Section A. Project Need & Quality of Design of Proposed Project

If you ask a five-year-old child just starting kindergarten what he or she will learn in school, one answer is likely to be "I will learn how to read." It is one of the first and most compelling of promises we as a society make to our schoolchildren, and the one most often broken by failing schools across the country. Unfortunately, a key truth about America is that children who do not develop basic reading and writing skills will never do well in school, and they will rarely succeed in the workplace. Our President has identified the urgent need to catch up with student achievement in other nations, and our Army has declared the low literacy rate of America's youth to be a national security risk because too few army prospects satisfy its literacy requirement (Mission: Readiness, 2009). The Children’s Literacy Initiative’s (CLI) innovative intervention is a direct response to this problem: it increases the number of highly-skilled teachers who can help their colleagues improve instruction and help students achieve the critical milestone of reading at or above grade-level by the end of 3rd grade. The intervention shows that exemplary teaching is observable, measurable, replicable, and scalable. It is a unique form of professional development that builds and sustains in-house capacity through the development of Model Classroom teachers.

Why Aren’t Children Learning to Read? A landmark report by the National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future (1996) showed that teacher quality accounts for 90% of disparities in student reading and math achievement and called for quality teachers for all children by 2006. A follow-up study, conducted in 2003, showed that teacher quality throughout the US was still a significant problem (National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future, 2003). Research from the National Council on Teacher Quality (2006) suggests that many
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teacher education programs do not adequately teach reading instruction. This is a particular problem in the early grades for several reasons. Most reading failure can be prevented when teachers address difficulties in the early grades (National Reading Panel, 2000). Poor readers at the end of 1st grade rarely read at grade level by the end of elementary school (Francis, Shawitz, Stuebing, and Fletcher, 1996; Juel, 1988; Shawitz, et al., 1999; Torgesen and Burgess, 1998). Reading on grade-level by the end of 3rd grade is an important indicator of future achievement and success (National Center of Education Statistics). The good news is that when instruction is expert, almost all children will learn to read (International Reading Association). (References are attached.)

**What is the Solution?** When teachers are well prepared to do their jobs, they are more likely to achieve instructional goals and are motivated to set higher expectations for themselves and their students. CLI’s professional development is effective because it meets the following key research-based criteria: being intensive and ongoing, e.g., at least 30 hours per year, (Yoon, Duncan, Lee, Scarloss and Shapley, 2007); inclusive of planned follow-up (Corcoran, 1995; Garet et al, 2001; Joyce and Showers, 1995); content-focused and classroom-based (Birman, Desimone, Porter and Garet, 2000; Corcoran, 1995; Garet et al 2001; Porter et al, 2003); and includes peer learning, which includes observing exemplary teachers in action, applying knowledge to practice, and reflecting with peers (Darling-Hammond, 2009; Berry et al, 2010), which have been shown to enhance quality of all grade-level peers, e.g., has a spillover effect (Jackson and Bruegmann, 2009). A large federally funded-study of The Literacy Collaborative found that larger amounts of coaching led to higher rates of student learning, reading gains, and increases in teacher expertise (Bryk, AERA Conference presentation, 2010). CLI’s strategy is to
invest in teachers who are already placed in the classroom in order to make positive change for teachers, schools, districts, and, most importantly, the children they serve, which is the most scalable and replicable model. CLI’s approach is similar to the Milken Foundation’s Teacher Advancement Program, but includes developing (rather than simply selecting) mentor/model teachers and using metrics to determine what is expert, with a direct focus on literacy. CLI’s work shows that teachers can become exemplary instructors when they receive the right combination and intensity of training and coaching.

**What is CLI’s Intervention?** CLI’s Model Classroom intervention is an innovative approach to deconstructing, standardizing, and spreading effective and evidence-based instructional practices. CLI focuses on the teaching, which can be observed and replicated, rather than the individual “superhero” teacher. The outcome of the intervention is a literacy-rich environment where teachers across a grade level develop young readers whose achievement far exceeds the low performance expectations most teachers have for students in high poverty schools. An independent two-year study of CLI’s Philadelphia Model Classrooms commissioned by the William Penn Foundation was conducted by the OMG Center for Collaborative Learning. It showed that a significantly higher percentage (11%) of kindergarten and first grade students in schools with Model Classrooms (students taught by Model Classroom teachers as well as students taught by colleague teachers benefiting from a spillover effect) reached district benchmarks than students in comparison schools. Because Model Classrooms leverage public investments already made in teachers, the University of Pennsylvania’s Center for High Impact Philanthropy identified CLI as an exemplary educational organization where charitable dollars can do the most good. This was determined using a cost per impact (impact being defined as the
child reaching benchmark reading scores for his or her grade, vs. not) calculation methodology that the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation later identified as an effective way to measure social value (Gates Foundation, December 2008 presentation).

The results in the Model Classrooms serve as benchmarks for what the children of their schools and districts can achieve. Model Classroom teachers take it as their responsibility to share their expertise with colleagues in order to make a larger impact. Because the exemplary teaching in Model Classrooms is documented in metrics such as CLI’s Teacher’s Effective Literacy Practices (TELP) checklist, the strategies that the teacher is utilizing are observable and replicable by others.

CLI’s Model Classroom intervention aligns with the Department of Education’s Request for Proposals that include strategies to identify, recruit, place, develop, reward, and retain highly effective teachers. CLI’s intervention will help the Department of Education achieve its Absolute Priority One to increase the number of highly effective teachers so that there is an impact on student learning. CLI’s successful intervention represents an “exceptional” approach to Absolute Priority One for the following reasons: it recognizes and leverages excellent practice; it establishes measurable standards of practice; the positive impact on students and teachers is supported by evidence (see Section B); it has been designed and documented so that it can be implemented with fidelity, which fosters its scalability and holds promise for its wider adoption (see Section E); and it builds a school’s in-house capacity for professional development (see Section F).

**How is the Intervention Implemented?** CLI has a three-pronged strategy for developing highly effective teachers in kindergarten through 3rd grade (K-3). This approach is based on
research and experience that show how students learn to read and how teachers learn to teach and is designed to build school’s in-house capacity to support professional development long after CLI’s three-year intervention.

