

A. Need for Project *(i) The magnitude or severity of the problem to be addressed by the proposed project and*
(ii) The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project, including the nature and magnitude of those gaps or weaknesses.

Native Hawaiians represent nearly half of the student population in the two public high schools in Kohala and Hāmākua. They also significantly contribute to the achievement gap that has been widening between subgroups. The table below indicates that a significant percentage of Native Hawaiians qualify for free and reduced lunch, perform less well on the Hawai‘i State Assessments (HSA), and are less likely to pursue college as compared to their Caucasian or Asian peers. The median income in Native Hawaiian households as compared to other major ethnicities is reflected in the higher percentage of Native Hawaiian students qualifying for the subsidized lunch program at school, a troubling statistic since family income and standardized test scores are consistently linked in education and social science research.¹

Table A: 2011 Comparisons of Disadvantaged Status, Test Proficiency Levels, and College Going Rates (Extracted from State of Hawai‘i, DOE database)²

Students	Native Hawaiian	Caucasian	Asian
Percent that qualify for free and reduced lunch	61%	25%	35%
Percent proficient on the Math HSA	19%	40%	26%
Percent proficient on the Reading HSA	58%	71%	62%
Percent proficient on the Science HSA	0%	30%	4%
Percent pursuing college after high school	37%	74%	82%

The results from the 2011 Hawai‘i State Assessments (HSA) indicate deficits in grade level skills in reading, math, and science. While HSA scores are just one measure of achievement, there is a high correlation of HSA performance to future performance on college aptitude tests results and eventual acceptance to four year college. Native Hawaiians comprise an average of 46% of the student population within the two schools. As a group, their rate of proficiency is 13, 21, and 30 percentage points less than Caucasian students in reading, math, and science, respectively.³ Based 2011 scores, both schools fall 9 percentage points below the

NCLB target scores of 72% for Reading and 35 percentage points short of the 64% target for math. As the target proficiency rates increase next year, there is an urgency to pursue a research based methodology to improve student performance. Student grades provide another indicator of students' academic deficiencies. The number of D's and F's in core classes has been disproportionate over the last two years. They represent 52% of Native Hawaiian students' quarterly grades in one or more core courses and are an indicator of their struggles to meet standards under current instructional conditions.

Furthermore, analysis of Senior Exit Plan data indicates that while 72% of the exiting seniors in 2011 planned to enroll in college, only 37% of Native Hawaiian students communicated the same intentions. Of the Native Hawaiian students who did enter college in 2011, 78% needed remediation as determined by performance on the COMPASS placement tests. Readiness for college as demonstrated by performance on college admission tests is lagging in comparison to state and national statistics. Retention in college is also an issue as only half of Native Hawaiian freshmen continued in college after their first year.⁴

Clearly, what is effective for Caucasian and Asian students is not working for Native Hawaiian populations at the two schools. Current classroom practices in Kohala and Honoka'a are predominately geared toward western learning styles where the emphasis is on individual effort and competition. The most common method of instruction is comprised of a teacher delivering content in a verbal format followed by conventional written practice in class and as independent homework. The characteristics of traditional western teaching include instruction delivered in variants of the lecture format and taught in a logical, sequential manner. Being that the average years of teaching experience is 14.7 at Kohala and Honoka'a, most teachers received

their formal training under the influences of the traditional teaching methodology of western culture.

Instruction delivered in this manner is placing Native Hawaiian students at a disadvantage. Their poor performance as compared to Caucasian and Asian peers is directly related to instruction that is not meeting their needs. Research reveals that using culture as a means to inform instructional decisions is vital to accelerating the academic growth of Native Hawaiian students. A study completed in Hawai‘i, the Kamehameha Early Education Program (KEEP) documented the effects of a culturally sensitive language arts program for Native Hawaiian students. Their favored communication, interpersonal, and learning styles were embedded within classroom instruction. When interactive strategies were employed in the classroom, their social and academic achievement significantly improved.⁵

This project does not negate the value of westernized strategies, but rather recognizes that, in particular, the conventional mode of delivery that most of our teachers received their training does not serve Native Hawaiian students effectively. Thus, Project *Pili A Pa‘a* will include educationally sound, research-based, best practice teaching strategies and protocols that reflect an understanding of the important role that culture plays in with the education of Native Hawaiian learners.

Research on cultural learning styles reveals that a thorough understanding of Native Hawaiian backgrounds will help teachers “match the contextual conditions for learning to the cultural expectations of the learner thereby increasing task engagement and task performance.”⁶ Under this theoretical model, knowledge of students’ culture enables a teacher to make accurate and intentional decisions about the best strategies and delivery modes to employ.

A concerted effort to address weaknesses in traditional western instructional methods by attending to culture will actually serve to bridge the gap between the Native Hawaiian subgroup and Caucasian/Asian learners. Being attentive to cultural contexts as an instructional approach is a method that holds promise for increased academic achievement not only for Native Hawaiian students but also for all other subgroups found at school. The embedding of instructional practices that will benefit the Native Hawaiian learner must include practices that are collaborative, interactive, and meaningful. Research on Native Hawaiian learning styles conclude that students prefer learning experiences that are practical and tend to struggle with learning for the sake of learning.⁷

Given these facts, it is critical that the pedagogical skills of teachers are improved to achieve learning environments where Native Hawaiian students can learn and excel. Findings across the educational community singularly identify the quality of instruction as being the most crucial factor in making significant strides to eliminate the achievement gap. Therefore, this project seeks to invest in opportunities that ensure teacher effectiveness in classrooms to make significant gains in student achievement at two public high school sites in North Hawai'i .

