



**REPORT OF
THE 2012 NATIONAL SURVEY OF
SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS EDUCATION**

FEBRUARY 2013

**ERIC R. BANILOWER
P. SEAN SMITH
IRIS R. WEISS
KRISTEN A. MALZAHN
KIIRA M. CAMPBELL
AARON M. WEIS**

**HORIZON RESEARCH, INC.
CHAPEL HILL, NC**

Disclaimer

The *Report of the 2012 National Survey of Science and Mathematics Education* was prepared with support from the National Science Foundation under grant number DRL-1008228. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.

Suggested Citation

Banilower, E. R., Smith, P. S., Weiss, I. R., Malzahn, K. A., Campbell, K. M., & Weis, A. M. (2013). *Report of the 2012 national survey of science and mathematics education*. Chapel Hill, NC: Horizon Research, Inc.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
List of Tables	v
List of Figures.....	xv
Acknowledgements	xvii
Chapter One: Introduction	1
Background and Purpose of the Study.....	1
Sample Design and Sampling Error Considerations.....	2
Instrument Development.....	3
Data Collection	4
Outline of This Report	5
Chapter Two: Teacher Background and Beliefs.....	7
Overview.....	7
Teacher Characteristics.....	7
Teacher Preparation	10
Teacher Pedagogical Beliefs.....	20
Teachers' Perceptions of Preparedness.....	23
Summary.....	31
Chapter Three: Science and Mathematics Professional Development	33
Overview.....	33
Teacher Professional Development	33
Professional Development Offerings at the School Level.....	43
Summary.....	51
Chapter Four: Science and Mathematics Courses	53
Overview.....	53
Time Spent in Elementary Science and Mathematics Instruction	53
Science and Mathematics Course Offerings	54
Other Characteristics of Science and Mathematics Classes	62
Summary.....	66
Chapter Five: Instructional Decision Making, Objectives, and Activities	69
Overview.....	69
Teachers' Perceptions of Their Decision-Making Autonomy	69
Objectives of Science and Mathematics Instruction.....	71
Class Activities	74

Homework and Assessment Practices	85
Summary	88
Chapter Six: Instructional Resources	91
Overview	91
Textbook Usage	91
Facilities and Equipment.....	101
Summary	108
Chapter Seven: Factors Affecting Instruction	111
Overview	111
School Programs and Practices	111
Extent of Influence of State Standards.....	115
Factors That Promote and Inhibit Instruction	116
Summary	127
Appendix A: Sample Design	
Appendix B: Survey Questionnaires	
Appendix C: Pre-Data Collection Communication	
Appendix D: Description of Data Collection	
Appendix E: Description of Reporting Variables	
Appendix F: Additional Equity Cross-tabulations	

LIST OF TABLES

Page

Chapter Two: Teacher Background and Beliefs

2.1	Characteristics of the Science Teaching Force, by Grade Range	8
2.2	Characteristics of the Mathematics Teaching Force, by Grade Range.....	9
2.3	Classes Taught by Teachers with Varying Experience Teaching Subject, by Subject and Proportion of Students Eligible for Free/Reduced-Price Lunch.....	10
2.4	Classes Taught by Non-Asian Minority Teachers, by Subject and Proportion of Non-Asian Minority Students in Class.....	10
2.5	Teacher Degrees, by Grade Range	11
2.6	Secondary Teachers with a Degree in Discipline, by Proportion of Students Eligible for Free/Reduced-Price Lunch.....	11
2.7	Science Teachers with College Coursework in Various Science Disciplines, By Grade Range	12
2.8	Secondary Science Teachers Completing Various Biology/Life Science Courses, by Grade Range.....	12
2.9	Secondary Science Teachers Completing Various Chemistry Courses, by Grade Range.....	13
2.10	Secondary Science Teachers Completing Various Physics Courses, by Grade Range	13
2.11	Secondary Science Teachers Completing Various Earth/Space Science Courses, by Grade Range	13
2.12	Secondary Science Teachers Completing Various Environmental Science Courses, by Grade Range.....	14
2.13	Secondary Science Teachers Completing Various Engineering Courses, by Grade Range	14
2.14	Teachers Completing at Least One Course in Their Field at Two-Year Institutions, by Grade Range.....	14
2.15	Average Percentage of Courses Teachers Completed in Their Field at Two-Year Institutions, by Grade Range.....	15
2.16	Elementary Science Teachers Meeting NSTA Course-Background Standards.....	15
2.17	Middle School Teachers of General/Integrated Science Meeting NSTA Course-Background Standards	15
2.18	Secondary Science Teachers with Varying Levels of Background in Subject	16
2.19	Secondary Science Classes Taught by Teachers with Substantial Background in Subject of Selected Class, by Equity Factors.....	17
2.20	Elementary Mathematics Teachers Completing Various College Courses	17
2.21	Elementary Mathematics Teachers' Coursework Related to NCTM Course-Background Standards.....	18
2.22	Secondary Mathematics Teachers Completing Various College Courses, by Grade Range.....	19
2.23	Middle School Mathematics Teachers' Coursework Related to NCTM Course-Background Standards	19
2.24	High School Mathematics Teachers' Coursework Related to NCTM Course-Background Standards.....	20
2.25	Teachers' Paths to Certification, by Subject and Grade Range	20

