

U.S. Department of Education
Washington, D.C. 20202-5335



APPLICATION FOR GRANTS
UNDER THE

NATIONAL PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

CFDA # 84.365Z

PR/Award # T365Z170235

Grants.gov Tracking#: GRANT12392349

OMB No. , Expiration Date:

Closing Date: Apr 24, 2017

****Table of Contents****

Form	Page
1. Application for Federal Assistance SF-424	e3
2. Standard Budget Sheet (ED 524)	e6
3. Assurances Non-Construction Programs (SF 424B)	e8
4. Disclosure Of Lobbying Activities (SF-LLL)	e10
5. ED GEPA427 Form	e11
<i>Attachment - 1 (1236-GEPA Certification)</i>	e12
6. Grants.gov Lobbying Form	e13
7. Dept of Education Supplemental Information for SF-424	e14
8. ED Abstract Narrative Form	e15
<i>Attachment - 1 (1235-Project SOAR Abstract)</i>	e16
9. Project Narrative Form	e17
<i>Attachment - 1 (1240-Project Soar TOC and Narrative)</i>	e18
10. Other Narrative Form	e59
<i>Attachment - 1 (1237-Indirects 2017)</i>	e60
<i>Attachment - 2 (1238-SOAR Position Descriptions for Key Personnel)</i>	e67
<i>Attachment - 3 (1239-Project SOAR Letters of Support)</i>	e68
11. Budget Narrative Form	e75
<i>Attachment - 1 (1234-Project SOAR Budget Narrative)</i>	e76

This application was generated using the PDF functionality. The PDF functionality automatically numbers the pages in this application. Some pages/sections of this application may contain 2 sets of page numbers, one set created by the applicant and the other set created by e-Application's PDF functionality. Page numbers created by the e-Application PDF functionality will be preceded by the letter e (for example, e1, e2, e3, etc.).

Application for Federal Assistance SF-424

* 1. Type of Submission: <input type="checkbox"/> Preapplication <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application <input type="checkbox"/> Changed/Corrected Application	* 2. Type of Application: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New <input type="checkbox"/> Continuation <input type="checkbox"/> Revision	* If Revision, select appropriate letter(s): <input type="text"/> * Other (Specify): <input type="text"/>
--	--	--

* 3. Date Received: <input type="text" value="04/24/2017"/>	4. Applicant Identifier: <input type="text"/>
--	--

5a. Federal Entity Identifier: <input type="text"/>	5b. Federal Award Identifier: <input type="text"/>
--	---

State Use Only:

6. Date Received by State: <input type="text"/>	7. State Application Identifier: <input type="text"/>
---	---

B. APPLICANT INFORMATION:

* a. Legal Name:

* b. Employer/Taxpayer Identification Number (EIN/TIN): <input type="text" value="716003252"/>	* c. Organizational DUNS: <input type="text" value="1914297450000"/>
---	---

d. Address:

* Street1:
Street2:
* City:
County/Parish:
* State:
Province:
* Country:
* Zip / Postal Code:

e. Organizational Unit:

Department Name: <input type="text"/>	Division Name: <input type="text"/>
--	--

f. Name and contact information of person to be contacted on matters involving this application:

Prefix: * First Name:
Middle Name:
* Last Name:
Suffix:

Title:

Organizational Affiliation:

* Telephone Number: <input type="text" value="479-575-3845"/>	Fax Number: <input type="text"/>
---	----------------------------------

* Email:

Application for Federal Assistance SF-424

*** 9. Type of Applicant 1: Select Applicant Type:**

H: Public/State Controlled Institution of Higher Education

Type of Applicant 2: Select Applicant Type:

Type of Applicant 3: Select Applicant Type:

* Other (specify):

*** 10. Name of Federal Agency:**

Department of Education

11. Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number:

84.365

CFDA Title:

English Language Acquisition State Grants

*** 12. Funding Opportunity Number:**

ED-GRANTS-022117-001

* Title:

Office of English Language Acquisition (OELA): National Professional Development (NPD) Program
CFDA Number 84.365Z

13. Competition Identification Number:

84-365Z2017-2

Title:

14. Areas Affected by Project (Cities, Counties, States, etc.):

Add Attachment

Delete Attachment

View Attachment

*** 15. Descriptive Title of Applicant's Project:**

Project SOAR: Strategically Organized for EL Academic Results

Attach supporting documents as specified in agency instructions.

Add Attachments

Delete Attachments

View Attachments

Application for Federal Assistance SF-424**16. Congressional Districts Of:*** a. Applicant * b. Program/Project

Attach an additional list of Program/Project Congressional Districts if needed.

17. Proposed Project:* a. Start Date: * b. End Date: **18. Estimated Funding (\$):**

* a. Federal	<input type="text" value="2,740,876.00"/>
* b. Applicant	<input type="text" value="0.00"/>
* c. State	<input type="text" value="0.00"/>
* d. Local	<input type="text" value="0.00"/>
* e. Other	<input type="text" value="0.00"/>
* f. Program Income	<input type="text" value="0.00"/>
* g. TOTAL	<input type="text" value="2,740,876.00"/>

*** 19. Is Application Subject to Review By State Under Executive Order 12372 Process?** a. This application was made available to the State under the Executive Order 12372 Process for review on b. Program is subject to E.O. 12372 but has not been selected by the State for review. c. Program is not covered by E.O. 12372.*** 20. Is the Applicant Delinquent On Any Federal Debt? (If "Yes," provide explanation in attachment.)** Yes No

If "Yes", provide explanation and attach

21. *By signing this application, I certify (1) to the statements contained in the list of certifications and (2) that the statements herein are true, complete and accurate to the best of my knowledge. I also provide the required assurances** and agree to comply with any resulting terms if I accept an award. I am aware that any false, fictitious, or fraudulent statements or claims may subject me to criminal, civil, or administrative penalties. (U.S. Code, Title 218, Section 1001)**

 ** I AGREE

** The list of certifications and assurances, or an internet site where you may obtain this list, is contained in the announcement or agency specific instructions.

Authorized Representative:Prefix: * First Name: Middle Name: * Last Name: Suffix: * Title: * Telephone Number: Fax Number: * Email: * Signature of Authorized Representative: * Date Signed:

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
BUDGET INFORMATION
NON-CONSTRUCTION PROGRAMS**

OMB Number: 1894-0008
Expiration Date: 06/30/2017

Name of Institution/Organization

University of Arkansas

Applicants requesting funding for only one year should complete the column under "Project Year 1." Applicants requesting funding for multi-year grants should complete all applicable columns. Please read all instructions before completing form.

**SECTION A - BUDGET SUMMARY
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FUNDS**

Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Project Year 5 (e)	Total (f)
1. Personnel	210,962.00	215,725.00	220,248.00	224,885.00	229,638.00	1,101,458.00
2. Fringe Benefits	59,391.00	62,845.00	66,309.00	69,896.00	73,612.00	332,053.00
3. Travel	22,000.00	22,000.00	20,000.00	17,500.00	9,450.00	90,950.00
4. Equipment	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
5. Supplies	21,000.00	10,000.00	3,500.00	3,500.00	3,000.00	41,000.00
6. Contractual	60,000.00	55,000.00	55,000.00	55,000.00	55,000.00	280,000.00
7. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
8. Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	373,353.00	365,570.00	365,057.00	370,781.00	370,700.00	1,845,461.00
10. Indirect Costs*	29,308.00	28,686.00	28,565.00	29,462.00	29,496.00	145,517.00
11. Training Stipends	144,888.00	152,334.00	155,644.00	147,976.00	149,056.00	749,898.00
12. Total Costs (lines 9-11)	547,549.00	546,590.00	549,266.00	548,219.00	549,252.00	2,740,876.00

***Indirect Cost Information (To Be Completed by Your Business Office):**

If you are requesting reimbursement for indirect costs on line 10, please answer the following questions:

(1) Do you have an Indirect Cost Rate Agreement approved by the Federal government? Yes No

(2) If yes, please provide the following information:

Period Covered by the Indirect Cost Rate Agreement: From: 07/01/2013 To: 06/30/2017 (mm/dd/yyyy)

Approving Federal agency: ED Other (please specify): DHHS

The Indirect Cost Rate is 49.00%.

(3) If this is your first Federal grant, and you do not have an approved indirect cost rate agreement, are not a State, Local government or Indian Tribe, and are not funded under a training rate program or a restricted rate program, do you want to use the de minimis rate of 10% of MTDC? Yes No If yes, you must comply with the requirements of 2 CFR § 200.414(f).

(4) If you do not have an approved indirect cost rate agreement, do you want to use the temporary rate of 10% of budgeted salaries and wages? Yes No If yes, you must submit a proposed indirect cost rate agreement within 90 days after the date your grant is awarded, as required by 34 CFR § 75.560.

(5) For Restricted Rate Programs (check one) -- Are you using a restricted indirect cost rate that:

Is included in your approved Indirect Cost Rate Agreement? Or, Complies with 34 CFR 76.564(c)(2)? The Restricted Indirect Cost Rate is 8.00%.

PR/Award # T365Z170235

Name of Institution/Organization University of Arkansas	Applicants requesting funding for only one year should complete the column under "Project Year 1." Applicants requesting funding for multi-year grants should complete all applicable columns. Please read all instructions before completing form.	
--	---	--

**SECTION B - BUDGET SUMMARY
NON-FEDERAL FUNDS**

Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Project Year 5 (e)	Total (f)
1. Personnel						
2. Fringe Benefits						
3. Travel						
4. Equipment						
5. Supplies						
6. Contractual						
7. Construction						
8. Other						
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)						
10. Indirect Costs						
11. Training Stipends						
12. Total Costs (lines 9-11)						

SECTION C - BUDGET NARRATIVE (see instructions)

ED 524

ASSURANCES - NON-CONSTRUCTION PROGRAMS

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 15 minutes per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0348-0040), Washington, DC 20503.

PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR COMPLETED FORM TO THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET. SEND IT TO THE ADDRESS PROVIDED BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY.

NOTE: Certain of these assurances may not be applicable to your project or program. If you have questions, please contact the awarding agency. Further, certain Federal awarding agencies may require applicants to certify to additional assurances. If such is the case, you will be notified.

As the duly authorized representative of the applicant, I certify that the applicant:

1. Has the legal authority to apply for Federal assistance and the institutional, managerial and financial capability (including funds sufficient to pay the non-Federal share of project cost) to ensure proper planning, management and completion of the project described in this application.
2. Will give the awarding agency, the Comptroller General of the United States and, if appropriate, the State, through any authorized representative, access to and the right to examine all records, books, papers, or documents related to the award; and will establish a proper accounting system in accordance with generally accepted accounting standards or agency directives.
3. Will establish safeguards to prohibit employees from using their positions for a purpose that constitutes or presents the appearance of personal or organizational conflict of interest, or personal gain.
4. Will initiate and complete the work within the applicable time frame after receipt of approval of the awarding agency.
5. Will comply with the Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. §§4728-4763) relating to prescribed standards for merit systems for programs funded under one of the 19 statutes or regulations specified in Appendix A of OPM's Standards for a Merit System of Personnel Administration (5 C.F.R. 900, Subpart F).
6. Will comply with all Federal statutes relating to nondiscrimination. These include but are not limited to: (a) Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (P.L. 88-352) which prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color or national origin; (b) Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, as amended (20 U.S.C. §§1681-1683, and 1685-1686), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex; (c) Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (29 U.S.C. §794), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of handicaps; (d) the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, as amended (42 U.S.C. §§6101-6107), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of age; (e) the Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act of 1972 (P.L. 92-255), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of drug abuse; (f) the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment and Rehabilitation Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-616), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of alcohol abuse or alcoholism; (g) §§523 and 527 of the Public Health Service Act of 1912 (42 U.S.C. §§290 dd-3 and 290 ee- 3), as amended, relating to confidentiality of alcohol and drug abuse patient records; (h) Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. §§3601 et seq.), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination in the sale, rental or financing of housing; (i) any other nondiscrimination provisions in the specific statute(s) under which application for Federal assistance is being made; and, (j) the requirements of any other nondiscrimination statute(s) which may apply to the application.
7. Will comply, or has already complied, with the requirements of Titles II and III of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-646) which provide for fair and equitable treatment of persons displaced or whose property is acquired as a result of Federal or federally-assisted programs. These requirements apply to all interests in real property acquired for project purposes regardless of Federal participation in purchases.
8. Will comply, as applicable, with provisions of the Hatch Act (5 U.S.C. §§1501-1508 and 7324-7328) which limit the political activities of employees whose principal employment activities are funded in whole or in part with Federal funds.

9. Will comply, as applicable, with the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act (40 U.S.C. §§276a to 276a-7), the Copeland Act (40 U.S.C. §276c and 18 U.S.C. §874), and the Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act (40 U.S.C. §§327-333), regarding labor standards for federally-assisted construction subagreements.
10. Will comply, if applicable, with flood insurance purchase requirements of Section 102(a) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (P.L. 93-234) which requires recipients in a special flood hazard area to participate in the program and to purchase flood insurance if the total cost of insurable construction and acquisition is \$10,000 or more.
11. Will comply with environmental standards which may be prescribed pursuant to the following: (a) institution of environmental quality control measures under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (P.L. 91-190) and Executive Order (EO) 11514; (b) notification of violating facilities pursuant to EO 11738; (c) protection of wetlands pursuant to EO 11990; (d) evaluation of flood hazards in floodplains in accordance with EO 11988; (e) assurance of project consistency with the approved State management program developed under the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. §§1451 et seq.); (f) conformity of Federal actions to State (Clean Air) Implementation Plans under Section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act of 1955, as amended (42 U.S.C. §§7401 et seq.); (g) protection of underground sources of drinking water under the Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended (P.L. 93-523); and, (h) protection of endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (P.L. 93-205).
12. Will comply with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968 (16 U.S.C. §§1271 et seq.) related to protecting components or potential components of the national wild and scenic rivers system.
13. Will assist the awarding agency in assuring compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (16 U.S.C. §470), EO 11593 (identification and protection of historic properties), and the Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. §§469a-1 et seq.).
14. Will comply with P.L. 93-348 regarding the protection of human subjects involved in research, development, and related activities supported by this award of assistance.
15. Will comply with the Laboratory Animal Welfare Act of 1966 (P.L. 89-544, as amended, 7 U.S.C. §§2131 et seq.) pertaining to the care, handling, and treatment of warm blooded animals held for research, teaching, or other activities supported by this award of assistance.
16. Will comply with the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act (42 U.S.C. §§4801 et seq.) which prohibits the use of lead-based paint in construction or rehabilitation of residence structures.
17. Will cause to be performed the required financial and compliance audits in accordance with the Single Audit Act Amendments of 1996 and OMB Circular No. A-133, "Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-Profit Organizations."
18. Will comply with all applicable requirements of all other Federal laws, executive orders, regulations, and policies governing this program.
19. Will comply with the requirements of Section 106(g) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act (TVPA) of 2000, as amended (22 U.S.C. 7104) which prohibits grant award recipients or a sub-recipient from (1) Engaging in severe forms of trafficking in persons during the period of time that the award is in effect (2) Procuring a commercial sex act during the period of time that the award is in effect or (3) Using forced labor in the performance of the award or subawards under the award.

SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED CERTIFYING OFFICIAL <input type="text" value="Katny Scheibel"/>	TITLE <input type="text" value="Ass't. Vice Provost for Research, Dir., RSSP"/>
APPLICANT ORGANIZATION <input type="text" value="University of Arkansas"/>	DATE SUBMITTED <input type="text" value="04/24/2017"/>

Standard Form 424B (Rev. 7-97) Back

DISCLOSURE OF LOBBYING ACTIVITIES

Complete this form to disclose lobbying activities pursuant to 31 U.S.C.1352

Approved by OMB
4040-0013

1. * Type of Federal Action: <input type="checkbox"/> a. contract <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> b. grant <input type="checkbox"/> c. cooperative agreement <input type="checkbox"/> d. loan <input type="checkbox"/> e. loan guarantee <input type="checkbox"/> f. loan insurance	2. * Status of Federal Action: <input type="checkbox"/> a. bid/offer/application <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> b. initial award <input type="checkbox"/> c. post-award	3. * Report Type: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> a. initial filing <input type="checkbox"/> b. material change
--	--	--

4. Name and Address of Reporting Entity:

Prime SubAwardee

* Name

* Street 1 Street 2

* City State Zip

Congressional District, if known:

5. If Reporting Entity in No.4 is Subawardee, Enter Name and Address of Prime:

6. * Federal Department/Agency: <input type="text" value="U.S. Department of Education"/>	7. * Federal Program Name/Description: <input type="text" value="English Language Acquisition State Grants"/> CFDA Number, if applicable: <input type="text" value="84.365"/>
---	--

8. Federal Action Number, if known: <input type="text"/>	9. Award Amount, if known: \$ <input type="text"/>
--	--

10. a. Name and Address of Lobbying Registrant:

Prefix * First Name Middle Name

* Last Name Suffix

* Street 1 Street 2

* City State Zip

b. Individual Performing Services (including address if different from No. 10a)

Prefix * First Name Middle Name

* Last Name Suffix

* Street 1 Street 2

* City State Zip

11. Information requested through this form is authorized by title 31 U.S.C. section 1352. This disclosure of lobbying activities is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed by the tier above when the transaction was made or entered into. This disclosure is required pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1352. This information will be reported to the Congress semi-annually and will be available for public inspection. Any person who fails to file the required disclosure shall be subject to a civil penalty of not less than \$10,000 and not more than \$100,000 for each such failure.

