IT STARTS HERE. ★

ARMY EDUCATIONAL OUTREACH PROGRAM

RESET

2019 Annual Program Evaluation Report

April 2020

ARMY EDUCATIONAL OUTREACH PROGRAM

1

1 | AEOP Consortium Contacts

U.S. Army Contacts

Matthew Willis, Ph.D.
Director for Laboratory Management
Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary
of the Army for Research and Technology
matthew.p.willis.civ@mail.mil

Jack Meyer
Army Educational Outreach Program (AEOP) Director
Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army
for Research and Technology
jack.m.meyer2.ctr@mail.mil

AEOP Cooperative Agreement Manager

Christina Weber
AEOP Cooperative Agreement Manager
U.S. Army Combat Capabilities
Development Command (CCDC)
christina.l.weber.civ@mail.mil

Battelle Memorial Institute – Lead Organization

David Burns
Project Director, AEOP CA
burnsd@battelle.org

RESET Program Administrators

Sally Pardue, Ph.D.
RESET IPA
Tennessee Technological University
spardue@tntech.edu

Jennifer Meadows, Ph.D.
PI
Tennessee Technological University
jrmeadows@tntech.edu

Evaluation Team Contacts – NC State University

Carla C. Johnson, Ed.D.
Evaluation Director, AEOP CA
carlacjohnson@ncsu.edu

Toni A. Sondergeld, Ph.D.
Assistant Director, AEOP CA
tonisondergeld@metriks.com

Janet B. Walton, Ph.D.
Assistant Director, AEOP CA
jwalton2@ncsu.edu

Report RESET_02_04152020 has been prepared for the AEOP Cooperative Agreement and the U.S. Army by NC State University College of Education on behalf of Battelle Memorial Institute (Lead Organization) under award W911 SR-15-2-0001.

2 | Table of Contents

3 | Introduction

Goal 1: STEM Literate Citizenry. Broaden, deepen, and diversify the pool of STEM talent in support of our defense industry base.

Goal 2: STEM Savvy Educators. Support and empower educators with unique Army research and technology resources.

Goal 3: Sustainable Infrastructure. Develop and implement a cohesive, coordinated, and sustainable STEM education outreach infrastructure across the Army.

The Army Educational Outreach Program (AEOP) vision is to offer a collaborative and cohesive portfolio of Army sponsored science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) programs that effectively engage, inspire, and attract the next generation of STEM talent through K-college programs and expose participants to Department of Defense (DoD) STEM careers. The consortium, formed by the Army Educational Outreach Program Cooperative Agreement (AEOP CA), supports the AEOP in this mission by engaging non-profit, industry, and academic partners with aligned interests, as well as a management structure that collectively markets the portfolio among members, leverages available resources, and provides expertise to ensure the programs provide the greatest return on investment in achieving the Army's STEM goals and objectives.

This report documents the evaluation of one of the AEOP elements, the Research Experiences for STEM Educators and Teachers (RESET). The evaluation study was performed by NC State University in cooperation with Battelle, the Lead Organization (LO) in the AEOP CA consortium.

Program Overview

Research Experiences for STEM Educators and Teachers (RESET) is sponsored by the U.S Army and managed by Tennessee Technological University (Tennessee Tech). Launched in 2016, RESET provides STEM educators (referred to as "participants" or "teachers" throughout this report) with online learning opportunities and summer research experiences at participating Army laboratories and research centers. The goal of this program is to reinforce teachers' content knowledge through research experiences and interactions with Army and Department of Defense scientists and engineers. Selected teachers participate in on-line learning as cohorts, with a subset of the cohorts selected to conduct research on-site with mentor Army scientists or engineers. The first part of the collaborative online learning module (Level I), called Introduction to Research, is conducted over 30 hours during the span of a month. A subset of the

online-learning cohort, Level II participants, travel to Army research laboratories to conduct research with Army scientists or engineers for four weeks (160 hours) of mentored experiential learning. While at the labs, Level II participants stay in touch with the initial cohort and share what they are learning. At the end of the summer, the full cohort reconvenes online for another 30 hours to collaboratively translate their knowledge and experience into enhanced STEM curricula and enriched learning experiences for students. Teachers who have completed Level II activities are eligible to act as Level III facilitators of the online component of RESET.