To improve the academic achievement of Native Hawaiian students, an innovative approach to teacher development will be undertaken with in-service for teachers at Kohala High and Honoka'a High Schools that will transform teaching and learning. In the second and third years, Kohala Middle School will be added to the project to build further capacity within the Kohala Complex. The middle school serves the same community and thus shares the similar demographics as the high school.

This project will help teachers apply knowledge of cultural preferences of Native Hawaiian students directly into their classroom practices. Research based practices and

protocols that best support teacher development to teach to the unique needs of Native Hawaiian learners will be accessed for this project. The project is described fully in the next section B:

Project Design.

B. Quality of the Project Design *(i) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs;*

This project directly addresses the needs of the target population of students and teachers. As referenced previously in section A, there is a need to improve the level of Native Hawaiian student achievement that currently exists at Honoka‘a High/Intermediate and Kohala High Schools as demonstrated by lagging achievement test scores, grades, and college readiness.

Research cited in Schmoker’s Focus indicates that effective teaching could eliminate the achievement gap in five years.⁸ Competitive priorities 1 and 6 are directly addressed in that activities within the project are aimed at improving student achievement and college retention rates for Native Hawaiian students who are considered at risk, high need, and high poverty. The goals, objectives, and measureable outcomes are outlined in Table B.

Table B

Goal 1	Objectives	Measureable Outcomes
To increase the instructional capacity of teachers through a systematic, research-based approach to developing effective teaching skills.	<u>Objective 1</u> To implement an instructional program that is engaging, rigorous, and relevant, 100% of the project’s instructional staff will incorporate research based strategies and protocols that are responsive to Native Hawaiian needs.	A. Walkthrough data and collaborative coaching logs will indicate inclusion of research-based strategies and protocols by 90% of teachers.
	<u>Objective 2</u> To increase the ability of Native Hawaiian students to graduate from high school with requisite skills to ensure college and career readiness, 70% of Native Hawaiian students will show increased achievement in core subject areas as evidenced by quarterly grades and proficiency assessments.	B. At year end, Lexile scores of Native Hawaiian students will increase by one grade level band on reading assessments.
		C. Native Hawaiian students will significantly ($p < .05$) increase in GPA by the end of the school year.
		D. At year end, there will be significant ($p < .05$) increases in percentages testing as proficient on HSA scores.

		E. Student performance on SAT, ACT and Compass exams will increase significantly ($p < .05$) in years one and two, and maintained in year three.
Goal 2	Objectives	Measureable Outcomes
To foster teacher leadership skills to build internal instructional capacity within the school and complex.	Objective 3 To develop a cadre of teachers who possess skills and behaviors to serve as effective instructional mentors, 75% of project teachers will complete mentor training and serve as a peer mentor for at least one teacher each year.	F. Participating teachers will improve significantly ($p < .05$) to greater levels than non-participating teachers on objective tests of attitudes, skills and knowledge engendered in the mentor training.
	Objective 4 To support the integration of culturally sensitive teaching strategies, 100% of project teachers will conduct peer observations.	G. 100% of participating teachers will meet their learning goal established in phase I of each cycle of professional development as evidenced by end of project teacher portfolio.
Goal 3	Performance Objectives	Measureable Outcomes
Establish Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) to create a supportive context for improving teaching and learning.	Objective 5 To improve teacher skills in making instructional decisions, 100% of teachers will develop and utilize common formative assessments.	H. 100% use of formative assessments will be evidenced by completed pacing guides and PLC minutes.
	Objective 6 To ensure increased academic performance of Native Hawaiian students, 100% of project teachers will participate in data driven, collaborative planning with other teachers.	I. The number of D's and F's in core subject areas will decrease by 10% each year as evidenced by year end grade reports.

Implementation of Project *Pili A Pa'a* will occur on two levels. On one level, six complete cycles of a focused teacher development program will occur each year. Each cycle will consist of an eight week period that is divided into four weeks of intensive, out of classroom professional development and four weeks of classroom application accompanied by coaching assistance. Each eight week cycle will provide six teachers with a significant amount of time to develop curricular units with depth, to reflect on their own teaching behaviors, and to engage in careful study of their classroom data to intentionally select strategies that will best fit their learners. Teachers will also participate in mentor teacher training. Developing the skills to become an effective instructional mentor will help to refine each teacher's repertoire of skills and serve as an important way to impact the teaching of others.

After four weeks, teachers will return to their classrooms to implement new teacher practices and lessons that they develop in the previous four weeks. The instructional coach and Hawai‘i Edison Alliance (Alliance) personnel will support the rollout within the classroom and help teachers utilize the formative data to readjust the instructional program during this time. Teachers will be a part of a professional learning community (PLC) to share their work and receive critical feedback to improve. PLCs will serve as a forum for teachers to analyze data on their Native Hawaiian students to determine what strategies are effective and what course of action to take when more support is required. Teachers will utilize the information they obtain about significant cultural traits and values of Native Hawaiians as a basis to interpret student data and intentionally embed strategies into lesson planning and delivery.

