U.S. Department of Education

Washington, D.C. 20202-5335

APPLICATION FOR GRANTS UNDER THE

NATIONAL PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM
CFDA # 84.365Z
PR/Award # T365Z110203
Grants.gov Tracking#: GRANT10865439

Closing Date: MAY 09, 2011

1. Institute of Higher Education (IHE): Indiana University Purdue University, Indianapolis (IUPUI)

2. Title of Program: IUPUI ESL Partnerships: Building Capacity Across and Within Institutions

3. Type and Number of Participants Served: This grant serves university personnel (56) and in-service teachers (141) or a total of 197 educators. The total number of university personnel served will be 56, with 28 faculty members participating in year one, 26 in year two, and 12 university supervisors in year five. The total number of in-service teachers served will be 141, with instructional coaching activities serving 96 (16 coaches, 80 teachers or 60 elementary/20 secondary STEM) and 45 teachers receiving ESL tuition scholarships. Forty teachers—16 coaches and 24 elementary teachers—complete coaching in year one and 26 teachers in year two. Twenty teachers complete coaching and 15 elementary scholarships are awarded, serving a total of 35 teachers in year three. Ten teachers complete coaching and 15 secondary STEM scholarships are awarded, serving a total of 25 in-service teachers in year four. A total of 15 secondary STEM in-service teachers are served in year five.

4. Partners: Indianapolis Public Schools (IPS) and the Metropolitan School District of Pike Township (Pike).

5. Project Description: Indiana has experienced a 409% growth in its EL population since 1997 (Batalova & McHugh, 2010) dramatically increasing the need for ESL certified teachers. Starting in 2007, IUPUI established a multi-level, inter-institutional, and collaborative ESL teacher education partnership with several districts creating a shared vision, ownership, and responsibility for quality ESL teacher preparation. This grant proposes to continue collaborative work by systematically building greater capacity within the university and across districts to increase use of data-driven differentiation, with the ultimate aim of improving student achievement among culturally, linguistically, learning, and/or economically diverse students.

Four goals and phases of activity define this project. Phase One is Assessment and Improvement. Faculty and district partners will seek consensus about the skills and practices defining high quality attention to data-driven differentiation in the regular classroom (Objective One). In year one, university faculty members will first analyze the type and quality of attention given to data-driven differentiation in content-area and ESL methods courses (Outcomes 1 & 2) and improve alignment to ESL standards and the new Common Core state standards (Outcome 3). Next faculty members and district partners will develop valid observation scales and checklists representing a continuum of attention to data-driven differentiation (Outcome 4) and quality STEM instruction (Outcome 5) to be used in coursework and instructional coaching. Finally, ESL faculty will analyze their existing secondary coaching data to improve instructional coaching protocols for working with secondary STEM teachers (Outcome 6).

Phase Two is Capacity Building. The university and districts will build their collective capacity to model, teach, and support research-based pedagogy, assessment, and differentiation for diverse learners by institutionalizing use of defined instructional targets. Objective Two invites 20 faculty members to participate in a three-day seminar on infusing curriculum, activities, and assignments into teacher education courses that institutionalize use of data-driven differentiation for diverse learners (Outcome 1). University faculty will redesign 14 courses, 8 of which will be STEM focused, during year two (Outcome 2 &3). In year five, 12 university supervisors will participate in a seminar (Outcome 4) and provide instructional coaching to a student teacher (Outcome 5). Objective three requires institutionalization of IUPUI's two-year ESL instructional coaching model in the districts across four years of the grant. Activities result

in a) the preparation of 16 district coaches prepared to coach for improved pedagogy (Outcome 1) and data-driven differentiation (Outcome 2); and b) creation of 60 elementary (Outcome 3) and 10 secondary STEM demonstration classrooms (Outcome 4) from years one to four.

Phase Three is ESL Certification. This grant increases the number of ESL certified teachers in the districts by awarding 21-credit graduate tuition scholarships to teachers (Objective 4). The program takes 16 months to complete. Starting in year three, 15 elementary teachers will receive scholarships (Outcome 1). In years four and five 15 secondary STEM teachers will be recruited for scholarships (Outcome 2). Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) measures 1.5 (percentage of in-service teachers earning ESL certification) and 1.6 (percentage of in-service teachers serving ELs) comprise Outcome 4.

Phase Four is Continuous Quality Improvement. Activities focus on analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data leading to continuous quality improvement (Objective Five) in teacher education curriculum (Outcome 1), the efficacy (Outcome 2) and scalability (Outcomes 3) of ESL instructional coaching, and its impact on K-12 student achievement (Outcome 4). Using quasi-experimental, repeated measures, and case study designs, analyses will address teacher transformation, development patterns, fidelity, sustainability of growth, and scaled and reliable use of IUPUI's two-year ESL instructional coaching model. The impact of teacher performance (pedagogy and differentiation) on students' academic and language achievement will also be evaluated. These data outcomes will be used to refine university-public school partnership goals and programs.

Together these goals, objectives, activities, and expected outcomes ensure systematic and collaborative improvement in university methods courses, the clinical placements for student teaching, and the professional development offered veteran teachers. This grant will build needed capacity to teach ELs in the regular classroom within the university and across district partnerships.

6. Priorities: This grant addresses three priorities. First, this project meets the expectation of Competitive Preference Priority 2: Enabling More Data-Based Decision-Making. It proposes to establish and evaluate of an ESL instructional coaching model that supports elementary and secondary teachers in learning to prepare, collect, use, and analyze various types of assessment data for the purposes of differentiating instruction to improve learning outcomes. Second, this project aligns with Competitive Preference Priority 3 by providing opportunities for high quality preparation and professional development for teachers of STEM subjects. Specifically, this grant engages STEM teacher educators in redesigning methods courses to infuse content and strategies for differentiating for diverse learners. Funding will support two years of ESL instructional coaching for 10 secondary STEM educators in an effort to create high quality clinical placements. Alignment from STEM methods courses to clinical placements will be solidified by the preparation of 12 university supervisors (6 STEM). The 30 ESL certification scholarships designated for secondary STEM educators will build needed district capacity to serve secondary ELs. Four ESL certification courses will be tailored to the needs of STEM educators. Finally, this project embodies the aim of Invitational Priority 2, which calls for the preparation of all teachers to better serve ELs. The two-year ESL Instructional Coaching Model is designed to prepare mainstream teachers to differentiate for ELs in the regular classroom. IUPUI's ESL certification program focuses on the content, skills, and concerns of mainstream teachers.

7. Contact: Dr. Annela Teemant, Project Director/Principal Investigator, 317-274-1228 (work), 801-808-6605 (cell), ateemant@iupui.edu or ateemant09@gmail.com.

Project Narrative

Project Narrative

Attachment 1:
Title: Pages: Uploaded File: **1240-03_IUPUIESLNarrF_2011.pdf**

Attachment 2:
Title: Pages: Uploaded File: **1241-02_Table_of_Contents_2011.pdf**

1. Need for the Project

Indiana has experienced a 409% growth in its English Learner (EL) population since 1997 (Batalova & McHugh, 2010), dramatically increasing the need for ESL certified teachers. In 2007, Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI) established a multi-layered, inter-institutional, and collaborative ESL partnership with Indianapolis Public Schools (IPS). The purpose was to create shared vision, ownership, and responsibility for quality ESL teacher preparation. The partnership accomplished the institutionalized use of the Standards for Effective Pedagogy (SEP) Instructional Model (Tharp, Estrada, Dalton, & Yamauchi, 2000). The SEP are being modeled and taught as a culturally relevant pedagogy in undergraduate Teacher Education, the graduate ESL program, and in IPS and the Metropolitan School District of Pike Township (Pike) through an ESL Instructional Coaching model (Teemant, Wink, Tyra, 2010). This work, however, has revealed a new need to improve the use of student data and work for making instructional decisions at all layers of teacher preparation. We talk about this effort as improving data-driven differentiation (DDD) to increase achievement among students with various combinations of cultural, linguistic, learning, and/or economic diversity.

