

## EVALUATION REPORT DELIBERATING IN A DEMOCRACY (DID)

Patricia G. Avery, Professor  
Carol Freeman, Research Associate  
Kyle Greenwalt, Research Assistant<sup>1</sup>  
University of Minnesota  
Minneapolis, MN 55455

Submitted July 21, 2006

### *Overview of the Project*

*Deliberating in a Democracy (DID)* is a project directed by the Constitutional Rights Foundation Chicago (CRFC), in partnership with the Constitutional Rights Foundation in Los Angeles (CRF) and Street Law, Inc. The two overarching goals of the Project are to provide: (1) a model for secondary teachers to learn and appreciate among themselves the power of deliberation in their classrooms; and (2) a platform for engaging secondary students in discussions of substantive content on the institutions, governmental systems, and basic principles of a democratic constitutional state. Major activities associated with the Project include: (1) teacher staff development workshops, (2) classroom deliberations, (3) an on-line Discussion Board for students and teachers, (4) a teleconference between students in partner sites, and (5) a teacher exchange.

In the first year of the project (2004-05), the Project was conducted with secondary teachers and their students in six sites: the European countries of Azerbaijan, the Czech Republic, and Lithuania; and the metropolitan areas surrounding Chicago, Los Angeles, and Washington, DC. During the 2005-06 school year, these sites continued to participate in the Project. Five additional sites began participating in the Project during the 2005-06 year: Estonia; Kaluga, Russia; Moscow, Russia; and two sites within the United States, Denver and Columbia, South Carolina. This report focuses on Year Two of the Project, 2005-2006.

### *Overview of the Evaluation*

The evaluation design consists of two overlapping components. The first component, designed to generate data for use by key stakeholders for improving the Project, is based on an adapted version of Thomas Guskey's<sup>2</sup> five-level model for evaluating professional development: (1) participants' reactions, (2) participants' learning, (3) organizational support and change, (4) participants' use of new knowledge and skills, and (5) student learning outcomes. The second component of the evaluation design assesses implementation fidelity, documents the degree to which the *DID Project* achieved its

---

<sup>1</sup> We would like to thank Annette Simmons and Muffet Trout for their assistance with data entry and analysis. We also very much appreciate the participation of the DID teachers, students, and staff in the evaluation component of the DID Project.

<sup>2</sup> Guskey, T.R. (2000). *Evaluating professional development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

stated outcomes, describes any mid-course corrections the Project may have made, and relates stakeholders' perceptions of the quality of the project design. As such, the key evaluation questions are:

1. *Participants' Reactions to Training:* How satisfied are the teachers with the professional development experiences?
2. *Participants' Learning:* Did teachers deepen their content and pedagogical knowledge as a result of professional development activities?
3. *Organizational Support and Change:* What support was provided for Project teachers?
4. *Participants' Use of New Knowledge and Skills:* Are the goals and objectives of the professional development experience reflected in teachers' practices?
5. *Student Learning Outcomes:* Are the goals and objectives of the professional development experience reflected in student learning?
6. *Implementation Fidelity:* To what degree did the *Deliberating in a Democracy Project* achieve its stated outcomes?

In order to address these questions, the Evaluation Team for the *DID Project* collected multiple types of data (documents, interviews, observations, surveys) from multiple sources (students, teachers, school administrators, site coordinators, project directors). We participated in two planning meetings (Prague–July 2005, Washington, DC–September 2005), attended the introductory workshops at each of the new sites<sup>3</sup> (October 2005 - January 2006), and observed and participated in activities during two teacher exchanges.

Each new site was visited at the conclusion of the school year. At each of these sites, student focus groups were conducted; school administrators, teachers, and site coordinators were interviewed; and classrooms were observed (see Table 1). At all 11 sites, written surveys of student knowledge, attitudes, and perceptions were completed at the beginning of the school portion of the project (December 2005/January 2006), and again toward the conclusion of the school year (April/May/June 2006). Teachers at all sites were surveyed at the end of the school year.

---

<sup>3</sup> Throughout this report, the term “new sites” refers to those sites that joined the Project in 2005: Columbia, South Carolina; Denver, Colorado; Estonia; Kaluga, Russia; and Moscow, Russia.

Table 1. Frequency of Data Collection at New Sites

Sites	Student Focus Groups	Teacher Interviews	Administrator Interviews	Classroom Observations
Columbia, SC	3	3	3	3
Denver	3	3	1	3
Estonia	2	2	2	2
Russia: Kaluga	2	2	1	4
Russia: Moscow	2	5	1	2
Total	12	15	8	14

Formative evaluation data were submitted throughout the project in the form of five “mini-reports.” These reports described and included participant reactions to five events: the Washington, DC meeting, and the introductory workshops conducted in the new sites: Columbia, South Carolina; Denver, Colorado; Moscow, Russia (the Kaluga and Moscow sites held a combined introductory workshop in Moscow); and Tallinn, Estonia.

### *Project Description*

#### *Chronology of Events*

This section provides the reader with a broad overview of the sequence of major events associated with the *DID Project* in 2005-06.

*September 2005.* The first meeting for all participating sites of the 2005-2006 *Deliberating in a Democracy Project* took place in Washington, D. C., from September 27 to September 30, 2005. Twenty-nine persons attended some portion of the proceedings. There were 21 Americans attending (four from Street Law, three from CRF-LA, three from CRF-Chicago, three teachers/district personnel from Fairfax County Schools, two site coordinators from Denver, Colorado, two teachers/district personnel from Columbia, South Carolina, one representative of the US Department of Education, and two evaluators from the University of Minnesota) and eight Europeans (two from Russia; one each from Czech Republic, Lithuania, Azerbaijan, Estonia, and Tajikistan; and one translator from the Ukraine).

The goal of the meeting was to prepare all sites to participate in the *Deliberating in a Democracy (DID) Project* in 2005-2006.

As a result of this meeting, expected outcomes were that all sites would be able to:

1. Use the Structured Academic Controversy model for their training in deliberation;
2. Participate in the evaluation component of the project;
3. Use the Discussion Board;
4. Plan for a teleconference;

5. Plan for the teacher exchanges; and
6. Formulate a DID action plan and timeline through June 2006.

*September 2005 – June 2006.* Timelines for specific sites varied, but all sites conducted a minimum of three staff development workshops, with each workshop being followed by teacher implementation of a SAC in their classrooms. Thus, the general sequence looked as follows:

- Staff Development Session #1
  - Teacher Implementation of SAC #1 in Classroom
- Staff Development Session #2
  - Teacher Implementation of SAC #2 in Classroom
- Staff Development Session #3
  - Teacher Implementation of SAC #3 in Classroom

Across the sites, the first staff development workshop consisted of a discussion of the rationale and goals associated with the Project, teacher participation in a Structured Academic Controversy, and an overview of the Evaluation Plan. The Discussion Board, the internet component of the Project, was introduced at some sites during the first workshop, and at other sites during the second workshop. The second and third workshops generally focused on teachers' reflections on their classroom deliberations, their experiences with the Discussion Board, planning for the teleconference, and in some cases, additional experience in deliberation. At each site, three issues were identified for classroom deliberation (see Table 2).

Table 2. Issues Deliberated at Project Sites

Issues	European Sites						U.S. Sites				
	Azer.	Czech Rep.	Est.	Lith.	Rus.: Kal	Rus.: Mos	Chic., IL	Col., SC	DC Metro <sup>a</sup>	Den., CO	LA
Bush Doctrine <sup>b</sup>	X	X	X						X	X	
Compulsory Voting	X	X		X	X	X	X	X			X
Educating Non-citizens							X			X	
Euthanasia											½
Global Climate Change											
Juvenile Offenders		X					X	X		X	½
National Service	X		X			X			X		
Public Demonstrations							X				
Violent Videogames				X	X						
Youth Curfew			X	X	X	X		X			X

<sup>a</sup>The third issue was chosen by individual schools.

<sup>b</sup>The exact wording of the issues questions can be found in Appendix A.

Each site was partnered with another site (see Table 3). Teacher exchanges took place between the partner sites at some point between the Staff Development Session #1 and the end of the school year. The teacher exchanges generally lasted one week. During the exchanges, teachers had multiple opportunities to visit schools and classrooms, to talk with their counterparts about educational issues, and to visit historical and cultural landmarks. Table 4 shows the number of teachers from each site who took part in the teacher exchanges.

Table 3. European-U.S. DID Project Partner Sites

European Site	United States Site
Azerbaijan	Washington, DC metro
Czech Republic	Chicago, IL
Estonia	Denver, CO
Lithuania	Los Angeles, CA
Russia: Kaluga	Columbia, SC
Russia: Moscow	Los Angeles, CA

Table 4. Number of Teachers Participating in Teacher Exchange by Site

Site	Teachers (n)
Azerbaijan	4
Czech Republic	3
Estonia	5
Lithuania	3
Russia: Kaluga	3
Russia: Moscow	4
Chicago	2
Columbia, SC	5
DC Metro	5
Denver	7
Los Angeles	4
TOTAL	45

Students and teachers at partner sites communicated about social and political issues through the Discussion Board. Through the Discussion Board, students were able to

exchange ideas about topics they had deliberated in their classrooms, ask questions about one another's cultures, and participate in issues polls.

Finally, each partnership participated in a teleconference toward the end of the school year. Teleconferences lasted approximately one hour, during which students exchanged ideas on a range of topics. Table 5 shows the approximate number of students who participated in the teleconferences at each site.

---

Table 5. Approximate Number of Students Participating in Teleconference by Site

---

Site	Students (n)
Azerbaijan	15
Czech Republic	30
Estonia	32
Lithuania	50
Russia: Kaluga	50
Russia: Moscow	60
Chicago	50
Columbia, SC	270
DC Metro	16
Denver	28
Los Angeles	100
TOTAL	701

Thus, partner sites interacted through the teacher exchanges, the Discussion Board, and the teleconference.

*Teachers and Students.* One hundred and fourteen (114) secondary teachers from six countries in 11 sites participated in the *DID Project*. Table 6 provides relevant demographic data about the teachers.

Table 6. Teacher Demographics by Site

Site	Teachers N (%)		Mean Years of Teaching Experience (Range)	Sex	
	N	%		F	M
Azerbaijan	8	7	17.0 (14 – 20)	8	0
Czech Republic	18	16	15.8 (4 – 25)	12	6
Estonia	8	7	13.6 (1 – 27)	5	3
Lithuania	8	7	19.1 (2 – 30)	8	0
Russia: Kaluga	11	10	15.7 (8 – 21)	11	0
Russia: Moscow	9	8	24 (20 – 28)	5	4
Chicago	10	9	8.5 (3 – 26)	6	4
Columbia, SC	6	5	9.4 (2 – 20)	4	2
DC Metro	13	11	10.5 (3 – 30)	5	8
Denver	8	7	12.6 (2 – 42)	6	2
Los Angeles	15	13	16.2 (3 – 33)	6	9
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>13.8 (1 – 42)</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>38</b>

Each teacher chose one class (a “target class”) to participate in the evaluation component of the *DID Project*; the students in the target classes participated in a minimum of three deliberations. Table 7 provides information about the demographics of these students.