(ii) *The extent to which the design of the proposed project reflects up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice;*

Project *Pili A Pa‘a* will provide a program that will improve the quality of instruction for Native Hawaiian students in partnership with two high schools in North Hawai‘i. The three main goals of this project are to: 1) Implement teaching pedagogy that improves Native Hawaiian student achievement, 2) Build instructional leadership capacities of all teachers to sustain the impact of the project beyond the grant cycle, 3) Create a culture of collaboration through PLCs. Research confirms that high quality instruction is the key to significantly raising student achievement. In fact, students working with an effective teacher can make 2-3 grades of growth in one school year.⁹ The services provided by Project *Pili A Pa‘a* will not only provide valuable information about Hawaiian culture, but they will also include the support mechanisms to assist teachers in using this knowledge to create culture rich, adaptive classrooms.

Each cycle will be replicated 6 times during the project year with different in-service teachers completing the process. During each of the first four week cycle, in-service teachers will be replaced by highly qualified replacement teachers in the classroom, while they engage in an in depth professional sabbatical to refine their pedagogical skills. The complete cycle is outlined by weeks in the charts that follow for cycles 1-6.

Table C

Week 1		Person(s) responsible
Day 1 and 2	Cycle Teachers participate in Professional Development; Review of research based effective teaching components of the lesson cycle to identify and develop specific “smart” learning goal(s) for the 4 week period; briefing on Native Hawaiian culture and learning styles.	Consultant, Instructional Coaches
Day 3	Meeting in job-a-like pairings with instructional coach to begin unit development (standard alignment, assessment, strategies, etc)	Instructional Coaches
Day 4 and 5	Cycle Teachers work on identified learning goal with assistance from instructional coaches (research, teacher observations, lesson/unit planning, pacing guides, creating formative assessments, collaborative group work).	Cycle Teachers, Instructional Coaches, Project Director
Weeks 2-3		
Day 1	Cycle Teachers-Targeted Professional Development determined by analysis of personal learning goals.	Instructional Coaches, Consultant
Day 2 and 3	Cycle Teachers work on specific learning goals and implement learning from previous day professional development session with assistance from instructional coaches (research, teacher observations, lesson/unit planning, pacing guides, creating formative assessments, collaborative group work).	Cycle Teachers, Instructional Coaches, Project Director
Day 4	Classroom observations within home school, different schools, and colleges.	
Day 5	Meeting in job-a-like pairings with instructional coach to develop units and create common formative assessments for content area and share strategies; create curricular alignments between schools	Instructional Coaches
Week 4		
1 Day per week	Meeting in job-a-like pairings with instructional coach to develop units and create common formative assessments for content area and share strategies	Instructional Coaches
Days 1-2	Cycle Teachers work on finalizing and refining instructional plans to be implemented upon return to the classroom. Activities occurring during this time are focused on preparing for return to the classroom. (Refining lesson/unit planning/pacing guides, Integrating use of developed formative assessments, role playing lessons with a colleague, team teaching lessons with replacement teacher)	Cycle Teachers
Day 3	Develop plan for mentoring, coaching with staff	Cycle teachers, Instructional Coaches
Day 4	Mentor Training; Development of mentoring plan to be implemented at school site	Consultant, cycle teachers
Day 5	Post-Conference /Debrief/Next steps	Cycle teachers,

	Transition activities, classroom observation, meeting with replacement teacher	School Admin, Instructional Coaches
--	--	--

An initial orientation of the cohort in week one will consist of an overview of the process, expectations of participation, a review of the goals and objectives, and the instructional protocols that will be utilized in the process. Sessions on Hawaiian culture and its impacts on learning for Native Hawaiian students will help teachers build culturally effective practices into their planning. Teachers will also review research based effective teaching components of the lesson cycle. The cycle of instruction complements Native Hawaiian learning styles as it infuses opportunities to learn from modeling, guided practice, engage in collaboration, and demonstrate learning in multiple formats. With the assistance of the instructional coach, cycle teachers will select individual learning goal(s). To determine specific learning goals for each teacher, the instructional coach will conduct individual data meetings with teachers. Instructional coaches will ensure that each cycle teacher's learning goal appropriately stretches the teacher's learning, is derived from a significant need, and is realistic in terms of the time for completion.

There is a structural commonality among effective teachers in which successful teaching practices include a review of prerequisite learning, clear expectations of learning goals, explicit presentation of new material, opportunities for active practice with guidance, frequent questioning to check for understanding, and systematic feedback and corrections.¹⁰ The instructional model that will provide a common foundation among participants includes a cycle of a class opening activity (Do Now, Opening Practice, Bell work, etc), Direct instruction, Guided Practice, Independent Work, and Closure. Based on the work of Pearson and Gallagher, the Gradual Release of Responsibility model asks that teachers engage in purposeful instruction and that a scaffolding of responsibility from teacher to student occur during the cycle.¹¹

The Gradual Release of Responsibility will be used as the anchor for instructional planning. The use of all parts of the instructional cycle as an expected practice will benefit students. Each component of the cycle is unique in its purpose and can be refined with the discriminate use of strategies that create conditions for Native Hawaiian students to learn. For example, precursors to instruction are important engagement tools for Native Hawaiian students. “The first thing students need to learn is what they are supposed to be learning.”¹² Because the making of meaning impacts the motivation of Native Hawaiian learners, strategies used in the opening minutes of class must underscore application value to the lesson. Graphic organizers are an example of a strategy to help students to make sense of the material using visual cues. Skillful use of graphic organizers can contribute to collaborative group work and high student engagement in the classroom.

