

U.S. Department of Education

Washington, D.C. 20202-5335



APPLICATION FOR GRANTS UNDER THE

NATIONAL PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

CFDA # 84.365Z

PR/Award # T365Z110054

Grants.gov Tracking#: GRANT10863895

Closing Date: MAY 09, 2011

**PROJECT PROFICIENT:
Improving the Education of
Limited English Proficient Students**

**Submitted by Morningside College
in consortia arrangement with Prairie Lakes Area Education Agency, Grant Wood Area
Education Agency, Area Education Agency 267, Northwest Area Education Agency, and
Keystone Education Agency**

ABSTRACT

This proposal is built upon a 4 year success rate of National Professional Development coordinated with other successful institutes of higher education across the nation and the CIMA Center at the University of Kansas. The project partners have collaborated with Morningside College in the identification of high needs for teacher assistance due to changes in demographics and analysis of student scores. Over 160 teachers have added their names to the interest list for the grant. The partners have pledged communication and support for the project and teachers.

The Project Proficient Goal is to prepare 100 teachers to become highly qualified—especially as they teach ELs effectively in integrated, inclusive settings that focus on achieving and mastering the new Common Core State Standards.

The **3 Program Objectives and expected outcomes** are: **Program Objective 1:** Over the course of this project, a minimum of 100 teachers will participate in professional development activities that improve their understanding of the needs of English language learners. **Expected Outcome:** Teachers who complete the professional development will implement in their classrooms effective, research-based curriculum and instruction that results in high academic achieving ELs. **Program Goal 2:** A minimum of 100 teachers in Iowa will be prepared to add the ESL endorsement to their teaching licenses. **Expected Outcome:** Professional development that leads to an ESL Endorsement and where they apply best practices in teaching, as demonstrated through documented findings through observations and research completed by this project. **Program Goal 3:** Project participants will collaborate with others for support and sharing of best practices. **Expected Outcome:** Develop two cadres of teachers and summer institutes of teachers—especially those in STEM from participating districts—to participate in project activities and where, they in turn, become facilitators of school reform and improvement in their respective schools.

The 50 teachers in the first cohort group and the fifty teachers in the second cohort group will be supported in their coursework. Project personnel will also travel to their classrooms and conduct research to determine if the coursework results in a change in teaching behaviors and student achievement. The use of **Biography Driven Practices Classroom Observations [BDP]** will be employed, as well. The BDP measure is an extension of the Standards Performance Continuum classroom observation instrument. **Project Proficient** will describe findings of classroom observations for each teacher participant and conduct analysis and research from each cohort group of participants served by this project during the course of 5-years. The primary purpose of this research will be to assess changes in teachers' classroom practices and language learner student performance over the course of the CLASSIC® program using a standardized measure of change. It is hypothesized that teachers' level of enactment of best practices and standards, as defined by the BDP rubric, would significantly increase from the beginning to the end of the program. Confirmation of this hypothesis will be interpreted as evidence of increased teacher effectiveness.

Section A: Quality of Project Design. (40 points)

On March 10th, 2010, Secretary of Education, Arne Duncan asserted in Selma, Alabama, “The achievement gap in our country is shameful . . . the achievement gap is still a cancer that imperils our nation's progress. America's school children cannot wait six years, or eight years, or ten years, for pervasive educational inequities to disappear. Your children, my children, our children, the students gathered here today, have only one chance—one chance—for an education. We cannot wait . . . therefore, we will all cross the bridge that leads to true equality [in learning]. Our children, and our nation, deserve no less.” Given this profound assertion, Morningside College and its collaborating Iowa Area Education agency partners, Prairie Lakes Education Agency, Grant Wood Area Education Agency, Area Education Agency 267, Northwest Area Education Agency, and Grant Wood Area Education Agency will embrace this challenge by creating and implementing a professional development [PD] program designed to enhance classroom instruction for ELs and will assist educators/support staff working with such students to meet high professional standards—including standards for certification and licensure.

Cultural and linguistic diversity is an increasing reality of social and demographic patterns in public school classrooms. Many school systems find themselves unable to recruit and retain the appropriate and the much needed educator talent appropriate to the increasing classroom diversity found in today’s schools. As such, we must find ways to educate, re-educate, retrain, and professionally equip district educators and support staff with the professional skills and capacities they need to appropriately educate ubiquitous students from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds.

Morningside College and its high-need rural and urban school districts in Iowa have identified in **Table 1** three significant needs shared among educators and policy makers in this

state. **The first critical need** demands the targeted improvement of academic achievement and success among ELs in the target high-need schools. This critical need will be addressed by the project via the extended, graduate-level PD of inservice teachers toward full ESL Endorsement. This PD will emphasize site-specific dynamics, EL student assets and learning needs, SIOP-based literacy development and content learning for ELs—especially for secondary content area teachers working in math and science (**addressing Competitive Priority # 3**), thus also reducing the high dropout rates among secondary-level ELs.

Table 1: Longitudinal Critical Need for School Districts in Iowa {2005-2011}

	Needs	Shortages	Weaknesses in Services
Impacted Iowa Education Agency	% Increase in # of identified ELs	% teachers holding an ESL Endorsement.	% ELs who <u>met</u> FY 10 State Reading Assesmnts
AEA 267	+266%	< 5%	34%
Grant Wood AEA	+78%	< 5%	44%
Keystone AEA	+227%	< .05%	35%

A **second compelling need** is to increase the very limited number of ESL endorsed/ licensed educators in these high-need areas. This need will be addressed through the partnering and utilization of the *CLASSIC Model* at Kansas State University [KSU]—the details of which will be discussed later in this proposal. **The third vital need** is for site-based, PD grounded in the identified needs, research-based best classroom practices, and one that addresses the district challenges in this rapidly and demographically changing region of the our state. As determined

by the planning team to address the needs identified of the districts, it's schools, staff and students, the project's purpose is to implement/evaluate/disseminate findings about an innovative PD program that contains quality, research-based supports/services designed to improve the academic performance of ELs in grades K-12 in the project schools and to provide endorsement eligible status to a total of 100 teachers during the 5-years of project operation. As the agencies collaborated with Morningside in the development of this proposal, they gathered data, assisted in forming a vision, and contacting administrators and principals. From those contacts, a list of over 150 teachers has been gathered for contact once the grant awards are made. Clearly the project will be able to fill the 100 opportunities this proposal creates.