Table 7. Student Demographics by Site (N = 3451)<sup>a</sup>

Site	Number of Students	Mean Age of Students (Range)	Sex	
			F	M
Azerbaijan	159	17.0 (15 - 20)	75	76
Czech Republic	308	18.3 (16 – 21)	205	99
Estonia	148	18.3 (16 – 21)	96	52
Lithuania	269	18.0 (14 – 23)	181	84
Russia	439	16.5 (14 – 20)	232	206
Chicago	549	17.1 (13 – 23)	307	241
Columbia, SC	192	16.7 (15 – 19)	103	89
DC Metro	457	17.9 (13 – 23)	248	209
Denver	349	15.6 (13 – 21)	178	171
Los Angeles	581	17.1 (13 – 22)	313	268
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3451</b>	<b>17.2 (13 – 23)</b>	<b>1938</b>	<b>1495</b>

<sup>a</sup>The total number of students is less than the number of students who identified themselves on the questionnaire as male or female, because some students chose not to indicate their sex.

**Evaluation Question #1:  
How satisfied are the teachers with the professional development experiences?**

There were two sets of professional development experiences for participating teachers: the staff development workshops conducted at each of the 11 sites, and the teacher exchanges.

*Staff Development Workshops*

A minimum of three formal staff development workshops took place at each site. The total amount of time devoted to formal staff development ranged from 16 to 32 hours, with an average of 23.36 hours. Table 8 shows the number of hours spent in formal staff development workshops at each of the sites. In all cases, informal gatherings, e-mail exchanges and/or phone conversations between teachers and site coordinators supplemented the formal workshops.

---

Table 8. Number of Hours of Formal Staff Development by Site

---

Site	Hours of Formal Staff Development
Azerbaijan	20
Chicago	21
Columbia, SC	22
Czech Republic	32
DC Metro	16
Denver	31
Estonia	18
Lithuania	16
Los Angeles	16
Russia: Kaluga	30
Russia: Moscow	24
AVERAGE	23.36 hours

In general, the first workshop focused on instructing teachers in a method of deliberation in the classroom, the Structured Academic Controversy (SAC). The second workshop familiarized teachers with the Discussion Board, and at both the second and third workshops, teachers were provided with opportunities to reflect on the deliberations or SACs they had conducted in their classrooms, share their students' reactions to the method, and work to address any challenges they may have encountered.

Table 9 presents teachers' responses to survey items about the quality of the professional development experiences. Similar to 2004-05, teachers were overwhelming positive about their experiences in the teacher workshops.

Table 9. Teacher Responses to Survey Items Related to Quality of Professional Development Experiences (N = 84)

<b>Items: The DID Project was EFFECTIVE in.....</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>sd</b>	<b>sa</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>SA</b>
a. providing models of good teaching practices.	1.2%	0%	0%	2.4%	45.2%	51.2%
b. providing adequate time for practice.	1.2%	1.2%	4.8%	16.7%	40.5%	35.7%
c. providing time for reflection.	1.2%	0%	3.6%	15.5%	52.4%	27.4%
d. providing adequate classroom materials.	1.2%	1.2%	1.2%	7.1%	28.6%	60.7%
e. engaging participants in active involvement with learning.	1.2%	0%	0%	3.6%	27.4%	67.9%
f. helping participants see the connections between democratic principles and classroom deliberations.	1.2%	0%	0%	9.5%	40.5%	48.8%

Note: SD = Strongly Disagree, D = Disagree, sd = Slightly Disagree, sa = Slightly Agree, A = Agree, SA = Strongly Agree

Teachers were also asked the following open-ended question on the survey given at the conclusion of the 2005-2006 *DID Project*: How does the quality of the *DID Project* compare to previous staff/professional development you have experienced? Only three of 84 respondents offered slightly negative responses; the remaining comments were overwhelmingly positive. Teachers' comments tended to center on six areas: the practical application of the deliberations to classroom instruction; the interactive nature of the workshops, the collegial climate engendered in the workshops; the well-organized structure of the workshops; the high quality of the DID materials; and the value of ongoing support throughout the year. Typical were comments such as the following:

*It is definitely one of the best professional development activities in which I have ever participated. There are many reasons for this: CRFC has made sure we are well-prepared, has visited our classrooms, and provided a lot of time for reflection and sharing of ideas. The professional development days for teachers have been great. They really follow through with all that we do in our classrooms. Most workshops that I have attended are one shot deals with no follow-up. Those are not very effective for helping teachers improve their teaching. (Chicago)*

*This was actually something that I was able to use in my classroom. It was helpful. (Columbia, SC)*

*Everything was always well prepared, adequate materials available, I like getting everything on CDs. (Czech Republic)*

*Much better inasmuch it provided on-going consultation and discussion throughout the school year. (DC Metro)*

*The coordination in Colorado was well organized and provided strong support. The time in staff development was carefully planned and productive. This was a very valuable experience for me as a teacher and for my students. (Denver)*

*Earlier training seminars were exclusively theoretical. DID project seminars focused both on theory and practice. For example, teachers took the role of students while participating in deliberations – mistakes were discussed. Some of the training time was allocated to the Internet component to get the teachers acquainted with online discussions. (Lithuania)*

*The quality of the project was far superior to the majority of professional developments I have experienced. It allowed us hands on experience, modeling of the process, a professional expert in the classroom for evaluation. Unlike many of the programs put on by the LAUSD district, we were treated as adults and as professionals. (Los Angeles)*

*My previous experience of in-service teacher training was nearly always limited by a study of theoretical issues. Participation in the DID project allowed me not only to acquire new theoretical knowledge, but also to widely use it in my practical work. (Russia – Kaluga)*

Interviews with selected teachers also indicated that they found the staff development workshops to be a positive experience. The following excerpts from interviews were typical:

*The first one we had was the most useful one, helpful one, because we actually did the whole thing; so they got like a big picture of what and then they felt ready to go. With the second one it was nice to hear how it went –the project– when they met the second time; the teachers were discussing among each other how the students coped with it, and what they did. Everything was right, and everything was very well organized. (Estonia)*

*Involvement was very important when we ourselves were like students during the test deliberation...if we would just read the translation it cannot be understandable. The second thing, it was very useful methods, very useful. (Russia - Moscow)*

When asked, “What suggestions do you have for improving the DID Project staff development sessions?” on the written questionnaire, 26 (33%) of the 79 teachers responding to the survey either said something such as “It was great” or did not give a

response, suggesting that they did not have specific ideas for improving the professional development workshops. There was little consensus among the teachers who did offer suggestions. Six teachers from four different sites indicated that they would like to have had more experience with the Structured Academic Controversy model as part of their professional development experiences, either by participating in an additional deliberation or by viewing a videotape of a classroom deliberation. All six teachers were new to the Project in 2005. Conversely, six teachers who had participated in the Project since 2004 indicated that they would like to be trained in other models of deliberation.

Five teachers, each from a different site, would have liked more interaction with the teachers from their partner countries. For example, an Estonian teacher wrote:

*A more thorough contact between the two countries' teachers. The visits of Colorado/ Estonia once a year is probably the most you can do, but the teleconferences between the teachers would be probably more possible. The communication just via e-mails isn't really "it"! (Estonia)*

Another teacher felt that earlier interaction between partnership teachers would promote more communication on the Discussion Board:

*There should be at least one staff development session with our partner teachers so we can plan/coordinate lessons. This will facilitate a much more effective on-line portion of the project. (DC Metro)*

Two of the European teachers felt that the materials used in the workshops, specifically the issues readings, reflected an American perspective. This observation was echoed in several student focus groups and teacher interviews conducted in Europe.

#### *Teacher Exchanges*

Interviews with selected teachers across the sites indicated that they found the teacher exchanges to be a very meaningful experience, both personally and professionally. Several commented that they would have liked to have spent a longer period of time in the host country.

The following comments about the teacher exchanges were typical:

*The trip itself was amazing. The people were great. We all got along very well. Really I learned more about Cold War that I ever did in a textbook. It wasn't – the deliberation part was neat, but I learned so much about the Cold War and just the communist block and how eastern Europe views Russia and their relationship. Talking to the people. The older generation is so different from the younger generation. So when you come back and you teach this stuff, you have source that you wouldn't have had in a history book. (Denver)*

On the written questionnaire, teachers responded to the question, “What was most meaningful to you about the teacher exchange (either as a traveler to your partner country or as part of the reception of partnering teachers)?” In general, only those teachers who

actually participated in the exchange responded to the item. Teachers were most likely to mention the opportunity to discuss educational practices and social/political issues with colleagues in another country. They particularly appreciated visiting schools and talking with students. Following are typical responses.

*For me, the political, economic, and cultural aspects of Estonia were the most meaningful. As a traveler, these are always the areas on which I focus in any country. I put my pictures into a lecture/powerpoint and used anecdotes from our trip with all of my classes. That is first-hand knowledge one simply can't extract from a text book. Everything from carryovers from Soviet control (i.e. implications to Estonian culture, economics) to visiting parliament and discussing the Estonian MP's view about Estonian foreign policy with the US and EU - ALL of these things are relevant to the courses I teach and things I never knew before I traveled to Estonia. I could go on and on.... (Denver)*

*The most important for me was to get a good picture and an understanding of the American (or Colorado in my case) school system. Because we, in Estonia are currently (or at least should be) going through a great renewing process- it is always interesting to learn from others' experiences and compare the situations and exchange ideas. Those kinds of exchanges also can give you a chance to reevaluate your own school and the system here. A lot of both negative and positive things will start standing out...it was also very important for me to get a better understanding of the US democracy and its processes. One of the most essential things for me was the Americans' own opinions and commentaries. (Estonia)*

*Opportunity to discuss the problems of the two cultures, the issues of education and, in particular, of teaching civics courses. (Russia - Kaluga)*

Although the teacher exchanges were clearly quite positive significant experiences for the teachers, the students in the classes visited by the partner teachers also appreciated meeting persons from another country. One Chicago teacher wrote:

*The classroom visits allowed students to meet a "real Czech" This was a highlight for my students – sort of validated the whole process. (Chicago)*

In interview and survey responses, teachers offered suggestions for future exchanges. There was little consensus around the suggestions for improvement; six teachers suggested that a small number of students might be included on the exchange; five teachers wondered if the number of participants on the teacher exchange could be increased; four teachers wanted to increase the amount of time they spent with students; and another four teachers would have preferred spending more time in fewer schools. All other categories of responses were voiced by three or fewer teachers. Overall, teachers' suggestions were modest; they were overwhelmingly positive about their experiences in their partner countries, as exemplified by the following teacher's response:

*Perhaps have the visit longer by several days. The program was very well done. Katie Moore was fantastic in her organizational skills and concern for a meaningful and successful visit. Our counterparts in Lithuania were also very helpful and made our visit exceptional. (Los Angeles)*

**Evaluation Question #2:**

**Did teacher members deepen their content and pedagogical knowledge as a result of professional development activities?**

As shown in Table 10, teachers (96%) indicated they had developed sufficient skill through the *DID Project* to conduct meaningful deliberations in their classrooms. Further, 94% said that their involvement in the Project had deepened their understanding of democracy.

