

National Professional Development Program Executive Summary (Suggested Template)

1. Key Project Goals and Objectives, including goals and objectives that support the STEM priority:

Project SPELL (Sustainable Practices for English Language Learners) offers sustained professional development activities to improve instruction for ELL students and assist district personnel to meet high professional standards. The project utilizes a professional development model that maximizes job-embedded professional learning through Professional Learning Communities (PLCs), university coursework specifically designed to scaffold in-service teachers' prior knowledge with research-based strategies, pre-service teachers placed in classrooms with ESOL endorsed mentors (classroom teachers), and district-based professional development coaches who provide on-going support. *Project SPELL* emphasizes the use of ESOL strategies in the areas of Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM). The collaboration between Western Oregon University, Salem-Keizer School District and Woodburn School District will reach almost 20% of all ELL students in Oregon. Project SPELL's goals and objectives are as follows:

Goal 1: To refine and expand the current ESOL and ESOL/Bilingual endorsement for in-service teachers. Working in collaboration with two school districts which include the second largest school district in the state and the school district with the highest percentage of English Language Learners, the project's outcomes for Goal 1 include (a) 140 licensed teachers with ESOL endorsement; and (b) 75% of licensed teacher completers providing instructional services to ELL students.

Objective 1a: Development and implementation of an advisory council to refine the current model. In order to address the needs of the districts and the university, an advisory council will be established to provide guidance and assess periodic performance of the overall project.

Objective 1b: Expand district-based coaching component. The provision of on-going professional development after completion of an ESOL endorsement is critical. District-based coaching will include modeling of research-based instructional methods, lesson/unit planning sessions, effective observations, and refinement of teaching based on K-12 student learning.

Objective 1c: Development and implementation of Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) in the school districts focusing on English Language Learners. PLCs will be developed in each district to accentuate job-embedded learning for teachers in instructional methods for STEM content in conjunction with ESOL strategies. Action research projects highlighting best practices will result from the PLCs.

Objective 1d: Development and implementation of ESOL STEM Conference. This end of the year conference will provide an opportunity for in-service and pre-service teachers to share their action research cases and to interact with one another.

Objective 1e: Implementation of the model. Professional development models centered around short workshops are known to have little impact on teachers' practice. Project SPELL will implement a model for sustained professional development that allows for varying levels of involvement, provides flexibility and works easily within the realities of public schools. With the guidance of the advisory council, Project SPELL will include the provision of endorsement courses, district-based coaching, PLCs, and the sharing of action research in a sustained professional development model.

Goal 2: To provide ESOL or ESOL/Bilingual endorsement for pre-service teachers completing their clinical experiences in the two partner school districts. The project's outcomes for Goal 2 include (a) 160 pre-service teacher completers receive ESOL endorsement; (b) 50% of pre-service teacher completers provide instructional services to ELL students within one year out of graduation; and (c) 70% of pre-service teacher completers provide instructional services to ELL students within three years out of graduation.

Objective 2a: Select and place pre-service teachers in Salem-Keizer School District.

Objective 2b: Select and place pre-service teacher in Woodburn School District.

Objective 2c: Assess number of pre-service participants providing instructional services to students one year out and three years out from graduation.

Goal 3: To improve PK-12 ELL student learning and achievement through data-based decision-making. Project SPELL is based on a model of professional development that is focused on learning rather than teaching. Progress and achievement of ELL students within classrooms taught by program completers will be monitored both in English language development and in the STEM content areas. Project outcomes for this goal include (a) 80% of ELL students in program completers classrooms show improvement in language ability as evidenced through formative, classroom-based assessments; (b) 80% of ELL students in program completers classrooms show increased achievement in science and math as evidenced through formative, classroom-based assessments; (c) 60% of ELL students in program completers classrooms meet or exceed OAKS benchmarks in science and mathematics; and (d) 50% of ELL students in program completers classrooms show progress in ELPA levels.

2. Summary of Progress made to date:

During this first year of the grant, we have been able to successfully accomplish all activities outlined in our initial proposal.

We have developed and implemented the **SPELL Project Advisory Council**, which includes members from Western Oregon University (WOU) and the Salem-Keizer and Woodburn School Districts. According to the initial project proposal, the advisory committee would consist of 17 members: the Salem-Keizer School District Coordinator, the five Salem-Keizer coaches, the Woodburn School District Coordinator, the three Woodburn coaches, the Principal Investigator/Project Director, the WOU Project Coordinator, the WOU ESOL Content Specialist, the Science Content Specialist, the Mathematics Content Specialist, the Technology Specialist and the External Evaluator. The initial project proposal indicated that this advisory committee would meet monthly during this first year. However, it quickly became apparent to us that this plan would be unfeasible and impractical. Instead of monthly meetings with the full group of 17 members, we held targeted meetings with subgroups of the advisory council on the WOU campus and in the Salem-Keizer and Woodburn districts. The smaller meetings allowed us to focus on issues that concerned the particular districts. In addition, we took advantage of online communication and held numerous discussions via email to increase our effectiveness.

