

# U.S. Department of Education

Washington, D.C. 20202-5335



## APPLICATION FOR GRANTS UNDER THE

**NATIONAL PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM**

**CFDA # 84.365Z**

**PR/Award # T365Z110182**

**Grants.gov Tracking#: GRANT10865357**

Closing Date: MAY 09, 2011

**Abstract**  
University of Arkansas, Fayetteville  
*Project RISE-Realizing and Increasing Student Excellence*

The University of Arkansas (U of A) College of Education and Health Professions proposes to implement **Project RISE - Realizing and Increasing Student Excellence** through increasing the number of ESL endorsed in-service teachers in Northwest Arkansas providing instructional services to EL students (GPRA Measures 1.5 and 1.6). The program proposes to serve 90-100 participants during a five year period (45-50 in each two and a half year period). Throughout the program , teachers will be coached on strategies that are especially effective for EL learners and trained as advocates for Culturally and Linguistically Diverse (CLD) students. As advocates teachers who complete the program will be mentors and leaders at their schools.

U of A's College of Education and Health Professions (COEHP) will partner with three surrounding large school districts, Springdale, Bentonville, and Fayetteville. These districts are among the ten school districts with the largest number of ELL students in the state and Springdale has the largest number of ELLs (79,060) in the state. We will also partner with the rural districts of Decatur, Prairie Grove, Gravette, and Farmington, to increase the number of highly qualified English Second Language (ESL) endorsed teachers in Northwest Arkansas and thereby raise achievement levels for English Language Learners (ELLs)

Project RISE will be a collaborative effort to replicate the Kansas State University CLASSIC<sup>®</sup> program, a research based professional development program for in-service teachers resulting in improved classroom instruction for ELLs. This program utilizes adult learning strategies, incorporates professional learning communities and distance learning. It will be provided for 90-100 teachers resulting in a minimum of 90 additional ESL endorsed teachers in northwest Arkansas providing instructional services to ELL students. (GPRA Measure 1.5 & 1.6).

The **project goal** is to 1) Improve the quality of in-service teachers' instructional practices for ELL students in our partnering districts in Northwest Arkansas. Our objectives are to recruit two cohorts of 45-50 in-service teachers from partnering districts to participate in Project RISE coursework and be coached in strategies to improve instruction for ELL students. These teachers will also pass the necessary licensing test for ESL endorsement. At the end of year five, a total of 90-100 in-service teachers will be ESL endorsed. Our second goal is to 2) Improve ELL student achievement. With additional teachers trained in best practices for ELL students, we expect an increase in student classroom achievement and also in state benchmark achievement. Our third goal is to 3) Have program completers advocate for ELL students and families.

The contributions for research on the effect of teacher professional development on student achievement could be ground breaking. Classroom observations will be used to document differences and similarities between classes where teachers were in Project RISE and classes with teachers not trained in ELL strategies. We plan to work with teachers in collecting ELL student achievement data in their classes to document improved teaching practices effect on student learning. Research conducted on the K State model and its replication have shown that it positively impacts teachers' classroom practices in a manner that benefits ELLs and increases ELL achievement. Policy implications are broad. In the future, this model can be delivered across the state utilizing distance learning and impact ELL student achievement across Arkansas.

## **Project RISE-Realizing and Increasing Student Excellence**

### **Section A: Quality of Project Design.**

Our classrooms are experiencing “a steady increase in students who come to school from backgrounds of poverty, as second language learners, or those with special learning needs” (Barnett, 2011). Half (49%) of middle and high school teachers agreed that the learning abilities of their students have become so varied that they can’t teach them effectively (MetLife Survey of the American Teacher, 2008). The U.S. serves more than 5 million English language learners (ELLs) which accounts for 10 percent of the national public school enrollment. “The need for national leadership to effectively address ELLs has become ever more acute, as the numbers and percentages of such students increase and as the failure of education systems to meet their needs becomes more evident (Improving Educational Outcomes for ELLs, Working Group on ELL Policy, 2010).

During the 2010-2011 school year, Arkansas reported 31, 401 ELLs (Arkansas Department of Education Home Language Survey Report, 2011). The majority of ELLs reside in Northwest Arkansas with 19,804 students representing 63% of all ELLs in the state. Springdale Public Schools is the leader with 7960 ELLs accounting for 44% of its total student enrollment and comprises 25% of all ELLs in the state. Bentonville and Fayetteville have 692 and 673 ELLs respectively.

