



**U.S. Department of Education**  
**Grant Performance Report Cover Sheet (ED 524B)**

OMB No. 1894-0003  
Exp. 02/28/2011

*Check only one box per Program Office instructions.*  
 Annual Performance Report     Final Performance Report

**General Information**

1. PR/Award #: U215X090346  
*(Block 5 of the Grant Award Notification - 11 characters.)*
2. Grantee NCES ID#: U215X090346  
*(See instructions. Up to 12 characters.)*
- 3 Project Title: 84.215X PLOWING FREEDOM'S GROUND  
*(Enter the same title as on the approved application.)*
4. Grantee Name *(Block 1 of the Grant Award Notification.):* LEE COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION
5. Grantee Address *(See instructions.):* 2410 Society Hill Road, Opelika, AL 36804-4830
6. Project Director *(See instructions.)* Name: John Saye      Title: PROJECT DIRECTOR  
 Ph #: ( 334 ) 844 - 6891    Ext: (    )      Fax #: ( 334 ) 844 - 6789  
 Email Address: sayejoh@auburn.edu

**Reporting Period Information *(See instructions.)***

7. Reporting Period:    From: 07/15/2009    To: 07/14/2010    (mm/dd/yyyy)

**Budget Expenditures *(To be completed by your Business Office. See instructions. Also see Section B.)***

8. Budget Expenditures

	Federal Grant Funds	Non-Federal Funds <i>(Match/Cost Share)</i>
a. Previous Budget Period		
b. Current Budget Period	\$189,552.99	\$57,853.12
c. Entire Project Period <i>(For Final Performance Reports only)</i>		

**Indirect Cost Information *(To be completed by your Business Office. See instructions.)***

9. Indirect Costs

- a. Are you claiming indirect costs under this grant?     Yes     No
- b. If yes, do you have an Indirect Cost Rate Agreement approved by the Federal Government?     Yes     No
- c. If yes, provide the following information:  
 Period Covered by the Indirect Cost Rate Agreement: From: \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_    To: \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_ (mm/dd/yyyy)  
 Approving Federal agency:     ED     Other *(Please specify):* \_\_\_\_\_  
 Type of Rate *(For Final Performance Reports Only):*     Provisional     Final     Other *(Please specify):* \_\_\_\_\_
- d. For Restricted Rate Programs (check one) -- Are you using a restricted indirect cost rate that:  
 Is included in your approved Indirect Cost Rate Agreement?  
 Complies with 34 CFR 76.564(c)(2)?

**Human Subjects (Annual Institutional Review Board (IRB) Certification) *(See instructions.)***

10. Is the annual certification of Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval attached?     Yes     No     N/A

**Performance Measures Status and Certification *(See instructions.)***

11. Performance Measures Status

- a. Are complete data on performance measures for the current budget period included in the Project Status Chart?     Yes     No
- b. If no, when will the data be available and submitted to the Department?    \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_ (mm/dd/yyyy)

12. To the best of my knowledge and belief, all data in this performance report are true and correct and the report fully discloses all known weaknesses concerning the accuracy, reliability, and completeness of the data.

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Name of Authorized Representative:      Title: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Signature:      Date: \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_



U.S. Department of Education  
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)  
Executive Summary

OMB No. 1894-0003  
Exp. 02/28/2011

PR/Award # (11 characters): **U215X090346**

**(See Instructions)**

The Plowing Freedom's Ground (PFG) project made substantial progress toward meeting project goals in Year One. These goals, as stated in our proposal are:

1. Provide quality professional development to accomplish project objectives, meet teacher's needs, and encourage high participation rates.
2. Increase teacher's (a) U.S. history knowledge, understanding, and interest, and (b) ability to apply historical content knowledge to problem-based historical inquiry teaching (GPRA 1).
3. Increase students' historical interest, motivation to learn history, and ability to analyze historical documents.

Due to the mid-July 2009 award date, we will not complete a full-year professional development cycle until Spring 2011. Project performance measures approved August 2009 anticipated the resulting lag in the first availability of meaningful outcomes data for Objectives 2 & 3.

