

U.S. Department of Education

Washington, D.C. 20202-5335



APPLICATION FOR GRANTS UNDER THE

NATIONAL PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

CFDA # 84.365Z

PR/Award # T365Z110239

Grants.gov Tracking#: GRANT10865421

Closing Date: MAY 09, 2011

Project Abstract

Name of the IHE: Southern Methodist University

Title of the Program: Connecting Research, Pedagogy and Curriculum in School Settings: Developing K-12 Educational Leadership Teams

Consortia Partners: Dallas Independent School District, Irving Independent School District, Mesquite Independent School District, Forney Independent School District and Region 10 Education Service Center. **Other Partner:** The Hispanic College Fund

Project Description: Research shows that today, one in five students in the United States is the child of immigrants, and by 2040 that ratio is projected to increase to one in three (Carhill, Suarez-Orozco & Paes, 2008). From 1990 through 2005 academic years, the number of English learners, enrolled in K-12, public schools grew 152%, with Hispanics accounting for 75% of these ELs (Tong, Lara-Alecio, Irby, Mathes & Kwok, 2008). Research also suggests that this trend is nationwide as ELs enrollment has grown 200% in at least 15 states (Francis, Rivera, Lesaux, Kieffer, & Rivera, 2006). The challenges faced by school districts across the nation are many and they also represent the needs across local districts in Texas. For example, across our partner districts besides the rapid growth of the EL population, there are two key factors to consider: (1) cultural and linguistic factors involving a wide range in the diversity of students; and (2) EL students' academic factors such as lack of schooling (e.g., newcomers and refugees) and/or low academic under achievement as in the case of long-term English learners.

Research indicates that schools with larger concentrations of English learners are more likely to have teachers who (a) have fewer years of teaching experience in general, (b) have fewer years of teaching at that particular school, (c) are not fully credentialed; and (d) when they are credentialed, still lack the professional training to address the literacy and language needs of their diverse student population (Short & Boyson, 2000; Darling-Hammond & Ball, 1997). Furthermore, research shows that those differences in teachers' professional development account for 12% to 14% of total variability in students' mathematics achievement gains during an elementary school year. Research also indicates that the effects of teachers on students' achievement compounds if students receive a series of effective or ineffective teachers (National Mathematics Advisory Panel, 2008). These findings point to the need for differentiated professional development training in order for teachers to address the academic needs of their diverse EL population. For example, in suburban district we find greater preponderance of migrant students who are English learners and long-term ELs. On the other hand, in urban districts we find a greater combined number of immigrant students, newcomers, refugees, and long-term ELs in the schooling process. These differences across districts call for differentiated instructional practices to be used with students as well as in the delivery of teacher professional development training. This means that professional development for teachers also needs to be differentiated given the context and level of proficiency in teaching methods, use and knowledge of assessment, and their content skills to name a few. In other words, effective professional development practices are those that require for programmatic efforts to be differentiated and contextual given the level of skills and knowledge (e.g., beginner, intermediate, advance and advance high) among educators.

The project, *Connecting Research, Pedagogy and Curriculum in School Settings: Developing K-12 Educational Leadership Teams*, reflects the priority of integrating research-based pedagogical practices along with research-based cultural, linguistic, and community aspects into K-12 curriculum and differentiated teacher professional development activities. The project reflects the priority of addressing the needs of at-risk students by developing curriculum, delivering professional development training, and evaluating professional development for educators who teach in schools with high concentrations of ELs. Teachers in the program will gain a supplemental ESL certification and for those already certified the program seeks to offer further professional development in math, science and bilingual education. The program seeks to promote teachers' use of effective pedagogy, gaining knowledge on the use of assessment tools and using research-based principles for the teaching and learning of at-risk students from diverse socio-cultural backgrounds.

This is a collaborative proposal with a consortia of four school districts participating through three interconnected goals: **Goal (1)** teacher professional development activities through (e.g., ESL Supplemental Certification, graduate level courses on assessment, cultural, linguistic, pedagogical, and community) for educators including: bilingual and content teachers (e.g., Math and Science) and Summer International Education and Leadership program component. This goal of the project addresses **Competitive Priority # 3** by increasing the opportunities for high-quality preparation of or professional development for, teachers and other educators of STEM subjects. **Goal (2)** Development of K-12 Educational Leadership Teams in schools: this goal will involve educators' training (e.g., paraprofessionals, community liaisons, counselors, administrators, and content teachers) on curriculum development and on how to implement data-based decision with their students, classrooms, and school in socio-cultural context. This goal addresses **Competitive Priority #2** by providing professional development activities on how to collect data, analyze data, and use data timely for the improvement of instructional practices, policies, and student outcomes in elementary and secondary schools. And **Goal (3)**, development of research-based teacher professional development curriculum/modules (e.g., through the integration of the Center for Research on Education, Diversity, and Excellence (CREDE)'s standards for effective teaching and learning interwoven with TEKS and ELPS. This goal addresses **Invitational Priority #2** on improving preparation of all teachers to better serve ELs.

To achieve these goals, we have partnered with four Independent School Districts in North Texas and with one of the 20 Education Service Centers in Texas - Region 10 - which serves over 80 school districts in the State of Texas. The partner districts include: (a) The Dallas Independent School District (DISD) with a total population of 156,728 students of which 36% are classified as LEP and 66% as academically at-risk, (b) The Irving Independent School District (IISD) with a total population of 33,563 students of which 39% are classified at LEP and 66% as academically at-risk, (c) The Mesquite Independent School District (Mesquite ISD) with a total population of 37,175 students of which 18% are classified as LEP and 47% as academically at-risk, and (d) the Forney Independent School District (Forney ISD) with a total population of 7,795 students of which 5% are classified as LEP and 33% as academically at-risk. The size of the districts (large, medium and small) as well as the settings (urban and sub-urban) points to the importance of the proposed projects in relation to its impact as well as in relation to the research findings on how to address unique and overlapping districts' needs across diverse ecological settings.

The proposed project will use established protocols for summative and formative evaluations (e.g., student achievement data, surveys, classroom observations to examine fidelity of implementation, resilience and learning environment scales). It is an interconnected evaluation component for data-driven decision making in order to inform curriculum/modules under development as well as to inform formative and summative aspects of the program. In addition, the proposed evaluation also includes a *quasi-experimental study* using a Delayed Treatment Control Group Design. This quasi-experimental study allows for comparisons between districts as well as within and between groups at each district. For example, what is the quality of teaching practices by teachers in our program in comparison to teachers who are in the wait-list control condition (e.g., cohort 3)? Because we will be doing this evaluation study in a longitudinal fashion (e.g., years 2, 3, 4, and 5) we will also be able to evaluate the longitudinal effect of the program and answer questions such as: at what point do teachers in our program begin to fully implement effective teaching practices in their classrooms? And at what point do we begin to see those effects having an impact on students' academic performance as well as in their views of the school and classroom environment? This is an important component of the evaluation since we cannot assume that any effect will take place in a short period of time or that the impact of the proposed project will be the same for all students. Furthermore, we will be able to differentiate between those program components that are context specific for each district (such as training needed to address the academic needs of larger population of newcomers, migrant students etc.) and those program components that are applicable to any districts (such as basic training needed on processes for second language acquisition, language transfer and memory processes to name a few).

