U.S. Department of Education

Washington, D.C. 20202-5335

APPLICATION FOR GRANTS UNDER THE

NATIONAL PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM
CFDA # 84.365Z
PR/Award # T365Z110124
Grants.gov Tracking#: GRANT10865020

Closing Date: MAY 09, 2011

Dr. Socorro Herrera, Proj. Director
(785) 532-2125
sococo@ksu.edu

Project KORE
Kansas State University
CFDA 84.365z

Abstract:

The Kansas' proposal for National Professional Development will address: 1) the established priority of reforming and improving [state educational agency] systems for personnel preparation and professional development in early intervention, educational, and transition services in order to improve results for English language learners [ELs] **(Invitational Preference Priority 2)** and, 2) speak to the Department's **Competitive Preference Priority 2** by improving instructional practices, policies, and student outcomes in elementary or secondary schools.

The primary, overarching goal of **Project KORE** [**K**ansans **O**rganized For **R**esults-based and **E**ffective Instruction] is to: *Scale up implementation of a coordinated, statewide system of personnel development/ professional development that will increase the capacity of Kansas school systems to establish and use a multi-tiered model of scientific, research-based instruction, intervention, and assessment to improve the progress and performance of all students—especially those who are English language learners (***Addressing Preference Priority # 2***)*. This goal will primarily be accomplished through four primary focus areas and four project objectives with supporting activities

- ***Focus 1****: IHE collaborators, with the KSDE, will: a) design and implement PD to Kansas educators that will enhance the Multi-tier System of Supports [MTSS] across Kansas' schools where effective/ meaningful application of research-based instructional strategies/ best practices for ELs is found in Tier 1 Core Instruction (**Competitive Priority # 3**; **Invitation Priority # 1**) and, b) where educators integrate the new Common Core State Standards [CCSS], the state's ESL Standards, the existing Kansas Performance Standards and CREDE Standards to design and drive instruction.*
- ***Focus 2:*** *Provide tailored PD for school-based instructional leaders (administrators, instructional coaches, department heads and counselors), where they coach, lead and hold accountable their staff in the use of research-based best practices during core instruction in K-12 classrooms.*
- ***Focus 3:*** *Conduct qualitative/ quantitative research to ascertain the level and effective application of the standards and biography-driven instructional principles within Kansas' classrooms once PD has been completed and determine the impact these attributes have on: a) teacher proficiency in teaching El learners and, b) EL student academic and language acquisition and language proficiency (**Competitive Priority #2**).*
- ***Focus 4:*** *IHEs will collaborate with each other to identify the essential standards, attributes and expected outcomes to be demonstrated by pre-service teachers and adopt these research-based principles in each teacher preparation training program—ensuring that all incoming, new teachers are prepared to effectively implement instruction for culturally and linguistically diverse students (**Invitational Priority #2**).*

These focus areas of work lead to the project's objectives; they are:

Objective 1: Deliver research-based PD/ technical assistance/ coaching to increase the number

Section A: Quality of Project Design. (40 points) The Secretary considers the following factors: 1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable. (35 points)

On March 14, 2011, President Obama stated eloquently that, " . . . Making a promise to educate every child with an excellent teacher -- that's the right thing to do, that's the right goal. Higher standards are right. Accountability is right. We need to hold our schools accountable for the success of every child — black, white, Latino, Asian, students with disabilities and English language learners. Shining a light on the achievement gap between students of different races and backgrounds, that's the right thing to do . . . We need to put outstanding teachers in every classroom. When the quality of a teacher can make or break a child's education, we've got to make sure our certified teachers are also outstanding teachers—teachers who can reach every last child . . . I want every child in this country to head back to school in the fall knowing that their education is America's priority . . . Roberto, Katherine, the millions of students like them across the country, they need us to offer them the best education possible—not only because that's how they'll succeed, not only because that's how we'll out-compete countries around the world, but because that's what we do. That's who we are. That's what America is about. And I'm confident that if we continue to reform American education, continue to invest in our children's future, that's the America we will always be. Let's seize this education moment."

Given this profound assertion and national expectation, the Kansas Department of Education [KSDE]—serving as the SEA representative, in coordination/ collaboration with Kansas teacher training institutions; that is, Kansas State University [KSU] serving as the fiscal agent, the University of Kansas [KU], Emporia State University [ESU] and it's partnering colleague, the Institute of Educational Excellence [Jones], will collaboratively embrace this challenge by creating/ implementing a comprehensive, state-wide professional development/ personnel [PD]

initiative designed to enhance, refine and scaffold upon the Kansas' Multi-Tiered System of Supports [MTSS] Model that will lead educators from across the state to implement, with effective and meaningful application, research-based instructional strategies/ best practices for English Learners [ELs]—especially during Tier 1 [Core] instruction. Furthermore, this PD will assist with the alignment integration within classrooms the new Common Core State Standards [CCSS], the state's newly adopted ESL and the nationally recognized CREDE standards and will target instructional leaders, regular classroom teachers and ESL staff working with such students to meet high professional standards—including standards for certification and licensure.

Numerous challenges exist. The U.S. Department of Labor projections indicate that 15 of the 20 fastest growing occupations will require greater levels of STEM-related skills. Yet, while the number of jobs requiring significant STEM proficiency is growing, increasing numbers of students, especially ELs, are choosing not to major in these disciplines. A multi-tiered educational dysfunction appears to exist within education that deserves our attention. At the first level is curriculum that lacks cultural relevance. At the next level are advisors, who could enroll students into the pipeline of challenging courses, yet often function as gatekeepers, and discourage ELs who could succeed given sufficient/ appropriate academic support. That academic support needs to come at the next level, from teachers, who are not explicitly trained to reach/ teach ELs, who have specific/ differentiated needs due to their culture/ language (Gebhard, 2010). Teachers are not held accountable, at the next level, by trained instructional coaches/ administrators who "expect and inspect" instructional planning/ implementation for evidence of rigor/ cultural relevance through classroom artifacts/ authentic

assessments and, by doing so, inadvertently negatively impact ELs ability to find higher schooling success/ fuller life contributing qualities.

In addition, Latinos are the fastest growing segment of the nation's school-aged population. One in five—over 10 million—public school students are Latino (KSDE, 2010). Subsequently, the proportion of Hispanic school-aged children is expected to grow by 166% by 2050, quickly outpacing the 4% expected growth of non-Hispanic children (Pew Hispanic Center, 2010). These numbers hold great significance for public schools, as the growth of the Latino population will inevitably lead to growth among ELs, where 40% of Latino students are also ELs (Lazarín & Ortiz-Licon, 2010). The sheer growth in the Latino population indicates that all schools will have to ensure that they effectively prepare ELs for college and futuristic workforce skills.

Approximately every year 1.2 million students dropout of high school. Today, the Latino high school dropout rate stands at 40% — four times higher than non-Hispanic whites. The National Hispanic Caucus estimates that nearly half of Latino students leave school by the eighth grade and more than 88% of Hispanics do not possess a bachelor's degree (Augilara, 2011). The aforementioned dropout rate has significant consequences. Poor academic performance has a direct/ serious impact on a student's adult life. Dropouts are more likely to become/ stay jobless, will witnessing dramatically lower lifetime earnings, are more likely to be unemployed and incarcerated (Education Quality Project, 2011).

