

TEACHER QUALITY PARTNERSHIPS
Grant Application
College of Education
Georgia State University

PROJECT DESIGN

The primary goal of the Network for Enhancing Teacher Quality (NET-Q) project is to increase the quality and number of highly qualified teachers who are committed to high needs schools. Project objectives and activities present an exceptional approach to the priorities established for this competition: (a) enhancing pre-baccalaureate teacher preparation programs; (b) enhancing post-baccalaureate teacher preparation programs; and (c) creating teacher and leadership programs residency for post-baccalaureate candidates. These initiatives will be complemented by a comprehensive induction/mentor program, enhanced professional development school partnerships, and the development of faculty knowledge. All initiatives (pre- and post-baccalaureate teacher and leader preparation programs and complementary initiatives) will include a focus on developing teachers' knowledge and skills related to teaching special education, English Language Learners (ELL), technology, and literacy across the content areas.

NET-Q Partners include: six urban school district partners, National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (NCTAF), Georgia Public Broadcasting (GPB), Clark Atlanta University (a Historically Black College [CAU]), Albany State University (rural, a Historically Black College [ASU]), Columbus State University (rural [CSU]), and Georgia Perimeter College (a 2-year institution [GPC]). Twenty-three rural school districts will partner with our rural university partners (19 with CSU and 4 with ASU).

Appendix 1 provides a chart with an overview of the NET-Q partnership.

1 Introduction and Over-all Needs

While the teacher education programs in the partnership have enjoyed relative success, changes in Georgia's student population and classroom organization have prompted needs in three focal areas and require partnership's response: (1) more and more effectively prepared **Special Education** teachers; (2) more and more effectively prepared teachers for **English as a Second Language (ESOL)**; (3) more integration of **technology** in teacher preparation and P-12 schooling; and (4) more integration of **literacy** instructional methods across all content areas. These areas are threaded throughout this proposal and have been indicated as high-needs areas by partner districts and the Georgia Professional Standards Commission (GPSC).

1.1 Special Education

Georgia's special education population is growing rapidly. Data show that between 1998 and 2007, Georgia's schools are serving an additional 18.5% of students with disabilities (an increase from 1,393,029 in 1998 to 1,650,730 in 2007 [Data Accountability Center, 2009; retrieved on June 30, 2009, from <https://www.ideadata.org/PopulationData.asp>]). Furthermore, special education constitutes the second largest shortage area of teachers in Georgia with, for example, 43.2% of elementary special education instructors not fully certified (GPSC, 2009). Therefore, more teachers are required to hold a certificate in Special Education. Additionally, Georgia's State Department of Education is implementing a mandate that more students be placed in inclusive settings (i.e., the general education classroom). In 2008, more than 80% of districts across the state placed at least 58% of students with disabilities in general education classrooms (Georgia Department of Education, 2008). This increase of inclusive classrooms requires that general education teachers have knowledge, skills, and strategies to accommodate students' needs. Almost every teacher, special education certified or not, will encounter students

with special needs in any given academic year (Georgia Department of Education, Retrieved on June 30, 2009, from <http://www.doe.k12.ga.us>).

1.2 ESOL

In addition, Georgia has one of the fastest growing ESOL populations in the nation and is vastly underprepared to meet the needs of these students (Maxwell, 2009). ESOL enrollment throughout Georgia's P-12 schools has burgeoned more than 200% between 1995-2005 (Maxwell, 2009). U.S. Census Bureau (2003) reports indicate that metro-Atlanta is experiencing the most rapid growth of Hispanic populations among the nation's 20 most populous cities. Like many states, Georgia faces a shortage of teachers specializing in English as a Second Language and currently is experiencing a "teacher gap" (Honawar, 2009). Currently about one in six ESOL students in Georgia are not served by ESOL teachers (GPSC, 2009); evidence suggests that this need will at least double in the next five years (Honawar, 2009; Manzo, 2009). The majority of these teachers will be needed in the metro-Atlanta area.

