NSF GK-12 "Building Bridges"
Summer Institute: July 7 – 11

Institute Evaluation I

For each of the activities of the Institute listed below, please rate them by circling the number corresponding to how well they helped to fulfill the mission of the Institute as you understand it. A score of 5 is considered high, and the activity should be offered again next year. A score of 1 indicates that the activity should be replaced.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction and Pre-Test</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Activities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort Selection</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Brock Williams (Sample Modules)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Jerry Dwyer (Sample Module)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. David Lamp (Sample Modules I)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. David Lamp (Sample Modules II)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Dominick Casadonte (Cognitive Development)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Richard Gale (Sample Module)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation on Aging/ Problem Development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation on Aging/ Problem Development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Jennifer Wilhelm (Constructivism, TIMS)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Ron Wilhelm (Sample Module)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aging / Problem Development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Module Development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pam Summers, LISD (TAKS and Testing in Texas)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Mary Baker (Sample Module)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Out on Aging Solutions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of Module Ideas and Discussion of Expectations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Demographic Information
My gender is _________.
   a) Male   b) Female
I am a _____________.
   a) Fellow  b) Teacher  c) Faculty
NSF GK-12 "Building Bridges"
Summer Institute: July 7 – 11

Institute Evaluation II

1) What was the (were the) most helpful parts of the Institute? Why?

Teachers:  
- Wow! It was so varied!! Lamp and Dwyer Modules  
- Pam Summers coming in.  
- The hands-on activities  
- Ron Wilhelm, because his modules best showed what we need to do.  
- Good cohort selection, social bonding with cohort  
- The sample modules  
- Sample modules in different areas  
- Sample modules  
- Interaction with our cohorts

Fellows:  
- The modules, because I was able to interact with my group  
- TAKS explanation and discussion with teachers  
- Social, getting to know. Also, spending a week with these people.  
- Understanding the need in education.  
- The modules on Tuesday were the most helpful  
- The discussions of learning by experience and inquiry  
- Different teaching styles, reaching the students and stimulating learning

Faculty:  
- Letting fellows and teachers get familiar with each other and working together to develop cooperative relationships.  
- Discussions outside of the presentations  
- Open discussions  
- Grad student-teacher interaction, because it is new to both

2) What were the least helpful parts of the Institute? Why?

Teachers:  
- Presentation from faculty was too much  
- The engineering lectures were way over my head.  
- Lectures  
- Too high level for modules, too long for modules, could have gotten more
accomplished
- The pre-test – no results were shared
- Lectures about fiber optics and photonics
- The pre-test; it made me feel stupid
- Some presentations contained too much information
- I'm not sure about the TAKS stuff-What do the Fellows actually need?
- I really struggled with the engineering modules

Fellows:  
- I didn't like the topic for the module that our group had to present.  
- The lectures on math and physics…very unrealistic and demeaning  
- None
- Control discussions a bit more.
- None
- Some of the modules were not applicable, I feel, to what we will be doing
- The lecture presentations. BORING
- TAKS explanations. Not exactly for the content, but that the experience will happen as the year progresses.

Faculty:
- Some activities couldn't involve all teachers and fellows and elicit their enthusiasm
- Too many modules
- Didactic lectures
- Some presentations of "raw" learning data. We've seen it before and are getting tired.

3) What were the most successful workshop(s) during the institute? Why?

Teachers:
- Dwyer, Lamp
- None
- David and Brock's workshops
- Ron Wilhelm's
- Topography, birds, moon, cognitive development, cohort selection time
- Working with our cohorts. Learning what the program was all about.
- Dr. Lamp's presentation on levers, proportionality; fits the level and just above that we teach
- All of them were successful
- Dr. William's, Dr. Lamp's, Dr. Casadonte's, and both Dr. Wilhelm's.

Fellows:
- Dom's, Dr. Lamp's and the Wilhelm's
- Dr. William's (M&M and Skittle) Dr. Casadonte (Mind) Dr. Dwyer (Topography) Dr. Wilhelm's (Mars)
- Dr. William's, Dr. Baker, Dr. Casadonte, Drs. Wilhelm
- Can't pick one. They were all very helpful!
- Jennifer, because it kept us engaged and delivered many clear concepts
- Dr. William's, Dr. Lamp's, Dr. Casadonte's, Dr. Dwyer
- The discussions on learning by experience and inquiry
- The workshops that stimulated a lot of discussion

Faculty:  
- Cognitive Development PPT, Constructivism PPT, the modules, and pre-test
- Dwyer, Wilhelm
- Hands on-less theoretical
- None

4) What were the least useful workshops during the institute? Why?