At the **Salem-Keizer School District**, we have delivered ESOL endorsement courses to a cohort of 20 licensed participants. **We are now in the process of offering the fifth in a series of graduate courses leading to the ESOL or ESOL/bilingual endorsement. With additional coursework being offered during the summer months, we anticipate that most participants will have completed the requirements for the endorsement by fall of 2012.** These participants have also attended STEM workshops delivered by WOU STEM content faculty. In addition, we have identified a team of five instructional coaches who will start implementing the coaching model in Salem-Keizer next year (2012-2013). Together with WOU faculty, the coaches have been working on designing and developing specific coaching activities, including a plan for effective data collection.

At the **Woodburn School District**, we have been working on planning the delivery of ESOL endorsement courses starting next year (2012-2013). Planning activities have included coordination with the district liaison and the superintendent. We have devised a schedule of classes, and have identified course instructors who will be delivering the classes on site. We have met with the instructors to discuss specific curricular matters related to each course. In-service participants who will comprise the first cohort have also been identified. We have held an informational meeting for the cohort members to give them an overview of project activities for next year as well as subsequent years.

In the subsequent pages of this report, we include specific details about this year's project activities summarized above.

3. Description of how the project plans to measure the following outcomes:

Participant reaction to training

- Course evaluations administered at the end of each class (numerical and open-ended questions)
- Program evaluations administered at the end of all coursework (numerical and open-ended questions)
- STEM workshop evaluations (numerical and open-ended questions)
- Coaching evaluations (numerical and open-ended questions)
- PLC evaluations (numerical and open-ended questions)
- Evaluations of yearly ESOL STEM Conference (numerical and open-ended questions)

Participant learning

- Course grades
- Scores on ESOL ORELA or ESOL NES exams

Participant application of knowledge and skills

- Scores on ESOL class observation protocol (sub-scores and overall scores; evaluative comments by supervisor/observer)
- Teacher Work Sample (sub-scores and overall scores; lesson plans, narratives in reflective and contextual components)

Completer effectiveness in instructional setting

- Scores on WOU ESOL observation tool (sub-scores and overall scores; evaluative comments by supervisor/observer)
- Teacher Work Sample (sub-scores and overall scores; lesson plans, narratives in reflective and contextual components)
- Action research projects

Impact on K-12 student achievement

- ELPA scores of ELLs in participants' classrooms
- OAKS scores for Math and Science of ELLs in participants' classrooms
- Formative and classroom-based assessments measuring achievement in language ability and in science and math content
- Teacher Work Sample (sub-scores and overall scores; lesson plans, narratives in reflective and contextual components)
- Action research projects

Organizational change, LEA/IHE capacity building

- Monthly reports, quarterly reports and yearly reports will be produced for the administrative team, the advisory council and for federal reporting purposes. Periodic analysis of these reports will permit assessment of progress in achieving project outcomes, and determination of any modifications that need to be made.
- The Goal Attainment Scale will be used to determine if: (a) timelines are being met, (b) milestones are met, (c) resources need to be re- allocated, (d) shifts need to be made in instruction and/or coaching, or (e) there is such a shift from the intended outcome that communication with the Project Officer is necessary.

PARTICIPANT TYPE	GPRA TARGETS*			
	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
Pre-service participants served	20	30	30	30
Pre-service completers	19	28	28	28
Pre-service completers state and locally certified	19	28	28	28
Pre-service completers from the previous reporting year placed in instructional settings with LEP students	0	15	15	15
Paraprofessional participants served				
Paraprofessional completers				
Paraprofessional completers who met state and/or local qualifications				
In-service participants served in programs of study designed to lead to certification	27	27	27	27
In-service completers in programs of study designed to lead to certification	24	24	24	24
In-service completers in programs of study designed to lead to certification who completed certification	15	15	15	15
In-service participants served in programs not designed to lead to certification				
In-service completers in programs not designed to lead to certification				
In-service completers who are providing instruction to LEP students (in programs designed and not designed to lead to certification)				

*For participant types you plan to serve in years 2-5 but, do not expect completers in a particular year, place a "0" in the completer(s) cell for the year(s) in which you do not expect completers.

A. NPD GPRA Data

Item A1 data table

A1.Pre-service program participants		
a. Does this project serve pre-service program participants? If “No”, skip to item A2.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	Target- Year 1	Actual
Pre-service participants/completers served in the NPD program during the reporting year		
b. Number of participants served	0	
c. Number of completers	0	
d. Number of completers who completed the program of study and were state and/or locally certified, licensed, or endorsed in LEP instruction	0	
<i>Note: If a zero was entered for item A1c, then enter “no completers” (“NC”) for item A1d.</i>		
Pre-service completers who completed the program of study the year prior to the reporting year		
e. Number of completers prior to the reporting year.		
f. Number of completers who were followed after program completion to determine placement status within 1 year of program completion.		
<i>Note: If a zero was entered for item A1e, then enter “NC” for item A1f.</i>		
g. Number of completers who were followed by the grantee, and were placed in instructional settings serving LEP students within 1 year of program completion.		
<i>Note: If a zero was entered for item A1e, then enter “NC” for item A1g.</i>		
Pre-service completers who completed the program of study 3 years prior to the reporting year		
<i>Note: Grantees should only report items A1h, A1i, and A1j in the Final Performance Report. Grantees should not provide target values for these items--only actual data.</i>		
h. Number of completers		
i. Number of completers who were followed to determine provision of instructional services to LEP students during the reporting year.		
<i>Note: If a zero was entered for item A1h, then enter “NC” for item A1i.</i>		
	Target	Actual
j. Number of completers who were followed by the grantee, and are providing instructional services to LEP students.		
<i>Note: If a zero was entered for item A1h, then enter “NC” for item A1j.</i>		

Explanation of Progress (Use as many pages as necessary).