Also, no comprehensive research study has been conducted to understand the impact teachers have on ELs academic performance when they consistently apply teaching practices grounded in the qualities of learning found through the integration of 1) the new national Common Core State Standards, 2) the new Kansas ESL Standards, and 3) CREDE Standards. With critical masses of ELs demonstrating proficiency at all levels with language/ academic achievement, research must

be conducted in order understand the impact of this alignment and how these conjoining efforts close the achievement gap between the existing performance of ELs and typical classroom peers.

Finally, a chasm exists with the training institutions themselves. While each of the IHEs collaborating with project efforts have many fine qualities in their existing teacher training programs, each of them has developed, in silos of isolation, pre-service and in-service teacher training programs that do not necessarily or consistently align with the rigor or quality of teaching required for ELs to demonstrate proficiency/ mastery with student content outcomes. To exacerbate this issue, only 417 teachers in the state hold ESL or Bilingual certification and most teachers feel inadequate to address the vast needs of this student population (Herrera, 2010). In 2010, the American Association for Employment in Education reported that nationwide 41% of teachers have ELs in their classrooms. Of those surveyed, 27% felt very well prepared to teach ELs, 60% felt moderately prepared, 12% felt unprepared, and only 12.5% of educators have participated in PD in the last 3 years. Kansas' educators hold similar attributes. This must change if we are serious about closing the gap in the academic performance and outcomes by ELs. By reducing the fragmentation of how we prepare teachers and conduct ongoing PD for existing staff—especially the regular classroom teacher where 97% of Kansas ELs spend up to 90% of their learning time in regular classrooms—we will eliminate this performance gap and will have effectively prepared teachers to teach diverse student populations.

Further exploration of: a) curriculum alignment, b) improved counselor/ EL student relationships, c) biography-driven culturally responsive instruction strategies within all classrooms, d) administrators/ instructional coaches holding teachers responsible for culturally responsive teaching strategies e) pre-service/ in-service training that is aligned with sound standards, and, f) research that is ongoing, authentic and one that provides data to constantly

refine teaching practices in Kansas classrooms, is warranted.

To address these challenges, **Project KORE**—**K**ansans **O**rganized For **R**esults-based, **E**ffective Instruction has one **Project Goal**: ***Scale up implementation of a coordinated, statewide system of personnel development/ professional development that will increase the capacity of Kansas school systems to establish and use a multi-tiered model of scientific, research-based instruction, intervention, and assessment to improve the progress and performance of all students—especially those who are English language learners.*** This goal will primarily be accomplished through **four primary focuses and four project objectives**:

Focus 1*: IHE collaborators, with the KSDE, will: a) design and implement PD to Kansas educators that will enhance the Multi-tier System of Supports [MTSS] across Kansas' schools, where effective/ meaningful application of research-based instructional strategies/ best practices for ELs is found in Tier 1 Core Instruction and, b) where educators integrate the new CCSS, the state's ESL Standards, and CREDE Standards to design and drive instruction.*

Focus 2: *Provide tailored PD for school-based instructional leaders (administrators, instructional coaches, department heads and counselors), where they coach, lead and hold accountable staff in the use of research-based best practices during K-12 core instruction.*

Focus 3: *Conduct qualitative/ quantitative research to ascertain the level and effective application of the standards and biography-driven instructional principles within Kansas' classrooms once PD has been completed and determine the impact these attributes have on: a) teacher proficiency in teaching El learners and, b) EL student academic and language acquisition and language proficiency.*

Focus 4: *IHEs will collaborate with each other to identify the essential standards, attributes and expected outcomes to be demonstrated by pre-service teachers and adopt these research-*

based principles in each teacher preparation training program—ensuring that all incoming, new teachers are prepared to effectively implement instruction for culturally and linguistically diverse students.

These focus areas of work lead to the four project's objectives; they are: **Objective 1:** Deliver research-based PD/ technical assistance/ coaching to increase the number of general/ administrators, ESL teachers, other personnel/ parents who understand/ implement MTSS instruction, intervention, and assessment, resulting in improved EL student performance. **Objective 2:** Increase the number of parents who participate and their level of participation in the educational decision-making process for their child across district sites. **Objective 3:** Increase the quality of IHE undergraduate and graduate educator preparation programs that implement MTSS content in their training curricula. **Objective 4:** Refine and implement a comprehensive evaluation process to measure the effectiveness of project activities. Further details regarding the objectives (**Activities, Responsible Parties, Timelines, Milestones**) are found in **Table 2: Management Plan Matrix.**

Wei, et al., (2009) found that, "The time and opportunities that are needed for intense, sustained PD with regular follow-up and reinforcement are simply not in place in most contexts, as evidenced by the short duration of most PD activities." (p. 61). Further, foundational research by Joyce/ Showers (2002) indicates that the greatest impact on teachers' classroom application of skills learned through PD occurs when coaching feedback is provided. As depicted in **Table 1**, their research showed that when coaching feedback is a component of training, teacher application of skills increases to 80-90%, compared with 5-15% for components such as presentation of theory, modeling, and practice and low risk feedback.

Table 1: Relationship Of Impact On Teachers/ Types Of Training Components Used

	Undrstnd Knldge/Skills	Actlly Lrn Skills	Actlly Apply Skills
Theory Presentation	85%	15%	5-10%
Modeling	85%	18%	5-10%
Practice/ Low-Risk Feedback	85%	80%	10-15%
Cching. Fdback. Peer Visits	90%	90%	80-90%

National data suggests that improvement in student achievement exists when schools adopt an Rti model, or its hybrid like that found with the Kansas MTSS Model. However, working on a school- by-school basis limits the impact with respect to scaling up evidence-based MTSS practices statewide—especially for teachers working with ELs. To address this issue, a "coaching-of- coaches" component will be added through which a cadre of 50 regionally-based external coaches that will enhance the learning outcomes for ELs by enhancing the current MTSS efforts found within the state. Project staff will provide training/ technical assistance/ coaching to these individuals, who in turn will serve as coaches for regional area districts.

A set of underlying assumptions provides a common framework for the activities directed toward achieving this goal: 1) Partnerships to accomplish particular goals/ objectives/ outcomes through coordination, collaboration, and/or the sharing of resources and expertise, will occur within and across multiple layers (e.g., state, regional, and local), be formed in many ways, and consist of varying structures; 2) Current Kansas MTSS initiatives that support various aspects of an integrated service delivery system provide the history, experience, and expertise needed to expand and build capacity, given an infrastructure and common vision upon which to build.

Project KORE is designed around a framework built on the following themes: 1) Collaborative activities linking partners—SEA, LEAs, IHEs and others who are interested in,

and who have resources, knowledge, and skills to contribute to the development of highly qualified ESL personnel; 2) Linking/ integrating ESL/ general education personnel development; 3) Working within the state's infrastructure for focused PD efforts at local/ regional/ state levels, in response to identified needs, with an emphasis on supporting low-performing districts with high EL populations; 4) Achieving significant unity regarding the purpose of personnel activities, trainings at both pre-service and in-service teacher training efforts and focusing on improved results. These themes will link local, regional, and state activities to the Kansas standards-based certification structure, to common evaluation/ data collection, and to conduct research on best practices in the education field.