* Signature:

* Name: Prefix * First Name Middle Name

* Last Name Suffix

Title: Telephone No.: Date:

Federal Use Only: Authorized for Local Reproduction
Standard Form - LLL (Rev. 7-97)

NOTICE TO ALL APPLICANTS

OMB Number: 1894-0005
Expiration Date: 03/31/2017

The purpose of this enclosure is to inform you about a new provision in the Department of Education's General Education Provisions Act (GEPA) that applies to applicants for new grant awards under Department programs. This provision is Section 427 of GEPA, enacted as part of the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994 (Public Law (P.L.) 103-382).

To Whom Does This Provision Apply?

Section 427 of GEPA affects applicants for new grant awards under this program. **ALL APPLICANTS FOR NEW AWARDS MUST INCLUDE INFORMATION IN THEIR APPLICATIONS TO ADDRESS THIS NEW PROVISION IN ORDER TO RECEIVE FUNDING UNDER THIS PROGRAM.**

(If this program is a State-formula grant program, a State needs to provide this description only for projects or activities that it carries out with funds reserved for State-level uses. In addition, local school districts or other eligible applicants that apply to the State for funding need to provide this description in their applications to the State for funding. The State would be responsible for ensuring that the school district or other local entity has submitted a sufficient section 427 statement as described below.)

What Does This Provision Require?

Section 427 requires each applicant for funds (other than an individual person) to include in its application a description of the steps the applicant proposes to take to ensure equitable access to, and participation in, its Federally-assisted program for students, teachers, and other program beneficiaries with special needs. This provision allows applicants discretion in developing the required description. The statute highlights six types of barriers that can impede equitable access or participation: gender, race, national origin, color, disability, or age. Based on local circumstances, you should determine whether these or other barriers may prevent your students, teachers, etc. from such access or participation in, the Federally-funded project or activity. The description in your application of steps to be taken to overcome these barriers need not be lengthy; you may provide a clear and succinct description of how you plan to address those barriers that are applicable to your circumstances. In addition, the information may be provided in a single narrative, or, if appropriate, may

be discussed in connection with related topics in the application.

Section 427 is not intended to duplicate the requirements of civil rights statutes, but rather to ensure that, in designing their projects, applicants for Federal funds address equity concerns that may affect the ability of certain potential beneficiaries to fully participate in the project and to achieve to high standards. Consistent with program requirements and its approved application, an applicant may use the Federal funds awarded to it to eliminate barriers it identifies.

What are Examples of How an Applicant Might Satisfy the Requirement of This Provision?

The following examples may help illustrate how an applicant may comply with Section 427.

(1) An applicant that proposes to carry out an adult literacy project serving, among others, adults with limited English proficiency, might describe in its application how it intends to distribute a brochure about the proposed project to such potential participants in their native language.

(2) An applicant that proposes to develop instructional materials for classroom use might describe how it will make the materials available on audio tape or in braille for students who are blind.

(3) An applicant that proposes to carry out a model science program for secondary students and is concerned that girls may be less likely than boys to enroll in the course, might indicate how it intends to conduct "outreach" efforts to girls, to encourage their enrollment.

(4) An applicant that proposes a project to increase school safety might describe the special efforts it will take to address concern of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender students, and efforts to reach out to and involve the families of LGBT students.

We recognize that many applicants may already be implementing effective steps to ensure equity of access and participation in their grant programs, and we appreciate your cooperation in responding to the requirements of this provision.

Estimated Burden Statement for GEPA Requirements

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1.5 hours per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. The obligation to respond to this collection is required to obtain or retain benefit (Public Law 103-382). Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Washington, DC 20210-4537 or email ICDocketMgr@ed.gov and reference the OMB Control Number 1894-0005.

Optional - You may attach 1 file to this page.

GEPA Certification.pdf

Add Attachment

Delete Attachment

View Attachment

GEPA Certification

There are no barriers that might prevent K-12 administrators, in-service or preservice teachers from participating in the activities outlined in the project narrative. The proposed activities focus on curriculum development, K-12 online PD and workshops, coaching and online coursework. All Arkansas K-12 public and private school teachers and administrators along with preservice teachers at the University of Arkansas, regardless of gender, race, national origin, color, disability, or race, will be eligible to participate in these activities. Furthermore, as an affirmative action institution, the University of Arkansas is committed to ensuring fair and equal treatment of all individuals in the processes which affect education and employment. The College of Education and Health Professions is in adherence with the procedure and intent of the University policy.

CERTIFICATION REGARDING LOBBYING

Certification for Contracts, Grants, Loans, and Cooperative Agreements

The undersigned certifies, to the best of his or her knowledge and belief, that:

(1) No Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid, by or on behalf of the undersigned, to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of an agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with the awarding of any Federal contract, the making of any Federal grant, the making of any Federal loan, the entering into of any cooperative agreement, and the extension, continuation, renewal, amendment, or modification of any Federal contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement.

(2) If any funds other than Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with this Federal contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement, the undersigned shall complete and submit Standard Form-LLL, "Disclosure of Lobbying Activities," in accordance with its instructions.

(3) The undersigned shall require that the language of this certification be included in the award documents for all subawards at all tiers (including subcontracts, subgrants, and contracts under grants, loans, and cooperative agreements) and that all subrecipients shall certify and disclose accordingly. This certification is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed when this transaction was made or entered into. Submission of this certification is a prerequisite for making or entering into this transaction imposed by section 1352, title 31, U.S. Code. Any person who fails to file the required certification shall be subject to a civil penalty of not less than \$10,000 and not more than \$100,000 for each such failure.

Statement for Loan Guarantees and Loan Insurance

The undersigned states, to the best of his or her knowledge and belief, that:

If any funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with this commitment providing for the United States to insure or guarantee a loan, the undersigned shall complete and submit Standard Form-LLL, "Disclosure of Lobbying Activities," in accordance with its instructions. Submission of this statement is a prerequisite for making or entering into this transaction imposed by section 1352, title 31, U.S. Code. Any person who fails to file the required statement shall be subject to a civil penalty of not less than \$10,000 and not more than \$100,000 for each such failure.

* APPLICANT'S ORGANIZATION University of Arkansas		
* PRINTED NAME AND TITLE OF AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE		
Prefix: Dr.	* First Name: Jennifer	Middle Name: E.
* Last Name: Taylor	Suffix:	
* Title: Ass't. Vice Provost for Research, Dir., RSSP		
* SIGNATURE: Kathy Scheibel	* DATE: 04/24/2017	

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION
FOR THE SF-424

OMB Number: 1894-0007
Expiration Date: 08/31/2017

1. Project Director:

Prefix: Dr.	First Name: Janet	Middle Name:	Last Name: Penner-Williams	Suffix:
----------------	----------------------	--------------	-------------------------------	---------

Address:

Street1:	751 W. Maple Ave.
Street2:	
City:	Fayetteville
County:	
State:	AR: Arkansas
Zip Code:	72701-1201
Country:	USA: UNITED STATES

Phone Number (give area code)	Fax Number (give area code)
479-575-2897	

Email Address:
jpenner@uark.edu

2. Novice Applicant:

Are you a novice applicant as defined in the regulations in 34 CFR 75.225 (and included in the definitions page in the attached instructions)?

Yes No Not applicable to this program

3. Human Subjects Research:

a. Are any research activities involving human subjects planned at any time during the proposed Project Period?

Yes No

b. Are ALL the research activities proposed designated to be exempt from the regulations?

Yes Provide Exemption(s) #: 1 2 3 4 5 6

No Provide Assurance #, if available: This has not gone through IRB review. Information will be provided if this is awarded.

c. If applicable, please attach your "Exempt Research" or "Nonexempt Research" narrative to this form as indicated in the definitions page in the attached instructions.

	Add Attachment	Delete Attachment	View Attachment
--	----------------	-------------------	-----------------

Abstract

The abstract narrative must not exceed one page and should use language that will be understood by a range of audiences. For all projects, include the project title (if applicable), goals, expected outcomes and contributions for research, policy, practice, etc. Include population to be served, as appropriate. For research applications, also include the following:

- Theoretical and conceptual background of the study (i.e., prior research that this investigation builds upon and that provides a compelling rationale for this study)
- Research issues, hypotheses and questions being addressed
- Study design including a brief description of the sample including sample size, methods, principals dependent, independent, and control variables, and the approach to data analysis.

[Note: For a non-electronic submission, include the name and address of your organization and the name, phone number and e-mail address of the contact person for this project.]

You may now Close the Form

You have attached 1 file to this page, no more files may be added. To add a different file, you must first delete the existing file.

* Attachment:

Project SOAR: Strategically Organized for EL Academic Results

IHE: University of Arkansas, Fayetteville **Title:** SOAR-Strategically Organized for EL Academic Results. **Partners:** Arkansas Department of Education (ADE); Keys For Networking (Parent Information Resource Centers, PIRC); Parents and Community Members, Springdale School District and other districts statewide; K-12 in-service (private and public) and preservice teachers; EL Coaches and Administrators. **Program Description:** Online micro-credentialed PD in ESL for K-12 teachers and administrators with outreach efforts for parent, family and community engagement. Preservice and in-service teachers offered courses to add-an ESL endorsement and TESOL graduate certificate.

NPD Priorities Addressed: Absolute, Competitive # 1, Competitive #2. What Works Clearinghouse *My Teaching Partner* (2015).

http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/intervention_reports/wwc_mtp_061615.pdf; “Organizing Instruction & Study to Improve Student Learning” (SBR; WWC “Practice Guide”, 2014 <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/PracticeGuide/1>) recommendations 1-4, 5b and 7.

Number and type of Targeted Participants to Be Served: **1)** 175 educators to complete PD online micro-credentialing—100 K-12 in-service teachers; 50 school district administrators/instructional coaches; 25 K-12 preservice teachers. Years 2—5; **2)** 100 educators participate in summer PD institutes Years 1-4—20 K-12 preservice 5 per year; 60 in-service K-12 teachers, 15 per year; **3)** 150 educators participate in ongoing PD for parent, family and community engagement—30 participants per year; **4)** 20 pre-service K-12 teachers complete 4 undergraduate/graduate-level ESL courses toward endorsement Years 2-5—5 per year; and, **5)** 40 in-service K-12 teachers complete ESL endorsement and TESOL graduate certificate—10 per year in Years 2 -5. **Summarized Goals, Objectives, and Performance Outcomes:** **Goal 1)** Complete micro-credentialed PD to Improve Instructions to K-12 ELs. **Obj.1a:** Develop online PD modules—Year 1. **Obj.1b:** 175 educators complete PD Online modules—100 K-12 in-service teachers; 50 school district administrators/ instructional coaches; 25 preservice teachers. Years 2-5. **Outcomes:** Statistically significant difference between randomly selected intervention group and matched cluster assignment for control group of K-12 teacher’s performance on the Biography-Driven Observation Assessments (BDOA); and 80% Completers on Module Assessments and Self Efficacy Results. **Goal 2)** Summer EL PD Institute using the Knight Reflective Coaching Model. **Obj. 2a:** 24 EL coaches receive Knight’s Reflective Coaching Model Institute. **Obj.2b:** 20 K-12 pre-service teachers complete a 3-week Summer Institute; **Obj.2b:** 60 in-service teachers complete a 3-week Summer Institute. **Outcomes:** Statistically significant differences between intervention and control group of teachers’ performance on BDOA Assessments; teacher self-efficacy with coaching model. **Goal 3)** Complete PD and outreach activities for parents, family, and community members that improves engagement in English Learner’s education and social involvement. **Obj. 3a:** 150 educators participate in online PD micro-credentials. **Outcomes:** 80% of K-12 in-service teachers plan & conduct family engagement activities that are videoed and submitted for micro-credentialing review. **Goal 4)** Improve teacher preparedness to teachers of ELs through ESL courses toward ESL endorsement and TESOL Graduate Certificate. **Obj. 4a:** 60 in-service teachers complete TESOL graduate certificate. **Obj.4b:** 20 preservice candidates take 4 ESL courses toward and obtain ESL endorsement. **Outcomes:** 80% of in-service teachers earn a passing score on ESL Praxis; 90% of preservice teachers obtain teaching license with ESL endorsement.

Contact: Janet Penner-Williams, Ed.D. PI 479-575-2897; jpenner@ark.edu

Project Narrative File(s)

* **Mandatory Project Narrative File Filename:**

[Add Mandatory Project Narrative File](#)

[Delete Mandatory Project Narrative File](#)

[View Mandatory Project Narrative File](#)

To add more Project Narrative File attachments, please use the attachment buttons below.

[Add Optional Project Narrative File](#)

[Delete Optional Project Narrative File](#)

[View Optional Project Narrative File](#)

SOAR Narrative Table of Contents

Section A: Quality of the Project Design 1

 A1: Goals, objectives and outcomes are specified and measurable..... 1

 A.2: Design can guide possible replications and inform effectiveness 7

 A.3: Project is supported by strong theory..... 8

 A.4: Competitive Priorities10

Section B: Quality of Project Personnel..... 13

 B1: Employment applications from traditional underrepresented groups 13

 B.2: Qualifications of the project director or primary investigator 14

 B.3: Qualifications/ trainings of key personnel 15

Section C: Quality of the Management Plan 15

 C1: Adequacy to achieved objectives on time and within the budget..... 15

 C2: Time commitments of personnel are appropriate and adequate..... 16

Section D: Quality of the Evaluation Plan 23

 D1: Methods are thorough/ feasible/ appropriate to goals/ objectives/ outcomes 23

 D.2: Methods can produce evidence about project’s effectiveness 32

 D.3: Methods can provide performance feedback and periodic assessment 33

 D.4: Methods can provide valid and reliable performance data or relevant outcomes.....35

Section A: Quality of Project Design (45 points). Overview of Priorities:

The University of Arkansas in Fayetteville (UAF) is the lead agency for **SOAR—Strategically Organized for EL Academic Results** in collaboration with the Arkansas Department of Education, (ADE) English to Speakers of Other Languages Division, UA Global Campus, Educational Renewal Zone, Northwest AR Education Service Cooperative, Parent Information Resource Centers, and Springdale Public Schools. Our NPD proposal addresses: **1) the Absolute Priority**—delivering professional development (PD) activities that improve English learners (ELs) classroom instruction and assist teaching personnel working with ELs to meet high quality standards; **2) Competitive Priority #1**—utilizing moderate evidence of effectiveness while simultaneously conducting research; **3) Competitive Priority #2**—enhancing and increasing parent, family, and community engagement.

SOAR is a joint venture between University of Arkansas (UA), Parent Information Resource Centers (PIRC) and ADE, 16 Arkansas Educational Cooperatives, and four Migrant Education Cooperatives and the University of Arkansas Educational Renewal Zone. Its overarching purpose is to provide PD for improving EL instruction and increase family, parent and community engagement.

(1) Goals, objectives and outcomes to be achieved are clearly specified and measurable.

This NPD project has **4 goals: Goal 1)** Online PD modules to improve instruction for K-12 ELs; **Goal 2)** Application of learning in summer EL PD institutes using the Knight Reflective Coaching; **Goal 3)** PD and outreach activities for parent, family, and community engagement; and, **Goal 4)** Enhance teacher preparedness to teach ELs through ESL endorsement, or graduate certificate coursework. Each goal is aligned with respective objectives and expected outcomes. Annual performance outcomes serve for meeting GPRA and project measures. Activities are outlined in Section C.1 of the Management Plan in evaluation criteria, GPRA, and project measures in **Section D—Evaluation Plan.**

SOAR—Strategically Organized for EL Academic Results

Goal #1: SOAR will develop and provide online PD for in-service and preservice personnel to improve instruction for K-12th grade ELs. **Obj. 1a:** Creation of online EL PD modules for micro-credentialing. In Year 1 (fall), the PI and the Project Director (D) will determine number of modules and content based on the needs assessment, and guidance from the WWC EL Practice Guides, TESOL/CREDE standards, the WWC “*Teaching Academic Content and Literacy to English Learners in Elementary and Middle School*” research, and from PIRC resources from parent/family and community engagement. Consultants will be secured to assist the PI/PPD in creating the online modules. To ensure module quality, experts in the field of teacher training and ESL will be secured and contracted. Module content will be enhanced with classroom video captured as the PI/PPD train K-12 educators to provide models of best practice in EL curriculum and instructional best practices.

The PI/PPD will closely work with the other divisions of the UA such as Global Campus and the Educational Renewal Zone at the university. Through this collaborative effort, they will oversee and manage the online EL PD modules, aid in instructional graphic design, and provide analytic support in kind. Furthermore, U of A Global Campus will be consulted for capturing, editing and producing videos to include in the online modules. To ensure operative design quality, an instructional designer from Global Campus specializing in online learning will review modules using Quality Matters standards for online learning and provide guidance.