The proposed project also has annual targets for GPRA Measures that are applicable to the type of educational personnel we propose to serve. We will provide professional development differentiated activities and ESL certification to 35 teachers yearly (for five years) for a total of 175. The program will also offer further professional development activities for 15 teachers, each year, in Bilingual and content area (Math and Science) for a total of 75 educators trained across five years. The project also seeks to provide capacity building professional development activities for K-12 Teams (seven educators per team – including administrators, lead teachers, paraprofessionals, community liaisons and counselors) to be implemented at four school for a total of 28 participants, each year of the project, for a total of 140 educators across five years. The program will provide further training and ESL supplemental certification to a combined total of 390 educators. This combined number does not reflect all of the indirect impact that the project will have on participating parents and other educators from school districts who will be invited to the *Summer Institute* to be held in collaboration with Region 10. Nor does it reflect the impact of college readiness activities with high school students through the collaboration with the Hispanic College Fund. This last component addresses *Invitational Priority #1* on improving achievement and high school graduation rates. Overall, these differentiated programmatic efforts are critically needed to ensure that EL students succeed in their schooling process.

Contact: Dr. Hector H. Rivera
(214) 768-1394
Email: hrivera@smu.edu

Narrative

The project titled *Connecting Research, Pedagogy and Curriculum in School Settings: Developing K-12 Educational Leadership Teams*, reflects the priority of integrating research-based pedagogical practices along with research-based cultural, linguistic, and community aspects into K-12 curriculum and teacher professional development activities. This is a collaborative proposal with a consortia of four school districts participating through three interconnected goals: **Goal (1)** teacher professional development activities through (e.g., ESL Supplemental Certification, graduate level courses on assessment, cultural, linguistic, pedagogical, and community aspects) for educators including: bilingual and content teachers (e.g., Math and Science) and Summer International Education and Leadership program. This goal of the project addresses *Competitive Priority # 3* by increasing the opportunities for high-quality preparation of or professional development for teachers and other educators of STEM subjects. **Goal (2)** Development of K-12 Educational Leadership Teams in schools: this involves educators' training (e.g., paraprofessionals, community liaisons, counselors, administrators, content and ESL/Bilingual lead teachers) on curriculum development and how to implement data-based decision with their students, classrooms, and school in a socio-cultural context. This goal addresses *Competitive Priority #2* by providing professional development activities on how to collect data, analyze data, and use data timely for the improvement of instructional practices, policies, and student outcomes in elementary and secondary schools. And **Goal (3)**, development of research-based teacher professional development curriculum/modules (e.g., through the integration of the Center for Research on Education, Diversity, and Excellence (CREDE)'s standards for effective teaching and learning interwoven with TEKS and ELPS. This goal addresses *Invitational Priority #2* on improving preparation of all teachers to better serve ELs.

To achieve these goals, we have partnered with four Independent School Districts in North Texas and with one of the 20 Education Service Centers in Texas - Region 10 - which serves over 80 school districts in the State of Texas. The partner districts include: (a) The Dallas Independent School District (DISD) with a total population of 156,728 students of which 36% are classified as LEP and 66% as academically at-risk, (b) The Irving Independent School District (IISD) with a total population of 33,563 students of which 39% are classified at LEP and 66% as academically at-risk, (c) The Mesquite Independent School District (Mesquite ISD) with a total population of 37,175 students of which 18% are classified as LEP and 47% as academically at-risk, and (d) the Forney Independent School District (Forney ISD) with a total population of 7,795 students of which 5% are classified as LEP and 33% as academically at-risk.

From 1997 to 2008, Texas public schools enrollment grew by 20.1%. This is an increase of more than three-quarters of a million students (NCES, 2010a). Meanwhile, the number of students identified as LEP grew by 47.1% between 1999 and 2010, and the number of student receiving bilingual or ESL instructional services increased by 56.5% across districts in Texas. Both, LEP students and students receiving bilingual and ESL services experienced increases of more than a quarter of a million students and since 2002, the percentage of immigrant students has experienced an steadily increase of 1.7% as reported until 2009-10 academic year. This increase in the cultural and linguistic diversity of students has also meant increased variability in the academic performance of English Learners in the schooling process. For example, in Dallas ISD in 2009 and 2010, the percentage of LEP third graders who met the TAKS standards, for all tests (e.g., English Arts, Mathematics, Science and Social Studies) was 76% and 78% respectively. In tenth grade, in 2009 and 2010, the percentage of students who met TAKS standards, for all tests, was 16% and 27% respectively. In 2009 and 2010, the percentage of LEP

third graders who met the TAKS standards, for all tests at Irving ISD was 56% and 58% respectively. In tenth grade, in 2009 and 2010, the percentage of students who met TAKS standards, for all tests, was 14% and 23% respectively. In Mesquite ISD, figures show that, in 2009 and 2010, the percent of LEP third graders who met the TAKS standards, for all tests, was 78% and 79% respectively and in tenth grade the percentages dropped to 11% and 22% respectively for all tests. A similar trend is also found for LEP students in Forney ISD where the percentage of third graders who met TAKS standards, in 2009 and 2010, was 82% and 86% respectively and for tenth graders the percentage was 17% who met TAKS standards for 2009 and no data on LEPs was reported for 2010, except for At-Risk students category with only 51% meeting TAKS standards for 2010 (TEA, 2009-10). These districts represent a wide spectrum from large size districts in urban settings (such as Dallas ISD), medium size districts (such as Irving and Mesquite) as well as small districts in sub-urban areas (such as Forney ISD). The proposed project will serve to inform on the unique needs, given the size of a district, as well as their overlapping concerns, instead of assuming a “one model fits all” solution.

Although districts’ academic needs seem to be similar, they also vary on the type of EL student that they are serving in their schools. For example, in suburban district we find a greater preponderance of migrant students who are English learners as well as long-term ELs. However, in urban districts we find a greater combined number of immigrant students, newcomers, refugees, and long-term ELs in the schooling process. These differences across districts call for differentiated instructional practices to be used with students as well as in the delivery of teacher professional development. Professional development also needs to be differentiated for teachers given the context and level of proficiency in teaching methods, use and knowledge of assessment, and content skills and knowledge to name a few. In other words, effective

professional development practices are those that require programmatic efforts to be differentiated and contextual given the level of skills and knowledge (e.g., beginner, intermediate, advance and advance high) among teachers.

Complexity of the Educational Issues faced across Districts

The challenges faced by school districts across the nation are many and they also represent the needs across local districts in Texas. For example, across our partner districts besides the rapid growth of the EL population, there are two key factors to consider: (1) cultural and linguistic factors involving a wide range in the diversity of students; and (2) EL students' academic factors such as lack of schooling (e.g., newcomers and refugees) and/or low academic under achievement as in the case of long-term English learners.

Cultural and Linguistic Factors: Research shows that today, one in five students in the United States is the child of immigrants, and by 2040 that ratio is projected to increase to one in three (Carhill, Suarez-Orozco & Paes, 2008). From 1990 through 2005 academic years, the number of English learners, enrolled in K-12, public schools grew 152%, with Hispanics accounting for 75% of these ELs (Tong, Lara-Alecio, Irby, Mathes & Kwok, 2008). Research also suggests that this trend is nationwide as ELs enrollment has grown 200% in at least 15 states (Francis, Rivera, Lesaux, Kieffer, & Rivera, 2006).

Research also shows that today's classrooms have a wide range of culturally and linguistically diverse students. The top five countries where immigrants come from include: (1) Mexico, (2) China, (3) India, (4) Philippines and (5) Vietnam (Pew Hispanic Center, 2008). For example, in Texas public school districts, Hispanics have the largest numerical increase in enrollment, rising by 748,385 students (or 49.0%) over the last decade. In 2008-09, Hispanic students accounted for the largest percentage of total enrollment with 47.9%. Within the

Hispanic community we also find a wide range of diversity represented by Latin American, Caribbean countries and indigenous communities of the Americas.