Rural school districts are also experiencing ELL growth. For example, in the last five years, Prairie Grove has experienced a 245% increase in ELL enrollment. Rural educators often serve a dual role, that of English as a Second Language (ESL) classroom teacher and ESL coordinator since they are the only ones holding ESL certification causing them to wear multiple hats and be spread very thin. Pull-out programs which are the least effective way to serve ELLs

(Thomas & Collier, 1997) exist as the norm in rural schools since few teachers are ESL trained. Moreover, during our needs assessment, two rural districts reported that they have been cited by the Office of Civil Rights due to challenges faced by their ESL Program and needed extensive assistance.

Given the need for high quality professional development (PD) for teachers in Northwest Arkansas and building the capacity of rural districts, the University of Arkansas and its collaborating school partners including Springdale, Bentonville, Fayetteville and the rural districts of Prairie Grove, Gravette, and Decatur will work together to increase the number of highly qualified ESL teachers in Northwest Arkansas and raise achievement levels for ELLs. These districts will embrace the challenge of implementing a professional development program designed to improve classroom instruction for ELLs. The districts will assist educators/support staff working with such students to meet high professional standards—including standards for certification and licensure (**Addresses Invitational Priority #1 and #2**). *It is imperative for educators to work together in Realizing and Increasing Student Excellence or to **RISE** to meet the achievement needs of ELLs as we prepare the next generation of leaders for tomorrow's workforce.* Hence, this project is entitled **Project RISE**.

Cultural and linguistic diversity is an increasing reality of social and demographic patterns in public school classrooms. Many school systems, like those targeted for this project, find themselves unable to meet the demands of increasing ELL enrollment. Recruiting and retaining teachers with the appropriate training to address today's classroom diversity takes time and money that has not kept pace with the rapid increase in student diversity. Therefore, 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 students from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds.

The University of Arkansas, Northwest Arkansas ESL Coordinators and local Superintendents have identified in **Table 1** three significant needs shared among educators and policy makers in this region of our state. **The first critical need** demands the targeted improvement of academic achievement and success among ELLs in the targeted high-need schools. This critical need will be addressed by the project via the extended, graduate-level professional development (PD) of in-service teachers toward full ESL Endorsement. This PD will emphasize site-specific dynamics, ELL student assets and learning needs, content learning for ELLs—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 ELLs and integrating common core standards within the model.

**Table 1: Longitudinal (2006-2011) Critical Need for Seven NW Arkansas School Districts**

|                                | Needs  | Total Number                                | Shortages                              | Weaknesses in Services                                 |
|--------------------------------|--|---|--|--|
| Impacted School District       | Percentage Increase in number of identified ELLs | Number of ELL's out of student population   | Percentage of teachers ESL Endorsed.   | % ELLs who <u>met</u> FY 10 State Reading Assessments. |
| Name of District<br>Springdale | <b>+29% increase</b><br><b>44% of students</b>   | <b>7960 out of</b><br><b>18,188 student</b> | <b>25 %</b><br><b>318 out of 1,266</b> | <b>14.69 %</b><br><b>11<sup>th</sup> Graders</b>       |

|                                   |  |                                 |                              |   |
|-----------------------------------|--|---------------------------------|------------------------------|---|
| Name of District<br>Decatur       | <u>+58% increase</u><br>31% of students  | 156 ELL out of<br>Out of 490    | 7%<br>3 out of 45            | No data due to<br>fewer than 10<br>students |
| Name of District<br>Bentonville   | <u>+9% increase</u><br>5% of students    | 692 out of<br>13,060            | Information not<br>available | <u>22.2 %</u><br>11 <sup>th</sup> graders   |
| Name of District<br>Fayetteville  | <u>+0% increase</u><br>7% of students    | 673 ELL out of<br>8566 students | Information not<br>available | <u>50%</u><br>11 <sup>th</sup> graders      |
| Name of District<br>Prairie Grove | <u>+245 % increase</u><br>2% of students | 49 ELL out of<br>1713 students  | 3.2%<br>4 out of 125         | No data due to<br>fewer than 10<br>students |
| Name of District<br>Gravette      | <u>+25 %</u><br>3% of students           | 52 ELL out of<br>1762 students  | Information not<br>available | No data due to<br>fewer than 10<br>students |
| Name of District<br>Farmington    | <u>+4 %increase</u><br>3% of students    | 56 ELL out of<br>2,150 students | 7%<br>11 out of 159          | No data due to<br>fewer than 10<br>students |