In summer 2018, K-12 EL Instructional Coaches (IC) will be invited to complete the online modules and provide feedback before the modules are available to in-services and preservice participants. As such, this will also provide the ICs with initial training as they work with K-12 educators. **Predicted Outcomes:** Creation of online modules. **Obj. 1b:** 100 in-service teachers and 50 administrators will complete online PD. All K-12 teachers and administrators/instructional facilitators in the state will be notified of **SOAR** and will be encouraged to apply online. The

SOAR—Strategically Organized for EL Academic Results

application process will include content knowledge assessment, and an EL teacher/administrator self-efficacy measure with informed consent. In Years 2-5, 50 K-12 teachers and 25 administrators will be randomly selected from the pool of applicants to receive the online EL PD modules. K-12 teachers will engage in online learning through micro-credentialing modules. As depicted by the research of Loeb, Soland, Fox (2014), their findings serve as the guide and implementation for preparing regular classroom teachers for teaching ELs. **Predicted Outcomes:** Statistically significant differences between intervention and control group of K-12 teachers' performance on CLASS and ELs performance on Teaching Strategies TSGOLD and the PPVT—4 will be evident; Pre/post module assessment—80% completers with 80% on each module plus a rating of proficient on a teaching video rated by a trained and reliable rater; and a significant gain on the Teaching English Language Learners Scale—TELLS (Carney2012) will be found. **Obj. 1c:** K-12 preservice teachers (30) will complete online PD modules. The preservice candidates may apply for an ESL focus in their undergraduate program. In Year 2 and each year thereafter, 6 preservice teachers will be selected to complete the online EL PD modules. The online PD will provide much-needed training regarding effective instruction for ELs for preservice staff, as these candidates will be better prepared to meet the needs of ELs in their upcoming classrooms. **Predicted Outcomes:** Pre/post assessment, as 80% module completers with 80% at the proficient level of overall performance as determined by trained observers of videos submitted by online participants.

Goal 2: SOAR will provide support for participants in applying the knowledge, strategies, and practices they have learned through PD and coursework in *My Teaching Partner* videos where participants reflect and coaches view and provide feedback. Summer Institutes using the Knight Reflective Coaching Model (RCM) will be conducted to facilitate this process. According to Allen (2011), PD with instructional coaching has proven effective in improving teacher practice.

SOAR—Strategically Organized for EL Academic Results

Additionally, participants will work with EL students during a summer enrichment program. **Obj.**

2a: In partnership with LEAs a summer enrichment program for EL students, ages 5-14, **SOAR** personnel will provide a one week, onsite training of best practices for the teaching of ELs prior to the two-week summer school for ELs. The 2014 *WWC Practice Guide for ELs* will serve as foundation for the instructional delivery and related program activities. During this five year timeframe, 100 educators will participate in summer PD institutes—12 Pre-K-12 teachers per year and 8 preservice teachers per year will plan and deliver instruction for ELs, implementing best practices for EL instruction focused on, “*Teaching Academic Content and Literacy to English Learners in Elementary and Middle School*” and “*Organizing Instruction & Study to Improve Student Learning*” with support from EL coaches trained in Knight’s Reflective Coaching Model (RCM) which includes four steps 1) Professional Development 2) Classroom Observation 3) Coaching reflection & feedback and 4) Diagnostic Assessment

Obj. 2b: Twenty-four (2 cohorts of 12) K-12 instructional facilitators and/or teachers with an ESL endorsement and a track record of successful teaching of ELs will be trained on the RCM to serve as instructional coaches for K-12 teachers participating in the onsite summer institutes and to coach through videos in *My Teaching Partner*. Dr. James Knight will use his vast experiences as a consultant to **SOAR**, personalizing/ developing the RCM for project participants. **Predicted**

Outcomes: Increased performance on the Coaching Practices Rating Scale (Rush & Sheldon, 2006). http://www.cocoaches.net/uploads/casetools_vol2_no2.pdf
http://pmarshallsei650gradportfolio.weebly.com/uploads/1/5/6/2/15624256/pmarshall_516_coachin_g_rating_scale.pdf

Obj. 2c: Preservice teachers (30) over five years will partake in the onsite summer institutes.

SOAR—Strategically Organized for EL Academic Results

Each year, 6 preservice applicants will receive in-depth PD that focuses on best instructional EL teaching practices. During the summer institutes, these teachers will plan and conduct instruction with ELs using effective, research-based instructional techniques. They will be guided and supported by EL Coaches and other **SOAR** personnel. Preservice candidates will also work with EL parents by providing parent education workshops, conducting family engagement opportunities & implementing *Parent and Children Together Time* (PACT) in their classroom. Comparison between students who have PACT time during the summer institute and those who do not will be conducted.

Predicted Outcomes: Increased performance on ESL observation instrument. **Obj. 2d:** In-service teachers (60) over 5 years will participate in the onsite Summer Institutes. During the first week, participants will receive in-depth PD focusing on best instructional practices. During the following two weeks, in-service personnel will plan and implement instruction for ELs using these effective instructional techniques. They will be guided and supported by EL Coaches and **SOAR** personnel. K-12 teachers will also work with parents of ELs by providing parents education workshops, family engagement opportunities and PACT. **Predicted Outcomes:** Statistically significant differences between intervention and control group of teachers' performance on CLASS and ESL observation instruments will occur; greater EL student gains as reported on the PPCT—4 and TSGOLD and the Teaching English Language Learners Scale TELLS--

<https://mospace.umsystem.edu/xmlui/bitstream/handle/10355/15865/research.pdf?sequence=2>

(p 73-76) will occur. **Goal 3:** **SOAR** staff will provide PD for preservice candidates, in-service teachers, and administrators to conduct outreach activities to improve outreach for parents, family and community engagement as part of the two-week school for ELs. **Obj. 3a:** 150 educators (30 participants in each year) will attend focused, ongoing PD symposiums. In collaboration with districts and schools from across the state, participants will receive ongoing PD for engaging

SOAR—Strategically Organized for EL Academic Results

parents, families and community to support EL learning needs. The districts/ schools will coordinate PD with PIRC—Parent Information Resources Centers—to lead the PD symposiums. Preparing teachers to work with culturally and linguistically diverse families and communities is a focus of the symposiums. A total of 30 K-12 teachers will attend two sessions per year. Participants will implement outreach activities for the parents and families in their classroom and community. Implementation progress will be shared and discussed between PD symposia at the Year 2-5 conference held in January and the final PD symposium. **Predicted Outcomes:** 80% of the in-service teachers will recollect two or more issues and provide activities with families to address these issues; 70% will video implementation of these activities. **Goal 4: SOAR** will improve K-12 teachers' effectiveness to teach ELs through completing TESOL endorsement or graduate certificate seeking coursework. **Obj. 4a:** A total of 30 pre-service K-12 teachers will finish 4 undergraduate/graduate-level ESL courses toward ESL endorsement—6 per year; and 60 in-service K-12 teachers in cohorts will complete the ESL Endorsement or TESOL Graduate Certificate (12 per year). Each Cohort will complete a 2.5-year ESL endorsement sequence and/or a graduate-level TESOL certificate program.

The courses are aligned with TESOL/CREDE Standards, the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), and the Arkansas Teaching Standards, with an emphasis on the Assessment of Learning—Summative Assessments. In the endorsement courses listed above, teacher participants will learn multiple strategies/ approaches reviewed by the WWC as meeting standards—with and without reservation—such as academic language skills (Snow, Lawrence, and White, 2010), instructional interventions for content and language learning (August, Branum-Martin, Cardenas-Hagan & Francis, 2009) and vocabulary development (Carlo, August, McLaughlin, Snow, Dressler, Lippman, Lively & White, 2004). All courses will require

SOAR—Strategically Organized for EL Academic Results

participants to design and implement projects in their classroom, schools and/or field experiences. In order for the teachers to apply what they have learned and to sustain this learning, each participant should have ELs in their classrooms. For meeting the program's practicum requirement, teachers will complete their graduate certification program by teaching for two-weeks in an EL summer program. Furthermore, courses will be delivered through professional learning communities (PLCs), summer institutes, Saturday classes and online platforms, as needed, utilizing the qualities associated with the WWC "*My Teaching Partner*" research <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/EvidenceSnapshot/635> . This varied delivery approach follows an onsite certification program from which effective outcomes were identified immediately following the intervention and also 10-years later (Spezzini & Austin, 2010; Spezzini, Austin & Prado, 201).

In **SOAR**, leading ESL researchers and authors will be contracted to present during the ESL summer institutes. Knowledge and skills in parent, family and community engagement will be introduced, developed, and expanded in several courses, culminating in a final course that expands educators' knowledge and skills for engaging parents, families and communities to meet ELs educational needs. **Predicted Outcomes:** 80% of in-service teachers will increase their score on the obtain a passing ESOL Praxis score and increase score on; Teaching English Language Learners Scale (TELLS) (pre-/posttest). **Obj. 4b: SOAR** will support 30 preservice teacher candidates in becoming prepared to teach ELs through the completion of ESL coursework. Cohorts of 6 participants will be selected each year. During their junior/ senior years, preservice cohorts will take up to 4 graduate-level ESL classes to assist them in completing a later fast-track Master of Arts in Teaching. (MAT) with tuition support from **SOAR**. This preparation of candidates is well supported by the research, in its findings and implications for success (Coady, Harper, and DeJong, 2011; Hutchinson, 2012). **Predicted Outcomes:** 80% of preservice candidates will add the ESL Endorsement to their initial

licensure and increase their score on Teaching English Language Learners Scale (TELLS).

Project SOAR will partner with the Arkansas Department of Education (ADE) to identify districts within the state that have the largest discrepancy between the percentage of ELs and the percentage of teachers that are ESL endorsed. These districts will be targeted for PD and micro-credentialing by modules. ADE will provide micro-credentials in Family & Community Engagement for ELs, Classroom Environments that Promote ELs Success, Administrative Look-Fors in EL Classrooms, along with current endorsement topics such as EL assessment, methodology, second language acquisition and culture in classroom practice.

University of Arkansas Global Campus will partner with the College of Education & Health Professions to develop online modules for the micro-credentials and for online coursework leading to an ESL Endorsement and/or a TESOL Graduate Certificate. The Global Campus will supply instruction designers and adhere to Quality Matters Standards for online instruction. We will also insure that all TESOL standards are addressed in the modules.

Springdale schools as the district with the highest percentage and number of ELs in the state will partner with U of A to pilot the online PD modules and coursework along with the two-week summer program for ELs grades K-12. Springdale and U of A have partnered successfully on previous NPD grants.

2) SOAR will guide possible replications of activities/ strategies including information about the effectiveness of the approach/ strategies employed.

As cited later (**Section D**), the project evaluation plan will generate information useful for documenting regarding the fidelity of the project's design, its implementation and the effectiveness of the interventions. This information, along with the shared commitment of the evaluation and management teams to use data to improve program function, will further support subsequent efforts

SOAR—Strategically Organized for EL Academic Results

to replicate effective components of **SOAR** to other projects/programs. Our project will build upon the existing ESL endorsement model created at UA through earlier Title III, Title VII NPD projects and the now ending Title III project supporting elementary and secondary teacher ESL endorsements. Our models are designed for establishing school/university partnerships, training preservice and in-service teachers in appropriate EL instruction, proving ESL certification through a learner-centered approach that is anchored in PLCs, and through providing quality PD to preservice and in-service teachers that includes the use of online modules for micro-credentialing. Should **SOAR** be awarded, UA and the Arkansas Department of Education (ADE) will share successful approaches/strategies with education systems through invited PD, conferences, presentations and publications. The modules will have the potential to be the ESL initial training for all K-12 -teachers in state-funded and private K-12 education programs. Should the project be awarded funding, the private schools within the LEAs **SOAR** works with will be consulted to see how they might participate in a mutually beneficial way in **SOAR**.

3) The extent SOAR is supported by strong theory. To prepare for program planning and the project's evaluation design (**Section D**), the use of a **logic model**, grounded in a variety of education research strategies, will be utilized. First, using Stephen Covey's research framework on the *Theory of Change* (2008), program planners focused attention to 'plan with the end in mind', rather than just consider inputs (e.g. budgets, employees) or just the tasks that must be done. **SOAR's** logic model is designed to evaluate program effectiveness and portrays the graphical depiction of the logical relationships between the resources, activities, outputs and outcomes. Secondly, as stated by Rossi, Lipsey and Freeman (2004), the evaluation should concern itself with measuring how the process indicators (inputs/outputs) have had an effect on the outcome indicators. Thirdly, **SOAR**, utilizing Scott Wager's (2013) framework, *20 benefits of collaboration as a researcher you cannot afford to ignore*, the project is designed to employ a

SOAR—Strategically Organized for EL Academic Results

cohort model supplemented by intensive support from staff, faculty and peers. Finally, a set of underlying frameworks provides a solid foundation for the strategies and practices directed toward achieving our project’s goal as outlined in 2B and 2C p.4-5 —partnerships, staff professional development, and building upon previous experiences and learnings. The strategies and practices to be highlighted in PD are outlined in the goals 1-4 of the project with objectives and outcomes. The effectiveness of the strategies is supported in the competitive priorities starting on p. 11.

As such, **SOAR** offers an effective teacher education program that prepares preservice and in-service candidates to implement evidence-based pedagogical practices, providing courses and PD based on the needs of adult learners working with EL students. As adult learners, candidates often thrive in the use of andragogy—environments personalized to the needs of the adult learner (Knowles, 1968). **SOAR**’s andragogy framework infers that adult learners differ from young learners in several important ways including taking more initiative to self-direct their own learning process. In order to support this self-directed learning aspect, **SOAR** will offer a wide variety of learning modes and a choice of micro-credentials to meet the candidate’s needs. The teacher-training curriculum is designed to promote candidate learning and collaboration through, action research projects and reflective practice, (Knight, 2016; Spezzini, Austin, Abbott & Littleton, 2009) as well as, through online PD (WWC, 2015; Allen, Pianta, Gregory, Mikami & Lun, 2009). **Rationale and Desired Outcomes:** The logic model for **SOAR** (**Table 2**) creates a framework from which the teachers’ education program can provide an evidence-based PD model designed through academic and collaborative activities to achieve outcomes, such as increased perceived self-efficacy in teacher candidates. Zimmer, Bandura and Martinez-Pons (1992) found that “sensed” self-efficacy builds motivation in the learner, which conversely, engenders momentum for further self-inquiry needed as a future education leader within a professional environment where ESL endorsed teachers have

SOAR—Strategically Organized for EL Academic Results

knowledge and skills needed by colleagues. Furthermore, implementing evidence-based practices throughout the life of the project will result in the transformation of the candidate’s conceptual framework of teaching and learning in order for him/her to advocate for the learning needs of diverse youth and their families. **Teacher Training through Micro-credentialing Rationale:** Participants will benefit from best practices in PD for adult learning, including new learning that is designed to: **1)** be delivered primarily in an asynchronous online environment; **2)** develop leadership qualities within oneself and among other professional educators; **3)** develop learners’ capacity to create, align and coordinate learning resources for ELs; **4)** require teachers to use a variety of sources and types of student achievement data for sound decision-making in lesson design and delivery of instruction; **5)** integrate theories of research on human learning; **6)** facilitate and support implementation of new learnings into changed classroom teaching practices; and, **7)** align professional learning with specific student learning outcomes (Learningforward, 2016). These seven attributes are incorporated into the design of the PD curriculum in micro-credentialing and the delivery model for the ESL certification courses to be offered to K-8 educators.

Addressing Competitive Priority #1: Moderate Evidence of Effectiveness (5 points): SOAR is calculated to validate the “*My Teaching Partner*” intervention (MTP; WWC “*My Teaching Partner*,” 2012) as the pedagogical approach for training K-12 teachers to use. *My Teaching Partner* has evidence of effectiveness at both elementary and secondary levels. “*Organizing Instruction & Study to Improve Student Learning*” (SBR; WWC “*Practice Guide*”, 2014 <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/PracticeGuide/1>) has two recommendations with strong evidence that will be utilized—1) Using quizzing to re-expose students to information and 2) Help students build explanations by asking and answering deep questions. In addition, four components have moderate evidence of effectiveness and will be utilized in SOAR—1) space learning over time 2)

interweave worked example-solutions and problem solving exercises 3) combine graphics with verbal descriptions and 4) connect and integrate abstract and concrete representations of concepts. All six strategies will be utilized with ELs in an added quasi-experimental study design. The Evidence Review Protocol for Interventions for ELs, Version 2.2 (WWC, 2013) was employed to guide determinations on the selection of interventions and data collection tools. The outcome measures meet the WWC requirement for internal consistency of .60, inter-rater reliability of .50 and synchronized validity Utilizing the pool of Arkansas’s existing 32,818 teachers in state-funded K-12 classrooms who choose to participate will be selected to receive the PD teacher online micro-credentialing training modules. The comparison group for each cohort will be comprised of K-12th grade teachers who also expressed an interest in participating and who also completed the pretest as part of the application. The comparison sample will be selected to match the treatment teachers based on type of classrooms and teachers, number of ELs, self-efficacy scores of teachers, and coop regions found within the State of Arkansas. Treatment teachers will complete a self-efficacy scale at the close of the intervention. It is projected that a subgroup of the comparison teachers will apply for the training the subsequent year and, by completing the teacher self-efficacy measure, will provide a comparison for changes in self-efficacy attributable to the PD training—while sample sizes within year may be underpowered for this variable if re-application rates are low, aggregate data across cohorts will be sufficient. The two groups will be compared statistically on differential changes on a variety of outcome measures. At the teacher level, the experimental and control groups will be assessed using a biography-driven assessment classroom observation tool entitled, CLASS—Classroom Assessment Scoring System) (Pianta, LaParo, and Hamre, 2008)—an EL environment measure—validated as part of the study, and self-efficacy when serving ELs (Carney, 2012). At the student level, data will be collected using TS GOLD—Teaching Strategies Classroom Assessment Scoring System—a viable

observation-based, authentic assessment measure that is reliable, valid and appropriate for students whose home language is not English (Kim, Lambert and Burts, 2013). Also, receptive language will be evaluated using the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test Fourth Edition (PPVT—4, Dunn & Dunn, 2007). Classroom data will be aggregated and used as the analysis unit when likening ELs rate of progress in receptive language to other students’ rate of progress in receptive in the class.