1.3 Technology

Technology in schooling is a concern throughout the nation; however, technology is especially important in Georgia, about half of teachers surveyed state-wide indicate a need for additional support with professional development (Georgia Department of Education, 2009). Although there is no common international assessment to compare nations in technology proficiency, experts agree that U.S. students are not likely to have the opportunity to compete successfully with their international peers (Manzo, 2009). Georgia's Department of Education (2003) has developed a plan for integrating technology into P-12 classrooms. This plan has been in place for more than five years; however, there is little evidence of change at the teacher preparation level.

1.4 Literacy

With the evolution of literacy technologies and growing accessibility of information, the definition of literacy is changing at an unprecedented rate. Critical literacy, or literacy across the content areas, requires students to do more with text than ever before (Cunningham, 2000; Harste, 1994; Leu & Kinzer, 2000; Moll, 1994). Literacy across the content areas requires skills such as understanding specialized texts, synthesizing information across texts, evaluating information, reading graphs and technical reports, and writing within disciplinary genres. Georgia’s newly revised state curricular standards (Georgia Performance Standards [GPS]) offers a “reading across the curriculum” strand to support literacy instruction by all content-area teachers; however, this strand is new and requires support via changes to teacher education and professional development.

With these focus areas in mind, the College will enhance and expand the following teacher and leader preparation programs:

Priority 1: Pre-baccalaureate Program enhancements (GSU with recruitment from GPC & Clark Atlanta University)	Priority 2: Post-baccalaureate Residencies and Program enhancements (GSU & ASU)
GSU Bachelor of Science in Education (B.S.Ed.) for Elementary Education	GSU: Master of Arts in Teaching (M.A.T.) for English Education, ESOL, Mathematics Education, Middle Level Education, Science Education, Social Studies Education, and Special Education
GSU B.S.Ed. with dual certification in Early Childhood Education and Special Education	ASU Residency Program
GSU B.S.Ed. in Middle Childhood Education (M.C.E.)	GSU Leader in Residency Program

Priorities one and two will be complemented with the following initiatives.

Complementary Initiatives		
Induction and Mentoring (all partners, including Columbus State Univ.)	Enhancements to Profes- sional Development School Network	Professional Development of University Faculty
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mentor training • Cross Career Learning Communities (CCLCs) • Conference • Summer Partnership Institute 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Menu/application process for school partners • School/University clinical instructors • University coaches in residence • Co-instructors for courses • TIP model for professional learning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research Wednesday colloquia • Conference/professional travel stipends • Co-teaching w/ faculty and P-12 teachers

2 Needs Assessments

To assess needs within district partners, GSU has (1) surveyed over 100 Professional Development Schools (PDS) teachers for the past four years, (2) conducted meetings with school leaders, and (3) collected data from the GPSC on highly qualified teachers (Hi-Q) teaching within their subject areas (including Georgia Assessment for the Certification of Teachers [GACE] passing rates, retention, etc.)

2.1 PDS² Surveys of Needs

GSU has benefitted from a 5-year Teacher Quality Enhancement grant sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education, titled *Professional Development School Partnerships Deliver Success* (PDS²), which has strengthened GSU's PDS partnerships from 2004-2009. With this grant, GSU formed lasting PDS partnerships with four of the six urban districts proposed in this grant application, contributed to the professional development of teachers in these districts, and supported the educational achievement of metro-Atlanta children in participating schools.

For each year of the PDS² evaluation, approximately 100 participating teachers in both PDS² intervention as well as control (comparison) schools were given the opportunity to complete the PDS² Teacher Survey. One item on the survey was presented in an open-response format, allowing the participant to write in his or her response to the following item: *Please list your top 3 professional development needs in regards to student achievement and professional growth.* The responses were coded for themes and categorized. This report represents a longitudinal examination of responses over the entire PDS² grant period.

Special Education: Respondents' answers indicate a substantial need for professional development activities to increase both pedagogical and content knowledge when working with special education students in both pull-out and inclusion classrooms. Differentiating instruction was cited regularly as a need. Respondents felt that they needed further assistance in co-teaching and inclusion-based environments. Developing IEPs (Individual Education Programs) and motivating special education students were also mentioned. Respondents indicated the need for additional classroom management training when working with behaviorally-challenged students, accommodating pull-out or inclusion students, working with emotionally or intellectually challenged students, and using effective TAG (Talented and Gifted) strategies.

