U.S. Department of Education

Washington, D.C. 20202-5335

APPLICATION FOR GRANTS UNDER THE

NATIONAL PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM
CFDA # 84.365Z
PR/Award # T365Z110009
Grants.gov Tracking#: GRANT10861295

Closing Date: MAY 09, 2011

Project Abstract

Name of IHE: Brown University

Title of Program: Building Charters' Capacity for English Learners (BCC)

Consortium Partner: Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

Project Description

Goal: Building Charters' Capacity for English Learners **(BCC)** will qualify 500 content area teachers in 25 Massachusetts charter schools to teach ELs in Sheltered English Immersion (SEI) classrooms and will improve teacher knowledge of and strategies in language and literacy development so that their ELs can meet rigorous curriculum and assessment requirements.

Project objectives	Activities	Outcomes/Outputs
1. 20 content-area teachers in each of 5 Massachusetts (MA) charter schools will be recruited for a total of 100 teachers each year. Each year 5 additional charter schools will be recruited.	Collaborate with the MA DESE Charter School Office to identify charter schools in greatest need of PD for teaching ELs. Priority will be given to charter schools with a STEM focus and to math, science, and technology teachers.	100 teachers from 5 charter schools are recruited each year, for a total of 500 teachers from 25 charter schools over the life of the project.
2. 100 content-area teachers in each of the five years of the project will be trained to provide meaningful, rigorous, data-driven instruction to ELs.	Train teachers in the 4 PD Categories for teachers of SEI required by DESE. Connect training to specific content area instruction, with emphasis on science, mathematics, and technology. Infuse training with data-driven instructional strategies.	100 teachers from 5 charter schools are trained each year, for a total of 500 teachers from 25 charter schools.
3. 500 participating teachers (100 per year) will implement learned knowledge and strategies in their instruction.	Provide classroom observations (3 per year), feedback, and consultation to each participating teacher. Document and analyze observations for implementation of new knowledge.	100 teachers from 5 charter schools implement learned knowledge and strategies in instruction each year, for a total of 500 teachers from 25 charter schools.

4. 500 charter school teachers will become qualified to teach ELs in Sheltered English Immersion classrooms.	Document teacher completion training. File notification of completion with appropriate state and district offices.	100 teachers from 5 charter schools become qualified teachers of Sheltered English Immersion each year, for a total of 500 teachers from 25 charter schools.
5. The academic achievement of ELs will improve in each participating charter school.	Analyze grades of ELs of participating teachers over the course of the year. Analyze MCAS scores of ELs in participating schools and compare them to those of ELs in comparable schools not in the project.	Report on change in EL academic achievement. Use of this information in program planning and revision.
6. EL enrollment will increase in each participating charter school.	Monitor EL enrollment at participating schools for 3 years.	Report on increases in EL enrollment in participating charter schools

Priorities

Building Charters' Capacity for ELs (BCC) will address Competitive Preference Priority 2 – Enabling More Data-Based Decision-Making and Competitive Preference Priority 3 – Promoting Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Education. BCC will build charter schools' capacity to collect, analyze, and use high-quality and timely data to improve instructional practices, policies, and student outcomes in Massachusetts charter schools. BCC will also increase the opportunities for high-quality professional development for teachers of STEM subjects.

GPRA Measure Targets

The following are annual targets for GPRA measures applicable to the type of educational personnel that the BCC program will serve.

BCC will serve 500 in-service teachers over the 5-year duration of the project.

Year 1 – 100 in-service teachers
Year 2 – 100 in-service teachers
Year 3 – 100 in-service teachers
Year 4 – 100 in-service teachers
Year 5 – 100 in-service teachers

In the 5-year duration of the project, 500 in-service teachers are expected to complete the project.

Year 1 – 100 in-service teachers
Year 2 – 100 in-service teachers
Year 3 – 100 in-service teachers
Year 4 – 100 in-service teachers
Year 5 – 100 in-service teachers

In the 5-year duration of the project, 500 in-service teachers will complete the program of study and become qualified (Massachusetts's terminology) in EL instruction.

Year 1 – 100 in-service teachers
Year 2 – 100 in-service teachers
Year 3 – 100 in-service teachers
Year 4 – 100 in-service teachers
Year 5 – 100 in-service teachers

Each project completer will serve English learners.

Year 1 – 100 in-service teachers
Year 2 – 100 in-service teachers
Year 3 – 100 in-service teachers
Year 4 – 100 in-service teachers
Year 5 – 100 in-service teachers

Contact: Project Director's name, telephone, and email

Sara Smith
The Education Alliance at Brown University
4 Richmond Square, Fourth Floor
Providence, RI 02906
Phone: (401) 867-8949
Email: sara_smith@brown.edu

Project Building Charters Capacity for ELs Narrative

(a) Quality of the project design

At every grade level and in every content area in Massachusetts schools, there is a shortage of general education teachers who are qualified to teach English learners (ELs); this is especially true of Charter schools. Brown University's **Building Charters' Capacity for ELs** will deliver professional development that will qualify 500 content-area charter school teachers to teach ELs and improve the quality of services offered to ELs in 25 MA charter schools. The Massachusetts Commissioner of Education has expressed the commitment of the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE), our partner in this project.

Building Charters' Capacity for ELs **(BCC)** will address **Competitive Preference Priority 2** – Enabling More Data-Based Decision-Making and **Competitive Preference Priority 3** – Promoting Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Education. **BCC** will build charter schools' capacity to collect, analyze, and use high-quality and timely data to improve instructional practices, policies, and student outcomes in Massachusetts charter schools. **BCC** will also increase the opportunities for high-quality professional development for teachers of STEM subjects.

Massachusetts currently has 79 charter schools, 16 of which were funded in spring 2011. Multicultural Education, Training, and Advocacy (META), a Somerville, Massachusetts-based advocacy group, contends that most of the new charter schools do not show a track record of serving ELs, a requirement of state law. META recommends that charter schools "demonstrate in their program design that they have programs in place to address the language and cultural needs of all ELL students and not just those who are already at the edge of English proficiency." This week, Mayor Thomas Menino of Boston announced a District-Charter Compact for Boston,

securing a pledge from Boston charter schools to serve more ELs (*Boston Globe*, April 28, 2011). The Compact now awaits ratification by the Boston School Committee and the individual charter school boards.