**Strategy #1: Train all K-3 teachers in a school in high-impact, evidence-based, literacy instructional practices and establish shared standards of practice**

a. CLI provides formal professional development trainings that begin with a documented three-day Institute to provide teachers with the fundamentals of high quality literacy instruction. CLI then facilitates mastery of the standards of practice through nine interactive seminars over three years. As a result, all K-3 teachers learn the following components that the National Reading Panel states are essential for teaching students to read: phonological and phonemic awareness, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension. Teachers use research-based instructional strategies to create rigorous, standards-based lessons; to develop literacy-rich classroom environments; and to examine, understand, and use data to drive practice. This includes a specific focus on formative assessment strategies developed by Dr. Darrell Morris (2008; 2005). Teachers often find it difficult and time consuming to collect and utilize formative, or diagnostic, data such as running records. In this project teachers will work with Professional Developers trained by Morris. They will learn to use classroom assessment tools that are doable within the confines of a normal school setting, provide teachers with timely data, and most importantly, provide usable data that teachers will rely on to inform their instructional decisions. These tools measure similar elements to the DIBELS, but teachers find the data more meaningful. Teachers will provide input to CLI on the usability of the assessments and the impact on their instruction.
b. CLI provides intensive, ongoing coaching to each K-3 teacher over three years, which is the key to ensuring that teachers can practice, apply, reflect on, refine, and master the standards of practice they learn via CLI’s Institute and seminars. Topics could include reading workshop, writing workshop, vocabulary development, phonics, etc. Coaching includes: (1) in-classroom coaching, where Professional Developers model teaching, co-teach, help design lessons, and/or observe teachers and provide immediate feedback; (2) small group coaching, where one or more teachers teach a lesson and all reflect on its effectiveness; (3) grade-level meetings where grade-level teams plan lessons, examine student work, interpret data, and refine instruction; and (4) guided visits to Model Classrooms to see exemplary teaching. Teachers leave Model Classroom visits motivated and better prepared to risk trying new strategies learned in seminars. All content-focused coaching sessions include a pre-conference for lesson planning, lesson delivery by a Professional Developer or teacher, and a post-lesson conference in which teachers analyze student work, consider a lesson’s effectiveness, and plan for future lessons. Teachers and Professional Developers utilize CLI’s Teacher’s Effective Literacy Practices (TELP) inventory tool to monitor progress in mastering the standards of practice. Use of this tool (which is focused on literacy, unlike commercially-available teacher observation tools) ensures that (1) coaching and evaluation of teacher progress are driven by a teacher’s individual needs and goals while (2) simultaneously ensuring that goals are informed by standards of practice.

c. CLI helps teachers create literacy-rich environments (see attached photo and description) that encourage student reading and writing, based on research that shows exposure to literacy-rich environments promotes rapid growth in literacy skills (Burns, Griffin, and Snow, 1999). The classroom’s focal point is a “library corner” where students read independently or in small
groups. Open areas are available for collaborative writing. Student work, graphic organizers, and rubrics are displayed, which motivates students to write and shows the high level of student achievement that is possible. These and many other classroom characteristics are captured on the TELP checklist, so that every element is defined and replicable.

d. **CLI provides content-rich instructional resources**, including classroom collections of high-quality children’s literature, authentic texts for teaching subjects like science and social studies, and leveled texts for guided reading. CLI carefully selects books for intentional lesson-based read alouds, independent reading, and home-lending library collections based on their rich content and vocabulary, the most important supports for reading comprehension (Willingham, 2006).

**Strategy #2: Identify, recruit, and develop one Model Classroom teacher per grade (K-3).**

CLI collaborates with each school’s principal to identify a teacher who is already placed in the school at each grade level (K-3) and recruit them to receive more intensive and extensive training, coaching, and high-quality resources than their grade-level colleague teachers. This higher intensity training prepares them to become models who can help their grade-level peer teachers draw on the spillover effect of working alongside an exemplary teacher to continue to master literacy standards of practice long after CLI’s coaching intervention is complete. CLI and principals select teachers who convey interest in expanding their learning and willingness to try something new. These teachers are not “superheroes” – they are simply teachers who are willing to participate in a strategic effort to help establish and sustain a cadre of teachers who know how to promote student achievement, with a goal of student growth of one and a half levels per year. They are teachers who are willing to constantly improve and develop their literacy instructional
practices. Model Classroom teachers are not “anointed;” rather, they are developed over time and according to a rubric of practices that CLI has begun to develop, called the “Tiers of Proficiency.” As part of this project, CLI will work with teachers and principals to gather their input in order to further develop this evaluation tool and increase its usefulness for selecting and developing Model Classroom teachers.

Model Classroom teachers receive *additional* training, twice as much coaching as colleagues receive, with a sharper focus on reading strategies, assessment, and intentionally developing teacher capacity to model exemplary practices. City-wide monthly Model Classroom teacher meetings, led by CLI Professional Developers, are a professional development study group network where teachers study instructional practices and recent research. Through ongoing collaboration with teachers from other schools and districts, they learn about excellent practices that have been implemented in other districts nationally, which deepens the learning of advanced instruction that they bring back to and share with teachers in their schools. In combination with coaching, monthly meetings prepare Model Classroom teachers to host visits to their classrooms by grade-level teachers, school leaders, legislators, concerned citizens, student teachers, and many others. These visits are key for raising expectations for, and investment in, student achievement in high-poverty neighborhoods and schools. Equally important, visits leverage the cost of one teacher’s learning by ensuring that there is always a way to share it with all other teachers in a school. Model Classroom teachers are rewarded with an annual $1,000 stipend for going “above and beyond”, and additional funds for high-quality resources, other learning opportunities, including reflecting on videotapes of their own lessons, and hosting visits to their Model Classrooms.
Beyond this financial reward, the Model Classroom teachers also gain psychic rewards of being recognized as leaders, being allowed some instructional autonomy, and knowing that there is a career lattice available to them. The MetLife Survey of The American Teacher has shown that a collegial workplace in which teachers collaborate is in fact more important to teachers’ job satisfaction and retention than are small salary increases.