The need to address the cultural and linguistic complexity of English learners is also evident in the disparity shown by research on their high school dropout rates, and their low entrance to colleges. For example, the high school dropout rate for all Hispanics nationwide is 21% and specifically for immigrant Latinos, 33.7% (Pew Hispanic Center, 2003). Among those who are able to graduate from high school, there is **a gap in their readiness for college**. In their case, only 35% enrolled for college (ages 18-24) in comparison to 46% for white students. Furthermore, 40% of Hispanics enrolling in college attend a two-year institution (Pew Hispanic Center, 2002). This is a concern for our partner districts as they also seek professional development so their schools can provide a college readiness environment to ELs.

Academic Factors: According to a report by the National Mathematics Advisory Panel (2008), in elementary school, the U.S. is not among the world leaders; only 7% of U.S. fourth graders scored at the advance level in TIMSS (Trends in Mathematics and Science Study), compared to 38% of fourth graders in other developed nations. Similarly, in the U.S., while only 36% of all fourth graders scored at or above the proficient level on a national assessment of mathematics, within ELs, only 11% scored at or above the proficient level (Francis et al., 2006).

Research also shows that schools with larger concentrations of English learners are more likely to have teachers who (a) have fewer years of teaching experience in general, (b) have fewer years of teaching at that particular school, (c) are not fully credentialed; and (d) when they are credentialed, still lack the professional training to address the literacy and language needs of their student population (Short & Boyson, 2000; Darling-Hammond & Ball, 1997). Furthermore, research shows that those differences in teachers' professional development account for 12% to

14% of total variability in students' mathematics achievement gains during an elementary school year. Research also indicates that the effects of teachers on students' achievement compounds if students receive a series of effective or ineffective teachers (National Mathematics Advisory Panel, 2008). Therefore, pointing to the need for differentiated professional development training in order for teachers to address the academic needs of their diverse EL students.

(a) Quality of Project Design (40 points)

(1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.

Complex Educational Issues Require Complex Solutions

In the past, our tendency has been to provide simple solutions to complex problems. For example, we tend to focus only on one dimension such as providing ESL supplemental certification and/or only providing further professional development activities; or only addressing the needs at the elementary or secondary level. Seldom do we pay much attention to the research on child development, learning environments, and program development that points out that an interconnected holistic approach seeking to develop a community of educators, within districts and across schools, is bound to produce greater achievement and impact (Tharp & Gallimore, 1998; Tharp et al., 2000; Waxman, Padron, Shin & Rivera, 2008). Therefore, we propose a combination of strategies that are as diverse as the needs encountered at each district but at the same time cohesive and wrapped around overarching research-based principles for effective teaching and learning.

Project Goals, Objectives and Activities

*Goals are bolded; followed by objectives, in bold italic. Key activities, with an asterisk, are linked to immediate goal and objective. Due to space limitations, the following is a partial list.

Goal 1: Provide Differentiated Professional Development ESL certification and training for K-12 teachers serving ELs (e.g., content Math and Science).

Objective 1a: To recruit, provide graduate level courses and professional development training for ESL supplemental certification to a total of 125 elementary and secondary teachers serving ELs during a year-long “Institute for Educators of English Learners”.

*Meet with District Consortium Committee to decide where project efforts will begin at their district (e.g., elementary or secondary school).

*Priority will be given to teachers in participating schools, each year of the project.

*Notify teachers, at each of the schools, across partner districts of the availability of project traineeships to promote the largest possible number of applicants from qualified candidates needing ESL supplemental certification (e.g., emails, school staff meetings, newsletters, etc).

* The SMU staff will provide information packets about the program to the principals of schools in the participating districts in elementary and secondary.

* A selection committee will be formed to choose project participants by the start date, and will include members from SMU faculty, ISDs and participating schools each year of the project.

*Twenty-five teachers from the partner ISDs will be selected, and admitted to the SMU “*Institute for Educators of English Learners*” (each year of the grant period). This institute will include (1) 4 graduate level courses, (2) participation in on-site (school) training workshops, (3) participation in the *Summer International Education and Leadership Program*, (4) participation in the *Summer Institute* for Educators and (5) ESL exam review session.

* The *Institute for Educators of English Learners* will serve to certify and prepare a total of 125 teachers. By the end of the spring semester 2016, 100 ISD teachers will have successfully

taken their ESL supplemental certification exam. The remaining 25 will be preparing to take the ESL exam in the summer of 2016.

Objective 1b: Provide a 4-day (short-term) differentiated professional development training to teachers across the four participating schools through the “Academy for the Professional Development for Educators of English Learners” during each year of the project.

*Recruit 25 teachers each year of the project to participate in this short-term *Academy*. This is meant to serve educators who either want to obtain ESL supplemental certification but who are not able to participate in the year-long program or for educators who are already ESL certified but who feel they need further training on current research-based teaching practices for ELs.

* Develop a training academy, containing 6 modules, to address the needs of Bilingual and ESL teachers as well as content teachers in math and science. Each module will focus on connecting relevant aspects from ESL, Bilingual and Content (e.g., math and science) as foundational connected knowledge in order to better serve ELs. For example, modules will include components integral to the needs of counselors, paraprofessionals and community liaisons in an effort to integrate these aspects into effective practices to serve ELs at each school campus.

*Teacher will choose 4 of the 6 modules most relevant to them in which to participate.

* During the spring, the *Academy for the Professional Development for Educators of English Learners* will continue through individual mentoring sessions between teachers, instructional coach/curriculum developer to assist schools in their data-based decision-making process.

*Provide an **elective graduate level course at SMU** for a total of 10 Bilingual and/or content teachers (who are ESL and content certified math and science) but who want to further update their knowledge and skills in their areas of teaching.

* Participants in the academy will also be prepared during an ESL test review session for their ESL certification exam. Participants from both programs (*Institute and Academy*) will be brought together at SMU for a comprehensive review in preparation for their ESL exam.

*Teachers will participate in the one-day *Summer Institute* and two weeks *Summer International Education and Leadership Program*.

*In the *Academy*, 10 out of 25 participants, each year of the project, will obtain ESL supplemental certification. By the end of the project period, 50 teachers across our partner districts will be ESL certified and 75 (Bilingual, ESL and content math, science) teachers will have received further professional development. This means that another group of 125 educators will be served through this short-term *Academy* program component.

Goal 2: Develop K-12 Educational Leadership Teams in school settings.

Objective 2a: Develop one K-12 Team at each district during each year of the granting period.

*Each district will chose the level (e.g., elementary or secondary) and school site where they want efforts to begin each year.

*During the fall of 2011 we will meet with school district academic program directors and other personnel to decide on participating schools for year 1 of the project. Similar steps will be taken during each spring semester to recruit schools for the following years of the project.

*Meet with personnel from chosen schools and present a plan of action on how the professional development activities will serve their school in areas of assessment, instruction, classroom/school environment, and leadership capacity building.

*The K-12 Teams will involve the engagement and participation of seven to eight educators including (1) one campus administrator, (2) one lead **teachers in ESL and/or Bilingual** education and (3) two lead **teachers in content areas** such as math, science, language art or

social studies, (4) one **staff in charge of family and community liaison** (5) one **paraprofessional** who serves multiple roles in the school such as individualized instructional needs and/or tutoring needs of ELs and (6) one **school counselor** (note: the participation of Bilingual, ESL and/or content teachers will vary by district depending if we are asked to work with elementary or secondary schools during any particular year).