In 2002, Massachusetts voters passed Question 2, a ballot initiative to end bilingual education in the commonwealth and to replace bilingual programs with Sheltered English Immersion. As a result, many districts dismantled their services for ELs in 2003-04 and placed ELs in mainstream classrooms with teachers who possessed little or no knowledge of teaching students who were not English proficient. In response to NCLB requirements, Massachusetts increased curriculum demands and expectations for all students, and implemented uniform statewide criteria for high school graduation. For ELs, the rigorous curriculum became inaccessible because many teachers are not prepared to teach them. This is especially true at charter schools, which employ a high percentage of new teachers, many of whom have entered teaching without full teacher certification and pedagogical training.

District administrators and staff in Massachusetts charter schools recognize their need for professional development in the knowledge and skills to teach ELs effectively. Since virtually every Massachusetts school district and charter school has or will have limited English proficient (LEP) students, under the law schools must be prepared to provide Sheltered English Immersion to LEP students. Sheltered English Immersion instruction is required in Massachusetts even if a district has only one LEP student. Each charter school is required to develop and implement a professional development plan for all staff serving ELs that includes appropriate Sheltered English Immersion training. In the past two years The Education Alliance at Brown University has received requests for professional development on teaching ELs from 20 Massachusetts charter schools.

In 2004 the Massachusetts Commissioner of Education issued guidelines on the minimum competencies required of all teachers to instruct ELs meaningfully and effectively in regular education classrooms. These guidelines are organized into four categories: (I) Introduction to Second Language Learning and Teaching, (II) Sheltered Content Instruction, (III) Assessment of Speaking and Listening, and (IV) Teaching Reading and Writing to LEP Students. The Education Alliance at Brown University has co-authored training curricula in these categories with DESE and has trained hundreds of teachers in many districts throughout Massachusetts over the past several years.

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

Goal: Building Charters' Capacity for English Learners **(BCC)** will qualify 500 content area teachers in 25 Massachusetts charter schools to teach ELs in Sheltered English Immersion classrooms and will improve teacher knowledge of and strategies in language and literacy development so that their ELs can meet rigorous curriculum and assessment requirements. Through intensive professional development in four EL professional development categories – *Second Language Learning and Teaching, Sheltering Content Instruction, Assessment of Speaking and Listening,* and *Reading and Writing in the Content Areas* – **BCC** will enhance participants' capacity to tap into the cultural and linguistic knowledge of ELs and to address learning gaps for ELs in their classrooms. Teachers will participate in professional development activities at their schools or in clusters of charter schools and will receive on-site classroom-embedded support from **BCC** staff following professional development activities. **BCC** will focus on charter schools identified by the DESE, a collaborating partner in this proposal, as being in the greatest need of support.

To achieve its goal, **BCC** will meet the following six objectives.

Objective 1: 20 content-area teachers in each of 5 Massachusetts charter schools will be recruited, for a total of 100 teachers each year. **BCC** staff will collaborate with the DESE Charter School Office to identify the charter schools in greatest need of professional development for content area teachers of ELs. Priority will be given to charter schools with a STEM-related focus and to math, science, and technology teachers. By the end of the project, 500 teachers from 25 Massachusetts charter schools will be recruited.

Objective 2: 100 content-area teachers in each of the five years of the project will be trained to provide meaningful, rigorous, data-driven instruction to ELs through professional development in the four Categories of training required by Massachusetts: *Second Language Learning and Teaching, Sheltering Content Instruction, Assessment of Speaking and Listening,* and *Reading and Writing in the Content Areas*. A total of 500 teachers will be trained in the four Categories of professional development for Sheltered English Immersion teachers by the end of the project.

Objective 3: 500 participating teachers (100 per year) will implement learned knowledge and strategies in their instruction. **BCC** staff will observe each teacher's instruction three times per year, documenting implementation using an observation protocol, and will provide on-site consultation and coaching.

Objective 4: 500 charter school teachers will become qualified to teach ELs in SEI classrooms.

Objective 5: The academic achievement of ELs will improve in each participating charter school.

Objective 6: EL enrollment will increase in each participating charter school.

BCC addresses the critical needs of teachers in Massachusetts charter schools. These schools have a history of inadequate instructional support for ELs. The design of **BCC**

incorporates five components to address these needs.

Component 1: Recruitment of content-area teachers

Upon notice of award, the project director will confer with the Massachusetts Director of Charter Schools to identify the five charter schools most in need of professional development to improve instruction for ELs. Priority will be given to charter schools with a STEM-related focus. **BCC** staff will meet with the heads of these charter schools, as well as other school administrators to explain project goals and plan for the recruitment of 20 content-area teachers from each of the identified charter schools. School administrators will assist in the identification of teachers to participate in the project. Priority will be given to teachers of STEM-related subjects.

Upon selection of the participating teachers, **BCC** staff will enter into agreements with school administrators and teachers that will include commitments to: a) participate in the equivalent of 11 full days of professional development; b) allow **BCC** staff to observe classrooms using a protocol; c) collect and analyze data to document the academic achievement of the ELs in their classes; and d) share school-based data on EL enrollment and achievement with **BCC** staff.

Component 2: Professional development for content-area teachers in *Second Language Learning and Teaching* (2 full days), *Sheltering Content Instruction* (5 full days), *Assessment of Speaking and Listening* (1 full day), and *Reading and Writing in the Content Areas* (3 full days)

Since November 2002, Sheltered English Immersion (SEI) has been the program model for ELs in Massachusetts. The state requires that sheltered content instruction be taught by teachers who hold an appropriate teaching license and possess the additional skills and knowledge required to teach content to ELs effectively. These skills and knowledge have been

identified by DESE and organized into four Categories outlined in Attachment 1 of the Commissioner's Memorandum of June 15, 2004, entitled *Updated Guidance on Qualifications for Teachers in Sheltered English Immersion Classrooms.*

Category I, a 10-15-hour training in *Second Language Learning and Teaching*, provides teachers with knowledge of key factors of second language acquisition and cultural difference as well as implications of these factors for instruction and student achievement. Category I training prepares teachers to analyze their classrooms as sites for language learning and to modify their instruction to maximize language-learning opportunities.

Category II, a 30-40-hour training in *Sheltering Content Instruction*, develops teachers' knowledge of how to plan instruction that 1) is appropriate for the multiple English proficiency levels of the ELs in the classroom; 2) derives from appropriate, standards-based content and language objectives; 3) makes connections to students' prior knowledge; and 4) offers opportunities for productive student interaction.

