide. One facilitator suggested labeling the exhibits clearly, permitting the facilitator to allow the teachers to work together in a large group, and providing copies of the overheads to the teachers (3 teachers also expressed a desire to receive copies of the overheads). Another facilitator considered the Unit Course Guide too controlled and commented, "Something over which you have no control is the personality of the facilitator. Sometimes it seemed too controlled."

Exhibit 6
Facilitators Responses Regarding the Unit Course Guide

Survey Question	Very Logical	Somewhat Logical	Not Very Logical	Not at All Logical
To what extent was the Unit Course Guide organized in a logical manner?	20%	80%	0%	0%
	Very Clear and Easy to Follow	Somewhat Clear and Easy to Follow	Not Very Clear and Easy to Follow	Not at All Clear or Easy to Follow
To what extent were the Unit Course Guide instructions clear and easy to follow?	20%	60%	20%	0%
	Not Nearly Enough Time	Somewhat Hurried	About Right	Idle Time or too Much Time
To what extent was the time allocation recommended in the guide appropriate?	20%	40%	40%	0%

Discussion

The formative evaluation results provide an abundance of useful information to inform the development of the remaining units in the workshop series. Overall, the teachers, facilitators, and observers were satisfied with the workshop and described the workshop's valuable attributes. A consistently noted attribute across all participant types was the occurrence of quality group discussions that allowed teachers to learn different perspectives.

Although this unit was only one in a series, the participants rated the workshop highly with regard to the grant goals. Participants reported that they gained a greater understanding of the lives, roles, and impact of individuals in American history; increased appreciation for the use of primary source materials to learn about history; a deeper understanding of American history; and a greater appreciation of American history. The goal the participants most consistently remarked on was the use of primary source materials. The teachers explained that the use of primary source materials in the workshop strengthened their connections with the content, reminded them to think critically about historical material, reminded them to use other sources than textbooks, and reminded them that primary source material can be used to expand upon more basic material.

The teachers and facilitators emphasized the benefits of a multimedia approach to professional development and all of the teachers indicated that the workshop made them want to learn more. The teachers asserted that because they learned more content and were inspired to search out additional information and resources, they would become better teachers. They also indicated that the depth of the content presented during the workshop made them more confident in their knowledge of and ability to teach this content.

An interesting finding regarding the content of the workshop was that teachers consistently reported that the workshop would help their peers more than themselves in terms of content. This sentiment could have several explanations. For example,

teachers who attended the workshops in their free time might be more interested in self-learning and therefore would have obtained more content knowledge than their peers. Another possible explanation could be that the teachers' content knowledge might be closer to their peers than they would like to admit and on the survey they possibly overestimated what they felt was review information for themselves. Further examination of this phenomenon in future data collection efforts would be useful and it will be important to keep in mind when evaluating the subjective acquisition of content knowledge through workshops.

The individual components of the workshop were highly rated by the participants. The print materials provided a solid foundation of content for the time period and the activities deepened the teachers' knowledge. Although the teachers indicated that some of the activities could be improved, they believed that the activities are appropriate for adults and reported that they provided the teachers with good ideas for classroom activities. One area of possible concern was that the primary purpose of the video was to provide an appealing introduction to the material. Yet participants thought the primary purpose of the video was to convey content. The participants' suggestions for increasing the appeal of the video ranged from decreasing the amount of expert talk to including more reenactments.

The activities were the area the facilitators consistently noted the importance of being prepared to lead the workshop. Were the activities in this workshop particularly difficult to prepare for or perhaps once the facilitators were leading the workshop they realized they were not as prepared as they would have liked. It would be beneficial to determine if facilitators needed more direction and prompting when leading this part of the workshops. Perhaps part of the confusion regarding the activities was due the facilitators not being fully prepared. It must be noted, that on the facilitators behalf the formative evaluation was on a tight timeline and this may have led some facilitators to not be as prepared as they would have liked. Additionally, the facilitators that received the revised activities had even less time to prepare the activities than the facilitators that received the original activities.

In general the teachers attending the workshop appeared to understand the purpose of the workshop. Yet, there were several comments throughout the surveys that suggested the teachers were confused regarding the purpose of the workshop. For example, teachers commented that the content they learned would not be useful because it did not directly apply to the state standards they are required to cover in their classes or that they wanted materials (i.e. curriculum, activities) they could take directly back to their classes.

RMC Research suggests the consortium partners consider the following recommendations based on the evaluation results when developing the remaining units in the workshop series:

- Organize the print materials differently. Participants suggested that print materials needed to flow more smoothly and be more user friendly.
- Make the video more appealing. The participants suggested focusing less on the historians and including more visuals.
- Examine the Columbian Exchange Activity in comparison to the other activities to glean why this activity was the most successful. How was this activity structured differently and why did it produce a more positive response from participants?
- Clearly define the purpose of the Artifact Activity. Participants suggested the instructions should more clearly state what they are supposed to do with the artifacts and why looking at artifacts is important.
- Include copies of some of the facilitator's overheads in the print materials. Participants indicated a desire for the questions on the overheads to be included in their print materials.
- Provide very clear instructions in the Unit Course Guide to ensure that facilitators understand that preparing for the successful implementation of the workshop activities requires much time and preparation.
- Either eliminate some of the workshop to make it shorter or retain all of the materials and extend the duration of the workshop.

- Make the facilitators and the teachers fully aware that the purpose of the workshop is to increase the teachers' content knowledge.

Appendix A

Teacher Closed Ended Responses

Turning Points in American History—Teacher

Respondents: 32

General

	Excellent	Moderate	Poor
1. How would you rate the . . .			
a) workshop overall?	45%	45%	6%
b) organization of the workshop overall?	50%	34%	3%

Grant Goals & Content

	To a Great Extent	To Some Extent	Not Very Much	Not at All
1. To what extent did the workshop advance your content knowledge?	41%	52%	7%	0%
2. To what extent do you feel the unit would advance the content knowledge of your peers?	63%	37%	0%	0%
3. Did the workshop help you gain a greater understanding of the lives, roles, and impact of individuals in American history?	45%	48%	6%	0%
4. After attending this workshop do you feel you gained a deeper understanding of American history?	39%	55%	6%	0%
5. Did the workshop improve your appreciation of American history?	47%	44%	9%	0%
6. Did the workshop increase your appreciation for the use of primary source materials to learn about history?	47%	41%	13%	0%
7. Did the workshop provide you with information that you wanted to know about this period?	45%	52%	3%	0%