The project structure will entail connecting to the existing MTSS Network, which will involve a collaborative partnership of the SEA, LEAs (school districts/ service centers); and IHEs—particularly KSU—who will serve as the lead fiscal agency, KU, ESU, the Jones Institute and others—all who will assist in the design/ development/ coordination of PD activities to occur across the state. The MTSS Network, along with it IHE collaborators, will employ personnel with expertise in coaching, school improvement, researched best practices in teaching ELs, interventions and be responsible 1) for the recruitment, training, and support of a cadre of external coaches; 2) to conduct state-wide PD and coursework to enhance the quality of teaching for ELs throughout the 5-years of the grant; 3) to complete activities that enhance pre-service and in-service teacher training; 4) provide principals/ instructional coaches PD on the attributes that they need to find/ guide/ coach teachers as teachers teach ELs and, 5) conduct research to ascertain the impact of PD regarding the increased qualities of teaching and achievement outcomes of ELs.

All PD provided through the MTSS Network IHE collaboration will involve a standardized

training curriculum through the use of 15 modules focused on improving EL student performance through the implementation of a MTSS instruction—with a heavy emphasis of STEM, intervention, and assessment, with added highlights on administrative leadership; scientific, research-based reading and math curricula and instruction at grades K-12; data-based decision making; universal screening/ progress monitoring; and parent involvement. Also, districts will be identified in each of the 10 State Board of Education geographic regions served by external coaches to enhance project replicability and to ensure that evaluation can be conducted at the district/ school levels. Low-performing districts, as determined by district/ school AYP status with large EL populations (20 percent or greater) will be given priority to participate in project activities. The external coaches, with direct support from the IHEs/ MTSS Network staff, will provide technical assistance and coaching to these districts (school personnel/ parents) to support implementation of a multi-tiered system of instruction, interventions, and assessment. They will also use a common coaching framework, further strengthening the systemic nature of the project.

The direct involvement of LEAs will ensure that the project reaches general/ existing ESL personnel, which will help bridge the gap that often exists and will facilitate a more unified system of PD. The involvement of IHEs will facilitate IHE teacher preparation faculty having access to PD resources, as well as incorporation of the PD content of the project into general/ ESL pre-service curricula, thus increasing the systemic impact of the project.

The parent involvement that is integral to the project design is also critical to systems change in that the more informed/ involved parents become, the greater the likelihood that they will advocate for and support continued implementation of quality practices to improve their children's education. The intended long-term outcome of the project is improved progress/

academic EL achievement performance and enhanced qualities of teaching from those who provide instruction to them.

Moreover, other outcomes are establishment a regionalized system of PD via regional "centers," each of which employ personnel with expertise in EL—MTSS. Through these centers, the project staff will conduct regional/ school-based training and technical assistance events for district/ school teams, with participation by many of the 293 LEAs found across the 10 regional Kansas sites. They will be able to provide onsite technical assistance and coaching to approximately 1,655 schools; in turn, these schools will served as data collection sites for project evaluation efforts. As discussed previously, in order to enhance sustainability, the project will create a "coaching-of-coaches' component through which personnel will provide training and support to a cadre of 50 regionally based external coaches. In turn, external coaches will provide PD/ coaching to LEAs to support EL—MTSS instruction, interventions, and assessments.

The evaluation for **Project KORE** involves several components, including, but not limited to, levels and fidelity of implementation of a multi-tiered model of scientifically based instruction, intervention, and assessment; parent involvement in the MTSS process; and student outcomes. The Biography-Driven Culturally Responsive Teaching Protocol (BDP) is an example of the evaluation tool to be used to assess a school's level and, in part, fidelity of implementation of the critical features and practices associated with a multi-tiered model. **Further explanation of this evaluation process and tools are found in Section D of this proposal.**

The project is designed so that a series of high-quality, research-based PD modules will be used to deliver small- and large-scale training throughout the project. These modules will serve as the basis for which 15 standardized training modules that focus on improving EL student performance. To ensure consistent presentation of the content, the 15 modules consist of an

Instructor Guide (including resources, annotated bibliography, web-links, and glossary), a Participant Guide, handouts, and PowerPoint slides. Beginning in spring, these modules will be available through two delivery methods: face-to-face presentations and self-paced online learning via the Kansas Virtual School platform. By using a standardized curriculum and common PD structure, the consistency of training will be improved, as will the systemic implementation of the knowledge and skills gained by the participants. Use of these modules will support "Use of Funds" from the grant application requirements because the content is designed to "improve the knowledge of ESL and regular education teachers and principals, and in appropriate cases, paraprofessionals, concerning effective instructional practices." With focus on improving student performance through the implementation of a multi-tiered system of instruction, intervention, and assessment, the modules will directly support PD activities that provide training in methods of scientifically-based instruction across all content/ subject areas, including 1) early literacy, oracy and numeracy instruction, 2) early/ appropriate interventions to identify/ assist ELs, and 3) assisting teachers in the use of classroom-based, research-based strategoes to assist ELs before referral to Tier 2/ Tier 3 intervention support is conducted.

Overall, the project goal and it supporting objectives will be accomplished through KSDE and IHE coordination and oversight; sub-grant and contractual activities; and collaborative efforts at the state/ regional/ local levels. The project goal, objectives, and activities are outlined extensively in **Table 2, Section C**. The goal will be achieved primarily through the Kansas MTSS Network and is designed to help build a long-lasting infrastructure for PD by requiring partnerships at many levels, focusing on common PD content across the state and establishing a cadre of 50 regionally based (within the 10 regions) external coaches who will be existing employees of LEAs, or other entities, and therefore will continue to support district/ school

teams long after the project ends.

Section B: Quality of project personnel. (10 points) **The Secretary 1) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director or principal investigator. (5 points)**

Each of the staff that will collaborate in the delivery of **Project KORE** will be chosen or has committed to participation on the basis of unique expertise for the roles and responsibilities to be associated with their project position, including their professional experiences with cultural and linguistic diversity. Each is qualified by professional preparation and experience to facilitate the learning process within the language learning emphasis in the various specialty areas of BE/ESL Education, Language and Literacy, and Multicultural Education. Key faculty will serve as instructors, mentors, coaches and/or advisors. In these capacities, they will variously develop course content, deliver instruction, supervise research and field experiences, enhance participant success in the program, monitor progress, and refine teacher education throughout the state for the differential learning needs of ELs. Other project staff will be selected on the basis of their preparation for and experiences in teacher-education, ESL, program administration, PD and/or school-community relations. In the interest of space, the following vignettes summarize the quality of key personnel for **Project KORE**.

2) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director or principal investigator; and 3) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key personnel.