Category III, an 8-10-hour training in *Assessment of Speaking and Listening*, prepares teachers to conduct classroom-based assessments of their students' English proficiency. This training is offered by the DESE Student Assessment Services Department.

Category IV, a 15-20-hour training in *Teaching Reading and Writing to Limited English Proficient Students*, builds teacher knowledge of theory and practice in developing reading comprehension in English for ELs, for teaching vocabulary, and for helping ELs develop writing skills in each content area. A significant feature of Category IV is its emphasis on differences in literacy development between ELs with no or little English oral proficiency and ELs with oral proficiency in English.

BCC staff will provide professional development aligned with Categories I, II, and IV.

Additionally, DESE Student Assessment Services staff will provide training in Category III to program participants. In each training, BCC training specialists will make explicit connections between training content and its application to instruction, especially in math, science, and technology classes. Each training will engage participants in collecting data on students' linguistic, cultural, and educational background, as well as academic performance, so that teachers can uses these data in planning effective lessons.

Category I. Participants will receive 10 hours (2 full days) of professional development in *Second Language Learning and Teaching*. Topics in this training include key factors affecting second language acquisition, the interrelationship of language and culture, introduction to the Massachusetts English language proficiency benchmarks, outcomes and levels for ELs, and creating responsive learning environments. In this training participants will collect data on their students' linguistic, cultural, and educational background, as well as prior test scores and grades in their particular content area. Students' academic performance, experience, and interest in math, science, and technology will be analyzed.

Category II. Participants will receive 30 hours (5 full days) of training in *Principles of Sheltered Content Instruction*. Topics of Sheltered Content Instruction include: developing lessons guided by standards-based content and language objectives and appropriate for the language proficiency levels of each EL in the class; developing meaningful, interactive learning activities; making content comprehensible through visuals, graphic organizers, and supportive language; scaffolding upon students' prior knowledge; and providing multiple means for students to show what they have learned. In this training, participants will collect data on their students' use of oral academic and social language. They will analyze the linguistic demands of the math, science, and technology learning activities in their classes and do cross-analyses with

students' oral language use.

Category IV. Participants will receive 15 hours (3 full days) of professional development in *Reading and Writing in the Content Areas*. Topics in this training include the reading process in a second language, concept development and perception across cultures, the role of discourse and syntax in comprehending text, building vocabulary in the content areas, and scaffolding academic text for ELs. In this training participants will collect data on their students' reading and writing in English. They will also analyze the literacy demands of their math and science assignments, as well as technology demands and resources, to determine and provide the support ELs need to complete assignments successfully.

Participants will store all data collected on their students in portfolios, so that they may view progress in English proficiency and content knowledge over the course of the year. Portfolios will not be shared publicly, but participants will draw on data collected for group discussions and reflection

Component 3: Supporting the implementation of strategies in the classrooms

To ensure the implementation of new knowledge and skills in participants' classrooms, **BCC** staff will provide three classroom observations for each participant, one after each professional development module. Using an observation protocol adapted specifically for this project, staff will observe each participating teacher in his/her classroom, and will provide pre- and post-observation consultation with each teacher on effective ways to implement best practice for maximizing EL academic achievement. Data from the observations will be entered into the **BCC** database for use in determining change in teacher practice over the course of the year.

Component 4: Recording the successful completion of participants as qualified teachers of ELs in Sheltered English Immersion classrooms

BCC staff will document the successful completion of all four Category trainings for each project participant and arrange for these records to be filed with appropriate district and state entities to ensure that completers are officially designated as qualified to teach ELs in Massachusetts Sheltered English Immersion classrooms.

Building Charters' Capacity for ELs (BCC) draws upon an existing collaborative relationship between the Massachusetts DESE and The Education Alliance at Brown University. The Office of Language Acquisition and Academic Achievement at the Massachusetts DESE and The Education Alliance have long partnered to improve English language learning and academic achievement of ELs in Massachusetts. As a department in a university with a commitment to helping schools and districts meet their goals, The Education Alliance is viewed by state departments of education in New England as a vehicle to assist in raising the academic achievement of all student groups. The Education Alliance employs a group of highly qualified specialists in the areas of second language acquisition, culture, literacy and professional development. States and districts know our knowledge of research in language and literacy education is current, as is our knowledge of changes in legislation, policy and practice.

The Education Alliance has worked closely with the Massachusetts DESE in designing, piloting, and providing training in effective instruction for ELs. In 2005 The Education Alliance and DESE co-authored a training manual and materials for Massachusetts teachers and trainers, titled *Introduction to Second Language Learning and Teaching: A Professional Development Unit for Category 1*. The Education Alliance has trained several cohorts of trainers in this module, and has delivered the 2-day training to teachers at many districts across Massachusetts. In 2007 The Education Alliance and DESE co-authored *Making the Connection: English Language Learners and Subject Matter Texts: A Professional Development Curriculum for*

Secondary Content Area Teachers Aligned with Category 4: Reading and Writing in Sheltered Content Classrooms. Again, The Education Alliance has trained several cohorts of trainers, as well as teachers in many Massachusetts districts. In 2011 The Education Alliance co-authored *School Leadership for English Language Learners: Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Practices* with DESE and will begin training school administrators in the summer of 2011.

The Education Alliance has a long history of close collaboration with dozens of school districts throughout Massachusetts in improving instruction for ELs. During the past two years, The Education Alliance has provided professional development to ten charter schools. Currently, requests from charter schools for our services are coming in daily. The Education Alliance has also conducted comprehensive program reviews and recommended changes in policy and instructional practices for ELs in several districts in this area. In the past 25 years, through its connection to the Portuguese and Brazilian Studies Department at Brown University, The Education Alliance has built district capacity by enrolling hundreds of educators from districts across Rhode Island and Southeastern Massachusetts in a Masters Degree program in ESL Education and Cross-cultural Studies. Participants in this program have taken knowledge and skills back to their districts and schools from courses in Theories of First and Second Language Acquisition; Language, Culture, and Society; Cross-cultural Human Growth and Development; Literacy, Culture, and Schooling for the Language Minority Student; Applied Linguistics for English as a Second Language; ESL Methodology for Assessment and Evaluation; and Language Theory and Curriculum Development.

BCC is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance. **BCC** will build capacity at the classroom and school level for the 25 charter schools involved. At the classroom level, 500 teachers will gain knowledge and skills in

teaching ELs. Knowledge includes second language acquisition, cross-cultural aspects of prior knowledge, cultural influences on oral and written communication, connections between oral language and literacy development, and research-based theory and practice regarding second language literacy development. Skills include ways to access prior knowledge, to scaffold learning to meet academic demands, to shelter language while maintaining high expectations for content learning, and to engage ELs in reading and writing in all content areas.