**Objective 1: Provide quality professional development to accomplish project objectives, meet teacher's needs, and encourage high participation rates.**

During the 2009-10 performance year, the project offered three types of professional development activities; Mentor Lesson Study sessions, Summer Seminar, and Summer Lesson Study Workshop (see *Project Profile; Description of the types of professional development activities* below). **88 % of all participants completed 80% or more of required project professional development activities and at least 90.5% (100% in Lesson Study Workshop) of participants rated the activities at 4 or higher on a 5-point satisfaction scale.**

**Objective 2: Increase teacher's (a) U.S. history knowledge, understanding, and interest, and (b) ability to apply historical content knowledge to problem-based historical inquiry teaching (GPRA 1).**

In Spring 2010, we gathered baseline data with observations of the classroom history teaching all project teachers. Several teachers were replaced at the end of the year due to changes in job assignments and baseline observations of replacements will occur in early Fall 2010. In April and July 2010, we gathered baseline data for project teacher content knowledge and beliefs about history and history teaching and pedagogy. In August-September 2010, we will gather baseline data for comparison group teachers. (See *Project Profile; Description of evaluation instruments used* below)

**Objective 3: Increase students' historical interest, motivation to learn history, and ability to analyze historical documents.**

In September 2010 we will gather from students of project and comparison group teachers baseline data for beliefs and motivations regarding learning history. Post-test data will be collected in Spring 2011. During the 2010-11 academic year we will gather from students of project teachers baseline data regarding the ability to use content knowledge and historical thinking to address historical issues. (see *Project Profile; Description of evaluation instruments used* below)

**PLOWING FREEDOM'S GROUND (PFG) PROJECT PROFILE:**

- **Number of teachers proposed to serve:** 30 (25 project teachers; 5 mentor teachers)
- **Number of teachers served in Year 1:** 30 (24 project teachers; 6 mentor teachers)
- **Number of teachers completing 75% or more of the professional development hours:**
  - **Current reporting period:** 88 % of project teachers (22 of 25); mentor teachers completed 100% of activities in which they were involved.
  - **Proposed in grant award:** At least 75% of participants
- **Specific Grade levels of participating teachers:**
  - **4<sup>th</sup> grade:** 8
  - **5<sup>th</sup> grade:** 3
  - **6<sup>th</sup> grade:** 4
  - **7<sup>th</sup> grade:** 1
  - **8<sup>th</sup> grade:** 1
  - **9<sup>th</sup> grade:** 1
  - **10<sup>th</sup> grade:** 1
  - **11<sup>th</sup> grade:** 4
  - **12<sup>th</sup> grade:** 1

[Note: Mentor teachers taught the following grades: 12<sup>th</sup> [1]; 10<sup>th</sup> [1]; 9<sup>th</sup> [2]; 8<sup>th</sup> [2]

- **Number of LEAs served:** 4 [not including the district of the mentor teachers]

- **Description of the types of professional development activities:**
  - **Mentor Lesson Study sessions (optional)**
    - Project teachers visited the classrooms of mentor teachers for one-day Lesson Study experiences (introduction to the lesson and its unit, observation, debriefing)
  - **Summer Seminar (5 days)**
    - Project teachers worked with historians and history educators to expand content knowledge on Year 1 topics and to master problem-based historical inquiry (PBHI) learning strategies
  - **Summer Lesson Study Workshop (5 days)**
    - Project teachers worked in grade level teams with mentor teachers, historians, and history educators to apply knowledge gained in Summer Seminar to the construction of PBHI lessons to be taught, observed, and refined during the 2010-2011 academic year.
- **Description of evaluation instruments used:** Teachers were evaluated in terms of: 1) history content knowledge, 2) their ability to apply their content knowledge to historical inquiry, and 3) their attitudes, beliefs, and motivation. We also assessed teacher satisfaction with professional development sessions. Students will be evaluated in terms of: (1) their attitudes, beliefs, and motivation and (2) their ability to use content knowledge and historical thinking to address historical issues.
  - Teacher content knowledge was assessed using a 50-item test, comprised of 44 multiple-choice items and 6 short response/essay items. Thirty (30) of the 44 multiple-choice items were drawn from validated national and state tests of American History (AP History Test [22], State of NY Regents Exam [5], Georgia End-of-Course Test [1], North Carolina Test of US History [1], California Standards Test [1]). The remaining items were developed by the project to assess more deeply topics featured in Year 1 professional development.
  - A content-specific unit planning scenario survey developed by project researchers in previous research was used to assess participating teachers' abilities to use the project framework to conceptualize problem-based historical inquiry teaching instructional decision-making. (Brush, et. al, 2008; Saye, et. al, 2009).
  - Widely used Authentic Intellectual Work (AIW) rubrics were used to assess teacher participants' ability to use the project framework to implement problem-based historical inquiry teaching (Newmann & Associates, 1996).
  - Motivation items for both teachers and students were drawn from two widely-used national instruments: Patterns of Adaptive Learning Survey (PALS), and the Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ)
  - Project-developed surveys were used to assess teacher satisfaction with professional development sessions
  - Widely used Authentic Intellectual Work (AIW) rubrics will be used to assess student participants' ability use content knowledge and historical thinking to engage in historical reasoning.
- **Problems encountered:**
  - Delays due to mid July 2009 award date: First full scale implementation of the professional development plan will occur from Spring 2010-Spring 2011. Meaningful outcome performance measures for a full grant year will not be available until Year 2 of the grant. We will have substantial carryover in YR1 mainly due to mid-July award date that delayed start of professional development and hiring of all project personnel. Maternity leave for a critical project staff member in Fall 2009 delayed her participation in the project and delayed the cost share portion of her salary to the project for Year 1.
  - Difficulty coordinating consistent procedures and timely billing among the financial offices for the seven participating institutions. We continue to fine-tune these processes to alleviate issues identified in first year.
  - Difficulty recruiting high school teachers. We will bring a 5<sup>th</sup> school district into the project in 2010-11 with an explicit focus on high school teachers.
  - Difficulty developing an authentic pre-test measure of student historical thinking (assessed in Years 3-5 of project). Based on teacher work in Summer 2010 we have a new idea for assessment that we will discuss with CEEP.