Primary Investigator: Dr. Socorro Herrera (.05 FTE) – Professor of Elementary Education at KSU and Executive Director of the Collaborative Intercultural Multilingual Advocacy (CIMA) has taught at the elementary level (K–6) and as a Title I teacher. Her research has emphasized emergent literacy with culturally and linguistically diverse children, reading strategies, and teacher preparation for the maximization of best practices and strategies to be used with effective classroom instruction for ELs. She is a nationally recognized author, presenter and consultant in the area of English language acquisition and the educational

programming for ELs. Dr. Herrera's recent publications have appeared in the Bilingual Research Journal and the Journal of Latinos and Education. Her recent research and teaching in education has emphasized emergent biliteracy, reading strategies, the differential learning needs of second language learners, and mutual accommodation for language learning students.

Project Director: Dr. Tonnie Martinez. The Project Director will be Dr. Tonnie Martinez, an Assistant Professor of Secondary Education at KSU. She taught English Language Arts at the secondary school level for 8 years. Her research has focused on teachers' accommodation readiness for EL students. Dr. Martinez has taught courses in ESOL and has PD experience with urgent-need school districts, nationwide. Dr. Martinez currently oversees curriculum planning and implementation for KSU pre-service teachers and in-service educators in Wichita, Kansas—a large, urban school district in Kansas, and online. Dr. Martinez recently participated as part of the writing team for the 2011 KSDE's revised ESOL state Standards and is co-authoring a textbook on the Common Core State Standards. **Duties/Responsibilities:** 1) Provides overall leadership, guidance and direction to project participants; 2) Monitors the implementation of goals, objectives and activities of the project within the expected timelines; 3) Implements a continuous PD program that is built on effective scientifically, research-based principles; 5) Applies/ disseminates research findings; 6) Assists in evaluating project staff in their performance on meeting project goals/objectives; 7) Provides effective ongoing communication/ collaboration with all staff including project personnel, KSDE staff, MTSS staff, school district staff and Evaluation Planning Team [EPT] members; 8) Coordinates information with the External Evaluator [EE] and assists with compilation of data needed to complete annual reports; 9) Communicates effectively with administrators, teachers, parents, and community agencies; 10) Reacts to change, tasks, and alterations in scheduling productively; 11) Facilitates the

personal, social, and intellectual development of staff and students; 12) Enforces rules, guidelines, and expectations related to staff/ student conduct; and, 13) Evaluates program effectiveness.

Project Coordinator [PC]: 1.0 FTE. Dr. Robin Cabral. The PC will be Dr. Cabral, ESOL Teaching Specialist for Special Education with the Wichita Public Schools. Having recently received her Ph.D. in Curriculum and Instruction, with an emphasis in ESOL, she has served as a leader in the proactive development and implementation of a intervention model for service CLD students within a Multi-Tiered System of Supports. She has served as a speech pathologist, oversees district, departmental and building level PD regarding instruction, intervention and assessments of CLD students, as well as increasing the appropriateness of services to and parental involvement of CLD students with special needs. The PC's duties include, but are not limited to: 1) recruiting participants; 2) ensuring participant selection/retention; 3) scheduling PD/ course trainings; 4) procuring training materials; 5) coordinating with administrators in participating schools; 5) monitoring participant progress; 6) coordinating with the SEA; 7) collaborating with the EE to collect post-training assessment data on participants; 8) monitoring budget expenditures; 10) enhancing participant placement efforts and high quality teacher status; 11) collaborating with the evaluation/ refinement of program processes/ products; 12) reporting program outcomes to key stakeholders; and, 13) serving as a resource diffusion to and collaboration with IHEs to improve teacher preparation/education for ELs.

(2) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel. (5 points)

To create cohesiveness with the evaluation design and process, and to lead the Evaluation Planning Team [EPT], an External Evaluator [EE] will be contracted. As such, Dr. Robert Fanning will be contracted to serve as the EE. Based on his extensive 37-year career serving diverse students in nineteen states, he will be secured as the EE to oversee the evaluation of the

work completed by project staff, program management and operation strategies and to ensure that project goals/ objectives are being met and in a timely fashion. He has considerable experience/training in the administration of federal/ state projects, ESL and migrant educational programming, program/ fiscal management and with the implementation of standards-based education emphasizing intervention services for students at risk. Dr. Fanning holds a doctorate in regular/ special education administration with an emphasis in program evaluation/effectiveness, school reform, English as a Second Language, special education and educational research. He also has managed numerous federal/ state grants, and now serves as an evaluator for numerous Federal grants and as an Implementation Coach for the Kansas Learning Network, which provides technical support for schools not achieving AYP.

Key IHE consultants to be secured to assist with state-wide PD and the development/ implementation of the modules are: Dr. Francie Christopher from KU, Dr. Abedelilah Sehloaui, Kim Kreicker and Dr. Nancy Albrecht from ESU, Melanie Stuart from the Jones Institute, and members of the current Kansas MTSS Model team.

Section C: Quality Of The Management Plan. (20 points) 1) The adequacy to achieve the objectives on time/ within budget, including responsibilities, timelines, and milestones (15 points).

To ensure maximum efficacy and efficiency, the management plan includes 3 main components: 1) a thoughtful, well designed plan of operation driven by assessed needs; 2) a plan that governs the project so that roles/responsibilities are clearly defined and information-based decisions are made by stakeholders collaboratively; and 3) effective utilization of all resources to achieve the project's goals and objectives. The Primary Investigator (.05 FTE) and the Project Director (1.0 FTE) [PD] will oversee the administration of the project in the 10 geographic areas and unfold the Phase-in process for all PD efforts pertaining to the 4 objectives and related activities found below. One (1.0

FTE) Project Coordinator [PC] will assist in the design/ development/ implementation of the statewide PD by coordinating courses/ institutes/ trainings/ studies, and develop tools and specific school-based support, as needed for assessment/evaluation of the project activities. Daily administration of project tasks will be the responsibility of the PD, assistance from the PC and a 1.0 FTE Administrative Assistant [AA]. As demonstrated in **Table 2: Management Plan Matrix,** a comprehensive profile is provided regarding the expected objectives' outcomes, the timeline for implementation, those responsible for the activity and the expected milestones.

Table 2. Management Plan Matrix

Goal: Scale up implementation of a coordinated, statewide system of personnel development/ PD that will increase the capacity of school systems to establish and use a multi- tiered model of scientific, research-based instruction, intervention, and assessment to improve the progress and performance of all students—especially for ELs.