Teachers:  
- Total internal reflection. The math was way over my head and presentation too fast; definitely didactic
- None
- Probably Dr. Gale's. There wasn't a hands-on activity to go with it.
- The lectures
- The others… (not Topography, birds, moon, cognitive development, cohort selection time)
- TAKS.TEKS review. But probably useful for the graduate students.
- Fiber optics. It did not sample a module.
- All of them were successful
- Dr. Gale's

Fellows:  
- I had a problem with Dr. Gale's presentation. It would have been interesting if he had brought down the level of information and allowed us to do experiments.
- All electrical engineering. Boring!
- Dr. Gale
- If I had to pick, it would be the "TAKS". I found it a bit confusing.
- Dr. Gale's lecture
- Dr. Gale and Dr. Baker. The info was over our heads and would be limited in application.
- The lecture presentations. BORING
- Dr. Gale's was a very in-depth module above the level of the majority of the class. In essence, the teachers and fellows felt lost, just like students in a classroom.

Faculty:  
- The first statistics module (not involve all participants)
- All useful, but in different ways
- Lectures
- Opening the Garrison question in our cohort groups Wed afternoon. We were exhausted.

5) Were the expectations and outcomes for the institute clearly stated?

Teachers:  
- Hmm… It depends on to whom I spoke – I heard several "main goals" – I think as the week went along we gradually sorted it out.
- No
- Eh. Not really
- The lectures
- I think so, many others don't
- No
- Yes
- Yes, except for what and when modules were due
- At first I was reserved as to the outcomes, but after day 2 I started to get the expectations.
- There was an element of uncertainty coming in; however, that should be expected. Communication about expectations and outcomes clarified our roles.

Fellows:
- It was a little vague and I think that the groups are responsible for deciding what works best.
- No! I had no idea
- No, thankfully
- After the week it was. However, I came to the institute blinded to expectations.
- I was a little confused before, but now I have a better concept.
- I think they were, but I don't know if we matched them.
- No
- No and yes. Basically stated as "get ready to learn to communicate. Here are some examples… Go!"

Faculty:
- Yes
- Not as clearly as I wanted
- No
- No. They are open ended. Some think graduate student training, some teacher, some modules. Not clear.

6) Were the workshop handouts useful? Comments?

Teachers:
- Yes – especially as they posted to moodle and I could download.
- Yes
- Yes. They gave me great ideas to go with.
- The lectures
- As examples
- Ok. Some good info
- Yes – need to provide one for each participant
- Yes. All handouts were very helpful.
- Yes. I intend to incorporate most of these into my classroom.
- Yes. Having the time to review them would have helped.

Fellows:
- If they are being posted on line, then I don't think a copy for each person is necessary.
- Majority (in particular the TAKS handouts)
- Dr. Gale
- Some were. I appreciate the instructions for modules and TAKS info
- Yes, it helped to follow the workshop clearly
- I have not had a chance to digest any of them.
- Mostly
- Not really. I'm not really a handout kind of guy
- Yes, in order to remember what and how the modules were structured and just general reference.

Faculty:
- Yes
- Yes
- Some
- Yes

7) Were the ancillary materials (notebooks, etc.) useful? Comments?

Teachers:
- I like the notebook as a place to collect things. I filled mine pretty quickly.
- Yes
- Yes. They helped me stay organized. Thanks you!
- Yes for notes
- Yes
- Yes. Could have actual access to computers and technology.
- Perfect for what we needed.
- Yes. I tried not to write on most of the handouts so I could use them.
- Yes. It provided me with a source to take notes.

Fellows:
- If they are being posted on line, then I don't think a copy for each person is necessary.
- OK. In particular the TAKS handouts
- Not really
- Yes, otherwise would have problems keeping organized with our own notes.
- Yes. I always had what I needed.
- Yes
- No. I learn best by watching and listening; ancillary materials distract me.
- Yes, for documenting the week…and the paper is really cool.

