

# U.S. Department of Education

Washington, D.C. 20202-5335



## APPLICATION FOR GRANTS UNDER THE

**NATIONAL PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM**

**CFDA # 84.365Z**

**PR/Award # T365Z110064**

**Grants.gov Tracking#: GRANT10864265**

Closing Date: MAY 09, 2011

### Program Abstract

<b>Applicant:</b>	Georgetown College, Georgetown, KY
<b>Title of Program:</b>	The Center for Culturally Relevant Pedagogy
<b>Participants:</b>	In-Service Teachers; Principals and Other District Administrators; Higher Education Faculty; Students, Parents and Community Members
<b>Number Served:</b>	25 In-Service Teachers and 8 Principals per year; 8 Higher Education Faculty (Years 2 & 3); 60-80 ELL Students per year
<b>Total Served:</b>	125 In-Service Teachers; 40 Principals; 16 Higher Education Faculty; Approximately 300-400 ELL Students and Families
<b>Consortia Partners:</b>	Bourbon County School District; Fayette County Public Schools; Paris Independent School District; Scott County School District; Kentucky Department of Education; Collaborative Center for Literacy Development (University of Kentucky)

#### Project Description:

The State of Kentucky has experienced tremendous growth in recent years in the number of students with limited English proficiency. District personnel report that teachers are ill-prepared to teach effectively this population of students. Further, districts have limited resources to provide supplemental support to these students. Thus, this project will provide intense, job-embedded experiences to regular classroom teachers who teach ELL students.

The proposed project includes several major components. These are:

- (1) building capacity in schools that serve ELLs through intense, year-long, on-site training for regular classroom teachers and an annual workshop for principals;
- (2) building capacity in the institution of higher education through annual workshops for faculty, required curriculum reform, and partnerships with the LEAs being served;
- (3) building sustainability through the creation of "clinical faculty" in local schools who will serve as mentors for Preservice teachers; and (4) enhancing ELL students' and teachers' knowledge in the STEM disciplines through summer robotics camps that will take place in local communities.

To prepare classroom content teachers for working with English learners, we plan to implement a year-long, job-embedded academy that will use the following instructional methods: (1) explicit instruction in the form of a summer institute and Saturday workshops interspersed throughout the year, to include video viewing of best practices in working with ELLs, curriculum development using a structured lesson plan format, and modeling of effective instruction; (2) in-classroom mentoring of participants with the assistance of a designated school-based coach, with accompanying on-line discussion forums; (3) monthly meetings with teacher teams to review student achievement data and provide suggestions for implementing the culturally responsive framework; (4) videotaped lessons followed by peer analysis and critique of instruction; (5) school-community events in the students' communities, and (6) community robotics camps for ELL students that will focus on the development of academic language in the STEM disciplines. The Project Director and External Evaluator will meet annually with district administrators to review student achievement data and make modifications to the professional development project if needed.

The primary goals of the proposed project are to:

- Provide high quality, effective instruction for ELL and all students that can be sustained over time and that results in increased levels of student achievement;
- Develop school-parent/community relationships that will enhance the learning of ELL students and can be sustained over time;
- Develop STEM initiatives in local communities through summer robotics camps that will be ongoing and sustained over time;
- Develop a cadre of Inservice teachers in local schools who have high levels of self-efficacy and degree of implementation in culturally responsive instruction and who can serve as clinical faculty for Preservice teachers enrolled in the IHE;
- Revise the undergraduate teacher preparation program to infuse culturally responsive dispositions and instructional practices throughout the curriculum.

The proposed project has the following objectives:

1) GPRA MEASURE 1.5: At least 125 in-service content teachers (25 per year for years 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5) will participate in professional development in effective instructional practices for ELLs. At least 10% of these teachers will be STEM content teachers. 100% of participants will complete all professional development requirements in ELL instruction for local certification (25 per year for years 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5).

2) GPRA MEASURE 1.6: 100% of inservice teacher completers (25 in years 2, 3, 4, and 5) are providing instructional services to ELL students.

3) PROJECT MEASURE: At least 60 teachers who complete the local certification program (12 per year for years 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5) will be designated by the higher education institution to serve as clinical faculty, as determined by outstanding instructional practices and dispositions. (This measure will be assessed using an observation instrument designed to determine teachers' dispositions and instructional practices in working with underserved student populations.)

4) PROJECT MEASURE: ELL student achievement will increase in classrooms served by the project, as determined by pre- and post student achievement data for years 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5.

5) PROJECT MEASURE: The teacher preparation program will be redesigned to include culturally responsive elements in course outcomes, candidate assessment, and clinical experiences that will meet the needs of all students, including ELLs. The redesign will occur during years two and three and will be completed at the conclusion of year three. Evaluation of course syllabi will occur in years 2 and 3.

6) PROJECT MEASURE: Teacher efficacy in implementing CRI practices will increase for 90% of the participants during years 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5.

**Priorities:** Competitive Preference Priorities 2 and 3; Invitational Priorities 1 and 2

**Contact:** Dr. Rebecca Powell, (502) 863-8158  
Rebecca\_Powell@georgetowncollege.edu

## Center for Culturally Relevant Pedagogy

### *Analysis of Need for the Project*

A recent report issued by the US Department of Education (*Winning the Future: Improving Education for the Latino Community*, 2011) states that “[o]ur nation faces a dropout crisis. When 25 percent of our students—almost 40 percent of our black and Hispanic students—fail to graduate high school on time, we know that too many of our schools are failing to offer their students a world-class education” (p. 6). The report goes on to state that “1 in 5 students in the public schools system is Latino. Yet almost half of Hispanic students never receive their high school diplomas” (p. 6).

Data from the *Digest of Education Statistics: 2010* reveal that in 2006-07 in our State of Kentucky, Hispanics dropped out at a rate that was nearly double their White counterparts (5.3% compared with 2.8% for Whites) (US DOE, 2010). Scale scores in reading, math, and science show significant differences between White and Hispanic students, with a 25 point difference in reading at both the 4<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade levels; a 14-point difference in math at the 4<sup>th</sup> grade level and 10 points at the 8<sup>th</sup> grade level; and a 14 point difference in science at both levels (NAEP, 2011). The proposed project is designed to address these gaps by providing regular classroom teachers with intense, job-embedded professional development in using culturally responsive instruction to assist limited English proficient students to meet language objectives and the new Common Core standards in content areas.