In FY19, 22 teachers participated in RESET; 15 of these teachers participated in Level I, 5 in Level II on-site research experiences, and 2 were Level III facilitators Table 1 summarizes participant demographics and Table 2 provides an overview of participating Army/DoD sites.

Table 1. 2019 RESET Participant Profile

Demographic Category	Number	Percentage of Participants
Participant Gender (n =22)		
Female	16	72.7%
Male	6	27.3%
Participant Race/Ethnicity (n =22)		
Asian	3	13.6%
Black or African American	5	22.7%
Hispanic or Latino	3	13.6%
Native American or Alaska Native	0	0%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	0%
White	9	41.1%
Other race or ethnicity	1	4.5%
Choose not to report	1	4.5%
School Setting (n =22)		
Urban (city)	9	41.0%
Suburban	11	50.0%
Rural (country)	2	9.0%
Frontier or tribal School	0	0%
DoDDS/DoDEA School	0	0%
Home school	0	0%
Online school	0	0%

Table 2. 2019 RESET Sites		
Command and Laboratory		**Location**
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers -- Engineer Research and Development Center -- Construction Engineering Research Laboratory (ERDC-CERL)	Champaign, IL
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers -- Engineer Research and Development Center -- Environmental Laboratory (ERDC)	Vicksburg, MS

Table 3 summarizes RESET costs for 2019. In FY19 the total cost for RESET was $ $128,631. The cost per participant was $5,847.

Table 3. 2019 RESET Program Costs	
Total Cost	$128,631
CCDC Cost	$0
IPA Cost	$128,631
Total Travel	$27,699
CCDC Travel	$0
IPA Travel	$3,116
Participant Travel	$24,583
Total Awards	$47,750
Participant Awards/Stipends	$47,750
Other Adult/Teacher/Mentor Awards	$0
Cost Per Participant	$5,847

4

4 | Evaluation At-A-Glance

NC State University collected the FY19 evaluation data for the RESET program. The RESET logic model below presents a summary of the expected outputs and outcomes for the RESET program in relation to the AEOP priorities. This logic model provided guidance for the overall RESET evaluation strategy.

Inputs	Activities	Outputs	Outcomes (Short term)	Impact (Long Term)
• Operations conducted by Tennessee Tech University and DoD partners • Development of online learning modules and partnership with Army labs and centers • Centralized branding and comprehensive marketing • Centralized evaluation	• STEM educators participating in online learning cohorts • STEM educators learn to use the Legacy Cycle to structure students' active learning and research • STEM educators participate in research experiences in Army labs • Program activities that expose STEM educators to AEOP programs and STEM careers in the Army or DoD	• Number and diversity of STEM educators engaged in programs • Number of schools served through educator engagement • Army labs and centers hosting educators for research experiences	• Increased educator proficiency in STEM teaching • Application of participant learning to teaching practices • Increased participant awareness of AEOP opportunities • Increased participant awareness of DoD STEM research and careers • Implementation of evidence-based recommendations to improve RESET programs	• Increased student learning and engagement in STEM • Increased teacher and student participation in AEOP and DoD-sponsored programs • Increased student pursuit of STEM coursework in secondary and post-secondary schooling • Increased student pursuit of STEM degrees • Increased student pursuit of STEM careers • Increased student pursuit of DoD STEM careers • Continuous improvement and sustainability of RESET

Because of the relatively small population of RESET participants, and because FY19 was only the second year with a full cohort of Level I, II, and III participants, the evaluation employed a formative approach, focusing on gathering descriptive information about RESET processes, resources, and activities and on understanding individual participants' perspectives about the program. These data were correlated with

overall AEOP objectives. The assessment strategy for RESET included seven interviews with RESET participants as well as program information from RESET administrators. Table 4 outlines the information collected in interviews and Table 5 summarizes the information provided by program administrators.