Faculty:
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes
- No

8) Was the room adequate for the Institute? Comments?

Teachers:
- No - too small. Computer connectivity too fickle. But, the location was user friendly
- No. Round tables not a good set up. Need wireless technology.
- Eh – a little small and stuffy, but it was nice.
- Yes
- Yes. Need more short breaks.
- There could have been more room for both handouts and computers.
- Yes, it was adequate, not too small and not too big!
- Yes, during lab activities we could have used a little more room. For computer activities we could have used a temporary password.
- Let's say it was sufficient.

Fellows: - The room allowed for collaboration with groups.
- It was good.
- No, it was slightly too cramped.
- A little crowded, but like the set up.
- Very cool and nice, but a bit stuffy.
- Yes
- Could be a tad bigger.
- A little bit cramped for the number of people but it still worked well.

Faculty: - It’s a little bit crowded.
- Too many tables
- Yes
- Barely larger is better.

9) Were the amenities (food, etc.) adequate? Comments?

Teachers: - Yes
- Yes
- Wahoo!! Thanks!
- Absolutely!
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes
- Absolutely. But if I were being picky, I would have liked a Coke or two.

Fellows: - Fine
- No donuts! This is why American is obese! We should all know better or provide healthy alternatives.
- Yes
- Needed coffee available all day. Other than that it was fine.
- Delicious! Thanks!
- Yes
- Healthier options, please!
- Yes. Food is good. Free food is great. Also helped me stay alert.
Faculty:  
- Yes  
- Yes  
- No – needed healthy snacks  
- Yes

10) Would Fellows and Teacher breakout sessions have been useful to you? If so, when should they come during the week?

Teachers:  
- I think, for the amount of time available, that working and bonding with our cohort was invaluable! Stick with cohort groups.  
- Yes, each day  
- Yes, at least once a day!  
- Together would help  
- Cohort groups need to meet more!  
- Yes – by Wednesday on to work on modules  
- Yes; at the beginning, middle, and end (we did this on our own)  
- If we could have a whole day to work with our fellows then I would feel we could become more comfortable with our "plan" or "plan of action"  
- Yes, an hour or so after lunch

Fellows:  
- Maybe 20-45 minutes at the end of Tuesday  
- We need to work more with just our cohort groups from the get go.  
- I don't think so.  
- We had small breakout sessions and thought they were enough. One hour. Know each other and learn what the institute is about and can clear/decide our future work outside of these classes.  
- Yes. Wednesday afternoon and Friday morning.  
- Yes. They should have been on Wed. or Thurs.  
- I don't know.  
- No sure, but if so, right after cohort selection.

Faculty:  
- Yes  
- Yes! Earlier in the week  
- Yes. Once per day  
- Yes. Some questions came up that are hard to discuss in front of each other. Last of each day.

11) Did the Institute meet your expectations in terms of what you understood would be expected of you and your development in the Bridges GK-12 program? Explain.

Teachers:  
- I really had very little image of what to expect. I've been delighted, excited, and challenged by what we've done.  
- None  
- No. I wanted more applicable module examples and a chance to talk to fellows about students, etc.  
- Yes
- No. Thought we would spend more time planning for the year.
- I expected to be able to work on the modules more.
- Yes; very well.
- Yes
- Yes, exceeded them. Admittedly, it is a little intimidating to be with (a) graduate students who are very knowledgeable, and (b) teachers with a plethora of knowledge and experience. This program will definitely enhance the way that I approach my teaching, and thrilled to be a part of it.

Fellows:  
- I think that our roles are not clearly defined, which is good – allows for flexibility
- No – No information was provided beforehand and I had no idea a majority of the time why we were going beyond anything we would teach at the high school level.
- None
- Yes, I loved the learning of how to learn and teach. It was an amazing eye-opening experience. It drove me to get even more interested in helping in education.
- I was unsure of my role, even with the contract. This has clarified my expectation as I was hoping.
- No. I don't know what is expected of me in terms of modules, and some faculty seemed unresponsive to the info being presented at a level above some of our (Fellows/Teachers) heads.
- 8/10 It took some hashing out to get an idea.
- I expected coming in to expect anything and was prepared to go in any direction.