Objective 1: Deliver research-based PD/ technical assistance/ coaching to increase the number of general/ administrators, ESL teachers, other personnel/ parents who understand/ implement MTSS instruction, intervention, and assessment, resulting in improved student performance. **Activity: 1.1.** Establish/ implement the Kansas EL—MTSS Network, including hiring of staff (1.0 FTE PC to oversee PD across 10 regional areas). **Responsible Parties:** KSDE cross-agency management staff, PD, MTSS Network [MTSS] sub-grantees. **Deliverables/ Completion Evidence/ Timelines:** 9/11 Project staff hired. **Activity 1.2.** Recruit external coaches [EC] to provide coaching/ mentoring support to identified LEAs—at least 10 coaches initially, each serving one or more districts or regions and training up to 50. **Responsible Parties:** PD, PC, MTSS. **Deliverables/ Completion Evidence/**

Timelines: Applications for external coaches issued/ finalized 10/11; signed agreements allocating FTE of coaches in place with LEAs/ SCs, **Activity 1.3.** Provide PD (at least 10 sessions per year in each geographic area) and coaching (onsite at least twice monthly) for the external coaches cadre to gain knowledge/ skills in coaching and in MTSS; includes support for external coaches by project staff through onsite coaching/mentoring, job shadowing, coaches networking meetings, etc. **Responsible Parties:** PD, PC, MTSS staff, KSDE C&I Division staff (modules development). **Deliverables/ Completion Evidence/ Timelines:** Training curriculum/ materials for coaching developed (including 15 modules); 4/12, with periodic updates/revisions; MTSS staff fully knowledgeable of content of 15 modules and other training content; 5/12 Training sessions scheduled, delivered, and evaluated; 6/12 through project end. Ongoing support for external coaches scheduled and provided; 6/12 throughout project life. **Activity 1.4.** Using predetermined criteria, recruit and select districts to receive external coaching services and serve as data collection districts (up to 80 districts initially, with 7-10 added annually). **Responsible Parties:** PD, PC, MTSS, External Coaches. **Deliverables/ Completion Evidence/ Timelines:** Signed agreements with districts in place, 8/12 and annually thereafter. At least 70 percent of participating districts on School Improvement Status or Corrective Action. **Activity 1.5.** Deliver PD (at least 10 per year per region) and coaching (onsite at least twice monthly) to district/ building-level staff, including internal coaches. **Responsible Parties:** External coaches, Employers of external coaches (e.g., LEAs, regional providers), MTSS staff. **Deliverables/ Completion Evidence/ Timelines:** Training sessions scheduled, delivered, and evaluated; 10/12 through project end; Coaching, including onsite visits, telephone and e-mail consultation, and cross-site meetings,

delivered and evaluated; 10/12 through project end. **Activity 1.6.** Use KSDE and the MTSS Stakeholder Group to review and provide input on project activities to make continual project improvements based on evaluation data. **Responsible Parties:** PD, PC, MTSS. **Deliverables/ Completion Evidence/ Timelines:** Regular updates to KSDE and MTSS, semiannually 2012-2016.

Objective 2: Increase the number of parents who participate and their level of participation in the educational decision-making process for their child across district sites. **Activity 2.1** Include the Kansas PTA, the Kansas Parent Information Resource Center [PIRC] and/or parent groups as active participants in the EL—MTSS Network. **Responsible Parties:** PD, PC, Parent Information Center Representatives, MTSS staff. **Deliverables/ Completion Evidence/ Timelines:** Kansas MTSS Network clearly specify parent entities as partners; 1/12; **Activity 2.2** Provide sub-grant(s) to the parent entities and the MTSS Network in a) printing and disseminating parent materials on EL—MTSS, including the role of parents in the MTSS process, and b) delivering training (at least five events per year) on MTSS and related topics for parents of ELs. **Responsible Parties:** PC, PIRC, MTSS staff. **Deliverables/ Completion Evidence/ Timelines:** Sub-grant(s) issued by 1/11 Partnership with other parent entities (e.g. Kansas PTA) established by 3/12; Parent materials produced and disseminated; 5/12 and annually thereafter. Training sessions scheduled (4 per year in each region)/delivered, 5/12 and annually thereafter. **Activity 2.3** Support participating districts to include EL parent representatives on the district leadership team to provide input on the effectiveness of school-level implementation. **Responsible Parties:** MTSS Network staff, external coaches, district administrators. **Deliverables/ Completion Evidence/ Timelines:** Parent names submitted by site administrators; 8/12 and then

annually as new sites are added; Meetings held and records reflect parent participation by 3/12 and ongoing through project end. **Activity 2.4** Facilitate active participation by parents in Tier 2 and 3 problem-solving meetings. **Responsible Parties:** District sites (leadership), school teams, parents. **Deliverables/ Completion Evidence/ Timelines:** Documented parent participation/ completed parent surveys, semiannually through project end.

Objective 3: Increase the quality of IHE undergraduate and graduate educator preparation programs that implement MTSS content in their curricula. **Activity 3.1** IHEs participate as a partner in the Kansas MTSS Network. **Responsible Parties:** IHE partner representatives. **Deliverables/ Completion Evidence/ Timelines:** Kansas MTSS Network clearly specify IHEs as primary partners, 12/11. **Activity 3.2** Establish and implement IHE Partnership. **Responsible Parties:** PD, PC, Stakeholder Groups. **Deliverables/ Completion Evidence/ Timelines:** Sub-grants awarded; 2/12. **Activity 3.3** Collaborate with the Kansas MTSS Network to provide training opportunities (using the 15 modules) to Kansas' educators. **Responsible Parties:** IHE Partnership, MTSS Network, PC. **Deliverables/ Completion Evidence/ Timelines:** Training modules delivered either in person or via online system; Summer 2012 and then regularly through project end. **Activity 3.4** Work with IHE teams at largest educator preparation programs to develop new and conduct reviews of pre-service program course syllabi for MTSS content aligned standards. **Responsible Parties:** PD, PC, IHE Partnership, External Evaluator [EE], participating IHEs. **Deliverables/ Completion Evidence/ Timelines:** IHE teams established KSDE (KSU, KU, ESU, Jones Institute, WSU, FHS); 5/12. Checklist completed for selected programs; 5-12/13. **Activity 3.5** Provide technical assistance via workgroups, e-mail, and telephone for IHE teams to

incorporate MTSS content into pre-service and in-service programs. **Responsible Parties:** IHE Partnership, Kansas MTSS Network. **Deliverables/ Completion Evidence/ Timelines:** Workgroups established; 11/12 Workgroups conducted; 1-6/13, annually thereafter. Content incorporated/ implemented Fall 2013 through end of project. **Activity 3.6** Establish/ refine a process for IHEs to forge collaborative relationships with districts to increase the number of graduates employed in low-performing districts with high populations of EL students. **Responsible Parties:** IHE Partnership, MTSS Network, PD, PC, KSDE PD staff. **Deliverables/ Completion Evidence/ Timelines:** Process established in Year 2 and implemented thereafter.

Objective 4: Refine and implement a comprehensive evaluation process to measure the effectiveness of project activities. **Activity 4.1** Finalize staff selection to conduct project evaluation. **Responsible Parties:** KSDE, PD, PC, IHEs, Kansas MTSS Network. **Deliverables/ Completion Evidence/ Timelines:** Agreement in place; 3/12. **Activity 4.2** Refine/ implement the project data collection system, incorporating and building on existing KSDE data collection systems. **Responsible Parties:** PC, PC, EE, Kansas MTSS Network staff. **Deliverables/ Completion Evidence/ Timelines:** Data collection structure refined and operable; 5/12. **Activity 4.3** Refine and implement project evaluation tools. **Responsible Parties:** EE, Kansas MTSS Network staff, IHE Partnership staff. **Deliverables/ Completion Evidence/ Timelines:** Fidelity Checklist, Data Protocol, TA Logs, Parent Survey, IHE Checklist. Tools refined and implemented; 5/12. **Activity 4.4** Provide training to project staff, external coaches, and participating district staff on evaluation system and tools and data entry. **Responsible Parties:** PD, PC, EE, Kansas MTSS Network staff, IHE Partnership staff. **Deliverables/ Completion Evidence/ Timelines:**