- No pre-service participants are served in Year 1 of the project. Pre-service participants will be served in Years 2-5.

Item A2 data table

A2.Paraprofessionals		
a. Does this project serve paraprofessional participants who are training to work as paraprofessionals and not working toward teacher credentials? If “No”, skip to item A3.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
	Target- Year 1	Actual
Paraprofessionals served in the NPD program during the reporting year		
b. Number of participants served		
c. Number of completers		
d. Number of completers who met state and/or local qualifications for paraprofessionals working with LEP students.		
<i>Note: If a zero was entered for item A2c, then enter “NC” for item A2d.</i>		

Explanation of Progress (*Use as many pages as necessary*).

- The project does not serve paraprofessionals.

Item A3 data table

A3.In-service participants		
a. Does this project serve in-service participants? If “No”, skip to Section B.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
b. Does this project have a program of study that is designed to lead in-service participants to state and/or local certification, licensure, or endorsement in LEP instruction? If, “No”, skip to A3f.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
In-service participants/completers in a program of study that is designed to lead participants to state and/or local certification, licensure, or endorsement in LEP instruction during the reporting year		
	Target-Year 1	Actual
c. Number of participants served	17	
d. Number of completers	16	
e. Number of completers who obtained state and/or local certification, licensure, or endorsement in LEP instruction as a result of the program. <i>Note: If a zero was entered for item A3d, then enter “NC” for item A3e.</i>	10	
f. Does this project have a program of study for in-service participants that is not designed to lead to state and/or local certification, licensure, or endorsement in LEP instruction? If, “No”, skip to A3i.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
In-service participants/completers in a program of study that is not designed to lead participants to state and/or local certification, licensure, or endorsement in LEP instruction during the reporting year		
	Target-Year 1	Actual
g. Number of participants served		
h. Number of completers		
For all in-service completers during the reporting year(all means those in programs of study designed to lead to certification as well as those that are not designed to lead to certification)		
	Target-Year 1	Actual
i. Number of completers who are providing instructional services to LEP students. (This number would include those who completed a program of study that is designed to lead to state and/or local certification, licensure, or endorsement in LEP instruction as well as those who completed a program of study that is not designed to lead to state and/or local certification, licensure, or endorsement in LEP instruction).	0	

Explanation of Progress (*Use as many pages as necessary*).

We are serving a total of 20 licensed participants in Year 1. Out of these 20 participants, 17 of them provide direct instructional services to K-12 students and therefore meet the grant’s definition of “in-service participants.” The others have roles such as instructional coaches for the district and special education administration.

Out of the 17 in-service participants, we anticipate that 16 participants will have completed all the requirements for the ESOL (or ESOL/Bilingual) endorsement program (including coursework, testing and practicum requirements) by the end of August, 2012. The last remaining participant currently does not have ELLs in her classroom, so she cannot complete the practicum requirements within her own

classroom. We do offer an opportunity for participants to complete the practicum requirements during the summer; however, for personal reasons, she cannot complete the practicum during the summer either. Therefore, she plans to finish the practicum requirements and complete the program during the 2012-2013 academic year.

Out of the 16 program completers, it is difficult to estimate how many will add the ESOL (or ESOL/Bilingual) endorsement to their licenses before the end of Year 1. Oregon's TSPC (Teacher Standards and Practices Commission) charges a fee every time an individual applies for a change in a teaching license. Many teachers decide to wait until their licenses are due for renewal to add their endorsement at the same time so they can pay the fee only once. We therefore estimate that 10 out of our 16 program completers will obtain the ESOL endorsement in Year 1.

Out of the 17 in-service participants currently in the program, we estimate that 13 of them will provide direct instructional services to ELL students in Year 2.

B. NPD Project Goals and Objectives (Use as many pages as necessary).

Do not report data for *GPR*A measures in this section.

Project Objective:

	Quantitative Data					
	Target			Actual Performance Data		
	Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
1.a. Performance Measure		/	%		/	%
1.a. Establish Advisory Committee						
Advisory members attend annual meetings		14/17	80%			

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data, Data Resulting from Experimental or Quasi-Experimental Design, and Data Collection Information) for the APR, CDR, and Final Performance Report. (Use as many pages as necessary).

- Assessment(s) used and timelines.
- Any information that would help to explain the information given under this measure.
- An explanation if progress was not made and steps for addressing the issue.
- How data and information were used to make improvements in the project.

Goal 1: To refine and expand the current ESOL and ESOL/Bilingual endorsement model for in-service teachers.

1.a. Establish Advisory Committee:

- Advisory committee guides the ongoing development of the project.
 - meetings will occur face to face in person or via Internet/phone conference.
- Instruments, data collection methods and schedules, and performance on assessments guide the progress of the project: System for data collection analysis is established and reviewed by Advisory Committee annually (and as needed via internet and telephone correspondence).