The components where the instruction is delivered and practiced, direct instruction and guided practice, are areas where teachers have the opportunity to convey information through a host of venues. During the first four weeks of each cycle, teachers will utilize the time investigating options and aligning strategies to meet learner needs. It is imperative that the opportunities to connect learning to higher levels of thinking and problem-solving occur with regularity during direct instruction, guided practice, and later during independent work. Guided practice represents the component that naturally plays to the strengths of the Native Hawaiian learner. The ability to show and apply learning to a practical and/or real life situation makes it meaningful to Native Hawaiian students. As an example, in Hawaiian culture, demonstration or modeling is an effective method to pass on information or cultivate talent. Within this mentoring approach, respect is mutually cultivated and students are invested as learners. Patience, cooperative learning, and creative thinking are encouraged and are evident in final products (i.e.,

art form, dance, or song rendition). Culturally sensitive strategies of the western world include many strategies that utilize collaborative learning groups and engage in a process with multiple solutions. Teachers will be tasked with developing a bank of strategies that will effectively engage Native Hawaiian students.

Teachers will learn to embed culturally sensitive, research based strategies in each component of the lesson cycle. Thoughtful planning and thorough understanding of learner needs will ultimately result in strong pedagogy and increased student achievement. Teachers will also learn to administer frequent formative assessments and to utilize the information derived from these assessments to continually adjust the instructional program to ensure that learning is optimized for all students.

During coaching and PLC discussions, two types of protocols will be utilized to keep discussion focused on the task. These research based protocols will aid the instructional coaches who will facilitate conferences with teachers and groups during each eight week cycle. The success analysis protocol, a five step process, will be used for discussions with the instructional coach. The tuning protocol, a method to effectively stimulate collegial discussions, will be used to facilitate the process within PLCs. The overarching purpose of a tuning protocol is to give teachers critical feedback in order to “fine tune” their practice.¹³

The rationale behind job-a-like pairings of teachers is to have two teachers from neighboring schools collaborate on instructional planning. Education in Hawai‘i exists under a state-wide umbrella of one system and it makes sense to achieve instructional alignment between schools sharing the same grade levels. Tangible teacher products from participation in this Project *Pili A Pa‘a* include a teacher learning portfolio that includes: 1) an identified learning goal, 2) an individualized learning plan, 3) detailed pacing guides that include strategies and

activities based on research of best practices for Native Hawaiian students, 4) completed curricular units, 5) common formative and summative assessments, and 6) collaborative assessment logs that document coaching discussions and next steps.

Simultaneously, a yearly professional development schedule on leading and learning within a professional learning community will be occurring for all staff members. The establishment of Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) is the third component of this project and addresses objectives 5 and 6 to improve teachers' ability to make informed decisions in order to ensure that the instruction students receive across the academic spectrum is engaging, rigorous, meaningful, and empowering. DuFour outlines three essential questions that drive the work of a community of learners: 1) What do we want each student to learn? 2) How will we know when each student has learned it? 3) How will we respond when a student experiences difficulty in learning?¹⁴ This process ensures that students are not only taught, but taught in such a way that leads to higher levels of student achievement. The products that result from collaborative teacher conversations include lists of agreed upon essential outcomes of learning a particular concept, common assessments, analysis of data, strategies to be employed in order to improve learning results, and calibration of what constitutes quality work. Teachers will utilize PLC's to analyze Native Hawaiian performance across subject areas and create action plans that address the three essential questions posed by DuFour.

(iii) The extent to which the proposed project will be coordinated with similar or related efforts, and with other appropriate community, State, and Federal resources.

In its first year, Project *Pili A Pa'a* will serve a population of 946 students of which approximately 400 are of Native Hawaiian descent and 72 teachers. The project will partner with two schools, Honoka'a High and Intermediate and Kohala High. The schools are located in

rural communities and are similar in Native Hawaiian presence. The level of coordination between Project *Pili A Pa'a* and state and federal resources is considerable.

Both schools are part of the West Hawai'i Complex Area on the island of Hawai'i. Project *Pili A Pa'a* has the full support of the Complex Area Superintendent (*letter of support is included in the Appendix*). Project *Pili A Pa'a* is clearly aligned with the State of Hawai'i Department of Education's priority of eliminating the achievement gap.