The following overarching project goal and related program goals and outcomes outline the general PD components for the project's operational design. The project's components are linked to current research, sound technology training and utilize methods to increase the likelihood of meeting all project expected outcomes. **Project Proficient** has one goal and three supporting program objectives—all designed to build capacity and to yield results that will continue beyond the 5-years of Federal assistance. **Project Goal:** Prepare 100 teachers to become highly qualified—especially as they teach ELs effectively in integrated, inclusive settings that focus on achieving and mastering the new Common Core State Standards. The **3 Program Objectives and expected outcomes** are: **Program Objective 1:** Over the course of this project, a minimum of 100 teachers will participate in PD activities that improve their understanding of the needs of ELs. **Expected Outcome:** Teachers who complete the PD will implement in their classrooms effective, research-based curriculum and instruction that results in high academic achieving ELs. **Program Goal 2:** A minimum of 100 teachers in the targeted districts will be prepared to add the ESL endorsement to their teaching licenses. **Expected**

Outcome: PD that leads to an ESL Endorsement and where they apply best practices in teaching, as demonstrated through documented findings through observations and research completed by this project. **Program Goal 3:** Project participants will collaborate with others for support and sharing of best practices. **Expected Outcome:** Develop two cadres of teachers and summer institutes of teachers—especially those in STEM from participating districts—to participate in project activities and where, they in turn, become facilitators of school reform and improvement in their respective schools. **Further delineation of expected outcomes, the timelines for implementation, who is responsible and what the expected milestones are for each activity is found in the Management Section, Section C.**

As cited earlier, Morningside College and the targeted districts will collaborate with KSU to implement the PD program. KSU—an award-winning, highly recognized leader among ESL teacher-training programs in the nation—has established and implemented with longstanding success a distance-learning, teacher endorsement program entitled, *The CLASSIC[®] ESL/Dual Language Program*. KSU has agreed and demonstrated, through their attached letter of commitment, to help Morningside and its targeted schools to adapt the model to address these serious needs. *CLASSIC[®]* is a copyrighted acronym for **C**ritically reflective **L**ifelong **A**dvocacy for **S**econd language learners, **S**ite-specific **I**nnovation, and **C**ross-cultural competency. The 5-course framework and sequence serving as the curriculum for the PD program will lead to an ESL endorsement—the state’s equivalent of an add-on licensure in a new teaching field in Iowa. The full program detail is found at <http://www2.coe.ksu.edu/esl/index.html>. This high quality PD program will be provided through the completion of 18 graduate level credit hours leading to an endorsement in ESL Education in our state. In addition, these IHE-delivered courses are

applicable to a *Master's degree in Teaching: Professional Educator* at Morningside College {Addresses Invitational Priority #2}.

The PD model will be purposively adapted in such a way that PD for project participants is directly linked to their identified needs and will also be grounded in the latest theory/research literature of best practice in the field. The best way to demonstrate these effective links between the KSU CLASSIC[®] PD program and the needs of the project's target school districts is to highlight the ways in which the design of the program addresses the *seven professional development needs found particular to demographically changing school districts*. Briefly, the Region IV Comprehensive Center (2010) identified *seven essential* professional development needs of demographically changing school systems and their educators. The CLASSIC[®] Program Model specifically addresses each of the needs in PD for target educators in the following ways:

1) **Engaging** – As discussed, the CLASSIC[®] Program offers educators PD that is *engaging* through its emphasis on collaborative group formation that is at minimum composed of educators from a common district, and under ideal circumstances, composed of educators from the same school. Such collaborations provide a critical nucleus for school-wide reform to better meet the needs of ELs {Addresses GPRA Performance Measure [GPM] #1.5-1.6}. 2) **Available, accessible, and adaptable** – The CLASSIC[®] Program offers participants *available, accessible, and adaptable* PD through an innovative and flexible format of faculty-facilitated and site-based *distance education*. Through this format, school participants receive content and instruction guided by theory- and research-driven practice. However, they are then prompted, in school district-based collaborative groups, to appropriately adapt that knowledge to *theory-into-practice applications* tailored to EL needs in their schools {Addresses GPM Performance Measure #1.5-1.6}. For each course, students receive: (a) an intensive on-site initiating session

wherein faculty explain and discuss course curricula, materials, texts, content, and intended outcomes; (b) a series of 8-10 instructional DVDs [varies by course of the ESL endorsement sequence—18 graduate credit hours—which participants view in collaborative groups of peers according to their own schedule and planning where each DVD-based professional development seminar is followed by a series of post-seminar activities which prompt school/district-based adaptations of content]; (c) facilitation in the completion of a course project which participant teachers appropriately adapt to reflect school/district needs in the particular subject area; (d) technology-based feedback loops for instructional support [including the CLASSIC[®] Webpage, E-mail, ListServe, Moodle, Real-time Text Messaging, SMART Boards, Polycom, Voice-over IP, the Iowa Communications Network, Skype, and Morningside online] throughout the term of the course; and (e) an intensive on-site faculty-delivered closure session in which participants discuss their learnings, present their course projects, and share ideas about school-based dilemmas of practice. **Project Proficient** participants will be further supported by *Regional Integrators* familiar with EL and family needs in their school district and in their geographic region. 3) **Capable of fostering linkages among practitioners** – The CLASSIC[®] Program will foster such *linkages* through program design emphasizing: (a) collaborative groups, (b) ongoing support of *Regional Integrators*, and (c) technology-based collaboration networks. 4) **Relevant and compatible** – The CLASSIC[®] Program offers project participants *relevant and compatible* PD through instructional approaches emphasizing process thinking and critical reflection/ self-evaluation on the appropriate adaptations/ modifications of theory and concepts. These approaches will target the particular needs of ELs in the classrooms of the participant's school district. Throughout this instruction, capacity building for cross-culturally competent professional practice and advocacy is highly emphasized. Educators in the schools served by this