According to the initial project proposal, the advisory committee would consist of 17 members: the Salem-Keizer School District Coordinator, the five Salem-Keizer coaches, the Woodburn School District Coordinator, the three Woodburn coaches, the Principal Investigator/Project Director,

the WOU Project Coordinator, the WOU ESOL Content Specialist, the Science Content Specialist, the Mathematics Content Specialist, the Technology Specialist and the External Evaluator. The initial project proposal indicated that this advisory committee would meet monthly during this first year. However, it quickly became apparent to us that this plan would be unfeasible and impractical. Instead of monthly meetings with the full group of 17 members, we held targeted meetings with subgroups of the advisory council on the WOU campus and in the Salem-Keizer and Woodburn districts. The smaller meetings allowed us to focus on issues that concerned the particular districts. In addition, we took advantage of online communication and held numerous discussions via email to increase our effectiveness.

In future years of the grant, we have decided to continue with this system of smaller meetings with targeted subgroups on an as-needed basis. In addition, we will schedule a yearly formal meeting with the full Advisory Committee (all 17 members) once a year in the spring, to coincide with our ESOL STEM Conference on the WOU campus.

The table below displays a schedule of targeted meetings which were held with subgroups of the Advisory Committee during Year 1:

Month	Advisory Committee Members in Attendance	Purpose of Meeting
September 2012	Principal Investigator/Project Director, WOU Project Coordinator, WOU ESOL Content Specialist, External Evaluator	Overall project planning
October 2012	WOU Project Coordinator, WOU ESOL Content Specialist, External Evaluator, Salem-Keizer School District Coordinator	Implementation details and fiscal discussion in Salem-Keizer
November 2012	Principal Investigator/Project Director, WOU Project Coordinator, External Evaluator, Woodburn School District Coordinator	Implementation details and fiscal discussion in Woodburn
December 2012	Principal Investigator/Project Director, WOU ESOL Content Specialist	Discussion of data collection needs
January 2012	Principal Investigator/Project Director, WOU ESOL Content Specialist, Science Content Specialist, Mathematics Content Specialist, Technology Specialist	Discussion of infusion of STEM content and data collection related to STEM component
February 2012	Principal Investigator/Project Director, WOU Project Coordinator, WOU ESOL Content Specialist, Woodburn School District Coordinator	Implementation details in Woodburn
February 2012	Principal Investigator/Project Director, WOU Project Coordinator, WOU ESOL Content Specialist, External Evaluator	Assessment of progress of project and review of evaluation data
February 2012	WOU Project Coordinator, WOU ESOL Content Specialist, Salem-Keizer School District Coordinator, three Salem-Keizer coaches	Development of coaching model in Salem-Keizer and discussion of data collection needs
March 2012	Principal Investigator/Project Director, WOU Project Coordinator, WOU ESOL Content Specialist, External Evaluator	Assessment of progress of project and discussion of APR reporting needs. Preparation of IRB application.

Project Name: *Project SPELL (Sustainable Practices for English Language Learners)*

PR Number: T365z110096

Reporting Period: 10/01/2011 to 04/30/2012

April 2012	Principal Investigator/Project Director, WOU Project Coordinator, WOU ESOL Content Specialist, Woodburn School District Coordinator	Implementation details in Woodburn and discussion of data collection systems
April 2012	Principal Investigator/Project Director, WOU Project Coordinator, WOU ESOL Content Specialist, External Evaluator	Assessment of progress of project and APR reporting, and review of evaluation data
May 2012	Principal Investigator/Project Director, WOU Project Coordinator, WOU ESOL Content Specialist, External Evaluator	Review of yearly targets for APR reporting
May 2012	WOU Project Coordinator, WOU ESOL Content Specialist, Salem-Keizer School District Coordinator, five Salem-Keizer coaches	Finalize coaching model in Salem-Keizer and coaching data collection system

1.b. Performance Measure	Quantitative Data					
	Target			Actual Performance Data		
	Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
Expand SD-based coaching component.		/			/	

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data, Data Resulting from Experimental or Quasi-Experimental Design, and Data Collection Information) for the APR, CDR, and Final Performance Report. (Use as many pages as necessary).

- Assessment(s) used and timelines.
- Any information that would help to explain the information given under this measure.
- An explanation if progress was not made and steps for addressing the issue.
- How data and information were used to make improvements in the project.

1.b. Coaches are trained in a comprehensive professional development model and in providing STEM content:

- Qualified English Language Acquisition Specialists working within the SDs are identified as coaches in Year 1.

The identification of the five coaches in the Salem-Keizer District took longer than expected. Three of the Salem-Keizer coaches were identified by February of 2012, and the remaining two coaches were identified by March of 2012. All five coaches are experienced English Language Acquisition Specialists within the Salem-Keizer District. The coaches in Woodburn have not been identified yet. They will be identified in Year 2 to begin planning and to implement the coaching model in Year 3.

In February of 2012, we held a meeting with the three coaches who had initially been identified to work in Salem Keizer to start working on the development of coaching model in Salem-Keizer and to discuss data collection needs. In May of 2012, we held our second meeting with all five coaches to finalize the coaching model and our system of data collection for the coaching component, including:

- classroom observations,
- evaluations of coaching sessions (numerical and open-ended questions),
- participants’ qualitative reflections (numerical and open-ended questions), and
- collection of K-12 student work and assessments.