*At the end of each year, we would have served four school teams (28 educators). This is a total of 20 team and/or 140 participants across five years of the project.

Objective 2b: Provide capacity building activities for all K-12 Teams at the University setting.

*One capacity building workshop (fall, spring, summer) between Program director, co-director, instructional coach/curriculum developer and K-12 Teams. Workshops will include activities such as (1) interpreting educational research, (2) developing and using assessment tools for the school and classrooms, (3) leadership strategies for the development of a school community, (4) building capacity among paraprofessionals, (5) meeting the counseling needs of ELs, (6) engaging families/community in students' academic development and (7) creating a college readiness environment in schools. Some of these workshops will be led by Region 10 and the Hispanic College Fund partners.

*Monthly capacity building and support by project's instructional coach/mentor and curriculum developer throughout each year of the project.

Objective 2c: Conduct a Needs Assessment at each of the four campuses participating in the project during each year of the granting period.

*During year 1, the Needs Assessment will be conducted in the fall of 2011 and thereafter during the spring, of each year, as a pre assessment for schools participating in the upcoming year.

*At each campus, we will work with the K-12 Team in the development and administration of a Needs Assessment (e.g., identifying their goals, etc.). Need Assessment data will be used to develop connected activities for **objective 2b on capacity building** as well as an integral part of the formative and summative evaluation of the project (e.g., surveys and other measures).

* Examine campus profiles from district achievement data. This will help us in the development of an action plan that is contextual and differentiated across each campus by focusing on their contextual needs. We will also share research findings across campuses and school districts for future implementation of similar teacher professional development efforts.

* Work with K-12 Teams in order to connect and make data-driven decisions for **Objective 1b**: Provide a 4-day differentiated training *Academy* to teachers across the four participating schools during each year of the project.

Objective 2d: provide national and international experience for the development of educational leaders

*Provide traineeships for educators to present in national conferences (e.g., American Educational Research Association, National Association of Bilingual Educator).

*Provide traineeships for educators to participate in ***Summer International Education and Leadership Program*** (e.g., Mexico, Guatemala and/or Peru).

*Offer 8 awards to participants in the K-12 Teams, each year, in order for them to present in national conferences and/or attend the ***Summer International Education and Leadership Program*** along with teachers from the year-long *Institute* and short-term *Academy*.

*Participants will be chosen by degree of engagement in the K-12 teams and by nomination of other team members from their schools.

*Each team will provide a set of goals and objectives for the participants in relation to what they expect from them after participation in the national or international program components. For example, participants may be asked to present to the rest of the school faculty on what they learned, what they researched and its applicability to their campus community.

Goal 3: Create a research-based *Teacher Professional Development Curriculum* through the integration of the Center for Research on Education, Diversity and Excellence (CREDE)'s standards for effective teaching and learning interwoven with TEKS and ELPS.

Objective 3a: Use CREDE's general research-based principles for teaching and learning as anchors to develop curriculum in collaboration with K-12 Teams at each school.

*Instructional coach/curriculum developer will conduct comprehensive review of the literature to identify empirical studies by CREDE researchers and other sources.

*Identify with K-12 Teams ways in which CREDE standards can be implemented in schools.

*Director and co-director will work with instructional coach/curriculum developer and K-12 Teams to triangulate data from Needs Assessment in order to address context specific curriculum needs at each school.

Objective 3b: Connect general research with contextual needs (as identified through Need Assessment survey) for each school participating in program.

*Infusion of findings from general research with context specific curriculum needs into all programmatic efforts proposed in this project (e.g., graduate courses, workshops, etc).

*Data-driven decisions for curriculum development at each school. This is to be connected with campus profiles and identified needs by district personnel.

Objective 3c: Integrate TEKS and ELPS into the curriculum to provide training on teaching and learning practices.

- *Use SMU graduate courses to train teachers on the integration of TEKS and ELPS.
- *Use *Academy* to train teachers on TEKS and ELPS by infusing standards into the modules.
- *Connect Needs Assessment with curriculum in ESL, Bilingual, and content area standards.
- *Use *Summer Institute* as an overarching activity at the end of each year, to provide all program participants with a comprehensive and integrated curriculum model that addresses context specific as well as general research-based practices for the teaching and learning of ELs.

Description of Major Program Components

The goals and objectives, for this professional development program, consist of two major components with several differentiated activities: 1) the academic program (graduate courses) for the year-long *Institute for Educators of English Learners* (to be referred to as the “*Institute*” in the remaining of the application) and for the short-term *Academy for the Professional Development for Educators of English Learners* (to be referred as the “*Academy*” in the remaining of the application). 2) Differentiated Professional Development Activities – Integrating standards (ESL, TEKS, ELPS and CREDE) in school context and community/culture/language activities through *coaching/mentoring*, creation of *K-12 Teams*, *Summer Institute* and *Summer International Education and Leadership Program*.

1. The Academic Program Components

The academic program leading to the ESL supplemental certification at SMU includes the following courses as shown in Table 1. It also shows some of the choices for elective courses that can be taken by participants in the *Academy*.

Table 1 – Curriculum for ESL Supplemental Certification Program		
Category	Courses	Titles
<i>Institute</i>	EDU 6320	ESL Language Teaching Research, Theory & Practice

	EDU 6390	ESL Classroom Instruction & Assessment for ELs
	EDU 6317	Culture and Community in Education
	EDU 6313	Spanish for Teachers
<i>Academy</i>	EDU 6321	Bilingualism/Biliteracy
1 Elective Course in	EDU 6339	Bilingual Content Instruction
Content Area	EDU 6370	Physical Science: Chemistry
	EDU 6381	Geometry and Measurement

In year 1, the courses will follow a spring, summer and fall schedule so the fall of 2011 can be used for planning with partner districts. Thereafter, the academic courses for the *Institute* will be offered during the fall, spring and summer semesters each year. For example, during the fall semester participants will take EDU 6390 and EDU 6317, during the spring semester participants will take EDU 6320 and during the summer they will participate in EDU 6313 (Spanish for Teachers) as part of their *Summer International Education and Leadership Program* or as a SMU campus course. Participants in the *Academy* will also have the opportunity to take one elective graduate level course at SMU in either Bilingual Education or content area (e.g., Math and Science). They will also have the opportunity to participate in the *Summer International Education and Leadership Program*.

2. Differentiated Professional Development Activities – Integrating standards for ESL, TEKS, ELPS, CREDE in school context and community/culture/language activities through *coaching/mentorship, K-12 Teams* and *National and International* field experience. Monthly mentorship activities at each of the four schools, each year of the grant, will allow for educators to find practical ways to integrate what they are learning through their academic

courses at SMU and other training workshops. The development of the K-12 Teams at each school will also add a new dimension by creating a supporting system that will continue after the granting period as each K-12 Team addresses relevant contextual issues based on data collected during their Needs Assessment and other research activities.