ESOL/ELL: Given that several schools within the PDS² network have high concentrations of ESOL/ELL enrollment (e.g., Latino, immigrant, highly mobile students) respondents cited the need for professional development activities to work with ESOL/ELL students in the following areas: science, mathematics, reading, language arts, grouping strategies, inclusion strategies, communicating with parents and families, and increasing parental involvement. Several respondents indicated a desire to acquire oral, written, and aural communication skills in Spanish, Vietnamese, or Korean, depending on the demographic reality in the respondents'

respective schools. Many respondents indicated a need for assistance in gaining additional certifications or endorsements in ESOL.

Technology Integration and Access: Respondents cited the need for professional development activities that center on integrating basic technologies into the day-to-day classroom and lesson plans. Respondents requested additional training in the use of Microsoft Office applications, general computer skills training, training in building websites, conducting web-quests, and the setting up and maintenance of centers/labs. Respondents also cited the need for professional development activities in the use of Promethian Boards, SmartBoards, utilizing digital and video editing software, utilizing graphing software, and using content-specific software applications for science, mathematics, English language arts (ELA), reading comprehension, writing, grammar, and spelling.

Literacy Across the Curriculum: Respondents indicated a need for professional development activities that focus on literacy across the curriculum. Specific related content areas mentioned were science, mathematics, social studies, ELA, biology, physical science, spelling, algebra, geometry, U.S. History, and reading.

In addition to teacher surveys, for the past three years (2006-2009), a needs analysis based on NCATE PDS standards in the form of a fidelity of implementation survey has been conducted in four of the urban school systems (Atlanta, DeKalb, Fulton, and Gwinnett) as part of the PDS² grant. The NCATE (2001) developmental guidelines identify four different levels of developmental stages (beginning, developing, at-standard, and leading) of a PDS based on five standards. The five NCATE standards, which are meant to be viewed holistically and which often overlap, address (a) learning community, (b) accountability and quality assurance, (c) collaboration, (d) equity and diversity, and (e) structures, resources, and roles. To judge the

extent to which NCATE PDS standards were being implemented, a survey of teachers consisting of 92 items was conducted in both PDS schools and comparison schools.

Based on the results of the first survey, findings showed that action research by teachers was not being sufficiently accomplished; thus, a need was indicated. The need was address by creating Anchor Action Research projects based on a team of at least one university professor, P-12 teacher, and PDS Intern (student obtaining a degree in teacher education), a model we refer to as the Teacher-Intern-Professor, or TIP, model. More recent surveys indicated that this approach was successful not only in involving P-12 teachers in conducting and better understanding research but also in providing an important reward structure for university faculty to devote significant portions of their time to working in P-12 schools. Hence, Anchor Action Research, which will be described in more detail later in the proposal (Section 5.1.3), will be implemented in the NET-Q grant with an additional new feature: fellowships to university and school faculty to replicate significant student achievement findings and disseminate the results of the Anchor Action Research project. In general, our needs analysis found that teachers endorsed the more practical aspects of NCATE PDS standards which related to their teaching rather than some of the more academic and abstract aspects of the NCATE standards.

2.2 University/School Partner Planning Meetings

To prepare for the TQP grant competition, two leadership planning meetings (March and April 2009) included university leaders (College of Education Dean, Associate Dean of Partnerships, research-evaluation leaders, professional development schools liaisons); P-12 district leaders, including superintendents or their designees, as well as leaders from curriculum, research/planning, professional learning, etc. Leaders reviewed the TQP statue and discussed school needs based on the federal priorities and initiatives. A menu of items was developed;

districts ranked their top critical areas for grant focus and implementation if awarded funding. Those areas included the following: Special education (co-teaching and inclusion), ELL, Science Technology Engineering Mathematics (STEM), Induction (including Cross Career Learning Communities [CCLCs] and other new teacher mentoring and support initiatives), Teacher Preparation, Collaborative Classroom/School-based Inquiry/Research (e.g., TIP), Teacher and Leader Capacity Building, Advanced Credentialing Support, and residencies.