Table 10. Teacher Perceptions of their Skills and Understanding (N = 82)

<b>Items:</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>sd</b>	<b>sa</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>SA</b>
a. After my involvement in this project, I have enough skill to conduct effective deliberations in my classroom.	1.2%	1.2%	0%	7.3%	35.4%	54.9%
b. My participation in this project has deepened my understanding of democracy.	2.5%	3.7%	0%	14.8%	38.3%	40.7%

Note: SD = Strongly Disagree, D = Disagree, sd = Slightly Disagree, sa = Slightly Agree, A = Agree, SA = Strongly Agree

Interviews with teachers as well as teacher responses to open-ended survey items across the sites suggested that they deepened their pedagogical and content knowledge as a result of participating in the various activities associated with the *DID Project*. The following excerpts are typical of teachers' perceptions of their growth as a result of being involved in the *DID Project*:

*My students were introduced to a strategy that helped them to communicate more effectively with their peers. They also began to understand why "deliberating" is so important in a democracy. The professional development piece also allowed me to grow tremendously as a teacher. By meeting, discussing, and reflecting with other teachers, I have improved my own practice. (Chicago)*

*I enjoyed learning about the democratic structures that exist in the former Soviet bloc, and ways in which this transition has been frustrating or successful. (Denver)*

*I personally got a better knowledge about democracy myself. (Estonia)*

*The main thing was to learn new methods and the ability to share my knowledge with others. I also learned how other teachers work and discuss about democracy. (Lithuania)*

*Development of own knowledge about democracy [has been most important to me], use of a new deliberating technique in own work which is conducive to improving my teaching skills. Getting to know American teachers from South Carolina. Opportunity to visit the USA. (Russia – Kaluga)*

### **Evaluation Question #3: What support was provided for Project participants?**

Teachers were asked “What support for implementing ‘deliberation’ was most helpful to you?” in an open-ended survey item and during interviews. Teachers were most likely to mention the Site Coordinators, curriculum materials, collaboration with colleagues, observation of other teachers’ classes, and their school administrators. Following are some representative comments:

*The modeling of the deliberation process during training sessions was helpful. However, seeing other teachers conduct a deliberation was the most helpful. (DC Metro)*

*Everything was great. Barbara and her team were very approachable if we had questions etc. They were also so organized and proficient. It was impressive. (Denver)*

*The students’ actual reaction and feel towards the deliberations. Right after the first deliberation, we felt like everyone enjoyed the sessions very much and therefore we have been also deliberating outside of the project- this time we've used of course a more simplified version. (Estonia)*

*I constantly felt support of the project organizers. We were provided with useful material. I could consult the project coordinator I. Zaleskiene any time I had difficulties. She gave me some advice how better to conduct the deliberation. We constantly kept in touch with other teachers and share[d] our experience. (Lithuania)*

*The well prepared handouts that included EVERYTHING I would need to conduct a successful deliberation. Also, the ability of CRF staff to provide class sets of handouts for the deliberation eased our preparation time. (Los Angeles)*

*A great support was provided by the project coordinator, by peer teachers who shared their experience of conducting "deliberations," pointing out the pros and cons of the classes with students. (Russia – Kaluga)*

Table 11 summarizes the responses from teachers on the open-ended survey item.

Table 11. Sources of Support Most Helpful to Teachers in Implementing Deliberations (N = 79)

Source of Support	N	% <sup>a</sup>
Site Coordinator	37	47%
Other Teachers	24	30
Project Materials	18	23
Workshops	8	10
Students (due to their enthusiasm for the method)	5	6
I observed a peer conducting a deliberation	4	5
Site Coordinator observed me conducting a deliberation	2	3
No Response	2	3

<sup>a</sup>Percentages do not add up to 100 because respondents were able to give more than one response.

It was apparent from interview and survey responses that the success of the Project rests not with one source of support, but with multiple sources of support.

#### **Evaluation Question #4:**

#### **Are the goals and objectives of the professional development experience reflected in teachers' practices?**

##### *In-class Deliberations*

Responses from teachers and students indicated that all but one of the *DID Project* teachers conducted a minimum of three deliberations in their classrooms. The Evaluation Team observed at least two deliberations at each of the new sites.

In all but one of the 14 classroom visits, our classroom observations of the deliberations indicated that students were exposed to multiple perspectives, and gave serious consideration to those perspectives.<sup>4</sup> There was some variation in the way in which the deliberations were being implemented, particularly in terms of the following steps within the method: clarifying questions, reversal of perspectives, and group consensus. Is the purpose of the clarifying questions to confirm understanding, challenge evidence, or both? Should students repeat the arguments of the opposite side when they reverse perspectives, or strive to add new arguments? Is the purpose of the group consensus to simply find areas of agreement, or possibly forge a new policy position? Despite variations in the way in which teachers appeared to view the purpose of these steps, in all but one of the classes we observed, students were discussing important public issues, and developing new understandings about those issues.

<sup>4</sup> One teacher had serious classroom management issues; the majority of the students were not "on task" during the class period. There was no indication that the off-task behavior was related to the deliberation.

On the written survey, teachers were asked: “What difficulties in implementing deliberation did you encounter?” Table 12 shows the categories of responses mentioned by more than one teacher.

Table 12. Difficulties Encountered by Teachers in Implementing Deliberations  
(N = 79)

<b>Difficulty in Implementing Deliberations<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Time constraints due to curricular requirements	23	29%
Students wanted to debate	11	14
Fitting the deliberation into one class period	7	9
Prompting/maintaining student interest	7	9
I had no difficulties	7	9
Lack of or weak connection to curriculum	4	5
Shy students	2	3
Getting students to ask clarifying questions	2	3
Students/Teacher needed more background information	2	3
Disruptions at school site	2	3

<sup>a</sup>Due to space limitations, only those responses offered by two or more teachers are presented.

Teachers’ time constraints due to other curricular requirements appear to be a universal phenomenon; this factor was mentioned by teachers at each of the sites. Teachers also mentioned that their students often wanted to argue instead of deliberate—an observation also reported by students in the student focus groups.

In many cases, teachers appeared to resolve the problems they encountered.

*The only difficulty was teaching the students how to deliberate rather than just argue. By the last deliberation, my students were able to deliberate by using evidence to support their position. (Chicago)*

*This has nothing to do with the DID materials, but sustaining a culture of respectful disagreement among my students - as great and sweet as they are - was an ongoing challenge. Again, nothing to do with these materials, and clearly they need the practice. They are great kids and clearly need as much practice in this regard as possible. I did observe improvement, which is the most important thing. Of course, this would not have been possible without these deliberations/materials. (Denver)*

*There was a lack of time very often, but if we would hand out the materials to the students beforehand for them to work through them at home, we had no problems. (Estonia)*

*Some students didn't know how to participate in deliberations as they never done that before. Some students were too shy and lacked self-confidence while some others were too pushy & intolerant. In the course of the project, after discussions about the rules for deliberation, main principles of it, some students changed their attitude and behavior & learned equal participation in deliberation. (Lithuania)*

*Teaching an AP class on a year-round schedule does complicate things but we were able to work it out. My students really enjoyed the problem and other teachers in my department decided to use the deliberation process in their classes after my enthusiastic response. My principal was delighted by their progress and stayed to observe. (Los Angeles)*

*Students had problems at the initial stage, because not all of them were able to take positions that were not their choice originally. Gradually students learnt to be more tolerant. (Russia - Kaluga)*

Perhaps most significant is the teachers' indication that they will continue using deliberation in their classroom whether they continue to be connected to the project or not. As shown in Table 13, seventy-six (76) or 94% of the teachers "strongly agreed" or "agreed" with the statement: "Because of my involvement in this project, I will continue using deliberation in my classroom in the coming years."

---

Table 13. Teachers' Belief that They will Continue to Use Deliberation (N = 81)

---

<b>Item:</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>sd</b>	<b>sa</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>SA</b>
Because of my involvement in this project, I will continue using deliberation in my classroom in the coming years.	1.2%	1.2%	0%	3.7%	33.3%	60.5%

Note: SD = Strongly Disagree, D = Disagree, sd = Slightly Disagree, sa = Slightly Agree, A = Agree, SA = Strongly Agree

*Discussion Board: Teachers Only Section*

The Teachers Only section of the Discussion Board provided a forum for all teachers and for each of the site partnerships. Table 14 lists the forums with the number of topics within each forum and the total replies to all topics within each forum. Most of the teachers did not use the Discussion Board for their communication. The Lithuania/Los Angeles Metro forum was used the most often. Los Angeles used the Discussion Board to ask the Lithuanian teachers what they would like to see when they came to Los Angeles on their teacher exchange.

Table 14. Teacher Only Forums

Forum	Topics	Replies
Teachers Only Forum	24	177
Azerbaijan/Washington DC Metro	4	20
Czech Republic/Chicago Metro	5	6
Estonia/Denver Metro	7	13
Kaluga/Columbia	6	24
Lithuania/Los Angeles Metro	6	84
Moscow/Los Angeles Metro	7	25

Within the Teachers Only Forum, the topics that generated a higher number of responses included: Teacher Exchanges (19 replies), Tips for the First Deliberation (15 replies), whether teachers used the DID Discussion Board during professional development sessions (29 replies), and Greetings (13 replies). Other topics appeared to provide valuable information to the person asking a question. For example, one teacher received seven replies to an inquiry about the evaluation of students' civic achievement. Another teacher asked how to proceed when students had not read the assigned DID materials prior to the deliberation; 11 responses provided ideas and other teachers' experiences.

A teacher from Azerbaijan raised the issue of whether students should be required to wear school uniforms, a current issue in her community, to help her prepare for the deliberation on the topic in her classroom. She wanted to know whether other schools required uniforms and what the arguments for and against would be. She received 15 replies.

#### **Evaluation Question #5:**

**Are the goals and objectives of the professional development experience reflected in student learning?**

There are three distinct but overlapping components of the *DID Project* intended to promote student learning: the classroom deliberations (the core of the *DID Project*), the Discussion Board, and the teleconference. Student learning from each of these experiences is described below, as well as student attitudes toward the experiences.

#### *In-class Deliberations - Students' perspectives*

In the focus groups, many students indicated that the deliberations were different from what they normally do in class.

*I don't mean this in a negative way, but [in other classes] it's a bit more cut and dry. It's more the research and the notes, and the test – and that's mostly class; I*

*mean, the [deliberation] is really welcome...almost a ...it's sort of a change, not really a break, but a really, and welcome change. (Columbia, South Carolina)*

*It's new that it is organized. I mean we always used this debates and discussions all the time, but this is organized and it's kind of - it makes you kind of do specifics; when all our other ones, they're just kind of out of the blue. (Denver)*

*Well, to be honest, we don't have many discussions in our classes, whatsoever, unfortunately; so this is kind of a change for us. I miss discussions and I would think most are, so that projects that we've taken part of are kind of liberating for us as well. Just for us to get change. (Estonia)*

*We like deliberation more than the usual lesson because it is more interesting. We can say our own opinions. The usual lesson, the pupils try to impress only their own opinion but when they discuss, they have opportunity to change their opinion. It is very educated. (Russia – Kaluga)*

*Personally I think that the process of the lessons here is much more interesting than the process I had at the school before. We had something like debates where we could interrupt each other and then I had only my opinion and I didn't listen to my friends. I wanted them to listen to me only and so here we listen to each other and we can even change our opinions. (Russia – Moscow)*

*I think we don't discuss such important questions such as we discuss now and I think that is why it is very beautiful. (Russia – Moscow)*

Students in the focus groups seemed to understand that one of the purposes of the deliberations was to help them develop the skill to see different sides of an issue.

*[The purpose of the deliberations] is to give us skills and knowing how to debate; knowing how to hold your arguments down and opening your mind to other people's ideas and opinions, and being willing to change your ideas if someone else has a good argument, so. It could help you learn how to reach compromises with people, so, if you have an argument going on with someone then it's easier to end it in a way that both of you like it. (Denver)*

*[The purpose of the deliberations] is to learn to see the whole picture. Because, mostly, the problem is that we only see one side and we just don't want to see the advantages of the other side, so that was very important; because we don't do these kind of discussions very often when we can express our emotions about some kind of problems which are very actual in the world. So, that's why it was quite interesting and useful. (Estonia)*

Some students, illustrated by the comment below from a student in South Carolina, made explicit ties between the deliberative process and democratic practices.