**Strategy #3: Ensure school leaders know how to leverage Model Classrooms and the school learning community to sustain and expand excellent literacy instruction.** Through regular meetings with principals and school-based instructional coaches, CLI reinforces and grows school-wide commitment to excellent literacy practices. CLI meets with principals bi-monthly and provides an Institute, two-day Coaching Camp, and two assessment seminars (including one focused on CLI’s TELP skills inventory) for school-based instructional coaches. Principals and school-based coaches both receive Administrator’s Handbooks and have access to CLI’s online resources. CLI teaches these school leaders how to develop and support learning communities, including how to identify teachers who would learn from Model Classrooms, and providing time for Model Classroom teachers to mentor peers through meetings and inter-visitation. In this way, principals and other school leaders leverage the cost of one teacher per grade’s learning to create a spill-over effect and spark school-wide improvement. Additionally, principals benefit from Model Classrooms by improving standards for recruiting, hiring, and retaining teachers who are a good fit with the school learning community. In addition to the school being a more desirable workplace, principals will have higher expectations of the candidates they interview. (See chart on following page for overview.)
# A 3-Year Strategy: How CLI Provides Professional Development to a Grade Level and Establishes a Model Classroom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- 3-day Institute, full-day seminars, intensive coaching for all teachers</td>
<td>- Seminars and intensive coaching for all teachers</td>
<td>- Seminars and intensive coaching for all teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Resources and books for all classrooms</td>
<td>- Additional seminars and coaching for Model teacher</td>
<td>- Additional coaching for Model teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Identification and recruitment of a teacher to become the Model Classroom teacher – to receive additional coaching and resources</td>
<td>- Resources for Model Classroom</td>
<td>- Model Classroom Network meetings for Model teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Model Classroom Network meetings for Model teacher</td>
<td>- Model Classroom Network</td>
<td>- Model Classroom Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Coaching Camp, 3-day Institute and seminars for school-based literacy coach</td>
<td>- Principal meetings</td>
<td>- Principal meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal meetings and coaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**INVESTING IN INNOVATION REQUEST:** CLI plans to demonstrate how an existing program for which moderate evidence of success exists (as defined in the Federal Register) can be taken to scale within a district and replicated both regionally and across the country to improve student achievement, increase the number of highly effective teachers, use metrics to set standards of practice, and have a spill-over effect that builds a school-wide culture of excellent literacy instruction.

**Goal:** CLI will increase the number of K-3 teachers who have the content knowledge and instructional skill needed to teach students to read on grade level by the end of 3rd grade. Ultimately, as Model Classroom teachers model exemplary literacy instruction throughout their careers, CLI will steadily increase the number of students who read on grade level and improve instructional practices throughout entire regions.

**Objective:** CLI will train 456 teachers in grades K-3 in 38 randomly selected public schools in geographically distinct areas of the US, reaching 45,600 students per year during the five year grant period (based on 25 students per class, 3 teachers per grade level, number of years teachers are participating in the project)

**Outcomes:** The primary research questions are: (1) What impact did the CLI Model Classroom treatment have on student achievement in early literacy? (2) What cumulative impact did providing multiple years of the CLI Model Classroom treatment have on student achievement in early literacy? and (3) What impact did the CLI Model Classroom treatment have on teacher instruction in early literacy?

**SCHOOL DISTRICT SELECTION:** Districts have been selected to participate in this Validation effort based on the following: large populations of low income, low performing students (based on the
percent of 3rd graders scoring proficient or above in reading according to state-defined proficiency standards for each grade, used for No Child Left Behind accountability; commitment to teacher development as a core strategy; and high population density so that CLI can leverage its practice, literacy specialists, and Model Classroom teachers to expand to additional, neighboring districts in each region at the end of the intervention period. In each of the following districts, CLI will work with superintendents to identify schools where its Model Classroom intervention can make the greatest impact in closing the achievement gap, and where CLI has not previously developed Model Classrooms.

a. Newark Public Schools (NPS) teaches 40,507 children, with 69.9% qualifying for free/reduced-price. Census data shows that 28.1% of the city’s public school students are “living in poverty” compared to the state average of 11%. Newark’s student body is primarily African-American (58%) and Latino (33.6%), and the city is behind the rest of the state in 3rd grade reading proficiency: the state average is 63%, while Newark’s is only 41%. For this reason, NPS’ Strategic Plan 2009-2013 includes 3rd grade reading improvement as a core goal.

b. The School District of Philadelphia (SDP) is a large, urban district where 68.4% of 172,704 students qualify for free/reduced-price lunch, and 30.1% of students live in poverty, compared to a state average of 15.1%. The student body is primarily African-American (61%) and Latino (16.3%), and only 54% of 3rd graders demonstrate reading proficiency compared to the state average of 77%. These statistics underscore the need for the highest quality teachers. Yet a 2007 study by Research for Action shows that teachers in the schools these children attend are actually likely to be less experienced and less credentialed. As a result, SDP outlines multiple strategies for achieving student success in its Imagine 2014 Strategic Plan, including professional
development, increased teacher collaboration, and more Model Classrooms so teachers can observe and learn from highly effective colleagues.

c. Chicago Public Schools (CPS) is the third largest school district in the US. It educates 407,500 students, 86% of whom qualify for free/reduced-price lunch. Its student body is primarily African-American (45%) and Latino (41%). 56% of 3rd grade students demonstrate reading proficiency, compared to the state average of 72%. CPS’ 2002 Education Plan focuses on developing high-quality teachers.

d. Camden City Public Schools serves one of the poorest communities in the United States. The district, which serves approximately 19,000 students, has been classified as “in need of improvement”. Camden’s student body is 51.5% African-American and 46.3% Latino. More than 80% of its students qualify for free or reduced price lunch; only 19% of 3rd grade students demonstrate proficiency on the state reading assessment compared to the state average of 63%.

**IMPLEMENTATION:** CLI will implement the exact same intervention that showed evidence of success (see Section B), e.g., same training curricula, sequence of activities, coaching strategies, dosage, and supporting resources. American Institutes for Research (AIR), which has been engaged as independent evaluator for the effort proposed herein, developed an implementation timeline that allows for a well-designed randomized control trial. CLI will begin work with 3rd grade in Year One, kindergarten and 1st grade teachers in Year Two and 2nd grade in Year Three.