8. To what extent was each individual, event, or concept listed below familiar to you or to other teachers?

	To what extent was it familiar to YOU?					To what extent would it be likely to be familiar to OTHER teachers?				
	It was new to me		It was review for me			Will be new to other teachers		Will be review to other teachers		
Key concepts historians use to think about this period										
a. Initial Encounters	0%	19%	19%	35%	26%	0%	45%	24%	21%	10%
b. Columbian Exchange	9%	19%	22%	28%	22%	7%	48%	28%	14%	3%
Key facts to understand about this period										
c. Extensive trade existed among Native Americans prior to encounters with Europeans.	0%	0%	22%	28%	50%	0%	10%	40%	37%	13%
d. Extensive trade existed between Africa, Asia, Europe prior to encounters in the Americas.	0%	3%	9%	34%	53%	0%	10%	37%	30%	23%
e. Many different Native American tribes were involved in initial encounters.	0%	3%	16%	31%	50%	0%	10%	41%	41%	7%
f. Many different European nations were involved in initial encounters.	0%	3%	10%	19%	68%	0%	3%	37%	33%	27%
g. Initial encounters occurred over vast areas including Alaska, Hawaii, and the interior of what is now the United States, as well as on the East Coast.	0%	7%	37%	33%	23%	3%	23%	33%	30%	10%
h. Initial encounters occurred over a period from 1492 through the early 1800s.	0%	9%	13%	41%	38%	0%	10%	30%	40%	20%
Key methods historians use to study this period										
i. Use of oral history to understand the past.	0%	6%	16%	34%	44%	0%	10%	48%	21%	21%
j. Use of material sources (dolls, artwork, archaeological finds, etc.) to understand the past.	0%	10%	19%	23%	48%	3%	10%	52%	14%	21%

Reading Materials

1. Were the reading materials provided to you prior to the workshop useful in preparing you for the workshop?
 - 75% Very useful
 - 22% Somewhat useful
 - 3% Not very useful (Please explain below)
 - 0% Not at all useful (Please explain below)

2. To what extent did the reading materials present the content in a useful order?
 - 56% The content was in a very useful order
 - 41% The content was in a somewhat useful order
 - 3% The content was not in a very useful order
 - 0% The content was not at all in a useful order

3. To what extent were the topics in the reading materials covered in adequate depth and detail?
 - 0% Way too much depth/detail
 - 3% A little too much depth/detail
 - 78% About the right amount of depth/detail
 - 019 Could have used more depth/detail
 - 0% Not nearly enough depth/ detail

4. To what extent did reading materials clearly explain the information presented?
 - 61% Very clearly
 - 39% Somewhat clearly
 - 0% Not very clearly
 - 0% Not at all clearly

5. To what extent did the reading materials interest you?
 - 72% They were very interesting
 - 25% They were somewhat interesting
 - 3% They were not very interesting
 - 0% They were not at all interesting

6. To what extent did the reading materials help you better understand the concepts addressed in the entire workshop?
 - 61% To a great extent
 - 35% To some extent
 - 3% Not very much
 - 0% Not at all

7. Approximately how much time would it take for a teacher to read the materials? 92.2

Video

1. Did the videos provide an appealing introduction to American history?
 - 66% The videos were very appealing
 - 28% The videos were somewhat appealing
 - 3% The videos were not very appealing
 - 3% The videos were not at all appealing
2. To what extent were the topics in the video covered in adequate depth and detail?
 - 9% The topics were covered in way too much depth/detail
 - 3% The topics were covered in a little too much depth/detail
 - 72% The topics were covered in about the right amount of depth/detail
 - 13% The topics could have used more depth/detail
 - 3% The topics were not covered in nearly enough depth/detail
3. To what extent did the videos clearly explain the information presented?
 - 81% Very clearly
 - 19% Somewhat clearly
 - 0% Not very clearly
 - 0% Not at all clearly
4. To what extent did the videos help you better understand the concepts addressed in the entire workshop?
 - 71% To a great extent
 - 29% To some extent
 - 0% Not very much
 - 0% Not at all

Activities

1. To what extent are the activity instructions clear and easy to follow? (All participants)
 - 68% Very clear and easy to follow
 - 29% Somewhat clear and easy to follow
 - 3% Not very clear or easy to follow
 - 0% Not at all clear or easy to follow
1. To what extent are the activity instructions clear and easy to follow? (Revised activity participants)
 - 79% Very clear and easy to follow
 - 22% Somewhat clear and easy to follow
 - 0% Not very clear or easy to follow
 - 0% Not at all clear or easy to follow
2. To what extent were the activities interesting? (All participants)
 - 69% Very interesting
 - 28% Somewhat interesting
 - 3% Not very interesting
 - 0% Not at all interesting

2. To what extent were the activities interesting? (Revised activity participants)
- 72% Very interesting
 - 28% Somewhat interesting
 - 0% Not very interesting
 - 0% Not at all interesting
3. To what extent do you feel the level of difficulty of the activities were appropriate? (All participants)
- 3% The activities were way too difficult
 - 22% The activities were challenging but doable
 - 69% About the right level of difficulty
 - 6% The activities were fairly easy
 - 0% The activities were way too easy
3. To what extent do you feel the level of difficulty of the activities were appropriate? (Revised activity participants)
- 0% The activities were way too difficult
 - 22% The activities were challenging but doable
 - 72% About the right level of difficulty
 - 6% The activities were fairly easy
 - 0% The activities were way too easy
4. To what extent did the activities help you better understand the concepts addressed in the entire workshop? (All participants)
- 52% To a great extent
 - 45% To some extent
 - 3% Not very much
 - 0% Not at all
4. To what extent did the activities help you better understand the concepts addressed in the entire workshop? (Revised activity participants)
- 47% To a great extent
 - 47% To some extent
 - 6% Not very much
 - 0% Not at all

Thank you!

Please give this form to X and X will give you your payment.

Appendix B
Teacher Open Ended Responses

Turning Points in American History—Teacher Results

General

2. How was this workshop different than other professional development workshops that you have attended?
 - Small with good interaction
 - Very information driver, yet collaborative also
 - Nice small group. Opinions of different viewpoints were part of our “exploration”
 - It was basically a review of materials that could be used in classes.
 - It was interesting to have open discussion of perspectives rather than a “concrete’ this is what happened type of thing.
 - The use of video and the variety of activities were great.
 - I’ve never examined artifacts at a workshop before or been served pizza.
 - I was asked to some previous reading to aid my background knowledge. I was engaged in all of the activities.
 - It was wonderful to have material ahead of time to begin to absorb and ponder connecting information.
 - Fewer people; more chances to give our opinions; not just lecture format giving information.
 - I enjoyed the size/intimacy of this workshop as it allowed for all group interaction and the compilation of ideas. I feel this workshop was more focused on the facts/useful teacher material than some which focus on theory.
 - It was more evaluative on the end of the teachers.
 - Smaller group-more geared to my topic area interests. Did not have to change my idea of teaching-only add to knowledge.
 - The small group size was helpful to be able to have more chances to interact rather than more people listening in a large group.
 - The focus was on history and primary sources. We are focused so much on reading and standards based education that we don’t get much of this.
 - There was more focus on content and less on teaching methodology, which I enjoyed. I also thought it was useful that we are all middle school history teachers. Everyone in the group understood what was going on and was interested. If you mix math teachers in the group, this would be less useful.
 - The workshop focused on primary sources and the discussion of these sources. It also looked at different perspectives of encounters, which opened up discussion how we look at history.
 - Opportunity to actually look at primary source materials and make connections to other events in history allowed me to really see that historical events don’t happen in isolation.
 - It was much more interactive. It also provided me with materials I could modify and use in my classroom tomorrow. I greatly appreciated that it was practical rather than theoretical.