At the school level, teams of trained teachers will develop greater understanding of the academic demands placed on ELs across the content areas, and ways in which these demands overlap or conflict. Teachers will gain insight into the vertical curriculum, and how the linguistic, cultural, and background knowledge they help students develop in content classes builds upon learning in the previous grades and prepares students for more and more complex linguistic demands as well as content challenges to come. This knowledge will raise the level of school-based understanding of the strengths and needs of ELs and appropriate ways to address them and can inform school-based decisions about program design, curriculum, student placement, and classroom instruction and assessment. This knowledge and skill will translate into higher enrollment of ELs in the charter schools **BCC** serves.

(2) The design of the Project reflects up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.

Research has consistently shown a direct relationship between teacher effectiveness and student achievement. Not only has a succession of effective teachers been shown to improve a student's achievement in reading and math, but collective teacher effectiveness as an organizational property of schools is positively associated with achievement levels (Boyd, Grossman, Ing, Lankford, Loeb, & Wyckoff, 2011; Heck, 2009). Still, many educators have had

little professional development in teaching language and literacy, and even fewer have had training in teaching literacy to ELs (Short, 2007) or in meeting the literacy needs of refugees and students with interrupted schooling (Echaverria & Short, 2010). According to a report on the research around professional learning, over two-thirds of teachers across the US had not had even one day of training on supporting ELs in instruction in the last three years (National Staff Development Council, 2009).

While teacher quality initiatives have had considerable success in raising the percentage of teachers with mastery of their content area, significant gaps persist in teacher pedagogical knowledge and cultural competence. The majority of general education teachers in the US still have had little preparation for teaching students whose language, culture, socioeconomic, experiential, and educational backgrounds are different from their own. This is particularly true in charter schools, which employ a majority of teachers from White, middle-class backgrounds, and enroll a disproportionately high number of minority students from high-poverty neighborhoods (Frankenberg, Siegel-Hawley, & Wang, 2010).

For students to have full access to the curriculum and to be able to meet core standards in all content areas, they need proficiency in academic English. This means that all teachers need to teach the particular language of their content areas (Saunders & Goldenberg, 2010). To graduate from high school prepared for college and careers in the 21st Century, students need access to high-level courses. Without adequate support for academic English language development, this is not possible for all ELs. Advanced Placement and high-level math courses in high school, for example, show severe racial/ethnic gaps in STEM (Reigle-Crumb & Grodsky, 2010). ELs are less likely to enroll in specialized STEM courses in high school despite the fact that this content may be more accessible to an EL than the content of humanities courses (Gandara, 2006).

Similarly, Latinos are a missing demographic in STEM disciplines in higher education and suffer from the largest gender gap in STEM careers compared with other minority groups (Chapa & De La Rosa, 2006). The majority of those few who receive graduate degrees in STEM tend to be temporary visa holders, not Latinos born or raised in the US (Chapa & De La Rosa, 2006; Rochin & Mello, 2007).

For many minority students, culturally relevant pedagogy has been found to be a key to success, enabling students to succeed without losing their cultural identity (Ladson-Billings, 1995). In math, culturally responsive teaching calls upon teachers to find ways to build on students' cultural capital (Nasir et al., 2008), thereby validating their prior experience and increasing their engagement in classroom activities. Culturally relevant practices improve student engagement, as students are encouraged to work on tasks that are relevant to them (Foster 2008). To ascertain what is relevant to students, teachers must a) get to know their students beyond their performance in class and b) collect and analyze data on their students' engagement in class activities and performance on assessments. This requires teachers to build data collection and analysis into their daily classroom routines (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2011).

Professional development for teachers of ELs includes several essential elements: theoretical knowledge, strategies development, modeling, guided practice, coaching and feedback, and independent application and analysis (Echaverria & Short, 2010). Professional development should build teacher knowledge in the language and discourse of the content-area; effective teaching methodologies, including sheltering and scaffolding instruction; socio-cultural factors that affect student motivation and performance; curriculum development that aligns with content and language standards; and ways to assess ELs that allow them to demonstrate what

they have learned (Echevarria & Short, 2010; Crawford, 2003; Wong Fillmore & Snow, 2002; Valdes, 1998). Johnson (1992) and Snow (2005) recommend that teacher training create opportunities for teachers to explore various theoretical and methodological models as well as to become aware of how their own beliefs affect the way they perceive, process, and act upon information in instruction. Gersten (1999) calls for professional development that supports teachers in developing instructional skills – how to systematically develop oral and written English language competence, build vocabulary, and design engaging lessons that help students gain analytical and comprehension skills. Teachers themselves have found professional development to be most helpful when it provides opportunities for hands-on practice, teaching techniques that apply directly to their classroom, in-class demonstrations, or personalized coaching. August and Calderon (2006) conclude that, to ensure knowledge and skills from training are implemented in the classroom, it is necessary "to present theory, model the instructional strategies, and give teachers the opportunity to practice with feedback and extensive support" (p. 560).

Critical is skill in differentiating instruction to address the various levels of English proficiency among the learners in the class (Tomlinson 2008). ELs are a heterogeneous group, and instruction must be designed to take differences into account (August & Erickson, 2006). Teachers' expectations for students with differing levels of English proficiency, and the instructional approaches aligned with these expectations, may influence students' level of engagement. Gersten (1999) recognized a tension teachers face between the need to engage students in meaningful learning and the need to see students demonstrate knowledge of correct English grammar and spelling. Teachers may interpret a large number of grammatical mistakes as a lack of effort or low level of capability on the student's part, with the result that teachers

lower their expectations and employ instructional practices that pose little challenge (August & Erickson, 2006).

Several instructional practices have been found to be potentially effective in developing EL academic language and literacy (Short & Fitzsimmons, 2007). Among these are ongoing integration of oral language and literacy skills into instruction (Genesee et al., 2006); explicitly teaching the processes, elements, and strategies of reading and writing for academic purposes (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005; August & Shanahan, 2006; Francis, Rivera, Lesaux, Keiffer, & Rivera, 2006); explicit vocabulary development (Francis, et al., 2006); frequent opportunities to engage in structured, academic talk (Francis, et al., 2006); connecting to and building on ELs' funds of knowledge and addressing gaps in background knowledge (Moje et al., 2004); teaching language and literacy through thematic content units (Short, 1999); using the native language strategically (Echevarria & Short, 2010); and using technology to enhance language and literacy acquisition (Kamil, Intrator, & Kim, 2000). Short has identified instructional features beneficial for building ELs' academic language and literacy: use of graphic organizers, hands-on cooperative learning, activities that teach and reinforce signal words and text features, vocabulary development through discussion and in context, and interpretation of visual and graphic materials. For both ELs and native speakers, studies have shown that instruction that encourages deep processing of word meanings and explores multiple uses of words leads to higher levels of reading comprehension (Shanahan & Beck, 2006).