2.3 Georgia Professional Standards Commission (GPSC) Data Tables

Hi-Q data from the GPSC show a need for increasing the number of Hi-Q special education teachers within the NET-Q partner school systems. Of particular concern are the following systems, where the percentages in brackets are the percent of Hi-Q special education teachers for special education classes: Clayton (82.6%), DeKalb (82.9%), Fulton (76.4%), Dougherty (50%), and Mitchell Counties (83.5%) within the NET-Q partnership. Furthermore, a longitudinal analysis of *qualitative data* taken from the PDS² evaluation supports the initial and continuing training efforts toward increasing the number of Hi-Q special education teachers through additional endorsements and certifications.

The following table shows the percentage of Hi-Q teachers statewide and various demographic groups that are often underrepresented.

NET-Q Partner Systems	2008				2009			
	Hi Q	Male	Minority	Non-White Male	Hi Q	Male	Minority	Non-White Male
Urban LEAs								
Atlanta Public	97.6%	91.2%	91.3%	91.1%	98.2%	90.7%	91.1%	90.6%
Clayton County	97.6%	89.9%	91.6%	90.0%	98.2%	93.5%	94.2%	93.6%
Cobb County	97.6%	99.1%	98.2%	98.5%	98.2%	99.6%	99.1%	99.4%
DeKalb County	97.6%	97.6%	97.6%	97.5%	98.2%	97.7%	97.7%	97.6%
Fulton County	97.6%	95.9%	93.9%	94.3%	98.2%	94.8%	93.5%	93.4%
Gwinnett County	97.6%	99.0%	99.1%	98.9%	98.2%	99.5%	99.4%	99.3%
Rural LEAs								
Calhoun County	97.6%	90.7%	94.6%	90.9%	98.2%	95.4%	97.1%	95.6%
Dougherty County	97.6%	92.2%	94.4%	92.6%	98.2%	90.7%	93.1%	90.8%
Mitchell County	97.6%	78.6%	87.8%	83.6%	98.2%	78.0%	87.5%	83.4%
Terrell County	97.6%	94.2%	95.8%	94.5%	98.2%	97.5%	98.3%	97.8%

Source: Georgia Professional Standards Commission (GPSC) Data Set (2009).

As can be inferred from the chart above, a minimum 7 out of 10 NET-Q partner systems fall below the State-wide 2009 Hi-Q average (98.2%) for the percentage of Hi-Q teachers for the typically underrepresented groups of males, non-White males, and members of ethnic minorities. These NET-Q urban partner systems include Atlanta Public, DeKalb, and Fulton. Eleven of the 12 rural NET-Q partner system percentages in the above table fall at or below the state average on all sub-groups over a 2-year period for the percentage of Hi-Q teachers (except for the non-White percentage in Terrell County), demonstrating the need to address rural systems in our work. For the Net-Q urban partner systems, all but Gwinnett and Cobb fall below the state average in regards to these demographic groups for the percentage of Hi-Q teachers (12 of the 18 percentages in this chart). Hence, the needs shown in this table also support TQP indicator 4.2, stated later in this proposal, for activities to increase the percentage of Hi-Q teachers from often underrepresented groups in teaching. Furthermore, Hi-Q data by academic subject indicate that in 2009, two of the four urban school systems in the PDS² study were below 95% Hi-Q (100% is ideal) for ELA, science, and mathematics. These systems are included in the NET-Q partnership,

thus providing additional support for intervention activities to increase the percentage of high quality teachers in these academic subject areas.

3 Priority 1: Enhancing Pre-baccalaureate Teacher Preparation Programs

Pre-baccalaureate programs at GSU have a proven track record preparing teachers for elementary teaching positions (P-5); however, the Middle Childhood Education program is new (starting fall 2009) and currently has no statistics. The Middle Childhood Education program is expected to serve about 30 students per year. GSU currently offers three program tracks leading to a Bachelor of Science in Education (B.S.Ed.) in Early Childhood Education (The Early Childhood Education department is the provider for elementary-level teacher education at GSU): (1) the Traditional Program with initial certification in Early Childhood Education (P-5); (2) the Dual Certification Program with initial certification in Early Childhood Education (P-5) and Special Education General Curriculum, consultative (P-12) (called Dual Cert.), and (3) the Traditional ESOL Program with initial certification in Early Childhood Education (P-5), including an ESOL Endorsement (called Trad. with ESOL). The B.S.Ed. programs consist of 12 cohorts, running simultaneously, a total of over 300 students served each semester. Annually, B.S.Ed. programs graduate and place approximately 170 teachers into the field; annual graduation rates for each program are as follows: Traditional Certification (140), Dual-Cert. (30), and Trad. w/ ESOL endorsement (approximately 50 out of the 140). The current graduation rate (within 6 years) over the past 3 years for pre-baccalaureate programs has averaged 97%.