- It covered an area, that as a U.S. teacher I do not cover. However, many facts of the seminar will be incorporated through colonization 1600–1775.
 - Small group interaction was good.
 - Much more interaction with materials and other participants.
 - The obvious answer is that it is highly content oriented, which I find refreshing. While teaching philosophy and methods are very important, content is often over looked. The variety of activities was also nice.
 - This actually focuses on a specific topic or topics and has practical application to what I teach.
 - I really like the variety of presentation materials. This would really appeal to students.
 - More directly involved with my subject area/interest level.
 - I felt part of a team which was organized to create/evaluate work which will be useful to many in the future (when finished).
 - This workshop was exactly what I've been looking for!! Not only was the content/info much pertinent to our study of history, but the presenter demonstrated excellent teaching methods/activities/etc. We can use in our own classroom.
 - Far more relevant. Very useful information and exchange of ideas. Activities were engaging and focused.
 - I found this workshop to be interesting and pertinent.
 - It was actually very informative and entertaining.
 - I was an active and interested participant – the workshop enabled me to really think about the material candidly. Usually I keep quite.
3. Did any part of the workshop make you want to learn more? Which parts and why?
- Look for more primary sources.
 - Yes-the reading. Also discussion questions were probing, open ended.
 - Concept of force labor (theme)
 - Basic information can be expanded upon from further sources.
 - Yes- the part of positive/negative exchange
 - Some of the information about economic impact. The impact of the exchange.
 - Our parts of the workshop-including the pre-reading made me curious to learn more because there were random smatterings of things I learned that I didn't know before.
 - I wanted to know more in general about many of the prominent figures introduced.
 - The primary documents.
 - I want more of the trivia that is interrelated to what we do teach. It added wonderful depth/more objective picture of the whole plant life/food/animals were fun.
 - Most all of it tempted me to want to learn more since the more you learn the more you realize there still is to learn.
 - Yes-How to obtain and incorporate more primary sources in the curriculum and to incorporate concepts that transcend centuries
 - Yes. I wanted to know more details about the individual encounters and expeditions. I am not familiar with these lesser known events.

- I always want more enhancement type learning to increase my knowledge base.
 - The impact of the European microbes on the Sioux and other cultures because it's important to learn the impact that these different cultures had on each other and didn't know they were spreading disease.
 - I enjoyed learning more history, looking at primary sources and analyzing them with fellow teachers. It is useful for history teachers to get together and talk history.
 - Yes, I would like more information about how these lesson could be implemented into our standards.
 - Yes, LaSalle and also the shipwreck in Texas. Completely new to me.
 - The information on LaSalle and the LaBelle was fascinating and something was totally unaware of. I was also interested in Estebans encounter with the Zuni which produced Katchina dolls for generations.
 - I thought the LaSalle and Esteban portions were very interesting. I had never known the natives enslaved Europeans.
 - I would have liked to have time to learn more about many different parts of exploration and the Columbian Exchange.
 - Yes, artifacts. They were interesting and the way they stimulated discussions with the questions posed.
 - I actually was familiar with a lot of the information but the personal accounts of Esteban's experiences were captivating and would be a great teaching tool because you get drawn into the idea of knowing this past individual has story illustrates several important pints, as well. (i.e., forced labor)
 - I am kind of interested in the rest of the programs because it offers a little different perspective on certain ideas.
 - Absolutely, there was quite a bit of new information. The focus of the content material was very interesting.
 - Need to brush up on early European exploration.
 - The interaction of Americans and Europeans. How these early encounters follow a pattern. Is it human nature? Will it continue in the future?
 - All parts of the workshop made me want to learn more, especially about positive effects of the Columbian Exchange, for it seems at times, teachers tend to stress the negative effects for one/two sides or vice versa. Sometimes we tend to teach to our own biases.
 - All of it – the info in the packet regarding Columbian Exchange, encounters between various groups the activities to use with students.
 - Yes, because that's the type of person I am.
 - Yes. It made me consider how American products changed other continents versus always looking at how America changed.
 - Iron and metal exchange. Desoto's exploration.
4. Was there any part of the workshop that was difficult to understand or confusing?
- No
 - No
 - The map activity was pretty fast, and had to write down.

- No.
- Yes, the timeline was difficult to expound upon
- Not really
- No.
- The map activity. I wasn't able to participate directions, expectations, and materials were limiting.
- No.
- A few questions; worried about portraying something incorrectly; data when do few people . . . was challenging and thought provoking.
- I wasn't sure as a participant what the purpose was of the overall workshop before coming- were we participating in an experimental sense, editing, evaluating ect.
- Some of the questions in the activities were confusing or non-applicable.
- The packet is choppy and in higher level language. It could be organized better to make it more user-friendly and easier to locate information.
- NO.
- In the Columbian Exchange, appendix B the neutral section didn't really seem to make sense for most of the products.
- I thought the timeline assignment was not so useful. I believe 8th graders would not get much out of that activity.
- I found the workshop understandable and the discussions after each activity.
- No.
- No. It was very clear.
- Not really, it seemed pretty upfront.
- I don't think any of the parts were difficult to understand. It went together very well sometimes thing were covered a little to quick.
- No.
- No.
- Some of the exerts are tough to figure out without any back ground knowledge. Ex: appendix C and the Clatsop.
- No, although I believe that students might need more explanation for some of the questions.
- No.
- Some primary source material seemed up for interpretation (so you could have many). So what is correct? Who is to say?
- Not really, for the most part most was reasonable, quite reachable for most educated audiences.
- No.
- Not really.
- The numbering of the map activity.
- How to do the timeline activity – the set up was initially confusing.

5. What do you think was the most valuable aspect of the workshop? Why?
- It reinforced the fact that teachers must look outside of the textbook to get away from the problem of “history is in the eye of the writer.” Everyone read the material beforehand and contributed.
 - Whole group discussion-info activity.
 - Doing hands on activities e.g. timeline would be great for middle school.
 - Sharing ideas and opinions of aspects of interpretations
 - That it provided a forum for conversation with a removal of antagonistic “one or the other” versions (good vs. evil)
 - The variety of activities the fact on how indigenous resources impacted the rest of the world.
 - The videos and pre-reading because of the density of information.
 - The discussion between peers
 - The differing perspectives of the participants. It is always valuable to have different insights than I myself have.
 - Ideas! How to use time line with groups or new ideas. Concepts through artifacts.
 - The combination of learning styles and activities- video, reading, group activities, timeline ect.
 - The new information about the Columbian Exchange-the impact of the exchange on cultures around the globe.
 - The video-I’m a visual learner.
 - I am able to walk away with a few materials and the promise of future . . . I have another knowledge base and resources.
 - Emphasizing the use of primary sources as a catalyst to generate critical thought.
 - Talking history with fellow history teacher we learn from each other.
 - The most valuable aspect of the workshop was the opportunity to discuss both side of an issue and be able to develop a better understanding of the historical documents.
 - Concrete questioning techniques I can use with my students. Loved the timeline activity.
 - The discussion/reflection question were thought provoking and meaningful. The video clips were also very informative.
 - I thought the two charts that we filled out that listed horses, yaws, etc as well as the fill in yourself chart were very good. I will make something like that for my class.
 - Learning about the relationships between the cultures and I learned about relationships and interactions I was unaware of.
 - The cultural exchanges were shown to be much more diverse and flowing both ways more than what is normally depicted in text books.
 - Doing activities makes people participate and directly relates to our profession. Is an additional source of new ideas while we are discussing the content.
 - Getting other ideas and input from the information given and also collecting data for classes through media sources.
 - I loved the interviews with experts and the way that validated what we had just discussed.