Building upon established partnerships with IPS and Pike, IUPUI now proposes systematically building greater capacity within the university and across districts by prepare every urban teacher to serve every student in the regular classroom. With stated goals of improving differentiation, building capacity, increasing ESL certification, and continuous quality improvement, this project meets identified student, district, and university needs by design.

At the student level, justification for focus on DDD precipitates from this fact: diverse learners, especially ELs, are persistently underserved in the regular classroom. Table 1 highlights the passing rate percentages of various student sub-groups on the 2010 Indiana Statewide Testing

for Educational Progress (I-STEP). These data show that IPS and Pike students from low socioeconomic and minority backgrounds lag behind white peers. Limited English Proficient (LEP) students have lower pass rates than White peers, and for some grade levels outperform their Black peers in mathematics. In IPS, performance declines dramatically between elementary and secondary grades. Such results demonstrate teachers in urban settings have challenges closing the minimum competency achievement gaps for every sub-group. Plucker, Burroughs, and Song (2010, p. 1), however, remind us of the "excellence gap," highlighting the need for more equitable opportunities at the highest levels of achievement for minority students as well. ELs are learning English, but they may also have needs emerging from giftedness, disabilities, or poverty. Teachers must learn to differentiate instruction in meaningful, manageable, and efficient ways to advance learning for all learners.

At the district level, Latinos represent the fastest growing population of students. Both IPS and Pike districts have a pressing need to improve instructional practices with ELs and increase achievement. Many teachers will be retiring from these districts within the next 10 years, and these teachers should be replaced with ESL certified teachers. This grant reduces shortages of ESL teachers and builds the instructional capacity of teachers serving ELs in the regular classroom. Therefore, grant activities target specific district needs.

Four elementary schools—Carl Wilde in IPS, and Deer Run, College Park, and Central in Pike—will participate in the grant. Table 2 shows that these schools have large minority populations, high percentages of students on free/reduced lunch, and large numbers of Limited English Proficient (LEP) students. LEP students pass the fifth grade language arts and math exams at a significantly lower rate than native English speaking students do. IUPUI has a history of collaboration with IPS. Using IUPUI's ESL Instructional Coaching Model, the district

Table 1

Percentage Passing Rate on ISTEP+ Test Spring 2009

ELA		All Students		White		Black		Hispanic		LEP	
Grade	State	Pike	IPS	Pike	IPS	Pike	IPS	Pike	IPS	Pike	IPS
3	74	65	56•	82	69•	60	51•	57	56	51	48
4	73	64	55•	88*	63•	61	51•	55	52	44	43
5	70	60	50•	85	59•	55	47	47	47	35	31
6	69	64	47•	82	55•	59	43	60	47	42*	32
7	67	60	37•	87	43•	53	33	54	45	39	26
8	65	65	37•	86	43•	59*	34•	58*	36	33*	17
State %		70%		77%		48%		56%		38%	
Math		All Students		White		Black		Hispanic		LEP	
Grade	State	Pike	IPS	Pike	IPS	Pike	IPS	Pike	IPS	Pike	IPS
3	72	57	54•	84	68•	49	47	57	61	53	57
4	70	60	51•	88*	62•	52	43•	60	62	53	53
5	76	69	63•	91	70•	63	58	66	67	59	61
6	73	62	61	83	71•	55	55	57	68	41	61
7	68	56	43•	83	50•	50	36•	45	59	34	43
8	67	60	39•	88*	48•	52	34	53	45	37	32
State Math %		71%		77%		47%		60%		54%	

*Highest or • lowest ranking among the 10 Marion County or Indianapolis districts

Table 2

State, District, and Elementary School Statistics

2010 Data	State	IPS	Pike	Wilde	Deer Run	College Park	Central
Free/Reduced Lunch	45.3%	82%	53%	95%	64%	67%	66%
Total Enrollment	1,047,145	33,372	10981	616	785	452	668
White	778,320	7,655	1574	42	36	24	47
Black	128,252	18,478	6535	160	458	248	414
Hispanic	74,351	5,266	1750	369	233	133	142
Other	66,222	1,973	1122	45	58	47	65
LEP # & %	49,073 / 5%	3902 / 12%	1677 / 15%	290 / 47%	245 / 31%	149 / 33%	197 / 29%
% Passing for Grade 5:							
ELA Non-LEP	73%	52%	65%	66%	57%	59%	35%
ELA LEP	38%	31%	35%	44%	26%	56%	56%
Math Non-LEP	73%	63%	72%	88%	63%	68%	59%
Math LEP	38%	61%	59%	76%	60%	56%	59%

successfully institutionalized use of SEP at multiple sites. The 25-coached elementary teachers (Teemant, 2010) and 30-coached secondary teachers (Teemant, 2011) all significantly improved instructional practices in contrast to a control group albeit secondary teachers changed at a significantly lower level than elementary teachers did. Secondary science and mathematics teachers (i.e., STEM teachers) improved significantly less than teachers of non-STEM subjects did. Findings suggest secondary teachers, especially STEM teachers, need more than one year of coaching to fully implement SEP with fidelity. Based on these experiences, IPS has requested that grant funding focus on two priorities. First, IPS would like scholarships and instructional coaching to target teachers at Carl Wilde Elementary to create an ESL demonstration school. At the secondary level, IPS would like to recruit secondary STEM teachers from across the district to participate in instructional coaching for two years and pursue ESL certification.

In 2010, IUPUI and Pike formed an ESL partnership to prepare a cadre of ESL instructional coaches to work with teachers in the regular classroom. We piloted scaling the use of IUPUI's ESL Instructional Coaching Model to two elementary schools with seven district coaches. Based on this success, Pike has two district priorities: a) preparation of 16 district coaches with capacity to coach teachers in the use of SEP with fidelity; and b) the preparation of coaches for a second year of ESL coaching focused on DDD.

At the university level, three priorities have emerged. First, Teacher Education faculty members have observed that student teachers are not able to analyze, interpret, or discuss student work at an adequate level of sophistication in their final exit interviews. K-12 students and student work revolve around a "teach to the middle" mindset. With this grant, the School of Education (SOE) would like to institutionalize a DDD mind set across multiple layers of Teacher Education, including methods courses and clinical placements.

Second, IUPUI would like to create a common vision of quality differentiation with district partners. This shared vision of DDD will raise expectations, lead to greater alignment in the partnership, and result in observational scales for DDD. This approach was successful in institutionalizing use of SEP. ESL teacher candidates are now regularly placed with coached teachers. These student teachers achieve the highest levels of fidelity to SEP. The university hopes to create the same quality conditions and alignment for improving focus on DDD.

Finally, IUPUI's Urban Center for the Advancement of STEM Education (UCASE) has the mandate to increase the numbers of highly qualified K-12 STEM teachers in urban settings. A joint effort among the Schools of Science, Education, and Engineering and Technology, UCASE supports second career adults in transitioning into STEM education through such programs as the Woodrow Wilson Fellowship Program and Noyce Scholarship Programs. The greatest challenge for UCASE programs is the lack of high quality urban clinical placements modeling quality inquiry or problem solving and differentiation for diverse students. UCASE would like to use the ESL program's two-year instructional coaching model to create high quality STEM clinical placements. ESL scholarships targeting STEM educators will also allow ongoing mentoring and funded course work for recent graduates building needed local capacity.