A **second compelling need** is to increase the limited number of grade level content teachers holding an ESL endorsement in these high-need districts. 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, professional development grounded in the identified needs and research-based best classroom practices. Planning team members from all participating districts will work together to address the needs identified in the districts, its schools, staff and students. The project’s goal is to implement, evaluate, and disseminate findings about an innovative professional development program that contains quality, research-based supports and services designed to improve the

academic performance of ELLs in grades K-12 in Springdale, Bentonville, Fayetteville, Prairie Grove and Gravette, Farmington, and Decatur schools. This goal will be reached by achieving the following two objectives: 1) Provide ESL endorsement eligible status to a total of 90-100 teachers 2) Train ESL Facilitators in coaching to support the teachers in the project to further build the capacity of ESL support staff during the 5-years of the project.

The following overarching project goal and related program goals and outcomes outline the general professional development 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 RISE** 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 90-100 teachers and support staff to become highly qualified—especially as they teach ELLs 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 90 teachers will participate in PD activities that improve their understanding of the needs of ELLs. **Expected Outcome:** Teachers who complete the professional development will implement in their classrooms effective, research-based strategies that result in high academic achieving ELLs. **Program Objective 2:** A minimum of 90 teachers in the targeted districts will be prepared to add the ESL endorsement to their teaching licenses. **Expected Outcome:** Professional Development that leads to an ESL Endorsement and application of best practices in teaching, as demonstrated through documented observations and research completed by this project. **Program Objective 3:** Project participants will collaborate with others for support and sharing of best practices. **Expected Outcome:** Develop two cadres

of teachers from participating districts to participate in project activities and upon completion become facilitators of school reform and improvement in their respective schools. In addition summer institutes of teachers, especially those in STEM fields, will assist in this effort.

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, the University of Arkansas and the targeted districts will collaborate with KSU to implement the professional development 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<sup>®</sup> ESL/Dual Language Program*. The University of Arkansas has successfully replicated this model through Project Teach Them All. From 1997 to the present, 90 in-service teachers in Springdale Schools have been trained in the *CLASSIC<sup>®</sup>* Program. A recent study in March 2011 confirmed that our replication of the *CLASSIC<sup>®</sup>* Program in Springdale resulted in similar teacher instructional practices as the *CLASSIC<sup>®</sup>* Program in Kansas. Formal classroom observations using the Biography Driven Practices Rubric (adapted from CREDE) in both the original program and replication were used to show similar effects. Teachers in both states were effectively teaching ELLs and their practices paralleled one another's in five areas, Joint Productivity, Language and Literacy Development, Contextualization, Challenging Activities, and Instructional Conversation. The results confirm that the model is replicable and yielding effective instruction for ELLs. Therefore, since the University of Arkansas was successful with the model in the district serving the largest number of ELLs in the state, it is ready to implement the model in other districts.

Kansas State University has agreed and demonstrated, through their attached letter of support, to help University of Arkansas and its targeted schools to adapt the model to address these urgent needs. *CLASSIC*® is a copyrighted acronym for Critically reflective Lifelong Advocacy for Second language learners, Site-specific Innovation, and Cross-cultural competency. The four course framework and sequence serving as the curriculum for the in-service professional development with successful passing of a Praxis exam will lead to an ESL endorsement in Arkansas.

