

State Application for Participation-The Adult  
Numeracy Instruction Professional Development  
(ANI-PD) Field Test Program  
1830-New Expiration xx/xx/2012

***Supporting Statement for  
Request for OMB Approval of Data Collection***

***Part A: Justification***

## Introduction

This initiative involves three Adult Numeracy Instruction (ANI) Professional Development Institutes. Twenty teachers and ten program administrators from ten adult education programs from each of two states will participate in a field test of the professional development Institutes. The goals of the institutes are to:

- Increase and deepen mathematics content knowledge among teacher participants
- Increase the repertoire of instructional skills among teachers working with adults in pre-GED (levels 3 and 4 of six levels) classes
- Increase state capacity to support teachers in the area of mathematics instruction

The study will involve the administration of the following instruments:

- Pre/Post surveys of participants
- Pre/Post administration of a cognitive assessment to participating teachers
- Post-professional development interviews with participating teachers and program administrators.

## **A. Justification**

### ***A1. Circumstances Making Collection of Information Necessary***

#### **a. Purpose of this Submission**

This document supports the clearance of selected data elements, materials, and procedures under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 and 5 CFR 1320, as amended, for the Strengthening America's Competitiveness through Math Instruction – Task 6: Field Test the Teacher Training Initiative task. MPR Associates Inc. will administer this survey under contract to the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) (Contract Number [ED-04-CO-0121/0004]).

OVAE is investigating the effectiveness of a teacher-training initiative to be piloted during 2009-2010. Specifically, OVAE is interested in changes in teacher knowledge and repertoire of instructional skills. OVAE is also interested in changes in state capacity to support teachers in the area of mathematical instruction. To that end, we will conduct a field test of the initiative; the application included in this submission will be used to determine participants in the field test (surveys).

#### **b. Legislative Authorization**

This project is authorized under the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act, Title II of Public Law 105-220, Section 243, National Leadership Activities. Section 243 allows the Secretary of Education to establish and carry out a program of national leadership activities to enhance the quality of adult education and literacy programs nationwide.

This activity shall support Goal Three of the Strategic Plan, "Ensure the accessibility, affordability, and accountability of higher education, and better prepare students and adults for employment and future learning."

### ***A.2. Purposes and Uses of the Data***

The main purpose of this application is to determine participants for the collection of data to support and improve the Adult Numeracy Instruction (ANI) professional development services. Data will provide information on the effectiveness of the institute in improving instruction in adult numeracy. The primary focus will be on the impact on teachers and program directors.

This application for teachers and program directors will determine those participating in the surveys where the respondent background and program information,

perspectives on learning and teaching math, and practices prior to and at the completion of the professional development will be determined. This application will be used for both teachers and program directors, determining, the background portion of the survey which will collect information about:

- ◆ Credentials and years teaching (or supervising) adults and mathematics;
- ◆ Current teaching/program situation, including type or level and characteristics of students in math classes;
- ◆ Institutional sponsorship of adult education program;
- ◆ Demographic characteristics.

For teachers, the surveys will also collect information on:

- ◆ Confidence in teaching math, specifically, in teaching the content areas relevant to the professional development (Algebra, Geometry, Numbers and Operations, and Data, Probability and Statistics);
- ◆ Current instructional practices and support for their teaching;
- ◆ Perspectives on learning and teaching math;
- ◆ Challenges and barriers to providing strong programs;
- ◆ Opportunities for professional development; and
- ◆ Expectations/goals for participating in the professional development.

For program administrators, the surveys will also collect information on:

- ◆ Awareness of good practices and expectations for instructional practices in their program;
- ◆ Current support offered to teachers and understanding of good support practices;
- ◆ Challenges and barriers to providing strong programs;
- ◆ Opportunities for professional development; and
- ◆ Expectations/goals for participating in the professional development.

Finally, this application will be used to determine the participants that will participate in interviews allowing researchers to obtain detailed information about teacher confidence, current instructional practices, and learning from the professional development services. An additional interview, conducted one year after the third Institute, will provide information on lasting changes to instructional practices and understanding of mathematics.

### ***A. 3. Use of Information Technology***

In order to maximize response rates, the survey will be administered to participants at the professional development sessions. Respondents will complete the

survey using pencil and paper. Survey responses will be hand-entered into a database and entries will be double-checked for quality assurance. In the case of this data collection where respondents are together for a professional development session, it seems more feasible to collect data using paper and pencil instruments rather than try to have computers available for electronic collection. Since we don't currently know the venues where the professional development will take place in each state, we don't know what computer resources will be available at the facilities. If, however, we find that the facilities do offer such resources, we will endeavor to use them to reduce the paper burden.

#### ***A.4. Efforts to Identify Duplication***

Because this project represents the evaluation of a new professional development program, no duplicate data collection efforts exist.