I.c. Performance Measure	Quantitative Data					
	Target			Actual Performance Data		
	Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		/			/	
Development and implementation of Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) focusing on STEM and ESOL.						

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data, Data Resulting from Experimental or Quasi-Experimental Design, and Data Collection Information) for the APR, CDR, and Final Performance Report. *(Use as many pages as necessary).*

- Assessment(s) used and timelines.
- Any information that would help to explain the information given under this measure.
- An explanation if progress was not made and steps for addressing the issue.
- How data and information were used to make improvements in the project.

Year 1: Begin developing the implementation plan

Since the Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) will not be implemented until Year 3 in Salem-Keizer and Year 4 in Woodburn, we have only held preliminary discussions about this aspect of the professional development model. The STEM and ESOL content specialists, as well as the district coaches, have planned their activities for Years 1 and 2 taking into consideration the fact that program participants will be able to extend and sediment their learning through the PLCs in future years. To measure for effectiveness and sustainability of the PLCs, we will conduct:

- PLC evaluation surveys (numerical and open-ended questions).

	Quantitative Data					
	Target			Actual Performance Data		
	Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
1.d. Performance Measure		/			/	
Conduct an annual ESOL STEM Conference at WOU.						

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data, Data Resulting from Experimental or Quasi-Experimental Design, and Data Collection Information) for the APR, CDR, and Final Performance Report. *(Use as many pages as necessary).*

- Assessment(s) used and timelines.
- Any information that would help to explain the information given under this measure.
- An explanation if progress was not made and steps for addressing the issue.
- How data and information were used to make improvements in the project.

1.d. Begin development and coordination in Year 1 of an annual ESOL STEM Conference at WOU beginning in 2013.

The first ESOL STEM Conference will be held on the WOU campus in the spring of 2013. This year, we have devised a system for data collection through the evaluation of the STEM workshops to give us input from participants regarding topics to be addressed at the conference. We have also started to identify key contributors from our partner districts who will be able to participate in the conference as presenters. For each ESOL STEM Conference, we will collect the following data:

- Evaluations of yearly ESOL STEM Conference (numerical and open-ended questions).

1.e. Performance Measure	Quantitative Data					
	Target			Actual Performance Data		
	Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
Implementation of refined ESOL/ESOL Bilingual endorsement program at WOU. Licensed participants served through the program in Year 1	20	/				
Licensed participants who complete the program	18					

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data, Data Resulting from Experimental or Quasi-Experimental Design, and Data Collection Information) for the APR, CDR, and Final Performance Report. *(Use as many pages as necessary).*

- Assessment(s) used and timelines.
- Any information that would help to explain the information given under this measure.
- An explanation if progress was not made and steps for addressing the issue.
- How data and information were used to make improvements in the project.

1.e. Implementation of refined ESOL/ESOL Bilingual endorsement program at WOU.

- 20 licensed participants are served through the WOU ESOL/ESOL Bilingual endorsement program in Year 1.

We are serving a total of 20 licensed participants in Salem-Keizer through the WOU ESOL/ESOL Bilingual endorsement program in Year 1.

Out of the 20 licensed participants, we anticipate that 18 participants will have completed all the requirements for the ESOL (or ESOL/Bilingual) endorsement program (including coursework, testing and practicum requirements) by the end of August, 2012.

Only two participants will not complete the program by the end of Year 1. One of them has temporarily stepped out of the program (for personal reasons) before completing the last two courses. She plans to return in Year 2 to complete the program. The other participant currently does not have ELLs in her classroom, so she cannot complete the practicum requirements within her own classroom. We do offer an opportunity for

participants to complete the practicum requirements during the summer; however, for personal reasons, she cannot complete the practicum during the summer either. Therefore, she plans to finish the practicum requirements and complete the program during the 2012-2013 academic year.

Levels of participant satisfaction of the program will be measured with the following survey instruments:

- Course evaluations administered at the end of each class (numerical and open-ended questions)
- Program evaluations administered at the end of all coursework (numerical and open-ended questions)
- STEM workshop evaluations (numerical and open-ended questions)

Other measures and instrumentation include,

Participant learning

- Course grades
- Scores on ESOL ORELA or ESOL NES exams

Participant application of knowledge and skills

- Scores on ESOL class observation protocol (sub-scores and overall scores; evaluative comments by supervisor/observer)
- Teacher Work Sample (sub-scores and overall scores; lesson plans, narratives in reflective and contextual components)

Completer effectiveness in instructional setting

- Scores on WOU ESOL observation tool (sub-scores and overall scores; evaluative comments by supervisor/observer)
- Teacher Work Sample (sub-scores and overall scores; lesson plans, narratives in reflective and contextual components)
- Action research projects

	Quantitative Data					
	Target			Actual Performance Data		
	Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
2.a. Performance Measure		/			/	
Select and place pre-service teachers in Salem-Keizer SD						

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data, Data Resulting from Experimental or Quasi-Experimental Design, and Data Collection Information) for the APR, CDR, and Final Performance Report. (Use as many pages as necessary).