- Discussion with other educators about how U.S. history is taught. Primary sources are always fascinating.
- Make a person stop to analyze many things. Great opportunity to hear other peoples ideas and thoughts. Very active. Very organized. Time flow.
- All was valuable. I loved seeing the video!!! Everything I saw on the videos I talk about in class, everyday – too bad the kids could not see it too!
- Small group. Engaging relevant activities. Great video.
- Being able to interact with other social studies teachers in small groups.
- The new information I gleaned as mentioned above. I also learned about the French trying to colonize Texas which I didn't know.
- Reflecting on what the Columbian exchange is . . . “diverse encounter” – what does this mean?

6. What do you think was the least valuable aspect of the workshop? Why?

- Peter H. Wood et al tend to interject value judgments.
- NA
- NA
- I enjoy sharing ideas and resources.
- NA
- Going over-time
- None.
- The map confusing.
- Some sections could have been shortened to or speeded up.
- None all interesting.
- Really not sure-Everything seemed linked and purposeful.
- Analysis of the color plates-for me. Probably valuable to the writers of the curriculum.
- The “group” activities are not necessary. I prefer to discuss the events instead of doing an activity.
- Time of night mostly because long day.
- The videos lacked life, they were not very engaging, my students would shut down.
- Timeline activity. See #4
- I would like to see the workshop be able to handout lesions that could easily be taken back to classroom.
- I wish we would have done these activities with 8th grade U.S. History resources.
- All of the pre-reading much of it was not discussed.
- The timeline.
- I do not believe there was a part that was not valuable.
- I did not find anything to be least valuable. I enjoyed this enough that I would not want to characterize any segment in that light.
- Nothing
- Nothing

- Factual materials – I already knew most of the materials regarding Columbian Exchange.
- Not always sure where we were headed. Is there more? What next? What can I do? What do I need to produce?
- There was nothing that was not valuable!
- All good!
- Dinner.
- Map activity.
- The first video we saw was too general.

7. What suggestions do you have to improve the workshop?

- This workshop gave me the impression we were editing a doctoral project. I would tend to think this workshop could be directed to people who have been in the teaching profession (history) for more than 5 years. We need to change our mindset and ethnocentrism e.g. Middle East vs. Southwest Asia.
- More people, voices are always beneficial.
- NA
- Reading list to gain more depth. Activities that promote questions about history.
- I'd like the Hawaiian experience expanded.
- Nothing for right now.
- A global map during the timeline activity would have been better.
- Have materials available for required activities. Bigger maps containing all places exposed by dates. Have sticky notes with dates to put where they go on the maps. Have notes color coded to each century. Not only compare one event from each century to find similarities but give a similarity and have audience pull the events that go to it.
- NA
- Perhaps a few more people to add comfort and greater realm of ideas.
- Perhaps if it is done in a trial sort of like this be sure participants are aware of their overall objectives as well yours.
- Monitoring who is talking when (smoothly allocating comments speeds things up)
- More organization-focus-overarching question maybe
- Give us a little more of the documentation of resource sources to work with instead of experts.
- Add music as a primary source. The one major draw back is that much of sources used are not in the California State standards. Try to gear it towards what is there and focus on one grade level. Much of this, I can not use as an 8th grade teacher. Lastly allow more time for in dept discussion.
- Units more closely connected to CA State standards.
- Making the workshop a 3 day activity. Also, to incorporate world history and its connection to U.S.
- See #6.
- It was difficult to concentrate for 2 ½ hrs after a full day @ school.

- Maybe having a larger group so that the seminar can include a variety of ideas.
- The workshop was good maybe a few slides showing the pictures of the artifacts people discussed in the activities.
- Actually, this is one of the best I have participated in 29 years, so I am still absorbing much of it and how to utilize the concepts or types of activities in my classes. Therefore at this point I really don't have any suggestions for improvement.
- Discuss the videos or incorporate an activity. The quality of, as a group.
- I think that this is fine, there is enough information, it is not too long, it was broken up into discussions and activities. I would maybe like to see some resources teachers could use and teaching ideas to use the information in lessons.
- This was well planned and easy to follow. I'm sure that for future training the context in which these units might be used will be discussed. Will the entire program be a stand alone, supplemental, etc?
- None. Very well done. Well, perhaps do this as a summer session. It's hard to do this on a school night and now I won't get to spend much time with my son (infant.)
- More think time. Require all member to speak. This was about North American history – not U.S. history. This wasn't made clear upfront.
- Nothing to improve it – but make it mandatory for all social studies teachers!
- More often and on other subjects.
- Nothing.
- I think that it was good to have a small group. It made it easy to communicate ideas and to move on to the next topic.
- I enjoyed this very much. I can't imagine an improvement. Keep teachers from same grade level together.

Grant Goals & Content

9. Did the workshop change your perception about something you already knew? Please explain.
- I had recently taken college/university classes and this material is very familiar. My professor made sure we looked without bias.
 - Yes, the impressions of a wider group of people instead of just who was in power.
 - NA
 - No, but it expanded the ideas that I already have.
 - It increased my awareness of the exchange perspective
 - The fact that the exchange benefited European culture.
 - It didn't really change my perception
 - Yes. I knew there was trading going on but didn't think about discuss or what was truly exchanged.
 - NO-gained some additional details.
 - Enslaved individuals knew about other people and how they were held for ransom or made to guide them ?

- Helped illuminate the finer details as well as the links/interdependencies of cultures and events.
- It made me more aware that European culture was impacted by exchange in Americas.
- NO.
- No.
- LaSalle shipwreck, encouraged Spain to settle with Texas, Chocolate the impact of the potato on Europe, the Sioux winter calendar.
- I have a greater appreciation for the complicity of Columbian Exchange.
- Many of the things that were shown to me I already knew. Therefore it did not change my perception.
- No.
- Yes, information on the potato and it's introduction to the European diet eventually led to Ireland's dependence or and then demise from the crop.
- Kind of. I already understood the damage to Native cultures that internation caused. It was fu to learn about Esteban.
- It did to a point. The discussions gave new perspective.
- Yes, use of artifacts and primary sources in terms of questions and interactions pertaining to them with small and large groups. Also use of the collaborative efforts for the initial and final timeline.
- Taking a deeper look at the uses of forced labor is an interesting concept and does expand ones perception of formed labor beyond antebellum south.
- Columbian exchange. I really did not think that deeply about it but there are a lot of applicable items.
- Yes, I had a much greater appreciation for the exchange of ideas, products, culture as a part of the Columbian Exchange.
- Not really, I've taught this subject/content many times so I already knew about the multiple contacts/trade routes etc. But it was good to see that others teach it similarly to me.
- That early encounter between Europeans and Americans natives began peacefully with trade and ended up in domination, slavery and war.
- Somewhat, it made me feel I must cover (equally and fairly) both/all point of view, as positive and negative as they may be.
- Russian involvement in US exploration.
- Yes, native American and European trade of diseases, mammals, etc.
- I changed my thinking about how to present the "Age of Exploration" and approach it as Columbian Exchange.

10. Do you think the content you learned will be useful in your profession as a teacher? Please explain.

- Absolutely. Sometimes it is okay to detour from the textbook that is biased and go to the primary sources.
- Yes, author's viewpoint analysis should always be part of reading.
- Yes it has given me a broader view and I liked the hands-on activities. I will use them.