project will have a long-standing contact with linguistic diversity or advocacy skills training to safeguard the rights of EL students and their families. 5) **Of high quality** – The CLASSIC[®] Program offers high-need schools PD that is *of high quality* as evidenced by the *special recognition status* granted to the Program by NCATE, in its recent review of the College of Education at KSU, and by the Distinguished Unit Award given by KSU to the CLASSIC[®] Program. 6) **Reinforcing in the message it transmits** – The CLASSIC[®] Program offers educators PD that is *reinforcing in its message*. It does so by reaching participants *through a variety of instructional and learning venues*. This reach is not only reinforced through *professional conversations* with peers, it is also bolstered through dedicated feedback loops such as E-mail, Real-time Text Messaging, List Serve, Polycom, Skype, online options, and more. Through these channels, statewide participants share ideas, problems, and solutions with each other and with collaborating faculty. Site-based, practice-driven feedback from participant teachers is then utilized to improve teacher education at Morningside *{Addresses Invitational Priority #2}*. In **Project Proficient**, reinforcing messages will also be strengthened via *collaboration networks facilitated by regional integrators* for the project. These collaborating networks will enable/support: (a) the sharing of course products [lesson plans, et al.] among state educators; (b) collaborations on dilemmas of (rural urban) practice with ELs; (c) participant's utilization of research and information provided electronically by KSU and Morningside, and (d) participant use of emergent aforementioned *technologies for networking*. To enable these networks, Regional Integrators will be further trained by an expert Technology Consultant, in conjunction with the project's SIOP and BDP Institutes—to be discussed later in this proposal. 7) **Promotion of sustained interactivity** – Ultimately, the CLASSIC[®] Program promotes

sustained interactivity through its emphasis on *collegial interactions* between district and regional educators, and with teacher education faculty {*Addresses Invitational Priority #2*}.

The CLASSIC[®] PD program is comprised of the following IHE courses and curricula: 1) **Linguistics for ESL Learners** [EDUC 715: 3 Hours] Prepares educators to excel in Linguistics, Sociolinguistics, with emphasis on practical application in the classroom. 2) **ESL Methods** [EDUC 705: 3 Hours] Details approaches, methods, strategies, and techniques for EL students (second language learners) in the public schools, including strategies for curricular/instructional adaptation, and advocacy for programs, approaches, and students. Curricula for **Project Proficient** will emphasize SIOP, CALLA and BDP methods. 3) **Language, Culture, and Classroom Practice** [EDUC 720: 3 Hours] Explores the cross-cultural and cross-linguistic dynamics of diverse school settings and details the foundations of professional effectiveness with EL students in these settings. 4) **ESL Assessment** [EDUC 710: 3 Hours] Details the dynamics of appropriate assessment practices for ELs, including key issues relating to the identification, placement, monitoring, and exiting of the second language learner. Includes hands-on use and interpretation of placement tests, such as the Language Assessment Scale (LAS), the BVAT, and the state's performance exam {*Addresses Invitational Priority #2*}. 5) **Second Language Acquisition** [EDUC 725: 3 Hours] This course applies the developmental levels of language learners and explores practical application of language theories and learning stages. 6) **ESL Internship(K-12)** [EDUC 730/731: 3 Hours] A portfolio-based final preparation for high-quality practice with Els that is grounded in field experiences with the effective education of second language learners. Capstone outcomes include an *endorsement portfolio* organized according to a *platform* for professional practice with ELs.

SIOP-Enhanced Curricula and [BDP] Biography-Driven Culturally Responsive Teaching Protocol Institutes – **Project Proficient** will provide participants with expert guidance in the maximization of the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) Model and BPD to guide accommodative instruction in grade-level classrooms and content areas. Specifically, SIOP and BPD trained faculty will teach participants how to reinforce and elaborate upon concepts and strategies taught in the sheltered instruction aspects of the Methods, Assessment, and Linguistics courses of the CLASSIC[®] Program Model. Recent research has indicated that the **SIOP Model of Sheltered Instruction** (Short and Echevarria, 2005) is a highly appropriate model for the rapidly changing EL demographics and limited staff capacities that exist in this project’s target school districts. The **BDP measure** is an extension of the Standards Performance Continuum classroom observation instrument, which reflects five standards of effective pedagogy - Joint Productive Activity, Language & Literacy Development, Contextualization, Challenging Activities, and Instructional Conversation (Herrera, 2010) and is a standardized measure to ascertain the degree to which teachers employ best practices in teaching ELs. In Years 2 and 4 of the 5-year project, Morningside College will organize and deliver two SIOP and BDP Summer Institutes for all project educators and for Morningside and district faculty and administration unfamiliar with the methods {**Addresses Competitive Preference Priority # 1**}. These Institutes will focus on the classroom-based development, maximization, and use-in-assessment of effective strategies for learning for ELs—especially for secondary teachers in the areas of math and science who work with secondary-level ELs {**Addresses Competitive Preference Priority # 3**}. Regionally and nationally recognized consultants will be employed by **Project Proficient** to deliver research-based informative, practical, and hands-on workshops that professionally prepare school educators and IHE faculty

to appropriately maximize content and language objectives and designed instructional activities in high-EL science and math classrooms and in the preparation of teachers for these classrooms. The content of the courses that will constitute the PD of **Project Proficient** will be periodically reviewed and revised based on current research findings in the fields of ESL Education, Language Acquisition, and Multicultural Education (Abedi, 2004; Anthony & Lonigan, 2004; Cummins, 2001; Gottardo, 2002; Herrera & Murry, 2005; Herrera, Murry, & Cabral, 2007; Salend, 2005; Shrake & Rhee, 2004; Thomas & Collier, 2002; Van Hook & Fix, 2000). The curriculum of the *CLASSIC*[®] Program and the design of **Project Proficient** reflect the most up-to-date theory, research, and best practice standards in the field. Therefore, this PD program will operate to enhance the high quality teacher (HQT) status of participating educators, as well as their post-training effectiveness with ELs and their learning within the school they attend. The activities of the **Project Proficient** are designed to achieve the project's primary objectives and target outcomes through a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and to support rigorous academic standards ground in the new Common Core Standards for ELs. The activities are designed to achieve the objectives necessary to attainment of the Project Goal are part of a *comprehensive effort* and will occur according to the details and time frames outlined in *Project Management Matrix, Section C {Addresses QPD, Part 4, CFDA 84.195N}*.