Teaching specific reading and writing strategies has been shown to benefit ELs (Shanahan & Beck, 2006). Teaching reading strategies to ELs should be combined with concerted efforts to build students' facility in oral English. Providing students extensive exposure to English text, and encouraging them to read in English in and outside the classroom,

have been effective in improving reading comprehension.

In studies of writing instruction, strategy training has increased the length of student responses (August & Erickson, 2006). ELs working collaboratively have produced pieces with better grammatical accuracy and complexity that those produced when the students worked alone (Shanahan & Beck, 2006).

Teachers are encouraged to identify the specific genres students need for academic or occupational purposes and to scaffold instruction based on students' knowledge of genre (Hyland, 2004). Showing ELs the relevant features of text in specific genres helps students in comprehension, analysis and composition in these genres. Teacher feedback on student writing varies in effectiveness and is most successful for ELs when it is specific, identifies examples from the student's writing, asks for specific information from personal experience or texts, and uses indirect error correction which requires the student to correct the error (Ferris, 2002). Peer response, which has been shown to be effective with regular education students, needs to be modeled, taught, and controlled to be effective for ELs (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005).

(b) Quality of project personnel

In the recruitment and employment of individuals through Brown University, **Building Charters' Capacity for ELs** will ensure that procedures for the selection of personnel follow federal and state rules and regulations without regard to race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. Equal opportunity employment is an explicit policy at Brown, including women and minorities in all aspects of University activities. The University has identified and adopted specific procedures to avoid discriminatory behavior and promote inclusion. These policies and practices will guide the project in its recruitment efforts.

(1) The Principal Investigator position requires experience in program development and

supervision as well as deep knowledge of research and practices in EL education. The Principal Investigator will provide oversight of all facets of the project, oversee the budget, and serve as a liaison to Brown University, DESE, and ED. With more than 30 years of experience as a teacher, district administrator, professional developer, adjunct professor, advocate for ELs, and recognized scholar and author in the fields of EL education, second language acquisition, and culturally responsive pedagogy, Dr. Maria Pacheco is highly qualified to serve as Principal Investigator. Dr. Pacheco has extensive experience supervising staff, overseeing budgets, managing evaluations, and collaborating with partner organizations through her years as administrator of bilingual and ESL education in an urban district in Massachusetts and as Director of Equity and Diversity Projects at The Education Alliance. She holds masters degrees in Bilingual/Bicultural Education and in School Administration, and a doctorate in Leadership in Schooling.

The Director/Trainer position requires successful experience in educational program management and teacher professional development, as well as deep, extensive knowledge of current research and best practice for EL education. The Director/Trainer will supervise project personnel, manage the project evaluation, including data collection, maintain ongoing relationships with schools to collect appropriate data, and serve as a co-trainer for professional development. Sara Smith is highly qualified to serve as Director/Trainer. In her 30-year career as director of educational programs, adjunct lecturer at Brown University, and successful professional developer for teachers of ELs, Ms. Smith has developed extensive expertise as a highly effective trainer of educators. Ms. Smith holds a masters degree in ESL Education and Cross Cultural Studies.

(3) Key Personnel: The two **Training Specialist** positions require extensive knowledge of current research and best practice for EL education; as well as experience providing professional development. The Training Specialists will train participants; observe them in classrooms, documenting instruction according to a protocol; provide feedback and consultation; and collect, record, and analyze data. Two of The Education Alliance specialists with extensive expertise in language acquisition, culture, literacy and professional development, as well as experience in working with charter school teachers, are highly qualified to be Training Specialists.

The External Evaluator will manage the project evaluation: analyze data, complete reports for ED; monitor and document project outputs and outcomes; collect and analyze quantitative and qualitative data to measure progress towards meeting the goal, objectives, and GPRA indicators as well as the project objectives and performance measures; and describe the pre-interventions, conditions, and outcomes of clients served by the project. Brach Evaluation & Consulting, LLC is a highly experienced independent evaluation firm that has evaluated multiple federally funded educational programs, including Title III programs.

(c) Quality of the management plan

(1) Adequacy of management plan to achieve objectives

Building Charters' Capacity for ELs will be managed at Brown University by Dr. Pacheco and Sara Smith. Two Education Alliance training specialists in language and culture, recognized as trainers by DESE, will be responsible for professional development, classroom observation and consultation, and data collection and analysis. Operational management of the project has five major elements. The first focuses on planning and involves a weekly analysis of tasks to be accomplished, assuring coordination among activities and attaching time frames to planned activities. The second focuses on acquisition and allocation of resources and involves

maximizing availability of resources and allocating resources to needs in an effective fashion. The third focuses on control of resource expenditures and ensuring that staff capabilities are optimally utilized and material specifications established. The fourth focuses on monitoring, control, and integration of inter-component activities, ensuring that planned activities contribute to overall program goals and that unforeseen problems are discovered and resolved. The final element focuses on maintaining working relationships with project partners: Massachusetts DESE and leaders in Massachusetts charter schools.