**Section B: Strength of Research and Significance and Magnitude of Effect**

There is moderate evidence, as defined in the Federal Register requirements, that CLI’s intervention has had a statistically significant, substantial, and important effect on improving student achievement. This evidence includes an independent quasi-experimental evaluation with
carefully matched comparison group design that provides strong internal validity and was independently commissioned by the William Penn Foundation and externally conducted by the OMG Center for Collaborative Learning (OMG, 2009). Researchers matched a set of 15 CLI treatment schools with a set of 14 non-participating control schools in the same district (Philadelphia) based on 10 key school characteristics. Characteristics included prior achievement test scores in 3rd grade reading on the state assessment (PSSA); demographic characteristics including ethnicity, poverty, proportion of students receiving special education services, proportion of students receiving English as a second language services, enrollment size and student-to-teacher ratio; and location within the district. Treatment and comparison groups were equivalent at baseline on observed characteristics. Implementation of the CLI Model Classroom treatment was well-documented with instrument response rates all above 79%. Students in both groups of schools entered kindergarten in the same year. Researchers evaluated the students’ achievement on the same validated test of reading skills (DIBELS) administered in the same way to both the treatment and comparison groups. The study showed that a higher percentage of kindergarten students in schools with Model Classrooms (students taught by Model Classroom teachers as well as students taught by grade-level colleagues benefiting from a spillover effect) reached district literacy benchmarks compared to students in comparison schools for each of the three years studied. For example, in both 2007-08 and 2008-09, students in Model Classroom schools and comparison schools started the year with no statistically significant differences in student performance. In 2007-08, 75% of students Model Classroom schools performed at benchmarks, compared to 68% in comparison schools. In 2008-09, 77% performed at benchmarks, compared to 68% in comparison schools. Additionally, the overall proportion of
students reaching grade level and the change from the beginning of the year to the end was always greater for Model Classroom schools. Significantly more African American students reached proficiency in Model Classroom schools than in comparison schools, 74% of kindergarten students in Model Classroom schools compared to 64% in comparison schools, 62% of 1st grade students in Model Classroom schools compared to 48% in comparison schools in 2008-09.

**VALIDITY, SIGNIFICANCE AND MAGNITUDE OF EFFECT:** Although the sample size was small, 14 treatment and 14 comparison schools, the study was conducted in a large, urban district working with a high-poverty elementary student population that is found in many other cities across the country. This study has moderate external validity generalizing to some of the districts, schools, and students that are at the center of the current push to turnaround low-performing schools. This study also fits the Federal Register requirements for a “potentially substantial and important” magnitude of the effect. Based on the Kindergarten 2006-07 results, the one-year effect on the percentage of students that reached proficient on the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) assessment of participation in a CLI Model Classroom school is substantial and important with an effect size of 0.29 SD, based on a conversion to the Cox index for dichotomous outcomes. Similar impacts for kindergarten were found in 2007-08 and 2008-09. The treatment in the proposed study is the same and the proposed i3 evaluation will examine not only a one-year impact but also a cumulative two-year impact on students (treated in both kindergarten and grade 1) whose schools and teachers received the CLI treatment over those two years. Several other less rigorously designed studies (McGill-Franzen et al., 1999; Scheffer,
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1999; Walter, 1999; 1996; Zill et al., 1998) have suggested similarly positive results for CLI treatment.

**Section C: Applicant Experience**

CLI has a 22-year track record of improving student achievement, increasing the number of highly effective teachers, and managing complex projects. CLI helps children in high-poverty schools become powerful readers, writers, speakers, and thinkers by improving the quality of literacy instruction in grades K-3 to help them reach the critical milestone of reading on grade-level by the end of 3rd grade. CLI’s intervention works with all teachers across the K-3 grade-levels, principals, and other school leaders, to standardize highly effective evidence-based literacy instruction practices. To date, CLI has established 135 Model Classrooms in ten cities. A study on the Philadelphia Kindergarten Literacy Intervention Program, a precursor to the Model Classroom, was conducted by Dr. Richard Allington, former President of the International Reading Association, and Dr. Anne McGill-Franzen. It showed that students whose teachers received two CLI interventions (30 hours of formal professional development training plus high quality books and materials) performed significantly better than students in control groups on all measures (1996). This study, which was published in the *Journal of Education Research*, led to development of Model Classrooms, which have shown great success and are the subject of the current validation request.

**District Achievement:** Promising outcomes from CLI’s work with Philadelphia schools is described in Sections A and B. It is worth repeating that significantly more African American students reached reading proficiency in Model Classroom schools than comparison schools. Latino non-English Language Learners in Model Classroom schools fared better than those in
comparison schools, with fewer requiring more intensive interventions at the end of the year. Other examples include White Plains, NY, where only 49% of students were meeting literacy benchmarks by the end of kindergarten when CLI began its work there; three years later 86% of kindergarten students met benchmarks. First grade students demonstrated similar gains, with 56% proficient at the start of CLI’s intervention and 74% proficient after implementation of Model Classrooms. The White Plains Assistant superintendent (see attached letter) credits CLI with helping the district develop and sustain a coherent approach to literacy instruction and “an embedded exemplary practice.”

**School Improvement:** CLI has played a critical role in helping schools make such exceptional improvement that they have received state and national honors. One example that has received recent national attention is Gotwals Elementary School in Norristown, PA, outside of Philadelphia. Since CLI established Model Classrooms in grades K-3 at Gotwals Elementary School, the percentage of 3rd grade students who demonstrated proficiency on the state’s standardized reading test grew from 20% to 69%. This helped Gotwals earn the 2009 National Title 1 Distinguished School Award for being one of two Pennsylvania schools with the greatest student gains over the past two years.

**Teacher Impact:** Teachers report that their students read and write more frequently and with greater confidence; that they have higher expectations for their students, themselves, and their fellow teachers; that they have greater confidence; and that they have higher job satisfaction. After working with CLI for three years, one veteran teacher saw her students achieving what she had struggled to accomplish for 15 years. She later told CLI, “I have become the teacher I always wanted to be.” CLI’s trainings are so popular that many teachers have participated when they...
were not being compensated for their time. CLI Professional Development is so highly valued that Model Classroom teachers look for other Model Classroom schools when they need to seek new district placements for personal reasons, which suggests the potential for using Model Classrooms as a recruiting tool.