- Yes, sharing ideas is always stimulating.
- Yes, it helps bring a more balanced perspective
- Yes, it is good to get different perspectives on history.
- Yes- like the succinct way it was organized.
- Yes. More depth of knowledge.
- Yes-anytime you can add context or details to explain is beneficial to students.
- Absolutely. Often we only are taught main people's/developments; this program showed how important the minor people/developments played in shaping this country.
- Definitely . . . The more I know the more comfortable I am diving deeper into content with my students and the more challenging I can create my curriculum.
- Yes-I will be able to successfully enrich my curriculum by making over-arching connections
- Yes- I have more knowledge to share.
- Yes. I gained some new insights into who, when and where these particular interactions occurred.
- Yes, the info above.
- Yes, I can speak more intelligently about this period of time. Examples and stories.
- Yes, I believe the material would be helpful for students to get a better understanding of American history.
- It will cause me to look deeper at the importance of chance first encounters.
- It would be useful if I taught 5th grade.
- To an extent. If I were instructing world history no doubt with U.S. history according to state standards. Only a little bit.
- Yes, to a point it is an earlier time period than I teach for the most part but it is good supplemental material.
- Yes, I see more relevance and importance of primary sources as well as how to use them in my classroom than I had experience with. I will use this method of timeline creation in between the 2 I already use.
- The above stated will help expand my slavery unit.
- Yes. I can generate other ways to integrate the information into my lessons.
- Yes, although I am not a classroom teacher. I can see the applications in special projects with gifted students.
- Yes, I like the primary sources and will be using them in future lessons.)
- Yes, I will address more fully the encounters between explorers and natives and how each gained form the other.
- Certainly, varying methods, different points of view, etc helps!
- Definitely – changes how I approach idea of “exchange” – use more “active” activities for students.
- Yes, new ideas of teaching strategies.
- Yes, because I can refer to new information.

- I am moving more and more to using primary sources and this urges me to continue on this route.

Multimedia Approach

1. Do you feel like the multimedia approach (i.e., using a combination of the video, activities, and written materials) is an effective method to increase teachers' content knowledge in American history? Please explain your answer.
 - Yes- Used all modes of learning – oral, visual. Ect. and we got to move about.
 - Yes. Change is good and keep a listener interested and engaged.
 - Yes, it gives variety
 - Yes, the internet is a great tool- Google “World library” will be.
 - Yes, it reaches more types of learners
 - Absolutely !!! It is great to learn using multiple approaches. It helps us as multiple intelligences.
 - Yes, it appeals to a variety of learning styles and makes the presentation more interesting.
 - Yes. Kept me focused.
 - Always-teachers learn just liked students do- multiple intelligences.
 - Yes! Variety keeps our interest/attention just like students.
 - Definitely-it targets multiple intelligences offers opportunity to build upon prior or even newly introduced knowledge and given opportunity for learning through repetition.
 - Yes. Because it appeals to different senses of learning styles.
 - Yes-Although I’m not a fan of “activities”
 - Yes . . . multi level and styles of learning.
 - Yes, but need more visuals in the PowerPoint.)
 - Yes. Mixing up learning modalities keep people awake. That is impatient.
 - Yes, like many students, people are visual learners other special or oral. The method use today focused on all these types of learners.
 - Yes, I try to do this in my classroom. It prevents boredom and allows different learning styles to be utilized.
 - It was very effective and held my attention.
 - Yes, anytime visual rather than auditory instructive is given the value appears.
 - I like the multimedia approach, it is what I try to do in my class.)
 - Yes, I felt it kept things interesting and provided different methods to portray and interpret the information of the workshop.
 - Very much so-just like with any students/guidance, it is more attention getting/keeping. It makes history come alive, seem more real-which is good because history is real life of past.
 - Yes. You simply get more perspectives and ideas from different sources.
 - Yes, all students and adults have different learning modes and attention spans- this fits a wide range of the above.

- Yes, it is effect-multi sensory learning experiences are best for all learners, regardless of age. We benefit from it as much as our kids do.
 - Yes, as a visual learner I really appreciated the use of media (video) in addition to the reading materials.
 - Certainly, we too are learners with the same needs as our students!
 - Yes – variety helps hold interest. Good modeling for students.)
 - Yes, it helps to reach different type of learners.
 - No – I enjoyed the way this seminar was done.
 - Yes of course – teachers have learning styles just like kids.
- 2 Was there material that appeared in one medium (video, written materials, or activities) that would be better covered in another medium? If so, which ones and why?
- All were good.
 - NA
 - NA
 - Many students are more visual/auditory/kinetic learners rather than reading.
 - Video was the most interesting since it was visual
 - I really enjoy the video
 - I don't think so.
 - Not necessarily
 - Some activities questions-maybe also on a handout, not just on the overhead.
 - No the variety was great. Only perhaps some hands-on artifacts would have made it fun for texture to feel/see closely.
 - I don't feel that there was.
 - NA
 - NA
 - NA
 - I don't think so.
 - I believe the combination of medium was well done.)
 - No.
 - Questions should be an hand outs.
 - No, the video was well put together.)
 - No.
 - Perhaps, but I thought these were well done served there purposes so well that I can not say that I would change any.
 - When looking at/discussing certain artwork, etc a slide show with BIGGER images would be nice.
 - Excellent balance, although I would encourage that topes be made available.
 - Overheads could be done in PowerPoint.
 - No.

- It all depends upon who is learning, if this was content taught to my students of social studies it would be great – the variety meets their diverse needs.
- No.
- No.
- The overheads are pretty useless I think – I'd like to see a graphic of the themes – make it more visual and not a written statement.

Reading Materials

1. Were the reading materials provided to you prior to the workshop useful in preparing you for the workshop? If the materials were not very adequate or not at all adequate, please explain why.
 - It gave all members a common starting place to valuable input could be made on a limited amount of time.
 - NA
 - A little sporadic so wasn't sure where it all fit; now I understand after we discussed what the research was after.
 - NA
 - I needed more time to read the material.
 - I was worried at first with the materials and questions, because some questions did not seem to cover the information presented in the packet. However, after using it in the workshop they were clearer and effective.
 - My prior knowledge make them somewhat unnecessary.
 - It would be good to end each section with review or questions.

8. How could the reading materials be improved?
 - Standing alone the reading material was blaa however using the material in the collaborative setting.
 - More daily encounters of everyday people would be interesting.
 - NA
 - More graphics –illustrations- Questions to focus readers.
 - NA
 - NA
 - More pictures, charts, graphs, ect.

- More depth details
- Make sure all terminology is familiar-or provide a vocab list (i.e., what is Yaus?)
- More organized.
- Not really maybe more artifacts
- I can't think of anything.
- Better organized-explanations of primary resources. More details or better user-friendly format (too bland)
- More of the surrounding contexts included.
- N/A
- Fewer readings.
- I think the primary resources worked just fine.
- Make sure that questions fit the reading. Some required assumptions or interpretations that young students probably would have difficulties with. Sometimes the questions were not really answered in the reading. I would suggest changing some or add that material information to the reading already there.
- I thought they were good. They had good facts but not a lot of information.
- In a binder or folder.
- Unknown – I thought they were very good.
- Add questions or summary at the end of each section.
- Include even more pictures/illustrations (mini ones in margin).
- They were fine.
- I enjoyed the reading very much.
- Rewrite the overviews to make them less generalized and pro – the theme. I felt the overview was pushing me to accept a point of view as the only explanation which made me less receptive to comprehending new ideas. So much is not mentioned in the overview.