The Project plan proposes to conduct its comprehensive program of PD activities in two 2.5-year cycles. The first cycle of the Project [C1] will endorse a cadre of 50 teachers in the identified school districts in ESL Education. This first cadre will then be assessed to measure program/ PD effectiveness {Addresses GPRA Performance Measure #1}. Data from post-training assessments will be collected, analyzed, and documented for program refinement {Addresses Invitational Priority #2; GPRA Performance Measures #1, #2 & #3; OELA

Program Measure #1}. Following subsequent and appropriate program refinements linked to ongoing applied research on the Program Model, the second cycle [C2] will endorse an additional cadre of 50 teachers. Ultimately, a total of 100 teachers will be endorsed through the two cycles of the five-year project. These teachers will be provided with high quality, long-term (2.5-year) PD leading to an endorsement in ESL Education, according to the schedule in the Project Cycles Table that follows. **Subsequent post-training assessment of C2 participant effectiveness with EL students will follow that project cycle.**

Project Cycles Table 2 – Project Proficient							
<i>Cycles by Course and Semester</i>	PD Courses/ Assessment Implementation						
Semester of Proposed Completion	MTH	AST	LGA	L/C	INT	PTA	2 nd LA
Fall, 2011	C1						
Spring, 2012		C1					
Fall, 2012			C1				
Spring, 2013				C1			
Fall, 2013	C2				C1		
Spring, 2014		C2				C1	
Fall, 2014			C2				
Spring, 2015				C2			
Fall, 2015					C2		
Spring, 2016						C2	
Summer 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015							C1, C2
Legend: MTH–Methods; AST–Assessment, LC–Language & Culture, LGA–							

Course content for **Project Proficient** is aligned with expectations set with the new Common Core State Standards and ESL Standards. *{Addresses GPRA Performance Measure #2, OELA Program Measure #2}*. **Table 3** demonstrates one example of the ways in which (for one exemplary standard) **Project Proficient** curriculum has been aligned with state and national standards for best practice with EL students:

<p>Table 3: CLASSIC[®] Program Course</p>	<p><i>EDUC 725: Second Language Acquisition:</i> (1a) Comparisons and contrasts between theory and research on first language acquisition vs. second language acquisition. (1b) Constructivist approaches to language Acquisition.</p>
<p>KSDE/ESOL Standards</p>	<p>The teacher of English for speakers of other languages understands the fundamentals, similarities, and differences of first and second language acquisition.</p>
<p>NCATE/TESOL</p>	<p>Goal 2: To use English to achieve academically in all content areas.</p>
<p>GWU Guiding Principles</p>	<p>Principle IV: Limited English proficient students receive instruction that builds on their previous education and cognitive abilities and that reflects their language proficiency levels.</p>
<p>NBPTS</p>	<p>Standard I: Knowledge of Students; Standard II: Knowledge of Language and Language Development; Standard III: Knowledge of Culture and</p>

	Diversity; Standard VI: Meaningful Learning; Standard VII: Instructional Resources.
CREDE	Standard III: Making Meaning: Connecting School to Students' Lives

It is envisioned that participating teachers and support staff will become the nucleus for site-based school-wide restructuring to better meet the needs of ELs and maximize these students' achievement potentials. In this way, each cadre of educators will, through site-specific activities in each of the courses of their studies and through collaboration and networking, initiate planning and implementation for further restructuring. In particular, the second cycle cadre of participants to complete the PD of the CLASSIC[®] Program will increase the capacity necessary to operationalize restructuring plans to institutionalization that will continue the established ESL Programming beyond the tenure of Federal financial assistance. The primary model for restructuring taught in the courses of this comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning in language acquisition settings will be the *Guiding Principles for restructuring to improve EL student achievement* (Center for Excellence in Education, 2006).

2) The extent the design reflects up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice. (5 points)

In **Project Proficient**, teachers' capacity building for classroom diversity will be grounded in the *CLASSIC[®] Model* (Murry & Herrera, 1999; Herrera, Murry, & Perez, 2005, Herrera, 2008) of PD. Universities and school districts in four states have utilized this model for capacity building among school educators of ELs with over 2,500 school educators. Much of the success of this PD is attributable the model's *core emphasis* on capacity building for *critically reflective practice* (validity testing of background-based assumptions in practice). The diverse

group of languages and cultures represented in twenty-first century classrooms is today matched only by the lack of diversity among the nations' population of inservice teachers (NCES, 2006). Therefore, capacity building for critical reflection is essential to effective teaching practice, given the many cross-linguistic and cross-cultural differences represented in American and Midwestern classrooms.

According to education researcher, Richard DuFour, in his recent publication, Learning By Doing (2010), "We learn best by doing. We have known this to be true for quite some time. Most educators acknowledge that our deepest insights and understandings come from action, followed by reflection and the search for improvement. Our profession attests to the importance and power of learning by doing when it comes to educating our students. We want students to be actively engaged in hands-on authentic exercises that promote experiential learning." The same holds true for those to whom we teach.

Section B: Quality of project personnel: (10 points)

- (1) **Project Director Qualifications:** The project director will be Joan Nielsen, Associate Professor of Education at Morningside College. She has experience in grant writing and administration of state and federal grants. Nielsen served as Interim Chair of the Education Department at Morningside College. She serves as a tenured member of the faculty and works with both the graduate and undergraduate programs to coordinate the ESL endorsement with course content. She has worked with the CLASSIC© curriculum and its implementation and research since 2007. Joan Nielsen is a member of TESOL and the National Association for Multicultural Education (NAME). She presented at the NAME Conference in March with representatives from Kansas State, the University of Arkansas, and East Carolina University about collaborative efforts during the past four

years. Nielsen is a licensed Iowa evaluator and has been trained in the CREDE observation protocol. She has participated in research with students at undergraduate and graduate levels.

- (2) **Project Manager Qualifications:** A project manager will be hired by Morningside College to conduct program activities once the initial award has been garnered. Successful applicants will have experience in delivering professional development, and in administration of programs. The successful applicant will receive training in the delivery of a program affiliated with the CLASSIC® ESL/Dual Language Program developed by Kansas State University. Qualifications include a Ph. D. or a Master's Degree and significant teaching experience; excellent communication skills; excellent computer technology skills; and the ability to work efficiently.

The Program Manager travels to classrooms and activities of participants, supervises the course internship, delivers course content, plans and implements the Summer Institutes, and coordinates research and data with area schools, agencies, and the External Evaluator. The Project Manager must also possess knowledge about and have experience with second language acquisition.

- (3) **Administrative Assistant Qualifications:** The Project Director and Manger will be assisted by the Project Administrative Assistant. The individual filling this role will be selected for the program once the initial award has been garnered. The person must have a bachelor's degree and experience in working with technology and computer graphics. Candidates should have knowledge of developing and maintaining a database of information and student records, ordering equipment, materials, and supplies, establishing and maintaining files and financial records, answering the phone, handling

mail and email correspondence and messages, typing forms, reports, syllabi, and requests, and communicating with others. The administrative assistant must also possess the ability to work with faculty, staff, and students effectively.

(4) **External Evaluator Qualifications:** The qualifications of the External Evaluator, Dr. Robert Fanning, are listed in Part D of this proposal.