2.26	Science Teachers Agreeing with Various Statements about Teaching and Learning, by Grade Range.....	22
2.27	Mathematics Teachers Agreeing with Various Statements about Teaching and Learning, by Grade Range.....	23
2.28	Elementary Teachers' Perceptions of Their Preparedness to Teach Each Subject.....	24
2.29	Elementary Teachers' Perceptions of Their Preparedness to Teach Various Science Disciplines.....	24
2.30	Elementary Teachers' Perceptions of Their Preparedness to Teach Selected Mathematics Topics.....	25
2.31	Secondary Science Teachers Considering Themselves Very Well Prepared to Teach Each of a Number of Topics, by Grade Range	26
2.32	Secondary Mathematics Teachers Considering Themselves Very Well Prepared to Teach Each of a Number of Topics, by Grade Range.....	27
2.33	Science Teachers Considering Themselves Very Well Prepared for Each of a Number of Tasks, by Grade Range	28
2.34	Science Classes in Which Teachers Feel Very Well Prepared for Each of a Number of Tasks in the Most Recent Unit, by Grade Range	28
2.35	Class Mean Scores for Science Teacher Perceptions of Preparedness Composites, by Equity Factors	29
2.36	Mathematics Teachers Considering Themselves Very Well Prepared for Each of a Number of Tasks, by Grade Range	30
2.37	Mathematics Classes in Which Teachers Feel Very Well Prepared for Each of a Number of Tasks in the Most Recent Unit, by Grade Range	30
2.38	Class Mean Scores for Mathematics Teacher Perceptions of Preparedness Composites, by Equity Factors	31

Chapter Three: Science and Mathematics Professional Development

3.1	Science Teachers' Most Recent Participation in Science-Focused Professional Development, by Grade Range	33
3.2	Mathematics Teachers' Most Recent Participation in Mathematics-Focused Professional Development, by Grade Range	34
3.3	Time Spent on Professional Development in the Last Three Years, by Subject and Grade Range	34
3.4	Classes Taught by Teachers with More than 35 Hours of Professional Development in the Last Three Years, by Subject and Equity Factors	35
3.5	Science Teachers Participating in Various Professional Development Activities in the Last Three Years, by Grade Range	35
3.6	Mathematics Teachers Participating in Various Professional Development Activities in the Last Three Years, by Grade Range	36
3.7	Science Teachers Whose Professional Development in the Last Three Years Had Each of a Number of Characteristics to a Substantial Extent, by Grade Range	37
3.8	Mathematics Teachers Whose Professional Development in the Last Three Years Had Each of a Number of Characteristics to a Substantial Extent, by Grade Range	37
3.9	Teacher Mean Scores for the Quality of Professional Development Composite, by Subject and Grade Range	37
3.10	Class Mean Scores for the Quality of Professional Development Composite, by Subject and Equity Factors	38
3.11	Science Teachers' Most Recent College Coursework in Field, by Grade Range.....	39
3.12	Mathematics Teachers' Most Recent College Coursework in Field, by Grade Range.....	39
3.13	Science Teachers Reporting That Their Professional Development/Coursework in the Last Three Years Gave Heavy Emphasis to Various Areas, by Grade Range	40

