MATH AND SCIENCE PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM EVALUATION (MSP-PE)

INTERVIEW INSTRUMENT FOR SITE VISITS
TO PARTNERSHIPS IN THE MSP PROGRAM

II. Interview with Other Partnering Staff
(Co-Principal Investigators and Partners)

Conducted by:

COSMOS Corporation
3 Bethesda Metro Center
Suite 700
Bethesda, MD 20814

Conducted for:

National Science Foundation
4201 Wilson Boulevard
Arlington, VA 22230

INTERVIEW INSTRUMENT FOR SITE VISITS
TO PARTNERSHIPS IN THE MSP PROGRAM

II. Interview with Other Partnering Staff
(Co-Principal Investigators and Partners)

1 hour for each Co-PI or Partner

Name and Title of Respondent(s):
Institutional Affiliation:
Date of Interview:
Interviewer:

Hello, my name is _____, and I work for the MSP-PE project team. We are carrying out a series of site visits as part of the evaluation of the MSP Program. The evaluation, like the program, is sponsored by the National Science Foundation (NSF).

My questions will cover the partnership and its activities in math and science education. Overall, the interview should take no more than 1 hour. The interview will cover the partnership's priorities, activities, outcomes, and content. Wherever possible, please note the timing or dates of the activities. All of your responses will be confidential.

A. PARTNERSHIPS

The first portion of the interview will cover the partnership's priorities, activities, outcomes, and content. Wherever possible, please note the timing or dates of the activities.

    1. Shared Partnership Vision and Priorities
        a. ***Partners***. Please identify your partnering organization and other partners in this partnership [*note: the interviewee should be a member of an organization <u>other than</u> the lead partner*]. Within the partnership, what is (are) the main activity(ies) of your partnering organization? [*Obtain any handout about the organizational titles and persons in the partnering organization.*]
        b. ***Creation and Maintenance***. To what extent has the partnership created and maintained a common vision and set of priorities? To what extent, and why, does your partnering organization understand and maintain the same broad vision and priorities? Can you briefly state the common vision? What conditions have hindered or helped these processes? [*Probe for awareness that a major objective is to strengthen K-12 student performance, as well as for the partnership to be an R&D project.*]

    2. Pre-existing Partnerships
        a. ***Identity***. What portions, if any, of the partnership had a pre-existing relationship that dealt with goals similar to those of the current partnership? Likewise, had key partnership leaders from different institutions previously collaborated? [*If none, skip Q.A2b and Q.A2c.*]

(Continued)

II. Interview with Other Partnering Staff (Cont.)

       b. *Relationship to Partnership Startup and Implementation*. Regarding the partnership's activity(ies) involving your partnering organization, describe how each pre-existing relationship might have helped or hindered the startup and implementation of the activity(ies) (e.g., the length of time of the prior relationship and its possible overlap with the time of the MSP award; sources of funding; activities; and accomplishments).

       c. *Relationship to Institutional Change and Sustainability*. Indicate how any pre-existing relationships also may be contributing to institutional change and the sustainability of the present partnership.

SKIP NEXT QUESTION (Q. A3)

   3. Partnership's Component Activities

       a. *Multiplicity of Activities*. Defining an activity as a separate "project" or "program" with its own distinct set of goals, resources, and timelines, and possibly locations, describe the array of activities under the partnership (e.g., some partnerships have "sub"partnerships, which alone would be considered separate activities).[1] Is there only a single project or program, or are there two or more? [*If only one, skip Q.A3b and Q.A3c.*]

       b. *"Project" or "Program" Priorities*. What is the relationship, if any, among the multiple projects or programs, and which have greater staffing or dollar investments? [*Probe for specific funding levels for each project or program within the partnership.*]

       c. *Coordination of "Projects" or "Programs."* How are the multiple projects or programs coordinated? Will the partnership's ultimate accomplishments mainly be the sum of their accomplishments or will they represent some greater whole, and if so, how?