There is strong administrative support for collaborative networking between schools and grant implementation. The school administrators for each of the schools are committed to successfully implementing the activities as outlined. In the role as instructional leaders at their respective schools, the school administrators spend a significant amount of time attending to improving student performance at all levels and are; therefore of one mind with the Project *Pili A Pa'a* to improve student achievement in North Hawai'i. In addition, the Hawai'i Edison Alliance (Alliance) will complement the services provided by Project *Pili A Pa'a*. The Alliance has been working with the schools for the past three years in Honoka'a and for the past year at Kohala High. When teachers return to the classroom after completing the first four weeks of the teacher development cycle, Alliance personnel will provide the coaching and assist with PLC work. The Alliance is also equipped to provide support in operationalizing the instructional model that will be utilized for Project *Pili A Pa'a*. As described in section A, in year two, Kohala Middle School will be added into the partnership adding 86 students of Native Hawaiian descent and 16 teachers to the populations impacted by the grant (486 Native Hawaiian students and 88 teachers). This project is a professional development initiative that is based on the premise that student achievement is commensurate with teacher effectiveness. Professional development will consist of three components: 1) Four weeks of an intensive examination of

curriculum, teaching strategies, learning styles, and building teacher mentorship skills; 2) Four weeks of coaching services upon returning to the classroom (in partnership the Alliance) ; 3) ongoing analysis of data and instructional refinements through the collegial practices of PLC work.

C. Adequacy of resources (i) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and to the anticipated results and benefits:

Cost items for the project have been carefully considered to support successful and complete implementation. A full description of budgetary items is described in the budget narrative. Costs outlined for the project are reasonable in terms of the number of students and teachers that it will impact over a three year period. In year one, 400 Native Hawaiian students will be impacted through the professional development services provided to 72 in-service teachers. In years two and three, with the inclusion of Kohala Middle School, an additional 86 Native Hawaiian students and 16 teachers will be added. Although all students will be impacted, the calculated costs that follow have considered counts for only Native Hawaiian students. With a total requested budget of [REDACTED], the individual cost during the first year amounts to [REDACTED]. In years two and three, the individual cost is [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] respectively. Taken from another perspective, in year one 472 students and teachers will be impacted. In year one, this translates to 538,080 contact hours and amounts to an hourly cost of [REDACTED] (where the total annual budget is divided by the number of students/teachers x 30 hours per week x 38 weeks). In years two and three, there will be 654,360 contact hours and the hourly per participant cost is projected at [REDACTED] in year two and year three at [REDACTED]. This demonstrates the reasonable cost of project implementation over three years.

In addition, the costs of project implementation are reasonable in terms of the anticipated results and benefits in that Project *Pili A Pa'a* is developing long term capacity through teacher development. It is anticipated that teaching quality will significantly improve through the implementation of this project. The impact of quality instruction is a result that will be sustained well beyond the grant cycle. Higher student achievement for Native Hawaiian students is a measureable result that makes the cost of project implementation reasonable. When students excel academically, their future options will be greater.

(ii) the relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project;

Partners in Development Foundation (PIDF) has managed over 50 USDOE grants and has expertise in managing multi-year project implementation. PIDF has established systems in place to manage the administrative and financial process to ensure accountability. The three schools, Kohala High, Kohala Middle, and Honoka'a High and Intermediate Schools are named partners in Project *Pili A Pa'a* providing teachers committed to the process of professional improvement and the full support of the school administrators. As the instructional leaders of their schools, they play an integral part in teacher development activities. The Alliance, an external provider secured by the Hawai'i Department of Education, is an established educational support entity that has expertise in assisting schools with corrective action status. The commitment of the Complex Area Superintendent and the Alliance is described in section B(iii).

The services of the Educational Consultant, Dr. Tom Many, has been secured as a partner in Project *Pili A Pa'a*. His responsibility is to conduct essential trainings in PLC development and to build a foundation of collaborative support and to strengthen skills in using data for decision-making. He will provide quarterly PLC trainings to all staff, provide

consultative services to the project team, and conduct monthly webinar sessions with cycle teachers as an ongoing support. Dr. Many has served as a consultant for successful implementation of PLC's within schools. *(See resume in Appendix)*

(iii) the extent to which the budget is adequate to support the proposed project

The process of determining adequacy of resources entailed a process that began with an analysis of the goals and objectives of the project in order to create a budget that was aligned to the purpose(s) of the grant. A determination was made on the specific enabling activities that would be implemented to successfully address each of the project's objectives and is included in a comprehensive management plan that follows in Section D. The management plan will ensure that timelines are met and that monies allocated will be expended as planned. Considerations were made to ensure that the costs involved were reasonable. The budget was finalized with confidence that it was adequate to support the proposed project in totality. A complete description and justification for the proposed budget is found in the budget narrative.

The project team is fully capable of engaging in ongoing analysis of the project and adjusting budgetary items to provide the most comprehensive services to the targeted population. Quarterly progress reports will include the status of project spending to ensure that the rate of spending is on target to projections and is appropriately distributed to meet the deliverables of the project on time and efficiently. The proposed budget, as described above, is reasonable in terms of cost per participant and lasting impacts and sustainability after the project ends.

D. Quality of the management plan *(i) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks*

A clear management plan complete with major tasks, timelines, and milestones to be met and persons responsible for each task is outlined in Table D. The table reflects the timeline for

year one. With the exception of startup activities in the first three months, the timelines for years 2 and 3 would be the same. The table also references the six objectives, GPRA measures, and competitive priorities that directly relate to the project goals.