Table 4. 2019 Participant Interviews	
Category	**Description**
Profile	Teaching experience, type of participation in RESET (online only or online plus research experience)
Satisfaction & Suggestions	Value of RESET to participants and suggestions for improving RESET program components
AEOP Goals 2 and 3 - Program Efforts	Extent to which participants were exposed to other AEOP opportunities
	Extent to which participants were exposed to STEM and Army/DoD STEM jobs
	Extent to which participants were exposed to Army/DoD research and resources
	Benefits to participants, suggestions for improving programs, overall satisfaction

Table 5. 2019 Administrator-provided Information	
Category	**Description**
Program	Description of course content and activities
AEOP Goals 1,2, and 3	Data on participant demographics and school settings
	Description of program activities; Participation of Army research facilities in activities
	Description of collaboration with other AEOPs
Program Efforts Program	Description of course content and activities

Information about evaluation methods are described in Appendix A, the evaluation plan. The reader is strongly encouraged to review Appendix A to clarify how data are summarized, analyzed, and reported in this document. The participant interview protocol is provided in Appendix B.

Study Sample

A subset of seven participants was chosen from the overall population of 22 RESET participants to participate in telephone interviews. Interviews were not intended to yield generalizable findings; rather they were intended to provide a descriptive narrative of RESET's efforts and impacts and to highlight areas for future exploration in programming and evaluation.

5

5 | Priority #1 Findings

Broaden, deepen, and diversify the pool of STEM talent in support of our Defense Industry Base

RESET participants interviewed had between 3 and 22 years of teaching experience. Four participants were female, and three were male. One participant taught middle school science, one was a career tech teacher in a middle school, one taught mathematics and science to 7th-12th graders in a charter school, and four taught high school science (biology and/or chemistry. Five of the teachers interviewed were Level I RESET participants and two were Level II participants. Four had participated in only the online portion of the program and three of the teachers had participated in hands-on experiences at Army labs or research facilities.

Interview participants reported having learned about RESET in a variety of ways. The first-time participants who offered information about how they learned about the program reported that they received information about RESET via an email received through the participant's school, through an online search for summer professional development opportunities, and from another teacher who had participated. One returning participant reported originally having learned about RESET through eCYBERMISSION and another through an email from a STEM center in his state.

One participant noted that she felt that the online portion of the program could be enhanced by recruiting more participants. In particular, she felt that this would permit the formation of more robust groups, possibly separated by geographic area and/or by teaching assignment (e.g., middle school or high school, special education).

6 | Priority #2 Findings

Support and empower educators with unique Army research and technology resources.

Interview participants all had positive comments about their RESET experiences along with various suggestions for program improvement. Teachers' comments spanned a variety of features of program features and focused on the overall value of RESET within both the online component of the program and the research experience component of the program.

RESET interview participants cited a number of benefits of participating in the program. Their comments focused on the value of learning about the research process, collaborating with other teachers and professionals, and the opportunity to improve their professional practice.

Research Experiences

All RESET participants interviewed who had participated in on-site research experiences had positive things to say about these experiences. In particular, participants cited the benefits of experiencing real-world research, working collaboratively with STEM research professionals, and the credibility it gives them to be able to cite these experiences in their own classrooms. For example,

> *"The biggest value is letting the teacher have experience ....[being] able to say [I worked at] the US Army Corps of Engineers on this research this past summer gives you more credibility compared to being a science teacher."* (RESET Level II Participant)

> *"It's invaluable to be allowed into a professional workspace where I am mentored and shown skills I didn't have before. Engineering was a whole new thing for me."* (RESET Level II Participant)

Two of the teachers commented on the funding for the onsite research experiences. One teacher noted that she had not yet (as of mid-September) received full payment and commented that the necessity for teachers to provide the initial funding for their own travel could be a barrier to participation for some. The other RESET participant who commented upon funding suggested that teachers participating in the Level II experiences be required to invest some of their own funds to indicate their commitment and

interest in participating. Both of these teachers commented that the payment structure should be streamlined to ensure timely payment and one suggested that a phased payment structure might work well.