During K-12 teams, educators will be able to see the connection that exist between what they do as ESL educators and what others do and how it can be integrated for a holistic approach across grade levels or even across feeder patterns from elementary to secondary schools in their district. For example, the K-12 Teams will assist in the development of modules/curriculum to be offered to their peers during the *Academy*. Some of the proposed modules include: (1) Foundations of Bilingual Education and ESL, (2) Classroom Instruction and Assessment for ELs, (3) Language, Research, Theory and Practice, (4) Culture and Community in Education (e.g., includes creating a college ready culture in the classroom), (5) Teaching and Learning Content for ELs (this module will involve training for math and science educators by Region 10 contracted trainers in these specific content areas), (6) addressing professional development needs for paraprofessionals and counselors in school context and (7) engaging parents and community in students' academic development (These efforts also meet *Invitational Priority #2* on improving preparation of all teachers to better serve ELs).

A goal of the SMU program is also to interconnect the academic components with the type of experiences that teachers need to have to become highly-effective in the classroom. Therefore, the proposed graduate level courses will be offered in connection with practicum activities in order to address ESL, TEKS and ELPS standards on cultural awareness, family and community involvement as well as ESL language acquisition standards. For example, the exposure of teachers to Spanish as their second language will help them to better understand the

processes of second language acquisition as they are also guided during formal instruction by faculty from SMU. At the same time, their participation in cultural and linguistic *Summer International Education and Leadership Program* in Mexico, Guatemala and/or Peru will provide community/culture/language activities for professional growth and impact in their respective campuses. The goal of this program component is service and leadership development. For two weeks, educators will participate in Spanish language training in the morning and in the afternoon they will participate in the delivery of workshops, lectures and other educational activities. Collaborative efforts are already taking place in Mexico, Guatemala and Peru. They include teacher training, capacity building for administrators and family community involvement through non-profits. Participants in our program will be receiving further professional development at the same time that they use their learned leadership skills to assist other educators in an international setting. This experiential approach will have a positive impact on how participants address the teaching of subject matter with EL students in their schools. Also, we are providing educators with training in a second language (Spanish) that at least 70% of the students and families speak in today' schools across Texas.

The *Summer Institute* represents another integral activity seeking to interconnect all programmatic efforts. Each cohort of teachers will participate in one-day institute to be held at SMU or Region 10 at the end of each year as a culminating activity across districts. This summer institute will bring teachers, counselors, paraprofessionals, administrators, community liaisons, and presenters (e.g., instructional coach, curriculum developers and guest speaker specializing on - ex. on assessment, content teaching, integrating standards into the lessons for ELs, etc). This will serve to connect the lessons learned during the year in order to make data-driven decisions for the future. During the *Summer Institute* participants will also work collaboratively to

develop action plans on how to encourage parental involvement, learn from each others' program experiences across elementary and secondary schools. For example, one of our partner districts already pointed out that they need more assistance at the secondary level before our project moves into any elementary school in year 2. This means that in this district we will not begin to work with bilingual teachers at the start. However, the fact that programmatic efforts will be taking place in other districts, at the elementary level, is something that they welcome as they see how those efforts will serve to inform programmatic efforts at their elementary schools in the near future. This is because the lessons learned and data collected at any level (elementary or secondary) will serve all districts on future program decisions.

We have also partnered with the Hispanic College Fund (a National Organization) that is conducting programs with high school students in the same school districts. We will collaborate with them on the inclusion of students' voices at the *Summer Institute* through workshops led by students and have some of their recognized student leaders from high school present to students from participating schools in order to aide in the development of a college readiness student community (Please See Hispanic College Fund Letter of Support). These efforts are also in line with *Invitational Priority #1* on improving achievement and high school graduation rates).

(2) The extent to which the design of the proposed project reflects up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practices.

Our team does not represent a new applicant. In 2007, we received an award to provide ESL certification for content teachers of Newcomer students in the schooling process. Through this grant we have been able to carry out multiple activities such as (1) ESL supplemental certification (e.g., math, science, technology, social studies, English etc) through a 1-year-long program including 4 graduate level courses at SMU. (2) A cultural and linguistic immersion

program in Cuernavaca, Mexico where teachers experience language instruction as well as content specific activities such as how to make a piñata using principles from geometry and how to incorporate, connect and contextualize science instruction through their participation in cultural activities. For example, teachers visit pyramids and other cultural sites to learn about the math and science methods of indigenous communities in their alignment of the solar calendar for planting and harvesting. (3) The Newcomer program also includes a yearly one-day institute. The Newcomer Summer Institute provides educators with culminating activity connecting academic course work, community involvement and effective research-based pedagogical practices. The institute began as an activity for teachers in our program only; but due to the need of such activities addressing ELs in the schooling process, we have expanded this effort and last summer we had participants from 10 districts, across North Texas.

An unexpected but welcome program component was also created. By requests from the educational community across North Texas, we created the **Newcomer Academy**. This is an academy that is offered twice per year for four Saturdays. In this academy educators (lead teachers in ESL and Bilingual education, administrators, and content area teachers) come together to receive further professional development through four curriculum modules developed by our team. These modules seek to provide another avenue for those teachers who are not able to enroll in the 1-year long program but who wish to receive ESL certification or for those only seeking further professional development. The Newcomer Academy also addresses current mandates by the state and local educational agencies (e.g., Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills Standards (TEKS) and the English Language Proficiency Standards (ELPS)).

It is in this context, of our previous work, that we are proposing the above goals and objectives. For example, the TEKS across various areas of study in grades K-12 require that

teachers facilitate students' use of background knowledge, cultural values and beliefs, and own personal experiences to connect, understand, and effectively analyze the complexity of the text.

With our partner districts, we have identified cultural, linguistic, pedagogical, leadership and assessment needs to be addressed through this proposed project. Letter of support from our partners address districts' commitments to goals and objectives of the project and the middle paragraph of each letter specifies their contextual needs to be addressed during each year of the project (See Districts' Letters of Support).

Furthermore, the goals, objectives, and activities of the proposed project clearly adhere to the standards for ESL supplemental certification. According to TEA, there are three domains that teachers need to master for ESL supplemental certification. These domains include: (1) Language Concepts and Language Acquisition, (2) ESL Instruction and Assessment, and (3) Foundations of ESL Education, Cultural Awareness, and Family and Community Involvement. Due to space limitations, a partial list, two domains, is given as illustration.

Domain II: ESL Instruction and Assessment Standards:

- * The ESL teacher has knowledge of the factors that affect ESL students' learning of academic content, language, and culture.
- * The ESL teacher understands formal and informal assessment procedures and instruments used in ESL programs and uses assessment results to plan and adapt instruction.

Domain III: Foundations of ESL Education, Cultural Awareness, and Family and Community Involvement Standards:

- * The ESL teacher has knowledge of the foundations of ESL education and factors that contribute to an effective multicultural and multilingual learning environment.
- * The ESL teacher knows how to serve as an advocate for ESL students and facilitate family and

community involvement in their education.

The proposed program also aims to make use of research-based evidence from the National Center for Research on Education, Diversity and Excellence (CREDE). Their research represents a body of knowledge that expands over 20 years. Their findings are synthesized into five Standards for Effective Pedagogy (Tharp, Estrada, Dalton, & Yamauchi, 2000):

Standard 1 -- ***Teachers and Students Producing Together*** (Joint Productive Activity).

Facilitate learning through joint productive activity between teacher and students.

Standard 2 -- ***Developing Language and Literacy Across the Curriculum***. *Develop competence in the language(s) of instruction and of the disciplines throughout the day.*

Standard 3 -- ***Making Meaning*** -- Connecting School to Students' Lives. *Embed curricular instruction in the interests, experiences and skills of students' families and communities.*

Standard 4 -- ***Teaching Complex Thinking***. *Challenge students toward cognitive complexity.*

Standard 5 -- ***Teaching Through Instructional Conversation***. *Engage students in dialogue.*

These Five Standards are based on research on instructional programs serving at-risk English learners in diverse communities (e.g., Hawaiian, Native American, and Hispanic) across several states such as Hawaii, California, New Mexico and Texas (Genesee et al., 2006; Rivera, Galarza, Entz & Tharp, 2002; Tharp et al., 2000; Tharp & Gallimore, 1998).