Table D

Task	Timeline	Milestone	Person(s) Responsible	Obj/GRPA/Priorities
Hiring of project staff: Announcements, Interviews, Selection	6 weeks Start date: 8/1/12	Recruitment of instructional coaches, project assistant and replacement teachers 9/15/12: Selections and hiring completed	Exec. Project Director/ Project Director	Obj: 1-6 Priorities:1,6
Orientation of replacement teachers	1 week Start Date: 9/30/12	Classroom observations and team teaching with first cycle teachers	Instructional Coaches	Obj: 1 Priorities:1,6
Management team meetings	Weekly Start Date: 9/15/12	9/15/12: Complete staff meeting calendar; Ongoing assessment of project progress	Exec. Project Director/ Project Director/ Consultant/ Cultural Specialist	Priorities:1,6
Selection of Cycle 1 teachers	Start Date 10/1/12	Three teachers from each school selected to participate in cycle 1	School Administrators	Obj: 1-6 GPRA: 1,3 Priorities:1,6
Initial program orientation for participating 1 st round teachers	2 days Start Date: 10/9/12	Overview : protocols, project objectives, and outcomes; Hawaiian culture orientation	Instructional Coaches/ Cultural Specialist	Obj: 1, 2 GPRA: 1,3 Priorities:1,6
Cycle 1: Job-a-like pairings support meetings	Weekly: 10/11/12	Vertically aligning curriculum, assessment development; embedding of best practices for Native Hawaiian learners	Instructional Coaches/ Cycle Teachers	Obj: 1,2,4 GPRA: 1,3 Priorities:1,6
Cycle 1: Group work sessions	Weekly Start Date: 10/12/12	Evidence of meeting learning goals; Completed pacing guides/lessons; Embedded best practice strategies; Implementation plan	Instructional Coaches/ Consultant	Obj: 1-4 GPRA: 1,3 Priorities:1,6
Cycle I: Individual planning and coaching	2 x per wk Start Date: 10/9/12	Progress report from instructional coach	Instructional Coaches Cycle Teachers	Obj: 1,2 GPRA:1,3 Priorities:1,6
Cycle I: Teacher leadership training	2 days in last week 11/5/12	Formal training on teacher mentoring skills and development of mentoring plan	Instructional Coaches/ Consultant	Obj: 3,4 GPRA:1,3 Priorities:1,6
Cycle 1: Post-Conference/ Closure	Last day of 4 week cycle	Individual teacher presentation Completed teacher learning portfolios; Evaluation	Project Director	Obj: 1-4 GPRA: 1,3 Priorities:1,6
Cycle I: Coaching	4 weeks Start Date: 11/12/12	Classroom implementation of new strategies and curriculum	HI Edison Alliance	Obj 1-6 GPRA: 1,3 Priorities:1,6
Cycles 2-6 (see Cycle 1 above)	4 week intervals	Schedule of activities as established for Cycle I	see above	See Above

Team Data Meeting	Quarterly Start Date: 10/9/12	Discuss, reflect, and monitor effectiveness and progress of implementation of first cycle. 12/14/12: 2 nd qtr 3/15/13: 3 rd qtr. 5/24/13: 4 th qtr.	Exec Project Director/ Project Director/ Consultant/ School Administrators/ Cultural Specialist	Obj: 5, 6 GPRA: 1,3 Priorities:1,6
Implement PLC trainings	Start Date: 8/15/12	Quarterly 8/15/12; 10/10/12; 1/9/13;4/3/13) Establishment of common protocols to run PLC's with entire teaching staff	Consultant	Obj: 5,6 GPRA: 1,3 Priorities:1,6
Schedule PLC's & mentoring	8/15/2012	Monthly	School Administrators	
Development/ completion of pre/post teacher surveys	Annually; 2 times	Pre 10/3/12 Post: 5/15/13 Completed surveys are reviewed by the management team	Project Director/School Administrators/ Cultural Specialist	Obj: 1-6 GPRA: 1,3 Priorities:1,6
Progress reports to Partners in Development Foundation	Quarterly Start Date: 10/31/12	Tentative Due Dates: 11/18/12: 1 st qtr 2/17/13: 2 nd qtr 5/18/13: 3 rd qtr 8/18/13: 4 th qtr	Project Director/School Administrators	Obj: 1-6 GPRA: 1,3 Priorities:1,6
Administration of pre/post student surveys: skills, attitudes, academics	Annually; 2 times	Pre-test: 8/3/12 complete pre-surveys to establish baseline Post: 4/30/13 administer post-test	Instructional Coaches	Obj: 2, 4 GPRA: 1,3 Priorities:1,6
School Community council presentations	Annual; 4/15/13	Teacher presentation of grant objectives/activities and their proposed impact on student achievement	Exec. Project Director/ School Administrators Project Director	Obj: 1-6 GPRA: 1,3 Priorities:1,6
Annual ACSD Instructional Leadership Conference	4 days	6/1/13: Complete travel authorizations, registration, and travel arrangements 6/28/13: 4 training days	Project Director/ Instructional Coaches/ School Administrators	Obj: 1-6 Priorities:1,6
Preparation of reports	Annually	As requested: USDOE reports	Project Director	Obj: 1-6 GPRA: 1,3 Priorities:1,6

(ii) The extent to which the time commitments of the project director and principal investigator and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project; and

The Project Team is confident that the objectives and accompanying activities are reasonable in terms of time allotted, budget, and commitment of team members. Key personnel attached to this project are highly qualified and can successfully carry out the responsibilities that are assigned to their specific roles. The Project Team will provide conscientious oversight of

project activities and will ensure that all project objectives are met. The management team consists of an Executive Project Director, a Project Director, the School Site Administrators, two Instructional coaches, and a part-time Project Assistant.