In sum, student, district, and university needs invite ESL teacher preparation into the center of the Teacher Education enterprise. This proposal focuses on institutionalizing use of an ESL pedagogy (SEP) and DDD as part of a comprehensive approach to preparing all teachers to teach ELs—and all diverse students—in the regular classroom with greater equity.

2. Project Design

This section provides a conceptual overview, specifies goals and objectives, describes four phases of activity with measurable outcomes, and establishes the significance of the project.

A. Conceptual Overview of Comprehensive Effort to Improve Instruction

IUPUI's existing ESL partnership provides an infrastructure for systemically and collaboratively improving teacher education. The grant addresses three invitational priorities: a) to enable more data-based decision making (Competitive Priority Two); b) to provide high quality preparation for teachers of STEM subjects (Competitive Priority Three); and c) to prepare all teachers to better serve ELs (Invitational Priority Two). Described outcomes are rigorously evaluated using longitudinal and quasi-experimental methods, ensuring attention to teacher change, program improvement, and K-12 student academic and English achievement.

To accomplish these goals, we propose entering a four-phase, five-year process of simultaneous university-public school improvement. Two innovative strategies ensure success. The first strategy builds on our existing multi-level, inter-institutional, and collaborative partnership for ESL teacher education. It creates shared vision, ownership, and responsibility for preparing every teacher to equitably serve diverse learners in the regular classroom. A second strategy institutionalizes use of the Standards for Effective Pedagogy (SEP) and data-driven differentiation (DDD) at every level of teacher preparation.

Equipping teachers to meet the needs of all learners requires more than minor adjustments in the common tradition of teacher-centered, behavior-oriented practices. Sociocultural theory and critical pedagogy have emerged as research-based foundations for diversity teacher preparation (e.g., Lewis, Enciso, & Moje, 2007; Rogoff, 1995; Vygotsky, 1978). Sociocultural theory rests on the premise that *learning is social*, and that it is through social interaction with teachers or peers—more knowledgeable others—that students receive needed assistance in their zone of proximal development (ZPD) to engage in culturally meaningful tasks. Thus, learning occurs best when collaboration between students and teachers

maximizes opportunities for language use and appropriate assistance. Critical perspectives rest in understanding issues of identity, agency, and power (e.g., Lewis, Enciso, & Moje, 2007).

Researchers at the Center for Research on Education, Diversity & Excellence (CREDE) synthesized sociocultural knowledge into the SEP instructional model (e.g., Tharp, et al., 2000). This model promotes use of multiple, simultaneous, and differentiated activity centers. Teachers design activities with specific and observable characteristics (Dalton, 2008): 1) **Joint Productive Activity:** The teacher and a small group of students collaborate on a shared product; 2) **Developing Language and Literacy Across the Curriculum:** The teacher provides structured opportunities for students to engage in sustained use of academic language and assists development by questioning, rephrasing, or modeling; 3) **Contextualization:** The teacher integrates new information with what students know from home, school or community; 4) **Teaching Complex Thinking:** Challenge students toward cognitive complexity; and 5) **Teaching through Conversation**: Engage students through dialogue, especially the Instructional Conversation.

When a teacher uses at least three of these standards simultaneously in an activity and organizes students into small groups, it radically increases opportunities for peer and teacher assistance (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988). More assistance advances student learning (Doherty & Hilberg, 2007). SEP is known to increase achievement among ELs (e.g., Doherty & Hilberg, 2007), but it also **works with all students** because it attends to individual learners and ensures all students experience success through differentiation.

Doherty, Hilberg, Epaloose, and Tharp (2002) developed a valid and reliable ($r = .91$) quantitative rubric of teacher performance called the Standards Performance Continuum (SPC). The SPC shows consistent, positive, predictive, and significant relationships to students'

performance on the SAT-9 for both native and non-native speakers of English (e.g., Doherty & Hilberg, 2007). Experimental, quasi-experimental, longitudinal, and survey studies have documented the positive relationship between teachers' use of SEP and a wide range of student outcomes (e.g., Doherty, Hilberg, Pinal, & Tharp, 2003; Estrada, 2005; Padron & Waxman, 1999; and Saunders & Goldenberg, 1999). Several recent studies have demonstrated the efficacy of the ESL instructional coaching model built upon use of the SEP in promoting positive teacher change (e.g., Teemant, 2010; Teemant, Wink, & Tyra, 2011). Together, these studies present a strong case for teachers' use of SEP with ELs.

In-service teachers will learn how to use SEP through intensive workshops and instructional coaching. A new second year coaching intervention will support teachers in moving from merely engaging students in different activities to differentiated activities based on examination of student data and work (DDD). Ultimately, new teacher candidates will take undergraduate methods courses designed to model use of SEP and DDD. During clinical placements, students will work with in-service teachers previously coached in SEP and DDD. In-service teachers (45) will pursue ESL certification that fully addresses curriculum, pedagogy, and assessment practices for differentiating for ELs in the regular classroom.

In sum, outcomes include a shared vision of DDD; the redesign of 14 university courses (8 STEM) to model SEP and DDD; the creation of 16 district coaches and 70 district demonstration classrooms (10 secondary STEM) modeling SEP and DDD; the ESL certification of 15 elementary and 30 STEM teachers; and professional development involving 46 university personnel. These outcomes indicate and determine if, and to what degree, improvements result in teacher change and greater student achievement. The details for each phase follow.

B. Program Phases, Goals, Objectives, and Measurable Outcomes

Chart 1 lists the goals, objectives, and measurable outcome targets in four phases. Phase 1 is Assessment and Improvement: Faculty members and district partners will seek consensus about the skills and practices defining high quality attention to data-driven differentiation (DDD) in the regular classroom (Objective 1). In the first, eight university faculty members will analyze the type and quality of attention given to DDD in content-area and ESL methods courses (Outcomes 1 & 2). They will also improve alignment to ESL standards and the new Common Core state standards (Outcome 3). This group functions as Collaboration Team I, charged with creation of a valid and reliable DDD Scale and checklist (Outcome 4) and a preparation of a dynamic faculty workshop on differentiation.

At the same time, ESL faculty will analyze their existing secondary coaching data to improve instructional coaching protocols for working with secondary STEM teachers (Outcome 6). These data will support the second year work of Collaboration Team II, charged with ensuring high quality differentiation in clinical placements. Four content-area teams of four members will work across the year to align clinical placement expectations and scales for use with university faculty, university supervisors, and cooperating teachers. The collaboration will result in use of valid and reliable observation scales and checklists representing a continuum of attention to DDD (Outcome 4) and quality STEM instruction (Outcome 5). These scales will be used in coursework and clinical placements, and refined through use in instructional coaching.

Phase 2 is Capacity Building: The university and districts will build their collective capacity to model, teach, and support research-based pedagogy, assessment, and differentiation for diverse learners by institutionalizing use of defined instructional targets. Objective Two invites 20 faculty members to participate in a three-day seminar on infusing DDD (Outcome 1). Ten faculty members, recruited to participate in a yearlong Curriculum Studies Group, will

Chart 1

Goals, Objectives, and Measurable Outcomes

PHASE 1: ASSESSMENT AND IMPROVEMENT	
Goal One: Improve Differentiation Measurably improve teacher performance with ELs through systematic attention to data-driven differentiation (DDD)	**Objective One: Develop Observation Scales for Evaluating Teacher Use of Data-Driven Differentiation (DDD) in the Regular Classroom** Measurably improve the capacities of all teacher candidates to educate ELs in the regular classroom by engaging university faculty and district partners in collaboration leading to consensus about the skills and practices defining high quality DDD for diverse learners.
Measurable Outcomes: 1. **Analyze** the type and quality of attention given to differentiation in university content-area methods courses through curriculum, teaching, and use of assessment data for culturally, linguistically, learning, and economically diverse students. 2. **Analyze** the quality of systematic attention given to differentiation in ESL certification courses through curriculum, teaching, and use of assessment data to English Learners with learning and socioeconomic diversity. 3. **Analyze and align** teacher education and ESL methods courses with new Common Core Standards and ESL standards. 4. Collaboratively develop **DDD Scale/s and Checklist** describing high quality attention to cultural, linguistic, learning, and economic diversity and use of various types of assessment data for making differentiation decisions.	