The professional development model will be purposely adapted in such a way that it is individualized for project participants and will also be grounded in the latest theory/research of best practice in the field. The best way to demonstrate these effective links between the KSU *CLASSIC*® 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 professional learning teams. Such collaborations provide a critical nucleus for school-wide reform to better meet the needs of ELLs {*Addresses GPRA Performance Measure [GPM] 1.5&1.6*}. 2) ***Available, accessible, and adaptable*** – The *CLASSIC*® Program offers participants available, accessible, and adaptable professional development 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 ELL needs in their schools *{Addresses GPM Performance Measure #1.5-1.6}*. For each course, students receive: (a) An intensive on-site initiating session where faculty explain and discuss course curricula, materials, texts, content, and engage in two to three activities and intended outcomes; (b) A series of eight instructional DVDs, which participants view in professional learning communities of three to five teachers according to their own schedule where each DVD-based professional development seminar is followed by a series of post-seminar activities which prompt school-based adaptations of content; (c) Facilitation in the completion of a course project which participant teachers appropriately adapt to reflect school needs in the particular subject area; (d) Technology-based feedback loops for instructional support [including the *Project Teach Them All* Webpage, E-mail, List Serve, Blackboard Learn<sup>®</sup>, Real-time Text Messaging, Elluminate and Integrity.] throughout the term of the course; (e) Coaching sessions-where each participant is coached once per semester for three consecutive semesters and (f) 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. 3) **Capable of fostering linkages among practitioners** – The CLASSIC<sup>®</sup> Program will foster such *linkages* through program design emphasizing: (a) collaborative groups, and (b) technology-based collaboration networks.

4) **Relevant and compatible** – The CLASSIC<sup>®</sup> Program offers project participants relevant and compatible professional development 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 ELLs 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 long-standing contact with linguistic diversity and advocacy skills training to safeguard the rights of EL students and their families. 5) **Of high quality** *The CLASSIC<sup>®</sup> 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<sup>®</sup> Program*. 6) **Reinforcing in the message it transmits** – The *CLASSIC<sup>®</sup> Program* offers educators professional development that is reinforcing in its message. It does so by reaching participants through a variety of instructional and learning venues. In **Project RISE**, reinforcing messages will also be strengthened via collaboration networks facilitated by district ESL Facilitators and the program Research Assistant. These collaborating networks will enable: (a) the sharing of course products [lesson plans, et al.] among state educators; (b) collaborations on dilemmas of (rural-urban) practice with ELLs; (c) participant’s utilization of research and information provided electronically by KSU and University of Arkansas, and (d) participant use of emergent aforementioned technologies for networking. 7) **Promotion of sustained interactivity** – Ultimately, the *CLASSIC<sup>®</sup> 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<sup>®</sup> PD program* is comprised of the following IHE courses and curricula:

- 1) **Second Language Methods** [MTH: 3 Hours] Details approaches, methods, strategies, and techniques for ELL students (second language learners) in the public schools, including strategies for curricular/instructional adaptation, and advocacy for programs, approaches, and students.
- 2) **Second Language Assessment** [AST: 3 Hours] Details the dynamics of appropriate

assessment practices for ELLs, including key issues related 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) and the state's performance exam. 3) **Second Language Acquisition** [LGA: 3 Hours] Prepares educators to excel in the Linguistics, Sociolinguistics, and Second Language Acquisition (SLA) 4) **Teaching People of Other Cultures** [MCE: 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.

**Reflective Coaching** In order to facilitate implementation of learning during professional development, reflective instructional, coaching will be utilized to guide accommodative instruction in grade-level classrooms and content areas. Specifically, coaches will teach participants how to reinforce and elaborate upon concepts and strategies taught in the sheltered instruction aspects of the Methods, Assessment, and Linguistics and Culture courses of the *CLASSIC*® *Program Model*. Coaching is key to the transfer of new learning (Joyce & Showers, 2003; Basile, Olson & Nathenson-Mejia, 2003). Reflective coaching will utilize the Biography Driven (BD) Protocol measure which is an extension of the Standards Performance Continuum classroom observation instrument. This measure reflects five standards of effective pedagogy for ELs- 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 ELLs. In Years 2 and 4 of the 5-year project, University of Arkansas will organize and deliver BD Coaching Institutes for up to 24 ESL facilitators. Beginning BDP Institutes for all project educators and for University of Arkansas and district faculty unfamiliar with the methods will be

presented as needed. These Institutes will focus on the classroom-based development, maximization, and use of effective strategies for learning for ELLs—especially for secondary teachers in the areas of math and science who work with secondary-level ELLs {Addresses Competitive Preference Priority # 3}. Regionally and nationally recognized consultants will be employed by Project RISE 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-ELL science and math classrooms and in the preparation of teachers for these classrooms.