- Assessment(s) used and timelines.
- Any information that would help to explain the information given under this measure.
- An explanation if progress was not made and steps for addressing the issue.
- How data and information were used to make improvements in the project.

Goal 2: To provide ESOL or ESOL/Bilingual endorsement for pre-service teachers completing their clinical experiences in the Salem-Keizer (S-K) and Woodburn School Districts (SD/s).

2.a. Place pre-service teachers in S-K SD.

During Year 2, WOU pre-service teachers completing the ESOL or ESOL/Bilingual endorsement will be placed in the Salem-Keizer School District to complete their clinical experiences in the classrooms of in-service teachers who completed the ESOL or ESOL/Bilingual endorsement program through Project SPELL during Year 1. (It is estimated that 20 pre-service teachers will be placed in S-K SD in Year 2.) The following measures and instrumentation will be used:

Participant application of knowledge and skills

- Pre/post scores on ESOL class observation protocol (sub-scores and overall scores; evaluative comments by supervisor/observer)
- Teacher Work Sample (sub-scores and overall scores; lesson plans, narratives in reflective and contextual components)

Effectiveness in instructional setting

- Pre/post scores on WOU ESOL observation tool (sub-scores and overall scores; evaluative comments by supervisor/observer)

Project Name: *Project SPELL (Sustainable Practices for English Language Learners)*

PR Number: T365z110096

Reporting Period: 10/01/2011 to 04/30/2012

- Teacher Work Sample (sub-scores and overall scores; lesson plans, narratives in reflective and contextual components)

Levels of participant satisfaction of the program

- Program evaluations administered at the end of all coursework and clinical experience (numerical and open-ended questions)
- STEM workshop evaluations (numerical and open-ended questions)

	Quantitative Data					
	Target			Actual Performance Data		
	Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
2.b. Performance Measure		/			/	
Select and place pre-service teachers in Woodburn SD						

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data, Data Resulting from Experimental or Quasi-Experimental Design, and Data Collection Information) for the APR, CDR, and Final Performance Report. *(Use as many pages as necessary).*

- Assessment(s) used and timelines.
- Any information that would help to explain the information given under this measure.
- An explanation if progress was not made and steps for addressing the issue.
- How data and information were used to make improvements in the project.

2.b. Place pre-service teachers in Woodburn SD

In the Woodburn School District, pre-service teachers will be served beginning Year 3. (See 2.a. above for future measures and instrumentation.)

	Quantitative Data					
	Target			Actual Performance Data		
	Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
2.c. Performance Measure		/			/	
Number of pre-service participants providing instructional services to students one year out and three years out from graduation						

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data, Data Resulting from Experimental or Quasi-Experimental Design, and Data Collection Information) for the APR, CDR, and Final Performance Report. *(Use as many pages as necessary).*

- Assessment(s) used and timelines.
- Any information that would help to explain the information given under this measure.
- An explanation if progress was not made and steps for addressing the issue.
- How data and information were used to make improvements in the project.

2.c. Number of pre-service participants providing instructional services to students one year out and three years out from graduation.

The first cohort of pre-service participants will graduate in December of 2012. Therefore, we will be able to report on this measure starting in December of 2013.

At that time, in addition to the GPRA measures, participants will be surveyed to assess

- a) whether or not they are providing instruction to English Language Learners,
- b) the number of ELL with whom they are currently or have in the past worked; and
- c) evidence of continued educator effectiveness.

	Quantitative Data					
	Target			Actual Performance Data		
	Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
3.a. Performance Measure		/			/	
Percentage of ELL students in program completer’s classrooms who show improvement in language ability						

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data, Data Resulting from Experimental or Quasi-Experimental Design, and Data Collection Information) for the APR, CDR, and Final Performance Report. *(Use as many pages as necessary).*

- Assessment(s) used and timelines.
- Any information that would help to explain the information given under this measure.
- An explanation if progress was not made and steps for addressing the issue.
- How data and information were used to make improvements in the project.

Goal 3: To improve PK-12 ELL student learning and achievement through data-based decision making.

3.a. Percentage of ELL students in program completer’s classrooms who show improvement in language ability. (Years 2-5; N/A Year 1.)

Starting in Year 2, we will collect assessment data of ELL students in program completers’ classrooms to measure improvement in language ability. Targets for this objective will be reported in Year 2 APR. The target given in the proposal is that 80% of ELL students in completers’ classrooms will show improvement in language ability as evidenced by the following:

- Pre/post formative and classroom-based assessments measuring achievement in language ability,
- Teacher Work Samples (sub-scores and overall scores; lesson plans, narratives in reflective and contextual components), and
- Action research projects (will start in Year 3).

	Quantitative Data					
	Target			Actual Performance Data		
	Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
3.b Performance Measure		/			/	
Percentage of ELL students in program completer’s classrooms who show improvement in science and mathematics						

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data, Data Resulting from Experimental or Quasi-Experimental Design, and Data Collection Information) for the APR, CDR, and Final Performance Report. (Use as many pages as necessary).

- Assessment(s) used and timelines.
- Any information that would help to explain the information given under this measure.
- An explanation if progress was not made and steps for addressing the issue.
- How data and information were used to make improvements in the project.