**Awards & Recognition:** CLI is recognized as a respected leader in the teacher professional development and literacy instruction fields. CLI has presented at the annual conferences of the National Staff Development Council, Holmes Partnership, National Black Child, Lesley University’s Literacy for All, and International Reading Association, among others. CLI has been asked to present at the U.S. Department of Education’s Early Childhood Educator Professional Development Program/Early Reading First Program and its Comprehensive Early Learning Systems National conferences. CLI’s work has been recognized by the International Reading Association for “Exemplary Service in the Promotion of Literacy” and by the Pennsylvania House of Representatives for its “Meaningful Contribution Toward a Better and More Productive Society”. CLI has received several prestigious funding awards, including the 2009 Bank of America Foundation Neighborhood Builder Award, which recognizes significant community-wide impact and is awarded to only two organizations in each of its large markets.

**Implementing Complex Projects:** CLI is accustomed to implementing, managing, evaluating, and reporting on complex projects. Highlights include the following:

a. **Model Classrooms** currently operate in 135 classrooms across the US. These were designed, implemented, managed, and evaluated by the same team of professionals who will lead this effort. This team can establish relationships with district stakeholders, raise funds, and implement the intervention with fidelity. This includes working with many schools in a district
and with numerous districts in the US simultaneously. All projects have been completed within budget and some have included working with independent evaluators to measure effectiveness.

b. The Wachovia Foundation’s Teachers and Teaching Initiative (TTI) was a $15,000,000 strategy to evaluate and strengthen the nation’s most effective teacher quality work. CLI was one of only 23 grantees nationally. Other grantees included some of the nation’s leading teacher quality organizations, such as Teach for America and the New Teachers Project. CLI received a multiyear $747,000 grant to implement Model Classrooms in northern New Jersey (see attached letter).

**PARTNERS:** The American Institutes for Research (AIR), the firm selected through a competitive RFP process to serve as CLI’s evaluator for this Validation grant, has more than 60 years of experience developing, implementing, and managing large-scale evaluation projects. AIR is a leader in the use of rigorous research to evaluate policies and practices in education, combining complex, mixed-method, multi-year studies as well as short-term data collection and analysis tasks. AIR is experienced in conducting randomized controlled trials in schools, including evaluations of educational interventions in the areas of early reading and teacher professional development. One particularly relevant example is its Professional Development Impact in Reading Study, which was completed last year for Institute of Education Sciences. This Randomized Controlled Trial (RCT) evaluated the impact of two different forms and levels of professional development offered to grade 2 teachers (PD institute and seminars alone, PD institute and seminars plus coaching) on teacher knowledge, reading instruction, and student achievement. Combining scientific rigor with an understanding of how schools operate, AIR researchers, several who are key staff on this proposed evaluation, collaborated with the program
developer, an advisory committee, and with educators in 90 schools in 6 districts nationwide over six years. This is just one example of its many multi-year, multi-site, multi-state evaluation projects, many of which have been supported by US Department of Education funds and have received additional support from philanthropic leaders, such as the Gates and Packard Foundations. Newark Public Schools, The School District of Philadelphia, Camden City Public Schools, and Chicago Public Schools also have significant experience managing complex projects similar to the Model Classrooms intervention described here. Each district has implemented programs that involve large numbers of its schools; partnered with external organizations to improve student achievement, which has included cooperating with independent evaluations to measure program success; and managing federal funds.

**Section D: Quality of the Project Evaluation**

**DESIGN:** AIR proposes to conduct a randomized controlled trial in which schools are randomly assigned to treatment and control groups. The treatment (CLI) schools will receive all aspects of the CLI program: formal teacher professional development training, expert instructional coaching, development of a Model Classroom teacher at each grade level, and books and resources. Control schools will continue to experience “business as usual” for the evaluation years, receiving CLI services at a later time. CLI has already secured an agreement to participate, with full understanding of this design, from four districts, for a total of 76 schools. This sample size is further discussed in the section below on statistical power. Within each participating Kindergarten, Grade 1, and Grade 2 classroom (we assume three classrooms per grade) in both treatment and control conditions, we propose drawing a random sample of 8 students to be assessed at the beginning and end of each treatment year.
**TIMELINE:** AIR proposes a 5-year evaluation plan, outlined in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluated Grades</th>
<th>Year 1 2010-2011</th>
<th>Year 2 2011-2012</th>
<th>Year 3 2012-2013</th>
<th>Year 4 2013-2014</th>
<th>Year 5 2014-2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning Year</td>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>Grade 1</td>
<td>Grade 1</td>
<td>Analysis and Reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Evaluated Grades in Treatment Schools</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delayed Treatment in Control Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>Kindergarten Grade 1 Grade 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AIR proposes that Year One (2010-2011) of the project be reserved for evaluation planning to include obtaining clearance through AIR’s Institutional Review Board (IRB), verification of school participation (e.g., signing memorandums of understanding), finalizing the design, developing and piloting implementation measures, and working with Dr. Darrell Morris to train staff and plan achievement test administration. During the planning year, we will also provide preliminary implementation data and formative performance feedback that CLI can use to ensure high quality implementation of the program for the evaluation period. Years Two, Three, and Four of the project will be used for program implementation for the purposes of evaluation (discussed in further detail below), and Year Five would be reserved for data processing, analysis and reporting.

**PHASE-IN:** Given the size of this intervention effort across a large number of schools and multiple grade levels at each school, participation in the CLI program will be phased in by grade level as shown in the table above. Within any participating school among the evaluated grades,
only Kindergarten and Grade 1 will participate in CLI during Year 2 of the project.

Kindergarten, Grade 1 and Grade 2 will participate in CLI during Year 3, and Grade 1 and Grade 2 will participate in Year 4. This design allows for estimation of the following treatment effects:

- After Year 2 of the project -- one year of teacher and one year of student participation.
- After Year 3 -- two years of student participation, for the students who participated in both Kindergarten and Grade 1; and one year of student participation but two years of teacher participation, for the students attending Kindergarten in 2012-2013.
- After Year 4 -- three years of student participation, for the students who participated in Kindergarten and Grades 1 and 2; and two years of student participation and two or three years of teacher participation, for the students attending Grade 1 in 2013-2014.

Per the agreement with participating districts to delay treatment onset in evaluated grades, CLI will implement professional development outside of the evaluated grades in Grade 3 in treatment schools beginning in year one. Control schools will not receive any CLI services, at any studied grade, until Year 4 of the study at which time Kindergarteners not included in any evaluated cohort will begin to experience CLI.