The curriculum of the *CLASSIC*® Program and the design of **Project RISE** reflect the most up-to-date theory, research, and best practice standards in the field. The curriculum standards incorporate Arkansas Department of Education, ESOL, NCATE, TESOL, NBPTS, and CREDE standards. 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 RISE** 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 grounded in the new Common Core Standards for ELLs. The activities 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 professional development activities in two 2.5-year cycles. The first cycle of the Project [C1] will endorse a cadre of 45-50 teachers in the identified school districts in ESL Education. This first cadre will

then be assessed to measure program effectiveness *{Addresses GPRA Performance Measure #1.1}*. Data from post-training assessments will be collected, analyzed, and documented for program refinement *{Addresses Competitive Preference #2; GPRA Performance Measures 1.5 and 1.6, #2 & #3}*; 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 45-50 teachers. Ultimately, a total of 90-100 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 ELL students will follow that project cycle. (Competitive Preference Priority 2)

| Project Cycles Table 2 – Project RISE |                                       |     |     |     |     |                    |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|--------------------|
| <i>Cycles by Course and Semester</i>  | PD Courses/ Assessment Implementation |     |     |     |     |                    |
| Semester of Proposed Completion       | MTH                                   | AST | LGA | MCE | BDC | BDC<br>&/or<br>PTA |
| Fall, 2011                            | C1                                    |     |     |     |     |                    |
| Spring, 2012                          |                                       | C1  |     |     |     |                    |
| Fall, 2012                            |                                       |     | C1  |     |     |                    |
| Spring, 2013                          |                                       |     |     | C1  |     |                    |
| Fall, 2013                            | C2                                    |     |     |     | C1  |                    |
| Spring, 2014                          |                                       | C2  |     |     |     |                    |

|  |  |  |    |    |    |    |
|--|--|--|----|----|----|----|
| Fall, 2014   |  |  | C2 |    |    |    |
| Spring, 2015   |  |  |    | C2 |    |    |
| Fall, 2015   |  |  |    |    | C2 |    |
| Spring, 2016   |  |  |    |    |    | C2 |
| <b>Legend:</b> MTH–Methods; AST–Assessment; MCE–Multicultural; LGA–Linguistics;<br>BDC–Biography Driven Coaching; PTA–Practicum/Core CurriculumC1–Cycle 1;<br>C2–Cycle 2 |  |  |    |    |    |    |

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 ELLs and maximize these students' achievement potentials. In this way, each cadre of educators will, through site-specific activities in each of the courses and through collaboration and networking, initiate plan and implement for further restructuring. In particular, the second cycle cadre of participants to complete the professional development of the *CLASSIC*<sup>®</sup> Program will increase the capacity necessary to institutionalize best practices for ELLs. This 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.**

In **Project RISE**, teachers' capacity building for classroom diversity will be grounded in the *CLASSIC*<sup>®</sup> Model (Murry & Herrera, 1999; Herrera, Murry, & Perez, 2005, Herrera, 2008) professional development. Universities and school districts in four states have utilized this model

for capacity building among school educators of ELLs with over 2,500 school educators. Much of the success of this professional development is attributable the model's *core emphasis* on professional learning communities and coaching. Capacity building for *critically reflective practice* (validity testing of background-based assumptions in practice) is also a cornerstone for CLASSIC<sup>®</sup>. 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.

**Section B: Quality of Project Personnel.**

To ensure compliance with the **U.S. Department of Education's General Education Provisions Act (GEPA) Section 427**, University of Arkansas, the Northwest Arkansas School Districts the Project Director and Project Manager will establish and maintain a close working relationship to assist participants who would benefit from **Project RISE**.

There are no barriers that might prevent teachers from participating in **Project RISE**. Moreover, the University of Arkansas is an affirmative action institution, and the College of Education and Health Professions in adherence with the procedure and intent of the University policy.

**Principal Investigator- Janet Penner-Williams, (Ed.D)** Dr. Penner-Williams is an assistant professor of curriculum and instruction and the assistant dean for academic affairs in the College of Education and Health Professions at the University of Arkansas. Her research interests include teacher professional development especially in the area of culturally and linguistically diverse student populations and assessment of higher education programs as it

pertains to teacher success in the field. She was previously principal of an elementary school in Texas which had a bilingual program. She has also supervised bilingual/ESL programs district wide.