(b) Quality of Project Personnel (10 points)

(1) Qualifications, relevant training and experience, of the project director.

Project Director: Dr. Héctor H. Rivera is an Assistant Professor at SMU, School of Education and Human Development. He obtained his doctoral degree in Developmental Psychology from the University of California at Santa Cruz in 2001. He conducted his post-doctorate training at CREDE at the University of Houston where later he worked as a scientific

advisor for the Texas Institute of Measurement, Evaluation and Statistics (TIMES). Currently, he is the chair of the *Bilingual/ESL Committee* at SMU and also the chair of the *Recent Immigrant and Newcomer Special Interest Group* (SIG) at the National Association of Bilingual Education (NABE). This SIG seeks to disseminate research-based strategies for school districts across the USA in order to serve bilingual immigrant and refugee students.

Dr. Rivera is also the director of the Newcomer ESL teacher certification program awarded by OELA. From this work with Newcomer ELs, he has published and developed research-based products that are already impacting the field. For example, research completed through the newcomer grant appeared in two peer reviewed monographs produced by the Federation of North Texas Universities titled: *Principles for the Successful Development and Implementation of Programs Serving English Language Learners (ELLs)* (Rivera et al., 2008); *Examining Programmatic Efforts for the Academic Achievement of ELL Newcomer Students in the Schooling Process* (Rivera, et al., 2010). The project director also collaborated on the development of Steck-Vaughn - *California Gateways: Motivating Students, Accelerating Achievement* (Scarcella, Rivera, H., Rivera, M., Beck, McKeown & Chiappe-Collins, 2008).

Overall, the project director's research is focused on school reform, academic programs and teacher professional development. Dr. Rivera has been involved in teacher professional development in Native American communities in New Mexico (Zuni Pueblo) as well as in school settings serving Hispanics in California (Pajaro Valle Unified School District). He has also collaborated with the Institute of Arctic Education in Greenland on a school reform project. This collaborative research focused on socio-cultural studies for the integration of Inuit culture and language into the everyday classroom practices. The director has also collaborated in language and pedagogical trainings in Peru among Quechua speaking communities in the Andes.

He is also currently collaborating on a Dual Language project in Antigua Guatemala through efforts on teacher training and capacity building of educators in urban and rural settings.

(2) Qualifications, relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.

Project Co-director: **Nancy Montgomery, Ed.D.**, is a faculty member in the Department of Teaching and Learning at the School of Education and Human Development in SMU where she teaches courses on ESL classroom instruction and assessment for ELs and ESL research, theory and practice to name a few. She obtained her doctoral degree in the field of Curriculum and Instruction with a focus on language and literacy from Texas A&M University, Commerce. Some of her work overseas includes: staff (teacher) developments, reading programs, and ESL programs in Russia, India, Indonesia, and Africa for schools and refugee camps. In addition, Dr. Montgomery has observed the language and cultures of Israel, Jordan (Bedouin camps and villages), Korea, China, and Thailand with the intent of enriching the knowledge of teachers in dealing with EL students from non-European cultures. Her passion for conditions and availability of education in refugee camps has led to collaboration with local North Texas community non-profits as well as school districts on issues pertaining to refugees' educational and psychological needs. She has been a school administrator and an ESL contributor for science books on effective teaching strategies to help new immigrant and refugee to comprehend content material. Dr. Montgomery also worked as the director of Bilingual/ESL programs for Region 10. She was instrumental in the development of the Bilingual/ESL Language and Literacy Co-operative at Region 10. While there, she also led efforts for the development of Training of Trainers' Modules, and design of professional development curriculum for educators serving ELs across North Texas school districts. She will be in charge of teaching ESL courses

under this application as well as leading the development of curriculum, proposed modules and K-12 Educational Leadership Teams at the schools.

Instructional Coach/Curriculum Developer, **Diana L. Hopes** (Masters in Bilingual Education), is currently a research associate for the Newcomer/ESL Program at SMU. Her specialties are in literacy and curriculum development for culturally and linguistically diverse learners. Her current projects at SMU include the designing and development of a Dual Language Curriculum in Guatemala, the preparation of generalist teachers for English as a Second Language (ESL) certification, and other professional development activities. She has also served as a lecturer for the University of North Texas in the Department of Teacher Administration and Education where she taught courses in Multiculturalism, Bilingualism and ESL methodology. She has also served in the Advisory Committee for the College Readiness P-16 initiative. From 2005 to 2009, Mrs. Hopes served as the Regional Program Coordinator for Bilingual/ESL and Migrant Education at Region 10. She has worked on the development and implementation of programs for culturally and linguistically diverse students, second language acquisition curriculum, and professional development modules to meeting the needs of ELs.

Project Evaluator, **Dr. Paul Yovanoff** completed his doctorate in Educational Psychology with an emphasis on psychometric theory and behavioral research methods at the University of Oregon in 1992. He will be working with the director and co-director on the development of instruments to conduct formative and summative aspects of the evaluation. Dr. Yovanoff is an expert in the development of assessment instruments. His expertise on measurement problems includes aspects of educational methodology, policy and leadership and Response Item Theory for the calibration of performance assessments. He will also advise on the development of authentic assessments to be developed by K-12 Teams.

* Qualifications of other personnel are not included due to space (See Budget Narrative).

(c) Quality of the Management Plan (20 points)

The project director will be responsible for both the administrative and instructional components of the program, including the following: (1) Coordination with the administrative units of the university and with federal, state and local agencies. (2) Fiscal management of all projected activities, in consultation with the office of Research Administration, and the Office of Grant and Contract Accounting. (3) Employment of staff in consultation with the Human Resources Division and the Office of Affirmative Action. (4) Supervision of program development and implementation in consultation with school districts, various committees and SMU faculty. (5) Implementation of the trainee selection process and (6) Advising participants.

The project director and co-director will also be responsible for the management plan. This management plan will incorporate ongoing feedback and continuous improvement in the operations of the project. To ensure the highest quality of management, we propose to have (1) a **Consortium Committee** consisting of administrator from partner districts and SMU faculty; (2) a **Community Advisory Committee** consisting of member from participating school during each year of the project. This will involve representatives from the K-12 teams at each school (such as school administrator, lead teachers (Bilingual, ESL, content Math and Science), counselors, paraprofessionals and one staff who is directly responsible for family and community outreach. These committees will advise the director and co-director on a wide range of issues, as needed. During the academic year, the project director will devote 25% effort for all project activities and 100% effort during the summers, the co-director will dedicate 50% effort during the academic year to support all proposed activities and the Instructional Coach/Curriculum Developer will dedicate 100% effort, 12 month each year of the project. The university will

release Dr. Rivera and Dr. Montgomery from one-fourth and half (respectively) of their teaching and departmental duties in order to promote effective program management (further description regarding time commitment and budget appropriateness can be found in Budget Narrative).

The Program coordinator (full time, 12 months) will assist the director and co-director with all aspects of program implementation. She will organize and maintain project files, organize committee meetings, keep student records, conduct orientation sessions, participate in committee meeting in order to maintain a time-line for project activities each semester, and interface with university offices including Student Enrollment Services (for further description of duties, including those of Instructional Coach, see Budget Narrative).