In Kentucky, there have been sharp increases in the number of English learners in the public schools. In fact, Kentucky is listed as one of the states with the fastest growing ELL population, having experienced a 417.4 % increase in the decade between 1994-95

and 2004-05 (Payán & Nettles, 2011). In 2007, Access data showed that students in Kentucky schools spoke more than 94 languages (KDE, 2011).

School district administrators and teachers struggle with the lack of training necessary to cope with such dramatic changes in student populations. Additionally, educators lack the knowledge needed to make appropriate policy changes and instructional decisions for English learners and their families. Under NCLB mandates, states have been required to establish English language proficiency standards. Our state has joined forces with fourteen other states in adopting the World Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) English Language Proficiency Standards. These standards include six levels of language proficiency and are designed to assist educators with developing curriculum, instruction, and assessment for ELLs.

Despite the fact that the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) has taken measures to ensure equitable accountability practices by incorporating the WIDA Consortium training model into the state accountability system, it has been our experience that educators in our region are not well versed in the WIDA and TESOL standards and do not consider language objectives in instructional planning. The emphasis in our state has been, and continues to be, on developing specific “learning targets” that address conceptual knowledge and understanding. While establishing learning targets for students is essential, developing language targets is critical for developing students’ academic language proficiency. Thus, there needs to be an emphasis on both the core academic standards and the language proficiency standards if English Language Learners are to excel in our schools.

### ***Project Design***

The proposed project includes several major components. These are:

- (1) building capacity in schools that serve ELLs through intense, year-long, on-site training for regular classroom teachers and an annual workshop for principals;
- (2) building capacity in the institution of higher education through annual workshops for faculty, required curriculum reform, and partnerships with the LEAs being served;
- (3) building sustainability through the creation of “clinical faculty” in local schools who will serve as mentors for Preservice teachers; and (4) enhancing ELL students’ and teachers’ knowledge in the STEM disciplines through summer robotics camps that will take place in local communities.

Based upon our conversations with local districts, the real need in our area is to prepare regular classroom teachers on effective instruction of ELL students. Districts currently have very few funds to hire licensed ESL teachers, and district administrators have told us that pull out programs place the burden of content instruction on ESL teachers instead of regular teachers, thereby limiting the development of students’ conceptual knowledge. Further, bilingual programs are generally not considered in our state because of lack of resources and bilingual personnel. Thus, the focus of the proposed project is to prepare regular (content area) teachers to work effectively with students who are at varying stages of English language acquisition.

The project will use the Culturally Responsive Instruction Observation Protocol (CRIOP) model as a guide for teacher professional development and for assessment of teachers’ implementation of culturally responsive practices. The CRIOP is a comprehensive framework that embeds most of the elements of the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol, or SIOP model (Echevarría, Short, & Vogt, 2008), as well as the

five standards of CREDE. It consists of eight elements: (1) teacher care; (2) classroom climate; (3) family collaboration; (4) culturally responsive assessment; (5) curriculum; (6) instruction/pedagogy; (7) discourse; and (8) sociopolitical consciousness.

Development of the CRIOP emerged from a statewide research study of literacy in the primary grades, which showed that reading intervention was effective in improving students' reading performance, but did not close the achievement gap (Rightmyer, 2010). Thus, the research team conducted a comprehensive review of the literature in culturally responsive instruction (CRI) and best practices for all students, including English learners, and developed an instrument that could be used to assess teachers' use of CRI in classrooms. The CRIOP model subsequently has been used as a framework for teacher professional development in a pilot grant project and in a recent graduate class.

The foundational element of the CRIOP is *Teacher Care*. Care is expressed through demonstrating high expectations for students, acknowledging that every student is a capable learner, and developing genuine relationships that are grounded in knowledge of and respect for the "whole student" (McKown & Weinstein, 2008; Monzó & Rueda, 2001; Waxman & Tellez, 2002). A culturally responsive *Classroom Climate* is an inclusive community that acknowledges that every student and family has resources that can be leveraged for instruction, and where students feel free to take risks and to share their stories (Campano, 2007). Further, in culturally responsive classrooms and schools, there is a norm of interdependence and group collaboration (Berry, 2006; Reyes, Scribner, & Scribner, 1999; Valenzuela, 1999).

*Family Collaboration* is a central element of the CRIOP and will be emphasized in Phase One of the project, to be described in greater detail below. Developing

relationships with parents/caregivers is essential for maximizing student achievement (Harry, 2008; Hildago, Bright, Epstein, Siu, & Swap, 1995), yet too often teachers are reluctant to visit the homes and communities of the families they serve. At the same time, there are many reasons why parents may be hesitant to visit the school and to be integrally involved in their children's education, from language barriers and a lack of understanding of the American educational system, to a sense of diminished control and inferiority (De Gaetano, 2007; Hensley, 2005; Johnson, Pugach, & Hawkins, 2004). A primary component of the proposed project will be to bring teachers and families together in non-traditional ways—within their communities—in order to develop genuine partnerships with parents/caregivers. The aim is to establish what Endrizzi (2008) refers to as “mutualism,” whereby teachers engage in genuine dialogue with parents and families in order to learn from them. Another purpose of this component of the project will be to determine families “funds of knowledge” that can be used in instruction to make important school-community connections (González, Moll, & Amanti, 2005).

The instructional features of the CRIOP model include *Assessment, Curriculum, Pedagogy, Discourse, and Sociopolitical Consciousness*. Assessment must be ongoing throughout the lesson to assure that no student “falls through the cracks.” Partner and small group discussion is infused throughout instruction so that ELL students are able to discuss concepts with their peers (Brock & Raphael, 2005) and teachers are able to check frequently for understanding. Alternative assessments are provided for students at varying stages of English language acquisition so that they have multiple ways for demonstrating conceptual knowledge (García, McKoon, & August, 2008). Assessment that occurs while students are using language in authentic contexts is particularly

important for ELLs in order to determine their level of language proficiency (Hurley & Blake, 2001).