Online training sessions scheduled and provided; begin 8/12 and as needed thereafter. **Activity 4.5** Provide semiannual data analysis and progress reports to KSDE and the MTSS Stakeholder Group to inform/ make continual improvements in project activities. **Responsible Parties:** EE, PD, Kansas MTSS Network staff, IHE Partnership staff, Project Data Specialist. **Deliverables/ Completion Evidence/ Timelines:** Data Analysis/ Progress Reports and meetings with KSDE/ MTSS Stakeholder Group, semiannually throughout project. **Activity 4.6** Produce/ present to KSDE an annual report of program effectiveness based on project data. **Responsible Parties:** PD, PC, EE, Kansas MTSS Network, IHE Partnership. **Deliverables/ Completion Evidence/ Timelines:** Annual Report within 90 days after end of each grant year. **Activity 4.7** Submit the annual report to OELA. **Responsible Parties:** PD, EE. **Deliverables/ Completion Evidence/ Timelines:** OELA Annual Report, May 2012 and annually thereafter.

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

As demonstrated by the **Person Loading Chart** [**Table 3**], a variety of staff from each of the participating parties will contribute to goal attainment via responsibilities that are well delineated and manageable. The PI (.05 FTE), the PD (1.0 FTE), and the PC (1.0 FTE) will collaborate and guide project activities toward the completion of the PD with participants from across the state of Kansas. The PD will also collaborate with the KSDE and all participating IHEs to ensure that sound communications and resources are made available to project staff and consultants, thus ensuing quality project management. The Office of Research and Sponsored Programs and Accounting at KSU will provide assistance in fiscal management and reporting. Project faculty will conduct PD trainings, teach courses, supervise participant experiences, and provide for specialized counseling, advising and

related support services for project participants. The PC will manage the day-to-day operation of the project and oversee the planning, monitoring, and appraisal of program effectiveness, project progress, and goal/objective achievement. An (1.0 FTE) Administrative Assistant [AA] will be secured to ensure the smooth reception, operation, proper documentation, and reliable reporting of project progress and outcomes.

The PD, Dr. Tonnie Martinez, will: 1) provide overall leadership in the management of the program; 2) oversee the coordination of program services; 3) assume overall responsibility for project budget/ management; 4) provide for program assessment/ evaluation; and, 4) coordinate the development of all project reports, continuation proposals, and required documents. The PC, Dr. Robin Cabral, will: 1) oversee the daily design, planning /implementation of the PD program; 2) coordinate/ develop/ implement training supplies for the initial phase; 3) identify resources needed in all areas; 4) assist in the identification of criteria for the selection/identification of participants; 5) assist in establishing evaluation rubrics of the program; and, 6) act as a conduit between the PD program, local schools and IHEs. **Table 3** provides commitment of time information for key project personnel.

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

Project Activities	PI	PD	PC	AA	EE
Hire Staff/Establish Program Initial Components	1	5		5	
Research/Prepare Materials	2	3	4	3	8
Select participants	2	7	1	7	
Develop program	4	35	10	35	
Implement program/ Implement Project Objectives	3	177	239	177	5
Data Collection/Process Dev.	1	15	2	15	15

Data Analysis	2	5	4	5	15
Dissemination		15	2	15	2
Totals	**15**	**262**	**262**	**262**	**45**

Other key consultants (**Budget Justification Narrative, Appendix X**) will also be secured to assist with the design, development and implementation of the training modules, provide face-to-face trainings throughout the 5-years of grant operation and assist with online PD/courses that lead to endorsed ESL teachers.

D. Quality of the Project Evaluation. **(30 points) The Secretary considers the following factors: 1) The extent the evaluation methods are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes. (10 points); and, 2) The extent to which evaluation methods include objective performance measures related to the outcomes and produce quantitative and qualitative data. (10 points)**

Project KORE will be evaluated through the thorough and methodical use of the latest scientifically supported and research driven methods of measurement, analyses, and documentation. Through this evaluation process, project staff/ collaborating IHEs and KSDE will collaborate with the CIMA Center at KSU to principally/ prudently align itself with the expectations of the designated evaluation criteria set by the evaluative standards found within the RFP and the NPD guidelines. In particular, the project will systematically target, monitor progress against and achieve the expectations of GPRA and OELA evaluation criteria. Moreover, staff will ensure that the evaluation process matches the GPRA Program/ Evaluation Measures (GPM) and OELA Program Measures (OPM) and that these indicators are then again aligned to the project goal, its various supporting objectives and with the expected outcomes.

Process data collection is an important evaluation aspect for use in documenting the implementation features of the project and for providing information that can be used to fine-tune the project—even as it is being implemented. Process data will allow the Evaluation Planning Team [EPT], to be described later, to answer questions such as: *"What features of the*

PD program contributed most to improving core instruction or changing patterns of instruction to support/accommodate the learning of ELs in inclusive/mainstream settings?" "What ways did partnerships—KSDE, IHEs and districts—help to strengthen the project design?

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

Through the use of multiple measures including data collection that examines teacher and individual student changes and other indicators of the effects of the model, evaluation evidence will be analyzed to determine the extent to which the project has made substantial progress toward meeting its goals and objectives, and was it cost effective. Multiple measures and procedures used by the project will include, but not limited to: the development of technology-based documentation procedures to maintain records on students, teachers, and administrators; the development of reporting forms and formats, focus groups and probes, observation instruments including contact logs, reflection logs, electronic journals and anecdotal/ structured

data and records, and reporting procedures to document the effectiveness of the model, its components and strategies used. The quality of the evaluation plan will be further enhanced through: 1) innovative data collection techniques such as a Systematic Shadowing Technique in which project staff spend time onsite shadowing school staff to document project implementation efforts; 2) Individual Development Plans (IDPS) maintained by staff who take responsibility for their own professional growth and learning to support the goals and objectives of the project; 3) electronic journals maintained by teachers who document and reflect on what works in practices and why, and what doesn't work and why not; 4) the collection of baseline data and longitudinal data on staff attitudes about their capacity to implement reform strategies to support the achievement of ELs, 5) documentation of needs, program descriptions and activities; instructional methods, techniques, and materials to implement the goals and objectives of the project; 6) reviewing and restructuring ways that instructional and planning time is spent; and 7) the implementation of an Evaluation Planning Team [EPT].