Project Timeline: A timeline, with specific dates, is provided below for the first year of the project for a number of major project goals, objectives and activities. Because of space limitations, dates for years 2-5 are not specified; however, the project will follow essentially the same cycle of activities, with two exceptions: 1) the selection of participants for the Fall semester, after year one, will occur in the spring of the second year and thereafter. 2) Teachers participating in the program in year one will begin courses in the spring of 2012 and continue in the Fall of 2012 along with the cohort 2 from year 2 of the grant. This is because it is expected that this award will not be announced until late July; therefore, the fall semester of 2011 will be used as time to develop the committees, meet with committees, recruit participants, and put in place the evaluation tasks for the entire project. In year 2 and thereafter, the program will follow a regular academic year (AY) calendar which includes a sequence of fall, spring and summer.

Major Tasks in Year 1

- Create Districts' Consortium Committee
- Create Community Advisory Committee

Completion Date

- August 15, 2011 (yr 1 only)
- August 31, 2011 (yr 1 only)

- Districts inform teachers of available traineeships Sept. 15, 2011 (yr 1 only)
- Applications mailed in reply to inquires Sept. 17 – Sep. 30 (yr 1 only)
- Orientation sessions for potential candidates October 1, 2011 (yr 1 only)
- Selection Committee to decide on candidate October 15; after that, Spring
- Send notice of Traineeships Awarded Oct. 21; after that, Spring
- Enrollment of participants in Institute and Academy December 1, 2011
- Begin Institute and Academy courses/activities Spring, Sum. & Fall of 2012

Sequence of Major Tasks in Year 2, 3, 4 and 5

Completion Date

- Program announcements, application review Starting April of 2012
- Applicants selected and notice of Traineeship Award June 1 of each year
- Enrollment of participants in Institute and Academy June 31 of each year
- Districts' Consortium Committee meets Fall, Spring, Summer
- Community Advisory Committee meets Fall, Spring, Summer
- Monthly team meetings for curriculum development Sept. – June (each year)
- Project Director meets with evaluator (twice per semester) Fall, Spring, Summer
- Institute and Academy courses and activities Fall, Spring and Summer AY
- SMU-Summer Institute June of each year
- Summer International Program July of each year

Due to space limitations not all activities can be outlined in this timeline. Also, in some cases, no specific dates can be provided on when the activities will take place. This speaks of the flexibility that the program needs to have in order to effectively address the needs across districts and schools in relation to testing dates and other school activities. This flexibility will allow for the proposed programmatic activities to be more than a “to do” check list for the schools but

instead to be viewed, by each school, as integral professional development activities that are bound to benefit their campus's goals and objectives.

Table 3 shows milestones for proposed professional development (PD) project.

Table 3: Milestones	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Total
Teachers in year-long Institute to be ESL certified	25	25	25	25	25	125
Teachers in short-term Academy to be ESL certified	10	10	10	10	10	50
PD graduate courses through Institute and Academy	110	110	110	110	110	550
Certified Teacher in Academy to receive further PD	15	15	15	15	15	75
Develop. & Delivery of Modules/Curriculum	1	1	1	1	1	5
SMU/Region 10 Summer Institute	1	1	1	1	1	5
International Program	1	1	1	1	1	5
Capacity Building of K-12 Educational Leadership Teams	28	28	28	28	28	140

The project's milestones will provide differentiated professional development activities for ESL supplemental certification to a total of 175 teachers from the Institute and Academy. The project will also offer further professional development activities (e.g., elective courses and

workshops), through the Academy, to 15 certified teachers in Bilingual and content area (Math and Science) for a total of 75 educators trained across five years. 140 educators will also benefit from capacity building activities in schools through the creation of K-12 Teams. Overall, the project will directly provide further training and ESL certification to a combined total of 390 educators. The above numbers do not reflect all of the indirect impact that the project will have on participating parents and other educators to be invited to the Summer Institute to be done in collaboration with Region 10. Nor does it reflect the impact of the college readiness activities to be offered by the Hispanic College Fund.

The adequacy of the management plan for meeting its objectives is further addressed in the budget narrative of the project. In there you will find detail description on responsibilities by key personnel as well as how the proposed activities can be met within budget.

(d) Quality of the Project Evaluation (30 points)

(1) Methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.

The proposed project will employ comprehensive, ongoing, and high-quality qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods. The evaluation utilizes a variety of objective and quantifiable methods to assess project progress (formative evaluation) and project outcomes (summative evaluation) for each component of the proposed project such as: (1) Institute, (2) Academy, (3) K-12 Teams, and (4) implementation of professional development curriculum (e.g., modules). This approach also seeks to integrate formative aspects of the evaluation as part of the data-driven decision-making at participating schools each year of the project. Some of the fundamental aspects of the overall project evaluation are addressed with an understanding that they are integrated across all components of the project. For example, the principal survey will

not only serve to gather information about participating teachers but also about the school environment, the student population, current on-going programmatic efforts and family/community engagement to name a few. Data collection across all surveys include **qualitative** (open-ended questions) and **quantitative** (close-ended questions) in order to address required performance measures along with summative and formative aspects of the evaluation.

The evaluation data will derive from three main sources: (1) SMU Graduate Courses (e.g., instructors' evaluations, Course-Instructor's grades, Program Questionnaire, Competency Assessment), (2) Participating Schools (e.g., Student Achievement data, Needs Assessment for further training, Principal Survey, Pre and post Teacher Survey, Student Survey, Parent Survey, Paraprofessional Survey, and Pre and Post survey with K-12 Teams (during each year of the project) and (3) Other Differentiated Professional Development Activities (e.g., Summer International Field Experience Survey, and Summer Institute Survey). Together, with other project sources (e.g., field notes from Instructional Coach, feedback from districts) these data will be used to create school profiles for data-driven decisions on formative aspects of the project and modules/curriculum development for the Academy and Summer Institute.

With this formative and summative evaluation approach, we will be able to collect data on the percentage of trainees who are placed or are already working with EL students each year of the grant period. We will also be able to evaluate the percentage of participants who are impacting their schools, districts and other educational settings through their implementation of the modules/curriculum developed. We will also be able to evaluate the percentage of trainees who meet NCLB highly qualified teacher requirements as well as examine the correlation between the proposed project participants and EL students' academic achievement.

In the past, the impact of educational research has been hampered by not knowing if teachers are implementing the training. Therefore, objective and well established **measures of fidelity** are an important component for this evaluation. For example, data will be collected on curriculum integrated ESL, TEKS, ELPS and CREDE standards through classroom observations of participating teachers in this proposed program. Students' achievement, from participating and non-participating teachers, will also be provided by partner districts in order to evaluate the impact of the proposed project. This will include pre-and-post program data as well as data collected at several intervals during the program (e.g., benchmark TAKS). This data will be used to develop an index of students' current academic success as measured by achievement outcomes (e.g., criterion reference test and norm reference test). The above evaluation components will also serve to document performance measures as required by the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA).

(2) Methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce qualitative and quantitative data to the extent possible.

As previously stated, some of our evaluation instruments (e.g., surveys) encompassed both qualitative and quantitative data gathering approaches. Furthermore, the project directors and several key personnel will work collaboratively to develop assessment questions relevant to the topics addressed during the Needs Assessment. For example, through conversations with instructional coach, participants will reflect on how they are connecting this new knowledge to previous knowledge. The instructional coach will maintain a journal of field notes for each teacher. This qualitative component will serve to integrate relevant aspects from teachers' reflections into the modules being developed.