**(2) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.**

**Project Manager/Co-Principal Investigator-Dr. Diana Gonzales Worthen.** Dr. Gonzales Worthen is the Director of **Project Teach Them All** in the College of Education and Health Professions. She is a Holmes Scholar and has a Ph.D. in Curriculum and Instruction (Concentration: Secondary Education, ESL and Educational Leadership) from the University of Arkansas, a Master of Arts in Teaching in Science Education from the University of Texas at Dallas and a B.S. in Biology from the University of Houston. Dr. Gonzales Worthen taught science in junior high and high school for 14 years including sheltered ESL biology and was a finalist for the National Science Foundation Presidential Award for Excellence in Mathematics and Science Teaching in Arkansas. Prior to becoming Director of Project Teach Them All, she served as Assistant ESL Curriculum Supervisor for Springdale Schools for five years. She has extensive experience coaching teachers of ELLs and has conducted numerous professional development trainings in SIOP, cooperative learning, ESL strategies and Latino parent involvement.

**Research Assistant-To Be Determined.** The primary roles and responsibilities include, but are not limited to: assisting with data collection, recording of classroom observations, transcribing of observation notes, compiling classroom observation data into spreadsheets, working with partnership schools in accessing benchmark data on ELL students with links to teachers, editing research drafts, and other duties as needed to ensure success of **Project RISE**.

**Research Consultant-**The National Office for Research and Measurement of Evaluation

Systems (NORMES) which is located at the University of Arkansas will collect and analyze student achievement data from the school districts participating in **Project RISE**. NORMES is responsible for compiling, maintaining and reporting student achievement for the Arkansas Department of Education. NORMES has the ability to access state benchmarks and do statistical analysis on the data. NORMES will coordinate with the external evaluator, Dr. Fanning who will oversee the entire evaluation plan including both quantitative and qualitative data. Dr. Fanning will insure that the project collects data needed to show achievement of its goals and objectives and will aid in analysis of the data in regards to project strengths and weaknesses.

**External Evaluator-Dr. Bob Fanning.** Dr. Fanning will design and aid in completion of the annual performance report. 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.

**Section C: Quality of the Management Plan.**

To ensure maximum efficacy and efficiency, the management plan includes three 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/Primary Investigator

[PD/PI] will administer the project and will coordinate efforts between the graduate teacher preparation programs at University of Arkansas and the participants. A Project Manager/Primary Investigator [PM/PI] will teach the courses, coach, supervise participant experiences, conduct coaching training institutes, provide for specialized counseling, advising, and related support services not already assumed by the PD/PI, 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 PM/PI demonstrated in **Table 2: Project RISE: 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 to: Prepare teachers and support staff to become highly qualified—especially as they teach ELLs effectively in integrated, inclusive settings that focus on achieving and mastering the new Common Core State Standards.

**Program Objective 1:** *Over the course of this project, a minimum of 90-100 teachers will participate in professional development activities that improve their understanding of the needs of ELLs.*

| Table 2: Project RISE: Management Plan Matrix                         |                |                                       |   |
|---|----------------|---------------------------------------|---|
| Program Goal Activities 1   | Timeline       | Personnel                             | Milestones  |
| 1. Advertise program and recruit, screen, select and orient teachers. | Summer, Winter | PD/PI,<br>PM/PI,<br>District<br>staff | Selected staff recruited each year                    |
| 2. Schedule classes according to phase-in                             | Summer, Winter | PD/PI                                 | Schedule is established and follows expected phase-in |

| process   |              |   | schedule  |
|---|--------------|---|---|
| 3. CLASSIC <sup>®</sup> program courses and trainings offered during each fall and spring semester at University of Arkansas, from the fall of 2011 through the spring of 2016, comprising two complete cycles. | Fall, Spring | PD/PI,<br>PM/PI,<br>KSU<br>faculty  | Courses completed according to phase-in schedule for each cohort of teachers. Endorsement of teachers completed at the end of 2.5 years of study. |
| 4. Offer Summer Institutes in Years 2 and 4   | Summer       | PM/PI,<br>PD/PI   | Summer BD Coaching and BDP institutes completed.  |
| 5. Assess performance and provide feedback to staff for quality control.  | Every course | PM/PI,<br>PD/PI, RA<br>Project<br>Participants  | Assessment results on file and project activities refined as a result of input.   |
| 6. Analyze impact of activities and prepare report  | Annually     | PM/PI,<br>PD/PI, RA<br>District<br>staff,<br>External<br>evaluator,<br>Research<br>Consultant | Completed research components and analyzed data to determine impact.  |