Video

5. How could the video be improved?

- Don't know
- Don't know
- NA
- More- I learn best through visual/auditory/kinesthetic
- Incorporate more examples
- More reenacting segments could be added. I liked seeing the representatives from Native American tribes as experts in these segments-how refreshing.
- It was good.
- Improve the music and speed up spots
- More visuals the better. Too many have "people" shots of the historians talking and my students "yawn" always.

- NA
- Less fact time more scenes.
- The presenters were bland. More pictures examples. Presenters were not enthusiastic.
- Very good . . . maybe just a little too short abbreviated.
- Make it more exciting and editing.
- They were kind of dry. Definitely not kid friendly.
- I really enjoyed the video as is.
- N/A
- Sometimes the presenters are a little too much like an average lecture. Perhaps people who are more professional performers would help. Sometimes they seemed to stumble with their response.
- More depth/detail. More congruence between segments-an overall then or direction.
- It was great!
- I felt that only one time mentioning that Native Americans didn't get along wasn't enough. They were very brutal to each other long before Europeans came. Video made it seem like massive violence only got here after 1492.
- I don't know.
- I think the video was great, I can't think of many ways to improve it!
- Little more depth.
- Not sure.
- Very clear but the info was geared to support a theme and I imagined my students accepting broad generalities when the history itself is so rich and complex. It does a disservice to the new way of seeing this part of our history – to generalize is to kill of curiosity.

Activities

5. Did the activities deepen your understanding of the history content? If so, how?
 - Collaboration added many new and interesting ideas.
 - Yes understanding the “Columbian Exchange.” Not just one way exchange but both.
 - Yes- Made me think about the relationships between different ? cultures.
 - Yes, the use of alternative materials.
 - Yes, again, the Columbian exchange was excellent.
 - Collaborating with others
 - The activities were good but I feel like the given amount of time they took more challenging activities could be used to enrich the workshop more. Perhaps this would not be the case for people who have less background of the content though.
 - Yes. I learn best by doing. It was helpful.
 - But questions on handouts would be nice-hard to look at the overhead all the time. Yes added insight and details from other teachers.

- Yes, hands-on with interesting materials helps clarify information. Yes, just more opportunities to take it all in.
- Not so much-to me it was a review of the reading material.
- OK
- Yes. They gave me some new teaching opportunity ideas as well.
- Chart was good, but discussing was most useful.
- Yes, very helpful to the understanding of the material.
- Yes. Discussion partner share and examination of documents created a complete “picture” of the events.
- Yes, they applied the knowledge gained and forced reflection.
- Like I mentioned, the timeline did not but I liked the charts.
- Yes, very much a multi-facted approach which all together brought a clearer picture than what 1 or 2 methods all one would do.
- They were good, particularly because of the follow-up questions to give purpose to the activities.
- Yes, I think for me review and activity after reading is perfect.
- Brushing upon critical reading – trying to determine details in primary source materials – working with other teachers – yes, the activities did help.
- Yes, it helped put things together – so I understood there connection.
- The activities not only deepened my understating of content, but also did so in an interesting way, where I was active in the learning process. Also, helped to make connections of highlights of American/World history.
- Yes – working with others – discussion.
- They helped to address what was read, activate prior knowledge and gave access to new knowledge.
- No – they helped me see a better patch – there are richer ways to teach this history – the timeline activity was great – I like the comparisons . . .

Appendix C

Facilitator Closed Ended Responses

Turning Points in American History—Facilitator

Number of Respondents: 5

General

1. Overall, how well was the workshop received by the teachers?
 - 100% Very well
 - 0% Somewhat well
 - 0% Not very well (Please explain below)
 - 0% Not well at all (Please explain below)

Multimedia Approach

No multiple choice questions

Content

1. To what extent do you feel the level of content was appropriate for the intended audience?
 - 0% The content was way too difficult
 - 40% The content was challenging but doable
 - 60% About the right level of content
 - 0% The content would be fairly easy for most
 - 0% The content was way too easy
2. To what extent do you feel the workshop advanced the content knowledge of the teachers?
 - 0% To a great extent
 - 100% To some extent
 - 0% Not very much
 - 0% Not at all

Course Guide

1. To what extent was the Unit Course Guide organized in a logical manner?
 - 20% Very logical
 - 80% Somewhat logical
 - 0% Not very logical
 - 0% Not at all logical
2. To what extent were the Unit Course Guide instructions clear and easy to follow?
 - 20% Very clear and easy to follow
 - 60% Somewhat clear and easy to follow
 - 20% Not very clear or easy to follow
 - 0% Not at all clear or easy to follow

3. Did the Unit Course Guide contain enough information for you to adequately lead the workshop?

60% Yes, to a great extent

40% To some extent

0% Not enough information (Please explain below)

0% No, not enough information at all (Please explain below)

4. To what extent was the time allocation recommended in the guide appropriate?

20% Not nearly enough time was allowed

40% The workshop would be somewhat hurried

40% The timing was about right

0% There would be some idle time

0% There was way too much time allocated

Video

1. Did the video provide an appealing introduction to American History?

60% Very appealing

40% Somewhat appealing

0% Not very appealing

0% Not at all appealing

2. To what extent were the topics in the video covered in adequate depth and detail?

0% Way too much depth/detail

0% A little too much depth/detail

100% About the right amount of depth/detail

0% Could have used more depth/detail

0% Not nearly enough depth/detail

3. To what extent did the video presentation clearly explain the concepts addressed?

40% Very clear

60% Somewhat clear

0% Not very clear

0% Not at all clear

Activities

1. To what extent are the activity instructions clear and easy for the teachers to follow?

20% Very clear and easy to follow

80% Somewhat clear and easy to follow

0% Not very clear or easy to follow

0% Not at all clear or easy to follow

2. To what extent were the activities interesting for teachers?
 - 80% Very interesting
 - 20% Somewhat interesting
 - 0% Not very interesting
 - 0% Not at all interesting

3. To what extent do you feel the activities helped teachers better understand the concepts addressed?
 - 100% To a great extent
 - 0% To some extent
 - 0% Not very much
 - 0% Not at all

4. To what extent do you feel the level of difficulty was appropriate for the intended audience?
 - 0% The activities were way too difficult
 - 40% The activities were challenging but doable
 - 60% About the right level of difficulty
 - 0% The activities would be fairly easy for most
 - 0% The activities were way too easy

5. To what extent was the time allocation recommended for the Warm Up/Opening activity appropriate?
 - 0% Not nearly enough time was allowed
 - 0% The activity would be somewhat hurried
 - 80% The timing was about right
 - 20% There would be some idle time
 - 0% There was way too much time allocated

6. To what extent was the time allocation recommended for the Historical Perspectives activity appropriate?
 - 20% Not nearly enough time was allowed
 - 20% The activity would be somewhat hurried
 - 60% The timing was about right
 - 0% There would be some idle time
 - 0% There was way too much time allocated