**U.S. Department of Education  
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)  
Project Status Chart**

OMB No. 1894-0003  
Exp. 02/28/2011

PR/Award # (11 characters): U215X090346

**SECTION A - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data** (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

**1. Project Objective**       Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

1.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Each year, at least 80% of participating teachers will report satisfaction with professional development activities.	PROJECT	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		20 / 25	80%		19 / 21 <sup>a</sup> 20/20 <sup>b</sup>	90.5% 100%	

1.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Each year, at least 75% of participating teachers will complete 75% or more of the total hours of professional development offered. (GPRA2)	GPRA	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		18.75/25	75%		22/25	88%	

## Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

1a – Two weeks of professional development were offered. At the end of each week, participants completed evaluation forms anonymously. Because of this anonymity, results from each week were summarized separately.

<sup>a</sup>-A total of 22 forms were returned for week 1 with 21 providing an overall rating. Of these 21, 19 (90.5%) providing a rating of 4 or higher on a 5-point scale and 17 (80.9%) providing an overall rating of 5. Twenty-one (21) participants also provided open-ended response about what was most useful. Of these 21 teachers, 9 (42.9%) indicated that they increased their content knowledge, 8 (38.1%) cited the useful examples and resources for their classroom, 8 (31.8%) described the value of having access to historians, and 5 (23.8%) indicated that being actively engaged was most useful.

<sup>b</sup>-In week 2, a total of 21 forms were returned, with 20 providing an overall rating. All 20 (100%) provided a rating of 4 or above while 17 (85%) provided an overall rating of 5. Twenty (20) teachers provided open-ended responses. Of these 18, 7 (35%) described the lessons they created as being most useful, 7 (35%) credited the collaboration with project staff and other teachers, 6 (30%) specifically described working with the mentor teachers, 4 (20%) credited the project historians, and 3 (15%) indicated that their content knowledge was improved.

1b – A total of 25 teachers were recruited for year 1 to participate in professional development. Of these teachers, 14 (56%) completed 100% of the professional development hours and 22 (88%) completed 80% or more. One teacher never attended professional development. He had a scheduling conflict at the time of the first session in April and was later reassigned to teach in another content area (Driver's Education), but did not alert project personnel of this until the third day of summer professional development. Teachers were also afforded the opportunity to engage in additional (optional) professional development to do a one-day Lesson Study with a mentor teacher. Of the 24 teachers that participated in professional development, 12 (50%) also engaged in the optional professional development activity.