**Statistical Power:** With assignment at the school level, our power analyses show that 76 total schools (3 classrooms per grade level and 8 students per classroom; ICC = 0.15) would give 0.80 power to detect program effects on student outcomes ranging from 0.18 to 0.22 of a standard deviation, depending on the ability of the baseline indicator to predict the posttest (calculated for a range of values: R-square = 0.40, 0.50, 0.60).
**IMPLEMENTATION:** AIR proposes gathering data on teacher training and coaching services to measure their fidelity to the CLI model. These data will also allow us to sufficiently document the key elements of the treatment to facilitate replication or testing in other settings. Our previous professional development and coaching studies have had success using customized fidelity forms and coaching logs, which can be administered in a Web-based or electronic form to preserve resources and reduce burden. Brief teacher surveys will be developed and administered to document the baseline equivalence of the treatment and control groups as well as to determine the extent to which the CLI interventions provided to treatment teachers represented a significant contrast to the business-as-usual professional development experienced by teachers in control schools. The CLI-developed Teacher’s Effective Literacy Practices (TELP) checklist will assist in exploring whether the unique characteristics that should be evident in classrooms of teachers who have experienced the CLI intervention were indeed present in treatment classrooms.

**OUTCOMES:** Primary research questions for this evaluation are: (1) What impact did the CLI Model Classroom treatment have on student achievement in early literacy? (2) What cumulative impact did providing multiple years of the CLI Model Classroom treatment have on student achievement in early literacy? and (3) What impact did the CLI Model Classroom treatment have on teacher instruction in early literacy? AIR plans to administer literacy assessments to students at the beginning and end of each intervention year for both treatment and control conditions. Assessments at the beginning establish baseline equivalence of the two groups. Assessments at the end measure growth and potential program impact. Baseline measures will be the Early Reading Screening Inventory (ERSI) and the Beginning Informal Reading Inventory IRI (Beg IRI). The ERSI measures alphabet knowledge, concept of word, phoneme awareness/spelling,
and word recognition. This instrument was originally developed by Dr. Morris in 1992 to screen beginning first grade readers for possible participation in an early reading intervention program. Subsequent research has shown that the ERSI has good predictive validity, correlating $r=0.70$ with end of first grade reaching achievement (Perney et. al. 1997). The Beg IRI is an informal reading inventory measuring fluency, also created by Dr. Morris. The data will also be used to provide high quality performance feedback in the treatment schools throughout the evaluation. The posttest measure will be the Group Reading Assessment and Diagnostic Evaluation (GRADE, 2001). This standardized measure has good evidence of reliability and validity as presented in the instrument’s technical manual. Two different forms of this assessment are available at Kindergarten, grade 1 and grade 2. The Kindergarten assessment measures sound matching, rhyming, same words, different words, print awareness, letter recognition, phoneme-grapheme correspondence, listening comprehension and word reading. The grade 1 and grade 2 assessments both measure sentence comprehension, listening comprehension, word reading, word meaning and passage comprehension. AIR will also evaluate the impact of the CLI program on teachers’ instruction, a critical intermediate outcome between the intervention and student learning. In year 3 of the project, AIR will conduct systematic two-hour observations of one randomly-selected teacher per grade in each school in each condition. AIR proposes to use the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) (Pianta et al., 2010) to capture teacher–student interactions supplemented by the Early Language and Literacy Classroom Observation Tool (ELLCO) (Smith et al. 2010) to assess instructional activities in literacy and the literacy environment (specifically, Approaches to Book Reading / Reading Instruction; Approaches to Children’s Writing / Writing Opportunities and Instruction and the Literacy Environment.
Checklist). Other secondary outcome measures such as teacher retention, teacher data use, teacher lesson planning practice, teacher self efficacy, and teacher professional community norms such as peer collaboration may also be analyzed drawing from teacher survey data and the teacher tracking database.

**ANALYSES:** Impact analyses will be conducted as “intent-to-treat” analyses including all teachers and students whether or not they were there for full treatment period, using hierarchical linear regression models. These models reflect the nested structure of the data, which has students nested within classes and classes nested within schools. The model will be estimated as a three-level hierarchical model using the MIXED procedure in SAS, with a pretest covariate at the student level and treatment by district indicator variables included at the school level. Impact will be estimated as the average impact across the districts weighting each district impact by its number of treatment schools. Brief interim reports providing high-quality implementation data and performance feedback on progress toward achieving intended outcomes will be produced at the end of the second and third years of the project and a final evaluation report will be produced by the end of the fifth year.

**INDEPENDENT EVALUATOR:** Neither the program developer nor the project implementer will evaluate the impact of the project. AIR will be the independent evaluator and will conduct an objective, rigorous evaluation, consistent with IES standards. Based on previous work funded by IES, AIR has independently constructed the evaluation budget to ensure sufficient resources for the evaluation described above.

In addition to the external evaluation, at the end of the five year project CLI will also review 3rd grade state reading assessment data from each district to identify trends.
Section E. Strategy and Capacity to Bring to Scale

**During the Grant Period:** CLI will increase the number of highly effective teachers by 456 and will directly reach 45,600 students during the grant period. The specific scale up strategy over the five-year grant period was developed by evaluators from the American Institutes for Research. CLI will begin implementing the intervention as follows: 3rd grade starting Year One; kindergarten and 1st grade starting Year Two; and 2nd grade starting Year Three. CLI’s intervention has been carefully designed so that it can be replicated with fidelity in diverse school districts across the country. It is replicable because components are standardized and consistent in its documented methods of delivery (training protocols, coaching model, materials, topics, metrics, and assessments). The intervention has been implemented in 135 classrooms across ten cities. In each case, replication has included the same method of intervention delivery (content-focused coaching model, TELP checklist, and well-documented training seminars), and desired outcomes. This process is overseen by CLI’s Director of Professional Development, who ensures that Professional Developers adhere to CLI’s standards of practice, and the Evaluation Manager, who ensures consistency of data collection and rigor of analysis. This is supported by CLI’s Human Resources Department, which applies a standardized system for screening and hiring coaches. This model ensures that CLI will be able to scale up quickly in all schools in this proposed project as well as any districts interested in implementing Model Classrooms during or after the grant period. By way of example, CLI began K-3 Model Classrooms in all schools in Vineland, NJ efficiently and effectively, in only 6 months. Additionally, the OMG study cited in Section B showed a high level of satisfaction with CLI’s implementation of the Model Classrooms, which suggests it will be similarly easy for other districts to implement. Finally,
CLI’s senior leadership team, including its Development Director, are working with philanthropic entities in Camden, Chicago, Newark, and Philadelphia to secure the 20% private contribution match required to implement the proposed project.