In planning for instruction, effective teachers consider the language expectations they have for their students and make intentional connections to students' and families' cultural and linguistic knowledge (Gutiérrez, Baquedano-Lopez, & Tejada, 1999; Villegas & Lucas, 2007). Important vocabulary and concepts are taught prior to instruction and are reinforced within a "language rich" environment (Taffe, Blachowicz, & Fisher, 2009). Teachers use various strategies to assure student understanding, such as providing background knowledge, providing extensive scaffolding of students' cognitive strategies and linguistic development, and using active, hands-on learning (August & Shanahan, 2008; Gersten & Jiménez, 1994). Students use written and oral language for authentic purposes and are engaged in academic conversations with their peers, a practice that has been shown to promote students' language development (Waxman & Tellez, 2002). Instructional conversation (Tharp & Gallimore, 1991) is promoted through the use of protocols such as the discussion web, which provides a structure for rich dialogue (Alvermann, 1991). Students are also taught about the situational appropriateness of language use, i.e., what forms of discourse to use in various social situations, and are encouraged to use their first language as a "mediational tool" to promote comprehension and to bridge to a new language (Martinez-Roldan, 2005; Moll & Dworin, 1996). Finally, students become integrally involved in inquiry on topics that are important to them, which promotes student motivation and also leads to authentic uses of academic discourse in various content areas.

### ***Plan for Professional Development***

Traditional professional development models foster a deficit perspective—the very perspective that culturally responsive professional development is supposed to be eradicating—in that teachers are viewed as having limited knowledge and skills (Clark, 2001). A more productive model is one that taps teachers’ existing knowledge as a source for further learning (Griffin, 1991), and that promotes collegiality and collaboration (Guskey, 2003). In her review of research on effective professional development for teachers of English language learners, Calderón (2009) cites three important features: (a) ongoing meetings between teachers and those providing the professional development; (b) opportunities for classroom practice coupled with mentoring and coaching; and (c) teacher learning communities (p. 417). The professional development coaching model that will be implemented in this project will incorporate all three of these features. As well, professional development will be individualized based upon teachers’ existing knowledge and practices.

Change in teacher behaviors is strongly related to teachers’ self-efficacy (Smylie, 1988), or the “belief or conviction that they can influence how well students learn, even those who may be difficult or unmotivated” (Guskey & Passaro, 1993, p. 3). Self-efficacy is particularly important in an examination of culturally responsive instruction, as teachers must believe that they can influence the learning of all students before they are amenable to changing their practices. In fact, a study by the RAND Corporation targeted teacher efficacy as the most important variable in change implementation (Berman et al., 1977). Yet teacher efficacy can dip after participation in professional development, indicative of teachers’ struggles in implementing new instructional

practices (Ross, 1994; Stein & Wang, 1988; Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2006). It is during this period that the mentoring support of a coach can be particularly important.

Consistent with research, the professional development model will involve explicit instruction in best practices for ELLs followed by practical application in classrooms. A primary feature of the professional development plan will be the use of Professional Learning Communities, whereby educators will assist one another in their professional development to assure that all students learn at high levels (DuFour, DuFour, Eaker, & Many, 2006). District partners have agreed to assist in identifying teachers in schools who will be participating in the project as a team. In consultation with school principals, teams of teachers will be identified who have the dispositions necessary for working with underrepresented student populations and have demonstrated leadership potential in their school. We intend to provide training to additional teams each year, thereby building capacity within selected schools by creating a “critical mass” of educators who can provide guidance and leadership within their schools and districts.

In two of the four districts who will participate in the project, two teams have already been identified. This identification was based upon demonstrated teacher interest in and commitment to the project. This selection process is consistent with the advice of Echevarría, Short, and Vogt (2008), who note that in selecting participants for their SIOP<sup>®</sup> training, it is important to begin with willing participants, and to treat them like professionals by providing stipends and/or course credit. Given the time commitment required, we intend to pay participating teachers \$150/day for their involvement in summer and Saturday workshops and after school team meetings (see Budget Narrative). To encourage additional study, they will also be awarded 3 hours of graduate credit that

can be applied to an ESL licensure program (EDU 587 – Communicating with Immigrants), and 3 hours of graduate credit that can substitute for our graduate class EDU 529 – Teaching in a Diverse Society and can also be applied as an elective to any advanced degree program. Teachers who are particularly interested in the STEM disciplines can receive an additional 3 hours of course credit through their participation in the summer community robotics camps (CSC 522 – Implementing STEM in the Classroom with Robotics). We intend to encourage STEM teachers to apply for this course through various recruitment initiatives. STEM teachers who are already involved in the year-long project will be particularly encouraged to apply; however, the course will not be limited to project participants.

To prepare classroom content teachers for working with English learners, we plan to implement a year-long, job-embedded academy that will use the following instructional methods: (1) explicit instruction in the form of a summer institute and Saturday workshops interspersed throughout the year, to include video viewing of CR practices, curriculum development using a structured lesson plan format, and modeling of effective instruction; (2) in-classroom mentoring of participants with the assistance of a designated school-based coach, with accompanying on-line discussion forums; (3) monthly meetings with teacher teams to review student achievement data and provide suggestions for implementing the CRIOP; (4) videotaped lessons followed by peer analysis and critique of instruction; (5) school-community events in the students' communities, and (6) community robotics camps for ELL students that will focus on the development of academic language in the STEM disciplines.