3.14	Mathematics Teachers Reporting That Their Professional Development/Coursework in the Last Three Years Gave Heavy Emphasis to Various Areas, by Grade Range	41
3.15	Teacher Mean Score on the Extent to which Professional Development/Coursework Focused on Student-Centered Instruction Composite, by Subject and Grade Range	41
3.16	Class Mean Scores on the Extent to which Professional Development/Coursework Focused on Student-Centered Instruction Composite, by Subject and Equity Factors.....	42
3.17	Science Teachers Serving in Various Leadership Roles in the Last Three Years, by Grade Range	42
3.18	Mathematics Teachers Serving in Various Leadership Roles in the Last Three Years, by Grade Range.....	42
3.19	Professional Development Workshops Offered Locally in the Last Three Years, by Subject and Grade Range	43
3.20	Locally Offered Professional Development Workshops in the Last Three Years with a Substantial Focus in Each of a Number of Areas, by Subject.....	44
3.21	Teacher Study Groups Offered at Schools in the Last Three Years, by Subject and Grade Range	44
3.22	Characteristics of Teacher Study Groups, by Subject	45
3.23	Origin of Designated Leaders of Teacher Study Groups, by Subject.....	45
3.24	Frequency and Duration of Teacher Study Groups, by Subject	45
3.25	Composition of Teacher Study Groups, by Subject	46
3.26	Description of Activities in Typical Teacher Study Groups, by Subject.....	46
3.27	How Schools Provide Time for Science/Mathematics Professional Development	47
3.28	Schools Providing One-on-One Science/Mathematics Coaching.....	47
3.29	Teaching Professionals Providing Science- and Mathematics-Focused One-on-One Coaching	47
3.30	Professionals Providing Science- and Mathematics-Focused One-on-One Coaching to a Substantial Extent	48
3.31	Services Provided to Science Teachers in Need of Special Assistance in Teaching, by Grade Range.....	48
3.32	Services Provided to Mathematics Teachers in Need of Special Assistance in Teaching, by Grade Range.....	49
3.33	Schools Providing Various Services to Science Teachers, by Equity Factors.....	49
3.34	Schools Providing Various Services to Mathematics Teachers, by Equity Factors	50

Chapter Four: Science and Mathematics Courses

4.1	Frequency with Which Self-Contained Elementary Classes Receive Science and Mathematics, by Subject	53
4.2	Average Number of Minutes per Day Spent Teaching Each Subject in Self-Contained Classes, by Grades	54
4.3	Type of Middle School Science Courses Offered, by Grade.....	54
4.4	High Schools Offering Various Science Courses	55
4.5	Access to AP Science Courses	56
4.6	Number of AP Science Courses Offered at High Schools	56
4.7	Average Number of AP Science Courses Offered at High Schools, by Equity Factors.....	57
4.8	Science Programs and Practices Currently Being Implemented in High Schools.....	57
4.9	Middle Schools with Various Percentages of 8 th Graders Completing Algebra 1 and Geometry Prior to 9 th Grade.....	58

4.10	Average Percentage of 8 th Graders Completing Algebra I and Geometry Prior to 9 th Grade, by Equity Factors	58
4.11	High Schools Offering Various Mathematics Courses.....	59
4.12	Access to AP Mathematics Courses	59
4.13	Number of AP Mathematics Courses Offered at High Schools	59
4.14	Average Number of AP Mathematics Courses Offered at High Schools, by Equity Factors.....	60
4.15	Mathematics Programs and Practices Currently Being Implemented in High Schools.....	61
4.16	Most Commonly Offered High School Science Courses	61
4.17	Most Commonly Offered High School Mathematics Courses	62
4.18	Average Class Size, by Subject and Course Type.....	62
4.19	Prior-Achievement Grouping in Classes, by Subject and Grade Range.....	64
4.20	Prior-Achievement Grouping in High School Courses, by Subject	64
4.21	Prior-Achievement Grouping in Grade K–12 Science Classes with Low, Medium, and High Percentages of Non-Asian Minority Students	65
4.22	Prior-Achievement Grouping in Grade K–12 Mathematics Classes with Low, Medium, and High Percentages of Non-Asian Minority Students	65
4.23	Average Percentages of Female and Non-Asian Minority Students in Courses, by Grade Range and Course Type	66