A summative evaluation process will allow project staff to measure project success over five-years to answer summative evaluation questions such as the following: 1) *How prepared are teachers with regard to implementing researched-based instructional practices for ELs in an enhanced, refined Kansas MTSS Model of Instruction?* To determine preparedness to implement practices as a measure of systemic education reform in rural schools, a self-assessment inventory will be adapted and administered that focuses on indicators of implementation (Special Strategies for Educating Disadvantaged Children (2007), U.S. Department of Education). The baseline data, compared to the survey administered on a yearly post measure schedule, will determine the change in teacher attitudes and demonstrated proficiencies in teaching ELs. 2) *How successful has the PD component been in increasing the ability to support the improvement of academic*

performance and results for ELs? To determine success, a pre- and post PD effectiveness rubric anchored to the National Standards for Staff Development will be refined and administered (National Staff Development Council, 2010). 3) *How successful has the project been in providing support to instructional leaders and teachers through the sharing of successful instructional practices and resources to promote research-based instructional practices in their daily teaching of ELs?* To determine success, anecdotal information will be collected through constituency focus groups and summarized using a trend analysis that clusters substantial trends. In addition, interaction logs and Individual Development Plans (IDPs) will be reviewed and the results analyzed to determine success trends in communication and PD. 4) *How successful has the project been as a means for promoting state-wide school reform and the use of researched-based teaching practices to increase the achievement of ELs?* To determine success, anecdotal information will be collected through constituency focus groups and summarized using a trend analysis that clusters substantial trends. In addition, interaction logs will be tallied and the results analyzed to determine trends in communication. 5) *How successful has the project's leadership been to serve as a support/catalyst for teams of educators, parents, and decision makers to improve services and results for ELs?* To determine success, surveys/ questionnaires will be developed, administered and analyzed. The evaluation plan was designed to provide a comprehensive look at project effectiveness by taking a team approach to the evaluation planning process. Upon award notification, an EPT will be formed to meet quarterly to discuss the evaluation design, the results of project implementation, and ways to improve the project—as the evaluation information will be used for continuous improvement of the project

The research-based framework, from which all evaluation processes will be completed, is co-anchored in the **Discrepancy Evaluation Model** (DEM), as developed by Malcolm Provus, and

the **Biography Driven Practices Classroom Observations** (BDP) measure—an extension of the Standards Performance Continuum classroom observation instrument, which reflects CREDE's five standards of effective pedagogy - Joint Productive Activity, Language & Literacy Development, Contextualization, Challenging Activities, and Instructional Conversation.

Discrepancy Evaluation Model: DEM evaluation is the comparison of an actual performance to a designated standard. Data is provided on the program outcome or the extent to which the program accomplished its targeted objectives. DEM also addresses the process or qualitative concerns and includes an analysis of the process used during the evaluation cycle. DEM consists of a number of specific steps. **Step 1** provides a portrayal of the program design, as planned. This portrayal includes program resources, related activities/ operations and the expected outcomes. The description follows closely those evaluation requirements detailed in 34 CFR 75.590. **Step 2** investigates and reports on the actual program installation, specifically addressing the question, *"Are the resources/ activities/ operations, as described in the design section, in motion?"* **Step 3** is the actual monitoring of the objective(s) accomplishments related to the overall program goal. This is perhaps the most important stage of the evaluation process and the one in which most time and energy will be invested. **Step 4** addresses the overall purpose of summative evaluation, asking the question, *"Was what was intended to be accomplished realized?"* and, *"Did the program accomplish its stated goal and objectives?"* **Step 5** looks at program cost benefits. This aspect analyzes the total cost of the treatment and judges the worth/ value of it in comparison to other approaches. Provus' DEM was designed to evaluate educational programs like **Project KORE**. The evaluative model expressly addresses project accomplishments while providing a structure for continuously identifying project needs, recording the various processes, and assessing the impact of the services provided by the project.

In order to be appropriately applied, the DEM requires the development of sound program objectives. These specific objectives, **(Detailed in Section A: Project Design)**, are distinguished from general objectives or overall goals. These program objectives: 1) state expectations in measurable, behavioral terms; 2) are stated in terms of the participants or learners; 3) have an expected terminal performance; 4) state the conditions imposed when performing the desired behavior (time limits); 5) specify an expected outcome; and, 6) indicate a rubric against which the achievement or terminal outcome can be compared. The DEM involves all project staff and project participants in the evaluation process. Staff and participants are queried as to their perceptions of the project to determine whether the activities they are engaged in are leading toward the accomplishment of the project's stated purpose and goal. This information, along with observational data collected by staff/ external evaluator, is used to monitor or refine program progress or direction as the project is being implemented. Evaluation will be an integral and essential part of the overall success of the project achieving its objectives, delivering quality services to students and managing its resources. Since the project will be fiscally housed at the CIMA Center at KSU, evaluation is an essential component of effective program management.

To further enhance the evaluation components found within the Discrepancy Evaluation Model (DEM), the use of **Biography Driven Practices Classroom Observations [BDP]** will be employed, as well. The BDP measure is an extension of the Standards Performance Continuum classroom observation instrument, which reflects 5 pedagogy standards- Joint Productive Activity/ Language & Literacy Development/ Contextualization/Challenging Activities/ Instructional Conversation (Herrera, 2010). Observers rate teachers' levels of enactment for the 22 BDP indicators on a 0-4 scale, where 0=Not observed, 1=Emerging 2=Developing, 3 =

Enacting, and 4 = Integrating. Individual indicators are categorized under and aligned with each of the original 5 standards. A composite BDP score is calculated to represent the overall level of BDP. As such, **Project KORE** will describe findings of classroom observations for teacher participants and conduct analysis and research from each cohort group of participants served by this project during the course of 5 years. The purpose of this research will be to assess changes in teachers' classroom practices and ELs performance using a standardized measure of change. We hypothesize that teachers' level of enactment of best practices and standards, as defined by the BDP rubric, would significantly increase from the beginning to the end of the program. Confirmation of this hypothesis will be taken as evidence of increased teacher effectiveness.

Before data can be analyzed from both the anchored DEM and BDP models, response data from all offerings will be exported to a CSV file. The raw data will then be saved as an Excel file and cleaned and coded in preparation for analysis. Clean teacher and student data will be exported to the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS, version 15.0), where the files will be merged as a single large database. SPSS will then be used to transform and compute variables and to analyze the data. This type of data will encompass all of the descriptive statistics produced from analysis of the responses for the entire sample, as well as the disaggregation of responses by population groups. Beyond the cleaning and coding of the raw data, the first step of analysis will be to conduct descriptive statistics on each of the items. These statistics provided frequencies of responses, means, and standard deviations for the scaled items. The results section that follows provides the means and standard deviations in descending value order. For sample description purposes, frequencies will also conducted for the nominal level demographic data. For the second phase of analysis, we will conduct a series of full factorial Analyses of Variance (ANOVAs) on the twenty-two items that were ranked by the full sample as

having the highest mean scores (indicating these characteristics are believed to be most important). This type of significance test is performed to determine if differences exist between the responses of different variables. For example, significance testing can be used to determine if Joint Productive Activity is similar in importance as Language & Literacy Development or if one group rates a characteristic as more important than the other one. Upon discovery, the research team will report results of the full sample across all variables. Subsequent descriptive statistics will be conducted for each data source to show the similarity of responses across the population groups and we will create tabular representations of responses for the full sample. These tables will depict the results and serve as a basis for each year's Annual Performance Report (APR).