In planning for this project, we consulted with teachers who were enrolled in a recent graduate course that used the CRIOP as a framework for teacher professional development. Students were asked to evaluate course activities on a scale of 0 to 3, with 0 being “not at all useful” and 3 being “very useful.” The survey was supplemented by written teacher comments and focus interviews on the final day of class. Interestingly, these in-service teachers provided feedback that is supported by the research, i.e., that the most effective professional development consists of application in actual classrooms, with intentional guidance and reflection (Sailors & Price, 2010). Results show that teachers overwhelmingly felt that (a) conversations with parents and (b) video viewing and critique of their own instruction with their peers were the most effective professional development activities in the course. In fact, participants stated that more home and community visits and an analysis of at least two lessons would have been helpful. They also felt that in-class modeling of CRI lessons and viewing videos that showed actual teachers using culturally responsive instructional practices were useful, as was the lesson plan format used in planning for instruction that required that they consider language objectives, students’ stages of language acquisition, pre-teaching of academic vocabulary, and the use of discourse throughout the lesson. All of these strategies will be incorporated in the planned professional development project. One component that some individuals felt would be valuable would be professor observations in classrooms with specific feedback, which will also be incorporated in the project through on-site coaching. One participant summarized the importance of applying the various elements of the CRIOP by stating that “without being pushed to implement these elements immediately, the lasting effects would have been much less.”

The academy will consist of three phases. In Phase One, classroom teachers and administrators will participate in initiatives designed to learn about the ELL families that are being served by the school. We are referring to this as the “Funds of Knowledge” phase. In Phase Two—the ESL phase—classroom teachers will receive explicit instruction on second language acquisition theory and practice. In Phase Three—the CRIOP phase—participants will be guided in implementing the Culturally Responsive Instruction Observation Protocol framework. Each of these phases is described in more detail below.

To provide for sustainability, we also plan to provide professional development training for school administrators and college instructors. These workshops are also described below. Further, as part of her work with Phases One and Two, the ESL consultant plans to implement a “community of practice” model that would involve participants in the creation of blogs, WIKIS, and screencasts for sharing new knowledge with college instructors, schools, communities, and pre-service teachers. These tools would constitute a shared repertoire of resources for assisting ELL students that can be utilized by various learning networks to promote student achievement.

Phase One: Funds of Knowledge. In our conversations with local school districts and our work with teachers, they have articulated that one of their most critical demands is their ability to cross language and cultural barriers and to establish relationships with the families of ELL students. Without such relationships, helping families to navigate the school culture and placing students appropriately can be problematic. Thus, before the start of school, we intend to work with designated school-community liaisons to establish at least one social event in the community(ies) of ELL children and their families. Prior

to this event, teachers will participate in a two-day institute in which they discuss their needs and concerns in working with families and also examine the text *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practices in households, communities, and classrooms* (González, Moll, & Amanti, 2005). During the institute, teachers will learn ways for transcending language barriers and for establishing productive relationships with families. They will research the families' cultures online to prepare for the event, and will be instructed on how to conduct effective ethnographies in order to learn about families' "funds of knowledge" and how those "funds" can be connected to the curriculum.

These social events will afford teachers and principals with the opportunity to get to know the families on a more personal level. Teachers will be guided in specific ways for establishing relationships that will encourage active parent collaboration and hence will enhance the potential for student success (e.g., sharing family photographs, creating family storybooks, etc.) (Ada, Campoy, & Zubizarreta, 2001). Teachers will also be guided in specific information to gather from families so that they can have a greater understanding of the students they teach and can draw on families' areas of expertise in their instruction.

At the start of the fall semester, follow-up sessions will be held at each school with project participants. The purpose of these sessions will be to discuss what they learned about the families that they serve and to chart the families' "funds of knowledge" that can be used as resources in instruction. Teachers will be asked to develop a family collaboration plan for furthering their relationships with these families and for making home-school connections in the curriculum.

The community robotics camps will also occur during Phase One. Our institution is known for its leadership in robotics, as we host camps and regional competitions each year on our campus. Since the program's inception, however, we have recognized the need to serve a more diverse student population. The success of all students in the STEM disciplines is critical for moving our nation forward as a leader in science and technology, and ELL students often possess global competencies that would complement STEM knowledge in providing this global leadership. Taking the camps into the communities will encourage the participation of ELL students and their families, and will have the added benefit of instructing teachers on how to assist ELLs in developing academic language in the STEM disciplines. The Project Director, who is a trained literacy and diversity specialist, will help to facilitate the camps to assure the infusion of strategies to promote written and oral academic language development. Further, in-service teacher participants who assist with the camps will be required to frame their instruction around the new Common Core Standards in Science (as those standards become available).

Phase Two: ESL. Phase Two will occur during the fall each year. Classroom teachers will attend two Saturday workshops, where they will receive instruction and guidance in second language acquisition theory and application. Teachers will learn how to identify the various language acquisition stages, how to develop language objectives for their ELL students, and how to assist students in transitioning from their native language to Standard American English. Teachers will also be taught various ways for using technology that can enhance the learning of ELL students, such as translator pens, Google translator, and other software applications.

During this phase, teachers will use lessons that they plan to teach and will be required to consider the language stages and the cultural knowledge of the students in their classrooms. They will then be required to embed the TESOL and WIDA standards and appropriate language objectives for those students, and will be guided in practices that can be used to help students acquire a second language. Teachers will also be encouraged to infuse families' funds of knowledge and students' cultural knowledge in their lessons by grounding their instruction in the lives of their students.

Throughout this and the other phases, it will be important that teachers work together in teams or "Professional Learning Communities" (PLCs). The expectation during phase two will be that teacher teams collaborate in lesson planning, development, and analysis. A coach will be present on-site at least once a month to provide guidance to PLCs as they develop curriculum and implement lessons that intentionally address students' acquisition of academic language.

Phase Three: CRIOP. Phase three will occur in the spring and will build upon the knowledge foundation established in the first two phases. During this phase, teachers will further develop their ability to plan and implement instruction that is appropriate for all students, including ELLs. As noted previously, the Culturally Responsive Instruction Observation Protocol (CRIOP) is a comprehensive framework that combines the various components of the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) and the five standards of CREDE: Joint Productive Activity; Language Development; Contextualization; Challenging Activities; and Instructional Conversation.