Chapter Five: Instructional Decision Making, Objectives, and Activities

5.1	Science Classes in Which Teachers Report Having Strong Control Over Various Curriculum and Instruction Decisions, by Grade Range.....	69
5.2	Mathematics Classes in Which Teachers Report Having Strong Control Over Various Curriculum and Instruction Decisions, by Grade Range.....	70
5.3	Class Mean Scores for Curriculum Control and Pedagogical Control Composites, by Subject and Grade Range	70
5.4	Class Mean Scores for Curriculum Control and Pedagogical Control Composites, by Subject and Region	71
5.5	Science Classes with Heavy Emphasis on Various Instructional Objectives, by Grade Range	71
5.6	Science Class Mean Scores on the Reform-Oriented Instructional Objectives Composite, by Grade Range.....	72
5.7	Science Class Mean Scores on the Reform-Oriented Instructional Objectives Composite, by Equity Factors	72
5.8	Mathematics Classes with Heavy Emphasis on Various Instructional Objectives, by Grade Range.....	73
5.9	Mathematics Class Mean Scores on the Reform-Oriented Instructional Objectives Composite, by Grade Range	73
5.10	Mathematics Class Mean Scores on the Reform-Oriented Instructional Objectives Composite, by Equity Factors.....	74
5.11	Science Classes in Which Teachers Report Using Various Activities in All or Almost All Lessons, by Grade Range.....	75
5.12	Science Classes in Which Teachers Report Using Various Activities at Least Once a Week, by Grade Range	76
5.13	Science Classes in Which Teachers Report Never Using Various Activities, by Grade Range	77
5.14	Science Classes in Which Teachers Report that Students Use Various Instructional Technologies at Least Once a Week, by Grade Range	77
5.15	Class Mean Scores on Science Teaching Practice Composites, by Grade Range	78

5.16	Class Mean Scores on Science Teaching Practice Composites, by Equity Factors.....	78
5.17	Science Classes Participating in Various Activities in the Most Recent Lesson, by Grade Range	79
5.18	Average Percentage of Time Spent on Different Activities in the Most Recent Science Lesson, by Grade Range	79
5.19	Mathematics Classes in Which Teachers Report Using Various Activities in All or Almost All Lessons, by Grade Range	80
5.20	Mathematics Classes in Which Teachers Report Using Various Activities at Least Once a Week, by Grade Range	81
5.21	Mathematics Classes in Which Teachers Report Never Using Various Activities, by Grade Range.....	82
5.22	Mathematics Classes in Which Teachers Report that Students Use Various Instructional Technologies at Least Once a Week, by Grade Range	83
5.23	Class Mean Scores on Mathematics Teaching Practice Composites, by Grade Range	83
5.24	Class Mean Scores on Mathematics Teaching Practice Composites, by Equity Factors.....	84
5.25	Mathematics Classes Participating in Various Activities in the Most Recent Lesson, by Grade Range.....	84
5.26	Average Percentage of Time Spent on Different Activities in the Most Recent Mathematics Lesson, by Grade Range.....	85
5.27	Amount of Homework Assigned in Classes per Week, by Subject and Grade Range	85
5.28	Science Classes in Which Teachers Report Assessing Students Using Various Methods in the Most Recent Unit, by Grade Range.....	86
5.29	Mathematics Classes in Which Teachers Report Assessing Students Using Various Methods in the Most Recent Unit, by Grade Range.....	87
5.30	Frequency of Required External Testing in Classes, by Subject and Grade Range	87
5.31	Classes Required to Take External Assessments Two or More Times per Year, by Subject and Equity Factors	88