*I don't think the purpose of the program was necessarily to educate and get us solid on the topics. I think it was more like to teach us the process of deliberations, and being opened to other people's opinions, instead of arguing and yelling at each other. Because that's the fundamental of a democracy, it's the purpose of a democracy. It's the only way it can work. (Columbia, South Carolina)*

When focus groups students were asked what they had learned from their experiences with the deliberations, they frequently talked about learning how to express their own opinions, and how to listen to the opinions of others.

*My favorite part of it was like seeing, how the other person thinks about the whole issues and stuff. Because like, I know sometimes I think, one thing and if somebody thinks something different of it then I'm like: "no, you are wrong" But it's fun to see like why they think the other thing. (Denver)*

*I learned to give my opinion to others, and maybe to talk more, defend my opinion and so on. (Estonia)*

*I think the deliberation gives an opportunity to study the other's points of view. (Russia – Kaluga)*

*[The deliberations] helps to find compromise in real life, to hear the others' opinions and the others' impressions. (Russia - Kaluga)*

*I also learned to hear people and to express my opinion and I learned to be more tolerant to other people. (Russia - Moscow)*

*I have learned that it is very important to listen to other people and to be listened by them. (Russia - Moscow)*

One student from Denver noted that the exchange of ideas helped him to develop a deeper understanding of the issues.

*I mean the good thing about it is that even when we disagree we know why we disagree, instead of just knowing that we disagree. We know, well this person believes this and I believe this. So, we know the actual differences between all the belief systems rather than just knowing that the other person thinks something different. (Denver)*

Students also appreciated learning factual knowledge about the issues.

*...it just kind of opened our eyes about certain issues, like some things I didn't know much about. When we started the deliberations we get to read all these information which presents, you know, different sides. (Columbia, SC)*

*I kind of like the fact that you just gain new insight on everything. Like, you would think of things that you never would've thought of before because of what somebody else said. By doing deliberation in both sides you kind of learn how to look at life like that. Like you'll take both sides of life instead of looking at one view specifically. (Denver)*

*I think we understood the issues a lot more too, once you read your packets because they are kind of - they're both sides really well and, I think it helps us form more solid opinions about what we had or change our opinions. (Denver)*

*I enjoyed that we had the [Bush] Doctrine written out on paper, and that it explained the whole thing, because I didn't know all the facts out before. I didn't do anything about it but it was very good to have the facts written in front of you. (Estonia)*

*I have learned some interesting facts about different problems in other countries and to my mind that deliberating is really important for us. (Russia - Moscow)*

When asked in the focus groups what they liked most about the deliberations, most students again mentioned that they liked being able to express their ideas, and to listen to others. However, students also mentioned that they appreciated talking about “real” issues with students their own age.

*For me I liked this process of deliberating as it is interesting for me to discuss such progress with people of my age as I already have heard a lot of opinions of the people who are older than me and I know their opinion and I'd like to know the opinion of the people who are my age. (Russia - Moscow)*

*[I liked the deliberations] because in the deliberation we discussed actual problems and it was interesting. (Russia – Kaluga)*

One student in Denver valued being able to discuss an issue with peers without direct teacher involvement.

*I really liked that as much as I love Ms. [Teacher's Name], it's... I liked the idea of being able to be ...on your own and not have a teacher involved with it. That it is you discussing it, not the teacher.*

Focus group students frequently mentioned that there is a higher level of student participation in deliberations than in regular class discussions.

*Student 1: You know, rather – it's like if we're just sitting in class and somebody is lecturing and, you know, a couple of people may add stuff in but it's not going to be like every person gets a chance to [...].*

*Student 2: Yeah, also being in like small groups it's like it allows people who are [...] more shy and like being in front of big groups it gives them a chance to voice their opinion [unintelligible comment] in front of their class, they're just scared to or don't want to. (South Carolina)*

A student from Denver voiced a similar sentiment.

*I like the fact that it's organized in a sense that everyone has a chance to talk, 'cause in some debates people will be wanting to say something and one person talks for the entire time. They [...] talk over and over; and when you'd try to jump in somebody else jumps-in in front of you. So I think it's nice that it's kind of like organized so that everybody gets a say. I like how it's a bit organized, it's not just, not shouting at you, like who can shout louder wins basically. (Denver)*

Students were divided about the value of the worksheets. A focus group in Denver included a spirited discussion in which some students thought the questions on the worksheet were “repetitive” and treat you “like you’re a kid or something,” and others thought it helped them to track the ideas that were being put forth. The format of the worksheets was criticized for not giving students ample space to write.

Similarly some students thought the strict time limits imposed on the deliberation were frustrating, and others felt they helped to facilitate participation.

Students had some specific suggestions for teachers. One student wanted teachers to provide more instruction in presenting ideas with which you do not agree.

*A lot of the times if somebody didn't get the point that they wanted to defend or that wasn't very close to their personal beliefs they would sort of treat it like it wasn't very important and they would kind of slap it off and not argue it as well as they could. So, I think that maybe teachers go over how to argue another point that you don't believe - before you have to deliberate so that you know how to deliberate, so that you know how to do it and you have tools to do it with. Because I think sometimes that kind of wound up just being not very good discussions, just because everybody in the group agreed with each other or didn't agree with each other but nobody was on the point they wanted to have. (Denver)*

Another student wanted the teachers to revise the worksheet that accompanies some of the deliberations.

*It's kind of confusing like where you want us to take notes because like we have the columns, then you also have the important ideas and stuff that is kind of hard to vary from where it is and stuff; or you should put different things. So, like maybe you can change the organization in the sheet. (Denver)*

Finally, a student from Estonia wanted teachers to provide more time for the deliberation and the written report.

*We have to write something like a report on that issue and sometimes we don't have enough time for that, because the discussion itself is so interesting that it takes a long time. So we should just have more time for both. (Estonia)*

Five items on the student survey asked students about their experiences with the deliberations. Between 74 and 87% of the students responded that they had increased their knowledge and skills as a result of participating in the deliberations (see Table 15). Eighty-three percent reported enjoying the deliberations.

Table 15. Students' Self-Report on Experiences with Deliberations

Item	Mean	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Agree (3)	Strongly Agree (4)
1. I enjoyed participating in deliberations. (n = 1959)	3.08	4%	12.7%	54.4%	28.9%
2. I learned a lot by participating in the deliberations. (n = 1952)	3.06	3%	14.4%	56.3%	26.4%
3. As a result of participating in the deliberations, I developed a better understanding of the issues. (n = 1948)	3.13	2.5%	10.2%	59.2%	28.1%
4. My participation in the deliberations increased my ability to state my opinions. (n = 1958)	3.01	3.2%	18.3%	52.9%	25.6%
5. Because of my participation in the deliberations, I am more confident talking about controversial issues with my peers. (n = 1950)	2.90	4.5%	22.1%	52.6%	20.9%

Although the majority of students reported enhanced learning and skills as a result of their experiences with the deliberations, female students were statistically more likely to report positive effects (see Table 16).

Table 16. Students' Self-Report on Experiences with Deliberations by Sex

Item	Male Mean	Female Mean	P-value
1. I enjoyed participating in deliberations. (n = 1934)	3.00	3.14	.000***
2. I learned a lot by participating in the deliberations. (n = 1927)	2.95	3.14	.000***
3. As a result of participating in the deliberations, I developed a better understanding of the issues. (n = 1923)	3.03	3.20	.000***
4. My participation in the deliberations increased my ability to state my opinions. (n = 1933)	2.93	3.06	.000***
5. Because of my participation in the deliberations, I am more confident talking about controversial issues with my peers. (n = 1925)	2.84	2.94	.005**

\*\*p < .01. \*\*\*p < .001

When students were asked on an open-ended survey item what they most liked about the deliberations, their responses were similar to those voiced in the focus groups. Students liked to be able to express their opinions in class, and appreciated hearing different perspectives (see Table 17).

Table 17. U.S. Students' Report of What They MOST Liked about the Deliberations (N = 1103)<sup>a</sup>

<b>Student Response</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Stating my opinion: I get to speak in class, other people get to say what they think, we get to debate and argue.	425	39%
Hearing different perspectives: I get to see all sides of an issue, form my own opinion, learn new facts.	418	38
The format is respectful: people listen and everyone gets a chance to speak.	104	9
The topics and processes are authentic: they are interesting, relevant, and affect our lives.	102	9
Bad: it was all bad.	22	2
Easy: we didn't have to work hard, we had lots of free time, we could goof around.	13	1
Good: it was all good.	9	1
International aspect: teacher exchange, online exchanges, or the chance to learn about another country.	7	1
Other.	3	>1

<sup>a</sup>Due to language differences, at this time only open-ended responses from the students in the United States have been analyzed.

When asked what they disliked about the deliberations, almost 20% indicated that they found the process somewhat boring or repetitive (see Table 18). Among this group, students often commented that there was a particular topic they did not like.

Table 18. U.S. Students' Report of What They LEAST Liked about the Deliberations (N = 997)<sup>a</sup>

<b>Student Response</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Boring: process is long, repetitive; the topic is not interesting or relevant; people go off topic frequently	198	20
Hot: topic too emotional, people wouldn't listen, not everyone agrees with me	160	16
Good: it was all good	126	13
Shy: I don't like to talk in class, people don't like to speak up, it can be hard to make myself understood or understand others	111	11
Materials: texts, note-taking, opinion writing are hard, boring, take away from the free flow of conversation	110	11
Restrictive: process forces you to do things you don't like/believe in	110	11
Particulars: a particular person or opinion was disagreeable	85	9
Rushed: we did not have enough preparation time or discussion time, people aren't ready to give informed opinions	77	8
Bad: it was all bad	14	1
Other	6	>1

<sup>a</sup>Due to language differences, at this time only open-ended responses from the students in the United States have been analyzed.

When asked from which deliberation they had learned the most, students were most likely to report the Juvenile Offenders issue (see Table 19). However, students indicated that they most enjoyed deliberating about the Youth Curfew issue (see Table 20). These results are difficult to interpret, however, because sites deliberated different issues, and there were different numbers of students responding to the item by site.

Table 19. Top Five Issues from which U.S. Students Report they LEARNED the Most (N = 1175)<sup>a</sup>

<b>Student Response</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Juvenile Offenders, Youth Crime	248	21
Educating Non-Citizens	214	18
Youth Curfews	200	17
Gun Control	87	7
Mandatory Voting	84	7

<sup>a</sup>Due to language differences, at this time only open-ended responses from the students in the United States have been analyzed.

Table 20. Top Five Issues U.S. Students Report they ENJOYED the Most (N = 1166)

Student Response <sup>a</sup>	N	%
Youth Curfews	240	21
Juvenile Offenders, Youth Crime	230	20
Educating Non-Citizens	157	14
Violent Video Games	109	9
Mandatory Voting	79	7

<sup>a</sup>Due to language differences, at this time only open-ended responses from the students in the United States have been analyzed.

*In-class deliberations – teachers’ perspectives*

Teachers’ perspectives of their students’ experiences with the deliberations were also quite positive. In interviews at the new sites, teachers commented that the deliberations helped students to analyze data, engage in critical thinking, express their opinions, and develop tolerance for different perspectives.