3.b. Percentage of ELL students in program completer’s classrooms who show improvement in science and mathematics: (Years 2-5; N/A Year 1.)

Starting in Year 2, we will collect assessment data of ELL students in program completers’ classrooms to measure improvement in science and mathematics. Targets for this objective will be reported in Year 2 APR. We provided the following target in our proposal: 80% of ELL students in completers’ classrooms will show increased achievement in science and mathematics as evidenced by the following data:

- Pre/post formative and classroom-based assessments measuring achievement in science and math content
- Teacher Work Samples (sub-scores and overall scores; lesson plans, narratives in reflective and contextual components)
- Action research projects (will start in Year 3)

	Quantitative Data					
	Target			Actual Performance Data		
	Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
3.c. Performance Measure		/			/	
Percentage of ELL students in program completer’s classrooms meet or exceed OAKS benchmarks in science and mathematics						

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data, Data Resulting from Experimental or Quasi-Experimental Design, and Data Collection Information) for the APR, CDR, and Final Performance Report. *(Use as many pages as necessary).*

- Assessment(s) used and timelines.
- Any information that would help to explain the information given under this measure.
- An explanation if progress was not made and steps for addressing the issue.
- How data and information were used to make improvements in the project.

3.c. Percentage of ELL students in program completer’s classrooms meet or exceed OAKS benchmarks in science and mathematics. (Years 2-5; N/A Year 1.)

Starting in Year 2, we will collect OAKS science and mathematics scores of ELL students in program completers’ classrooms to determine if they meet or exceed the OAKS benchmarks. Targets for this objective will be reported in Year 2 APR. The target given in the proposal is that 60% of ELL students in completers’ classrooms will meet or exceed the OAKS benchmarks in science and mathematics. We will work with the districts in collecting this data.

	Quantitative Data					
	Target			Actual Performance Data		
	Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
3.d. Performance Measure		/			/	
Percentage of ELL students in program completer’s classrooms who show improvement in language proficiency on Oregon’s English Language Proficiency Assessment (ELPA).						

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data, Data Resulting from Experimental or Quasi-Experimental Design, and Data Collection Information) for the APR, CDR, and Final Performance Report. *(Use as many pages as necessary).*

- Assessment(s) used and timelines.
- Any information that would help to explain the information given under this measure.
- An explanation if progress was not made and steps for addressing the issue.
- How data and information were used to make improvements in the project.

3.d. Percentage of ELL students in program completer’s classrooms who show improvement in language proficiency on Oregon’s English Language Proficiency Assessment (ELPA). (Years 2-5; N/A Year 1.)

Starting in Year 2, we will work with the districts to collect ELPA scores of ELL students in program completers’ classrooms to measure progress in language proficiency. Baseline data will be the students’ previous year’s levels of language proficiency on the ELPA (beginning with project Year 1). The proposal gives a target of 50% of ELL students in program completers’ classrooms will show improvement in language proficiency as measured by the ELPA.

C. NPD Project Budget Information (See instructions)

Funds are being expended and have been drawn down at the expected rate during this reporting period. There have been no significant changes to the approved budget.

We do expect to have some unexpended funds at the end of the first year:

- Funds left in Personnel are a result of over-estimating salary and fringe increases. However, we do expect additional increases in the university's new fiscal year (after July 1, 2012), and the current unexpended balance will be used for that purpose if need be.
- Funds left in Travel may be decreased should additional trips be completed between June and September. The current balance does not take into account any pending trips at this time.
- We have some funds left in Supplies, which may also be used between June and September. There are currently no pending expenses.
- Funds in the Training Stipends category are due to differences in tuition and fees compared to the original budget. Two participants stepped away from the program for personal reasons (one is re-joining next year), and a few participants had already taken the first course and opted out. The original budget included tuition for all participants to take the practicum class and 14 out of 20 participants will be able to waive the practicum. Carryover in this category will be used in Year 2.

We have included (Section D. Additional Information) a slightly revised budget for Year 2. This reflects the current Personnel with anticipated FTE, as well as salary/fringe increases, planning for a STEM workshop that was not originally budgeted in Year 2, and increases in the university's tuition and fees for the Training Stipends. We have not changed any category more than 10% and we anticipate using any carryover in the corresponding categories during Year 2. The attached budget also shows the current anticipated carryover in each category. As mentioned above, the carryover amount will most likely decrease by September 2012, taking into account any pending expenses not yet encumbered for Year 1.