Georgia State University's pre-baccalaureate teacher preparation programs will make the following improvements:

- 1) *Recruiting and selecting*: Increase the number of male candidates and candidates from underrepresented groups by marketing the programs through community service

organizations on GSU's campus, historically Black fraternities and sororities, and via partnerships with CAU (a Historically Black College), and GPC (a two-year institution).

- 2) *Expanding/enhancing specialized programs for Special Education and ESOL endorsement concurrent with Elementary Certification:* Expand the Dual-Certification Program for Elementary and Special Education and the Trad. with ESOL Program.
- 3) *Developing faculty knowledge:* Train and support faculty to address the needs of students with disabilities and ELLS, as well as to enhance technology and literacy integration in courses and P-12 placements.
- 4) *Enhancing prospective teachers' understanding of research and pedagogy:* Coordinate with practicing teachers to involve prospective teachers in action research and data analysis (in addition to aligning research-based practice in all coursework).
- 5) *Improving mentoring:* Coordinate with GPB to improve mentor training for cooperating teachers and increase the number of trained mentors.
- 6) *Integrating PDS work:* Expand the roles of existing professional development schools to include more field-based courses and more direct work with students and practicing teachers.

3.1 Recruiting and Selecting Prospective Teachers

Partners within the current PDS network have indicated a desire for more diversity among teacher candidates; therefore, recruitment and selection of prospective teachers will align with the partners' hiring objectives. The B.S.Ed. programs currently prepare one male teacher for every 19 female teachers. This rate (fewer than 5%) is significantly lower than the national average of 27% for elementary teachers (Zumwalt & Craig, 2005). Although evidence suggests that teachers' gender does not affect student achievement (Zumwalt & Craig, 2005), concerns

persist about the need for male teachers as role models for boys and the general need to ease a foreseen “teacher shortage” (Ladson-Billings, 1994; NCTAF, 1996). The B.S.Ed. programs seek to recruit more men into teacher preparation.

The B.S.Ed. teacher education programs maintain a relatively high minority representation. Roughly 60% of prospective teachers in the programs are non-White, compared to a national average of about 20% (Zumwalt & Craig, 2005). However, almost all of these prospective teachers will teach in schools with “majority-minority” populations (e.g., populations in which the majority of students are from minority demographic groups). Some evidence suggests that teachers of color are more likely to boost the achievement scores when they teach students of the same race or ethnicity (Zumwalt & Craig, 2005). Therefore, B.S.Ed. programs would benefit NET-Q partner schools and districts (all of which serve vast and growing minority populations) by recruiting more candidates from underrepresented groups into the teacher preparation programs.

These programs will recruit male candidates and candidates from underrepresented groups by visiting local service organizations, including Black fraternities on the GSU’s campus, at GPC, and at CAU. Selection of candidates will be based on a cumulative score derived from grade point average, an interview (adapted from Haberman, [1995]), and a writing sample.

3.2 Expanding and Improving Specialized Programs

Expanding the B.S.Ed. Dual-Certification Program in Early Childhood and Special Education and the B.S.Ed. ESOL endorsement program will increase the number of certified teachers prepared to teach students with disabilities and English Language Learners in a general education classroom or resource setting. Each specialized program will increase by a minimum of 5% annually.