*Encouraging students to use real data to make an analytic decision is very important because so many [students] go on an emotional level or what somebody has told them without anything to back it up. I think that is the most valuable part...[students] will stop and think there is more than one way to answer this question and give validity to an opinion even if they don’t agree with it. (Columbia, SC)*

*Some kids were doing more sophisticated reasoning by the end because they were pushed by the other students. (Denver)*

*[The students] learn how to deliberate and discuss and say their own opinion and listen to other’s opinions. It’s very important. (Estonia)*

*There were [other types of] lessons where some students didn’t take part in the discussion, and the students were not able to express their opinion, but with deliberation method it is possible to involve all the pupils and it helped them to express their opinions and showed that all of the class is a good class. (Russia – Kaluga)*

*It is very important to me that [through the deliberations] they are learning to listen to the arguments of others. (Russia – Moscow)*

*It seems for the first time they learned to select the arguments from the text to support their own position. They have not such a task in any of the other school subjects. (Russia – Moscow)*

On the written survey, teachers from the United States echoed similar observations (see Table 21). Over 90% of the teachers who responded to the survey “agreed” or “strongly agreed” that their students developed a deeper understanding of issues, engaged in critical thinking, used sound decision-making processes, and respected their peers’ perspectives.

Table 21. U.S. Teachers’ Report of Student Learning through Deliberation (N = 47)<sup>a</sup>

<b>Items: During the deliberations, almost all students...</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>sd</b>	<b>sa</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>SA</b>
a. developed a deeper understanding of the issues.	0%	0%	0%	6.7%	42.2%	51.1%
b. engaged in critical thinking.	0%	0%	0%	6.4%	51.1%	42.6%
c. made a decision based on sound reasoning.	0%	0%	0%	8.5%	59.6%	31.9%
d. were respectful of one another’s views.	0%	0%	0%	6.4%	55.3%	38.3%

Note: SD = Strongly Disagree, D = Disagree, sd = Slightly Disagree, sa = Slightly Agree, A = Agree, SA = Strongly Agree

<sup>a</sup>These items were added after the European surveys had already been translated.

#### *On-line Deliberations on the Discussion Board*

Students had the opportunity to get other perspectives on their deliberation topics from students in other classrooms either in their country or in another country through the use of the Internet and the DID Discussion Board. Working closely with all DID sites, CRF-Los Angeles oversaw the development and maintenance of the on-line DID Discussion Board. The DID staff envisioned that teachers could use the Discussion Board for planning with their partners as well as working with their students. Students could utilize the Discussion Board to deepen their knowledge about the deliberation topics and other issues important to young people around the world. All participants were encouraged to utilize the Discussion Board to learn more about one another and what it means to be a citizen in a democratic society.

The Discussion Board, located at <http://www.deliberating.org/>, had a section for all teachers and students involved in the *DID Project* and a section for the six site partnerships. Within each section, there were sub-sections with multiple forums and multiple topics within each forum. For example, there was a “Students Only” section (teachers have access) open to all DID students, within which there were three forums. One of the forums was entitled Culture and Society, and included the prompts, “People you admire? Why?” Within each of the six site partnerships, there was a forum for each of the paired classroom partners. The classroom partners created and responded to topics started by the Site Coordinator or by any teacher or registered student. Site Coordinators typically started a topic for each of the classroom deliberation questions, and teachers and students started topics related to other current issues or to school and student life.

When teachers and students registered, they were associated with a member group. A student from Chicago, for example, had access to the general “Students Only” forums

and to the “Chicago Metro/Czech Republic” forums. DID teachers had access to the “Teachers Only” forums and to their classroom partnership forum. All DID teachers and 3,689 students were registered members.

There were 3,689 teachers and students registered as members. Table 22 shows the number of members by the number of posts made under their name. The actual number of students involved in viewing and posting on the DID Discussion Board is unknown because pairs or groups of four students regularly posted together, and students “borrowed” other students’ passwords when theirs were not accessible. Thus, although 43% of the registered users did not post in their name, this does not necessary mean that they did not use the Discussion Board. The only conclusion we can state with some certainty is that 57% of the users posted one or more messages, and about 10% posted 11 or more times. For those members showing posts in their name (excluding the 43% who did not post at all), an average of 7.1 posts were made.

---

Table 22. DID Discussion Board Members by Number of Posts Made

---

<b>Number of Posts Made</b>	<b>Number of Members<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Percent of Members</b>
0	1,588	43%
1-10	1,787	48%
11-20	193	5%
21-50	97	3%
51-100	12	>1%
101-200	10	>1%
201+	2	>1%
	Total=3,689	

<sup>a</sup>“Members” includes students and teachers.

Table 23 shows the number of students from each site who indicated on the written survey that they had participated on the Discussion Board. Chicago and Lithuania had the highest percentage of DID students who reported participating on the Discussion Board; Denver and Estonia and Azerbaijan had the lowest percentage of students reporting participation.

Table 23. Students' Report of Participation on Discussion Board

Site	Number of Students Who Reported Participating in On-line Discussions	Percentage of Responding Students
Azerbaijan	29	38.7%
Chicago	241	62.6
Columbia, SC	54	56.3
Czech Republic	59	43.4
DC Metro	61	39.4
Denver	52	23.3
Estonia	18	21.7
Lithuania	109	62.6
Los Angeles	228	60.8
Russia (Kaluga & Moscow)	82	42.9
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>890</b>	<b>49 %</b>

Table 24 shows the number of posts on the DID Discussion Board for students and teachers at each site. Teachers often preferred communicating directly by email, but some found the Discussion Board useful as well. The number of posts by students (and teachers) varies widely by site for a variety of reasons, such as lack of access to the Internet or computers, low skill in writing English, or failure of partner class to be involved in the Discussion Board.

Table 24. DID Discussion Board Posts by Students and Teachers by Site

Site	Total Posts by Students	Total Posts by Teachers
Azerbaijan	375	107
Chicago Metro	1,861	39
Columbia	671	90
Czech Republic	551	17
DC Metro	1,512	42
Denver Metro	522	30
Estonia	85	150
Lithuania	2,206	37
Los Angeles Metro	2,427	142
Russia (Kaluga and Moscow)	3,071	151
<b>Total Posts</b>	<b>13,281</b>	<b>805</b>

In a number of schools, students did not have ready access to the Internet at school nor did they have it at home. Teachers reported some difficulties in motivating their students to participate in the Discussion Board, particularly if the students had not received responses to previous posts from their partner classroom.

*Most [students] don't have computers at home. Though we have an Internet Computer Center at school, most of the students don't have any working skills on computers at all. And there is a long waiting list in the center. Also, some students are shy about making mistakes in English. I'm trying to encourage all of them and hope they will enjoy participating on Discussion Board more often soon.*  
(Azerbaijan)

*My pupils very much like to communicate. But we must overcome three barriers - some people badly know English (I too), some people have no access to the Internet, and pupils need time to think of what to write, they do not know from what to start. . . . [In spite of that], my pupils [did write] 1-3 messages. We with impatience wait for answers of our partners. (Kaluga, Russia)*

Some sites might have been more active on the Discussion Board if students from their partner class had replied. For example, Russian students from Moscow and Kaluga reported during student focus groups their frustration that American students did not answer their questions. They wanted the American students to write more often. One student said, "We are waiting for answers."

Table 25 summarizes participation numbers by site partnerships and by classroom partnerships. One example is the Chicago/Czech Republic site partnership, which generated 72 topics across all their classroom partners and had 1550 replies to posted topics. Chicago/Czech Republic had 10 classroom partnerships; in seven of those partnerships, both classes were active to some extent on the Discussion Board. Within four classroom partnerships (eight classes total), there was interaction between the two classes; that is, there were students from both classes who responded directly to students from their partner class.

Table 25. Participation of Site and Classroom Partners on the On-Line Discussion Board

Site Partnerships	Topics all site partners	Replies, students and teachers all site partners	Classroom partnerships	Class partners both active	Interaction between the two classes <sup>a</sup>
Chicago/Czech Rep	72	1,550	10	7	4
Columbia/Kaluga	143	756	9	6	2
Denver/Estonia	61	554	8	4	2
Los Angeles/Lithuania	88	1,706	7	7	4
Los Angeles/Moscow	66	1,187	7	5	3
Wash DC/Azerbaijan	82	800	11	7	0
Totals	512	6,553	52 <sup>b</sup>	36 (69%)	15 (29%)

<sup>a</sup>Interaction means students clearly are responding to posts from the partner school.

<sup>b</sup>There were only 52 classroom partnerships; some partnerships included three or four teachers' classes.

Overall, nearly 70% of the classroom partnerships had students from both countries participating in their classroom partnership forum, providing the opportunity to read opinions of students from their own class and from students in their partner class. Students from nearly 30% of the classroom partnerships not only read and learned from students from another country but interacted by responding directly to the opinions of students from their partner class.

Following their classroom deliberation on the topic, Chicago and Czech Republic students exchanged opinions about how juvenile offenders should be treated. Following is an example of a thoughtful exchange of opinions:

*Deliberation Question: In our democracy, should juvenile offenders younger than 18 who are accused of serious crimes such as murder, rape, armed robbery, or kidnapping be prosecuted and then punished as adults?*

**Posted:** Jan. 18, 2006, 07:31: (Chicago student) I believe that prosecuting juvenile offenders younger than 18 shouldn't be punished as adults because juveniles are not yet biologically or socially developed or mature. So therefore they would not think before they act and they would do this just to have fun or peer pressure, but then later would realize that they were just immature. Also prosecuting children as adults contradicts the fact that young people can't buy tobacco products until 18, see rated R movies at 17, vote at age 18, and have local curfew laws, but yet they could prosecute a juvenile as adults. Instead of punishment they should rehabilitate these young juveniles. So they still have a chance to succeed in life and become someone

**Posted:** Jan. 22 2006, 02:21: (Czech student) Well, everybody has his own border when he can recognize between good and bad things - even if you speak about major offence. Maybe we can let the judges decide if 13 years old murderer is enough "adult" for some punishment. This can be a good solution. What do you think?

**Posted:** Feb. 22, 2006, 08:00: (Chicago student) I agree Juvenile offenders shouldn't be charged as adults at such an early age. What if sending a teenager to jail will only harden him into a cold criminal thus making his situation worst then it is.

**Posted:** Feb. 28 2006, 12:17: (Czech student) Well I must disagree with you because even the juveniles are able to think about what they are doing and they also can distinguish what is right and what is wrong (unless they are mentally retarded). That means they **are able** to figure out all consequences of their actions so I do not see any difference between thinking of an adult and a juvenile in such easy problems (It really is very easy to figure out that murdering someone is a crime). If you write that sending a juvenile to the jail may make him into a cold criminal, I must agree that this is possible but I must also add that it is necessary to keep society safe from such deviants.

Table 26 includes examples of six of the more popular topics in the section of the Discussion Board open to all DID students. It shows that students from all of the DID sites gave information or opinions on cultural and political topics.

Table 26. Participation in the Students Only Section of the DID Discussion Board

Forum	Topic	Replies	Sites represented	Views <sup>a</sup>
Culture & society	People you admire? Why?	512	All ten sites <sup>b</sup>	4,119
	What types of music do you enjoy? Why?	391	Eight	3,327
	National traditions?	288	Nine	1,908
	Raising children?	248	Eight	
Citizenship in a Democracy	Do you believe in the death penalty?	189	Nine	1,183
	Do you think religion should play a part in a country/ people's lives?	189	Nine	1,039

<sup>a</sup>The term "Views" is used to denote when an entry on the Discussion Board is viewed, but no response is posted.