**AFTER THE GRANT PERIOD:** Assuming successful outcomes, CLI will scale up and replicate as follows: (1) implementing Model Classrooms within the 38 control schools upon completion of the evaluation; (2) expanding to additional schools and districts in proximity to the districts in the original project; and (3) implementing Model Classrooms in other low income, low performing school districts in the nation. Once the model’s effectiveness has been validated, CLI’s staff will share evaluation results with other districts, inviting superintendents and other leadership staff to visit Model Classrooms.

**SCALE UP COST:** Many project costs, including assessment, labor and infrastructure, will be leveraged, lowered or eliminated entirely with a full scale project scale up. CLI estimates that the three year intervention and network costs for two subsequent years will cost $374.04 per child annually. (The network support for the teacher drops to $25-50 per child annually after the fifth year and would be sustained in perpetuity.) This suggests that scale up costs are: $37.4 million for 100,000; $93.5 million for 250,000; and $187.0 million for 500,000 children.

**DISSEMINATION:** CLI will disseminate information about and promote further replication of its Model Classrooms innovation through conference presentations, articles in peer-reviewed academic journals and other literacy- and teacher effectiveness-related periodicals, our website, and Model Classroom visits for local private funders. In addition, a core component will be CLI’s participation in a professional learning community comprised of Investing in Innovation Fund grantees and dissemination of information via its Innovation Portal. CLI will also
disseminate findings beyond the education field as it is frequently asked to present to diverse audiences. Examples include the CLI Executive Director’s “Knowledge at Wharton” podcast for Wharton Business School and her participation in an annual invitation-only gathering of thought leaders from the social and corporate sectors and Army generals, held at West Point and organized by The Conference Board.

**Section F: Sustainability**

*SUSTAINING MODEL CLASSROOMS IN CHICAGO, NEWARK, CAMDEN, AND PHILADELPHIA:* The impact of Model Classrooms is not limited to one teacher, one classroom, or one school. Model Classroom teachers raise expectations, standardize practices, and provide mentorship to other teachers in their districts. School principals and district superintendents see results – higher achieving students, higher quality teachers, and a growing commitment to exemplary practices. They bring others into Model Classrooms to help share the innovation with other districts, helping to build and sustain the practice to benefit children nationwide. This intervention is not a dependency model; three strategies help to ensure that schools build internal capacity to sustain Model Classrooms on their own, which ensures that project purposes are incorporated within each partner district.

- **a. The Model Classroom Network Professional Learning Community** continues to meet monthly and provide Model Classroom teachers with continuing and deepening professional development after the three-year intervention. They continue to study and apply literacy instruction strategies, learn with/from peers, and build leadership skills and exemplary instructional practice to bring back to their schools. The research described in Section B found that teachers reported greater confidence in their capacity to do their job well, stronger relationships with colleagues, and
greater job satisfaction, which has been shown to be an important factor in teacher success. These factors strengthen the spillover effect of peer learning, which has been shown to be a critical factor for increasing teacher effectiveness within a school and sustaining the knowledge gained and skills put into practice. CLI plans to strengthen sustainability by increasing CLI’s web-based resource portal that synthesizes existing resources and make new ones, including webinars, podcasts, photos and video clips of teachers illustrating exemplary standards of practice from the TELP that Model Classroom teachers aspire to master, and other tools. CLI will invest initial funds to continue the development of these resources.

b. CLI establishes standards of practice school-wide by working with all K-3 teachers and principals in Model Classroom schools, which ensures that they understand the approach. This promotes consistent literacy development across grade levels and encourages other teachers to visit Model Classrooms and share in the expertise developed through CLI’s intensive coaching. Equally important, it assures that there are teachers in a school who are ready to step in if a Model Classroom teacher decides to leave the school during or after the intervention. CLI’s work with principals and other school leaders sustains the impact and benefits of the intervention because they learn to identify teachers in need of literacy instruction support and can offer them a positive, rewarding professional development opportunity by connecting them to Model Classrooms. Bi-monthly meetings with principals help generate and sustain principal support for Model Classrooms, which builds their investment in the intervention. The research described in Section B found that 80% of principals reported that CLI’s successful work with K-3 teachers positively changed the way they think about and approach literacy. CLI knows that these
sustainability strategies are working because nearly all of the 135 Model Classrooms it has
developed continue to operate and to increase teacher effectiveness and student outcomes today.

c. Model Classrooms are sustained at a very modest cost. For approximately $5000 per school
annually, teachers can access the CLI web portal, principals can attend CLI principals meetings,
and Model Classroom teachers can attend monthly CLI professional development. Schools also
cover the cost of a substitute teacher for one half-day per month to allow teachers to attend
Network meetings, and reward Model Classroom teachers with an annual honorarium.

**Leveraging Resources to Support Expansion:** At the end of the grant period, CLI will work
with the project’s districts to pursue discretionary government and philanthropic funding to
replicate the Model Classrooms in the control schools. CLI; will also work with newly identified
districts in other locales to secure initial implementation support. CLI will leverage validation
evaluation results, relationships it is developing in each of its regions (including the development
of regional Boards), and its accomplished fundraising staff to raise funds to launch Model
Classrooms in other parts of the country. CLI has a successful track record of working closely
with districts to raise funds quickly to launch Model Classroom implementation. Recent
examples include a $300,000 challenge grant from one individual donor that CLI was able to
match with private sector funds within 9 months in a brand new Model Classroom major gifts
campaign. Major donors appreciate Model Classrooms and choose to individually sponsor them.
CLI has an excellent reputation among foundations for responsible stewardship and thorough
reporting, which has resulted in long-term institutional support from the Pew Charitable Trusts,
Geraldine R. Dodge Foundation, William Penn Foundation, Wachovia Foundation, Victoria
Foundation, and Prudential Foundation. Equally important, philanthropic support of this type
Section G: Quality of the Management Plan & Personnel