The evaluation will also employ several objective performance measures. For example, the **Classroom Observation Schedule (COS)** instrument is designed to systematically obtain data (quantitative) on students' classroom behaviors and teacher's classroom practices. It documents observed student behaviors in the context of ongoing classroom instructional learning processes. The COS will serve to examine teachers' fidelity of implementation of CREDE standards and implementation of ESL, ELPS and TEKS standards that have been integrated in the curriculum. This observation instrument has been found to be valid and reliable with an inter-observer reliability of .96 (Waxman & Padrón, 2004).

EL students' resilience, classroom perceptions, motivations and attitudes will also be assessed and correlated with their achievement data as a feedback mechanism to the program. An adapted version of the "**My Class Inventory**" (Dryden & Fraser, 1996) will be used to collect data on students' perceptions of their classroom-learning environment near the beginning and near the end of the school year. The questionnaire contains eight scales that assess students' perceptions in the following areas: (a) Satisfaction, (b) Friction, (c) Competition, (d) Difficulty, (e) Cohesion, (f) Self-Esteem/Efficacy in Content Area, (g) Teacher Support, and (h) Equity. In a study, the internal consistency reliability coefficients of the eight scales were found to range from .62 to .80 with an average of .70. Therefore the questionnaire has adequate internal consistency reliability. The discriminant validity for the sample (i.e. the mean correlation coefficient of a scale with each of the other scales) ranged from .01 to .59 with an average of .22 suggesting that there was adequate scale discriminant validity (Rivera & Waxman, 2007). This instrument will allow for an examination on the correlation between perceptions of the classroom-environment, methods for delivery of instruction and students' achievement.

Progress Monitoring by Project Staff and Faculty

The summative and formative evaluation also includes progress monitoring at SMU. We will employ a database monitoring system that will facilitate studying the relationships between selection criteria and retention and performance of participants. Faculty teaching the courses will supply semester-by-semester data on academic hours taken, completed, passed, GPA, academic recognition, honors, entrance and progress tests taken, and number of certifications achieved. We will also gather data at the beginning and end of the year across nine teaching areas including: Language (English/Spanish) Proficiency, Methods of Teaching, Linguistics knowledge, Cultural Applications, Assessment of Students, Assessment of Materials, and integration of standards into Curriculum: Utilization and Adaptation, Parents-Community Relations, and Content Areas Competencies. Also, participants will be assessed on teaching skills, leadership, special assignments, promotion/recognition and awards (ratings supplied by principals in participating schools) on an annual basis (e.g., Principal Survey).

(3) Methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

The project will aggregate semi-annual and annual data on participants' completion of courses, their satisfaction with the program, fidelity of implementation, course-instructor ratings, semester hours taken/completed/passed, semester and cumulative grade-point average, honors/awards, and program completion. These data will provide performance feedback as well as periodic assessment on the progress of teachers participating in the project. Our evaluation approach involves a triangulation method for data analysis from participating teachers, instructional coach/curriculum developer, K-12 Team, EL students' surveys, and SMU faculty. This approach allows for progress monitoring for measuring the achievement of intended goals.

Follow-up Evaluation: The lessons learned from teachers as they exit the program will be of great importance for the continuous improvement of the program as well as for the long-term study on the effectiveness of the program on teachers' professional development and consequently their students' achievement. Each year of the funding period, after a cohort's completion of the project, educators will supply a retrospective assessment of the SMU program in relation to their training experiences and the extent to which they were prepared for their current jobs to serve EL students. This process will also involve the assessment competency gained to work with ELs and suggested areas of program improvement (e.g., Teacher Post Program Survey). Cohorts will be invited back to participate in subsequent *Summer Institute* where post data will also be collected to examine their professional growth.

Examining the Effectiveness of Project Implementation Strategies

The project also includes a **quasi-experimental/cross-sectional longitudinal evaluation study** encompassing a Delayed Treatment Control Group Design that will examine the short-term and long-term effects of the training on the participating schools, teachers, other educators (e.g., administrators, paraprofessionals, community liaisons, and counselors) and EL students.

This quasi-experimental evaluation study will serve to examine the impact of the curriculum/modules and other program components at participating schools each year of the project. During year 1, we will set the baseline at each school district in relation to how schools are functioning (e.g., parent involvement, paraprofessionals' level of training etc), teachers' professional development training needs and academic standing of their EL students. Starting in year 2, we will use, as a treatment, the modules developed in year 1 (in response to these identified needs) as well as other program components also implemented in participating schools in year 1. The same treatment will be delivered during the fall of 2012, to cohort 2, in the form of

the proposed professional development activities and in the fall of 2013 to cohort 3 and so on until year 5. This approach will allow for the implementation of the Delayed Treatment Control Group Design in which, during year 2, the awaiting cohort 3 becomes a wait-list control group condition that will receive the same professional development components (or treatment) in year 3 of the project. Such approach allows for the comparison between cohorts as one receives and implements the modules and other project components while the other waits to receive the professional development at a later time. For example, this will allow us to conduct group comparisons between those in the program (cohort 2) and those not yet in the program (cohort 3). Also, we will have pre assessment data on cohort 3, before they entered the program as well as during and after their program completion (post assessment). These data will provide research evidence on the impact and gains from the point of non-participation to the point of program participation for each cohort. Therefore, gains in performance, teaching practices and students' achievement can be scientifically attributed to the SMU program in accordance to this type of methodological design.

This quasi-experimental study allows for comparisons between districts as well as within and between groups at each district; it also allows us to evaluate several components of our training program and answer questions of formative and summative value. For example, what is the quality of teaching practices by teachers in our program in comparison to teachers who are in the wait-list control condition? Because we will be doing this evaluation study in a longitudinal fashion (e.g., years 2, 3, 4, and 5) we will also be able to evaluate the longitudinal effect of the program and answer questions such as: at what point do teachers in our program begin to implement effective teaching practices in their classrooms? And at what point do we begin to see those effects having an impact on students' academic performance as well as in their views of

subject matter, school and classroom environment? This is an important component of the evaluation since we cannot assume that any effect will take place in a short period of time. Therefore, the longitudinal nature of this portion of the evaluation will serve to answer important questions of program effectiveness and appropriateness in the context of large, medium and small size school districts serving ELs. Furthermore, we will be able to differentiate between those components that are context specific for each district (such as training needed to address the needs of larger population of newcomers, migrant students etc.) and those that are applicable to any districts (such as training needed on basic processes for second language acquisition, language transfer and memory processes to name a few). Some data such as achievement data and survey data will be more constant across years of the project. These types of data will lend themselves to a wide range of statistical analysis such as Correlations, MANOVA, ANCOVA, and Factor Analysis to name a few. Descriptions of these analyses are beyond the scope of this application; however, they are within the scope of skills of the evaluator and program director (note: appropriate statistical procedures will be used in order to make appropriate comparisons given educators' differentiated levels of expertise as they enter the program. The design will also vary according to schools chosen by districts, each year, such as elementary or secondary).

Summary: The proposed project reflects the priority of addressing the needs of academically at-risk EL students by developing, delivering, and evaluating professional development for educators who teach in schools with high concentrations of ELs. The project will address current needs in the EL population as well as the differentiated professional development needs for wide range of educators serving these students. This project is bound to have a positive impact in our partner districts in the Dallas Metroplex as well as in other districts across North Texas in the near future.