During Phase Three, teachers will read *Literacy for All Students: An Instructional Framework for Closing the Gap* (Powell & Rightmyer, 2011). This text details the eight

components of the CRIOP and provides theoretical and practical information on the CRIOP model. With the assistance of an on-site coach and the other teachers on their teams, participants will be provided with explicit guidance on how to embed the various CRIOP elements into their instruction. In addition to lesson planning using the CRIOP lesson planning guide, they will videotape at least two of their lessons and will engage in peer analyze and critique using the CRIOP framework and accompanying observation indicators.

During this final phase, as teachers perfect their lesson and unit development, we intend to assist them in embedding the new national Common Core Standards in their particular discipline(s). We will employ content specialists as consultants to assist with curriculum development beginning with the areas of Mathematics and English/Language Arts (those standards that have already been released), and adding other national standards as they become available. The project director has attended teacher leadership meetings on the new national ELA standards and has participated in standards disaggregation. She has also developed a culturally responsive unit of study that is being used as a model throughout the state that combines the ELA common core standards and the various elements of the CRIOP. Thus, she is poised to provide guidance in utilizing the ELA standards in curriculum development.

The CRIOP provides a useful framework for embedding the ELA standards, as these standards include all aspects of the English/Language Arts (reading, writing, speaking and listening). At the same time, the CRIOP also provides a useful instructional framework in all content areas, including STEM. It will be essential that curriculum planning in all content areas begin with the national core standards and the knowledge

and skills required for meeting those standards. In developing any instructional sequence, participants will need to consider the standards and the disaggregated components of those standards to assure that they are providing targeted instruction for all students, including ELLs.

Professional Development Workshops for Principals and College Faculty: In order to support the important work that occurs in classrooms, it is imperative that school administrators have an understanding of effective instruction for ELL and other underrepresented students. Thus, the project includes a one-day workshop for administrators that will provide an overview of the research and the professional development framework. Included in the workshop will be information on second language acquisition research and practice, WIDA and TESOL standards, curriculum planning, and the CRIOP framework.

Faculty at the college will participate in a three-day institute that will provide similar information; however, faculty will already have a basic knowledge of the CRIOP as it will be the focus of an upcoming fall retreat. Thus, the institute will build on this knowledge by reading and discussing the CRIOP text (*Literacy for All Students*) and by viewing examples of the model in practice (written lesson plans, video clips of instruction). In addition, faculty will be guided in conversations about how to embed this framework into the curriculum for Preservice teachers. A major focus of the institute will be examining the results of the professional development project, including classroom observation data, teacher self-efficacy data, and student achievement data. Faculty will be encouraged to use strategies in their classes that were successful in working with teachers

in the project, and they will be given the opportunity to revise their course syllabi and clinical requirements to include promising activities in implementing the CRIOP.

### ***Project Goals and Objectives***

The primary goals of the proposed project are to:

- Provide high quality, effective instruction for ELL and all students that can be sustained over time and that results in increased levels of student achievement;
- Develop school-parent/community relationships that will enhance the learning of ELL students and can be sustained over time;
- Develop STEM initiatives in local communities through summer robotics camps that will be ongoing and sustained over time;
- Develop a cadre of Inservice teachers in local schools who have high levels of self-efficacy and degree of implementation in culturally responsive instruction and who can serve as clinical faculty for Preservice teachers enrolled in the IHE;
- Revise the undergraduate teacher preparation program to infuse culturally responsive dispositions and instructional practices throughout the curriculum.

The table below outlines the specific objectives of the proposed project and the activities that will be used to realize those objectives.

Objective	Activities for Realizing the Objective
<p><b>GPRA MEASURE 1.5:</b>* At least 125 in-service content teachers (25/year over 5 years) will participate in professional development in effective instructional practices for ELLs. At least 10% of these teachers will be STEM</p>	<p>3-phase professional development sequence that focuses on family collaboration, second language acquisition, and the CRIOP model</p>

<p>content teachers. 100% of participants will complete all professional development requirements in ELL instruction for local certification.</p>	
<p><b>GPRA MEASURE 1.6:</b> 100% of inservice teacher completers are providing instructional services to ELL students.</p>	<p>Regular, ongoing meetings with administrators in LEAs to monitor the outcomes of the project</p>
<p><b>PROJECT MEASURE:</b> At least 60 teachers who complete the local certification program (12 per year over five years) will be designated by the higher education institution to serve as clinical faculty, as determined by outstanding instructional practices and dispositions.</p>	<p>Evaluation of culturally responsive instruction and teacher dispositions using the CRIOP instrument</p>
<p><b>PROJECT MEASURE:</b> ELL student achievement will increase in classrooms served by the project.</p>	<p>Professional development for classroom teachers; the development of parent-school partnerships through non-traditional social events and home visits; summer robotics camps in students' communities that emphasize STEM and language/literacy development; use of technology to enhance instruction</p>
<p><b>PROJECT MEASURE:</b> The teacher preparation program will be redesigned to</p>	<p>Summer workshops for IHE faculty that includes discussion of CRIOP elements</p>

include CRIOP elements in course outcomes, candidate assessment, and clinical experiences.	and alignment of TESOL and WIDA language standards and core content standards with course and program objectives; required syllabi revision
<b>PROJECT MEASURE:</b> Teacher efficacy in implementing CRI practices will increase for 90% of the participants.	3-phase professional development sequence that focuses on family collaboration, second language acquisition, and the CRIOP model

\*Note: Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) Measures 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 are not applicable in our state, as licensure occurs at the advanced level only. Please see the previous explanation on why we have chosen to focus on the local certification of regular classroom teachers (as opposed to state licensure).

### ***Project Personnel***

Several individuals will be responsible for the management and implementation of the proposed project. These include the project director and principal investigator, a school coach, several project consultants, administrators in local LEAs, and a part-time staff member. The Collaborative Center for Literacy Development will serve as the External Evaluator. Names and responsibilities of these individuals and entities are outlined below.