Addressing Competitive Priority #2: Improving Parent/ Family/ Community Engagement (5 points). A plethora of thorough, well-documented research exists demonstrating that when educators involve families in the EL education of their child, EL outcomes are enhanced (Chen, Kyle & McIntyre, 2008; Waterman & Harry, 2008). Furthermore, according to Bronfenbrenner’s bio ecological systems theory, it is vitally important to have present quality interactions among multiple “layers” of environments that consists of family, school and community members; and as such, these essential components are embedded throughout the **SOAR** intervention model.

Importantly, since 2010, the USDE requires all teachers/schools to actively explore ways to engage and empower families. However, mainstream K-12 teachers demonstrate a need for further PD on how to effectively work with families of ELs (Calderón, M., Slavin, R., and Sánchez, M. (2011). For **SOAR**, research findings and the principles of best practice for ELs promote parent, family and community engagement as in the Arkansas Competencies for English Second Language Teachers, Grade K-12 based on TESOL Standard 2 and 5 along with CREDE standards (CREDE,2016), the NAEYC standards (NAEYC, 2016), *the Framework for Parent Involvement* (USDE 2014) and the *Handbook of Family Literacy* (Wasik, 2012) and will guide the infusion of their engagement for project goal completion. As seen below, Competitive Priority #2 will be met through several key aspects of our project.

SOAR—Strategically Organized for EL Academic Results

The online PD modules for micro-credentialing (Goal 1) will be offered to a total of 100 in-services, K-12 teachers and 50 administrators. Research shows that online modules are effective for PD (Allen, Pianta, Gregory, Mikami & Lun, 2011). Micro-credentialing is a method of making PD more relevant and individualized with a focus on the application to student learning (Sawchuk, Education Week, 3/29/2016) One micro-credential will include a focus on working with parents/families of ELs. The Summer EL PD Institutes (Goal 2) will include a strong family engagement component. K-12 teachers will host family education trainings and workshops to promote parents in the understanding of school curriculum and how to support academics and native language in the home (Epstein, 2009).

Together with University of Arkansas' work with the state's Family Literacy Centers and the Parent Information Resources Centers (PIRC), **SOAR** will provide educators with ongoing PD (Goal 3) focused on engagement of parents and families with access to resources for planning and conducting family education workshops (Epstein, 2009). When educators assist in conducting family engagement workshops, parent learning increases (Delgado-Gaitan, 2001). **SOAR** will include 150 (30 per year) in-service teachers and administrators in two full days' symposia (fall/spring) and a round table discussion at the conference each January during the 5 years of operation. For members engaged in the TESOL endorsement and/or graduate certificate (Goal 4), a new course, *Parent/Family/Community Engagement for Supporting ELs* and will be designed and implemented.

Section B: Quality of Project Personnel (10 points).

1) SOAR encourages employment applications from members of groups traditionally underrepresented based on race, national origin, gender, age or disability.

UA and the partnering ADE are committed to equal opportunity for both education and employment. Project positions and those serving as consultants, will be filled from a diverse applicant

pool giving consideration, when selecting among applicants with equal qualifications, to those from underrepresented groups—especially those from bilingual, Spanish-speaking backgrounds. The proposed project director and research assistant are from bilingual, Spanish speaking backgrounds. UA’s Equal Opportunity Policy states: “*Qualified applicants are considered for all positions and employees are treated during employment, without regard to race, color, religion, age, sex, national origin, disability or veteran status.*” As reaffirmed recently by UA (2016), “UA is expressly committed to maintaining and promoting nondiscrimination in all aspects of recruitment and employment throughout UA. In accordance with applicable law, UA prohibits, and will not tolerate, discrimination in any personnel actions, UA programs and UA facilities on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, disability unrelated to job performance, veteran status, or genetic or family medical history. Furthermore, UA prohibits discrimination against individuals on the basis of sexual orientation, gender identify or gender expressions. UA complies with the Age Discrimination in Employment Act which prohibits employment discrimination against persons 40-years of age or older. UA’s personnel actions, programs and facilities are administered in accordance with UA’s equal opportunity commitment and affirmative action plan” (UA AA Plan, 2017).

2) Qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the PI and PD.

Dr. Janet Penner-Williams will serve as project investigator. Dr. Penner-Williams has her doctorate from the University of Houston with a concentration in teacher education. She has 31 years of experience in PK-12 education and 12 years of experience in higher education. During her tenure in PK-12, she was principal of a bilingual school and curriculum director in a district with a high percentage of ELs. During her years at U of A, she has served as an associate professor in Curriculum & Instruction, an assistant department head, and assistant dean for education where she oversaw accreditation, and the senior associate dean for academic affairs. Dr. Penner-Williams has

been project investigator for two previous OELA PD grants. She also successfully applied to ADE for the U of A to direct the Arkansas ESL Academy grant in collaboration with Arkansas Tech University from 2015 to present.

Dr. Diana Gonzales Worthen, Ph. D. (PD) has been project director for two previously awarded OELA PD grants under the University of Arkansas. She has taught ESL students in secondary school science, taught preservice teachers and graduate students. She also helped create and pilot a summer reading program for elementary ELs with a non-profit community organization of which she is a founder.

3) Qualification, including relevant training and experience of key project personnel.

Dr. Robert Fanning (Educational Solutions) will be contracted as the external evaluator. He has been a PI, PD on numerous Federal grants, state grants and has been a university adjunct/ associate professor (University of Kansas, Washburn University, Harvard, UCLA), administrator, ESL, special education and classroom teacher for over 40 years. He has led many federally sponsored teacher-training projects and his experiences fit well to ensuring that project outcomes will be achieved and accomplished on time and within budget.

Dr. Eva Diaz will serve as research associate. Dr. Diaz has her Ph.D. from Pennsylvania State University with a major in bilingual education. She will be assisting with our research based on participant feedback for Project SOAR.

Section C: Quality of Management Plan (25 points).

1) Adequacy of the management plan to achieve objectives on time, within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines and milestones for accomplishing tasks.

The PI and the PD will manage and operationalize **SOAR**, whose roles and responsibilities are detailed in the **Project Management/ Activities Matrix**, pages 17-21. This matrix specifies the ways

SOAR—Strategically Organized for EL Academic Results

in which the defined goals/ objectives will be achieved, persons responsible, the timelines in which they will be achieved, and those milestones that indicate goal/objective attainment. The budget and budget narrative further exhibits the manner in which the project's goals/ objectives will be achieved within the Years' 1-5 budget. To further ensure budget adherence and as a cautionary measure, **SOAR** includes small costs increases associated with tuition, services, salary/ fringe benefits.

Specifically, a clear management plan that offers focused, multi-layered PD experiences to preservice/ in-service teachers and other personnel and includes clear milestones for project completion is found in **Table 3**. Initial recruiting for potential K-12 candidates will be initiated in summer 2018. Preservice participant recruitment will be initiated immediately thereafter, as Cohort 1 will start in Fall 2018. Cohorts of 6 preservice participants will be selected each year to participate in all preservice level interventions; that is: the *Online PD micro-credentials* (Goal 1c); *Onsite Summer EL PD institutes* (Goal 2b); *PD on parent, family and community engagement* (Goal 3a), and completing *4 ESL courses toward MA ESL degree* (Goal 4b). In-service teacher recruitment will begin in fall 2017 upon the start of the school year. Recruiting participants for PD on parent, family and community engagement (Goal 3a) will begin promptly as the first Parent Information Resource Center (PIRC) symposium will be in fall 2017. K-12 teachers will be informed on the online EL PD, the onsite summer EL PD institutes, and the ESL endorsement or graduate certificate coursework offered by **SOAR** through announcement from ADE and **SOAR** personnel presentation at the annual K-12 conference held each January. Multiple Cohorts are planned throughout the life of **SOAR** degree; Cohort #1 will take their first course in fall 2018 and finish within 2.5 years

2) Time commitments of the PD/PI/other personnel is appropriate and adequate.

The time commitments for each of **SOAR**'s personnel are based on the respective responsibilities found in Section C1 of the Management Plan. The time dedicated by key personnel is appropriate and

SOAR—Strategically Organized for EL Academic Results

adequate to meet project objectives and outcomes. **The PI (35%)** will oversee project implementation, supervise personnel, assist in creating the online EI modules, plan/ implement the onsite EI Summer PD institutes, collaborate with PIRC to implement the parent engagement and outreach, and collaborate with the PD and External Evaluator to disseminate project findings through presentations and scholarly articles.

Table 2 Management Matrix/ Activity Timelines

Timeline	Fall	Spring	Summer
Year 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Needs assessment completed by K-12 teachers (Goal 1a) • Determine module content and hire consultants; begin development and video collection (Goal 1a) • ESL classroom observation tool validated • Recruit preservice Cohort 1 to begin in early summer; cohort finalized in late summer • Preservice Cohort 1 (6) attends PIRC parent, family and community engagement. PD (Goal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed online modules (Goal 1a) • Inform K-12 in-service teachers of opportunities at state conference (All goals) • In-service K-12 teachers apply in spring for online participation (Goal 1b); 50 teachers selected/ control group assigned • Recruit 6 preservice teachers for Cohort 2; determine Cohort before summer session 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Invite K-12 coaches to complete online modules and provide feedback (Goal 1a) • Revisions to online models (Goal 1a) • Coaches trained on Knight’s Reflective Coaching (Goal 2a) • Preservice Cohort 1 complete summer institute (Goal 2b); complete ESL courses (Goal 4b) • In-service teachers (12) complete summer institute (Goal 2c)

	<p>3); begin ESL coursework (Goal 4b)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In-service K-12 teachers (22) selected and attend PIRC fall PD • New course(s) development and revising existing courses (Goal 4) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preservice Cohort 1 attend PIRC spring PD (Goal 3a); continue ESL courses (Goal 4b) • In-service teachers and administrators attend January roundtable discussion and PIRC PD • Complete new course (s) development/ revision of existing courses (Goal 4) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 15 in-service teachers from Cohort 1 selected for ESL courses (Goal 4a) • Preservice Cohorts complete summer PD institute (Goal 2b); complete ESL courses (Cohort 2 ends 2019; #3 ends 2020; #4 ends 2021 (Goal 4b) • In-service teachers (12) complete summer institutes each year (2c) • 15 in-service teachers (degree Cohort 2 in 2019/ 3 in 2020 selected for ESL coursework completed (Goal 4a)
--	--	--	--

<p>Years 2-4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New preservice Cohort of 6 begins each year—Cohort 2 (2018); Ct. 3 (2019); Ct. 4 (2020); begin online modules (Goal 1c); attend PIRC PD (Goal 3a); begin ESL courses (Goal 4b); In-service teachers begin each year; 40 begin online EL PD modules (Goal 1b); of the 50, 22 attend family and community engagement. PD (Goal 3; 6 begin courses toward ESL MA (degree Ct. 1 in 2018; Ct. 2 in 2019; Ct. 3 in 2020 (Goal 4A) • In-service endorsement Cohort take Praxis (degree Ct. 1 in 2018; Ct. 2 in 2019; Ct. 3 in 2020 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preservice Cohorts finish online modules (Goal 1c); attend PIRC Spring PD (Goal 3a) continue ESL courses (Goal 4b) • 50 In-service teachers and 25 administrators completed online modules (Goal 1b); 20 attended January roundtable discussion and PIRC training (Goal 3) • Degree Cohorts continue courses toward MA with emphasis in ESL (Goal 4b). • In-service teachers apply for summer institutes—12 selected • In-service teachers apply in late spring for online PD module 	<p>Train 3 EL Coaches on Reflective Coaching (Goal 21)</p> <p>Preservice Cohorts complete summer EL PD institutes (Goal 2b); complete coursework—Cohort 2 ends 2019, #3 ends 2020, #4 ends 2021 (Goal 4b)</p> <p>15 in-service teachers completed summer institutes each year (Goal 2c)</p> <p>6 in-service teachers (degree Cohort #2 in 2019 and #3 in 2020 selected for ESL coursework completion (Goal 4a)</p>
------------------------------------	--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In-service Cohort 1 finishes program in 2020 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> participation (Goal 1b); 50 will be selected and control group assigned Recruit 8 preservice teachers each year for the next preservice Cohort; determine Cohort before summer 	
Year 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preservice Cohort 5 (8) begin online EI PD modules (Goal 1c) In-service K-12 teachers attend PIRC PD (Goal 3a); begin ESL courses (Goal 4b) In-service teachers (50) begin online EL PD modules (Goal 1b); 30 are selected for PD in family engage. & attend PIRC fall PD (3a) In-service degree Ct. finishes 2020 Ct. 3 cont. ESL endorsement (4a) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preservice Cohort 5 finished online modules (Goal 1c); attend PIRC spring PD (Goal 3a); continue ESL courses (Goal 4b) 50 In-service teachers completed modules (Goal 1b); 20 attend January roundtable discussion and PIRC PD (Goal 3a); degree Cohort 3 continue coursework (Goal 4a) 12 In-service teachers apply for summer institute 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preservice Cohort 5 completed summer institute (Goal 2b); completed ESL courses (Goal 4b) In-service teachers (12) completed summer institute (Goal 2c) Cohort 3 finishes program coursework in fall 2022.

c) Extent the time commitment of the PD/PI/other personnel is appropriate and adequate.

The time commitments for each of **SOAR**'s personnel are based on the respective responsibilities found in Section C1 of the Management Plan. The time dedicated by key personnel is appropriate and adequate to meet project objectives and outcomes. **The PI (35%)** will oversee project implementation, supervise personnel, assist in creating the online EL modules, plan/ implement the onsite El Summer PD institutes, collaborate with PIRC to implement the parent engagement and outreach, and collaborate with the PD and External Evaluator to disseminate project findings through presentations and scholarly articles.

The PD (1.0 FTE) will support the PI in project implementation, supervision of personnel, planning and delivery of online EL PD modules, training of EL Coaches and working with participants in summer PD institutes, and dissemination of project findings through presentations and scholarly articles. The part-time **summer El PD Coordinator** will collaborate with the PI and PD in planning, coordinating and supervising the SOAR onsite, summer El PD institutes. Duties will also include recruitment and registration of 4-17 year olds for the site of the summer PD institutes, assign classrooms/ teachers and matching coaches/ teachers **The Administrative Assistant/Fiscal Associate (1.0 FTE)** will manage all fiscal operations, process payments— purchasing, salaries, tuition, other disbursements, manage all financial documents and serve as a link to UA's grant office.

Dr. Robert Fanning, through Educational Solutions, will oversee the project's evaluation. Dr. Fanning has been a PI, PD and investigator on teacher training grants with the USDE and has led numerous evaluations of other federally funded training projects. He has generated numerous Annual Performance Reports (APRs) that include GPRA measure outcomes. His evaluation team has also evaluated other personnel preparation and teacher training grants for the USDE and NSF,

contributing to APRs, and Final Performance Reports (FPR). These evaluators are skilled at both quantitative and qualitative research methods and have expertise in developing and validating evaluation measures such as the classroom environment scale **SOAR**. The evaluation team will meet at least quarterly with the PI and PD and the Evaluation Planning Team (EPT) will work collaboratively to assure that data is collected for making timely program improvements and for considering the intended/ unintended outcomes as part of the evaluation.

Finally, some of the personnel proposed for **SOAR** are on current Title III projects that will end in FY 2017. As such, they will be able to carryover their expertise and understanding of how to implement effectively the SOAR grant proposal.

Section D: Quality of Project Evaluation (20 points).

1) Extent to the evaluation methods is thorough, feasible and appropriate.

SOAR will be assessed through scientifically supported and research-driven methods of measurement, examination, analysis and documentation. With this process in mind, project staff and collaborating partners will align prudently themselves with designated evaluation criteria set by the evaluative standards found within the RFP and OELA NPD guidelines. The project will systematically target, monitor progress against and achieve GPRA and Program Measures. These indicators are further aligned to the project goal and its various supporting objectives with expected outcomes.