Chapter Six: Instructional Resources

6.1	Classes Using Commercially Published Textbooks/Programs, by Subject	91
6.2	Instructional Materials Used in Mathematics Classes, by Grade Range	92
6.3	Instructional Materials Used in Science Classes, by Grade Range	92
6.4	Market Share of Commercial Textbook Publishers, by Subject and Grade Range	93
6.5	Most Commonly Used Science Textbooks, by Grade Range and Course.....	94
6.6	Most Commonly Used Mathematics Textbooks, by Grade Range and Course.....	95
6.7	Classes Using Instructional Materials Developed with NSF Funding, by Subject and Grade Range.....	95
6.8	Publication Year of Textbooks/Programs, by Subject and Grade Range	96
6.9	Perceived Quality of Textbooks/Programs Used in Classes, by Subject and Grade Range	97
6.10	Percentage of Textbooks/Programs Covered during the Course, by Subject and Grade Range	97
6.11	Percentage of Instructional Time Spent Using Instructional Materials during the Course, by Grade Range.....	98
6.12	Ways Teachers Substantially Used Their Textbook in the Most Recent Unit, by Grade Range	99
6.13	Reasons Why Parts of the Textbook Are Skipped, by Grade Range.....	100
6.14	Reasons Why the Textbook Is Supplemented, by Grade Range	101
6.15	Availability of Instructional Technologies in Science Classes, by Grade Range	102

6.16	Availability of Instructional Technologies in Science Classes, by Prior Achievement Level of Students	102
6.17	Availability of Instructional Technologies in Mathematics Classes, by Grade Range	103
6.18	Availability of Instructional Technologies in Mathematics Classes, by Percent of Non-Asian Minority Students in Class.....	103
6.19	Expectations that Students will Provide their Own Instructional Technologies, by Grade Range	104
6.20	Median Amount Schools Spend per Pupil on Science and Mathematics Equipment and Consumable Supplies, by Grade Range	104
6.21	Median Amount Schools Spend per Pupil on Science Equipment and Consumable Supplies, by Equity Factors.....	105
6.22	Median Amount Schools Spend per Pupil on Mathematics Equipment and Consumable Supplies, by Equity Factors.....	106
6.23	Science Classes with Adequate Resources for Instruction, by Grade Range	106
6.24	Mathematics Classes with Adequate Resources for Instruction, by Grade Range	107
6.25	Class Mean Scores on the Adequacy of Resources for Instruction Composite, by Grade Range	107
6.26	Class Mean Scores on the Adequacy of Resources for Instruction Composite, by Equity Factors.....	108

Chapter Seven: Factors Affecting Instruction

7.1	Use of Various Instructional Arrangements in Elementary Schools, by Subject	112
7.2	High School Graduation vs. State University Entrance Requirements, by Subject.....	112
7.3	Prevalence of Block Scheduling.....	113
7.4	School Programs/Practices to Enhance Students' Interest and/or Achievement in Science/Engineering, by Grade Range.....	113
7.5	School Programs/Practices to Enhance Students' Interest and/or Achievement in Mathematics, by Grade Range	114
7.6	School Programs/Practices to Enhance Students' Interest in Science/Engineering, by School Size.....	114
7.7	School Programs/Practices to Enhance Students' Interest in Mathematics, by School Size	115
7.8	Respondents Agreeing with Various Statements Regarding State Science Standards, by School Type	115
7.9	Respondents Agreeing with Various Statements Regarding State Mathematics Standards, by School Type	116
7.10	School Mean Scores on the Focus on State Standards Composite	116
7.11	Effect of Various Factors on Science Instruction	117
7.12	Effect of Various Factors on Mathematics Instruction.....	117
7.13	Science Program Representatives Viewing Each of a Number of Factors as a Serious Problem for Science Instruction in Their School, by Grade Range	118
7.14	Mathematics Program Representatives Viewing Each of a Number of Factors as a Serious Problem for Mathematics Instruction in Their School, by Grade Range	119
7.15	School Mean Scores on Factors Affecting Instruction Composites, by Grade Range.....	120
7.16	School Mean Scores for Factors Affecting Science Instruction Composites, by Equity Factors.....	120
7.17	School Mean Scores for Factors Affecting Mathematics Instruction Composites, by Equity Factors	121
7.18	Effect of Various Factors on Instruction in the Randomly Selected Science Class.....	122