**Rebecca Powell** holds a doctorate in Curriculum and Instruction with an emphasis on literacy and diversity. She will serve as the Project Director and Principal Investigator. Dr. Powell has authored and co-edited four books on culturally responsive instruction,

including the latest volume titled *Literacy for All Students: An Instructional Framework for Closing the Gap* (2011). She also has extensive administrative experience, serving as Project Director of the current professional development grant and having formerly served as Dean of Education. She will have primary responsibility for overseeing the project, for working with districts to recruit participants and analyze student achievement outcomes, and for determining whether project goals are being met. She will also have the primary responsibility for teacher, administrator, and college faculty training in the CRIOP, and will be given reassigned time to assist the school-based coach in working with teams of teachers in the local schools. Dr. Powell will have a part-time staff assistant to help with project implementation. This individual has not yet been hired.

**Susan Hill** holds a doctorate in Education from Texas A & M University. Dr. Hill will serve as the primary coach in schools. Dr. Hill has extensive clinical experience working with teachers in schools. As a doctoral student at Texas A & M, she assisted teachers in the Bryan School district in the area of reading instruction. As a Visiting Assistant Professor at Roosevelt University in Chicago and the Director of the US Department of Education TQE (Teacher Quality Enhancement) project, she collaborated with the College of Arts and Sciences and with private, public, and charter schools to provide mentoring for new teachers on site. Most of that work involved demonstration and/or co-teaching with first and second year teachers. She was also consultant to the federal courts in Kansas City, Missouri as part of an on going desegregation order. Her work there involved monitoring the way 25 schools in the city system were implementing job-embedded professional development and then doing demonstrations of teaching techniques that the district chose to highlight as part of their system-wide improvement

plan. At Loyola University, Dr. Hill worked closely with a Professional Development School and a second dual immersion Spanish-English school to provide teacher education for students in ELL programs. At Georgetown College, she has worked extensively in the field with students who were career changers and working towards a masters in LBD. Her work in the field primarily involved modeling and discussing differentiated teaching techniques and the use of data based decision making in the classroom. She will be provided with ½ reassigned time and will be assigned to participating schools to meet with teams and assist teachers in their classrooms.

**Andrea Peach**, who holds a doctorate in Instructional Design and Technology, will direct the robotics camps in local communities and will also provide professional development in the uses of technology for ELL students. Eight years ago, after seeing a need for training teachers in implementing STEM through technology and engineering activities, Dr. Peach started a robotics program using the Lego Mindstorms Robotics. In her graduate class, teachers learn how to build and program robots and how to implement other appropriate technology and engineering content in their classrooms. They also participate in the robotics camp, which Dr. Peach offers annually to local elementary and middle school students. Dr. Peach is the founder of a statewide robotics competition for students who participate in Kentucky's Student Technology Leadership Program, which draws students statewide. She regularly presents on robotics and other instructional technology topics at district, state, and national / international conferences and has co-written two book chapters (in press) on the use of technology with young children.

**Christel Broady** holds a doctorate in Curriculum, Instruction & Administration with a specialization in Second Language acquisition. Dr. Broady is a native of Germany and

acquired English as a second language. In Europe, Dr. Broady studied German as a Second Language for Turkish and Muslim immigrants. Dr. Broady serves as the Director of our English as a Second Language endorsement program and will be a major consultant on the project. She has extensive experience teaching ESL courses and directing ESL initiatives, both at the state and national level. She has held many service and leadership positions in the profession, including: current chair of TESOL's global Elementary Education IS, past chair-elect, NCATE/TESOL program reviewer, TESOL Elementary Education steering board member, Past President of the Kentucky TESOL, board member of the KY TESOL, liaison between KY TESOL and TESOL, and current Professional Development board member at the KY TESOL.

**Yolanda Gallardo Carter** holds a doctorate in Curriculum and Instruction from Kansas State University, with an emphasis on second language acquisition and diversity. She will serve as a consultant on the project. Dr. Carter is bilingual and of Mexican descent, and taught elementary school in the state of Arizona on the border of Mexico for 12 years. During the first two years of her teaching career she conceptualized, designed, and implemented a dual language program. She also served as a bilingual consultant and district writing specialist throughout her years as an elementary school teacher. While at Kansas State, she was the Associate Director for the CLASSIC ESL/Dual Language Program. She also served as a Diversity Specialist working with faculty and staff within the college on issues of diversity and second language acquisition. She has conducted numerous professional development sessions for teachers and faculty both in our local region and in other states. She currently serves as Dean of Education at our institution.

**Lisa Eddy** holds a doctorate degree in Mathematics Education. She has served as a middle school mathematics teacher for the past several years and is knowledgeable in the new national Common Core Standards in Mathematics. She will serve as a Math consultant on the grant project. As additional standards are released (e.g. Science, Social Studies), we will ask faculty in these content areas to serve as consultants to assist participants in incorporating the standards into lesson and unit planning.

**Shelda Hale**, who serves as Title III Program Consultant at the Kentucky Department of Education, has the primary responsibility for overseeing ELL initiatives in the state. Dr. Hale assisted with the conceptualization of the project and will continue to serve as a consultant so that we can stay abreast of state and national initiatives as they impact EL students and families.

**The Collaborative Center for Literacy Development** at the University of Kentucky has extensive experience conducting research on statewide literacy projects. For over a decade, the CCLD has directed investigations on various literacy initiatives in the state, e.g., Reading First, Read to Achieve, and Read Kentucky (an adult literacy project that used technology). In 2006, CCLD received a \$2.8 million grant to investigate the effectiveness of a literacy intervention program as part of the U. S. Department of Education's Striving Readers program, a federal effort to raise the reading achievement levels of middle and high school students. The primary role of the CCLD is to promote literacy in the state through new programs and ongoing research. The CCLD will be the external evaluators for the project. **Susan Cantrell**, Ed.D., is the Director of Research for the Collaborative Center for Literacy Development (CCLD) and she will be working directly with the Project Director to evaluate the quality of the project.