SOAR's evaluation design is process-oriented and built for accountability, as the evaluative methods align logically, appropriately and feasibly to project activities and outcomes and that such activities and outcomes are targeted to the project goals. Furthermore, the EPT—Evaluation Planning Team—is confident that it can accomplish the proposed evaluation processes on time and within budget. **Evaluation Model:** **SOAR's** evaluation will be grounded on a traditional

SOAR—Strategically Organized for EL Academic Results

CIPP evaluation model; that is, context, input, process and product. CIPP is consistent with the logic model found in **Table 3**, page 24. The resources (inputs) and long-term impacts (outcome) typically found as a part of the logic model have been limited due to space constraints. However, within CIPP, context and input evaluation components will address inputs and the environmental outcomes of **SOAR**. The process evaluation component will address activities—often cited as outputs of the logic model. All activities/outcomes of **SOAR** correspond directly to the targeted long-term impacts. The project involves diverse groups of participants including K-12 teachers, K-12 coaches, K-12 preservice teachers, administrators, PD curriculum developers and presenters, as well as, K-12 students and their families and each community. All groups will be involved/ reported in the process/ product evaluation system.

Context evaluation will consist of the description of the K-12 teachers in the treatment and control conditions each year, as well as characteristics of their classrooms, information on prior exposure that any participant has had regarding ELs, and technological resources. Support for online PD will include a Blackboard support desk available in the evenings and on weekends to assist participants in completing online modules. This aspect of the evaluation provides insight about the environment associated with implemented project activities, and as such, can be useful when considering issues of program improvement, scalability, comparability and sustainability. Input evaluation will monitor the expended grant-based and non-grant resources that were used to implement the project activities that indirectly support the project. This data and information will provide a context for how fiscal and personnel resources were allocated within and outside **SOAR** that supported the goals of the project. Such data further informs the need for program improvement, sustainability and transferability of the project. This aspect of the evaluation involves the monitoring of grant fiscal expenditures in light of proposed plans and non-grant

resources used on behalf of the project program and GPRA goal attainment.

Process evaluation concentrates on the extent to which: a) project activities are delivered as expected (e.g. online micro-credential development, fidelity of PD implementation, teacher recruitment and assignment, delivery of all institutes, symposia, etc.); 2) project activities involve the types/ numbers of participants targeted; 3) the project observes the established timeline for the delivery of activities; and, 4) activity modifications occur as a result of both informal and formal feedback from the EPT, External Evaluator or other key stakeholders. It is crucial to comprehend the qualities associated with the fidelity, strengths, and limitations of delivery of program processes, as the activities are assumed to directly relate to success in achieving program outcomes that are consistent with the theories of change and the propelling logic model. Process evaluation data collection will be secured by the External Evaluation team, the EPT and internal project personnel. Various approaches will be utilized to collect/ record/ document implementation data— e.g. observations, logs, online micro-credential usage statistics, evaluation of teaching materials/ resources, course and PD registrations and meeting minutes.

The product (Outcome) evaluation emphasis is on the degree to which targeted outcomes were achieved for participants—preservice, in-service, coaches, administrators, and ELs. Found within the Outcome Evaluation Chart (**Table 3**). Primary project outcomes and the measurement procedures used to monitor success would be summarized. A multi-approach will be used to monitor and analyze the accomplishments of all quantitative and qualitative outcomes.

Table 3: SOAR’s Logic Model		
Activities/ Resources/ Participants	Short Term Outcomes -	Long Term Outcomes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop online modules in Year 1 • Validate ESL Class. Observation Meas. Year 1 • Randomly sample 200 in-service K-12 teachers per year from a volunteer pool to complete online EI PD system—unselected teachers each year who apply for the subsequent year as well will serve as the comparison sample for each Cohort • Preservice candidates (16) complete online PD—4 per year, Years 2-5) • In-service teachers (60) will be randomly selected from those who volunteer after 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 80% of in-service and preservice who score proficient on each module evaluation. • 80% of K-12 teachers who participate in PD symposia recall 2 or more issues from the PD; 70% will describe 1 activity that they implemented as a result of PD • 80% of the K-12 participants express satisfaction with activities and rate all PD activities as effective in preparing them to serve ELs and their families • Validated classroom EL 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coaches indicate 70% of participants show a sustained effect and ability to serve ELs for at least 1-year after program completion. • Degree of statistical and practical significance associated with TELLS on pretest and posttest for each module for each group • EL Coaches improve scores on Knight’s Coaching Practice Observation Scale • Statistically and practically significant difference between ELs’ performance on TS GOLD and

<p>completing online training will participate in 2-week summer institute—12 per year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preservice teachers (40) will participate in 2-week summer institute—8 per year • EL Coaches 2 cohorts (12 per cohort) will receive Knights Coach Model during the summer institute • K-12 educators (150, 30 per year) will attend focused, ongoing PD symposiums • In-service teachers will graduate degree and ESL certification (18 total, 6 per year in Years 2 through 5) • Preservice K-12 candidates (40 total, 8 per year) will complete 4 ESL courses towards ESL endorsement 	<p>environmental measures, and self-efficacy ratings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants completing summer institutes and the online courses will show significantly higher CLASS & EL environmental ratings. Their students will show greater student gains on the PPVT—4 and TSGOLD than teachers who only complete online PD 	<p>PPVT—4 for teachers who complete online PD and those who do not during each Cohort</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statistical significant difference between K-12 teachers who complete and those who do not access online modules on performance on improvements in CLASS, validated classroom EL environmental measures, and self-efficacy ratings • In-service teachers complete ESL endorsement and/or TESOL graduate certification (60 total)
---	--	---

Measurement Approaches: A series of measurement approaches will be utilized in this study for process and product evaluation completion. A variety of electronic surveys and assessments will be developed and conducted. Pretest and post assessments for all modules will be developed and completed—with 75% overlapping items on each measure. Content measures will be developed and conducted for the PD symposia. Some online surveys will monitor initial and follow-up satisfaction of participants. Other surveys will monitor and address the participants' perception regarding fidelity for implementation of project activities, as well as, self-reports of implementation. The CLASS assessment tool will be employed as a valid measure of classroom environment and will be supplemented by an EL classroom observation scales relating to best practices in EL instruction. The new scale will be validated during Year 1 in collaboration between investigators and the evaluation team. A validated measure of self-efficacy for teachers of ELs—the Carney's TELLS will be used to measure changes in self-efficacy of K-12 teachers. Using the PPVT—4 and TSGOLD, K-12 student data will be collected and analyzed across academic and developmental domains with repeated measures. These measures will be collected along with the use of the Arkansas's K-12 teacher and student evaluation system.

Relationship of the EPT—Evaluation Planning Team—to SOAR's Management Team: Dr. Robert Fanning (Educational Solutions) will be contracted to conduct the evaluation. Dr. Fanning, CEO and director of ES, has been a PI, PD on numerous federal and state grants. He has been a university professor most recently at Kansas State University, a school administrator, an ESL teacher, special education and classroom teacher for over 40 years. He has led previous NPD teacher training projects, and his experience ensures that project outcomes are achieved and accomplished on time and within budget. The evaluators are committed to using data collected as

part of process and product evaluation to inform decisions and improve practices.

The Evaluation Planning Team (EPT), consisting of the PI, PD, participant, IHE and SEA representatives, parents and students, will review confounding factors (positive and negative) that may impact outcomes, as these aspects may cause a need to be flexible in order to address them appropriately. The EPT will meet with the project leadership quarterly. As cited earlier, the evaluation planning team will consist of experts with backgrounds in the evaluation of K-12 EL programs, developing online surveys, teacher training modules, evaluating teacher training programs (Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation), evaluating the quality of PD, and conducting focus groups and interviews with diverse populations. Furthermore, the EPT will have additional consulting access to other resources and personnel with expertise in student and adult teacher learning.

GPRAs and Program Measures: The evaluation plan is calculated to generate information and data that assesses program effectiveness according to grant requirements and within the GPRA framework. Each year, the EPT will determine **SOAR**'s progress in meeting GPRA and program measures. As required by the USDE, such progress will be reported in quarterly reports, APRs and the Final Performance Report (FPR). The evaluation of program outcomes, along with the measures and timelines for the evaluation of each, is found in **Table 4**.

Table 4: Evaluation Of Program/ GPRA Outcomes		
Outcomes	Measure	Timing
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pre/ In-service teachers (80%) will score at proficient level or above on module evaluation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project developed pretesting/ post-testing assessment based on each micro-credential 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Online data collected with annual evaluation of results

SOAR—Strategically Organized for EL Academic Results

	<p>& rubric to review videos showing participant application of learning</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A statistically (d=.33 or greater) significant gain in the %age of correct scores between pretest/posttests for each group module 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project developed pretesting/ post-testing content matter knowledge assessments based on each module 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Online data collected with annual evaluation of results
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A statistical (d=.33) difference between K-12 teachers completing and those who do not complete the online modules on the performance on CLASS, validated classroom EL environment measures and self-efficacy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carney’s Teaching English Language Learners Scale. Self-efficacy measure, CLASS environment scales and ELs environment observation scale administered, analyzed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fall to spring classroom environment and self-efficacy measures data collected, analyzed and submitted results in APRs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A statistical difference between ELs performance on TSGOLD and the PPVT—4 for teachers who complete online training and with those who do not for each cohort 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TSGOLD sub-scores and the PPVT—4 administered with gathered data analyzed and reported 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fall to spring data collected and analyzed of control group Cohorts completed each

SOAR—Strategically Organized for EL Academic Results

		year
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summer institute teachers who also participate with the online modules will have significantly higher CLASS and environment ratings, self-efficacy ratings, and greater student gains on the PPVT—4 and TSGOLD than teachers who complete online only 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TELLS self-efficacy measure, CLASS, TSGOLD, PPVT—4 measures completed, analyzed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fall to spring classroom and child measures after the summer institutes; Spring to spring self-efficacy completed with results analyzed
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EL Coaches will improve scores on the Knight’s Reflecting Coaching Model and the Coaching Practices Observation Scale outcomes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coaching Practices Rating Scale completed and analyzed. Review of candidate’s videos of application with ELs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spring of each year
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 80% of the teachers express satisfaction with activities and rate all PD activities as effective or very effective in preparing them to serve ELs, their families and communities (GPRA, 4 , 6) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Online survey, data completed and analyzed with report findings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Following one month after PD completion
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers (80%) who participate in PD symposia recall 2 or more issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developed online survey data completed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Following one month after PD

SOAR—Strategically Organized for EL Academic Results

from the PD and 70% can describe one activities that they implemented	and analysis completed with report findings	completion
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coaches/ school leaders indicate improvement in ability to serve teachers (80%) for those who completed online modules; 70% of the participants demonstrate sustained skills for at least one year after program completion (GPRA 5) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Online survey developed and completed by coaches/ school leaders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Springtime of each project year
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 80% of in-service teachers complete modules, summer institutes, coursework and graduate program (GPRA 1, 2 and 3) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Logs of attendance; Registered grades and completion of requirements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ongoing and annually summarized

2) Evaluation methods will produce evidence about the project’s effectiveness that meets the What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards with reservations.

The EPT and project staff have confidence in the evaluation activities of **SOAR**, as the activities are informed by best practice and that the research/evaluation plan—randomized or matched cluster assignment—will measure the differential effects of micro-credential-based PD on teacher behavior, teacher self-efficacy, classroom characteristics and EL students’ academic and development outcomes that meet the WWC Evidence Standards. K-12 teachers from across the state will have the opportunity to apply to participate in the online micro-credentialed training. All K-12 teachers who are interested in joining **SOAR** will be requested to complete demographic information and the self-efficacy scale relating to serving ELs. Fifty teachers will be randomly

selected from the completers. All other teachers will serve as the potential pool of the comparison group. Differences in the distribution of ELs across the state, the density of classrooms within certain facilities (a risk of cross-contamination of a treatment effect may exist if comparison and treatment classrooms are nested within the same facility), and differences in classroom type distributions across the state may preclude random sampling of comparison teachers/ classrooms. Classrooms of treatment teachers will be paired with comparison classrooms based on the type of the classroom, number of ELs, self-efficacy score of teachers and the region of the state. Annually, a new cohort of K-12 teachers will be recruited for the online PD in the same way—including the completion of the self-efficacy measure. Of the initial comparison group, it is expected that a significant number of participants will wish to participate in the PD during the subsequent year and will, therefore, complete the application and self-efficacy measure again. Therefore, repeated measures of self-efficacy for all treatment and a subset of comparison teachers will occur. This process will continue during each year of the project. The EPT and program management team believe that these clusters (i.e. teacher/ classroom) matching processes meet or exceed the WWC's Evidence Standards in terms of the impact of the online micro-credentials and the summer institutes on classroom environment and student outcomes. (see competitive priority #1 p. 12).

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

Ensuring continuous feedback and improvement that includes ongoing communication between staff, formative/summative evaluation activities, outside agency collaborations, and the EPT, **SOAR** has identified procedures needed to accomplish this outcome in **Table 5**.

Table 5: Communication Processes and Resulting Project Improvements

Project Process	Results From Continuous Feedback Looping
Bi-weekly project staff meetings	Review implementation plan, process data and allocation of human and fiscal resources
Coordination between project staff, mentors, partner service providers	Increased breadth/depth quality of support resulting in increased teacher and student performance
Integrated systematic evaluation collecting qualitative and quantitative data	Implementation and process data for program improvement and summative evaluation reports
PI, PD and other staff meet monthly as they visit local coaches to discuss status implementation of PD with participants	Participant’s individual needs are met through planned and reviewed direct services; participants take an active part in goal setting for short and long-term planning
Structured communication processes between project staff and regional sites established; between partners, staff and participants	The Communication Plan maintains information regarding the effectiveness over regional service areas. Instruction/ support services accountability is maintained through Cohort team reviews

SOAR connects a number of mechanisms to ensure results are produced, including high quality products/services such as: 1) coordinated project activities as delineated in **Section A**; 2) evaluation activities (**Section D**); 3) bi-weekly staff meetings; 4) EPT (**Section C**); 5) Evaluation timelines are monitored and document project implementation efforts (**Section D**); and, 6) the completion of annual evaluation reports (**Section D**). Data will be collected from a

series of cohorts, and assessments will occur with enough frequency for the project to make corrections and improvement while participants are in the programs. The cohort nature of **SOAR** allows for improvements to benefit subsequent cohorts. The management and EPT teams believe the evaluation plan will provide performance feedback of sufficient frequency to promote program success for all targeted groups of participants.

4) The evaluation methods will provide valid and reliable performance data on outcomes.

The evaluation will use appropriate usable, viable and reliable analysis methods and statistical techniques that focus both on the process and products of K-12 in-service/ preservice preparedness to work with ELs and on student outcomes—see program evaluation measures in **Table 4** The evaluation design is to provide a comprehensive look at the effectiveness of the project by taking a team approach to the evaluation planning process. Upon notification of contract award, an EPT will be formed consisting of key stakeholders in the project who will meet quarterly to discuss the evaluation design, the results of project implementation, and ways to improve the project. This use of evaluation information for continuous improvement is one of the tenets of the project.

To further increase the objectivity of the evaluation process and to lead the Evaluation Planning Team, a highly-qualified external evaluation team under the leadership of Dr. Fanning will be contracted. Dr. Robert Fanning has evaluated over 100 Federal grant awards in 21 states, including Arkansas.

The EE will inform EPT regarding evaluation activities, person(s) responsible for carrying out the evaluation activities, and the timelines for completion. An evaluation-planning calendar will be drafted and distributed to each member of the team within one week after the first EPT meeting. Because the EPT is broad-based, it is an appropriate and objective vehicle for completing the evaluation of **SOAR** with valid and reliable GPRA and program outcome measures

References

- Allen, J.P., Pianta, R.C., Gregory, A., Mikami, A. Y., & Lun, J. (2011). An interaction-based approach to enhancing secondary school instruction and student achievement. *Science*, 333(6045), 1034-1037.
- August, D., Branum-Martin, L., Cardenas-Hagan, E., & Francis, D. J. (2009). The impact on an instructional intervention on the science and language learning of middle grade English language learners. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness*, 2(4). 345-376.
- Austin, J.S. (2007). Working effectively with IHE faculty: Partners in ESL education. Panelist: *Higher education faculty development: Strategies that support and enhance English language learners' school success*. Office of English Language Acquisition Celebrate Our Rising Stars Summit VI, Washington, DC.
- Ball, D. L., & Cohen, D. K. (1999). Developing practices, developing practitioners: Toward a practice-based theory of professional development. In G. Sykes & L. Darling-Hammonds (Eds.), *Teaching as the learning profession: Handbook of policy and practice* (pp. 30–32). San Francisco, CA
- Berry, B., Montgomery, D., & Snyder, J. (2008). Urban teacher residency models and institutes of higher education: Implications for teacher preparation. Washington, DC: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. Retrieved from http://www.ncate.org/documents/news/UTR_IHE_Aug122008.pdf.
- Blank, R. K., de las Alas, N., & Smith, C. (2008). Does teacher professional development have effects on teaching and learning: Analysis of evaluation findings from programs for mathematics and science teachers in 14 states. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers. Retrieved from http://www.ccsso.org/content/pdfs/crossstate_study_rpt_final.pdf
- Boyd, D., Grossman, P., Lankford, H., Loeb, S., & Wyckoff, J. (2006). How changes in entry requirements alter the teacher workforce and affect student achievement. *Journal of Education Finance and Policy*, 1, 176-216.
- Boyd, D., Lankford, H., Loeb, S., & Wyckoff, J. (2005). Explaining the short careers of high-achieving teachers in schools with low-performing students. *American Economic Review*, 95(2), 166-171.
- Boyd, D., Loeb, S., Wyckoff, J., Lankford, H., & Rockoff, J. (2008). The narrowing gap in New York City teacher qualifications and its implications for student achievement in high-poverty schools. *Journal of Policy Analysis & Management*, 27, 793- 818. Retrieved from <http://www.teacherpolicyresearch.org/portals/1/pdfs/JPAM%20Narrowing%20the%20Gap.pdf>
- Brandt, C., Mathers, C., Oliva, M., Brown-Sims, M., & Hess, J. (2007). Examining district guidance to schools on teacher evaluation policies in the midwest region (REL 2007–No. 030). Washington, DC: Institute for Education Sciences Regional Education Laboratory Program.

- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1986). Ecology of the family as a context for human development: Research perspectives. *Developmental Psychology*, 22, 723-742.
- Carlo, M.S., August, D., McLaughlin, B., Snow, C.E., Dressler, C., Lippman, D.N., Lively, T., & White, C.E. (2004). Closing the gap: Addressing the vocabulary needs of English Language learners in bilingual and mainstream classrooms. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 39, 188-215. http://ies.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/intervention_reports/WWC_VIP_101906.pdf.
- Carney, M.S. (2012). Teaching English language learners scale (TELLS): A study of validity and reliability. Unpublished dissertation at the University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri.
- Center for Research on Education, Diversity & Excellence. (CREDE). (2017). The CREDE Five Standards for Effective Pedagogy and Learning. Crede.berkeley.edu/research/crede/standards.html
- Chen, C., Kyle, D.W., & McIntyre, M. (2008). Helping teachers work effectively with English language learners and their families. *The School Community Journal*, 18 (1), 7-20.
- Coady, M., Harper, C., and de Jong, Ester. (2011). From preservice to practice: Mainstream elementary teacher beliefs of preparation and efficacy with English language learners in the State of Florida. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 34 (2), 223-239.
- Darling-Hammond, L., & Haselkorn, D. (2009, April 1). Reforming teaching: Are we missing the boat? *Education Week*, pp. 30, 36. Retrieved from <http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2009/04/01/27hammond.h28.html>
- Darling-Hammond, L., Wei, R. C., Richardson, N., Andree, A., & Orphanos, S. (2009). Professional learning in the learning profession: A status report on professional development in the U.S. and abroad. Washington, DC: National Staff Development Council.
- Desimone, L., Porter, A. C., Garet, M., Yoon, K. S., & Birman, B. (2002). Effects of professional development on teachers' instruction: Results from a three-year longitudinal study. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 24, 81-112. Donaldson, M. (2009). So long, Lake Wobegon: Using teacher evaluation to raise teacher quality. Washington, DC: Center for American Progress.
- Delgado-Gaitan, C. (2001). *The power of community: Mobilizing for family and schooling*. New York: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Díaz-Maggioli, G. (2004). *A passion for learning: Teacher-centered professional development*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Dimino & Taylor. (2015). *Professional Learning Communities Facilitator's Guide*. National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance: Institute of Education Sciences.

Dunn, L.M., Dunn, D.M. (2007). *Peabody picture vocabulary test* (4th edition). Minneapolis, Minnesota, Pearson.

Epstein, J. L. (2009). *School, family and community partnerships: Your handbook for action* (3rd edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Hill, K. (2012). Empowering families and supporting students through family education workshops. *Association for Childhood Education International: Focus on PreK and K.*, 25 (2), 5-8.

Hill, K. (2015). Misguided intervention: RTI for emergent bilingual students in kindergarten. *MidSouth Literacy Journal* 1, (1), 13-28.

Hutchinson, M. (2012). Bridging the gap: Preservice teachers and their knowledge of working with English language learners. *TESOL Journal*, 4(1), 25-54.

Kim, D.H., Lambert, R.G., and Burts, D.C. (2013). Evidence of the validity of Teaching Strategies GOLD® assessment tool for English language learners and children with disabilities. *Early Education and Development*, 24 (4), 574-595.

Knowles, M.S. (1968). Andragogy, not pedagogy. *Adult Leadership*, 16 (10), 350-352.

Learningforward. (2016). Standards for professional learning. Retrieved from: <http://learningforward.org/standards/outcomes#.VorlyGdli70>

Leithwood, K., Louis, K. S., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). How leadership influences student learning. Chicago, IL: American Educational Research Association. Retrieved from <http://www.wallacefoundation.org/SiteCollectionDocuments/WF/Knowledge%20Center/Attacj.emts/PDF/Revow/Research/LearningFromLeadership.pdf>.

Loeb, S., Soland J., and Fox, F. (2014). Is a good teacher a good teacher for all? Comparing value-added of teachers with their English learners and non-English learners. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 36 (4), 457-475.

Merriam, S., and Bierama, L. (2014). *Adult Learning: Linking theory and practice*. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass.

Pianta, R.C., LaParo, K.M., and Hamre, B.K. (2008). *Classroom assessment scoring system [CLASS]*. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing.

Rush, D.D., Sheldon, M.L. (2006). Validity of the coaching practices rating scale. *Case in point: Insights into Early Childhood and Family Support Practices*, 2, 1-5.

Rush, D. D., Sheldon, M.L. (2011). *The early childhood coaching handbook*. Baltimore: Paul H. Brooks Publishing Co.

Samson, J.F., and Collins, B.A. (2012). Preparing all teachers to meet the needs of English language learners: Applying research to policy and practice for teacher effectiveness. Center for American Progress. <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED535608.pdf>

Snow, C.E., Lawrence, J.F., White, C. (2010). *Generating knowledge of academic language among urban middle school students*. Extract from the Society for Research on Educational Effectiveness conference. <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED513343>

Spezzini, S., Austin, J. (2010). Collaborative mentoring among K-12 teachers: Professional development on the effective instruction of English language learners. *AccELLerate! National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition*, 2 (2), 11-13. http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/accelerate/8/Accelerate_2_2.pdf.

Spezzini, S., Becker, A. (2012). Summer book clubs for ELLS: Teacher collaboration for promoting academic achievement. In A. Honigsfeld and M. Dove (Eds). *Co-teaching and other collaborative practices: Rational, research, reflections, and recommendations* (175-185). Information Age Publishing.

Spezzini, S., Austin, J., and Prado, J. (2015). “Why didn’t anyone tell me this before?” In D. Freeman and Y Freeman, *Research on preparing in-service teachers to work effectively with emergent bilinguals; Advances in Research on Teaching*, Volume 24 (205-232. Emerald Group Publishing, Limited.

TESOL International Association. (2010). *Standards for the Recognition of Initial TESOL Programs in P-12 ESL teacher Education*. Author.

The Annie E. Casey Foundation (2016). Kids Count Data Center. <http://datacenter.kidscount.org>. Baltimore, MD. Author.

U.S. Census Bureau, State and County QUickFacts. Retrieved March 15, 2017 from <http://www.census.gov/quickfacts/table/PST045215/00,01055>

U.S. Department of Education (2010). Supporting families and communities. Retrieved March 15, 2017. <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/blueprint/faq/supporting-family.pdf>.

Wasik, B.H. (Ed). (2012). *Handbook on family literacy—2nd edition*. New York: Routledge.

Waterman, R., Harry, B. (2008). *Building collaboration between schools and parents of English language learners: Transcending barriers, creating opportunities*. Tempe, AZ: National Center for Culturally Responsive Educational Systems.

What Works Clearinghouse (2013). *Evidence review protocol for interventions for English Language Learners*, Version 2.2. http://www.ies.ed.gov/nce/wwc/pdf/reference_reports/wwc_ell_protocol_v2.2pdf

What Works Clearinghouse (2015). *My teaching partner*. http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/intervention_reports/wwc_mtp_061615.pdf.

What Works Clearinghouse (2014). *Procedures and Standards Handbook (Version 3.0, March 2014)*. <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/DocumentSum.aspx?sid=19>.

Zimmerman, B., Bandura, A., Martinez-Pons, M. (1992). Self-motivation for academic attainment: The role of self-efficacy beliefs and personal goal setting. *American Educational Research Journal*, 29 (3), 663-676.

Other Attachment File(s)

* Mandatory Other Attachment Filename:

[Add Mandatory Other Attachment](#)

[Delete Mandatory Other Attachment](#)

[View Mandatory Other Attachment](#)

To add more "Other Attachment" attachments, please use the attachment buttons below.

[Add Optional Other Attachment](#)

[Delete Optional Other Attachment](#)

[View Optional Other Attachment](#)



DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES

Program Support Center
Financial Management Portfolio
Cost Allocation Services

1301 Young Street, Room 732
Dallas, TX 75202
PHONE: (214) 767-3261
FAX: (214) 767-3264
EMAIL: CAS-Dallas@psc.hhs.gov

April 4, 2017

Mr. Tim O'Donnell
Vice Chancellor for Finance & Administration
University of Arkansas
316 Administration Building
Fayetteville, AR 72701

Dear Mr. O'Donnell:

A copy of a facilities and administrative (F&A) cost and fringe benefit (FB) Rate Agreement are being sent to you for your signature. This Agreement reflects an understanding reached between your organization and a member of my staff concerning F&A and FB rates that may be used to support your claim for these indirect costs on grants and contracts with the Federal Government.

Please have the agreement signed by an authorized representative of your organization and return to me by email, retaining the copy for your files. Our email address is CAS-Dallas@psc.hhs.gov. We will reproduce and distribute the agreement to the appropriate awarding organizations of the Federal Government for their use.

In addition, your FB cost rate(s) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2017 based on actual costs for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2015 and FB cost rates for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2018 based on actual costs for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2016 under-recovered (-) or over-recovered (+) amounts are listed below:

	<u>2015/2017</u>	<u>2016/2018</u>
Group #1	\$10,303	(\$8,434)
Group #2	\$40,578	\$104,144
Group #3	(\$311,421)	(\$149,801)
Group #4	(\$28,872)	(\$23,308)
Group #5	(\$2,486,386)	(\$5,903,422)
Co-op Ext. Serv. #1	(\$438,897)	(\$444,173)
Co-op Ext. Serv. #2	(\$8,114)	\$3,327

The fixed rates for the fiscal years ended June 30, 2015 and June 30, 2016 are considered final.

Mr. T. Donnell
April 4, 2017
Page 2 of 2

During our review of your proposal, it was disclosed that the Institution's actuarially determined pension contributions exceeded the Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) Statement No. 68 calculated pension expense. However, 2 CFR 200.431(g)(3) only allows pension plan costs determined in accordance with GAAP (i.e., GASB 68). The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) is aware of this issue and is currently considering revising the regulations. Therefore, we reserve the right to revise this Agreement to disallow the pension contributions in excess of the GASB 68 calculated pension expense, if OMB does not revise the regulation or issue an exception.

Please indicate your concurrence with this condition by counter-signing this letter below and returning it to me.

A Fringe Benefit cost proposal, together with supporting information and the certified audit financial statement, is required each year. Thus, your next Fringe Benefit cost proposal based on actual costs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2017 is due in our office by December 31, 2017. Your next Facilities and Administrative cost rate proposal based on actual costs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2016 is currently under review.

Since this is an integral part of the negotiation agreement, please note your acceptance by signing in the space provided below of this letter.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Arif M. Karim -A

Arif Karim
Director
Cost Allocation Services

Digitally signed by Arif M. Karim -A
DN: c=US, o=U.S. Government, ou=HHS, ou=PSC,
ou=People, cn=Arif M. Karim -A,
0.9.2342.19200300.1001.1.1=2000212895
Date: 2017.04.05 12:04:07 -05'00'

Enclosures

ACCEPTANCE

University of Arkansas

Ins: (b)(6)


Signature

Tim O'Donnell
Name

Vice Chancellor, Finance
Title

4/14/17
Date

COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES RATE AGREEMENT

EIN: 1716003252A3

DATE:04/04/2017

ORGANIZATION:

FILING REF.: The preceding agreement was dated 02/05/2016

University of Arkansas
316 Administration Building
Fayetteville, AR 72701

The rates approved in this agreement are for use on grants, contracts and other agreements with the Federal Government, subject to the conditions in Section III.

SECTION I: INDIRECT COST RATES

RATE TYPES:	FIXED	FINAL	PROV. (PROVISIONAL)	PRED. (PREDETERMINED)	
<u>EFFECTIVE PERIOD</u>					
<u>TYPE</u>	<u>FROM</u>	<u>TO</u>	<u>RATE(%)</u>	<u>LOCATION</u>	<u>APPLICABLE TO</u>
PRED.	07/01/2014	06/30/2015	46.50	On Campus	Organized Research
PRED.	07/01/2015	06/30/2016	47.00	On Campus	Organized Research
PRED.	07/01/2016	06/30/2017	47.50	On Campus	Organized Research
PRED.	07/01/2013	06/30/2017	49.00	On Campus	Instruction
PRED.	07/01/2013	06/30/2017	37.00	On Campus	Other Sponsored Activities
PRED.	07/01/2013	06/30/2017	46.00	On Campus	Ag. Exp. Station
PRED.	07/01/2013	06/30/2017	42.00	On Campus	Ark. Arch. Survey Inst.
PRED.	07/01/2013	06/30/2017	31.00	On Campus	Coop. Ext. Service
PRED.	07/01/2013	06/30/2017	30.00	On Campus	Criminal Justice Inst.
PRED.	07/01/2013	06/30/2017	37.00	On Campus	Clinton School
PRED.	07/01/2013	06/30/2017	26.00	Off Campus	All Programs

ORGANIZATION: University of Arkansas

AGREEMENT DATE: 4/4/2017

<u>TYPE</u>	<u>FROM</u>	<u>TO</u>	<u>RATE(%)</u>	<u>LOCATION</u>	<u>APPLICABLE TO</u>
PROV.	07/01/2017	06/30/2019			Use same rates and conditions as those cited for fiscal year ending June 30, 2017.

*BASE

Modified total direct costs, consisting of all direct salaries and wages, applicable fringe benefits, materials and supplies, services, travel and up to the first \$25,000 of each subaward (regardless of the period of performance of the subawards under the award). Modified total direct costs shall exclude equipment, capital expenditures, charges for patient care, rental costs, tuition remission, scholarships and fellowships, participant support costs and the portion of each subaward in excess of \$25,000. Other items may only be excluded when necessary to avoid a serious inequity in the distribution of indirect costs, and with the approval of the cognizant agency for indirect costs.

ORGANIZATION: University of Arkansas
AGREEMENT DATE: 4/4/2017

SECTION I: FRINGE BENEFIT RATES**

<u>TYPE</u>	<u>FROM</u>	<u>TO</u>	<u>RATE(%)</u>	<u>LOCATION</u>	<u>APPLICABLE TO</u>
FIXED	7/1/2016	6/30/2017	0.20	All	Group #1
FIXED	7/1/2016	6/30/2017	6.26	All	Group #2
FIXED	7/1/2016	6/30/2017	6.68	All	Group #3
FIXED	7/1/2016	6/30/2017	16.24	All	Group #4
FIXED	7/1/2016	6/30/2017	28.71	All	Group #5
FIXED	7/1/2016	6/30/2017	33.52	All	CES Group #1
FIXED	7/1/2016	6/30/2017	7.85	All	CES Group #2
FIXED	7/1/2017	6/30/2018	0.38	All	Group #1
FIXED	7/1/2017	6/30/2018	5.74	All	Group #2
FIXED	7/1/2017	6/30/2018	5.95	All	Group #3
FIXED	7/1/2017	6/30/2018	16.19	All	Group #4
FIXED	7/1/2017	6/30/2018	30.98	All	Group #5
FIXED	7/1/2017	6/30/2018	34.14	All	CES Group #1
FIXED	7/1/2017	6/30/2018	6.98	All	CES Group #2
PROV.	7/1/2018	6/30/2020			Use same rates and conditions as those cited for fiscal year ending June 30, 2018.

** DESCRIPTION OF FRINGE BENEFITS RATE BASE:
Salaries and wages.

ORGANIZATION: University of Arkansas

AGREEMENT DATE: 4/4/2017

SECTION II: SPECIAL REMARKS

TREATMENT OF FRINGE BENEFITS:

The fringe benefits are charged using the rate(s) listed in the Fringe Benefits Section of this Agreement. The fringe benefits included in the rate(s) are listed below.

TREATMENT OF PAID ABSENCES

Vacation, holiday, sick leave pay and other paid absences are included in salaries and wages and are claimed on grants, contracts and other agreements as part of the normal cost for salaries and wages. Separate claims are not made for the cost of these paid absences.