7.19	Factors Seen as Promoting Effective Instruction in the Randomly Selected Mathematics Class, by Grade Range	123
7.20	Factors Seen as Inhibiting Effective Instruction in the Randomly Selected Mathematics Class, by Grade Range	123
7.21	Extent to Which Technology Quality Is a Serious Problem for Instruction in the Randomly Selected Science Class, by Grade Range	124
7.22	Extent to Which Technology Quality Is a Serious Problem for Instruction in the Randomly Selected Mathematics Class, by Grade Range.....	124
7.23	Class Mean Scores on Factors Affecting Instruction Composites, by Grade Range	125
7.24	Class Mean Scores on Factors Affecting Science Instruction Composites, by Equity Factors.....	126
7.25	Class Mean Scores on Factors Affecting Mathematics Instruction Composites, by Equity Factors.....	127

Appendix A: Sample Design

A-1	Definition of School Locale Code, Based on School Address	A-3
A-2	Distribution of Sample, by Stratum.....	A-4
A-3	Teachers Selected in Each School Stratum	A-6

Appendix D: Description of Data Collection

D-1	School Participation, By Stratum	D-3
D-2	Results of Program Questionnaires, by Stratum and Subject	D-4
D-3	Results of Teacher Questionnaires, by Stratum and Subject	D-5

Appendix E: Description of Reporting Variables

E-1	Quality of Professional Development	E-4
E-2	Extent to Which Professional Development/Coursework Focused on Student-Centered Instruction	E-5
E-3S	Perceptions of Content Preparedness: Science	E-6
E-3M	Perceptions of Content Preparedness: Mathematics	E-8
E-4	Perceptions of Preparedness to Teach Diverse Learners	E-9
E-5	Perceptions of Preparedness to Encourage Students	E-10
E-6	Perceptions of Preparedness to Implement Instruction in Particular Unit	E-11
E-7	Curriculum Control	E-12
E-8	Pedagogical Control	E-13
E-9	Reform-Oriented Instructional Objectives	E-14
E-10S	Use of Reform-Oriented Teaching Practices: Science	E-15
E-10M	Use of Reform-Oriented Teaching Practices: Mathematics	E-16
E-11	Use of Instructional Technology	E-17
E-12S	Adequacy of Resources for Instruction: Science.....	E-18
E-12M	Adequacy of Resources for Instruction: Mathematics	E-19
E-13	Extent to Which the Quality of Instructional Technology Is Problematic for Instruction.....	E-20
E-14	Extent to Which the Policy Environment Promotes Effective Instruction	E-21
E-15	Extent to Which Stakeholders Promote Effective Instruction	E-22
E-16	Extent to Which School Support Promotes Effective Instruction	E-23
E-17	Focus on State Science/Mathematics Standards.....	E-25
E-18	Supportive Context for Science/Mathematics Instruction	E-26
E-19	Extent to Which a Lack of Materials and Supplies Is Problematic	E-27
E-20	Extent to Which Student Issues Are Problematic.....	E-28

E-21	Extent to Which Teacher Issues Are Problematic	E-29
E-22	Extent to Which a Lack of Time Is Problematic	E-30