### **District Administrators and Liaisons**

In addition, several administrators in the partnering LEAs were involved in conceptualizing the project and will continue to assist with its implementation. These include the following individuals and their roles:

- 1) Bourbon County: Mr. Jim Dickerson, Director of Planning and Programs; Ms. Jeanne Crowe, Instructional Coordinator & Director of Federal Programs; Ms. Carol Lizer, ESL Teacher;
- 2) Fayette County: Mr. Vince Mattox, Director of School, Community, and Government Support; Ms. Barbara Connor, Superior Customer Service Coordinator and Communications Supervisor;
- 3) Paris Independent: Mr. Clay Goode, District Instructional Supervisor and Assessment Coordinator;
- 4) Scott County: Mr. Chip Southworth, Director of Secondary Education; Mr. Matthew Thompson, Director of Elementary Curriculum; Mr. Steve Hill, Migrant Education Director.

The Project Director will meet with school administrators annually (and more often if needed) to review the project goals and to determine the effectiveness of the professional development. School administrators will also assist project personnel in identifying teachers and schools, in planning and implementing summer robotics camps and family social events, and in reviewing and analyzing evaluation results that might lead to project refinement. In addition, districts have identified school-community liaisons who will assist with community camps and events.

### ***Demographic Information on LEAs***

Bourbon County: The ELL population in Bourbon County has grown significantly in recent years, from 48 students in 2008 to over 250 who are currently being monitored by district personnel. Students speak six different native languages, with Spanish being the most dominant. Bourbon County is a rural county and many of the ELL families work in the agricultural industry. Data from 2009 district profiles show that 3% of the student population has limited English proficiency, 6% are migrants, and 7% are of Hispanic descent (KY Legislative Research Commission, 2010).

Fayette County: Fayette County Public School District is headquartered in Lexington, Kentucky and services both urban and rural populations. The ELL population in this district is extremely diverse, with some ELL families working in the urban environment and others working on local farms (especially horse farms). The demographics of FCPS in 2009 were 7% Limited English Proficient, 1% Migrant, and 9% Hispanic (KY Legislative Research Commission, 2010).

Paris Independent: Paris Independent School District is a small district in Paris, Kentucky (Bourbon County). The number of LEP students has doubled in the past three years, with a total of 29 in 2009 compared to 14 in 2006. District personnel report that their Hispanic students are dropping out of high school, and they want to stop this trend. (In 2006, Paris Independent reported a 0% drop-out rate.) Their ELL student population is Hispanic, and this population has increased from 6% of the student population in 2006 to 11% in 2009 (KY Legislative Research Commission, 2010).

Scott County: Scott County is a primarily rural county and provides clinical placements for many of our students, as the college is also located in this county. As in the other surrounding counties, low socioeconomic status contributes to the achievement gap;

however, the county has also seen a surge in the number of ELL students. The number of students with limited English proficiency has nearly doubled in the county in the past five years, from 87 in 2006 to 162 in 2009, which represents 2% of the total school population (KY Legislative Research Commission, 2010).

### ***Management Plan***

The following table outlines the timelines, project activities, the persons responsible for each activity, and the percentage of time that key staff will devote to project activities.

<b>Timeline</b>	<b>Project Activities</b>	<b>Responsible Individual(s)</b>	<b>Percentage of Time Expected</b>
<b>YEAR ONE: 2011 - 2012</b>			
August	Data gathering	External Evaluator	(See sub-contract for estimated hours)
August - September	Phase One: Two PD sessions on developing relationships with ELL families; planned social event in local communities (and/or home visits)	Project Director; School Administrators and Liaisons; Teachers (for home visits); ESL consultant	Project Director: 50% reassigned time during fall semester; ESL consultant: 4 days; School Liaison: 2 days for assisting with social event
September - December	Phase Two: Two PD sessions for teachers with site-based	Project Director; ESL consultant;	Project Director: 50% reassigned time during fall semester; School-based

Timeline	Project Activities	Responsible Individual(s)	Percentage of Time Expected
	follow-up with teacher teams on second language acquisition theory and application and technology applications for ELLs	Bilingual consultant; Technology consultant; School coach; KDE Consultant	Coach: 50% reassigned time; ESL consultant: 4 days (includes planning, on-line discussion forums and establishing Communities of Practice); Bilingual consultant: 2 days (includes planning); Technology consultant: one day for training on translator pens and other software (includes planning); KDE Consultant: ½ day
January - May	Phase Three: Two PD sessions plus site-based follow-up with teacher teams on implementing elements of the CRIOP	Project Director; School-based Coach; Content Specialty Consultant(s)	Project Director: 100 % of reassigned time during spring semester; School-based coach: 50% of reassigned time; Content specialist(s): one day consulting (includes

<b>Timeline</b>	<b>Project Activities</b>	<b>Responsible Individual(s)</b>	<b>Percentage of Time Expected</b>
			planning)
May	Data gathering for project evaluation	External Evaluator	(See sub-contract for estimated hours)
June	Meetings with district personnel to evaluate project and plan for upcoming year	Project Director; District Administrators; External Evaluator	Project Director: 50% of reassigned time during summer
June	Planning and recruitment for community-based Robotics Camps	Project Director; Technology Consultant; Community Liaisons	Project Director: 50% reassigned time during summer; Technology Consultant: 2 days for coordinating with liaison and planning camps; Community Liaison: 1 day for camp recruitment
<b>YEAR TWO: 2012 - 2013</b>			
July	Hold two week-long community-based robotics camps for	Project Director; Technology	Project Director: 50% reassigned time during summer; Technology

<b>Timeline</b>	<b>Project Activities</b>	<b>Responsible Individual(s)</b>	<b>Percentage of Time Expected</b>
	ELL students	Consultant	Consultant: 50% summer teaching load for teaching robotics course (integrated with the camps)
July – August	Phase One: Two PD sessions on developing relationships with ELL families; planned social event in local communities (and/or home visits)	Project Director; School Administrators and Liaisons; Teachers (for home visits); ESL Consultant	Project Director: 50% reassigned time during fall semester; ESL Consultant: 4 days; School Liaison: 2 days for assisting with social event
July - August	One PD session for school administrators (from years one and two); three PD sessions for college faculty	Project Director; ESL Consultant; Bilingual Consultant; KDE Consultant	Project Director: 50% reassigned time during summer; ESL Consultant: 4 days; Bilingual Consultant: 2 days; KDE consultant: ½ day
September - October	Project Evaluation with District	Project Director;	Project Director: 50% reassigned time during fall