One teacher, who had completed his second on-site research experience commented on the benefit of participating a second time. He particularly noted that he had more autonomy in research and was able to accomplish more in the lab because of the decreased need for orientation and induction during his second round of participation. This participant added that a natural extension of the participant on-site lab experiences would be for teachers to take students to the labs for an on-site research experience. This teacher noted that this would be particularly useful in making AEOP lab experiences available to high school students who live in areas distant from Army labs and are not otherwise able to participate. In his own words,

> *"Me taking [RESET] to the next level is taking a student or two with me to experience research. If the goal is to inspire students to get into a STEM field, how amazing would it be to have their teacher mentor go with them on site?"* (RESET Level II Participant)

Another Level II participant also suggested a way for RESET teachers to be involved with students on site at Army research facilities. This teacher had worked with a GEMS program as part of her on-site experience and saw value in having RESET participants visit sites as GEMS teachers as a type of shorter duration lab experience. She commented that this could fulfill a need for resource teachers for GEMS while giving RESET participants unable to commit to an entire month on-site a way to have an on-site experience.

This participant also suggested that placing more than one RESET participant at a single lab could be valuable. She particularly noted the support that the teachers could provide one another, both in terms of the lab experience and the lifestyle factors associated with living for a month in a location distant from their homes. This teacher indicated that the overlap between her time and another RESET participant's at the lab had been useful in terms of adjusting to the lab climate, being able to share ideas about classroom applications of lab experiences, and having a social contact outside of the lab. She extended this idea to suggest that teachers who had previously participated in on-site experiences could act as mentors to first-time Level II participants.

Online Component

Teachers also commented favorably on the online component of RESET. Participants appreciated the collaborative aspects of the online component, the quality of instruction, and the content knowledge they gained.

Several participants emphasized the value they found in collaborating with other teachers, emphasizing the value they found value in sharing ideas. One teacher cited the benefits of being challenged to explore new disciplinary areas through collaborative work and the opportunity to develop empathy for students who are being exposed to new disciplinary areas. Participants said, for example,

> *"I enjoyed the teleconferencing. Just everybody talking; it was like a huge brainstorming session. Everybody took pieces from each other."* (RESET Level I Participant)

> *"I was involved in a biochemistry project. I struggled with it openly. That helps me appreciate what I want my student to be able to do...They're having to relate new information to their lives and, to them, it's like learning ballet."* (RESET Level II Participant)

RESET participants also made positive comments about the instruction they received and the support the program provided in enabling them to apply their learning to their own practice context. As one participant said,

> *"I felt very supported. I can't say this enough. Coming from a public school side of things in a state that has an underfunded public education system, [RESET] did a very great job of meeting each educator where they were...in the materials available to them, and in their professional learning stage.*" (RESET Level I Participant)

RESET participants also commented that they gained new understandings about research and the research process from the online component of the program. A participant noted, for example,

> *"I had a lot of misunderstandings about what research is. The way that I experienced research is somebody sets up a news story and tries to get me to adjust my lifestyle in an uncomfortable way...In fact, research is a necessary activity if you want the culture to thrive in the world."* (RESET Level I Participant)

All teachers interviewed reported that they had or would be able to incorporate what they learned in RESET into their classroom practice, both in terms of pedagogy and content. Teachers commented both upon the research processes taught during RESET (e.g., the Legacy Cycle and the lotus blossom approach) and the pedagogical knowledge they gained. For example,

> *"[RESET] introduced us to the concept of a lotus blossom plant. You start with a question, and then you surround it with other questions…and you expand it out. I find that's a very powerful tool to engage students…their imagination, their experiences, and their memories."* (RESET Level I Participant)

> *"I [can] pass on my passion for science and doing research to my students…I am literally teaching my students how to do a research project. I'm in the initial phase where I'm helping them refine their research topic…I wouldn't have gotten to that point unless I had done RESET this year."* (RESET Level II Participant)

> *"I'm a firm believer [in RESET]. It has really changed my teaching style and how I approach a lot of things."* (RESET Level II Participant)

One RESET teacher reported that she created a lesson based upon the legacy cycle in her classroom and described the "legacy cycle windmills" her students created. This teacher, who works in a middle school that uses project-based learning regularly, also reported teaching her students the lotus blossom method of refining research questions.