Appendix F: Additional Equity Cross-tabulations

F-1	Science Classes Taught by Teachers with Varying Experience Teaching Science, by Equity Factors	F-1
F-2	Mathematics Classes Taught by Teachers with Varying Experience Teaching Mathematics, by Equity Factors.....	F-2
F-3	Secondary Teachers with a Degree in Discipline, by Equity Factors.....	F-3
F-4	Secondary Science Classes Taught by Teachers with Substantial Background in Subject of Selected Class, by Equity Factors.....	F-4
F-5	Class Mean Scores for Science Teacher Perceptions of Preparedness Composites, by Equity Factors	F-5
F-6	Class Mean Scores for Mathematics Teacher Perceptions of Preparedness Composites, by Equity Factors	F-6
F-7	Classes Taught by Teachers with More than 35 Hours of Professional Development in the Last Three Years, by Subject and Equity Factors	F-7
F-8	Class Mean Scores for the Quality of Professional Development Composite, by Subject and Equity Factors	F-8
F-9	Class Mean Scores on the Extent to which Professional Development/Coursework Focused on Student-Centered Instruction Composite, by Subject and Equity Factors.....	F-9
F-10	Schools Providing Various Services to Science Teachers, by Equity Factors.....	F-10
F-11	Schools Providing Various Services to Mathematics Teachers, by Equity Factors	F-11
F-12	Average Number of AP Science Courses Offered at High Schools, by Equity Factors.....	F-12
F-13	Average Percentage of 8 th Graders Completing Algebra I and Geometry Prior to 9 th Grade, by Equity Factors	F-13
F-14	Average Number of AP Mathematics Courses Offered at High Schools, by Equity Factors.....	F-14
F-15	Science Class Mean Scores on the Reform-Oriented Instructional Objectives Composite, by Equity Factors	F-15
F-16	Mathematics Class Mean Scores on the Reform-Oriented Instructional Objectives Composite, by Equity Factors	F-16
F-17	Class Mean Scores on Science Teaching Practice Composites, by Equity Factors.....	F-17
F-18	Class Mean Scores on Mathematics Teaching Practice Composites, by Equity Factors.....	F-18
F-19	Classes Required to Take External Assessments Two or More Times per Year, by Subject and Equity Factors	F-19
F-20	Availability of Instructional Technologies in Science Classes, by Equity Factors	F-20
F-21	Availability of Instructional Technologies in Mathematics Classes, by Equity Factors	F-21
F-22	Median Amount Schools Spend per Pupil on Science Equipment, Consumable Supplies, and Software, by Equity Factors	F-22
F-23	Median Amount Schools Spend per Pupil on Mathematics Equipment, Consumable Supplies, and Software, by Equity Factors	F-23
F-24	Class Mean Scores on the Adequacy of Resources for Instruction Composite, by Equity Factors.....	F-24
F-25	School Mean Scores for Factors Affecting Science Instruction Composites, by Equity Factors.....	F-25
F-26	School Mean Scores for Factors Affecting Mathematics Instruction Composites, by Equity Factors	F-26

F-27	Class Mean Scores on Factors Affecting Science Instruction Composites, by Equity Factors.....	F-27
F-28	Class Mean Scores on Factors Affecting Mathematics Instruction Composites, by Equity Factors.....	F-28

LIST OF FIGURES

Page

Chapter Four: Science and Mathematics Courses

4.1	Class Size, Science: Elementary.....	63
4.2	Class Size, Science: Middle	63
4.3	Class Size, Science: High.....	63
4.4	Class Size, Mathematics: Elementary	63
4.5	Class Size, Mathematics: Middle	63
4.6	Class Size, Mathematics: High.....	63

Appendix E: Description of Reporting Variables

E-1	K–12 Science: Quality of Professional Development	E-4
E-2	K–12 Mathematics: Quality of Professional Development	E-4
E-3	K–12 Science: Extent to which Professional Development/Coursework Focused on Student-Centered Instruction	E-5
E-4	K–12 Mathematics: Extent to which Professional Development/Coursework Focused on Student-Centered Instruction	E-5
E-5	Perceptions of Content Preparedness: Biology/Life Science	E-7
E-6	Perceptions of Content Preparedness: Chemistry	E-7
E-7	Perceptions of Content Preparedness: Earth Science	E-7
E-8	Perceptions of Content Preparedness: Integrated/General Science	E-7
E-9	Perceptions of Content Preparedness: Physical Science	E-7
E-10	Perceptions of Content Preparedness: Physics	E-7
E-11	Perceptions of Content Preparedness: Mathematics.....	E-8
E-12	K–12 Science: Perceptions of Preparedness to Teach Diverse Learners.....	E-9
E-13	K–12 Mathematics: Perceptions of Preparedness to Teach Diverse Learners.....	E-9
E-14	K–12 Science: Perceptions of Preparedness to Encourage Students in Science and/or Engineering	E-10
E-15	K–12 Mathematics: Perceptions of Preparedness to Encourage Students in Mathematics	E-10
E-16	K–12 Science: Perceptions of Preparedness to Implement Instruction in Unit	E-11
E-17	K–12 Mathematics: Perceptions of Preparedness to Implement Instruction in Unit.....	E-11
E-18	K–12 Science: Curriculum Control	E-12
E-19	K–12 Mathematics: Curriculum Control	E-12
E-20	K–12 Science: Pedagogical Control.....	E-13
E-21	K–12 Mathematics: Pedagogical Control.....	E-13
E-22	K–12 Science: Reform-Oriented Instructional Objectives	E-14
E-23	K–12 Mathematics: Reform-Oriented Instructional Objectives.....	E-14
E-24	K–12 Science: Use of Reform-Oriented Teaching Practices.....	E-15