<sup>b</sup>For this table, the two site partnerships in both Los Angeles and Russia are counted as one site.

Topics related to school and student life were also discussed in the classroom partnership forums. Most forums included at least one topic that encouraged students to write about aspects of their lives and to ask one another questions. During the following exchange, Los Angeles and Lithuanian students learned about each other's music:

**Posted:** Feb. 19 2006,18:25 (LA student) my favorite music is Rap, hip pop and reggeton what kind of music do you listen to?

**Posted:** Feb. 20 2006,06:34 (Lithuanian student) to: [gives name],why do you like rap? I don't like it, because I prefer romantic music...and slowly...

**Posted:** Feb. 23 2006,20:50 (same LA student) Well i also like romantic I don't like rock music but my best friend loves it so i got use to listening it. I also like Aviral lavine she sings ok but my favorite singer is tupac Shakus he sings rap music

**Posted:** Feb. 25 2006,08:38 (different Lithuanian student) I like listen to different types of music. It dependes on my mood.I can't imagine my life without music! My favourite group is "Putnu Balle". "Putnu Balle" is Latvian group. In English "Putnu balle" mean "Chicken run".

**Posted:** Feb. 28 2006,09:12 (different Lithuanian student) do you know yellowcard? or Taking bach sunday? these are great too

**Posted:** Mar. 02 2006,17:35: (LA student) I ALSO HEARD OF THE BAND YELLOWCARD.IS IT LIKE PUNK MUSIC. BUT I HAVEN'T HEARD OF THE OTHER ONE YOU WROTE DOWN

**Posted:** Mar. 04 2006,10:11 (Lithuanian answers) you should download it - u will see how great it is. =) trust me ;)

Table 27 shows polls that were conducted on the Discussion Board. DID staff members initiated 10 polls based on deliberation topics, and students started two polls. The polls that generated the highest number of responses related to whether voting should be compulsory in a democracy and whether the Bush Doctrine should be part of U.S. foreign policy. All categories of Discussion Board membership—students, teachers, and staff—participated in the polls. Members could vote and leave their comments to explain their vote. The following two posts represent some of the views on compulsory voting:

**Posted:** Nov. 11 2005,08:44: (Chicago student) I am an advocate of compulsory voting. There are some things in democracies that people need to take part in and voting is one of them. If compulsory voting was enforced, i feel that the voters would want to learn more about current events and politicians. If voters were truly displeased with all of the candidates, there should be a section on the ballot to punch for "neither".

**Posted:** Nov. 14 2005,07:50: (Czech student) The most important principle of democracy is that people are given the chance to choose. And not to participate in

elections is also a possibility they can choose. So if the voting was compulsory, the main principle of democracy would be destroyed.

Table 27. Polls Conducted on the Discussion Board

<b>Poll Question</b>	<b>Replies</b>	<b>Views<sup>a</sup></b>
Should voting be compulsory in our democracy?	208	2,626
Should the Bush Doctrine be part of U.S. foreign policy?	194	1,948
Should our democracy punish juvenile offenders younger than 18 the same way it punishes adults for serious crimes such as murder, rape, armed robbery, or kidnapping?	164	1,744
Should our democracy permit physicians to assist in a patient's suicide?	109	1,094
Should our democracy place criminal penalties on anyone who sells or rents violent video games rated AO (ESRB) or 18+ (PEGI) to persons under age 18?	101	1,044
Should our democracy impose curfews on people under age 18?	90	806
Is the violence in video games really to blame for the violence in real life? Or is violence already embedded in our minds? (student initiated)	61	362
Should our democracy sign a binding international treaty to regulate global greenhouse gas emissions?	48	486
Should our democracy require citizens between 18 and 25 years of age to participate in at least one year of national service?	42	384
Should our democracy extend government support for higher education to immigrants who have entered the country illegally?	18	128
Should our democracy have the power to require a permit for any public demonstration in order to avoid violence?	3	43
Are your parents fair? (student initiated)	2	15

<sup>a</sup>The term "Views" is used to denote when an entry on the Discussion Board is viewed, but no response is posted.

The students who participated in the Discussion Board seemed to learn a lot from the experience.

*Yeah, it is like 'wow!' you know? We really have stuff in common. But then there is other stuff they throw out there [...] and what we throw out there, and they are like 'wow! Is that different than us. Like all the clubs that we have and all the people we have here - there is like a hundred and twenty students in their school and it's all grades. There is like, he said there is like fifteen in his class. In his full like senior, he is a senior or something - junior or senior - that's all that's in his one class. (Denver)*

*There were some interesting facts about [the Discussion Board] and the most interesting fact is that you can communicate with the people from other countries*

*and to listen to them and to try to understand what they want to teach us and to process the most interesting facts of this process. (Russia – Moscow)*

Table 28 shows U.S. students’ report of what they learned from using the Discussion Board. Similar to the focus group responses, students were struck by the differences and similarities they found with their counterparts in other areas of the world.

Table 28. U.S. Students’ Report of What They LEARNED from Discussion Board (N = 536)<sup>a</sup>

<b>Student Response</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%<sup>b</sup></b>
Student learns that people are different, that everyone has his/her own opinion, that all opinions worth consideration	145	27
Student learns communication skills, how to get along with people, how to listen better	109	20
Student states they learned about others’ views or states a specific view they have learned	100	19
Student learns something about a foreign culture	74	14
Student learns that people are the same everywhere	51	10
It was all good	27	5
Student learns how his/her country is viewed abroad	18	3
It was all bad, I learned nothing	12	2

<sup>a</sup>Due to language differences, at this time only open-ended responses from the students in the United States have been analyzed.

<sup>b</sup>Percentages do not add up to 100 because students were able to give more than one response. In addition, some students chose not to respond to the item.

When asked what they most liked about the Discussion Board, students’ responses again indicated a new appreciation for similarities and differences around the world (see Table 29).

Table 29. U.S. Students' Report of What They MOST LIKED about Discussion Board (N = 581)<sup>a</sup>

Student Response	N	% <sup>b</sup>
International aspect: we meet people from all over the world, and see they similarities and differences among teenagers	204	35
Hearing different perspectives: I get to see all sides of an issue, form my own opinion, learn new facts	186	32
Stating my opinion: I get to speak, other people get to say what they think, we get to debate and argue	93	16
Easy to use Discussion Board	36	6
The topics are authentic: they are interesting, relevant, and affect our lives	33	6
It was all good	13	2
It was all bad	11	2
Anonymity: I can say my views easily, without people knowing who I am	5	1

<sup>a</sup>Due to language differences, at this time only open-ended responses from the students in the United States have been analyzed.

<sup>b</sup>Percentages do not add up to 100 because students were able to give more than one response. In addition, some students chose not to respond to the item.

There were also aspects about the Discussion Board that students did not like (see Table 30).

Table 30. U.S. Students' Report of What They LEAST LIKED about Discussion Board (N = 691)<sup>a</sup>

Student Response	N	% <sup>b</sup>
Boring, repetitive, lack of substantive conversation	182	26
The asynchronous nature of it: delayed response, not seeing the person or having a picture of them	166	24
Our partnering classroom didn't respond, not everyone participated	102	15
Complicated to use Discussion Board, technological difficulties	83	12
Student liked everything	77	11
Teacher didn't give student enough time, student was too busy to get online	39	6
Student disliked everything	25	4
Rude or inappropriate postings	17	3

<sup>a</sup>Due to language differences, at this time only open-ended responses from the students in the United States have been analyzed.

<sup>b</sup>Percentages do not add up to 100 because students were able to give more than one response. In addition, some students chose not to respond to the item.

In the focus groups, students noted that they would like to have communicated directly with students in their partner site.

*The Discussion Boards, I like the back and back forth, yeah, the back and forth talking. But I would agree with [student's name], you'd need to have some sort of way to talk to a specific student like, where you would and it'll be more easy to understand what's going on there. And like, our class, they are not really talking to us; and on the main forums, they just kind of; you'd just kind of post your opinion. You are not really replying to anybody else's opinion. So, it's kind of hard to get where they are at and stuff. (Denver)*

One student from Denver said that it was difficult for him to tell if he had received a response to a question.

*And it's kind of hard to see if, like someone has responded to you on the Discussion Board exactly; and like, 'cause we are not allowed to use the messaging stuff on the boards. And that might've been able to make that a little better because we could've had more in-depth conversations with the one person. (Denver)*

#### *Teachers' Perceptions of On-line Deliberations*

Sixty-three (63) or 77.8% of the 81 teachers who responded indicated that their students participated in on-line deliberations with students from other schools or countries. This is significantly higher than the previous year, when only 59% of the teachers who answered the item responded similarly. Table 31 shows how the teachers rated the effectiveness of the on-line deliberations.

Table 31. Teacher Perceptions of the Effectiveness of the On-Line Deliberations (N = 81)

<b>Item:</b>	<b>VI</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>si</b>	<b>se</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>VE</b>
How effective were the on-line deliberations?	10.4%	9%	16.4%	32.5%	28.4%	3%

Note: VI = Very Ineffective, I = Ineffective, si = Slightly Ineffective, se = Slightly Effective, E = Effective, VE = Very Effective

Teachers were also asked about what “worked particularly well” in terms of the Discussion Board (see Table 32).

Table 32. Teacher Response to “What about the on-line interactions worked particularly well?” (N = 79)

<b>Aspect of On-Line Interactions that Worked Well<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%<sup>b</sup></b>
Intercultural communication; learning about others	19	24%
Generated high level of student interest	11	14
Easy to use; simpler than last year	8	10
Improved students’ communication skills	4	5
Students really liked the Students Only section	4	5
Some students very active; others in my class not much	3	4
Opportunity for students to express views in open forum	3	4
No Response	25	32

<sup>a</sup>Due to space limitations, only those categories of response indicated by two or more teachers are included.

<sup>b</sup>Percentages do not add up to 100 because teachers were able to give more than one response. In addition, some teachers chose not to respond to the item.

A teacher from Moscow said that “to go to the Discussion Board to discuss the problem issues again with partners from the United States is a very important feeling [for the students].”

The most significant problem associated with the Discussion Board appears to have been the lack of response from partner sites (see Table 33), an issue that was mentioned in some of the student focus groups as well.

Table 33. Teacher Report of Difficulties with On-line Component  
(N = 79)

<b>Difficulty with On-line Component<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%<sup>b</sup></b>
Lack of response/untimely response from partner country	21	27%
Lack of or limited computer access, school	12	15
Passwords didn't work; trouble logging on	8	10
Language barrier	6	8
Can't really engage in dialogue, deliberation; students can't reply directly to comments	5	6
Technical problems; Discussion Board down, slow	4	5
Laziness, indifference on part of teacher	2	3
Hard to motivate students	2	3
No Response	11	14

<sup>a</sup>Due to space limitations, only those categories of response indicated by two or more teachers are included.

<sup>b</sup>Percentages do not add up to 100 because teachers were able to give more than one response. In addition, some teachers chose not to respond to the item.

#### *Teleconference – Students' Perceptions*

In open-ended survey items, students from the United States expressed enthusiasm for the teleconferences. Unlike the Discussion Board, in which many students tended to focus on the differences between themselves and students at their partner site (see Table 28), students found they had much in common with their peers in other countries through the teleconference (see Tables 34 and 35).