7. To what extent was the time allocation recommended for the Following Faces of American activity appropriate?
 - 0% Not nearly enough time was allowed
 - 20% The activity would be somewhat hurried
 - 80% The timing was about right
 - 0% There would be some idle time
 - 0% There was way too much time allocated

8. To what extent was the time allocation recommended for the Historians At Work/Concluding activity appropriate?
- 20% Not nearly enough time was allowed
 - 0% The activity would be somewhat hurried
 - 80% The timing was about right
 - 0% There would be some idle time
 - 0% There was way too much time allocated

Appendix D

Facilitator Open Ended Responses

Turning Points in American History—Facilitator

General

1. If *not very well* or *not well at all*, please explain below.
2. What do you think was the most valuable aspect of the workshop? Why?
 - High quality resources, well paced outline for the workshop.
 - It causes teacher to think about what they do-both in content coverage and methodology.
 - The in depth discussion. The new concepts/encounters that many were not aware of made this workshop new and different.
 - Identifying new information. New learning. The timeline provided an opportunity to get up and move around. Discussion on Esteban-closing video.
 - Multiple sources and presentation materials. Great dialog. Small group.
3. What do you think was the least valuable aspect of the workshop? Why?
 - It actually all seemed valuable.
 - Initial activity. It was energizing enough. Need to develop something that will get participants talking and interesting.
 - Too many activities and not enough time.
4. Did the workshop employ good professional development methods? Why or why not?
 - Yes, respected the need for a variety of activities stop keep the participant engaged.
 - Yes, but one needs to be flexible in approach. If a small group, most activities can be done as a whole.
 - Yes it did. There is room for improvement as in anything.
 - Most of the time. 1st video segment mislabeled.
 - Yes, higher level thinking. Can be used directly in the classroom (application).
5. What suggestions would you give an instructor preparing to conduct a workshop using these materials?
 - Thoroughly read the material.
 - Read your audience-how will they most effectively respond to each activity.
 - Take the time to become very familiar with the methods.
 - Review all the materials. Watch the time to insure we get out in the time allocated.
 - Pace. Keep moving prompting.
6. What suggestions do you have to improve the workshop?
 - All in all I thought it was pretty well put together.
 - See #4 & 5 about.

- There is too much her for 2 ½ hrs. My suggestion would be to cut out some of the reflective pieces or to extend the time.
- Watch the amount of information within the time period.
- Longer time.

Multimedia Approach

1. Compared to other professional development workshops that you have led how did the multimedia approach (i.e., using a combination of the video, activities, and written materials) compare to other formats that you have used in professional development workshops?
 - This is similar to approach I've used for other courses. I find it works well.
 - Effective & similar
 - Combinations are what I always use in PD workshops. It is very important to "mix it up" or you will lose your audience. The same is true in the classroom.
 - Very similar. I normally use multiple learning formats, recognize variety in learning styles.
 - Great combination of activities, hands on video discussion.

2. Do you feel like the multimedia approach is an effective method to increase teachers' content knowledge in American history? Please explain your answer?
 - Yes, Primarily because multimedia can play to different teaching styles that participants will come with.
 - Yes, but teachers are understandably always focusing on how they can use the content knowledge in class.
 - Yes, because we live in a multimedia age.
 - Yes. I would not suggest any other way. Greater use of primary and the additions of secondary materials would be helpful. Also addition of web sources.
 - Yes, brings samples of artifacts to life, testimonials.

3. Was there material that appeared in one medium (video, written materials, or activities) that would be better covered in another medium? If so, which ones?
 - Not really
 - Some overheads are just as easily copied for each teacher on paper.
 - No. Good mix. Maybe more live action like the 3rd segment.
 - No suggestion.

Content

3. Did it appear that there was a good balance of old and new information presented to the teachers? Please explain below.
 - I think so, some participants were able to add to the content being presented and extend the learning of others.
 - Yes, they mentioned what was new to them and what they already knew.

- There were things they were familiar with but many others they were not. It was a good balance.
- Yes. Some had recently taught the Columbian Exchange to others it was new information.
- Yes, I think it reinforced topics that had been previously presented.

Course Guide

3. Did the Unit Course Guide contain enough information for you to adequately lead the workshop?

- Yes, to a great extent
- To some extent
- Not enough information (Please explain below)
- No, not enough information at all (Please explain below)

If *not enough information* or *no, not enough information at all*, please explain below.

- There were some gaps when I did not know the next step. Mislabeled video.
5. What do we need to know that we are not considering in this Unit Course Guide?
- N/A
 - Exhibits not always clearly identified.
 - Something over which you have no control is the personality of the facilitator. Sometimes it seemed almost too controlled.
 - None
 - None at this time.
6. What other suggestions do you have for improving the Unit Course Guide?
- Reference to web board resources.
 - Build in more flexibility especially with a small core of teachers – a committee of the whole works.
 - None

Video

4. How could the video be improved?

- I think they're pretty on target.
- Get the "need to know" this concept up front in the video. How and why is this kind of emphasis important for teachers to know and use.
- Perhaps video of actual sits (in the first two segments) and not as many stills.
- Better linkage between the video and the activities.
- N/A

Activities

9. What suggestions would you give an instructor preparing to conduct a workshop using these activities?
 - Be flexible in adjusting to the energy level of the participant.
 - Be prepared to address content knowledge vs methodology as a goal of the workshop.
 - Plan ahead and plan the placing.
 - Have all materials ready. Rehearse.
 - Be sure to read materials and be able to dialog with audience.

10. What other comments do you have that would help improve the activities?
 - Ask teachers more specifically if and how they might use this information and give them time to brainstorm ideas as a group. Always remember, teachers are busy, pragmatic people!
 - The activities were interesting and seemed to be enjoyed by the participants. They all took the activities seriously and were willing to learn.
 - None
 - Keep group small.

Appendix E

Observer Protocol

Turning Points in American History—Observer

Number of respondents = 4

General

1. Overall how well was the workshop received?
 - Very well. They learned some from packet. Worked well together. Mostly excited about the information and activities.
 - It was well received. It flowed well and teachers were engaged in the activities.
 - Very well. Around 6:30 there was a little yawning. Other than that, they appeared engaged up until the end.
 - The workshop was received very well as indicated by teacher comment and engagement.

2. During what parts of the workshop did the teachers seem particularly engaged/interested or disengaged/disinterested?

Description:

- Good discussion about what was in the packet. Some struggle for a complete definition of Columbian Exchange. Time line, adding to some not sure what was wanted and what they could add. Forced labor/artifacts – unclear, teachers not as engaged. Unclear what connections to make and how to use.
- Teachers very interested in Colombian Exchange activity. Very much engaged throughout Colombian Exchange activity. Worked well together and discussed ideas.
- Some yawning during the artifact activity. Those who had passages to read needed more time compared to those with a visual image. Timeline activity was great. Some commented that it was good to get up and move a little. When reviewing the products associated with the Columbian Exchange, they worked very hard. When they had extra, time, they began personal conversations. Very interested in video about the archeological activities associated with the ship.
- Teachers seemed most engaged during the group cooperative learning activity with the graphic organizer (chart). Teacher also were completely engaged during the times they were in discussion about the content. Teachers demonstrated a high level of engagement during the “timeline” activity. Teachers seemed engaged during the videos.