**PROJECT TEAM:** Implementation will be managed by a Project Team that consists of CLI’s Director of Professional Development, Kelly Hunter, and Evaluation Manager, Kristin Haegele-Hill. Hunter will serve as Project Director. In this role she will establish relationships with principals to assure the intervention addresses each school’s specific goals; hire, train and supervise District Managers (who are described below); hire and provide initial training to Professional Developers (also described below); and meet regularly with CLI’s Senior Management Team to help with fundraising and marketing efforts for the project. Hunter has extensive experience managing complex projects (including multiple federal grants), many of which have included managing large numbers of staff in different geographic locations, and a long history of managing professional development programs for elementary-level literacy teachers. Hunter has a Master’s degree from the Reading, Writing & Literacy Program at the University of Pennsylvania and will soon receive her doctorate. Haegele-Hill, who will oversee data collection, work with independent evaluators, and develop reports, has a Master’s in Educational Research from West Chester University. They will be supported by additional staff, including: a Manager of Content, who refines training material; Coordinator of Content, who develops hand-outs and sends these to districts in advance of trainings; Book Collection Planner, who plans classroom collections of high quality materials for each classroom; Materials Ordering, Receiving, and Shipping staff; Report Writer, who assists with reporting; Project
Tracking Coordinator, Manager, and Supervisor, who provide operating, project tracking, and accounting support.

**DISTRICT TEAMS:** CLI has established teams of literacy experts in every region where it works. This includes Managers, who are required to have a Master’s and extensive literacy coaching experience, who serve as “on the ground” literacy and district specialists. They ensure deep understanding of the location, including knowledge of its unique issues, key stakeholders, and sources of most promising Professional Developers. Managers communicate with school principals to ensure that CLI meets school (as well as district) goals and provide ongoing support to Professional Developers who work directly with teachers. Responsibilities include: matching Professional Developers to teachers, monthly meetings for Professional Developers, observing coaching sessions and providing relevant feedback, and developing new workshops or trainings for Professional Developers, as needed. Professional Developers provide intensive, one-on-one content-focused coaching to teachers. They must have a Master’s in Reading, Early Childhood Education, or Elementary Education; be certified to teach; have at least four years experience in a K-3 classroom; and capacity to apply advanced literacy concepts. CLI has clear systems, structures, and processes in place for recruiting and training Professional Developers. Professional Developers are hired and trained by the Project Director through a three-day Institute, coaching camp, and 3-4 annual workshops. They receive one-on-one and small group support from the Manager, including shadowing more experienced Professional Developers. CLI holds Professional Developers to specific performance metrics that are carefully designed to promote their capacity to develop exemplary teachers. A Coordinator provides logistical support, which includes collecting all data needed by CLI’s Evaluation Manager. CLI
has offices and teams in Chicago and Philadelphia/Camden. CLI has a team in place in Newark and will establish an office there upon award of funding.

**Organizational Leadership:** CLI’s senior leadership team will provide project oversight. This includes CLI’s: Executive Director, Linda Katz; Deputy Director, Cameron Voss; Chief Operating/Financial Officer, Bruce Bonner; Director of District Expansion, Roxanne White; Director of Development, Bonnie Asher; and Human Resources/Recruitment Coordinator, Mahan-Jiwan Khalsa. Bonner, who has an MBA and many years experience directing operations in the private sector, will provide fiscal oversight. Asher will help to develop and implement fundraising strategies to support Model Classroom development. Khalsa will oversee hiring, to include working with CLI Managers to vet and hire Professional Developers. Voss, and Katz, who has an MBA from the University of Pennsylvania’s Wharton School, will provide overall oversight, with a particular focus on relationship-building at the senior level with superintendents and key stakeholders. Additionally, Katz, Voss, and White will play key roles in scale up efforts by disseminating evaluation results via conferences, professional association membership and networks, and meetings with superintendents, State Educational Agencies, and others.

**Evaluation:** Project evaluation will be conducted by AIR. AIR staff bring the methodological sophistication needed to design an evaluation and analyze data, the expert knowledge of reading development and measurement of achievement, and the experience necessary to oversee the logistics of a large randomized controlled trial implemented in real-life school settings. Dr. Terry Salinger, who completed a doctorate in reading, has conducted site-based research on early reading for Educational Testing Service and served as Director of Research for the International Reading Association before joining AIR, will serve as Principal Investigator. Dr. Kathryn
Drummond, who received her doctorate in educational psychology with a focus on reading acquisition from UCLA, will serve as the evaluation’s Project Director. Before coming to AIR seven years ago, she led the reading-related reviews conducted by the What Works Clearinghouse. She currently directs a randomized control trial that involves 92 teachers across three states. Monika Townsend, who is currently completing her doctorate in Education Research, Statistics and Evaluation, will serve as Design and Task Analysis Leader. Her work has included analyzing data for more than 90 VA schools are part of the states Reading First evaluation. Her work at AIR includes conducting analysis for the Florida Reading First Professional Development Study and the Collaborative Strategic Reading randomized control trial. Additional research staff will support the work in all of its phases.

**PROJECT TIMELINE & MILESTONES:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hire and train additional professional developers for each district as needed, to supplement current teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launch training, coaching, and monthly Model Classroom meetings for Cohort 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begin developing technology tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalize evaluation clearances and protocol</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Two</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continue training, coaching, and monthly Model Classroom meetings for Cohort 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launch training, coaching, and monthly Model Classroom meetings for Cohort 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begin evaluation research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue developing technology tools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continue training, coaching, and monthly Model Classroom meetings for Cohorts 1 and 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launch training, coaching, and monthly Model Classroom meetings for Cohort 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue evaluation research and continue developing technology tools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Four</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continue training, coaching, and monthly Model Classroom meetings for Cohorts 2, and 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launch post-intervention Model Classroom Network for Cohort 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue evaluation research and continue developing technology tools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Five</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continue training, coaching, and monthly Model Classroom meetings for Cohort 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launch post-intervention Model Classroom Network for Cohort 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue Model Classroom Network for Cohort 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalize evaluation research and disseminate research findings to launch expansion to other districts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>