OFF-CAMPUS DEFINITION: For all activities performed in facilities not owned by the institution and to which rent is directly allocated to the project(s) the off-campus rate will apply. Grants or contracts will not be subject to more than one F&A cost rate. If more than 50% of a project is performed off-campus, the off-campus rate will apply to the entire project.

Equipment Definition -

Equipment means article of nonexpendable, tangible personal property having a useful life of more than 1 year and an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more per unit.

FRINGE BENEFITS:

FICA	Retirement
Worker's Compensation	Life Insurance
Health Insurance	Long Term Disability
Unemployment Insurance	Short Term Disability
Tuition Remission	Employee Assistance Program
Dental Insurance	Termination Pay

The next Facilities and Administrative cost rate proposal based on actual costs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2016 is currently under review. The next Fringe Benefit cost proposal based on actual costs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2017 is due in our office by December 31, 2017.

ORGANIZATION: University of Arkansas

AGREEMENT DATE: 4/4/2017

SECTION III: GENERAL

A. LIMITATIONS:

The rates in this Agreement are subject to any statutory or administrative limitations and apply to a given grant, contract or other agreement only to the extent that funds are available. Acceptance of the rates is subject to the following conditions: (1) Only costs incurred by the organization were included in its facilities and administrative cost pools as finally accepted; such costs are legal obligations of the organization and are allowable under the governing cost principles; (2) The same costs that have been treated as facilities and administrative costs are not claimed as direct costs; (3) Similar types of costs have been accorded consistent accounting treatment; and (4) The information provided by the organization which was used to establish the rates is not later found to be materially incomplete or inaccurate by the Federal Government. In such situations the rate(s) would be subject to renegotiation at the discretion of the Federal Government.

B. ACCOUNTING CHANGES:

This Agreement is based on the accounting system purported by the organization to be in effect during the Agreement period. Changes to the method of accounting for costs which affect the amount of reimbursement resulting from the use of this Agreement require prior approval of the authorized representative of the cognizant agency. Such changes include, but are not limited to, changes in the charging of a particular type of cost from facilities and administrative to direct. Failure to obtain approval may result in cost disallowances.

C. FIXED RATES:

If a fixed rate is in this Agreement, it is based on an estimate of the costs for the period covered by the rate. When the actual costs for this period are determined, an adjustment will be made to a rate of a future year(s) to compensate for the difference between the costs used to establish the fixed rate and actual costs.

D. USE BY OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES:

The rates in this Agreement were approved in accordance with the authority in Title 2 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Part 200 (2 CFR 200), and should be applied to grants, contracts and other agreements covered by 2 CFR 200, subject to any limitations in A above. The organization may provide copies of the Agreement to other Federal Agencies to give them early notification of the Agreement.

E. OTHER:

If any Federal contract, grant or other agreement is reimbursing facilities and administrative costs by a means other than the approved rate(s) in this Agreement, the organization should (1) credit such costs to the affected programs, and (2) apply the approved rate(s) to the appropriate base to identify the proper amount of facilities and administrative costs allocable to these programs.

BY THE INSTITUTION:

University of Arkansas

(INSTI) (b)(6)
(SIGNA)

Tim O'Donnell

(NAME)
Vice Chancellor - Finance

(TITLE)
4/4/17

(DATE)

ON BEHALF OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

(AGENCY) Digitally signed by Arif M. Karim - A
DN: c=US, o=U.S. Government, ou=HHS,
ou=PSC, ou=People, cn=Arif M. Karim - A,
0.9.2342.19200300.100.1.1=2000212895
Date: 2017.04.05 12:03:03 -0500

Arif M. Karim - A

(SIGNATURE)

Arif Karim

(NAME)

Director, Cost Allocation Services

(TITLE)

4/4/2017

(DATE) 0009

HHS REPRESENTATIVE: Theodore Foster

Telephone: (214) 767-3261

SOAR

Position Descriptions for Key Personnel

Principal Investigator (PI) (35% FTE): The with the co-PI will coordinate the creation of the online PD micro-credentialing modules, the creation of two new ESL courses and the development and further validation of an EL Classroom Observation Instrument. The PI, with the Co-PI who serves as Project Director, will set up weekly supervision; consultation, and reporting meetings on activities. The Summer Institute Coordinator and the External Evaluator (Educational Solutions) will be part of these meetings as needed. The PI's further work entails the supervision and assistance with the development in-field, summer EL PD institutes; supervision of the Knight Reflective Coaching Model (RCM), collaboration with PIRC and the design and implementation of PD that focuses on family engagement; oversight of the graduate courses; and overall supervision of the project.

Co-Principal Investigator and Project Director (CoPI and PD) (100% FTE): The Co-PI and Project Director will collaborate with the PI in supervising all the PD, which includes consultation with the Summer Institute Coordinator, assistance with the online EL PD modules, training the EI Coaches on the Knight Reflective Coaching Model, validation of the ESL Classroom Observation Instrument and co-oversight of the project. The Co-PI and Project Director will devote 100% FTE to Project SOAR.

Coordinator for Summer Symposiums (SSC) (33% FTE): The summer institute coordinator will have a specialty in early childhood education and literacy. The selected individual will collaborate with the PI and PD in planning, coordinating and supervising the in-field, summer EL PD institutes. This individual will assist with the development and implementation of the in-depth PD for the summer institute participants. His/her duties will include recruitment and registration of ECE students, with a focus on English learners, for the site of the summer PD institute and assigning classroom and teachers. The summer coordinator will devote 25 % FTE time to Project SOAR, which represented three months during the summer as payment equal to 33% of a 9-month faculty salary. **Fiscal Associate (AA) (100% FTE):** The FA will be responsible for managing all fiscal operations for the project. The FTE will process purchasing, salaries, tuition payments and other disbursements. This position is 1.0 FTE to be paid by grant funds.

Research Associate (RA) (100% FTE) The RA will be responsible for organizing research including literature review, methods and research results to ensure program interest and spread state-wide and national replication. This position is 1.0 FTE to be paid by grant funds.

External Evaluator—(EE) (35% FTE) The external evaluator with his team will be responsible for all aspects related to the evaluation of this project. The evaluation team will design the study evaluation based on WWC standards, gather and analyze quantitative and qualitative data, interpret findings, and prepare the Annual Performance and Final Performance Reports



Arkansas Department of Education

Transforming Arkansas to lead the nation in student-focused education

April 20, 2017

Johnny Key
Commissioner

Janet Penner-Williams, Ed. D.
College of Education and Health Professions
335 Graduate Education Bldg.
University of Arkansas
Fayetteville, AR 72701

**State Board
of Education**

Mireya Reith
Fayetteville
Chair

Dear Dr. Penner-Williams:

Dr. Jay Barth
Little Rock
Vice Chair

As the ESOL Program Director for the Arkansas Department of Education (ADE), I am writing this letter in support of *Project SOAR—Strategically Organized For EL Academic Results*, being submitted to the Office of English Language Acquisition in consideration for funding through the National Professional Development program CFDA 84.365Z by the College of Education and Health Services at University of Arkansas (UA). Arkansas has 41,932 English Learners (ELs) comprising 9% of the student population. Many of our ELs are in rural districts with few or no trained English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) teachers.

Joe Black
Newport

ADE believes that by partnering with UA in this endeavor, we will be able to scale-up implementation of a coordinated, statewide system of personnel development and professional development (PD) that will increase the capacity of Arkansas school systems across the state to establish and use research-based instruction, interventions, strategies and assessments to improve the language and academic performance of English Learners (ELs).

Susan Chambers
Bella Vista

Charisse Dean
Little Rock

Dr. Fitz Hill
Little Rock

As a partner in this project, ADE commits to collaborating with UA to design and implement PD to educators across the state that will enhance the effective and meaningful application of research-based best practices for ELs that should be evident in Tier 1 Core Instruction for elementary and secondary students. It is critical that educators of ELs in Arkansas be able to integrate the Arkansas Academic Standards, the state's English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards, the existing Arkansas Teacher Performance Standards and CREDE Standards to design and drive instruction. ADE is currently in the process of adding two EL Specialists to build capacity for providing integrated professional development to educators throughout the state and *Project SOAR* would greatly accelerate our ability to effect change throughout the state.

Ouida Newton
Poyen

R. Brett Williamson
El Dorado

Diane Zook
Melbourne

ADE fully embraces the project's plans to provide PD to educators on how to provide outreach activities for parents, family, and community members that improves engagement in ELs' education and social involvement. This is critical to the success of ELs in Arkansas. ADE anticipates collaborating with UA on a thorough evaluation of *Project SOAR* to ensure program objectives are well-monitored.

Four Capitol Mall
Little Rock, AR
72201-1019
(501) 682-4475
ArkansasEd.gov

We are excited about the opportunity to partner with UA, schools, teachers and parents to advance outcomes for our EL students!

Sincerely,

(b)(6)

*An Equal
Opportunity
Employer*

PR/Award # T365Z170235

Tricia Kerr
Page e68
Arkansas Department of Education ESOL Program Director

Northwest Arkansas Education Service Cooperative

4 N. Double Springs Road, Farmington Arkansas 72730
479-267-7450 FAX 479-267-7456

April 18, 2017

Dr. Janet Penner-Williams
Senior Associate Dean
College of Education & Health Professions
University of Arkansas
Fayetteville, AR 72701

Dear Dr. Penner-Williams:

The Northwest Arkansas Education Service Cooperative is eager to support the grant proposal being submitted by the University of Arkansas—**Strategically Organized for EL Academic Results (SOAR)**. We are already working with the Arkansas Department of Education (ADE) ESOL program to provide support to in-service teachers and administrators in our region in best practices for ESL. The micro-credentialing modules proposed by the grant would increase our effectiveness with the northwest Arkansas in-service teachers and administrators both in public and private schools.

In addition, the Northwest Arkansas Education Service Cooperative also provides training for teachers in parent/family community engagement. The cooperative and the University of Arkansas together as partners for parent family community engagement for English Learner families would be able to make a major impact on the region of Arkansas that has the highest number of English Learners in the state.

Finally, while the Northwest Arkansas Education Service Cooperative works primarily with the northwest region of the state, we also work state-wide with the other 15 Arkansas Educational Cooperatives. We would be able to assist Project SOAR in taking the training for teachers, administrators, families, and communities of English Learners statewide.

(b)(6)

Marcia Sanders

Serving the public schools of Benton, Madison & Washington Counties
Bentonville Decatur, Elkins Farmington, Fayetteville, Gentry Gravette, Greenland, Huntsville, Lincoln
Pea Ridge, Prairie Grove, Rogers, Siloam Springs, Springdale, West Fork

Making a Difference!



UNIVERSITY OF
ARKANSAS

College of Education
& Health Professions
Education Renewal Zone

GRAD 110 ♦ Fayetteville, Arkansas 72701 ♦ (479) 575-3641 ♦ (479) 575-8797 (Fax)
College of Education & Health Professions, Education Renewal Zone

04/19/2017

Lindsey Swagerty
Director, UA Education Renewal Zone
751 W Maple Street, GRAD 110
Fayetteville, AR 72701

Re: Letter of Commitment to project SOAR—Strategically Organized For EL Academic
Results

I am writing to express our support in collaborating with project SOAR.

The University of Arkansas's Education Renewal Zone is a broad-based P-20 initiative assigned the task of concentrating and coordinating available resources to improve school performance and student achievement. The primary focus is through a collaborative effort of the partners to build the capacity of schools in providing a competent organizational structure, a quality learning environment, and effective research-based instruction for all students.

The establishment of Education Renewal Zones provides a vehicle for the collaborative development of a partnership among institutions of higher education, education service cooperatives, public schools, local businesses, parents, and community members all focused on school improvement and systemic educational reform in Arkansas.

The UA Education Renewal Zone will provide the following support and assistance:

- Assist with publicity, recruitment, and registration
- Provide resources for transportation
- Provide supplies for participants
- Contribute to professional development and presentation cost

(b)(6)

Lindsey M. Swagerty
Director: Education Renewal Zone (ERZ)
University of Arkansas
College of Education and Health Professions
GRAD 110
Fayetteville, AR 72701
Email: lmswager@uark.edu
Phone: 479-575-3641



April 19, 2017

Dr. Janet Penner-Williams
Senior Associate Dean
College of Education & Health Professions
University of Arkansas
Fayetteville, AR 72701

Dear Dr. Penner-Williams:

The University of Arkansas Global Campus is proud to partner with the College of Education and Health professions on the grant proposal for **Strategically Organized for EL Academic Results (SOAR)**. Global Campus will provide its expertise in assisting participating faculty to design online PD modules for micro-credentialing teachers and administrators in English-as-a-Second Language best practices.

Global Campus is the University of Arkansas's premier support unit for online degree, certificate, and course programming; learning technologies generally; and non-credit workforce-development programming. Our Instructional Designers, Academic Technologists, Support Specialists, and Media Production professionals work closely with faculty to help design, build, and deliver high-quality, innovative, engaging, and effective for-credit and non-credit course content across all instructional modes: fully online (whether part of a fully online or an on-campus program), a hybrid course of both online and face-to-face delivery, a fully face-to-face course, or a self-paced online course. Global Campus has helped to develop and currently supports the University's 43 online graduate and undergraduate degree, certificate, and licensure programs and plans, and its 551 online courses, as well as its robust catalogue of non-credit offerings. We assist the 2,747 U of A students studying exclusively online, and the nearly 13,000 U of A students who take at least one online course, as well as the more than 27,000 students who use learning-technology resources. As a support unit to the entire campus, we work well in an interdisciplinary environment. Our years of providing support to several intercollegiate consortia have given us experience working with faculty and administrators across multiple institutions. We have partnered with U of A departments in aid of other grants at the state and federal levels and have ourselves been awarded a substantial state grant to provide workforce training. We have specific experience in designing and building modularized, micro-credentialed training programs. Finally, our business model emphasizes nimble, efficient, and cost-effective service delivery.

Based on our discussions with you concerning the deliverables contemplated under this grant, we are confident that our experience and expertise will be of substantial assistance in fulfillment of its requirements

(b)(6)

Donald P. Judges, J.D., Ph.D.,
Interim Vice Provost for Distance Education
Professor of Law
University of Arkansas

Lee Elementary School
Learning for All
400 Quandt
Springdale, AR 72764
Office: (479) 750-8868 Fax: (479) 750-8870
Principal: Justin Swope
Assistant Principal: Molly Brock

April 18, 2017

Dr. Janet Penner-Williams
Senior Associate Dean
College of Education & Health Professions
University of Arkansas
Fayetteville, AR 72701

Dear Dr. Penner-Williams:

Lee Elementary in Springdale Schools is eager to support the grant proposal being submitted by the University of Arkansas: **Strategically Organized For EL Academic Results (SOAR)**. We have seen the regression of learning affecting our English Learners over the summer months. We would be proud to partner with the University of Arkansas in providing a two week summer program for our ELs K-5th grade.

Our teachers in these grade levels would also appreciate the opportunity to take PD online for micro-credentialing or graduate course credit. Some of our teachers would likely volunteer for the one-week training prior to the EL two-week summer school and participate in the two week program with ELs. Since our school is sixty-nine percent English Learners, our teachers are always looking for ways to learn more about best practices with ELs.

Sincerely,

(b)(6)

Justin Swope, Ed. S.
Lee Elementary Principal



SPRINGDALE SCHOOL DISTRICT

Dr. Megan Slocum
Associate Superintendent

April 19, 2017

Janet Penner-Williams, Ed.D.
Assistant Dean for Academic Affairs
College of Education and Health Professions
Graduate Education Bldg. 335
Fayetteville, AR 72701

Re: *SOAR – Strategically Organized for EL Academic Results*

Dear Dr. Penner-Williams:

This letter is to convey Springdale Public School District's support for *SOAR*. Our school district has 9385 English Learners (ELs) and the population continues to grow. To date, 43% of our students are ELs and 54% speak a language other than English in their homes. Just fewer than 80% of District ELs are not ready or exceeding on the reading section of our state assessments. (ACT Aspire 2016). Our goal is to increase reading during the summer months by offering an enrichment opportunity for Pre-K through grade 5 ELs and their families.

Reading proficiency is a key indicator to a child's success in life. Project PREP encourages paraprofessionals, parents, teachers and community-based organizations to work closely together year round so that ELs reach their fullest potential. Additionally, we want to strengthen our relationships with parents of ELs and become more aware of community resources that can assist our families.

Springdale Public Schools is committed to supporting the University's Professional Development Program by the following:

- Participate in Professional Development outside the instructional day on evenings, summer and weekends to increase numbers of educators with up-to-date knowledge and skills, including research-based instructional practices to improve results for ELs.
- Implement research-based practices

Thank you for the opportunity to partner with the University of Arkansas on behalf of Springdale Public Schools.

Sincerely,

(b)(6)


Dr. Megan Slocum
Associate Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction



Keys for Networking, Inc.

Kansas Parent Information and Resource Center • www.keys.org

The State Organization of the Federation of Families for Children's Mental Health

Dr. Janet Penner-Williams
University of Arkansas
220 Peah
Fayetteville, AR 72701

Regarding: Project SOAR

Dear Dr. Penner-Williams,

Keys for Networking, serving as the Parent Information and Resource Center, is pleased to lead efforts and collaborate with the University of Arkansas in Fayetteville regarding the implementation of Project **SOAR—Strategically Organized For EL Academic Results**. This proposal is partially designed to improve parent, family and community engagement involvement (**Competitive Preference Priority 2**). This is where Keys fits in to the comprehensive design of the project.