5. Collaboratively develop **STEM Instructional Coaching Scales** (i.e., inquiry, problem solving, etc) to promote common understandings across partnership institutions about high quality STEM instruction to improve clinical placement experiences.

6. **Analyze secondary instructional coaching outcomes and coaching conversations** to determine challenges and possible solutions for increasing STEM teachers' implementation of research-based teaching practices for ELs.

PHASE 2: BUILD CAPACITY ACROSS UNIVERSITY-PUBLIC SCHOOL PARTNERSHIPS

Goal Two: Build Capacity	**Objective Two: Institutionalize Use of Data-Driven Differentiation**
Measurably improve teacher capacity to differentiate for diverse learners in the regular classroom	Institutionalize the necessary conditions for modeling, teaching, and supporting the use of effective assessment and data driven decision-making strategies for ensuring high quality differentiation for diverse learners throughout teacher education and in partnership districts through workshops, instructional coaching, and ongoing cycles of evaluation.

Measurable Outcomes:

1. **SOE faculty members (20) participate in seminars** focused on infusing curriculum, activities, and assignments that promote high quality attention to data-driven differentiation into university courses.

2. **SOE faculty members redesign 10 university courses** to teach and model research-based pedagogy, curriculum, and assessment that promote high quality DDD: 2 ESL, 4 STEM, and 4 humanities methods courses (elementary/secondary).

3. **ESL faculty members redesign ESL courses (4)** as special STEM sections to meet the needs of secondary STEM educators.

4. **SOE university supervisors (12) participate in professional development** to learn about IUPUI's commitments for clinical placements, including use of research-based practices in teaching, assessing, and differentiating for diverse learners.

5. **SOE university supervisors (12) provide instructional coaching to new teacher candidates** during clinical placements in use of research-based practices in teaching, assessing, and differentiating for diverse learners.

Goal Two: Build Capacity	**Objective Three: Institutionalize Use of a Research-Based Instructional Coaching Model**
Measurably improve teacher capacity to differentiate for diverse learners in the regular classroom	Institutionalize the necessary conditions for modeling, teaching, and supporting the use of a two-year ESL instructional coaching model with fidelity at multiple district sites through seminars, expert shadow coaching, and data analysis leading to continuous quality improvement.

Measurable Outcomes:

1. **Prepare a cadre of 16 district instructional coaches** capable of scaling **use of the SEP** through instructional coaching among teachers using an expert shadow-coaching model to achieve high fidelity and inter-rater reliability.

2. **Prepare a cadre of 16 district instructional coaches** capable of scaling **use of DDD** through instructional coaching among teachers using an expert shadow-coaching model to achieve high fidelity and inter-rater reliability.

3. Collaboratively **create 60 elementary demonstration classrooms** modeling use of the SEP & DDD practices to serve as high quality clinical placements.

4. Collaboratively **create 10 secondary STEM demonstration classrooms** through two years of instructional coaching to model use of the SEP & DDD to serve as high quality clinical placements.	
PHASE 3: ESL CERTIFICATION	
Goal Three: Increase ESL Certification Increase the number of teachers certified to teach ELs in the regular classroom	**Objective Four: Increase Number of ESL Certified Teachers** Increase the quantity of teachers completing ESL certification by awarding graduate tuition scholarships.
Measurable Outcomes: 1. Provide **tuition stipends to 15 elementary teachers** to complete the 21 credits for the English as a New Language Program. 2. Provide **tuition stipends to 30 STEM teachers** to complete the 21 credits for the English as a New Language Program. 3. Provide data for **Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) measures**: a) The percentage of in-service teacher completing coursework and obtaining state certification (1.5); and b) who are providing instructional services to ELs (1.6).	
PHASE 4: CONTINUOUS QUALITY IMPROVEMENT	
Goal Four: Continue Quality Improvement Increase student achievement through improved teacher pedagogy and data-	**Objective Five: Evaluate Curriculum Redesign, Instructional Coaching, Teacher Growth, and Student Achievement Outcomes** Evaluate improvements in teacher education curriculum, ESL instructional coaching capacities, teacher use of SEP and DDD, and K-12 student achievement patterns to

driven differentiation for diverse learners	improve university programs and professional development offered to districts.

Measurable Outcomes:

1. Teacher Education Curriculum: a) Provide qualitative evidence of faculty curriculum change in the type and quality of attention given to DDD in university content-area and ESL methods courses; b) provide evidence of increased student teacher use of DDD in lesson planning (qualitative) and during instruction in clinical placements (quantitative); and c) provide quantitative evidence of ESL certification completers fidelity to the SEP and DDD during K-12 instruction.

2. Efficacy of ESL Instructional Coaching: Provide quantitative and qualitative (i.e., focus group, coaching notes, and recordings) evidence of the coached teachers' a) fidelity to SEP and DDD; b) patterns of development across coaching cycles for each model; c) ability to sustain improvements one year after the end of coaching.

3. Scalability: Provide quantitative evidence of district coaches obtaining a) inter-rater reliability on SEP and DDD scales, and b) high levels of fidelity by teachers they coached with and without the benefit of the expert coach shadowing them.

4. Student Achievement: Investigate quantitatively the influence of teacher use of SEP and DDD on students' academic achievement and English proficiency attainment.

institutionalize use of DDD through readings, activities and assignments (Outcome 2). University faculty will ultimately redesign 14 courses, 8 of which will be STEM focused, during year two (Outcome 2 & 3) to attend to linguistic, cultural, learning, and economic diversity. Using qualitative evidence from student assignments and quantitative data from student teaching observations, faculty members will then showcase their learning in the fall of the third year for the SOE. In year five, 12 university supervisors will participate in a seminar (Outcome 4) and provide instructional coaching to a student teacher (Outcome 5). Outcomes will be investigated qualitatively by evaluating student work and quantitatively through observations assessing the quality of implementation by student teachers using SEP, DDD, and content-area scales.

Objective Three requires institutionalization of IUPUI's two-year ESL instructional coaching model in the districts. Instructional coaching has proven effective in helping teachers to expand skills, sustain change over time, and improve student achievement (e.g., Knight, 2009). Grant activities result in a) the preparation of 16 Pike coaches in SEP (Outcome 1) and DDD (Outcome 2) and b) creation of 60 elementary (Outcome 3) and 10 secondary STEM demonstration classrooms in Pike and IPS (Outcome 4) from years one to four of the grant.