D. Additional Information (See instructions)

Project SPELL							
WESTERN OREGON UNIVERSITY							
PROPOSED SECOND YEAR BUDGET - OCTOBER 1, 2012 - SEPTEMBER 30, 2013							
						Total	Carryover
PERSONNEL						86,884	4,313
	FTE	Salary	Amount	Fringe	Amount		
Dr. Maria Dantas-Whitney	0.33	59,994	19,978	53.67	10,723		
<i>Project Director & PI</i>							
Dr. Maria Dantas-Whitney (summer)	0.33	59,994	3,996	25.00	999		
<i>Project Director & PI</i>							
JoNan LeRoy	0.15	72,284	10,843	49.55	5,373		
<i>Project Coordinator</i>							
Dr. Carmen Caceda(9 mo salary)	0.33	46,377	15,444	60.79	9,388		
<i>ELL Specialist</i>							
Dr. Adele Schepige (9 mo salary)	0.125	64,935	2,705	25.00	676		
<i>Science Content Specialist</i>							
Dr. Rachel Harrington (9 mo salary)	0.125	51,183	2,132	25.00	533		
<i>Math Content Specialist</i>							
Dr. Mary Bucy (9 mo salary)	0.125	54,333	2,264	25.00	566		
<i>Technology Content Specialist</i>							
Dr. Robert Ayres	0.15	84,727	12,709	46.60	5,922		
<i>External Project Evaluator</i>							
Laurel Cuthbertson	0.15	49,171	7,376	59.01	4,352		
<i>Data Specialist</i>							
Jennifer Keen	0.05	31,000	1,550	76.35	1,183		
<i>Administrative Assistant</i>							
Robin Farup-Romero	0.08	36,083	2,887	29.43	850		
<i>Salem-Keizer SC Project Coordinator</i>							
TBD (Salem-Keizer & Woodburn)	5.00	1,000	5,000	29.43	1,472		
<i>Coaches</i>							
FRINGE BENEFITS						42,037	4,629
TRAVEL						11,596	6,468
Conference Travel: 2 trips for 2 staff						9,543	
Airfare: 2 trips x 2 staff x \$750						3,000	
Lodging: 2 trips x 2 staff x 4 nights x \$177						2,832	
Meals: 2 trips x 2 staff x 5 days x \$65						1,300	
Ground Transportation/Taxi & Parking						911	

(Continued next page)

Project SPELL			
WESTERN OREGON UNIVERSITY			
PROPOSED SECOND YEAR BUDGET - OCTOBER 1, 2012 - SEPTEMBER 30, 2013			
Conference Registration	1,500		
Travel for Advisory Council meetings		555	
Mileage (\$0.555/mile x 50 miles x 4 x 5 staff)	555		
Travel for Mentor Observations (Salem-Keizer)		500	
Mileage (\$0.555/mile x 50 miles x 9 x 2 staff)	500		
Travel for Mentor Observations (Woodburn)		999	
Mileage (\$0.555/mile x 100 miles x 9 x 2 staff)	999		
 EQUIPMENT			 0
 SUPPLIES			 2,500
Miscellaneous including laptop & iPad	2,500		2,235
 CONTRACTUAL			 70,398
Salem-Keizer School District	46,122		0
Woodburn School District	24,275		
 CONSTRUCTION			 0
None			
 OTHER			 1,500
Spring 2013 STEM Workshop at Western Oregon University			(65)
Meals & refreshments for approx. 75 people	1,500		
 TOTAL DIRECT COSTS			 214,915
			17,580
 INDIRECT COSTS @ 8% of Total Direct Costs (1st \$25K of Contractual only)			 15,503
			1,406
 TRAINING STIPENDS			 187,800
Stipends for 20 teachers (Salem-Keizer)	125,200		10,606
Stipends for 10 teachers (Woodburn)	62,600		
 TOTAL PROJECT COSTS			 418,219
			29,592
 Award Amount			 399,515
			29,592
 Year 2 Award + Carryover Available to Spend			 429,107

Project SPELL
 Salem-Keizer School District
 PROPOSED SECOND YEAR BUDGET - OCTOBER 1, 2012 - SEPTEMBER 30, 2013

						Total
PERSONNEL						26,732
	FTE	Salary	Amount	Fringe	Amount	
Robin Farup-Romero	0.07	96,168	6,732	33.57	2,260	
<i>Salem-Keizer SC Project Coordinator</i>						
TBD	5.00	4,000	20,000	33.57	6,714	
<i>Coaches</i>						
FRINGE BENEFITS						8,974
TRAVEL						0
EQUIPMENT						0
SUPPLIES						2,000
Classroom supplies for 20 teachers					2,000	
CONTRACTUAL						0
CONSTRUCTION						0
OTHER						5,000
Substitutes for 20 teachers to attend STEM Workshop					5,000	
TOTAL DIRECT COSTS						42,706
INDIRECT COSTS @ 8% of Total Direct Costs						3,416
TOTAL PROJECT COSTS						46,122

Project SPELL
 Woodburn School District
 PROPOSED SECOND YEAR BUDGET - OCTOBER 1, 2012 - SEPTEMBER 30, 2013

						Total
PERSONNEL						12,812
	FTE	Salary	Amount	Fringe	Amount	
Sonia Kool	0.05	96,246	4,812	48.12	2,315	
<i>Woodburn Project Coordinator</i>						
TBD	2.00	4,000	8,000	48.12	3,850	
<i>Coaches</i>						
FRINGE BENEFITS						6,165
TRAVEL						0
EQUIPMENT						0
SUPPLIES						1,000
Classroom supplies for 10 teachers					1,000	
CONTRACTUAL						0
CONSTRUCTION						0
OTHER						2,500
Substitutes for 10 teachers to attend STEM Workshop					2,500	
TOTAL DIRECT COSTS						22,477
INDIRECT COSTS @ 8% of Total Direct Costs						1,798
TOTAL PROJECT COSTS						24,275