Timeline	Project Activities	Responsible Individual(s)	Percentage of Time Expected
	Personnel Using Student Achievement Data from Year One	External Evaluator; District Administrators	semester
September - December	Phase Two: Two PD sessions plus follow-up with teacher teams in schools on second language acquisition theory and application and technology applications for ELLs	Project Director; ESL consultant; Bilingual consultant; Technology consultant; School coach; KDE Consultant	Project Director: 50% reassigned time during fall semester; School-based Coach: 50% reassigned time; ESL consultant: 4 days (includes planning, on-line discussion forums and establishing Communities of Practice); Bilingual consultant: 2 days (includes planning); Technology consultant: one day for training on translator pens and other software (includes planning); KDE Consultant: ½ day

Timeline	Project Activities	Responsible Individual(s)	Percentage of Time Expected
January - June	Repeat of timeline and responsibilities from year one, with implementation of Phase Three, Project Evaluation, Meetings with Districts, and Planning/Recruitment for Robotics Camps		
<b>YEAR THREE: 2013 – 2014 and YEAR FOUR: 2014 - 2015</b>			
<p>Years Three and Four will repeat the activities of Year Two, with the implementation of Phase One before the start of school, the implementation of Phase Two during the fall semester, and the implementation of Phase Three during the spring semester. Pre- and post-evaluations will occur in August and May of each cycle. Meetings with districts to evaluate project goals will occur in the fall, after student achievement data is available from the previous year. Planning and implementation of community robotics camps will occur in June and July. Workshops for college faculty will occur in Years Two and Three and will be phased out in Year Four, unless otherwise needed for training new faculty and providing funds are available.</p>			
<b>YEAR FIVE: 2015 - 2016</b>			
Year five will repeat the activities from the previous years. Additional responsibilities are noted below.			
May - June	Compile date for final project evaluation report	External Evaluator	(See sub-contract for estimated hours)
May - June	Ceremony to honor selected school-based	Project Director	50% reassigned time during the summer

<b>Timeline</b>	<b>Project Activities</b>	<b>Responsible Individual(s)</b>	<b>Percentage of Time Expected</b>
	clinical faculty		
June	Write final project report	Project Director	50% reassigned time during the summer

### ***Project Evaluation Plan***

A comprehensive evaluation will continuously inform the project in terms of both its implementation and impact. Feedback from ongoing data collection and analysis will enable appropriate adjustment and modification of professional development activities. Researchers at the Collaborative Center for Literacy Development (CCLD) will conduct an independent evaluation with measures tied directly to project objectives. The following chart indicates the proposed evaluation activities:

<b>Project Objectives</b>	<b>Measures &amp; Data Collection</b>	<b>How Data will be Used</b>
<b>GPRA MEASURE 1.5:*</b> At least 125 in-service content teachers (25/year over 5 years) will participate in professional development in effective instructional practices for ELLs. At least 10% of these teachers will be STEM content teachers.	<i>Attendance records</i> will be taken at each professional development session, and <i>coaching logs</i> will document the number of hours that each teacher participates in on-site professional development activities. Pre- and post-professional	Participation data will be reported at the school level and by teachers' content area. Aggregated results from CRIOP observations will be shared with all project personnel each year to determine areas

<p>100% of participants will complete all professional development requirements in ELL instruction for local certification.</p>	<p>development <i>CRIOP</i> observations will be conducted in each teacher's classroom the year s/he participates in the project.</p>	<p>in which teachers need strengthened support from professional development and administrators</p>
<p><b>GPRA MEASURE 1.6:</b> 100% of inservice teacher completers are providing instructional services to ELL students.</p>	<p><i>Student demographic information</i> for each teacher's class will be collected at the end of each year of the project. The percentage of inservice teachers providing services to ELL students will be reported.</p>	<p>School-level data related to the number of completers who are providing services to ELL students will be shared with school administrators during school-level administrator meetings to ensure appropriate adjustments are made.</p>
<p><b>PROJECT MEASURE:</b> At least 60 teachers who complete the local certification program (12 per year over five years) will be designated by the higher education institution</p>	<p>Post-professional development <i>CRIOP</i> observations will be used to select high implementers of CRI to serve as clinical faculty. <i>Institutional records</i> will be gathered at the end of each year of the project</p>	<p>Project staff will utilize these data to make adjustments to clinical placement processes.</p>

to serve as clinical faculty, as determined by outstanding instructional practices and dispositions.	to ascertain the number of designated clinical faculty with whom pre-service teachers are placed.	
<b>PROJECT MEASURE:</b> ELL student achievement will increase in classrooms served by the project.	<i>Student-level state assessment scores (reading, mathematics, and science)</i> will be obtained from schools in the fall of each year. Gains for all students in participating teachers' classrooms will be computed. Gains for ELL students will be disaggregated.	Data will be shared with project personnel, participants, and school administrators so that implementation in needed content areas can be strengthened for increased student achievement.
<b>PROJECT MEASURE:</b> The teacher preparation program will be redesigned to include CRIOP elements in course outcomes, candidate assessment, and clinical experiences.	At the beginning of each project year, <i>course syllabi</i> will be analyzed for alignment with CRIOP elements.	Analysis of course syllabi and recommendations for further improvements will be shared with project personnel each year.
<b>PROJECT MEASURE:</b> Teacher efficacy in implementing CRI practices	The <i>Culturally Responsive Teaching Survey (CRTS)</i> (Siwatu, 2007) will be	Overall survey results will be shared with project personnel each

<p>will increase for 90% of the participants.</p>	<p>administered to teachers prior to their participation in the professional development activities and at the end of their participation year. A change score will be computed for each teacher, and overall gains in teacher efficacy will be reported each year.</p>	<p>year of the project.</p>
---	---	-----------------------------