Additional explanations of duties and time involved for project personnel are found in Table 5 and in Section C.

Section C: Quality Of The Management Plan.

To ensure maximum efficacy and efficiency, the management plan includes 3 main components: 1) a thoughtful, well designed plan of operation driven by assessed needs; 2) a plan that governs the project so that roles/responsibilities are clearly defined and information-based decisions are made by stakeholders collaboratively; and 3) effective utilization of all resources to achieve the project's goals and objectives. The Project Director [PD] will administer the project and will coordinate efforts between the graduate/ undergraduate teacher preparation programs at Morningside. A Project Manager [PM] will teach the courses, supervise participant experiences, provide for specialized counseling, advising, and related support services not already assumed by the PD, and develop tools as needed for assessment/evaluation of the project activities. Daily administration of project tasks and goal attainment will be the responsibility of the PD and full-time Administrative Assistant [AA]. The External Evaluator [EE] works with collection and analysis of data.

As demonstrated in **Table 2: Project Proficient: Management Plan Matrix**, a comprehensive profile is provided regarding the expected objectives' outcomes, the timeline for implementation, who is responsible for the activity and what are the expected milestones. The overarching **Project Goal** is: Prepare teachers and support staff to become highly qualified—especially as they teach ELs effectively in integrated, inclusive settings that focus on achieving and mastering the new Common Core State Standards.

Program Goal 1: *Over the course of this project, a minimum of 100 teachers will participate in PD activities that improve their understanding of the needs of ELs.*

Table 4: Project Proficient: Management Plan Matrix			
Program Goal Activities 1	Timeline	Personnel	Milestones
1. Advertise program and recruit, screen, and select teachers.	Summer, Winter	PD, PM, AA, District staff	Selected staff recruited each year
2. Schedule classes according to phase-in process	Summer, Winter	PD	Schedule established and follows expected phase-in schedule
3. CLASSIC [®] program courses offered during each fall, spring, and summer semester at Morningside	Fall, Spring	PD, PM, KSU faculty	Courses completed according to phase-in schedule for each cohort of teachers. Endorsement of teachers

College, from the fall of 2011 through the spring of 2016, comprising two complete cycles.			completed at the end of 2.5 years of study.
4. Offer Summer Institutes in Years 2 and 4	Summer	PM, PD	Summer SIOP and BDP institutes completed.
5. Assess performance and provide feedback to staff for quality control.	Every course	PM, PD, Project Participants	Assessment results on file and project activities refined as a result of input.
6. Analyze impact of activities and prepare report	Annually	PM, PD, District staff, External Evaluator	Completed research components and analyzed data to determine impact.
7. Monitoring budget expenditures	Ongoing	PD, PM	Budget monitored and funds expended yearly as expected.

PD=Project Director; PM=Project Manager; Administrative Assistant will assist in all activities, as required.

Program Goal 2: *A minimum of 100 teachers in the targeted districts will be prepared to add the ESL endorsement to their teaching licenses.*

Program Goal Activities 2	Timeline	Personnel	Milestones
1. The CLASSIC [®] program cycle will be completed twice from the fall of 2011 through the spring of 2016.	Fall, Spring, Summer	PM, PD	Completed program cycles with expected number of teachers completing coursework successfully.
2. Serve as a liaison between the school districts, the college, and the Iowa Department of Education	Ongoing	PD, District staff	Liaison activities completed with successful coordination and addressing PD needs of the district.

Program Goal 3: *Participants will collaborate with others for support/sharing of best practices.*

Program Goal Activities 3	Timeline	Personnel	Milestones
1. Develop process for participants, college staff, and district staff to share thoughts, reflections, successes, and challenges (informal meetings outside of classroom at least once each semester and use of technology—Blackboard™	Summer 2007	PM, PD, District staff	Summer institutes completed. Documented and coordinated activities of best practices on file.

online discussion boards and collaboration tools).			
2. Implement and maintain communication process.	Ongoing	PD, PM, KSU faculty	Communication process identified and maintained throughout project life cycle.
3. Facilitate conference attendance for participants.	Annually	PM	Conference facilitation completed and attendance record on file.
4. Evaluate, analyze and report findings to key stakeholders.	Each spring with completion of Annual Performance Report	PD, PM, participants, district staff, External Evaluator	Evaluation and research attributes completed. Data analyzed and project activities refined yearly based upon findings.

2) The time commitments of key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives.

As demonstrated by the Person Loading Chart to follow, a variety of staff will contribute to goal attainment via responsibilities that are well delineated and manageable. The PD (.1 FTE), and a PM (1.0 FTE) will collaborate and guide project activities toward the outstanding completion of the project with participants. The PD will also collaborate with the Dean of the College of Education to ensure that sound communications and university resources are made available to project staff and consultants, thus ensuing quality project management. The Business

Office will provide assistance in fiscal management and reporting. Project faculty will teach the courses, supervise participant experiences, and provide for specialized counseling, advising and related support services for project participants. The PM will manage the day-to-day operation of the project and oversee the planning, monitoring, and appraisal of program effectiveness, project progress, and goal/objective achievement. She/he will be assisted by an (1.0 FTE) Administrative Assistant [AA] whose primarily clerical contributions will be to ensure the smooth operation, communication, proper documentation, and reliable reporting of project progress and outcomes.

The PD, an experienced project director, will: 1) provide overall leadership in the management of the program; 2) oversee the coordination of program services; 3) assume overall responsibility for project budget/ management; 4) provide for program assessment/ evaluation; and, 4) coordinate the development of all project reports, continuation proposals, and required documents. The PM, who will be hired immediately after the grant is awarded, will: 1) oversee the daily planning /implementation of the program; 2) coordinate/ develop/ implement training supplies for the initial phase; 3) identify resources needed in all areas; 4) assist in the identification of criteria for the selection/identification of participants; 5) assist in establishing evaluation rubrics of the program; and, 6) act as a conduit between the PD program, local schools and Morningside. **Table 5** provides commitment of time information for key project personnel.