Table 34. U.S. Students' Report of What They LEARNED from Teleconference (N = 176)<sup>a</sup>

<b>Student Response</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Student learns that people are the same everywhere.	34	19
Student states they learned about others' views or states a specific view they have learned.	33	19
Student learns something about a foreign culture.	31	18
Student learns how his/her country is viewed abroad.	21	12
Student learns that people are different, that everyone has his/her own opinion, that all opinions are relative.	21	12
Student learns communication skills, how to get along with people, how to listen better.	20	1
Student learns nothing.	16	9

<sup>a</sup>Due to language differences, at this time only open-ended responses from the students in the United States have been analyzed.

The students from the United States reported simply enjoying talking with youth from another country (see Table 35).

Table 35. U.S. Students' Report of What They MOST LIKED about Teleconference (N = 179)<sup>a</sup>

<b>Student Response</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Talking to, seeing people at foreign sites	152	85
Learn about another culture	11	6
Meet other Americans	8	5
Nothing	7	4
Get out of class	1	1

<sup>a</sup>Due to language differences, at this time only open-ended responses from the students in the United States have been analyzed.

When asked what they least liked about the teleconference, students from the United States were most likely to indicate that it was “boring, repetitive” and “didn’t allow us to really talk about stuff” (see Table 36).

Table 36. U.S. Students' Report of What They LEAST LIKED about Teleconference (N = 174)<sup>a</sup>

<b>Student Response</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Boring, repetitive, lack of substantive conversation	79	45
The organization of the teleconference: assigned parts, disorganized at times, bad questions	31	18
Technological difficulties.	23	13
Not long enough, not enough time to talk.	16	9
The whole class couldn't participate.	12	7
The time difference, not being face-to-face.	9	5
Liked it all.	3	2
Disliked it all.	1	>1

<sup>a</sup>Due to language differences, at this time only open-ended responses from the students in the United States have been analyzed.

#### *Teleconference – Teachers' Perceptions*

Seventy-five (75) or 91.5% of the 82 teachers who responded indicated that they had some of their students participate in the teleconference. Almost 95% of the teachers rated it “effective” at some level. Table 37 shows how the teachers whose students participated in the teleconference rated its effectiveness.

Table 37. Teacher Perceptions of the Effectiveness of the Teleconference (N = 76)

Item:	VI	I	si	se	E	VE
How effective was the teleconference?	3.9%	1.3%	0%	19.7%	44.7%	30.3%

Note: VI = Very Ineffective, I = Ineffective, si = Slightly Ineffective, se = Slightly Effective, E = Effective, VE = Very Effective

When asked on an open-ended survey item, “What about the teleconference worked particularly well?” teachers were most likely to mention that the student-to-student communication provided students with an opportunity to express their own opinions and to learn the viewpoints of peers from another country (see Table 38).

Table 38. Teacher Response to “What about the teleconference worked particularly well?” (N = 79)

Aspect of Teleconference that Worked Well <sup>a</sup>	N	% <sup>b</sup>
Student-to-student communication; opportunity to express ideas and to learn about others’ perspectives	26	33%
Just seeing one another made the experience “real”	20	25
High interest for students; students very motivated	10	13
Debriefing after	4	5
Preparing for the conference	4	4
Tech worked	3	4
Unscripted Questions	3	4
Well organized	3	4
Immediacy of it	3	4
Everything was good	2	3
Selection of topics	2	3
No response	13	16

<sup>a</sup>Due to space limitations, only those categories of response indicated by two or more teachers are included.

<sup>b</sup>Percentages do not add up to 100 because teachers were able to give more than one response. In addition, some teachers chose not to respond to the item.

The following comments from teachers in Chicago and Estonia reflect the sentiments of many of the teachers.

*My students commented that it was 'really cool' to actually see and hear the students from the Czech Republic. They liked hearing how Czech people view themselves and how they view the U.S. (Chicago)*

*The students seemed to be keen on the fact that the American students as well were for example very skeptical about the Bush's doctrine. In the same time they saw that opinions can differ very much and that the US youth is not as different*

*from ours. The teleconference gave a realistic picture about the people they had been communication with on-line and just changed the whole experience more real for them. (Estonia)*

Teachers offered suggestions for future teleconferences in their responses to an open-ended survey item (see Table 39). The teachers seemed to sense that their students wanted to engage in more unscripted discussion. Twelve of the teachers suggested that more than one teleconference be held during the year, preferably one at the beginning and one at the end of the year. Some teachers noted that a teleconference at the beginning of the year might prompt more students to be engaged in the Discussion Board component of the *DID Project* during the year. In general, teachers seemed to feel that the teleconference involved too many students, with the result being that few of the students were actually able to talk. To remedy this problem, nine of the teachers suggested that the teleconferences take place between classrooms, as opposed to sites.

Table 39. Teacher Suggestions for Future Teleconferences (N = 79)

Suggestions for Teleconference <sup>a</sup>	N	% <sup>b</sup>
Less scripted questions; allow students to discuss	15	19%
Hold more than one; beginning and end of year	12	15
More time for teleconference	10	13
Hold teleconference between two classes	9	11
Allow more students to ask/answer questions during the teleconference	7	9
No suggestions; worked well!	4	5
Better audio; technical connection	4	5
Devote conference to specific topic	2	3
No response (15)	15	19

<sup>a</sup>Due to space limitations, only those categories of response indicated by two or more teachers are included.

<sup>b</sup>Percentages do not add up to 100 because respondents were able to give more than one response.

A comment from one of the teachers interviewed in Columbia, South Carolina expressed the sentiments of many of the teachers:

*...I thought it was pretty amazing that it even happened. But it's like everything, you have to practice. I would like to have more than one experience a year. It would be nice to have one to kick-start and introduce each other, maybe after one deliberation and just say hello and talk about what we are going to do this year and then have another one in the spring. If it's possible—I know it's difficult. But the students got a lot out of it. (Columbia, SC)*

### General Student Political Learning

Some pre and post survey items were designed to assess students' general political knowledge and interest during the course of the Project. As shown in Table 40,<sup>5</sup> students' self-report of their political knowledge and their understanding of political issues demonstrated statistically significant increases from the beginning to the end of the *DID Project*.

Table 40. Student Self-Report of Political Knowledge and Interest

Item	Mean	P-value	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Agree (3)	Strongly Agree (4)
1. I know more about politics than most people my age. (n = 1463)	2.30 <b>2.53</b>	.000***	10.3% <b>6.9</b>	53.8% <b>42.4</b>	31.6% <b>41.6</b>	4.3% <b>9.0</b>
2. When political issues or problems are being discussed, I usually have something to say. (n = 1466)	2.72 <b>2.86</b>	.000***	4.6 <b>3.9</b>	30.6 <b>22.1</b>	52.9 <b>58.2</b>	12.0 <b>15.7</b>
3. I am able to understand most political issues easily. (n = 1456)	2.67 <b>2.79</b>	.000***	4.4 <b>2.9</b>	31.3 <b>26.9</b>	56.8 <b>58.4</b>	7.5 <b>11.8</b>
4. I am interested in politics. (n = 1451)	2.49 <b>2.53</b>	.109	12.3 <b>12.3</b>	35.4 <b>33.2</b>	43.2 <b>43.9</b>	9.2 <b>10.7</b>

Note. Post-survey data are bold and italicized.

<sup>a</sup>The Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks Test was used to compare the difference between students' pre and post responses.

\*\*\*p < .001.

Students were asked to indicate the degree to which they discuss controversial issues with peers, parents, and teachers (see Table 41). Not surprisingly, there were statistically significant increases in the degree to which students reported that they discussed controversial issues with peers and teachers over the course of the *DID Project*.

<sup>5</sup> In order to assess change over time, Tables 40 and 41 use data only for which there are matched pairs. That is, in order to be included in the analysis, students needed to respond to items on both the pre and the post-survey. Student absence on either day the surveys were administered, or student omission of particular items, accounts for the difference between the total number of students involved in the Project and the number of student responses included in these tables.

Table 41. Student Report of Discussions of Controversial Public Issues

Item: <i>How often do you have discussions about controversial public issues?</i>	Mean	P-value	Never (1)	Rarely (2)	Sometimes (3)	Often (4)
1. With people your own age [peers] (n = 1461)	2.57 <b><i>2.71</i></b>	.000***	10.5% <b><i>7.2</i></b>	36.3% <b><i>30.2</i></b>	39.2% <b><i>47.0</i></b>	14.0% <b><i>15.6</i></b>
2. With parents or other adult family members (n = 1455)	2.78 <b><i>2.81</i></b>	.370	8.5 <b><i>6.7</i></b>	26.0 <b><i>27.3</i></b>	44.1 <b><i>44.5</i></b>	21.4 <b><i>21.5</i></b>
3. With teachers (n = 1457)	2.84 <b><i>2.91</i></b>	.001**	8.5 <b><i>5.9</i></b>	23.6 <b><i>24.0</i></b>	43.6 <b><i>43.1</i></b>	24.3 <b><i>27.0</i></b>

Note. Post-survey data are bold and italicized.

<sup>a</sup>The Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks Test was used to compare the difference between students' pre and post responses.

\*\*p<.01. \*\*\*p<.001.

### Evaluation Question #6:

**To what degree did the *Deliberating in a Democracy* Project achieve its stated outcomes?**

Appendix C displays the stated outcomes as identified in the *DID Project* proposal, the data sources the Evaluation Team used for assessing the outcomes, and the Evaluation Team's assessment of the degree to which the outcomes were met. Of the 20 outcomes, 17 were achieved, and three were partially achieved. Data from focus groups, interviews, observations, surveys, and documents indicated that the *DID Project* was indeed successful in Year 2, 2005-2006.

Two of the outcomes that were "partially achieved" relate to the Discussion Board, the on-line component of the Project (Outcomes #6 and #12). Over one-third (35.8%) of the teachers rated the on-line deliberations "ineffective." An analysis of the posts on the Discussion Board indicated that 43% of the teachers and students who were registered did not make any posts. Of the students who responded to the item on the written survey, 51% indicated that they had not participated in the Discussion Board. Still, participation in the Discussion Board increased in comparison to Year 1, owing in part to improved formatting. Further, whereas in Year 1 students and teachers at all sites reported difficulties with the technology, there were far fewer reports of technical problems in Year 2.

The third outcome that was "partially achieved" is Outcome #11: "Students will participate in lessons on democracy and three deliberations in their classrooms and with their community leaders." The Evaluation Team did not find evidence to indicate that "community leaders" participated in deliberations on any consistent basis. Project leaders may want to consider whether this outcome should be revised.

## Summary Statement

*The multiple components of the DID Project are viewed quite favorably by students, teachers, and administrators.* Structured academic controversy, the deliberative method used in the *DID Project*, provides teachers with a pedagogical tool for enhancing students' ability to analyze complex public issues, express their opinions, and consider multiple perspectives. The Discussion Board, significantly improved since the beginning of the Project in 2004, provides students with a platform for not only discussing controversial issues, but also appreciating similarities and differences across cultures. The teleconferences make the experience "real" for students. Finally, the teacher exchanges are the type of experiences that have a significant impact on teachers' worldviews, both from a pedagogical and cultural perspective.

No one expressed any serious reservations about the *DID Project*; however, suggestions were offered to improve what is considered to be a very worthwhile and valuable endeavor.

As the Project Directors and Site Coordinators plan for the next year, following are some areas they might address.

1. *Implementation of the Structured Academic Controversy (SAC) method.*

Classroom observations of the SAC indicate that students are being exposed to multiple perspectives, and giving consideration to those perspectives. However, there is variation in the way in which the SAC is being implemented, particularly in terms of the following steps within the method: clarifying questions, reversal of perspectives, and group consensus.