E-25	K–12 Mathematics: Use of Reform-Oriented Teaching Practices	E-16
E-26	K–12 Science: Use of Instructional Technology	E-17
E-27	K–12 Mathematics: Use of Instructional Technology	E-17
E-28	K–12 Science: Adequacy of Resources for Instruction	E-18
E-29	K–12 Mathematics: Adequacy of Resources for Instruction	E-19
E-30	K–12 Science: Extent to Which Quality of IT Is Problematic for Instruction.....	E-20
E-31	K–12 Mathematics: Extent to Which Quality of IT Is Problematic for Instruction	E-20
E-32	K–12 Science: Extent to Which the Policy Environment Promotes Effective Instruction	E-21
E-33	K–12 Mathematics: Extent to Which the Policy Environment Promotes Effective Instruction	E-21
E-34	K–12 Science: Extent to Which Stakeholders Promote Effective Instruction.....	E-22
E-35	K–12 Mathematics: Extent to Which Stakeholders Promote Effective Instruction.....	E-22
E-36	K–12 Science: Extent to Which School Support Promotes Effective Instruction	E-23
E-37	K–12 Mathematics: Extent to Which School Support Promotes Effective Instruction	E-23
E-38	K–12 Science: Focus on State Standards	E-25
E-39	K–12 Mathematics: Focus on State Standards	E-25
E-40	K–12 Science: Supportive Context for Science Instruction	E-26
E-41	K–12 Mathematics: Supportive Context for Mathematics Instruction	E-26
E-42	K–12 Science: Extent to Which a Lack of Materials and Supplies Is Problematic	E-27
E-43	K–12 Mathematics: Extent to Which a Lack of Materials and Supplies Is Problematic	E-27
E-44	K–12 Science: Extent to Which Student Issues Are Problematic	E-28
E-45	K–12 Mathematics: Extent to Which Student Issues Are Problematic	E-28
E-46	K–12 Science: Extent to Which Teacher Issues Are Problematic	E-29
E-47	K–12 Mathematics: Extent to Which Teacher Issues Are Problematic.....	E-29
E-48	K–12 Science: Extent to Which a Lack of Time Is Problematic	E-30
E-49	K–12 Mathematics: Extent to Which a Lack of Time Is Problematic	E-30



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The 2012 National Survey of Science and Mathematics Education was coordinated by Horizon Research, Inc. (HRI) of Chapel Hill, North Carolina with support from the National Science Foundation (NSF). The project was led by Eric R. Banilower, P. Sean Smith, and Iris R. Weiss. A number of other HRI staff assisted with the study, including Belle Booker, Alison Bowes, Jayme Dunnon, William Fulkerson, Susan Hudson, Leonard Lind, Scott Pion, Adrienne Smith, and Peggy Trygstad. The sample design was developed by Mike Brick and Pam Broene of Westat, Inc. of Rockville, Maryland.

The project advisory board, consisting of a number of science and mathematics educators contributed to the design of the survey. Board members were Rolf Blank, Hilda Borko, Jere Confrey, Doug Grouws, Thomas Hoffer, Frances Lawrenz, Ohkee Lee, Shirley Malcom, Jim Minstrell, Andrew Porter, Senta Raizen, Sharon Senk, Margaret (Peg) Smith, and Brian Stecher. Janice Earle of NSF's Division of Research on Learning in Formal and Informal Settings provided valuable advice as Program Officer for the study. Special thanks are due to the thousands of teachers throughout the United States who took time from their busy schedules to provide information about their science and mathematics teaching.

Finally, special acknowledgment is due to Iris R. Weiss who founded HRI and served as President until her retirement in 2012. Dr. Weiss began the National Survey effort in 1977. Through her invaluable leadership, there have been four successive iterations, including the 2012 National Survey.