|                                   |         |                 |   |
|-----------------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|
| 7. Monitoring budget expenditures | Ongoing | PD/PI,<br>PM/PI | Budget monitored and funds expended yearly as expected. |
|-----------------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|

PD/PI=Project Director and Primary Investigator; PM/PI=Project Manager and Co-Primary Investigator; RA= Research Assistant

**Program Objective 2:** *A minimum of 90-100 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 <sup>®</sup> program cycle will be completed twice from the fall 2011 to spring 2016       | Fall, Spring | PM/PI,<br>PD/PI                    | Completed program cycles with expected number of teachers completing coursework successfully.      |
| 2. Serve as a liaison between the school districts, the college, and the Arkansas Department of Education | Ongoing      | PD/PI,<br>PM/PI,<br>District staff | Liaison activities completed with successful coordination and addressing PD needs of the district. |

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

| Program Objective<br>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 Learn™ online discussion boards and collaboration tools). | July-Dec.2011 | PM/PI,<br>PD/PI,<br>District staff | Summer institutes completed.<br>Documented and coordinated activities of best practices on file. |
| 2. Implement and maintain communication process.  | Ongoing       | PD/PI,<br>PM/PI, KSU<br>faculty    | Communication process identified and maintained throughout project life cycle.                   |
| 3. Facilitate conference attendance for participants.   | Annually      | PM/PI                              | Conference facilitation completed and attendance record on file.                                 |
| 4. Evaluate, analyze and  | Each spring   | PD/PI,                             | Evaluation and research  |

|                                      |  |  |  |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| report findings to key stakeholders. | with completion of Annual Performance Report | PM/PI, RA, participants, district staff, External Evaluator, Research Consultant | 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/PI (.10 FTE), and a PM/PI (1.0 FTE) will collaborate and guide project activities toward the outstanding completion of the PD with participants. The PD/PI 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 ensuring quality project management. The Office of Research and Sponsored Programs and Accounting will provide assistance in fiscal management and reporting. The PM/PI will teach the courses, coach and supervise participant experiences, conduct coaching training institutes, provide for specialized counseling, advising and related support services for project participants. The PM/PI 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.

The PD/PI, Dr. Janet Penner-Williams 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, 5) coordinate the development of all project reports, continuation proposals, and required documents. The PM/PI, Dr. Diana Gonzales Worthen will: 1) oversee the daily planning /implementation of the PD 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 University of Arkansas. **Table 3** provides commitment of time information for key project personnel.

**Table 3: Person Loading Chart by Time in Day(s) By Person Responsible**

| Project Activities                 | PI        | PM         | RA         | EE       | RC       |
|------------------------------------|-----------|------------|------------|----------|----------|
| Staff/Establish Program Components | 5 days    |            |            |          |          |
| Research/Prepare Materials         | 3         | 4          | 5          |          | 2        |
| Select participants                | 7         | 3          |            |          |          |
| Develop program                    | 2         | 10         |            |          |          |
| Implement program                  |           | 200        |            |          |          |
| Data Collection/Process Dev.       | 1         | 3          | 52         | 5        | 2        |
| Data Analysis                      | 2         | 4          | 52         | 3        | 3        |
| Dissemination                      | 3         | 2          | 4          |          |          |
| <b>Totals</b>                      | <b>23</b> | <b>226</b> | <b>113</b> | <b>6</b> | <b>7</b> |

PD/PI=Project Director/Primary Investigator; PM/PI=Project Manager/Primary Investigator;

RA=Research Assistant EE=External Evaluator RC=Research Consultant

## 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 ELL student academic achievement. **Project RISE** 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 RISE** will systematically target, monitor progress against and achieve the expectations of GPRA and OELA evaluation criteria. Project 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. Moreover, **Project RISE** will collaborate with the National Office for Research, Measurement & Evaluation Systems (NORMES) to obtain and analyze student achievement data with the participating school districts during the five year program.