One participant commented on the lesson plan her group created in the online component of the program. This Level II participant teaches high school science and noted that she plans to implement the lesson plan in her classroom at the end of the school year after testing is completed.

Another participant added that he not only has applied his learning from RESET in his classroom, but also in professional development that he has delivered to other teachers:

> *"I do use what I have learned from [RESET] in my classrooms, but I also use it in my professional development. I have used a couple of the literature pieces provided through the online component to inform some of the PD that I've given to some colleagues."* (RESET Level II Participant)

Suggested Improvements

RESET participants were asked in the interviews to share their ideas about ways the components of the RESET program could be improved in the future. Participating teachers suggested the following improvements to the online portion of RESET:

- Make the online component continue for the span of a semester/longer program with fewer hours each week
- Lengthen the induction time for the online component
- Provide additional online modules with different focus areas
- Provide cohorts of participants with similar practice settings (e.g., middle school, high school, special education)
- Recruit more participants to allow for more specialized cohort groupings
- Facilitate synchronous meetings to support creation of the group lesson plan
- Provide opportunities for cohorts to meet in person

- Clarify with participants that group lesson plans must be widely applicable (i.e., not only targeted toward private school settings where religious content can be incorporated)
- Provide hands-on activities
- Provide feedback on final project
- Provide more information about Army/DoD STEM careers

Level II participants offered the following suggestions for improvements to on-site research experience component of RESET:

- Place RESET participants at Army sites as GEMS teachers as a type of shorter duration lab experience
- Place more than one RESET participant at a single lab
- Add a component of RESET in which teachers can take their students to Army labs for on-site research experiences
- Ensure timely payment
- Institute a phased payment structure

7

7 | Priority #3 Findings

Develop and implement a cohesive, coordinated and sustainable STEM education outreach infrastructure across the Army.

Awareness of STEM Careers in the Army or DoD and Other AEOP Initiatives

In alignment with the AEOP goals to create a pipeline of programs that attracts a diverse group of students and to provide information about STEM careers in the Army or DoD, RESET interview participants were asked to comment on the knowledge they gained about STEM careers in the Army or DoD and other AEOPs during their RESET experiences.

All but one of the interview participants indicated that they had learned about STEM careers in the Army or DoD during their RESET experiences. Two teachers specifically noted that they had received information about Army/DoD STEM careers in the online portion of RESET. Level II participants reported that their main source of knowledge about Army/DoD STEM careers came from their onsite experiences at Army labs although two did acknowledge having some exposure during the online portion of the program. One Level II participant noted the impact of the on-site experience in terms of his awareness of Army/DoD STEM careers, noting that he had been approached by an employee at the lab about the possibility of applying for a job there:

> *"I was not very aware that the DoD employed civilians...I was very surprised. It opened up a new possibility of a career field."* (RESET Level II Participant)

Three of the interview participants reported that their students are, or have in the past been, involved in an AEOP (regional JSHS, eCYBERMISSION, GEMS). All but one interview participant cited receiving information about AEOPs through the online portion of the program, and one RESET teacher reported that he had introduced his students to JSHS as a direct result of his RESET participation.

8

8| Summary of Findings and Recommendations

The following is summary of findings from the FY19 RESET evaluation, with findings aligned to the 3 AEOP key priorities:

1. Broaden, deepen, and diversify the pool of STEM talent in support of our Defense Industry Base
2. Support and empower educators with unique Army research and technology resources
3. Develop and implement a cohesive, coordinated and sustainable STEM education outreach infrastructure across the Army.

AEOP Priority: Broaden, deepen, and diversify the pool of STEM talent in support of our Defense Industry Base

RESET participants were primarily female (73%). Less than half of participants (41%) were White, compared with 2018 when (50%) were White. The next most commonly reported race/ethnicity was Black or African American (23%, compared to 30% in 2018). Three participants (14%) were Hispanic Latino (10% in 2018), and 3 (14%) were Asian). These teachers represented 20 different K-12 schools, 15 of which were Title I status schools (compared to 7 in 2018). Half of the participants reported teaching at a suburban school (compared to 30% in 2018), and 41% at urban schools (35% in 2018). Two teachers (9%) reported teaching at rural schools.