Faculty:  
- The institute stated its expectations for fellows and teachers. But some fellows are still confused about what kind of role they will play in the classroom.
- Too long
- N/A
- No. Most modules were undeveloped and choppy.

12) Are you leaving the Institute with a sense of excitement for the GK-12 experience? If not, how would you describe your overall experience at the Institute and your anticipation for the upcoming year?

Teachers:  
- Absolutely – YES!!
- Sort of
- Yes, I am excited! Wahoo!
- Not yet, need "digestion time", but look forward to the year
- Yes – excited more about the program, not the workshop
- Yes – I really want to get started
- Yes
- I'm very excited about the GK-12 program. I see it as another way to make our students successful.
- Absolutely. I am extremely excited.
Fellows:
- I think it will be fun!
- I am really excited to work with my cohort group. I think this is going to be a great experience.
- YES!!!
- As my answers have expressed, I am very excited and looking forward to applying the learning.
- Yes! I can't wait to dive in and change the world!
- I am, because my teachers are excited about what to expect from me.
- Yes
- Absolutely. I am ready to get into it.

Faculty:
- Kind of. The fellows need more information about the strengths of integrating math and science together, and they need to clarify the importance of their presence in the classroom.
- The institute was too long!
- N/A
- Yes

12) Will the material that you learned from the institute be of use to you in:

- Teaching in the K-12 environment? _____________
  If "yes", how?

Teachers:
- Yes – reminding me to think more globally as I plan lessons
- None
- Perhaps
- Yes, the technique
- Yes, ways to spark interest
- Yes, some of the modules will be modified and used
- Yes, I know what and how I will work with others
- Yes
- Yes, applications of content as well as teaching styles

Fellows:
- Yes, I can use some of the modules/problems
- No. Nothing was discussed regarding actual classroom experience.
- Yes, I feel like I know a little more what to expect.
- Can't say for sure, but I think yes.
- Yes, it gave me a clear picture of 1) the current state of education, and 2) a variety of methods and tools for new teaching styles.
- No, I don't feel we learned a lot of this.
- Yes. Not necessarily material, but teaching style (inquiry)
- Yes, but at the same time it will still be a challenge to go from teaching in a university to a high school.

Faculty:
- N/A
- N/A
- N/A
- Yes, as I help teachers.

• Preparing the modules? ________________
  If "yes", how?

Teachers: - Yes – reminding me to think more globally as I plan lessons
- None
- Yes. Problem solving
- Somewhat. Real world time will be an issue
- Yes. Some idea of what's expected
- Yes. More time could be allowed for development of the modules.
- Yes. Great examples of modules.
- Yes
- Yes. I now have a general framework to work in.

Fellows: - Yes/no. I think we should have been allowed to come up with a problem that we were interested in.
- Yes, way toned down
- Yes
- Yes. Not sure I can answer this clearly. But I will be applying what we learned her to the teaching methods and to create the modules.
- Yes, inspiring me with examples of what works and what doesn't.
- No, I don't feel we learned a lot of this.
- Yes, because.
- Yes, since there was a wide variety of teaching styles and development.

Faculty: - Yes. Teachers and Fellows cooperate to design modules
- N/A
- N/A
- Yes, as I write activities.

• Working with the teachers (GK-12 Fellows only)?
  If "yes", how?

Fellows: - They provided knowledge and insight into teaching
- No. We were barely able to discuss our own background and experience.
- None
- Yes
- Yes. Socializing with them made it very easy to work together.
- Yes. After talking with the teachers, we know what to expect of each other.
- Kind of. The best would be actual classroom experience.
- Kind of. We still have to get into the classroom and into the environment in order to define the Fellows roles.
• Working with the Fellows (Gk-12 Teachers only)?
  If "yes", how?

Teachers:  - Yes --gives us some common basis for discussion
  - None
  - Perhaps
  - Yes, to learn how to support
  - Yes, we talked a lot as a cohort group
  - Yes. I think they have a better idea of what to expect.
  - Yes, because I know how to tie to them.
  - Yes
  - Yes. All Fellows in our cohort worked well together. Communicating with them this week will help start things out right.