Professional development for coaches and teachers will consist of participation in a five-day workshop during the summer, followed by seven cycles of individualized instructional coaching for teachers across the school year. An expert coach will shadow district coaches in use of SEP or DDD in coaching for seven weeks across the school year to ensure fidelity. For coaches and teachers, the Standards Performance Continuum (SPC) defines SEP performance targets for teaching and evaluation of teacher progress. In essence, the rubric ratings reveal a teacher's ZPD in relationship to the model and become the site of expert-novice activity (i.e., conversation, planning, teaching, and reflecting) for the coach and teacher. The evidence

gathered by the coach makes teaching improvement visible and actionable. The reflection makes it personally relevant to the teacher. The coach-teacher partnership revolves around making progress toward increased use of sociocultural practices; however, the rate, route, and ultimate attainment of these performance targets remain teacher directed. Authentic transformation must be developmentally appropriate and intrinsically satisfying to the teacher, not forced. Therefore, while the SPC provides the performance targets for teaching, the reflective conversations are individualized. Conversations may focus on management, academic content, instructional strategies, analysis of student work, but they are simultaneously anchored by the SPC as an agreed upon target.

In the first year of instructional coaching, teachers focus on classroom organization (i.e., shifting from whole class to small group configurations), management issues, and the design of activities using the SPC rubric as the target. The hallmark of success for the first year of coaching is demonstrated by a teacher regularly conducting instructional conversations with homogeneously grouped students while heterogeneously grouped students work independent of the teacher to accomplish challenging activities collaboratively, requiring rich interaction.

In the second year of instructional coaching, the SPC remains the foundation of teacher pedagogy; however, teachers scrutinize anew with the DDD scale a) connections between learning goals and evidence of learning (Tomlinson & McTighe, 2006), b) how they use various types of assessment data to understand student development (e.g., Stiggins, 2007), and c) how to use data to differentiate instruction. Teachers/Coaches attend a five-day DDD workshop, and follow up with seven more cycles of instructional coaching. The DDD instructional coaching protocol provides grounding in sociocultural principles of assessment for ELs being useful, meaningful, and equitable (Smith, Teemant, & Pinnegar, 2004). Tomlinson and McTighe (2006,

p. 27) argue for "more clearly defined goals, more appropriate assessments, and more purposeful teaching." This epitomizes what DDD instructional coaching should accomplish.

Phase 2 activities build capacity in the university-public school partnership that will lead to validation and refinement of DDD scale/s and checklists as a defined instructional target. It will establish inter-rater reliability with the scale/s. Its efficacy as a second year ESL instructional coaching intervention will also be evaluated. The workshops, instructional coaching, curricular and pedagogical redesign of university and district classrooms institutionalize the theoretical, pedagogical, and assessment foundations for preparing every teacher to teach every student in the regular classroom. Furthermore, coaching prepares quality clinical placement sites for IUPUI. Coached teachers solidify learning as they model and coach new teacher candidates. (*Note:* The teacher education faculty's DDD scale will be informed by, but necessarily identical to, the scale developed for ESL instructional coaching. Collaboration means inviting the input of others and allowing for improvements as and if needed.)

Phase 3 is ESL Certification: This phase increases the number of ESL certified teachers in the districts by awarding 21-credit graduate tuition scholarships to 45 teachers (Objective 4). The program takes 16 months to complete. In year three, 15 elementary teachers will receive scholarships (Outcome 1). In the fourth and fifth years, 30 secondary STEM teachers will be recruited for ESL scholarships (Outcome 2). These STEM ESL cohorts will benefit from ESL courses that have been tailored to the needs of STEM educators. Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) measures 1.5 (percentage of in-service teachers earning ESL certification) and 1.6 (percentage of in-service teachers serving ELs) comprise Outcome 4.

Phase 4 is Continuous Quality Improvement: Activities focus on analysis of both quantitative (SPC, DDD, content-area scales) and qualitative (student work, focus groups) data

leading to continuous quality improvement (Objective Five) in teacher education curriculum (Outcome 1), the efficacy (Outcome 2) and scalability (Outcomes 3) of ESL instructional coaching, and its impact on K-12 student achievement (Outcome 4). Using quasi-experimental, repeated measures, and case study designs, analyses will address teacher change, development patterns, fidelity to models, sustainability of growth, and scaled and reliable use of IUPUI's ESL instructional coaching interventions. The impact of teacher performance (SEP and DDD) on students' academic and language achievement will also be evaluated. Formative data refine partnership goals, university coursework, and instructional coaching. The evaluation documents the efficacy of improvements at multiple levels of teacher preparation.

Together these goals, objectives, activities, and expected outcomes ensure systematic and collaborative improvement in university methods courses, the clinical placements for student teaching, and the professional development offered veteran teachers. This grant will build university and district capacity to teach ELs in the regular classroom while simultaneously benefiting all students with linguistic, cultural, learning, or economic diversity.

C. Significance of the Project

The IUPUI ESL partnerships matches the profile of numerous partnerships in the nation with growing EL student populations, inadequate numbers of highly qualified teachers, and shrinking budget allotments to meet the demands of higher accountability. Traditional teacher preparation has not kept pace with urban student realities and needs; nevertheless, teacher development is one of the most fruitful ways of improving student achievement (e.g., Darling-Hammond, 2000). Professional development is a "big ticket item" in school and state operating budgets (Zepeda, 2008, p. 31). Demonstrating efficacy of a professional development model specifically targeting improved teacher performance with diverse learners is a pressing need

(Knight & Wiseman, 2005). Therefore, this grant contributes to the national dialogue on diversity teacher preparation. The improvements are sustainable and extend beyond the period of federal assistance because they are part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning within the partnership and across multiple layers of teacher preparation. The goals and objectives are linked to measurable outcomes which, when reached, will signal successful completion of the project. The quality of personnel and the management plan, which follow, provide the administrative structure and accountability that make this grant feasible.

3. Project Personnel

Seven key personnel representing five positions provide leadership at the micro-level of grant activity. The Project Director (PD) and Principal Investigator (PI) is Dr. Annela Teemant (Ph.D., Ohio State University, 1997). She is an Associate Professor of ESL Education, directs the ESL Program, and is a research fellow with UCASE. She has expertise in sociocultural pedagogy, instructional coaching, and quantitative research methods. She has been author and PD/PI of three federal grants (OELA NPD 2002, 2007, and Teacher Quality 2005) focused on university-wide and inter-institutional efforts to prepare all teachers for ELs. While at CREDE (2005-2007), she collaboratively established the SEP instructional coaching model. She ensures adherence to the entire project's goals, timeline, benchmarks, budget, and scheduled professional development and evaluation activities.

The Project Manager (PM) supports the PD and assumes responsibility for executing all districts activities, including recruitment, scheduling, and professional development. The PM coordinates with District Liaisons (DL). The PM also takes the lead in tailoring ESL courses for secondary STEM cohorts and provides coaching to STEM teachers in years 3 and 4 of the grant.

The person hired for this position will be a certified secondary STEM educator, have a master's degree in ESL, and at least seven years of STEM and ESL K-12 teaching experience.

The District Liaisons (DL) are Marilee Updike and Dr. Jennifer Wheat. Mrs. Updike is a well-respected, dual certified teacher with a master's degree, and 30 years experience in IPS. Dr. Wheat is Pike's Literacy Specialist, coordinating Pike's coaching program. The DLs handle scheduling and recruitment of coaches, teachers, and scholarship recipients. DLs meet at least 3 times per year with the PD/PM and communicate regularly with teacher liaisons at participating schools to expedite scheduling and resolution of problems.

Expert Coaches (EC) provide evaluation support and instructional coaching services, which includes direct instructional coaching in IPS and shadow coaching of district coaches in Pike. Dr. Serena Tyra and Dr. Christy Reveles collaboratively established CREDE's SEP instructional coaching model with Dr. Teemant in 2005. Dr. Tyra's degree is in Early Childhood Education (Ph.D., Brigham Young University, 2005). She is a certified bilingual teacher with eight years experience. She is National Board certified and Reading Recovery certified. Dr. Christy Reveles (Ed.D., University of La Verne, 2002 in Education Leadership) has certification as a bilingual teacher, principal, and professional coach and worked at the county and state levels. She is fluent in Spanish and has coaching expertise in data-driven differentiation.