*We recommend clarification of the following steps in the SAC method, with particular attention to the rationale for each step: clarifying questions, reversal of perspectives, and group consensus.*

*We recommend that during the professional development workshops, teachers view an actual Structured Academic Controversy conducted with students, either through video or direct observation at a school site.*

*We recommend that during the professional development workshops, teachers participate in more than one deliberation. This will allow teachers to see and experience the critical components of deliberation, and not attribute a critical component of the deliberation process to the specific topic being deliberated.*

*We recommend that teachers be observed when they conduct their first or second deliberation, either by the Site Coordinator, or by another teacher. This observation would provide support and feedback for teachers in terms of their implementation of the SAC method. This appeared to take place at some sites during Year 2—most notably Chicago, Denver, Kaluga, Lithuania, Los Angeles, and Moscow—and was greatly*

*appreciated by the teachers. We recommend this practice be extended to other sites as well.*

2. *The Discussion Board.* The Discussion Board appears to be a very important component of the *DID Project* for some teachers and some students, and there were sufficient interchanges between students from partner classrooms to suggest the potential for rich exchanges. However, approximately half of the participants are not using the Discussion Board.

*We recommend that the DID Project Site Coordinators investigate why the Discussion Board is not being used more extensively. In cases where teachers and students have extremely limited access to the Internet, it may not be reasonable to expect participation in this aspect of the Project. For students partnered with such a site, it is discouraging not to receive responses to communication. If, however, teachers need more training in the technical aspects or the pedagogical strategies associated with the Discussion Board, then Site Coordinators should strive to provide the necessary training.*

*We recommend that teachers be given an opportunity during a professional development session to use the Discussion Board (this appears to have happened in some instances; in others, teachers viewed a demonstration). Perhaps some of the teachers' more interested students could attend this session and teachers and students could be trained together.*

*We recommend that students from the United States be reminded that the language they use in everyday conversation usually includes numerous slang expressions, and may be difficult for their counterparts to translate. Thus, U.S. students may need to translate their "street language" into standard English.*

3. *The Teleconference.* The teleconference is an important "bonding" experience for the partner sites. However, teachers and students felt that it could be improved in terms of frequency and format.

*We recommend that consideration be given to holding two teleconferences—one early in the Project and one toward the conclusion of the school year. A teleconference early in the project (perhaps immediately after the first deliberation) might give students the face-to-face contact they need as an incentive to use the Discussion Board on a regular basis. We recommend that the second teleconference in particular be less scripted and allow more time for students to discuss issues on a more extemporaneous basis.*

*We recommend that more teleconferences be held with fewer students in order to allow for greater student participation.*

*We recommend that consideration be given to holding a teleconference between teachers at partner sites early in the year. This may provide an incentive for teachers and their classes to be more involved in the Discussion Board.*

4. Professional Development. Many of the teachers involved in the DID Project have now been participated for two years. Consideration needs to be given to the role these teachers should assume in Year 3.

*We recommend that consideration be given to expanding the roles of teachers who have been involved in the Project since Year 1. Many of the teachers are now “experts” in deliberation, and could be mentors to new teachers, workshop leaders, etc. Expert teachers could also develop additional activities, such as in-depth research and writing components, to compliment the actual classroom deliberations.*

5. Readings. A few European teachers and students observed that the reading materials contained a large number of examples from the United States.

*We recommend that an effort be made to include more examples from outside the United States in the readings.*

## Appendix A

### Questions for Issues Deliberations

<b>Issue Abbreviated</b>	<b>Issues Question</b>
Bush Doctrine	Should the Bush Doctrine be part of U.S. foreign policy?
Compulsory Voting	Should voting be compulsory in our democracy?
Educating Non-citizens	Should our democracy extend government support for higher education to immigrants who have entered the country illegally?
Euthanasia	Should our democracy permit physicians to assist in a patient's suicide?
Global Climate Change	Should our democracy sign a binding international treaty to regulate global greenhouse gas emissions?
Juvenile Offenders	In our democracy, should juvenile offenders younger than 18 who are accused of serious crimes such as murder, rape, armed robbery, or kidnapping be prosecuted and then punished as adults?
National Service	Should our democracy require citizens between 18 and 25 years of age to participate in at least one year of national service?
Public Demonstrations	Should our democracy have the power to require a permit for any public demonstration in order to avoid violence?
Violent Videogames	Should our democracy place criminal penalties on anyone who sells or rents violent video games rated AO (ESRB) or 18+ (PEGI) to persons younger than 18?
Youth Curfew	Should our democracy impose curfews on people under age 18?

Appendix B

Calendar of Events for Sites: September 2005 – May 2006

	September	October	November	December	January
<b>Chicago/ Czech Republic</b>		October 19, 2005 Professional Development Session #1 (Czech Rep.)	Teacher Exchange (Chicago to Czech Rep.)	December 10, 2005 Professional Development Session #2 (Chicago)  December 12, 2005 Professional Development Session #2 (Czech Rep.)	Deliberation #2 (Chicago/Czech Rep.)
<b>Columbia/ Kaluga</b>					Jan. 4, 2006 Professional Development Session #2 (Columbia)  Deliberation #1 (Columbia)  Jan. 10, 2006 Professional Development Session #2 (Kaluga)  Deliberation #1 (Kaluga)
<b>Denver/ Estonia</b>			Professional Development Session #1 (Denver)	Professional Development Session #2 (Denver)  Deliberation #1 (Denver)	Professional Development Session #3 (Denver)
<b>Los Angeles/ Lithuania</b>				Dec. 16, 2005 Professional Development Session #2 (Lithuania)  Deliberation #2 (Lithuania)	January 12, 2006 Professional Development Session #2 (Los Angeles)  Deliberation #2 (Los Angeles)  January 28,

					2006 Professional Development Session #3 (Lithuania)
<b>Los Angeles/ Moscow</b>				Professional Development Session #2 (Moscow)	January 12, 2006 Professional Development Session #2 (Los Angeles)  Deliberation #2 (Los Angeles)  Deliberation #2 (Moscow)
<b>Washington, DC/ Azerbaijan</b>					Jan. 27, 2006 Professional Development Session (DC)

	February	March	April	May	June
<b>Chicago/ Czech Republic</b>		March 9, 2006 Professional Development Session #3 (Chicago)  March 22, 2005 Professional Development Session #3 (Czech Rep.)  Deliberation #3 (Chicago/Czech Rep.)	April 1-8, 2006 Teacher Exchange (Czech Rep. to Chicago)	May 3, 2006 Teleconference  May 20, 2006 Professional Development Session #4 (Chicago)	
<b>Columbia/ Kaluga</b>		Deliberation #2 (Columbia/ Kaluga)  March 30, 2006 Teleconference (Columbia/ Kaluga)	April 8-14, 2006 Teacher Exchange (Columbia to Kaluga)  Teacher Exchange (Kaluga to Columbia)		
<b>Denver/ Estonia</b>	Deliberation #2 (Denver)  Professional Development	Teacher Exchange (Denver to Estonia)	Deliberation #3 (Denver)  Professional Development	Teleconference (Denver/ Estonia)	

	Session #4 (Denver)		Session #5 (Denver)		
<b>Los Angeles/ Lithuania</b>	<p>Deliberation #3 (Lithuania)</p> <p>Deliberation #2 (Los Angeles)</p>	<p>Professional Development Session #3 (Los Angeles)</p> <p>March 25-April 1, 2006 Teacher Exchange (Lithuania to Los Angeles)</p>	<p>Deliberation #3 (Los Angeles)</p>	<p>May 9, 2006 Professional Development Session #4 (Lithuania)</p> <p>May 18, 2005 Teleconference (Los Angeles/ Lithuania/ Moscow)</p>	
<b>Los Angeles/ Moscow</b>	<p>Deliberation #2 (Los Angeles)</p> <p>Professional Development Session #3 (Moscow)</p>	<p>Professional Development Session #3 (Los Angeles)</p>	<p>Deliberation #3 (Los Angeles)</p> <p>Teacher Exchange (Moscow to Los Angeles)</p> <p>Teacher Exchange (Los Angeles to Moscow)</p>	<p>May 18, 2005 Teleconference (Los Angeles/ Lithuania/ Moscow)</p>	
<b>Washington, DC/ Azerbaijan</b>		<p>Teacher Exchange (Azerbaijan to DC)</p>	<p>Teacher Exchange (DC to Azerbaijan)</p>		

Appendix C.  
Achievement of Project Outcomes

Project Outcome	Data Source <sup>6</sup>								Achievement of Outcome			
	Interviews				Surveys		Obs	Doc				
	Ad.	SC	ST	T	ST	T			No	Minimal	Partial	Yes
1. To establish six staff development programs Republic, Lithuania, and the United States		X		X		X	X					X
2. To involve 60 secondary teachers in Azerbaijan, the Czech Republic, Lithuania, and the United States in the staff development programs.						X	X					X
3. Teachers will increase their understanding of democracy.				X		X						X
4. Teachers will strengthen their skills to facilitate classroom deliberations of civic issues.				X		X	X					X
5. Teachers will conduct and reflect on a minimum of three such civic deliberations with their students.		X		X		X						X

<sup>6</sup> Ad = School Administrator, SC = Site Coordinator, ST = Student, T = Teacher, Obs = Observation, Doc = Document Analysis

Appendix C. Achievement of Project Outcomes (Cont.)

Project Outcome	Data Source								Achievement of Outcome				
	Interviews				Surveys		Obs	Doc					
	Ad.	SC	ST	T	ST	T			No	Minimal	Partial	Yes	
6. Teachers will engage their students in on-line discussions with students in other classrooms and countries.			X	X	X	X			X			X	
7. Teachers will be favorably disposed to continue using civic deliberations in their classrooms.				X		X							X
8. Teachers will report greater satisfaction with new models of staff development.				X		X							X
9. Approximately 3,000 secondary students (assuming 50 students per teacher) to engage in authentic civic deliberations.						X	X						X
10. Students will learn democratic principles and how to deliberate.			X			X							X

Appendix C. Achievement of Project Outcomes (Cont.)

Project Outcome	Data Source								Achievement of Outcome			
	Interviews				Surveys		Obs	Doc				
	Ad.	SC	ST	T	ST	T			No	Minimal	Partial	Yes
11. Students will participate in lessons on democracy and three deliberations in their classrooms and with their community leaders.			X	X	X	X					X	
12. Students will participate in on-line civic deliberations with students in their country and/or another country.			X	X		X		X			X	
13. Students will increase their knowledge of civic issues and the democratic principles which relate to them.			X	X	X	X		X				X
14. Students will increase their skill in being able to deliberate.			X	X	X		X					X
15. Students will have a deeper understanding of democratic issues historically and currently.			X	X	X							X

Appendix C. Achievement of Project Outcomes (Cont.)

Project Outcome	Data Source								Achievement of Outcome			
	Interviews				Surveys		Obs	Doc				
	Ad.	SC	ST	T	ST	T			No	Minimal	Partial	Yes
16. Students will value hearing multiple perspectives.			X	X	X	X		X				X
17. Students will be more confident in engaging in discussions of controversial issues with their peers.			X	X	X							X
18. Both NGO's and Policy-Makers will report satisfaction with these new models of staff development.		X										X
19. Both NGO's and Policy-Makers will support the use of lessons on democracy, constitutional government and/or the history of democracy in developing countries.		X										X
20. Both NGO's and Policy-Makers will value and promote deliberation as an on-going strategy for improving civic education.		X										X