#### ***A.5. Method Used to Minimize Burden on Small Businesses or Other Small Entities***

The application will determine participants in the survey that will be administered to teachers and program directors who participate in the professional development, as part of the professional development institute; therefore, we do not expect data collection to place a large burden on small entities. In addition, the survey is designed to include only a small number of questions critical to addressing the research questions listed above. We estimate that the survey will take only about 20 minutes to complete, on average. Teachers and program staff should be able to answer all of the questions based upon their own attitudes and knowledge and should not require search of records.

#### ***A.6. Frequency of Data Collection***

The application will determine participants for data to be collected at various intervals during this study. The frequency of data collection varies by respondent. Teachers will receive the survey and cognitive assessment at the first and after the third professional development sessions. Program directors will receive the survey at the first and after the third professional development sessions. Teachers will be interviewed at the end of the third professional development session and at the end of the school year following the first institute. The institutes will take place in August and November of 2009 and March of 2010. The teachers will participate in the last follow-up interview between March-May 2010.

#### ***A.7. Special Circumstances of Data Collection***

No special circumstances of data collection are anticipated.

## ***A.8. Consultants Outside the Agency***

During the initial stages of design and development, the Agency consulted with: Mary Jane Schmitt and other staff members of TERC, subcontractor to this project and a not-for-profit education research and development organization dedicated to improving mathematics, science, and technology teaching and learning; Lynda Ginsburg, an education researcher at the Center for Mathematics, Science and Computer Education at Rutgers University, a subcontractor to this project; and Myrna Manly, project consultant and a mathematics teacher with experience at many academic levels, who was the Mathematics Specialist for the 1988 version of the GED test. These individuals gave guidance and feedback on the instruments and ensured alignment between the data collection and the professional development efforts.

## ***A.9. Provision of Payments or Gifts to Respondents***

There will be no payments or gifts provided to respondents for completing this survey.

## ***A.10 Assurance of Confidentiality***

The data collection contractor, MPR Associates Inc., is a licensed user of individually identifiable data from the National Center for Education Statistics. They adhere strictly to the requirements of the Obey-Porter law (1987), which imposes strict constraints on the use of individually identifiable data and serious consequences (including fines and jail time) for the unlawful disclosure of these data. In addition, it is standard practice at MPR to separate survey responses from respondent identifying information, to assign a random respondent ID, and to maintain the cross-walk between the random ID and the identifying information in a secure, locked location. These requirements go above and beyond federal requirements. MPR has always received the highest marks for data confidentiality procedures during site visits for compliance by the federal government. Furthermore, MPR personnel with access to the completed surveys have completed “Contractor Security Screening” in accordance with OM:5-101.

## ***A.11. Sensitive Questions***

The survey does not include any questions of a sensitive nature.

## ***A.12. Estimates of Response Burden***

To determine participants for the professional development, a recruitment letter will be sent to the state director in each of 45 states (other states have already participated

in similar professional development). Since this is a new initiative and a new data collection, we don't know how many states may complete an application. From those that apply, two states will be chosen as sites and from each of them, 20 teachers and 10 administrators will be identified to participate in the professional development. We estimate that it will take the state director one hour to complete the application, and since we don't know how many might apply, we have calculated the burden based on participation by the maximum number of those eligible, or 45 state directors.

<b>Instrument</b>	<b>No. State Directors</b>	<b>Response Time</b>	<b>Total for State Directors</b>
State application	45 eligible	1 hour	45 hours

Total for applications from state directors = 45 hrs.

### ***A.13. Estimates of Cost***

There are no capital, startup, or operating costs to programs for participation in the survey. No equipment, printing, or postage charges will be incurred by respondents.

### ***A.14. Costs to Federal Government***

The total cost to the federal government of the data collection, analysis, and reporting will be approximately \$236,468. The breakdown of these costs include \$82,779 for developing the instruments; \$153,689 for data collection, data analysis and reporting. Direct costs to the federal government include time for staff to review and comment on the reports.

### ***A.15. Reasons for Changes in Response Burden and Costs***

This is a new program, so changes are due to program change.

### ***A.16. Publication Plans and Time Schedule***

The formal contract for this project requires a final technical report on the results of the evaluation of the professional development. The current data collection and reporting schedule is as follows:

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Date</b>
Data collection complete	06/30/2010
Final report first draft	08/01/2010
Final report final draft	08/31/2010

### ***A.17. Approval to Not Display Expiration Date for OMB Approval***

The expiration date for OMB approval of the information collection *will be displayed* on the data collection instrument and materials. No special exception to this request is requested.

### ***A.18. Exceptions to Certification for Paperwork Reduction Act Submissions***

There are no exceptions to the certification statement identified in the Certification for Paperwork Reduction Act Submissions of OMB Form 83-i.