Fewer applications were received in 2019 compared to 2018 (27 and 24 respectively). The number of enrolled participants increased from 20 in 2018 to 22 in 2019, however.

AEOP Priority: Support and empower educators with unique Army research and technology resources

Teachers interviewed all had positive feedback about their RESET experiences and were able to articulate ways that they would apply their learning, both from the online portion of the program and the on-site portion, in their classrooms. In contrast to 2018 findings, when nearly all teachers shared how they would apply their learning in specific, content-related ways, most participants cited their implementation as primarily procedural, implementing the Legacy Cycle and lotus blossom method to teach their students how to conduct research or as a framework for project-based learning activities. The one teacher who noted that she would use the lesson plan created with her online cohort added as a caveat that it would be implemented in her science classes at the end of the school year, after standardized and end-of-course testing were complete.

Teachers valued the communities of practice they formed during RESET. Of particular value was the opportunity to share ideas and challenges about their classroom practice and gain insight with others who work in different practice settings. Several RESET participants expressed a desire for expanded cohorts online. In addition to online communities of practice, teachers expressed interest in face-to-face contact with other teachers, pondering ways that cohorts could meet in person or synchronously online. One participant also proposed the idea of on-site cohorts of teachers for Level II participants. Two participants commented on the value of RESET participants mentoring other teachers, either in Level II on-site research experiences or by using the resources and knowledge they gained from RESET to deliver professional development to other teachers.

Level II interview participants all had positive things to say about their on-site experiences at Army labs and centers. Participants cited as benefits experiencing real-world research, working collaboratively with STEM research professionals, and the credibility they gain from being able to cite these experiences in their own classrooms. All were enthusiastic about sharing details of their on-site research experiences with their students, and one even proposed taking students to an Army lab to enable students to gain real-world research experience first-hand. The improvements suggested for the on-site component of the program were primarily administrative in nature, including suggestions to streamline funding, provide funding in phases, or require teachers to fund a portion of the experience themselves to indicate commitment. Level II participants also suggested novel ways to structure on-site experiences such as placing a cohort of teachers at a single lab and providing shorter duration lab experiences by placing RESET teachers as GEMS resource teachers.

Participants also cited several benefits of the online component of RESET. These included the value of collaboration and communities of practice, learning about the research process and research strategies, and instruction that was sensitive to participants' varied practice settings. Participants' suggestions for improvements included suggestions for the structure of the course such as lengthening the duration of the online component while shortening the weekly time commitment, providing additional online modules, providing additional ways for participants to connect with one another either online or in person, and increasing the numbers of teachers in each cohort. In addition, RESET teachers suggested providing hands-on activities, feedback on the final project, and more information about careers.

AEOP Priority: Develop and implement a cohesive, coordinated and sustainable STEM education outreach infrastructure across the Army

Most participants reported having some familiarity with STEM careers in the Army or DoD either through their onsite experiences or through information from the online component of the program. Level II participants were most impacted by their on-site experiences and cited the value of learning first-hand how researchers collaborate and some indicated that they had previously been unaware that the DoD employs civilians.

Most RESET teachers also reported being familiar with other AEOPs, primarily through their experiences in the online component of the program. One teacher reported learning about RESET through

eCYBERMISSION while another learned about JSHS through RESET, suggesting that RESET is becoming integrated into the infrastructure of the AEOP pipeline.

Recommendations for FY20 Program Improvement/Growth

Evaluation findings indicate that RESET was perceived favorably by participating teachers, and the addition of Level III facilitators to the program has resulted in improved communication in the online portion of the program by providing additional points of contact for participants. Notable successes for the year include the continued high participation rate for females, growth in participants' learning about STEM jobs/careers, and reports of classroom implementation of strategies participants learned during RESET. While these successes are commendable, there are some areas that remain with potential for growth and/or improvement. The evaluation team therefore offers the following recommendations for FY20 and beyond:

AEOP Priority: Broaden, deepen, and diversify the pool of STEM talent in support of our Defense Industry Base

As in FY18, RESET should explore options for aligning its and funding cycle more closely with educators'. This may result in an increased number of participants, since teachers in interviews noted that the application process seemed "last minute" for teachers and did not accord well with school cycles.