YEAR 1 (Summer 2011- Spring 2012)	
Summer 2011	Collaborate with MA DESE Charter School Office to identify 5 Charter schools. (Maria Pacheco, Sara Smith) Meet with charter school administrators to select teachers. (MP, SS)
September 2011 – June 2012	Deliver 11 full days of PD to each charter school. (SS, Education Alliance Specialists in language and culture) Deliver job-embedded observation/consultation. (EA Specialists) Collect EL performance data. (EA Specialists)
YEAR 2 (Summer 2012 - Spring 2013)	
July 2012 – August 2012	Analyze EL performance data at each school. (SS + EA Specialists) Analyze EL enrollment at each school. (SS) Collaborate with DESE Charter School Office to identify 5 new charter schools. (MP, SS) Meet with charter school administrators to select teachers. (MP, SS)
September 2012 –June 2013	Deliver 11 full days of PD to each charter school.) (SS + EA Specialists) Deliver job-embedded observation and consultation. (EA Specialists)

	Collect EL performance data. (EA Specialists)
YEAR 3 (Summer 2013 - Spring 2014)	
July 2013 – August 2013	Analyze EL performance data at each school. (SS + EA Specialists) Analyze EL enrollment at each school. (SS) Collaborate with DESE Charter School Office to identify 5 new charter schools. (MP, SS) Meet with charter school administrators to select teachers. (MP, SS)
September 2013 –July 2014	Deliver 11 full days of PD to each charter school (SS + EA Specialists) Deliver job-embedded observation and consultation. (EA Specialists) Collect EL performance data. (EA Specialists)
YEAR 4 (Fall 2014 - Spring 2015)	
July 2014 – August 2014	Analyze EL performance data at each school. (SS + EA Specialists) Analyze EL enrollment at each school. (SS) Collaborate with DESE Charter School Office to identify 5 new charter schools. (MP, SS) Meet with charter school administrators to select teachers. (MP, SS)
September 2014 – July 2015	Deliver 11 full days of PD to each charter school. (SS + EA Specialists) Deliver job-embedded observation and consultation. (EA Specialists) Collect EL performance data. (EA Specialists)
YEAR 5 (Fall 2015 - Spring 2016)	
July 2015 – August 2015	Analyze EL performance data at each school. (SS + EA Specialists) Analyze EL enrollment at each school. (SS) Collaborate with DESE Charter School Office to identify 5 new charter

	schools. (MP, SS) Meet with charter school administrators to select teachers. (MP, SS)
September 2015 – July 2016	Deliver 11 full days of PD to each charter school. (SS + EA Specialists) Deliver job-embedded observation and consultation. (EA Specialists) Collect and analyze EL performance data. (EA Specialists)

(2) Time commitments of project personnel are appropriate.

As Principal Investigator, Dr. Pacheco will spend 10% of her time, or 26 days per year, on the project. Dr. Pacheco will spend approximately 4 days on meeting with DESE and charter school leaders and 22 days on overseeing daily operations and budget.

As Director/Trainer, Sara Smith will spend 20% of her time, or 52 days, on the project. She will spend approximately 10 days on personnel supervision, 10 days working directly with DESE and charter school leadership, 10 days on evaluation- and reporting-related activities, and 22 days as co-trainer.

Two Education Alliance Training Specialists in language and culture will each devote 60% of their time, or 156 days per year each, to the project. They will each spend approximately 50 days on the planning and delivery of professional development activities, 70 days on observation and consultation, and 36 days on data collection and analysis and on program evaluation related activities.

In order to create an effective professional development program, **BCC** staff will employ a management model that is divided into three phases. Each phase will generate feedback for program improvement. During the first phase, project staff will focus on revisiting project requirements. This involves revising and continuing to collect needs-oriented data, defining the professional development goals, revisiting the identified district and state needs related to

defined goals, and completely specifying performance objectives. During the second phase, project staff will focus on developing and conducting the professional development trainings. This involves defining the instructional objectives, defining the desired training outcomes, developing instructional frameworks for the trainings, and selecting or developing appropriate instructional materials. During the third phase, project staff will focus on validating the program. This involves defining effectiveness criteria for the program, developing proficiency measures for each component, conducting the trainings, observations, interdisciplinary projects, and evaluations, and updating the instructional materials and program activities.

(d) Quality of the project evaluation

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

The objective of the evaluation will be to monitor and document project outputs (teacher development activities, and products) and outcomes (knowledge acquired, resulting data) to enhance Building Charters' Capacity for ELs **(BCC)** programming. The evaluator will compile and analyze quantitative and qualitative data for 2 purposes: (i) to measure progress towards meeting the US Department of Education's National Professional Development (NPD) Program Objective and GPRA indicators (ii) and to measure progress towards meeting the objectives, performance measures, and benchmarks as stated in the **BCC** proposal.

The evaluation measures will address 2 domains of inquiry:

- the effect of project activities on teachers' knowledge acquisition and instructional practice
- the effect of enhanced teacher practice on the achievement of their ELs using both

classroom-based assessment and standardized school-based comparative assessment.

Evaluation of this project will be conducted by Brach Evaluation & Consulting, LLC, a highly experienced independent evaluation firm that has evaluated multiple federally funded education programs, including regional Equity Assistance Centers, Magnet School Assistance Programs, state-wide Even Start Programs, Title III training programs, professional development projects for university faculty, and federally funded state-wide mentoring initiatives.

Dr. Brach will direct the evaluation and will be involved throughout the project from the beginning through the conclusion of the grant. The implementation of the evaluation will be a cooperative effort between the evaluator and the practice-based specialists of The Education Alliance at Brown University. Both the quantitative and qualitative data generated will be explicitly linked to the goal of The US Department of Education's National Professional Development Program. As stated in the project indicators, each product or service will be appropriate to improving "instruction for students with limited English proficiency" and assisting "educational personnel working with such children to meet high professional standards."

The evaluation plan has been customized to address every activity or service provided by **BCC** specialists including: the documentation of project participants and the profiles of each participating charter school, the knowledge gained from the approved Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) Category trainings, observations of participant practice documenting the application of lessons and units adapted for ELs, the resulting effect of enhanced instruction on the achievement of ELs using classroom-based measures and state standardized measures, and the receipt of the credential qualifying **BCC** trained teachers to teach ELs in Sheltered English Immersion classrooms. In addition, the compilation of enrollment data

disaggregated by subgroup will document increasing enrollment of ELs in charter schools as they implement culturally responsive teaching practices. The collection of data to address the GPRA Performance Measures is also specified in this plan.

Methods described in detail below are feasible because **BCC** specialists from The Education Alliance at Brown University have extensive experience with the development and implementation of tools for documenting their work through the collection of project data. They are fluent in the development and use of tracking relational databases, observation protocols, pre-post surveys, and achievement data disaggregated by subgroup. The collection of project data has been embedded within project activities to ensure that the collection is not intrusive, and is convenient to implement, resulting in substantial amounts of data.

Participant progress will be monitored through the teacher database, built largely from objective district records and documentation provided by the DESE Charter School Office, the state agency monitoring charter schools in Massachusetts. Outcome data will be analyzed by the evaluator and presented to staff to catalyze program development.

Below, the project goal, objectives, and activities are listed. Evaluation questions were developed for each objective. Data sources and evaluation methods that are aligned with each objective are listed directly below each evaluation question.