The President of Partners in Development Foundation (PIDF), Mr. Jan Hanohano Dill, will serve as Executive Project Director (█ FTE) and will provide administrative direction and oversight for this project (*see resume in appendix*). Since 1997, this 501(c)(3) non-profit organization has successfully managed multiple federal and state funded projects in Hawai'i. Partners in Development Foundation has the necessary financial and administrative management systems and personnel to effectively implement the proposed project with the United States Department of Education.

Ms. Joyce Hashimoto will serve as the Project Director (█ FTE). Ms. Hashimoto is a retired educator. Her most recent position has been as a Career Technical Education Resource within the West Hawai'i Complex Area in Hawai'i (*see resume in appendix*). She has had experience in the management of federal grants. Her responsibilities include direct oversight of project activities at the schools including supervision of instructional coaches, collaboration with school administrators and Hawai'i Edison Alliance resource personnel, and hiring of replacement teachers. In collaboration with the school administrators, the Project Director will develop the recruitment schedule for teachers entering each cycle, and clearly delineate the responsibilities and expectations for in-service teachers participating in the program.

The School Site Administrators (in kind services) will collaborate with the Project Director and the consultant on the professional development schedule that all staff members will be receiving and will provide supervision over the implementation of professional learning communities. They will provide instructional oversight at the school and work closely with

Alliance personnel as they provide coaching services to teachers. The School Site Administrators will attend and contribute to project team and management meetings to ensure grant alignment with school initiatives.

The role of the Instructional coach (██████ FTE) will include the ongoing coordination of teacher leader training sessions and will serve as an instructional mentor for teams of six teachers enrolled in each 8-week teacher development cycle. During each 4 week cycle, the Instructional Coach will lead teachers through a process of honest reflection of the current state of their practices and the creation of a revised plan of effective strategies attuned to the Native Hawaiian learner that can be implemented upon return to the classroom. The Instructional Coach will be a resource for strategies and tools to help teachers develop detailed pacing guides embedded with planned activities and lessons built on research based practices that will delineate how student learners will be engaged in the learning process.

Services provided by the Cultural Specialist Team are integral to the grant's implementation. Services will include cultural training of teachers during the orientation phase of each of the six cycles. Teacher knowledge of the cultural values and learning preferences for their students will create the basis for their work on refining their pedagogy. The Cultural Specialist team will also provide ongoing consultation with the Project Director and instructional coaches. A member of the team will be a part of management meetings and team data meetings to help the project team formatively assess the progress with the implementation process and to make adjustments as required.

The Project Assistant, Carol Fuentes (██████ FTE), will work directly under the Project Director and will be responsible for all clerical duties inclusive of preparation of payroll information, written correspondence, scheduling of appointments, and preparation of training

materials. She will also collect and prepare data for analysis for monthly project team meetings and prepare contracts for the professional development providers. *(see resume in appendix)*

(iii) The adequacy of mechanisms for ensuring high quality products and services from the proposed projects

The assembled project team and firm commitments of partners associated with the project create a powerful mechanism for ensuring successful implementation of Project *Pili A Pa'a*. The strong connection and singular vision with the schools allow for a project that will be implemented with fidelity. The regularly scheduled team meetings and progress monitoring will keep the project on track to meet its timelines and measureable outcomes. The expertise of PIDF in managing grants has built in mechanisms to ensure an efficient process of accountability and quality assurance.

The level of collaboration that has been included in the grant activities provides teachers with valuable time to discuss, share, and to serve as mentors with their colleagues. The articulation between schools is another mechanism that will strengthen the work within the project. Peer support has always proven to be an effective motivator for adults and children.

Six teachers will be contracted under the supervision of the School Site Administrators during the first and second years (four teachers in the third year). These teachers have an integral part of ensuring quality services during the absence of the in-service teachers during each four week cycle. The project team plans to seek venues such as the Teach for America program to serve in this role as past experiences have been very successful. Candidates are well prepared for effective instructional delivery upon arrival and have the ability to successfully migrate from one classroom to the next without jeopardizing the quality of the instruction.

E. Quality of Project Evaluation *(i) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the context within which the project operates.*

PIDF and partnering agencies are implementing an Integrated Evaluation Model (IEM) to ensure the integrity of PIDF and its various programs. While the model addresses a variety of Native Hawaiian educational programs with specific content and assessment tools, there is a set of common precepts underlying the logic model of goals, strategies and intended outcomes for each individual program, and programs for similar populations even share some common evaluation measures. The PIDF IEM mandates (1) formative process evaluation, (2) summative process evaluation and (3) outcome evaluation, of which all three use some common data.