3. What do you think was the most valuable aspect of the workshop? Why?

Description:

- Discussion of info in reading. Felling in chart, a lot of sharing and discussion. Especially about using in the classroom with teachers. Discussion about Columbian Exchange and understanding of it. Video LaBell and discussion.
- The exchange and discussions of teachers, bouncing ideas and theories with each other.

- Time for reflection and discussion after each activity and segment of the workshop. Helped teachers tie together what they had seen and done. Timeline activity helped visualize the period being discussed. Many thought they could use it with students. Info on the Columbian Exchange-this was new to many teachers. Artifacts activity-not an area typically covered in most classes-teachers lack time to find artifacts.
- The most valuable aspect was time given for teacher exchange (discussion) about the ideas references and content. The brainstorming session was very positive. The teachers showed a conceptual connection between the timeline activity and the content. Use of the graphic organizer as a guide for downward understanding was excellent.

4. What do you think was the least valuable aspect of the workshop? Why?

Description:

- Forced labor – teachers really did not see this in video or using it in class the way it is unclear. Artifact work – teachers know using is important but did not see it developed clearly in this workshop.
- The time line needs to be refined.
- None-there was something there for everyone.
- The use and interactions with the artifacts caused the level of excitement to lower. They seemed confused as what to do with them. The historians! Presentation was interesting but was passive in comparison to other activities.

Multimedia Approach

1. To what extent do the multimedia components flow smoothly? Please record instances when it flowed well and then times when it did not.

Description:

- Video taking notes, filing in more on chart seemed very engaged. Forced labor just did not come together for the group. LaBell video. They really enjoyed this piece.
- Video continued Columbian exchange idea and then led into next idea and activity (timeline). It appeared video was a good change of pace and transition to the next activity.
- I did not notice any of the areas of concern that were addressed at the Advisory Board meeting. There seemed to be a good flow of activities and video.
- The use of the projection and TV good for visual reinforcement of the ideas. The historian also added the auditory component needed for specific types of learners.

2. Which specific topics in the workshop would be better covered in the video, written materials, or during the activities or vice versa?

Description:

- Teachers really were overly positive about the written materials. Video did not clearly lay out the forced labor issue for them. Timeline was great for discussion. Need to have better, clearer artifacts and better (different) directions for using them and evaluating them.

- Provide more time to discuss the Columbian Exchange. Many were unfamiliar with this. Provide more time for artifact activity-those who had a passage to read needed more time.
- The artifacts should have been used to promote excitement rather than a stand along addition to this content. The “forced labor” activity could have been enhance through video.

Content

1. What indications did the teachers give that they were comfortable or uncomfortable with the content level?

Description:

- Talking, sharing, working together on chart, discussion among teachers, artifacts not much engagement.
- Felt they learned details that were interesting and engaging. Engaged in great conversation between forced labor and slavery. Felt the guide to interpreting artifacts was useful in guiding them.
- Throughout the workshop, the teachers were all actively involved in the various parts of the workshop and tried to do their best on all of the activities. Some were a bit hesitant when asked to plot the timeline onto a map. Not as many participated in the discussion that followed, required prior knowledge.
- Teachers seemed comfortable with the written content and used it to stimulate and confirm ideas. Teachers indicated on excitement in learning new information (yaws). Teachers made connections to the content and experiences with their students. Teachers were engaged in comfortable discussion about the topics.

2. Are there certain parts of the workshop where more or less information needs to be provided? Please explain.

Description:

- Artifacts need to be different ones, better questions to be asked – perhaps video going over one then give them one to do in the workshop. Forced labor – teachers just did not engage much.
- Suggest provide a map in the reading to help student visualize items listed in the timeline or following the map activity show students what their map should look like. This will help lead your discussion in the right direction. Some were unsure where to place things on their maps and had little time to think about it.

Workshop Materials

1. How did the teachers respond to the written materials? What did they like or not like?

Description:

- Really engaged with them. They were not sure if it was theirs, they wanted to write on it, highlight, etc.
- Many teachers loved the choicable materials. It was interesting to them. Talked and exchanged ideas and thoughts of written materials. Teachers engaged in time line activity. You can not only read or hear it but see it.

- Found the “chocolate” article very interesting. Indicated that page numbers would have been helpful when looking for a reading for the artifact activity. Throughout the workshop I noticed that they had highlighted various parts of the reading or made note in the reading before coming to the workshop. Indicated they learned a lot from the reading.
- Written materials were well received. Teachers continued to refer to parts that they had read. The information cards used on the timeline were good support for visualizing time and the progression (sequence) of events.

2. How did the teachers respond to the video? What were some negative and positive reactions?

Description:

- First, very engaged. Second, informative but were not as engaged and not an easy discussion to use for forced labor. LaBell-supports their efforts to let bids see what historians do and how were learn about history.
- Teachers appeared interested in the videos. They were attentive. Very engaged in LaSalle video. Interested in new content.
- Reactions to the video were very positive. It provided useful information as well as a break from reading writing and discussions. Loved historians at work. Wished they had a copy of the video to take into their classes and show students. Historians were a little dry. .
- The video was passively received, but was interesting by teacher comments. The video helped to clarify ideas and concepts. The narrative defined information and gave a getter understanding to content.

3. How did the teachers respond to the activities? What went well or didn't go well? Were the instructions confusing/clear?

Description:

- Filling in chart a lot of discussion and sharing of info. They all said they'd do this in their classroom. A little struggle with writing a definition to early in workshop, they get out later. Forced labor fell flat.
- Very interested in the Columbian Exchange activity. Teachers were engaged in this activity. Good discussions on Columbian Exchange. Had problem with neutral questions. Not sure of what was needed.
- Needed more time to read and answer questions during the artifact activity because reading was not fresh in their minds. Loved the time line activity. Promoted communication and cooperative learning. Example: when given opportunity to add to the time line, they asked others in the group if they were unsure of a date.
- Teachers seemed enthusiastic and receptive to all the activities. Energy flowed though out the duration. The facilitator did a good job of reading the needs of the audience. The artifact activity needed more guidance toward the more exciting (energizing/activities).

Possible Impact

1. What indication did the teachers give that the workshop will be useful for them in their work?

Description:

- Saying they'd use this in their classroom.
- Said this activity (Columbian Exchange) was a great way to have discussions in the classroom. Made them think. Was two-sided instead of one sided account. A different perspective or perspectives. The interpretations of artifacts would be a useful guide for students and there classrooms.
- The majority of them wanted to participate additional workshops that might be offered in the future. There were frequent references to being able to use on activity of part of the workshop in their classes. Example: time line activity.
- At the end of the workshop teachers responded about how much they enjoyed the experience and how some of the information they weren't aware of. Teachers talked about having a series of workshops like this one. Some teachers (2) stayed later discussing the positive ness of the workshop.

Other Comments

1. Any other comments about the workshop?
 - The workshop was on a Thursday 4:30–7:00. So teachers had put in a full day and almost full week so could have had some affect.
 - We had a few problems taping the workshop at the begging. It was a little hectic trying to act as an observer as well as the photographer.
 - Time (length of workshop) is of the essence. The facilitator was key to keeping the group involved and not aware of the lengthiness of the duration. Craig did an excellent job. The evaluation period was enhanced only through the receptiveness of the workshop success.