Table 5: Person Loading Chart By Time in Day(s) By Person Responsible

Project Activities	PD	PM	EE	AA
Hire Staff/Establish Program Initial Components	5			2
Research/Prepare Materials	3	4		3

Select participants	7	1		7
Develop program	2	10		17
Implement program		177		17
Data Collection/Process Dev.	1	2	5	3
Data Analysis	2	4	3	4
Dissemination	3	2		2
Communication, appointments, phone calls, scheduling, ordering, documentation, reporting				145
Totals	23	200	8	200

D. Quality of the Project Evaluation.

The evaluation plan is process-oriented, designed for practicality, applicability, and accountability. A key feature of the evaluation plan is that it is highly interactive and integrative to produce quality results. In essence, the evaluation plan is viewed by the project planners as being an essential component of the proposal in order to determine the successful implementation of all project activities/ expected outcomes. As such, the evaluation plan includes process and outcome data, as well as an extensive research component to determine the impact the project is having on its participants and the students they serve—especially as it relates to EL student academic achievement. **Project Proficient** will be evaluated through the thorough and methodical use of the latest scientifically supported and research driven methods of measurement, analyses, and documentation. Through this evaluation process, project staff will collaborate with the CIMA Center at Kansas State University to principally and prudently align itself with the expectations of the designated evaluation criteria set by the evaluative

standards found within the RFP and the National Professional Development guidelines. In particular, **Project Proficient** will systematically target, monitor progress against and achieve the expectations of GPRA and OELA evaluation criteria. Moreover, staff will ensure that the evaluation process matches the GPRA Evaluation Measures (GPM) and OELA Program Measures (OPM) and that these indicators are then again aligned to the project goal, its various supporting objectives and with the expected outcomes.

Process data collection is an important evaluation aspect for use in documenting the implementation features of the project and for providing information that can be used to fine-tune the project—even as it is being implemented. Process data will allow the Evaluation Planning Team [EPT], to be described later, to answer questions such as: *"What features of the PD program contributed most to improving instruction or changing patterns of instruction to support/accommodate the learning of ELs in inclusive/mainstream settings?"* *"What ways did partnerships help to strengthen the project design?"*

In tandem with process data, outcome data collection is an equally important evaluation component. Outcome data consists of participants' test and assessment results and information collected to ascertain attitudinal changes in teachers' perceptions of their ability to teach diverse students, changes in the academic/social performance of students under the guidance of the teachers completing the program of study, and determining the quantifiable effect the PD activities have had on students. Examples of outcome data questions are: *"As a result of the project, to what extent were teachers better able to demonstrate learner centered principles of instruction that are correlated with increased student achievement?"* *"Did ELs close the gap between their achievement (AMAO—academic measurable achievement outcomes) on district/state standards as compared with the achievement of standards made by other students in the*

district using standardized measures?"

Through the use of multiple measures including data collection that examines teacher and individual student changes and other indicators of the effects of the model, evaluation evidence will be analyzed to determine the extent to which the project has made substantial progress toward meeting its goals, objectives, and cost effectiveness. Multiple measures and procedures used by the project will include, but are not limited to: the development of technology-based documentation procedures to maintain records on students, teachers, and administrators; the development of reporting forms and formats, focus groups and probes, observation instruments including contact logs, reflection logs, electronic journals and anecdotal/ structured data and records, and reporting procedures to document the effectiveness of the model, its components and strategies used. The quality of the evaluation plan will be further enhanced through: 1) innovative data collection techniques such as a Systematic Shadowing Technique in which project staff spend time onsite shadowing school staff to document project implementation efforts; 2) Individual Development Plans (IDPS) maintained by staff who take responsibility for their own professional growth and learning to support the goals and objectives of the project; 3) electronic journals maintained by teachers who document and reflect on what works in practices and why, and what doesn't work and why not; 4) the collection of baseline data and longitudinal data on staff attitudes about their capacity to implement reform strategies to support the achievement of ELs, 5) documentation of needs, program descriptions and activities; instructional methods, techniques, and materials to implement the goals and objectives of the project; 6) reviewing and restructuring ways that instructional and planning time is spent; and 7) the implementation of an Evaluation Planning Team [EPT].

A summative evaluation process will allow project staff to measure project success over five-

years to answer summative evaluation questions such as the following: 1) How prepared are teachers with regard to implementing researched-based instructional practices for ELs? To determine preparedness to implement practices as a measure of systemic education reform in rural schools, a self-assessment inventory will be adapted and administered that focuses on indicators of implementation (Special Strategies for Educating Disadvantaged Children (2007), U.S. Department of Education). The baseline data, compared to the survey administered on a yearly post measure schedule, will determine the change in teacher attitudes and demonstrated proficiencies in teaching ELs. 2) How successful has the PD component been in increasing the ability to support the improvement of academic performance and results for ELs? To determine success, a pre- and post PD effectiveness rubric anchored to the National Standards for Staff Development will be refined and administered (National Staff Development Council, 2010). 3) How successful has the project been in providing support to teachers through the sharing of successful instructional practices and resources to promote research-based instructional practices in their daily teaching of ELs? To determine success, anecdotal information will be collected through constituency focus groups and summarized using a trend analysis that clusters substantial trends. In addition, interaction logs and Individual Development Plans (IDPs) will be reviewed and the results analyzed to determine success trends in communication and PD. 4) How successful has the project been as a means for promoting reform and the use of researched-based teaching practices to increase the achievement of ELs? To determine success, anecdotal information will be collected through constituency focus groups and summarized using a trend analysis that clusters substantial trends. In addition, interaction logs will be tallied and the results analyzed to determine trends in communication. 5) How successful has the leadership been to serve as a support/catalyst for teams of educators, parents, and decision makers to improve

services and results for ELs? To determine success, surveys/ questionnaires will be developed, administered and analyzed. The evaluation plan was designed to provide a comprehensive look at project effectiveness by taking a team approach to the evaluation planning process. Upon award notification, an EPT will be formed consisting of stakeholders to meet quarterly to discuss the evaluation design, the results of project implementation, and ways to improve the project—as the evaluation information will be used for continuous improvement of the project

The research-based framework, from which all evaluation processes will be completed, is co-anchored in the **Discrepancy Evaluation Model (DEM)**, as developed by Malcolm Provus, and the **Biography Driven Practices Classroom Observations (BDP)** measure—an extension of the Standards Performance Continuum classroom observation instrument, which reflects CREDE’s five standards of effective pedagogy - Joint Productive Activity, Language & Literacy Development, Contextualization, Challenging Activities, and Instructional Conversation.