The External Evaluator (EX) is Dr. Charles Hausman (Ph.D., Vanderbilt University, 1997) from Eastern Kentucky University's Educational Leadership Department. Dr. Hausman provides expertise in large-scale database analyses and an additional layer of objectivity in the evaluation of progress on grant outcomes. He is former assistant superintendent of evaluation for the Salt Lake City School District. (See Budget Narrative for personnel funding rates.)

4. Management Plan

Chart 2 summarizes the grant's governance structure for building and sustaining inter-institutional capacity. The management plan ensures stated goals, objectives, and outcomes are accomplished through use of an advisory board, timeline, critical benchmark system, specific roles and responsibilities, and monitoring expenditures.

A. Management Advisory Board

The Management Advisory Board (MAB) for this grant ensures external accountability and institutionalization of a shared vision of pedagogy and differentiation for urban education at multiple layers of teacher preparation. This board is comprised of university and district stakeholders. Their charge is creating a culture of open communication and collaboration at the macro-level of the partnership. The board members will communicate electronically as needed and meet face-to-face twice during year one, and once every spring in subsequent years to review progress on benchmarks, respond to formative feedback, and share institutional perspectives. Together they ensure simultaneous inter-institutional improvement.

B. Timeline and Benchmarks

Chart 3 presents the five-year timeline and loading of activities year-to-year. The defining benchmarks include participant recruitment for professional development and scholarships, development of a shared vision, professional development activities (i.e., workshops, coaching, coach training), course redesign, inter-institutional collaboration teams, and evaluation activities. Clearly identified are the personnel with responsibility for monitoring and assessing fulfillment of benchmark activities.

C. Roles and Responsibilities within the Project

The success of the management plan depends on collaboration. Chart 2 described key personnel with unique roles and responsibilities at the macro and micro levels. Built into these

Chart 2

Governance Structure

Management Advisory Board (MAB): University and Public School Stakeholders	
IUPUI Advisory Board Members:	**District Advisory Board Members:**
Dr. Pat Rogan, Dean of School of Education	Dr. Beth Niedermeyer, Pike Asst. Supt.
Dr. Kathleen Marrs, UCASE Director	Marilee Updike, IPS ESL Director
Dr. Jomo Mutegi, UCASE Assistant Director,	School Principal Representatives (2)
Dr. Joy Seybold, Secondary Chair	Teacher-Leaders Representatives (3)
Dr. Beth Berghoff, Graduate Chair	Community Members or Parents (2)

Project Director/Principal Investigator (PD/PI): Dr. Annela Teemant		
Project Manager (PM): To Be Hired		
District Liaisons (DL): Marilee Updike (IPS) & Jennifer Wheaton (Pike)		
Expert Coaches (EC): Dr. Serena Tyra and Dr. Christy Reveles		
Elementary Schools (60 Teachers)	Secondary Schools (10 STEM Teachers)	Teacher Scholarships (15 ELEM/30 STEM Teachers)
External Evaluator (EX): Dr. Charles Hausman		

levels of management are procedures and mechanisms that elicit formal and informal feedback on grant processes and outcomes, which are used to promote continuous quality improvement. At the macro level, the MAB promotes dialogue around equity, accountability, and excellence from inter-institutional perspectives. At the micro level, the Project Director (PD), Project Manager (PM), and District Liaisons (DL) are the key individuals ensuring successful completion of grant activities on a day-to-day basis. The PD works a 25% FTE in year one

Chart 3

Timeline and Benchmarks

Column Labels **A**: Months of year **B**: Benchmarks **C**: Activities **D**: Person Responsible

E: Year of Grant/ Week of Month: 1, 2, 3, 4 or **T** = Term Long Activity

Benchmark Key:

R	Recruitment:	PD	Professional Development Interventions:
	RDT = Teachers/Coaches		PD1: Teacher Workshop or Coaching
	RUF = University Faculty		PD2: Instructional Coaches
	RSS = Scholarship Students		PD3: University Faculty/Supervisors
CTI	Collaborative Team I: DDD	CTII	Collaborative Team II: Clinical Placements
EVL	Evaluation Component	FSG	I: Faculty Curriculum Study Group
REP	Evaluation Report Due		II University Course Infusion
EX	External Evaluation	RD	STEM ENL Course Redesign

Person Responsible Key:

PD	Project Director	PM	Project Manager	EC	ESL Expert Coaches
DL	District Liaisons	UF	University Faculty	EX	External Evaluator

A	B	C	D	E1	E2	E3	E4	E5
7	EVL	IRB Approval/Renewal Process	PD	1	1	1	1	1
	RDT	Recruit Teachers/Coaches-Year 1	DL	1-3				
	EXT	External Evaluator Site Visit	PD/EX		1		1	1
	PD1	Standards for Effective Pedagogy	PD/EC	4	2	2	2	2
	PD1	Data Driven Differentiation	PD/EC	4	4		4	4

A	B	C	D	E1	E2	E3	E4	E5
8	EVL	Baseline Observations- Year 1	PM/EC	3-4				
	EVL	Obtain St. Achievement Data	PD	4	4	4	4	4
	RUF	Recruit Collaboration Team I	PD	3-4				
	PD2	Coaching & Reliability Seminars	PD/EC	4	4	4		
	PD3	Faculty Study Group Showcase	PD/UF		3			
	PD1	Schedule Year's Coaching Plan	DL/EC	1	1	1	1	1
	RUF	Recruit Collaboration Team II	PD		3-4			
	PD3	University Supervisor Seminar	PD/UF					2
	RDT	Recruit Student Teachers (ST)	UF					3
9	RUF	Recruit Faculty Curriculum Study	PD	1-4				
	CTI	DDD Scales & Checklists Done	PD/PM/UF	T				
	FSG	II: Infused Courses Taught	UF		T			
	PD1	Coaching for teachers: Session 1	EC/PM	1-2	1-2	1-2		
	EVL	Complete Achievement Report	PD/EX	1-4	1-4	1-4	1-4	1-4
	CTII	STEM Coaching Scales Complete	PD/UF		T			
	PD3	University Supervisors Coach ST	PM/UF					T
	EVL	Analyze HS Coaching Data	PD/PM	T				
10	REP	Complete Performance Report	PD/EX	1	1	1	1	1
	PD1	Coaching for teachers: Session 2	EC/PM	1-2	1-2	1-2	1-2	1-2
11	PD1	Coaching for teachers: Session 3	EC/PM	1-2	1-2	1-2	1-2	1-2
12	PD1	Coaching for teachers: Session 4	EC/PM	1-2	1-2	1-2	1-2	1-2
1	PD1	Coaching for teachers: Session 5	EC/PM	1-2	1-2	1-2	1-2	1-2