**U.S. Department of Education  
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)  
Project Status Chart**

OMB No. 1894-0003  
Exp. 02/28/2011

PR/Award # (11 characters): U215X090346

**SECTION A - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data** (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

**2. Project Objective**       Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

2.a. Performance Measure	<b>Measure Type</b>	<b>Quantitative Data</b>					
During years 2-5, participating teachers who complete at least 75% of professional development hours will demonstrate an average percentage change in scores of at least 5% on content knowledge test of American history (GPRA 1). *	GPRA	<b>Target</b>			<b>Actual Performance Data</b>		
		<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>
			/			/	

2.b. Performance Measure	<b>Measure Type</b>	<b>Quantitative Data</b>					
By the end of Years 2-5, participating teachers will score at least 25% higher on a project specific test of American history knowledge as compared to non-participating teachers.	PROJECT	<b>Target</b>			<b>Actual Performance Data</b>		
		<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>
			/			/	

2c. Performance Measure	<b>Measure Type</b>	<b>Quantitative Data</b>					
By the end of Years 2-5, at least 80% of participating teachers will report beliefs about history and teaching history that are more closely aligned with project emphases when compared to their pre-test belief scores.	PROJECT	<b>Target</b>			<b>Actual Performance Data</b>		
		<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>
			/			/	

2d. Performance Measure	<b>Measure Type</b>	<b>Quantitative Data</b>					
By the end of Years 2-5, participating teachers will score at least 10% higher on a measure reflecting inquiry-based beliefs about history and teaching history as compared to non-participating teachers.	<b>PROJECT</b>	<b>Target</b>			<b>Actual Performance Data</b>		
		<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>
			/			/	

2e. Performance Measure	<b>Measure Type</b>	<b>Quantitative Data</b>					
During Years 2-5, at least 50% of a purposeful sample of participating teachers will improve their PBHI teaching performance over the previous year as measured by the AIW rubrics.	<b>PROJECT</b>	<b>Target</b>			<b>Actual Performance Data</b>		
		<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>
			/			/	

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

Teachers just completed their first summer of professional development. Initial, baseline assessments of their knowledge, attitudes and beliefs, and classroom teaching have been completed. Initial data collection for comparison teachers is also underway this summer. At the end of year 2, we will have the pre- and post data necessary to address the above performance measures.

**3. Project Objective**       Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

3.a. Performance Measure	<b>Measure Type</b>	<b>Quantitative Data</b>					
During Years 2-5, students taught by participating teachers will demonstrate improved beliefs about learning history, becoming more closely aligned with project emphases as measured by pre-and post- belief surveys. This improvement will be for at least 50% of students in year 2, 60% in year 3, 70% in year 4, and 75% by the end of year 5.	<b>PROJECT</b>	<b>Target</b>			<b>Actual Performance Data</b>		
		<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>
			/			/	

3.b. Performance Measure	<b>Measure Type</b>	<b>Quantitative Data</b>					
During Years 2-5, students taught by participating teachers will demonstrate increased motivation to learn history as measured by pre- and post motivation measures. This increase will occur for at least 50% of students in year 2, 60% in year 3, 70% in year 4, and 75% by the end of year 5.	<b>PROJECT</b>	<b>Target</b>			<b>Actual Performance Data</b>		
		<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>
			/			/	

3c. Performance Measure	<b>Measure Type</b>	<b>Quantitative Data</b>					
During years 3, 4, and 5, a purposeful sample of students taught by participating teachers will improve in their abilities to use content knowledge and historical thinking to address historical issues, as measured by pre- and post AIW scoring rubrics. This improvement will occur for at least 50% of sampled students in year 3, 60% in year 4, and 75% by the end of year 5.	<b>PROJECT</b>	<b>Target</b>			<b>Actual Performance Data</b>		
		<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>
			/			/	

**Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)**

Initial data collection is scheduled for students taught by participating teachers is scheduled for September. Post-tests will be administered in April so that the above performance measures may be addressed.





Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)  
Project Status Chart

PR/Award # (11 characters): U215X090346

**SECTION B - Budget Information** (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

	Approved	Actual	Encumbered	Committed	Carryover
<b>Personnel</b>	<b>\$33,000.00</b>	<b>\$22,997.71</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>		<b>\$10,002.29</b>
<b>Fringe</b>	<b>\$8,332.00</b>	<b>\$1,223.22</b>	<b>\$3,607.26</b>		<b>\$3,501.52</b>
<b>Travel</b>	<b>\$9,409.00</b>	<b>\$1,790.27</b>	<b>\$1,588.80</b>		<b>\$6,029.93</b>
<b>Equipment</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>		<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>Supplies</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>		<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>Contractual</b>					
<b>Indiana</b>	\$15,444.00	\$5,119.39	\$1,444.97		\$8,879.64
<b>Auburn University</b>	\$206,462.00	\$127,820.85	\$0.00	\$33,208.50	\$45,432.65
<b>Auburn City Schools</b>	\$5,492.00	\$656.42	\$0.00	\$2,869.25	\$1,966.33
<b>Contractual subtotal</b>	<b>\$227,398.00</b>	<b>\$133,596.66</b>	<b>\$1,444.97</b>	<b>\$36,077.75</b>	<b>\$56,278.62</b>
<b>Other</b>	<b>\$4,700.00</b>	<b>\$2,992.60</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>		<b>\$1,707.40</b>
<b>Total Direct Cost</b>	<b>\$282,839.00</b>	<b>\$162,600.46</b>	<b>\$6,641.03</b>		<b>\$77,519.76</b>
<b>Indirect</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>		<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>Training Stipends</b>	<b>\$36,150.00</b>	<b>\$2,439.00</b>	<b>\$17,872.50</b>		<b>\$15,838.50</b>
<b>Total Cost</b>	<b>\$318,989.00</b>	<b>\$165,039.46</b>	<b>\$24,513.53</b>	<b>\$36,077.75</b>	<b>\$93,358.26</b>
<b>Non-Federal Funds</b>					
<b>Auburn University</b>	<b>\$34,171.00</b>	<b>\$20,901.70</b>			<b>\$13,269.30</b>
<b>Indiana University</b>	<b>\$48,184.00</b>	<b>\$36,951.42</b>			<b>\$11,232.58</b>

**Explanation of Budget:**

**Encumbered funds** are for expenses that were incurred by July 16 for which Lee County did not receive invoices until after that closing date.

**Committed funds** are for expenses that were incurred during the grant year for which Lee County has not yet received final invoices.

The unexpended funds in each category are largely due to the mid-July 2009 project start date. Some major items include: (1) Normal project start-up, including recruiting project staff during Fall 2009, delayed the hiring of all Auburn University contractual personnel until January 2010. A substantial portion of unexpended personnel funds from Fall 2009 will be spent over the 3 years of the award to cover a major increase in fringe benefit rates due to increasing health coverage costs. (2) The bulk of professional development for teachers in this grant occurs in summer. Due to the timing of the award, we were unable to implement professional development in Summer 2009. The first full-scale implementation of the professional development plan will occur from Spring 2010-Spring 2011. We have, as approved, included funds encumbered as part of our July 2010 professional development sessions; however all partners did not get all invoices in by July 31 and so some of the funds committed in July do not appear as encumbered on the Year 1 budget. (3) Because of academic term budgets at Auburn University, contractual personnel costs budgeted for Year 1 will not be fully expended until August 15, 2010. This represents a substantial portion of the contractual carryover. We will adjust those pay periods for Year 2 to lessen this carryover in future years. (4) Much of the budgeted evaluation costs for travel and materials have not yet been expended as July 2010 professional development was a prerequisite for field evaluation. Travel costs in this category will increase in future years as we have added a more distant school district partner. (5) With full implementation now underway, Indiana University will make up their carryover in Year 2 as they begin to produce and host digital project content and assist teachers with technology implementation.

Other issues that account for carryover: (1) Because of small enrollments in two systems, we have only one lead teacher covering the two districts for a total of 5 rather than 6 lead teacher stipends. We will add a sixth lead teacher in Year 2 when our new school district comes on board. The new system's costs for project administration will also address some carryover in the Personnel budget line. (2) As approved, systems paid substitute teachers at the regular system sub rates for the days when teachers missed contract days during the academic year due to project professional development. This payment was made in lieu of paying a portion of teachers' salaries at the higher budgeted daily stipend rate and resulted in carryover for this budget line. At its September 2010 meeting, the Steering Committee will consider ways to spend those funds (and some carryover travel funds) in Year 2, including adding an additional professional development day at a historical site and increasing teacher training stipends as an incentive to teacher retention. (3) Maternity leave for a critical AU project staff member in Fall 2009 delayed the cost share charge for her salary for Year 1. We will build that Year 1 cost share contribution in over the next two years. (4) One partner school system failed to file a Time and Effort statement in time to be compensated for \$5,000 budgeted for system administration. We are working to correct that problem so the payment can be made.

---

**SECTION C - Additional Information** (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

An additional school district has been added to the project for the coming year. Troup County, Georgia will join the original 4 school system partners. We will focus teacher recruitment in Troup County at the high school level in an effort to provide more balance in the project between elementary and secondary classrooms.