Discrepancy Evaluation Model: DEM evaluation is the comparison of an actual performance to a designated standard. Data is provided on the program outcome or the extent to which the program accomplished its targeted objectives. DEM also addresses the process or qualitative concerns and includes an analysis of the process used during the evaluation cycle. DEM consists of a number of specific steps. **Step 1** provides a portrayal of the program design, as planned. This portrayal includes program resources, related activities/ operations and the expected outcomes. The description follows closely those evaluation requirements detailed in 34 CFR 75.590. **Step 2** investigates and reports on the actual program installation, specifically addressing the question, *"Are the resources/ activities/ operations, as described in the design section, in motion?"* **Step 3** is the actual monitoring of the objective(s) accomplishments related to the overall program goal. This is perhaps the most important stage of the evaluation process

and the one in which most time and energy will be invested. **Step 4** addresses the overall purpose of summative evaluation, asking the question, *"Was what was intended to be accomplished realized?"* and, *"Did the program accomplish its stated goal and objectives?"* **Step 5** looks at program cost benefits. This aspect analyzes the total cost of the treatment and judges the worth/ value of it in comparison to other approaches. Provus' DEM was designed to evaluate educational programs like Project Proficient. The evaluative model expressly addresses project accomplishments while providing a structure for continuously identifying project needs, recording the various processes, and assessing the impact of the services provided by the project. In order to be appropriately applied, the DEM requires the development of sound program objectives. These specific objectives, (**detailed in Section A: Project Design**), are distinguished from general objectives or overall goals. These program objectives: 1) state expectations in measurable, behavioral terms; 2) are stated in terms of the participants or learners; 3) have an expected terminal performance; 4) state the conditions imposed when performing the desired behavior (time limits); 5) specify an expected outcome; and, 6) indicate a rubric against which the achievement or terminal outcome can be compared. The DEM involves all project staff and project participants in the evaluation process. Staff and participants are queried as to their perceptions of the project to determine whether the activities they are engaged in are leading toward the accomplishment of the project's stated purpose and goal. This information, along with observational data collected by staff/ external evaluator, is used to monitor or refine program progress or direction as the project is being implemented. Evaluation will be an integral and essential part of the overall success of Project Proficient achieving its objectives, delivering quality services to students and managing its resources. Since the project will be fiscally housed at Morningside College, evaluation is an essential part of effective program management.

To further enhance the evaluation components found within the Discrepancy Evaluation Model (DEM), the use of **Biography Driven Practices Classroom Observations [BDP]** will be employed, as well. The BDP measure is an extension of the Standards Performance Continuum classroom observation instrument, which reflects five standards of effective pedagogy - Joint Productive Activity, Language & Literacy Development, Contextualization, Challenging Activities, and Instructional Conversation (Herrera, 2010). Observers rate teachers' levels of enactment for each of the 22 BDP indicators on a 0 - 4 scale, where 0 = Not observed, 1 = Emerging 2 = Developing, 3 = Enacting, and 4 = Integrating. Individual indicators are categorized under and aligned with each of the original five standards. A composite BDP score (average score across all 22 items) is calculated to represent the overall level of BDP. As such, **Project Proficient** will describe findings of classroom observations for each teacher participant and conduct analysis and research from each cohort group of participants served by this project during the course of 5-years. The primary purpose of this research will be to assess changes in teachers' classroom practices and EL student performance over the course of the CLASSIC[®] program using a standardized measure of change. We hypothesize that teachers' level of enactment of best practices and standards, as defined by the BDP rubric, would significantly increase from the beginning to the end of the program. Confirmation of this hypothesis will be interpreted as evidence of increased teacher effectiveness.

Before data can be analyzed from both the anchored DEM and BDP models, response data from all offerings will be exported to a CSV file. The raw data will then be saved as an Excel file and cleaned and coded in preparation for analysis. Clean teacher and student data will be exported to the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS, version 15.0), where the files will be merged as a single large database. SPSS will then be used to transform and compute

variables and to analyze the data. This type of data will encompass all of the descriptive statistics produced from analysis of the responses for the entire sample, as well as the disaggregation of responses by population groups. Beyond the cleaning and coding of the raw data, the first step of analysis will be to conduct descriptive statistics on each of the items. These statistics provided frequencies of responses, means, and standard deviations for the scaled items. The results section that follows provides the means and standard deviations in descending value order. For sample description purposes, frequencies will also be conducted for the nominal level demographic data. For the second phase of analysis, we will conduct a series of full factorial Analyses of Variance (ANOVAs) on the twenty-two items that were ranked by the full sample as having the highest mean scores (indicating these characteristics are believed to be most important). This type of significance test is performed to determine if differences exist between the responses of different variables. For example, significance testing can be used to determine if Joint Productive Activity is similar in importance as Language & Literacy Development or if one group rates a characteristic as more important than the other one. Upon discovery, the research team will report results of the full sample across all variables. Subsequent descriptive statistics will be conducted for each data source to show the similarity of responses across the population groups and we will create tabular representations of responses for the full sample. These tables will depict the results and serve as a basis for each year's Annual Performance Report (APR).

To create cohesiveness with the evaluation design and process, and to lead the EPT, an External Evaluator [EE] will be contracted. As such, Dr. Robert Fanning will be contracted to serve as the EE. Based on his extensive 35-year career serving diverse students in nineteen states, he will be secured as the EE to oversee the evaluation of the work completed by project staff, program management and operation strategies and to ensure that project goals/ objectives

are being met and in a timely fashion. He has considerable experience/training in the administration of federal and state projects, ESL and migrant educational programming, program and fiscal management and with the implementation of standards-based education emphasizing intervention services for students at risk of academic failure. Dr. Fanning holds a doctorate in regular/ special education administration with an emphasis in program evaluation/effectiveness, school reform, English As A Second Language, special education and educational research. He also has managed numerous federal and state grants, and now serves as an evaluator for numerous Federal grants and as an Implementation Coach for the Kansas Learning Network, which provides technical support for schools not achieving AYP. He has worked as an evaluation consultant with the Program Evaluation and Assessment Unit of the Kansas, Colorado and Hawaii Departments of Education, as an advisor/ evaluator of 11 systemic reform and demonstration grants in Kansas and Colorado. Members of the EPT will include: an External Evaluator, the Project Director, the District representatives, two project participants and a school administrator. Each EPT member will be informed by the EE regarding the project evaluation activities, person(s) responsible for carrying out the evaluation activities, and the timelines for completion. A calendar of evaluation planning will be drafted and distributed to each member of the team within one week after the first EPT meeting. Because the EPT is broad-based, it will serve as an appropriate, objective vehicle for carrying out the evaluation of the project.