Process data collection is an important formative 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 professional development program contributed most to improving instruction or changing patterns of instruction to support/accommodate the learning of ELLs 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 professional development activities has 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 ELLs who had program teachers 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 ELL 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 and objectives, and was it cost effective. Multiple measures and procedures used by the project will include, but 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, learning 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) audio and video-recordings of pre and post coaching conferences and participant observations via coaching observations of classroom instruction; 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 ELLs, 5) documentation of needs, program descriptions and activities; instructional methods, techniques, and materials to implement the goals and objectives of the project; 6) the coordination between the Project Investigators, External Evaluator and Research Evaluator

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 ELLs? To determine preparedness to implement practices as a measure of systemic education reform in rural schools, a self-assessment inventory, Concerns Based Adoption Model (Conway & Clark, 2003) will be adapted and administered that focuses on indicators of implementation. 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 ELLs. 2)

How successful has the professional development component been in increasing the ability to support the improvement of academic performance and results for ELLs? 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 ELLs? To determine success, anecdotal information will be collected through constituency focus groups and summarized using a trend analysis that clusters substantial trends. In addition, learning 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 ELLs? To determine success, classroom observations using the Biography Driven Instruction rubric based on CREEDE will be used and student achievement scores for ELLs with teachers in the program 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 ELLs? 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 each semester 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 RISE**. 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 RISE** achieving its objectives, delivering quality services to students and managing its resources. Since the project will be fiscally housed at the University of Arkansas, 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 RISE** 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 ELL student performance over the course of the CLASSIC<sup>®</sup> program using a standardized measure of change. We 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.

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. Members of the EPT will include: an External Evaluator, the Project Director/Primary Investigator, Project Manager/Primary Investigator, a NORMES representative the District representatives, two project participants

(current or former) 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 and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.**

**Quantitative Evaluation Criteria:** Effective evaluation processes and other related criteria used with **Project RISE** will employ and target scientifically-based quantitative measures to determine the efficacy in meeting expected outcomes. As such, the University of Arkansas 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 RISE** 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 5: Quantitative Evaluation Measures of Project RISE |                                |   |  |
|---|--------------------------------|---|--|
| Program Strategy.   | Implement.                     | PT Progress/Outcomes  | PT Effectiveness   |
|   | <i>Address. GPM, Part 1, 3</i> | <i>Address. GPM, Part 1, 3</i><br><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<br>Achievement Tests, CBMs,<br>Criterion Ref. Assessments |
| BDP pre scores  |                                | BDP post scores   |  |
| PT Prgrm. Evl. Surveys                                    |                                | PT GPA by Course  |  |
|   |                                | Rank order surveys of program components                          |  |
|   |                                | PT PRAXIS Score   |  |

PT: Participant; GPM: 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 incorporate 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 RISE** 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 6** depicts data to be collected and evaluated.

| <b>Table 6: Quantitative Evaluation Measures of Project RISE</b> |   |                                  |
|--|---|----------------------------------|
| Program Implement. Strategy                                      | PT Progress/Outcomes  | PT Effectiveness                 |
| <i>Address. GPM, Part 1, 3</i>                                   | <i>Address. GPM, Part 1, 3</i><br><i>Addresses QPM, Parts 1,2</i> | <i>Addresses QPM, Parts 1, 2</i> |
| Participant BDP Observation                                      | IHE, District, and Participant Coursework Records                 | Participant Shadowing            |
| Semi-structured Interviews                                       | Participant Observation during coaching sessions                  | Admin. Interviews                |
| Quasi-structured Surveys   | PT, Dist., & IHE Documents  | Dist & Admin. Documents          |
| Learning Logs  | Pre- and post- coaching conferences                               | 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 (Strauss & Corbin, 1997); 2) Etic Coding, according to the CLASSIC Model as a substantive Framework (Mitchell, 2006); 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 bi-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 PD/PI, PM/PI, 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 in-service teacher completers who complete State and/or local certification, licensure, or endorsement requirement in English language learner instruction as a result of the program. 2) The percentage of in-service teacher completers who are providing instructional services to English language learners. 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.