AEOP Priority: Support and empower educators with unique Army research and technology resources

Participants had several suggestions of how to utilize their experiences to reach other teachers. Ideas that were shared included having RESET teachers mentor other teachers in STEM, as well as providing professional development to others. It is recommended that RESET consider these options as methods to not only grow RESET but to also expand the reach of other AEOP programs.

AEOP Priority: Develop and implement a cohesive, coordinated, and sustainable STEM education outreach infrastructure across the Army

RESET participants suggested some programmatic changes to the delivery of the program. One suggestion was to expand the cohorts online and include more face-to-face in person and synchronous opportunities online. RESET participants who were engaged in experiences at Army labs and suggested the use of cohorts placed at the same location rather than the current 1:1 model – to expand the learning opportunities and collaboration. The evaluation team suggests RESET consider these suggestions in future programming.

9

9| Appendices

Appendix A | RESET Evaluation Plan

Participant Interviews

Purpose:

The evaluation for FY19 was formative in nature and was intended to refine the delivery of RESET program activities. As per the approved FY19 AEOP APP, the external evaluation of RESET included telephone interviews with participants.

Interviews provide the evaluation team with first-hand opportunities to speak with RESET participants. The information gleaned from these interviews assists us in illustrating and more deeply understanding and describing the program's operation in its first year.

Data Analyses

Qualitative data were compiled and analyzed after all data collection concluded. Emergent coding was used for the qualitative data to identify the most common themes in responses.

Appendix B | FY19 RESET Participant Interview Protocol

Facilitator: My name is [evaluator] and I'd like to thank you for meeting with us today! We are really excited to learn more about your experiences in RESET. I will be audio recording our interview today so that I do not have to take notes and can more closely focus on your shared experiences. The interview will take no more than 40 minutes. Do I have your permission to audio record our conversation??

Key Questions:

1. **Please describe briefly your background, including the numbers of years you have been teaching, and tell me a bit about your current teaching assignment.**
2. **For how many years have you participated in RESET (are you Level I, II, or III)?**
3. **How did you learn about RESET?**
4. **Please describe to me what the primary activities were in the RESET program that you participated in this past year? Were you a participating teacher in Levels I or II or a Level III facilitator?**
    a. Did you complete an on-site summer research experience?
        i. Where?
        ii. What kinds of activities?
        iii. Will you/Did you incorporate elements of your research experience into your classroom? How?
    b. What did you think about the online component of the program?
        i. Will you/Did you incorporate elements of your online learning experience into your classroom? How?

5. **When you think about RESET, what kind of value does this program add**?
    - How do you think you benefitted from participating in RESET?
    - How do you think your students benefit from your participation?
    - What were the best parts about the program?
    - What aspects of the program could be improved?

One of the primary sponsors of the RESET program is the Army Educational Outreach Program (AEOP). The AEOP needs specific information to improve programs and defend funding for its outreach programs.

6. **We need to understand more about how RESET is helping participants know more about STEM career opportunities in the Department of Defense, especially civilian positions.**
    a. Did you experience any efforts by RESET to educate participants about the Army, DoD, or careers in the DoD? Please explain.

The AEOP sponsors a wide range of national STEM outreach programs that your students may qualify for.

7. **The AEOP needs to know if RESET is teaching participating teachers about the other STEM outreach programs that it sponsors.**
    a. First, are you aware of the other programs offered by the AEOP? (e.g., e-CYBERMISSION, JSS, JSHS, REAP, SEAP, etc.)
    b. Do your students participate in any of the programs?
    c. Have you seen any efforts at RESET to educate participants about the other AEOP programs?

8. **Last Chance - Have we missed anything? Tell us anything you want us to know that we didn't ask about.**