To create cohesiveness with the evaluation design and process, and to lead the EPT, an External Evaluator [EE] will be contracted. As such, Dr. Robert Fanning will be contracted to serve as the EE. Based on his extensive 37+ year career serving diverse students in nineteen states as a teacher, school administrator, and technical advisor, he will be secured as the EE to oversee the evaluation of the work completed by project staff, program management and operation strategies and to ensure that project goals/ objectives are being met in a timely fashion. He has extensive experience/training in the administration of federal and state projects, ESL and migrant educational programming, program/ fiscal management and with the implementation of standards-based education emphasizing intervention services for students at risk. Dr. Fanning holds a doctorate in regular/ special education administration with an emphasis in program evaluation/effectiveness, school reform, ESL, special education and educational research. He also has managed numerous federal and state grants, and now serves as an evaluator for numerous Federal grants and as an Implementation Coach for the Kansas Learning Network, which provides technical support for schools not achieving AYP. He has worked as an

evaluation consultant with the Program Evaluation and Assessment Units in Colorado, Pennsylvania, Iowa and Hawaii Departments of Education and as an advisor/ evaluator of 11 systemic reform and demonstration grants.

Members of the EPT will include: an EE, the PI, PD, PC, the various IHE/ District representatives, project participants and school-based administrators/ instructional leaders. Each EPT member will be informed by the EE regarding the project evaluation activities, person(s) responsible for carrying out the evaluation activities, and the timelines for completion. An evaluation-planning calendar will be drafted and distributed to each member of the team within one week after the first EPT meeting. Because the EPT is broad-based, it will serve as an appropriate, objective vehicle for evaluating the success of the project.

3) The extent to which the evaluation methods provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. (10 points)

Quantitative Evaluation Criteria: Effective evaluation processes and other related criteria used with **Project KORE** will employ and target scientifically-based quantitative measures to determine the efficacy in meeting expected outcomes and provide an avenue for ongoing performance feedback. As such, KSDE and its collaborating IHES will utilize evaluative strategies that ensure that such attributes of internal validity, external validity, reliability measures and objectivity are employed throughout all stages of the evaluation design. A variety of evaluation strategies will be used to ensure that internal validity is secured; they are: a) the use of consistency between the measurement conditions of pre- and post-interventional assessments, especially those that will measure the effectiveness of project implementation strategies; and, b) the use of random sampling and/ or analyses to ensure inter-rater reliability; and c) incorporating controls designed to avert statistical extreme scores in assessments. Also, a variety of methods will be used to ensure that external validity components are addressed; they are: a) the use of

randomized sampling of participant groups for quantitative data analyses, where appropriate, b) conducting comparisons between comparable groups, and (c) completing multi-site analyses and applicable comparisons. To ensure that reliability to the process is established, a variety of processes will be utilized; they are: a) the use of piloted, field-tested assessment/evaluation instruments, and b) using evaluative processes to arrive at reliability coefficients, where applicable. Finally, objectivity in the overall evaluation process is needed. As such, project staff will establish/ maintain data/ documentation of implemented project efforts and will use specifically designed evaluation methods that employ quasi-experimental designs and related methodologies to assess achieved outcomes. Given these quantitative assessment parameters, the types of data found in **Table 4** will be collected to evaluate the quantitative aspects of the project. In addition, SPSS and ANOVA will be used to do this detailed analysis.

Table 4: Quantitative Evaluation Measures of Project KORE		
Prgrm Implement. Strategy.	Participant Progress/Outcomes	Participant (PT) Effectiveness
Address. GPM, Part 1, 3	*Address. GPM, Part 1, 3* *Addresses QPM, Parts 1,2*	*Addresses QPM, Parts 1, 2* *BDP Protocol/ Data*
PT GPA by Course	PT Critical Reflection Journals	K-12 Student Performance on Stdzd. Achv. Tests, Criterion Ref. Assessments
PT Practicum Portfolio	PT GPA by Course & Portfolio	
PT Prgrm. Evl. Surveys	PT PRAXIS Score	

GM: GPRA Standards; QPM: Quality Program Measures

Qualitative Evaluation Criteria: Quantitative evaluation results serve only as one aspect of design; as such, it is also important that the evaluative process incorporate a measure of qualitative achievement of expected outcomes. Hence, the EPT will utilize the qualitative measuring standards as identified by key researchers as that found with Lincoln and Guba, 1985; Anfara, Brown, and Mangione, 2002; and, Cho & Trent, 2006. These sound, qualitative

assessment principles include aspects associated with ensuring qualitative credibility through the use of such attributes as prolonged engagement, persistent observation, referential adequacy, thick description, dependability, triangulation, and confirmability. The attainment of overall credibility in the evaluation design involves a twofold task: 1) conducting the evaluation in such a way that credible findings are yielded, and 2) by reviewing the findings through the critical eye of the following methods: a) prolonged engagement— where the evaluation of the project is conducted through a continuous, ongoing evaluative process throughout the project's life; b) persistent observations—where objective observations are conducted and; c) referential adequacy—where the tenets of the evaluation design are archived for analysis long after other project data has been analyzed. If this data, when analyzed, yields similar findings to that which has already been scrutinized, then this yields further credibility to the overall evaluation findings. As such, **Project KORE** will submit thorough annual and final reports to the applicable officers of OELA in Washington, DC project findings for their review and consideration. Any recommendations from that office for the enhancement of project research or evaluation methodologies will be immediately incorporated; d) transferability—where strategies to ensure the valid shifting of findings and the project's design to other settings or to others are employed; e) thick description—where the EE sets the stage for accountability, as well as identifying the comprehensive assessment methods to be used in the evaluation design; f) dependability—where the aspects of validity, reliability and credibility are secured and consistently applied; g) triangulation—where the findings from the multiple sources of data are compared to each other to determine if the sources yield similar results; and, h) confirmability—where consensus has been reached among the key stakeholders regarding the findings of the project. Given these qualitative assessment parameters, **Table 5** depicts data to be collected and evaluated.

Table 5: Qualitative Evaluation Measures of Project KORE		
Program Implement. Strategy	Participant Progress/Outcomes	Participant [PT] Effectiveness
Address. GPM, Part 1, 3	*Address. GPM, Part 1, 3* *Addresses QPM, Parts 1,2*	*Addresses QPM, Parts 1, 2*
Participant BDH Observation	KSDE, IHE, District, and Participant Records	Participant Shadowing
Semi-structured Interviews	Participant Observation	Admin. Interviews
Quasi-structured Surveys	PT, Dist., & IHE Documents	Dist & Admin. Documents

Analyses of qualitative data will be conducted for all aspects of **Table 6** utilizing the following strategies: 1) The Constant Comparative Method (Boeije, 2002); and 2) Etic Coding, according to the BDP Model as a substantive Framework (Mitchell, 2006; Herrera, Murry, & Cabral, 2010). The evaluation strategies will be persistent in the form of day-to-day management functions. Evaluation will be an ongoing process and monthly visits will be made to the project site by the EE. Formative data gathered throughout the year will be reported each year to OME in the form of progress reports. In addition to the yearly progress reports, a yearly Annual Performance Report will also be submitted to OME—including information regarding **GPRA** (seen at this end of this section) and US Education Department Program Measures. In Year 5, a final summative evaluation report will be submitted, as well. Prior to submission of yearly progress and the APRs, the evaluator and the lead agency will provide evaluation findings to the PI, PD, KSDE, all participating IHEs, project staff and other key stakeholders. In response to the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA), project staff will document and report on the extent to which the project is achieving against these performance measures. These performance measures are: 1) The percentage of pre-service program graduates who are placed in

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