   4. Partnership Processes

       a. *Joint Activities*. What kind of partnership activities involving your partnering organization would have been impossible to carry out without the formal partnership, compared to a single partner working alone or to more informal arrangements? [*Probe for specific examples.*]

       b. *New or Modified Institutional Arrangements*. Besides joint activities, has your partnering organization been associated with new or modified institutional arrangements with the other partners, and if so, how? [*Probe for K-16 vertical integration; cross-campus acceptance of courses for credit, at either K-12 or undergraduate levels; joint K-16 academic appointments; and mergers or reorganizations of departments.*].

       c. *Explanation of Partnership Processes*. What conditions have facilitated, impeded, or otherwise influenced the partnership's progress in pursuing your partnering organization's activity(ies): 1) the formation and continuing maintenance of the partnership; 2) designing and implementing activities (projects and programs), such as the recruitment and retention of the IHE faculty or the K-12 teachers participating in the activities; and 3) striving to achieve the relevant substantive outcomes, such as increased teacher knowledge or student performance in mathematics and science education? [*Probe for conditions <u>within</u> the partnership, to avoid repeating Q. A5d below.*]

       d. *Leadership*. What role does the lead partnering organization play in relation to your organization, and how has this relationship worked?

(Continued)

---

[1]The objective is not to list all of a partnership's sponsored events (e.g., individual workshops) but to understand how these events might be clustered under a coherent activity or "project" or "program" (e.g., summer institutes). Typical activities would therefore include a professional development institute or degree program (preservice or inservice), a project to review and modify a district's curriculum standards, internship programs for K-12 teachers or students, a program to make subgrants to schools or districts for self-proposed activities, or a program to encourage university-based research on mathematics or science education.

II. Interview with Other Partnering Staff (Cont.)

    5. Community and Other Contextual Conditions

        a. ***Community Support***. In carrying out your partnering organization's activity(ies), how has the partnership engaged the local community (e.g., businesses, residents, and community organizations) in supporting its vision and priorities?

        b. ***Related STEM Activities with Other External Support***. In what ways does (do) the activity(ies) include or overlap with related STEM activities supported by other external sources (e.g., other NSF awards, ED-MSP awards, or foundation awards)? If related STEM activities exist, what is their relationship, and how does coordination take place?

        c. ***Family and Parental Involvement***. What role does family and parental involvement play in the activity(ies)? How has such involvement been encouraged?

        d. ***External Policy and Other Conditions Relevant to the Partnership***. How, if at all, have external policies or other conditions influenced the activity(ies)?

[*Probe for:*

    1) *community conditions* (e.g., population shifts affecting student enrollment; IHE or K-12 labor relations; fiscal conditions; and community economic conditions);

    2) *state and local education conditions* (e.g., state standards and policies such as curriculum, assessment, graduation, or re-certification policies; state or local court rulings; the role of state or local school board or elected officials; changes in local practices or policies such as new class-size restrictions; and changes in IHE requirements or practices; and

    3) *federal education conditions* (e.g., conflicts and complementarities related to the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*); and

    4) *K-12 student conditions* (e.g., continuation or influx of racial, ethnic, or ELL students.)]

SKIP SECTIONS B, C, D, AND E IN THEIR ENTIRETY

F. EXPLANATIONS REGARDING THE PARTNERSHIP'S WORK

Without repeating your earlier responses (see Qs.A4c and A4d), I would like to get a fuller and broader view of the workings of the partnership.

    1. Building and Maintaining a Math and Science Partnership

        a. ***Influential Conditions***. How would you best describe the conditions that have most influenced the running of the partnership and its ability to support high-quality math and science education activities? [*Probe for internal and external conditions.*]

        b. ***Other Implementation Conditions***. What kinds of conditions would make it easier or harder for the partners to work together and for the implementation of its activities?

    2. Rival Explanations

        a. ***Prior Relationships***. To what extent did the partnership start afresh, compared to having had collaborative relationships between key individuals or organizations that predated the start of the MSP award?

        b. ***Non-MSP Relationships***. To what extent have non-MSP conditions (e.g., new district, university, state, or federal education policies) been a driving force in promoting the partnership and its activities?