A	B	C	D	E1	E2	E3	E4	E5
1	FSG	I: Formative Analysis Complete	PD/UF	T				
	PD3	Faculty Shadow w/new scales	PD/UF		T	T		
2	PD1	Coaching for teachers: Session 6	EC/PM	1-2	1-2	1-2	1-2	1-2
3	PD1	Coaching for teachers: Session 7	EC/PM	1-2	1-2	1-2	1-2	1-2
	EVL	Schedule Final Observations	PM/DL	1	1	1	1	1
	RDT	Recruit Teachers for Coaching	DL/PM	1-4	1-4	1-4	1-4	1-4
4	EVL	Post-Intervention Observations	PD/PM/EC	1-4	1-4	1-4	1-4	1-4
	EVL	Sustainability Observations	PD/PM/EC	1-4	1-4	1-4	1-4	1-4
	EVL	Baseline Observations	PD/PM/EC		1-4	1-4	1-4	1-4
	CTI	Product: Faculty Seminar Plan	PD/PM	1				
5	EVL	Focus Group with Teachers	PD	1-2	1-2	1-2	1-2	1-2
	PD3	3-Day ILC Faculty Seminar	PD/UF	2				
	FSG	II: Group Summative Analysis	PD/UF		T			
	RSS	Recruit Scholarship Students	PM/DL		1-4	1-4	1-4	
	REP	Annual report due	PD/EX	3-4	3-4	3-4	3-4	3-4
6	EVL	Data Entry/Analysis for Year	PD/EX	1-4	1-4	1-4	1-4	1-4
	RD	STEM ENL Course Redesign	PM/PD		1-4	1-4		

(100% summer FTE) and a 50% FTE in each subsequent year (62% to 85% summer FTEs) as evaluation activities increase. The PM works a 100% FTE for five years coordinating school-based professional development activities with the DLs. The DLs work closely with principals, teacher-leaders, and individual teachers as necessary. They ensure that cohorts are organized and

professional development facilities and activities are scheduled at schools. Expert coaches (ECs) deliver coaching services and collect essential evaluation data as contracted.

The PD, PM, and ECs will formally meet seven times and communicate electronically on a weekly basis to coordinate, respond to concerns, and reciprocally monitor progress. The PD, PM, and DLs jointly plan for MAB meetings and elicit and respond to formative feedback. In summary, this management plan attends to crucial elements of communication, coordination, delivery, feasibility, and creation of a dynamic and democratic culture associated with a university-public school partnership. It relies on team members who know Indianapolis schools well and have years of successful collaboration experience on similar federally funded programs.

5. Evaluation Plan

The Project Director (PD) and External Evaluator (EX) are responsible for evaluation of the grant's differentiation, capacity building, ESL certification, and continuous quality improvement goals in a timely and ethical manner. The strength of the plan is that it builds on an objective, valid, reliable, and established quantitative performance measure—the SPC (see p. 7)—as well as qualitative data. The evaluation plan provides yearly formative feedback and summative reports from the EX in years 2, 4, and 5. The PD, PM, EC and EX will collect, analyze, interpret data, write and disseminate reports, and elicit feedback from stakeholders.

A. Evaluation Questions

Chart 4 identifies four main evaluation questions: 1) Do university-public school partners create a shared vision of high quality DDD that improves all teachers' capacities to educate diverse learners; 2) Have ESL pedagogy (SEP) and DDD been institutionalized; 3) Do participants complete ESL teacher certification; and 4) Have professional development activities measurably improved the performance of instructional coaches, classroom teachers, and student

Chart 4

Evaluation Questions and Data Sources

Goal 1: Differentiation Objective: *Do university-public school partners create a shared vision of high quality DDD that improves all teachers' capacities to educate diverse learners?*	
Evaluation Sub-Questions	**Data Sources**
O1.a Do faculty increased attention to data-driven differentiation in university methods course curriculum?	• Artifacts from Collaboration Team I: Differentiation • Formative/summative analysis of faculty curriculum and student work
O1.b Are valid and reliable observation scales and checklists developed for measuring implementation of DDD?	• Completed DDD scale/s & checklist • Inter-rater reliability scores for scales & checklist
O1.c Are valid and reliable observation scales and checklists developed for measuring quality STEM instruction?	• Artifacts from Collaboration Team II: Placements • Completed STEM Instructional Coaching Scales • Inter-rater reliability scores for scales & checklist
Goal 2: Capacity Building Objectives: *Have SEP and DDD been institutionalized?*	
Evaluation Sub-Questions	**Data Sources**
O2. Has DDD been institutionalized at the university?	• List of university participants in professional development • List of redesigned university courses infusing DDD • Summative analysis by Faculty Curriculum Study Group
O3. Has use of IUPUI's two-year ESL Instructional Coaching Model been institutionalized with partnership districts?	• List of 16 district coaches and 70 coached teachers • Individual coaching records of expert and district coaches • Analysis of teacher portfolio evidence for DDD • Focus group discussions with district coaches and teachers

Goal 3: Increasing Quantity Objective: *Do participants complete ESL teacher certification?*	
Evaluation Sub-Questions	**Data Sources**
O4. Have 45 teachers received their state ESL Certification?	• Number of state certifications granted • GPRA Measure 1.5 & 1.6

Goal 4: Continuous Quality Improvement Objective: *Have professional development activities measurably improved the performance of instructional coaches, classroom teachers, and student achievement patterns?*	
Evaluation Sub-Questions	**Data Sources**
O5.a. Curriculum Impact: What level of fidelity to SEP and DDD Instructional Models do a) student teachers and b) ESL certification program completers obtain based on participation in revised university methods courses?	• Student teaching or end of program SPC, DDD, & new STEM observation data
O5.b. Efficacy: To what degree does ESL instructional coaching improve teachers' use of SEP and DDD?	• Pre-/Post-intervention SPC & DDD • Focus group discussion data
O5.c. Efficacy: What patterns of development emerge across coaching cycles for teacher use of SEP and DDD?	• Individual coaching records (sessions 1 to 7) for each teacher
O5.d. Efficacy: What levels of fidelity do teachers sustain one-year after the end of instructional coaching on SEP and DDD Instructional Models?	• One Year After intervention SPC & DDD observations data • Focus group discussion data
O5.e. Scalability: Do district coaches achieve inter-rater reliability on SPC and DDD observation tools?	• Inter-rater reliability scores
O5.f. Scalability: Do district coaches achieve the same level of fidelity to SEP and DDD with teachers when	Post-intervention SPC & DDD data

they are and are not shadowed by the expert coach?	
O5.g. What is the relationship between teacher use of SEP and DDD and student achievement among native and non-native speakers of English?	• SPC & DDD observation data • I-STEP achievement data • English Proficiency data
Q5.h. What is the nature of teachers' ongoing understandings about using various types of data to make instructional decisions?	• Teachers' DDD portfolios of student work and growth

achievement patterns? Additional sub-questions support these questions.

B. Overview of Evaluation Activities by Goal, Objective, and Data Sources

Evaluation activities are associated with each grant goal and objective. Evaluation of Goal 1 (Improve Differentiation) attends to collaborative consensus building resulting in an institutionalized vision of DDD. Qualitative data (e.g. meeting notes, artifacts, syllabi, assignments, and student lessons plans) from Collaboration Teams I, II and the Faculty Curriculum Study Group provide evidence of consensus (O1.a, O1.b, & O1.c). Observational scales, checklists, and inter-rater reliability for DDD and quality STEM content instruction provide evidence of consensus (O1.b, & O1.c). New scales will be refined until inter-rater reliability can be established among faculty, coaches, and university supervisors. Evaluation of Goal 3 (Increase ESL Certification) will be evaluated by the number of state certifications awarded and by responding to established GPRA measures for in-service educators (1.5 & 1.6).

Goal 2 (Build Capacity) attends to institutionalization of DDD at the university (O2) and the ESL instructional coaching model in the districts (O3). Lists of participants provide evidence of institutionalization. The rigor of the evaluation plan is that Goal 2 is also evaluated under Goal

4 (Continuous Quality Improvement) using direct classroom observation. For example, the Faculty Curriculum Study Group will provide qualitative evidence comparing the quality of attention to DDD in student work before and after course improvements (O2) under Goal 2. However, under Goal 4, student teachers and ESL certificate program completers are observed in K-12 classrooms using the SPC and new DDD and STEM scales, as appropriate, to quantitatively assess teacher use of DDD in urban classroom (O5.a).