3) The extent to which the evaluation methods provide performance feedback

Quantitative Evaluation Criteria: Effective evaluation processes and other related criteria used with **Project Proficient** will employ and target scientifically-based quantitative measures to determine the efficacy in meeting expected outcomes. As such, Morningside College will utilize evaluative strategies that ensure that such attributes of internal validity, external validity,

reliability measures and objectivity are employed throughout all stages of the evaluation design. A variety of evaluation strategies will be used to ensure that internal validity is secured; they are: a) the use of consistency between the measurement conditions of pre- and post-interventional assessments, especially those that will measure the effectiveness of project implementation strategies; and, b) the use of random sampling and/ or analyses to ensure inter-rater reliability; and c) incorporating controls designed to avert statistical extreme scores in assessments. Also, a variety of methods will be used to ensure that external validity components are addressed; they are: a) the use of randomized sampling of participant groups for quantitative data analyses, where appropriate, b) conducting comparisons between comparable groups, and (c) completing multi-site analyses and applicable comparisons. To ensure that reliability to the process is established, a variety of processes will be utilized; they are: a) the use of piloted, field-tested assessment/evaluation instruments, and b) using evaluative processes to arrive at reliability coefficients, where applicable. Finally, objectivity in the overall evaluation process is needed. As such, members of **Project Proficient** will establish and maintain data/ documentation of implemented project efforts and will use specifically designed evaluation methods that employ quasi-experimental designs and related methodologies to assess achieved outcomes. Given these quantitative assessment parameters, the types of data found in **Table 5** will be collected to evaluate the quantitative aspects of the project. In addition, SPSS and ANOVA will be used to do this detailed analysis.

Table 6: Quantitative Evaluation Measures of Project Proficient

Prgrm Implement. Strategy.	Participant Progress/Outcomes	Participant (PT) Effectiveness
<i>Address. GPM, Part 1, 3</i>	<i>Address. GPM, Part 1, 3</i> <i>Addresses QPM, Parts 1,2</i>	<i>Addresses QPM, Parts 1, 2</i>

PT GPA by Course	PT Critical Reflection Journals	K-12 Student Performance on Stdzd. Achv. Tests, CBMs, Criterion Ref. Assessments
PT Practicum Portfolio GPA	PT GPA by Course & Portfolio	
PT Prgrm. Evl. Surveys	PT PRAXIS Score	

GM: GPRA Standards; QPM: Quality Program Measures

Qualitative Evaluation Criteria: Quantitative evaluation results serve only as one aspect of design; as such, it is also important that the evaluative process incorporates a measure of qualitative achievement of expected outcomes. Hence, the EPT will utilize the qualitative measuring standards as identified by key researchers as that found with Lincoln and Guba, 1985; Anfara, Brown, and Mangione, 2002; and, Cho & Trent, 2006. These sound, qualitative assessment principles include aspects associated with ensuring qualitative credibility through the use of such attributes as prolonged engagement, persistent observation, referential adequacy, thick description, dependability, triangulation, and confirmability. The attainment of overall credibility in the evaluation design involves a twofold task: 1) conducting the evaluation in such a way that credible findings are yielded, and 2) by reviewing the findings through the critical eye of the following methods: a) prolonged engagement— where the evaluation of the project is conducted through a continuous, ongoing evaluative process throughout the project’s life; b) persistent observations—where objective observations are conducted and; c) referential adequacy—where the tenets of the evaluation design are archived for analysis long after other project data has been analyzed. If this data, when analyzed, yields similar findings to that which has already been scrutinized, then this yields further credibility to the overall evaluation findings. As such, **Project Proficient** will submit thorough annual and final reports to the applicable officers of OELA in Washington, DC project findings for their review and consideration. Any

recommendations from that office for the enhancement of project research or evaluation methodologies will be immediately incorporated; d) transferability—where strategies to ensure the valid shifting of findings and the project’s design to other settings or to others are employed; e) thick description—where the EE sets the stage for accountability, as well as identifying the comprehensive assessment methods to be used in the evaluation design; f) dependability—where the aspects of validity, reliability and credibility are secured and consistently applied; g) triangulation—where the findings from the multiple sources of data are compared to each other to determine if the sources yield similar results; and, h) confirmability—where consensus has been reached among the key stakeholders regarding the findings of the project. Given these qualitative assessment parameters, **Table 7** depicts data to be collected and evaluated.

Table 7: Quantitative Evaluation Measures of Project Proficient		
Program Implement. Strategy	Participant Progress/Outcomes	Participant [PT] Effectiveness
<i>Address. GPM, Part 1, 3</i>	<i>Address. GPM, Part 1, 3</i> <i>Addresses QPM, Parts 1,2</i>	<i>Addresses QPM, Parts 1, 2</i>
Participant BDH Observation	IHE, District, and Participant Records	Participant Shadowing
Semi-structured Interviews	Participant Observation	Admin. Interviews
Quasi-structured Surveys	PT, Dist., & IHE Documents	Dist & Admin. Documents

Analyses of qualitative data will be conducted for all aspects of **Table 6** utilizing the following strategies: 1) The Constant Comparative Method (Boeije, 2002); 2) Etic Coding, according to the CLASSIC Model as a substantive Framework (Mitchell, 2006); 3) 3) Emic Coding, according to emergent participant perspectives/voice (Herrera, Murry, & Cabral, 2010)

The evaluation strategies will be persistent in the form of day-to-day management functions. Evaluation will be an ongoing process and monthly visits will be made to the project site by the external evaluator. Formative data gathered throughout the year will be reported each year to OME in the form of progress reports. In addition to the yearly progress reports, a yearly Annual Performance Report will also be submitted to OME—including information regarding **GPRA** (seen at this end of this section) and US Education Department Program Measures. In Year 5, a final summative evaluation report will be submitted, as well. Prior to submission of yearly progress and the APRs, the evaluator and the lead agency will provide evaluation findings to the PI, PD, project staff and other key stakeholders.

In response to the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA), project staff will document and report on the extent to which the project is achieving against these performance measures. These performance measures are: 1) The percentage of pre-service program graduates who are placed in instructional settings serving limited English proficient students within one year of graduation; 2) The percentage of pre-service program graduates who meet NCLB Highly Qualified Teacher requirements; 3) The percentage of in-service teacher completers who are providing instructional services to limited English proficient students. In addition, project staff will document and report the extent to program measures have been accomplished. These program measures are: 1) The effectiveness of graduates/completers in the instructional setting; and, 2) The degree to which IHE pre-service and in-service training programs are aligned with K-12 State standards and assessments, including English language proficiency standards and content standards.