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

***Project Goal*:** Building Charters' Capacity for English Learners **(BCC)** will qualify 500 content area teachers in 25 Massachusetts charter schools to teach ELs in Sheltered English Immersion classrooms and will improve teacher knowledge of and strategies in language and literacy

development so that their ELs can meet rigorous curriculum and assessment requirements.

Project Objective 1: Twenty content area teachers in each of 5 Massachusetts charter schools will be recruited, for a total of 100 teachers each year. Project staff will collaborate with the DESE Charter School Office to identify the charter schools in greatest need of professional development for content area teachers of ELs. Priority will be given to schools with a STEM-related focus and to math, science, and technology teachers. By the end of the project, 500 teachers from 25 Massachusetts charter schools will be recruited.

Evaluation Question 1: How many charter school teachers, who meet selection preferences described in Project Objective 1, have been selected to participate?

Evaluation Method: *Teacher Database Analysis*

Specialized IT staff at the Education Alliance will create a database describing teacher recruitment credentials and demographics for each teacher, such as content area, academic and state credentials, employment history, and charter school profiles.

Data Source The database will be built in EXCEL from the participating charter school records and official documentation provided by the recruits. Data describing the profile of the identified charter school will be provided by the DESE Charter School Office.

Project Objective 2: One hundred content area teachers in each of the five years of the project will be trained to provide meaningful, rigorous, data-driven instruction to ELs through professional development in the four Categories of training required by Massachusetts: *Second Language Learning and Teaching*, *Sheltering Content Instruction*, *Assessment of Speaking and Listening*, and *Reading and Writing in the Content Areas*. A total of 500 teachers will be trained in the four Categories of professional development for Sheltered English Immersion teachers by

the end of the project.

Evaluation Question 2: How many teachers have completed the four Categories of professional development for Sheltered English Immersion teachers by the end of the project?

Evaluation Method: *Teacher Database Analysis*

Specialized staff at the Education Alliance will collect and enter data on each participating teacher adding to the teacher database described in Project Objective 1. Staff will record the completion of each Category training unit as well as the related 3 observations and required assignments. These data will document progress towards completion of each teacher by cohort.

Data Source The source of these data will be from attendance sheets completed by each participant at training activities. Additionally, attendance data based on classroom assignments and surveys will by kept by The Education Alliance training specialists and will be used to verify participation at every session.

Evaluation Question 3 What is the percentage of in-service teacher completers who are providing instructional services to ELs? (GPRA Measure 1.6)

The percentage of teachers providing high quality instructional services to ELs, both during and at project completion, is expected to be close to 100% because, as stated in Project Objective 1 "Project staff will collaborate with the DESE Charter School Office to identify the charter schools in greatest need of professional development for content area teachers of ELs." This suggests that the identified charter schools will have a population of ELs that need to be served in the classrooms of the referred teachers.

Data Source The current practice in Massachusetts schools regarding the identification of ELs within charter schools is inconsistent. There are no procedures for teachers to learn this

information about their students. Practice at charter schools varies by school.

Recognizing that learning about their students is a basis for the adaptation of instruction, **BCC** specialists will teach participants how to identify their ELs, using questionnaires and/or interviews to learn the students' language capabilities as well as their cultural and background knowledge, schooling history in their home country, etc. Participants will also be required to learn about their students' previous performance on state standardized tests.

Based on this assignment, teachers will be asked to provide numbers of ELs they are serving in their classrooms. These data will be verified during the classroom observations (described below) and will be entered into the **BCC** database each semester/year for each teacher. (GPRA Measure 1.6)

Project Objective 3. Five hundred participating teachers (100 per year) will implement learned knowledge and strategies in their instruction. **BCC** staff will observe each teacher's instruction three times per year, documenting implementation using an observation protocol and will provide on-site consultation and coaching.

Evaluation Question 4 To what extent are the Category trainings effective in developing teachers' expertise in EL education?

Evaluation Method: *Pre – Post Intervention Teacher Surveys*

Teachers will complete pre-intervention surveys at the beginning of each Category module describing aspects of their current state of knowledge and expectations for the training activities in which they are enrolled. Post-intervention surveys will be completed by participating teachers at the end of each module to assess the knowledge acquired, the degree to which it met teachers' expectations, and the degree to which the knowledge was applicable to their current

professional practice, including aspects of their practice that they plan to change, and suggestions for improving the professional development activity.

Data Source Surveys will produce both quantitative and qualitative data describing levels of teacher satisfaction, knowledge participants acquired, anecdotes, and recommendations for improvement. Survey data will be analyzed by the evaluator. Pre-surveys will be compared to post-surveys to quantify increases in knowledge and levels of client satisfaction across the sample. Qualitative data will be summarized and coded.

Evaluation Question 5 To what extent are the project's instructional materials and methods being implemented by the participating teachers?

Evaluation Method: *Classroom Observations*

Education Alliance specialists will conduct three classroom observations, one per Category module, of each participating teacher, using a protocol designed to record the implementation of classroom strategies in the content area.

The specialists will hold individual consultations with teachers both before and after each observation, providing immediate feedback and discussion on the observational findings.

Data Source Data documenting the implementation of strategies, both the quantity and quality, will be recorded by the specialists on protocol-recording templates. Data from observations will be analyzed by the evaluator to study the increasing use of strategies and materials over time by each teacher. Data will also be summarized across the sample to describe the types of modifications teachers are using and the success of the training in enhancing practice.

Project Objective 4. Five hundred charter school teachers will become qualified to teach ELs in Sheltered English Immersion classrooms.

Evaluation Question 6 What is the percentage of in-service teacher completers who complete

state and/or local certification, licensure, or endorsement requirements in EL instruction as a result of the **BCC** program? (GPRA Measure 1.5)

Evaluation Method: *Teacher Database Analysis*

Completion of Category I - IV professional development training modules provides the minimum competencies required of teachers to instruct ELs effectively as stated in the guidelines issued by the Massachusetts Commissioner of Education in 2004. The completion of the training will be documented by Education Alliance training specialist records and the teacher database, which will continuously track the progress of each participant towards completion. The DESE does not confer a formal credential on educators who have completed this training, but the percentage of completers will be determined through the database. (GPRA Measure 1.5)

Project Objective 5. The academic achievement of ELs will improve in each participating Charter school.

Evaluation Question 7 To what extent is EL achievement, as measured by classroom-based tests, impacted by teachers' instructional practice?