Evaluation of Goal 1 and Goal 4 are also linked at the district level. Under Goal 1, the PD, PM, & ECs document participants served and qualitatively analyze coaching records, audio/videotaped coaching sessions and coach meetings, teacher DDD portfolios, and focus groups (O.2, O.3 & O5.h). Quantitatively, Goal 4 requires pre-/post-intervention classroom observations of teachers in participating schools, resulting in a quasi-experimental design with control and intervention groups. The analysis of individual coaching records (repeated measures) allows evaluation of the efficacy of the two-year instructional coaching model to be longitudinal. The pre-/post- and repeated measures designs together evaluate (a) if and to what degree of fidelity (O.5.b), (b) with what pattern (O.5.c), and (c) to what degree of sustainability (O.5.d) coached teachers enacted SEP and DDD. District scalability is evaluated by inter-rater reliability scores (O.5.e) and with post-intervention SPC and DDD data for teachers coached by district coaches (O.5.f). Finally, the external evaluator will evaluate the efficacy of Goals 1 and 4 at the school level by analyzing the relationship between student achievement (academic and English) and teacher fidelity to SEP and DDD using a growth model approach (O.5.g).

The PD and ECs have years of experience preparing coaches, gathering coaching data, and have established high inter-rater reliability with SEP. They will support the preparation of the PM as an instructional coach during the first two years of the grant, building university

capacity to gather, enter, and analysis data across time. The grant will allow evaluation of DDD and STEM scale inter-rater reliability and coaching data. The PD and EX have the required expertise in quantitative analysis, and IPS and Pike have committed to provided achievement and English proficiency data each year. The evaluation plan allows rigorous quantitative and qualitative study of ESL interventions for mainstream teachers.

C. Overview of Procedures

In order to collect these data from evaluation participants (EPs), the PD/PM/ECs/EX will collaboratively use the following general procedures:

1. Identify, invite, and orient EPs during recruitment period. No university or school-based participants will be denied equitable access or participation in any aspect of this grant based on gender, race, national origin, color, disability, or age. Appropriate accommodations will be made for participants with special needs. English translation services will be provided to parent participants as required for meetings. Teachers will participate on a strictly volunteer basis and random selection of subjects will be employed when called for by the evaluation design.

2. Orient PM and district coaches to use of SPC, DDD, and coaching process with EPs.

3. Observe each year's EPs (control and intervention) prior to professional development using the SPC, DDD, & content scales. Post-intervention observations obtained each year.

4. Develop and establish inter-rater reliability with new scales and checklists (DDD and STEM) with university personnel and coaches (years 1 to 3)

5. Analyze university curriculum for alignment with Indiana and Common Core content and English language proficiency standards and assessments (year 1).

6. Gather evidence (e.g., scheduled meetings, notes, and artifacts) of visioning meetings and faculty redesign effort/meetings (i.e., redesigned syllabi & student work) during years 1-2.

7. Track a) attendance at trainings (years 1-5), faculty meetings (years 1-2), and coaching sessions (years 1-5) and b) the number of scholarships/certifications awarded (years 3 to 5).

8. Collect all individual coaching records and recordings of coaching sessions each year.

9. Hold focus groups with EPs from schools and ESL STEM cohorts at end (years 1-5).

10. Capturing, transcribing and preparing data for formative analysis and intervention improvements is a continuous real time process.

11. Annual reports for stakeholders include analyzed, summarized, and interpreted data.

12. The External Evaluator collaboration will synthesize summative data, especially teacher performance and academic and English proficiency achievement data (years 2, 4, and 5).

6. References

Batalova, J. & McHugh, M. (2010). *Number and Growth of Students in US Schools in Need of English Instruction*. Washington, DE: Migration Policy Institute.

Dalton, S. (2008). *Five standards for effective teaching: How to succeed with all learners*. San Francisco, CA: John Willey & Sons, Inc.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). Teacher quality and student achievement. *Educational Policy Analysis Archive, 8*(1). Retrieved from http://epaa.asu.edu/ojs/article/view/392.

Doherty, R.W., & Hilberg, R.S. (2007). Standards for effective pedagogy, classroom organization, English proficiency, and student achievement. *Journal of Educational Research, 101*(1), 24-35.

Doherty, R. W., Hilberg, R. S., Epaloose, G., & Tharp, R. G. (2002). Standards Performance Continuum: Development and validation of a measure of effective pedagogy. *Journal of Educational Research, 96*(2), 78-89.

Doherty, R. W., Hilberg, R. S., Pinal, A., & Tharp, R. G. (2003). Five standards and student

achievement. *NABE Journal of Research and Practice, 1*(1), 1-24.

Estrada, P. (2005). The courage to grow: A researcher and teacher linking professional development with small-group reading instructional and reading achievement. *Research in the Teaching of English 39*(1), 320-364.

Knight, J. (2009). Instructional coaching. In J. Knight (Ed), *Coaching Approaches and perspectives* (pp. 29-55). Thousand Oakes, CA: Corwin Press.

Knight, S.L., & Wiseman, D.L. (2005). Professional development for teachers of diverse students: A summary of the research. *Journal of Education for Students Placed At Risk, 10*(4), 387-405.

Lewis, C., Enciso, P., & Moje, E. (2007). *Reframing sociocultural research on literacy: Identity, agency, and power.* Mahway, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Padron, Y. N., & Waxman, H. C. (1999). Classroom observations of the five standards of effective teaching in urban classrooms with English language learners. *Teaching and Change, 7*(1), 79-100.

Plucker, J.A., Burroughs, N., & Song, R. (2010, February 4). Mind the (Other) Gap! The Growing Excellence Gap in K-12 Education. Indiana University Bloomington: Center for Evaluation and Education Policy.

Rogoff, B. (1990). *Apprenticeship in thinking: Cognitive development in social context.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Saunders, W., & Goldenberg, C. (1999). *The effects of comprehensive Language Arts/Transition Program on the literacy development of English learners* (Technical Report). Santa Cruz, CA: Center for Research, Diversity & Excellence, University of California.

Stiggins, R.J. (2002). Assessment crisis: The absence of assessment FOR learning. *Phi Delta*

Kappan, 83(10), 758-765.

Smith, M.E., Teemant, A., & Pinnegar, S. (2004). Principles and practices of sociocultural assessment: Foundations for effective strategies for linguistically diverse classrooms. *Multicultural Perspectives, 6(2),* 38-46.

Teemant, A. (2011). *Comparing elementary and secondary teacher instructional coaching outcomes*. Manuscript in preparation.

Teemant, A. (2010). Measuring the Effectiveness of an ESL coaching model. In C.J. Casteel & K.G. Ballantyne (Eds.), *Professional development in action: Improving teaching for English learners,* (pp. 21-23). Washington, DC: The National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition and Language Instruction Educational Programs at The George Washington University.

Teemant, A., Wink, J., & Tyra, S. (2011). Effects of coaching on teacher use of sociocultural instructional practices. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 27*(4), 683-693.

Tharp, R. G., Estrada, P., Dalton, S., & Yamauchi, L. (2000). *Teaching transformed: Achieving excellence, fairness, inclusion, and harmony*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.

Tomlinson, C.A., & McTighe, J. (2006). *Integrating differentiated instruction & understanding by design: Connecting content and kids*. Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*, trans. and ed. M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, and E. Souberman. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Zepeda, S.J. (2008). *Professional development: What works*. Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.