Specifically, providing research grounded professional development that enhances the skills and competencies of school leaders (principals, program specialists, teachers, practitioners to build meaningful relationships with school age students' parents or families through systemic initiatives that may also support students' learning at home is a focus of our work that has extended over three decades.

We know that parents make good choices when they have sound information and access to resources. Keys is dedicated to building English learning "peer-to-peer" networks that connect parents & youth and provides access to services, resources and information for behavioral, education, emotional, mental health, physical health and substance abuse issues.

Knowing that our focus of work would be to design and implement PD activities that assist parents and educators in often high-stress situations. As such, Keys' primary mission is to provide stakeholders with reliable, valid and sound information and training tools so they can get the services and supports needed to effectively provide quality programming for all participants. Whereas, participants will become proficient in utilizing these newly acquired skills.

Keys is committed to complete SOAR's PD and outreach activities for parents, family and community members that is designed to enhance the engagement for young English learners. In fact, we will explicitly address the GPRA standard of ensuring that 80% of the professional development completers rate the program for skills in parent, family and community engagement as highly effective.

I wish to support you wholeheartedly in your pursuit of receiving this award. If I can be of any further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely, Dr.

(b)(6)

Executive Director

900 South Kansas Avenue, Suite 301 • Topeka, Kansas 66612
785-233-8732 • 800-499-8732 • FAX 785-235-6659
www.facebook.com/keys4networking

PR/Award # T3652170235

Budget Narrative File(s)

* **Mandatory Budget Narrative Filename:**

To add more Budget Narrative attachments, please use the attachment buttons below.

SOAR Budget Narrative

A. Personnel

Principal Investigator (PI) (35% FTE): Janet Penner-Williams, Ed.D. will be the PI as she has expertise and experience in early childhood education, English as a Second Language and parent/family/ community engagement. Dr. Penner-Williams will devote 35% FTE to Project SOAR, which is represented during the academic year as a one course release and two months of summer pay. 25% budgeted time is for the creation of the online PD modules, creation of two new ESL courses and the development and further validation of an EL Classroom Observation Instrument. Ten percent budgeted time is for weekly supervision; consultation with the Co-PI who serves as Project Director, the Summer Institute Coordinator and Dr. Fanning, head of the External Evaluation team. Dr. Penner-Williams' further work entails the development of and assistance with the in-field, summer EL PD institutes; collaboration with PIRC and the design and implementation of PD that focuses on family engagement; oversight of the graduate courses; and overall supervision of the project. Years 2 through 5 included annual salary adjustments for the projection of possible increases of 3% for inflation and rising health insurance costs. The cost is: Year 1 \$ 34,362; Year 2: \$35,393; Year 3 \$36,455; Year 4: \$37,549 and Year 5 \$38,676. TOTAL Years 1-5=\$182,435

Co-Principal Investigator and Project Director (CO—PI and PD) (100% FTE): Dr. Diana Gonzales Worthen will be the CO—PI with a specialty in teaching English Learners (ESL endorsement and reflective coaching. Dr. Gonzales Worthen will collaborate with the PI in supervising all the PD, which includes consultation with the Summer Institute Coordinator, assistance with the online EL PD modules, training the EI Coaches on the Knight Reflective Coaching Model, validation of the ESL Classroom Observation Instrument and co-oversight of the project. Dr. Gonzales Worthen will devote 100% FTE to Project RISE (project name). Years 2 through 5 included annual salary adjustments for the projection of possible increases of 1-2% for inflation and rising health insurance costs. The cost is: Year 1 \$ 80,000; Year 2: 81,600 Year 3 \$ 82,416; Year 4: 83,240; and Year 5 \$ 84,072. TOTAL Years 1-5=\$411,328

Coordinator for Summer Symposiums (SSC) (10%FTE): The summer institute coordinator (to be determined) will have a specialty in early childhood education and literacy. The selected individual will collaborate with the PI and PD in planning, coordinating and supervising the in-field, summer EI PD institutes. This individual will assist with the development and implementation of the in-depth PD for the summer institute participants. His/her duties will include recruitment and registration of students, with a focus on English learners, for the site of the summer PD institute and assigning classroom and teachers. The summer coordinator_ will devote % FTE time to Project SOAR, which represented three months during the summer as payment equal to 33% of a 9-month faculty salary. Years 2 through 5 included annual salary adjustments for the projection of possible increases of 3% for inflation and rising health insurance costs. The cost is: Year 1 \$20,000; Year 2: \$20,600 Year 3 \$21,218; Year 4: \$21,855 and Year 5 \$ 22,511. TOTAL Years 1-5=\$106,184

Fiscal Associate (AA) (100% FTE): The FA will be responsible for managing all fiscal operations for the project. Allyson Ballew will process purchasing, salaries, tuition payments and other disbursements. This position is 1.0 FTE to be paid by grant funds. Years 2 through 5 included annual salary adjustments for the projection of possible increases of 2% for inflation

and rising health insurance costs. The cost is: Year 1 \$31,000; Year 2: \$31,620; Year 3 \$32,252; Year 4: \$32,897 and Year 5 \$ 33,555. TOTAL Years 1-5=\$161,324

Research Associate (RA) (100% FTE) The RA will be responsible for organizing research including literature review, methods and research results to ensure program interest and spread state-wide and national replication. This position is 1.0 FTE to be paid by grant funds. Years 2 through 5 included annual salary adjustments for the projection of possible increases of 2% for inflation and rising health insurance costs. The cost is: Year 1 \$45,600; Year 2: \$56,512 Year 3 \$ 47,907; Year 4: \$49,344 and Year 5 \$50,824. TOTAL Years 1-5=\$240,187

TOTAL Salary & Wages =\$1,101,458

B. Fringe Benefits

The fringe benefits are calculated at 31% for faculty/staff academic calendar salary and 17% for summer personnel. Years 2 through 5 included annual salary adjustments for the projection of possible increases of 1-3% for inflation and rising health insurance costs. The cost is: Year 1 \$59,391; Year 2: \$62,845 Year 3 \$66,309; Year 4: 69,896 and Year 5 \$ 73,612. TOTAL =\$332,053

C. Travel

- The **PI and/or Co-PI** will attend and/or present at events such as the International TESOL convention, regional TESOL conferences, the state's annual ESL symposium, the NAEYC summit, the OELA NPD Directors meetings annually and other related activities. The PI will attend the PreK institute each year in Years 1-5. \$5,000 is budgeted for the PI and Co-PI each year in Years 1-5. The budget pertains to lodging, travel, registration and meal expenses. The cost is: Year 1 \$ 6,000; Year 2: 6,000 Year 3 \$ 5,000; Year 4: 6,000 and Year 5 \$ 3,000.
- The **PD** will attend and/or present at events such as the International TESOL convention, regional TESOL conferences, the state's annual ARKTESL conference, the NAEYC summit, the OELA NPD Directors meetings annually and other related activities. In Years 1-5. \$2,500 is budgeted for the PD each year in Years 1-5. The budget pertains to lodging, travel, registration and meal expenses. The cost is: Year 1 \$6,000; Year 2: \$6,000 Year 3 \$ 5,000; Year 4: \$6,000 and Year 5: \$3,000.
- **Project participants** will be encouraged to share project outcomes at professional conferences. The purpose is for participants to demonstrate professional growth and to share project outcomes. \$3,000 is budgeted each year throughout the life of the project. The number of participants who can be supported in any given year for presenting at conferences will vary annually, depending on the conference location, the number of presentations that are offered at each event. The cost is: Year 1 \$3,000; Year 2: \$3,000, Year 3 \$ \$4,000; Year 4: \$1,000 and Year 5: \$1,000.
- **Thirty (30) participants** will participate in ongoing PD for engaging parents, families, and local community members. Participants will attend two, full day institutes provided by PIRC. \$2,500 is budgeted for hotel expenses and travel for this in-service training/ conference. The cost is: Year 1 \$4,000; Year 2: \$4,000 Year 3 \$ \$4,000; Year 4: \$1,500 and Year 5: \$1,000.

- **Mileage reimbursement** will be provided to project personnel to do onsite visits, to meet with EPT members and SEA counterparts, to plan and implement activities and to provide PD. During Year 1-2, the mileage budget includes \$2,000 per year as the online PD module creations will include classroom videos and other classroom evidence presentations. This will require many onsite visits for the PI, CO—PI, and the videographer and PD module creation consultants to co-plan, co-teach and complete video outcomes from classroom observations. The ESL Classroom Observation Instrument will also be validated during Year 1, and will require site visits to complete necessary observations. In all project years, mileage reimbursement will be provided to field experience supervisors for supervising field experience and internships placements and the teaching of lessons. Mileage reimbursement will also be provided to the External Evaluator(s) to secure evaluation/assessment data. Since the schools are located from across the state, \$2,000 has been budgeted each year. The cost is: Year 1 \$ 3,000; Year 2: \$3,000 Year 3 \$2,000; Year 4: \$3,000 and Year 5 \$ 1,450.

D. Equipment

Not Applicable

E. Supplies

- **Centralized office communications** (office telephone, faxes) will be implemented, as well as costs for project personnel to access cellphone usage. The amount budgeted for these activities are in Year 1 is \$2,000. The cost is: Year 2: \$2,000; Year 3 \$1,000; Year 4: \$1,000, and Year 5 \$1,000
- **Laptop computers** will be purchased to support project activities, produce printed documents, conduct workshops, PD, summer institutes, generate reports, etc. The Co-PIs,, and the Summer Coordinator will each obtain a laptop with printer capabilities. \$7,500 has been budgeted in Year 1 for this purpose. The cost is: Year 1 \$ 7,500; Year 2: \$0; Year 3 \$ \$0; Year 4: \$0 and Year 5 \$ \$0.
- **Office materials**—printer, cartridges, paper markers, post-its, etc.—are required for planning, implementing and evaluating project activities. During Years 1-2 \$1,000 has been budgeted Years 3-5 \$500 per year for a total of \$3,500.
- **Online surveys tools**—Zoomerang, Survey Monkey, Others—will required the payment of subscription per year of service. \$500 is budgeted each year for five years. The cost is: Year 1: \$500; Year 2: \$500; Year 3 \$500; Year 4: \$500, and Year 5 \$500.
- **Professional Development and workshop materials** will be needed. As such, costs associated with PD include flash drives, paper, handouts, booklets, handbooks, professional texts, video, books, and games. Materials for parent, family and community engagement workshops will be purchased—books, games, supplies, handbooks, etc. In addition, supplies will be needed for the summer institutes—materials for curriculum, etc. The costs for each year is set at \$5,000. The cost is: Year 1 \$5,000; Year 2: \$3,000; Year 3 \$500; Year 4: \$500, and Year 5 \$500.
- **Supplies for supporting coursework** (textbooks, photocopies) is hudget for each year of the project. The amount in Year 1 is \$2,000.: Year 2: \$2,000; Year 3 \$1,000; Year 4: \$1,000, and Year 5 \$500.
- **Swivel cameras to record classroom observations and teaching**—with tripod, case and peripherals. The cameras will be used to collect videos from PreK-3 classrooms that will be

used for part of the online PD modules. These cameras will be used to record the pre/post teaching of lessons in order to measure project effectiveness in teacher performance using the ESL Classroom Observation instrument. The cameras will also be used by participants to plan and implement lessons in meeting coursework expected outcomes. Two swivel cameras will be secured in Year 1 at a cost of \$1,500 per camera (\$3,000). As the number of participants increase in Years 2 through 5, 8 more cameras will be bought—2 each year during Years 2 -5. The cost is: Year 1 \$3,000; Year 2: \$2,000; Year 3 \$0; Year 4: \$0, and Year 5: \$0.

F. Contractual

- **The extensive evaluation plan and research**, to be overseen by Dr. Fanning (EE) of Educational Solutions, will be responsible for all aspects related to the evaluation of this project. The evaluation team will design the study evaluation based on WWC standards, gather and analyze quantitative and qualitative data, interpret findings, and prepare the Annual Performance and Final Performance Reports (APRs, FPR). Funding will be provided to the evaluation team at a cost of \$35,000 in Year 1, with a decrease of \$30,000 in Years 2 through 5. The higher amount in Year 1 is due to the covering of costs associated with the design and initial set up of the evaluation process.
- **Professional Services-Consultants for PD will be secured** to co-create, with the PI, and co-PI the online PD modules. A total of 7 (estimated) modules will be generated; consultants will be compensated up to \$1,000 for each module developed. To ensure module quality, experts found in the field of early childhood and ESL will be contracted. Consultants will lead workshops and summer PD institutes for participants. In Year 1, \$5,000 has been budgeted; however, costs are reduced in Years 2 through 5 to an amount of \$5,000 each year. The cost is: Year 1: \$5,000; Year 2: \$5,000; Year 3 \$5,000; Year 4: \$5,000, and Year 5: \$5,000.

G. Construction

- Not Applicable

H. Other

- **Participant EL Coaches who attend the summer PD institutes** will receive PD in Knight's Coaching Model. Three EL coaches will be trained each year and will serve as the EL coach during the in-field summer institute. Each will be responsible for collaborating on the PD with the PI and summer PD institute. During the 3-week summer institute, coaches will be co-planning, co-teaching and engaging in reflective discussions with the PD participants to facilitate the use of effective strategies for ELs. A total of \$10,000 is budgeted for each of years 1-3 of the project, for 3 coaches' training and attendance during the summer 3-week institutes. The originally trained coaches will train new coaches in years 4-5 and stipends will be given to the training coaches and those who are trained. The cost is: Year 1: \$10,000; Year 2: \$10,000; Year 3: \$10,000; Year 4: \$6,000, and Year 5: \$6,000.
- **Participants who attend the summer EL PD institutes** will complete a 3-week institute for credit in the Family & Community Engagement Course. Tuition and Fees will be paid by the grant and are covered in tuition & fees category. A stipend for summer work will be provided

at \$225 per participant for 20 participants in Year 1= \$4,500 and Years 2=\$4,500 Year 3=\$4,500 Year 4

- **PIRC institute participants** will receive ongoing PD for engaging parents, families and community members as they acquire knowledge and application of working with EI students their families. A total of 30 preservice and in-service teachers will attend 2 sessions each year. A total of \$4,500 per year in Years 1 through 5 has been budgeted—2 institutes times \$75 times 30 teachers. The cost is: Year 1: \$4,500; Year 2: \$4,500; Year 3 \$4,500; Year 4: \$4,500, and Year 5: \$4,500.
- **Stipends for Online PD module completers** will be provided. K-12 instructional coaches, in-service K-12 teachers and Pre-service K-12undergraduates will be compensated for completing each module with a score of 80% passage on each module. During the summer of Year 1, 55 K-12instructional coaches may earn \$250 to complete the online modules and provide feedback regarding the quality of the modules, for a total of \$15,000. In Years 2 through 5, \$15,000 is budgeted to cover a stipend of \$250 per teacher for 60 Preservice and In-service teachers. An additional amount of \$2,000 is budgeted in Years 2 through 3 and for control group taking the online content knowledge and self-efficacy assessment. The allocated amount decreases in Years 4 and 5, as there will be few teachers who have not already had the opportunity apply. Year 1=\$15,000; Year 2=\$17,000; Year 3=\$17,000 Year 4-\$7,650 Year 5=\$5,150.

I. Total Direct Costs:

- The direct costs comprise Budget Categories A-G. The total amount requested in Years 1 through 5 is \$1,818,961.

J. Indirect Costs:

Indirect costs are calculated at a rate of 8%. The total amount requested in Years 1 through 5 is \$ 145,517.

K. Training Stipends—Participant Tuition/ Fees:

- **In-service (60) teachers will receive graduate tuition and fees** for the 15-credits/hours in an advanced degree through which they will earn the ESL license or certification. Their program of study will be completed in 2.5 year cycles. The in-service tuition is calculated at a cost of \$68,465 each year, for a total of \$342,659.
- **Preservice (40) teachers (undergraduate candidates) will receive tuition and fees** for completed 4 undergraduate/graduate courses in the MAT ESL programming. Eight (8) students will start each year—4 in the fall and 4 in the spring terms—for all 5 years of project operation. Each will complete coursework in one to two years. The preservice tuition represents a costs of \$228,439.
- **Total Tuition and Fees** will be covered by the project for both in-service and preservice teachers. The cost for graduate tuition and fees are calculated at the current rate for a 3-credit graduate course, which varies from \$1360 to \$1400 because of differences in the online fee, lab fees, supervision fees, etc. Also calculated is a project 10% increase in the tuition and fees per years as suggested by the current increase trends at the IHE. The total amount for tuition and fees over the 5 years is \$571,098.

L. Total Costs:

- The **total budget** reflects an amount of \$2,740,876. Each year the following totals are requested as seen in the budget justification found above: Year 1: \$547,549; Year 2: \$546,590; Year 3: \$549,266; Year 4: \$548,419; and Year 5: \$549,252.