13) The amount of time for the Institute was 3.5 too short 6 too long 11.5 about right

14) Was the cohort selection process adequate?  If not, how would you change it?

Teachers:  - Because our groups seems to be gelling so well, I'd say yes
  - No. We need more interaction before cohort selection.
  - Yes
  - Great for me
  - Yes
  - Yes
  - I don't know what they used to pick
  - Allow us to work with different grad students rather than locking in after one day
  - Yes

Fellows:  - Not sure how you selected us, but I get along with and enjoy my group
  - Yes! Our group meshes very well and personality testing was successful
  - Sure
  - I don't know the criteria, thus, I don't know
  - My group rocks!
  - Yes!
  - Perhaps, without telling us, put us in cohort groups for a day and then privately meet with us about what we thought of the people at our table and modify accordingly.
  - I have no clue because we had no part in it, but I am happy with my personal group selection.

Faculty:  - Its good, just except the Monterey cohort
  - Need interviews beforehand, need research interests of the Fellow for the teachers to see and teaching areas of the teachers for the Fellows
  - Yes
- Yes. More candidates or more cohorts. It was a few body process with some poor fits.

15) What would you have done differently if you were in charge of the institute?

Teachers:  - Be sure you have a good idea of what a set module looks like and make sure that the university presentations model that type of module.
- None
- More role play to prepare the fellows. More presentations by the teachers!
- More school district input at a high level
- More time to prepare module, more time with cohort to discuss classroom
- Less lecture. More hands on and time to work with modules
- Nothing
- Allow us to work with different grad students rather than locking in after one day, get rid of pre-tests, spend more time pondering ideas for modules
- Perhaps establishing more background of what to expect this week. Again, expectations were exceeded and have been communicated, but more clarification prior to meeting this week would be one suggestion.

Fellows:  - Found it well organized and informative but a little long and too much like a classroom
- Kick out about three professors who were just trying to show who was smarter and put in an LISD administrator to bring everyone back to reality.
- Longer, perhaps with more cohort socials
- Hold questions to the end of the modules. Have coffee all day!!!
- Nothing, really
- Give a better idea of appropriate module/talk about the background of the students at the schools we are assigned to/discuss writing process for scholarly journals
- Healthier options, please!
- Half days for two weeks

Faculty:  - No comment
- Shorter time, more interactions
- Clearer expectations/more discussion sections/less lectures/no faculty "talking down" to teachers/shorter hours – more breaks
- Bigger tables/fewer computers/more mixing between cohorts
### Evaluation Results
#### Summer Institute 08

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Fellows</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monday</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introduction and Pre-Test</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Activities</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cohort Selection</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tuesday</strong></td>
<td>Dr. Brock Williams (Sample Modules)</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Jerry Dwyer (Sample Module)</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. David Lamp (Sample Modules I)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. David Lamp (Sample Modules II)</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wednesday</strong></td>
<td>Dr. Dominick Casadonte (Cognitive Development)</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Richard Gale (Sample Module)</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation on Aging/ Problem Development</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation on Aging/ Problem Development</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thursday</strong></td>
<td>Dr. Jennifer Wilhelm (Constructivism. TIMS)</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Ron Wilhelm (Sample Module)</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aging / Problem Development</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beginning Module Development</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friday</strong></td>
<td>Pam Summers, LISD (TAKS and Testing in Texas)</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Mary Baker (Sample Module)</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Report Out on Aging Solutions</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation of Module Ideas and Discussion of Expectations</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Evaluation Results
### Summer Institute 08

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fellows</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. David Lamp (Sample Modules I)</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Brock Williams (Sample Modules)</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. David Lamp (Sample Modules II)</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Dominick Casadonte (Cognitive Development)</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort Selection</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Jerry Dwyer (Sample Module)</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of Module Ideas and Discussion of Expectations</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Ron Wilhelm (Sample Module)</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Activities</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Out on Aging Solutions</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Jennifer Wilhelm (Constructivism. TIMS)</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Module Development</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pam Summers, LISD (TAKS and Testing in Texas)</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation on Aging/ Problem Development</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation on Aging/ Problem Development</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aging / Problem Development</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction and Pre-Test</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Mary Baker (Sample Module)</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Richard Gale (Sample Module)</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>