Evaluation Method: *Analysis of Classroom-based EL Student Achievement Data to Inform Practice*

Data Source The data that teachers will use for this analysis are the ongoing grades from classroom-based activities such as chapter tests, quizzes, or graded work products.

During the Category I training instructors will teach participants how to identify their EL students and assess their level of functioning by using questionnaire/interview data as described earlier.

The evaluator, in collaboration with the Director and/or Training Specialists, will develop a template either on paper or electronically, using EXCEL, for each teacher to record the grades

of their identified EL students, with the class mean score on each test or activity as a general benchmark. Teachers will keep track of their ELs' performance throughout the 4 training modules, noting if they are scoring below, on a par with, or above their classroom means and by how much.

Teachers will meet once per Category module to analyze their EL performance and assess how they can address the needs of each student as demonstrated by instructional assessments. For example, a teacher may become aware that an EL performed a partially correct computation, but did not receive full credit because they did not complete the problem due to a misreading of a linguistic nuance. The teacher will modify further tests, and evaluate progress.

Teachers will maintain student data over the course of the training. The focus of the teachers analysis will be twofold: (i) to inform instructional practice over the course of the year and evaluate its effectiveness, (ii) to measure change in student progress over time as the teacher becomes increasingly comfortable with the strategies and has compiled a skill set of strategies and methods to make their instruction more accessible to their ELs. Teachers will be encouraged to consider their students' performance on the state standardized tests, the MCAS, as part of their study.

At the end of each year, the evaluator will collect the data from a random sample of 5 individual teachers per charter school, 25 per year, and will compile an electronic database for analysis, developing a coding metric to reduce the different data sets to uniform, likely interval, scores. The evaluator will analyze these data across the sample of all teachers to study the growth of ELs over time as compared to the classroom benchmarks. To protect the privacy of the students, names will not be used and scores will be listed by an assigned ID number.

As a result of this study each year, teachers will assess student achievement using

practical, feasible assessment tools. They will have learned how their instructional methods affect their students' learning through continuous daily encounter with student performance in their practice.

Rationale for Data Analysis Classroom grades and scores are sensitive to content that is taught at the present moment and presents a direct way for teachers to examine their practice and assess their students' learning. Participants in **BCC** will come from different charter schools, grade levels, and content areas. Project designers recognize the crucial importance of studying student performance, but there are currently no standardized testing protocols that will equalize all of these conditions and deliver feedback on an immediate basis so teachers can respond to the findings in real time.

Evaluation Question 8 To what extent does the achievement of ELs, measured by state standardized tests, improve in each charter school as a result of **BCC** training?

Evaluation Method: *Analysis of Standardized EL Student Achievement Data by School*

The Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) is the state standardized student achievement test in use throughout the commonwealth. Public charter schools are required to administer the test at several grade levels. Scores are posted by school on the state website with the scores disaggregated by subgroup and performance level, such as the number of students performing in each of 4 levels, from "advanced" to "failing."

The evaluator will analyze these data by aggregating the scores of the ELs at each of the charter schools that have received training, combining the top 2 levels and the lower 2 levels. She will compare (i) the percentage of ELs scoring in the top proficiency levels during the training year and compare those data with the previous year before the training to study the effect of participation for each charter school. (ii) The evaluator will ask the Charter School Office to

select matched comparison schools for comparative purposes. The schools will be matched in size, demographics and location if possible. She will compare the performance of the students from the charter schools that have participated in **BCC** with those that did not to study the effect of participation on the achievement of their students. She will also explore the possibility of converting the student means to *Z* scores for analysis of differences. These data will be presented graphically to demonstrate patterns of student achievement after the training. Depending on the success of this analysis, the evaluator will continue to add successive cohorts of schools to the database so the number of "treatment schools" will increase and patterns in the scores will become clearer over the 5-year span of the finding.

Data Source MCAS data will be taken from the DESE website. Additional information on schools will be provided by the individual schools and the DESE Charter School Office.

Rationale for Data Analysis The classroom-based assessment is likely to be more sensitive to any changes in student achievement as a result of enhanced instructional practice. However, the availability of disaggregated data from state assessment departments facilitates the analysis of summative performance data. It is beyond the scope of this analysis to implement a full analysis of individual student scores by school; this would also introduce privacy concerns. However, because the numbers of teachers trained at each school is so large, comprising about half of the teachers in an average size charter school or more, the effect on school community practice is likely to be significant, affecting nearly every student within the school. Thus, the impact of the training is likely to be magnified, rather than having a greater effect on only a small group of students. For this reason, this analysis could yield compelling results as to the effect of **BCC**.

Project Objective 6. EL enrollment will increase in each participating charter school.

Evaluation Question 9 To what extent does EL enrollment increase at each participating charter

school?

Evaluation Method *Database Analysis*

As described above under Project Objective 1, charter school profiles will be included in the teacher database. Part of these profiles will be the numbers of ELs enrolled at the school. These data will be collected for 3 years following the training to determine if the number of ELs at the charter schools that have participated in **BCC** has increased.

Data Source Data will be provided from the State Charter School Office. Qualitative data explaining any trends will also be provided both by the Charter School Office and the participating charter school.

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

Evaluation Question 10 How will data be used to provide performance feedback and support assessment of progress towards achieving project objectives?

Evaluation Method: *Data Analysis and Presentation*

As has been proposed above, data will be collected from multiple sources documenting the progress towards each of the six Project Objectives of **BCC**. Data documenting the achievement of project benchmarks by tracking the rates of participant completion are recorded in the teacher database. Data describing program outcomes are analyzed separately by the evaluator. These data will be the focus of presentations to staff and project stakeholders according to the following schedule.

At the end of the final "training series event" in June of each year, the evaluator will present the compiled student achievement data to the teacher participants to illustrate how their ELs performed as a group over the course of their training. Discussion and assessment of the

impact of high-quality instruction and its affect on EL grades will follow.

The evaluator will convene **BCC** staff and project stakeholders at a June conference that will feature an analysis of both outcome and process data to describe the impact of high-quality instruction on the achievement of ELs.

Pre-post survey data and observations from a full year will describe the effectiveness of the coursework in the acquisition of knowledge, the implementation of strategies in the practice of the teacher participants, and client satisfaction with the program. Quantitative data on the impact of high quality instruction on EL classroom grades and standardized tests will also be presented. Discussion will focus on the assessment of progress towards goals and program adjustments to address any concerns that arise following the presentation of the data.