(1) The formative process evaluation will monitor “implementation fidelity” by measuring and documenting the extent to which the project implements the planned objectives, on a timely basis, in compliance with project plans, and the extent to which they contribute to the overall program goals. Program objectives will be broken into the expanded sequence of “action steps” required to achieve each objective, and each action step will be cross-walked to the “person(s) responsible, deadlines and completion status.” Completion status will be reviewed (monthly, quarterly and annually) by assessing each action step *qualitatively* as being “in planning/not yet due, on-schedule, completed or delayed.” The percentage of steps in each category will be quantified by program objective and project-wide. Continuous monitoring will serve to alert administrators of problems as they emerge to enable early remedial actions.

(2) The summative process evaluation will provide quarterly reports of cumulative inventories of indicators of the variety of project activities such as the numbers and characteristics of students and families served and realizing various program benefits, in the context of project activities (e.g. professional development) contributing to those results. Together, formative and summative data will document the extent to which planned activities

were completed and resulted in achieving the overall project goals and objectives to give staff feedback to support program improvement and replication.

(3) The outcome evaluation will measure and document systemic and programmatic outcomes with a focus on direct results for participants, including changes in student and teacher characteristics within (pre to post) and across successive program years, using common statistical tests of the significance of those changes (e.g. t- and F-tests, chi-square).

Whenever a comparison group is available (e.g. teachers participating vs. not participating in training), the full two-group design below will be used. When comparison groups are not available (e.g. training required of all teachers) a simple one-group design will be used,

	Intake	Follow-up
Intervention Group	X_{pre}	X_{post}
Comparison Group	X_{pre}	X_{post}

simply eliminating the comparison group row in the diagram. Appropriate combinations of measures will be combined in multiple analysis of variance (MANOVA) models for repetition computing multivariate (Hotelling's T) as well as univariate (F/t-tests) tests of significance, using the general linear model (GLM). Measureable dosage effects will be assessed by entering training attendance into the MANOVA analyses as a covariate. Categorical data (e.g. HSA proficiency across years) will be assessed in contingency table analyses using *chi-square* significance. Results will be presented in local Hawaiian education forums and professional seminars.

Dr. Scott Ray will serve as the external evaluator. Dr. Ray holds a Ph.D. in Social Science Research including significant statistical coursework in educational psychology. He resides in Hawai'i; has 35 years of experience, including serving as a Research Director in a University setting and on several large-scale Federal grants; teaching statistical research methods

and evaluating scores of Federal grant projects, including a dozen projects targeted to Native Hawaiians. *(See resume in Appendix).*

(ii) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide timely guidance for quality assurance.

As specified above, formative and summative process analyses will be performed and the results shared with the project team and PIDF administrators quarterly and thereafter, with annual summaries. The initial monthly reports will be abbreviated summaries designed to identify and address difficulties with the start-up of the project. Early standardized tests (e.g. Edison Benchmark, STAR and HSA assessments) will be distributed to teachers to support tailoring curriculum and instruction. Outcome analyses will be added into the quarterly reports cumulatively as sufficient data become available to support analysis and reporting, beginning with baseline data in the initial reports and incorporating analyses of changes from pre- to post-tests as follow-up data are collected. These reports will be presented annually to school's stakeholders, PIDF board of Directors, and to USDOE as requested. As indicated above, process evaluations will qualitatively assess and quantitatively summarize the overall status and progress of the project, delayed action steps, emerging issues, recommendations, and lessons learned as well as the implications of outcome data as it is accumulated. At the end of the project, the collective results of quarterly reports will be summarized in a narrative that will support *replication* by identifying the history of project implementation; problems that arose; outcomes achieved; remedial actions that were taken; and which remedial actions were successful or not.

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

Both process performance indicators and outcome measures were specified in relationship to the specific program goals and objectives in Table B, and additional behavioral performance indicators were specified in Table C that detailed in-service training activities and Table D that detailed the overall work plan. The crosswalks of program objectives to person(s) responsible, deadlines and completion status specified in the IEM above will include the behavioral objectives from Table B, C, and D and possibly other important objectives of the program that develop. These behavioral performance indicators will be broken into the more specific action steps required to achieve them as appropriate.

The outcome measures were also specified in Table A. The Project Director and Evaluator will work together to develop the instruments assessing teachers attitudes, knowledge and skill related to the training. As a formative measure, the evaluator will factor analyze the internal validity of the attitudinal measures and perform item analysis on the other measures to be created relating to the specific training curriculum.

Summary statistics on walkthroughs and coaching logs will be used to assess Objective 1 on incorporation of research-based strategies. Lexile scores, student GPAs, HSA assessments and college entrance and placement exams will assess the achievement of Native Hawaiian students specified in Objective 2, and the tests to be developed on teacher's attitudes, knowledge and skills will be used to assess the efficacy of the training specified in Objective 3. Formative assessment data will assess improvements in teaching pedagogy (objective 5), and the decrease in D's and F's will assess the quality of instruction specified in Objective 6. Finally, the specified GPRA data relevant to the Native Hawaiian students in schools served by this program (percentages meeting specified proficiency standards and graduation from high school) will be reported to USDOE as required.