All B.S.Ed. programs currently entail five semesters of coursework (including a summer semester), three semesters of field-based internships (in which students spend at least two days weekly observing and participating in elementary classrooms), and one semester of student teaching. Each B.S.Ed. program consists of 1-2 cohorts of 25-35 students. In their cohorts, prospective teachers take all courses together throughout the program and create collegial relationships (Kesner, Collier, & Meyers, 2003). Cohorts currently enroll in 12 credits of literacy coursework and 12 credits of mathematics coursework. The methods courses focus on real classroom application and overlap with field assignments throughout the first three semesters of each program. While child development, cultural diversity, and classroom management are discrete courses, their content is also woven throughout each program in all methods courses. Additionally, the Dual-Cert. Program requirements include five courses in special education, including field experiences in class settings inclusive of students with special needs and a practicum and student teaching experience in special education. B.S.Ed. program requirements for students earning an ESOL Endorsement include two additional courses focusing on curriculum and instructional methods for teaching ELLs as well as a course on language acquisition and assessment.

The B.S.Ed. Programs will enhance quality through the integration of empirically based, scientifically valid practices for focal areas (e.g., special education, ESOL, technology, literacy) in all content areas. This will be supported via Faculty Professional Development (see 5.3) as well as through including prospective teachers in research about these topics (see 5.1.3). For the expanded Traditional w/ ESOL program, at least one literacy course will be taught on-site with ELLs. This course will involve the prospective teachers in conducting diagnostic assessments

and targeting instruction for an ELL student. In addition, special education faculty will co-teach content-area select courses (science, math, literacy) within all programs.

All programs, specialized and traditional, will be enhanced by integrating a focus on special education, ELL, technology, and literacy. Below are descriptions of the types of topics that will be integrated into courses across all pre-baccalaureate programs:

Teaching children in Special Education in general education classrooms. Prospective teachers in all programs will learn about laws related to Special Education and students with disabilities, individualized education program teams, principles of universal design, Response to Intervention, and content-specific strategies for teaching students with disabilities such as incorporating the essential components of reading instruction, differentiating instruction through modifications, and assessing learning. The IRIS Center Website will provide a useful resource for scientifically-validated, evidenced-based instructional strategies (www.iris.peabody.vanderbilt.edu). One guiding textbook will be *Differentiating Instruction: Collaborative Planning and Teaching for Universally Designed Learning* (Thousand, Villa, & Nevin, 2007). This book provides a detailed overview of universal design and can be adapted for P-12. This area will be supported by co-teaching of select courses by special education faculty and content area faculty.

Teaching English Language Learners in general education classrooms. Prospective teachers will learn definitions and laws related to ESOL, language proficiency assessments, research on second language acquisition, and teaching strategies (e.g., Freeman & Freeman, 2004) (e.g., Total Physical Response, Natural Approach, Cognitive Academic Language Learning, Language Experience Approach). One guiding textbook will be *The SIOP Model: Making Content Comprehensible for English Language Learners*, 3rd ed. (Echevarria, Vogt, &

Short, 2007). This book is being used at many schools/school systems as PD for P-12 and the authors are respected in the field. Several faculty members who specialize in ESOL have agreed to serve as peer-coaches for faculty who will spearhead this integration.

Integration of technology in general education classrooms. Prospective teachers will focus on integrating technological tools in P-12 classrooms. Social networking and Web2.0 tools (e.g., blogs, wikis, Ning™), online communication via gaming tools (e.g., Second Life™), online educational platforms (e.g., Elluminate™), and other technological tools common to general education classrooms (e.g., Promethian boards™, Smartboards™) will be used as means to enhance traditional curricula.

In addition, WiMax real-time, high-bandwidth video that link university classrooms to volunteer P-12 classrooms will provide real-time scaffolding of prospective teachers' observations. WiMax systems provide opportunities for prospective teachers to observe their teaching in P-12 classrooms and, through real-time conversations with practicing teachers, debrief on observations. Additionally, WiMax systems support observations of prospective teachers as they teach in P-12 classrooms and allow faculty supervisors to provide instant feedback. The WiMax system will be supported by the Advanced Learning Technologies Group in the college of Education via a social support network for new teachers through the use of Web 2.0 technologies and a suite of applications geared to support and mentor new teachers. GSU has a state-of-the-art Information and Technology Center that has agreed to model, consult, and co-teach courses at the request of faculty to support all technology integration.

Literacy across the content areas. Literacy is currently taught across three semesters (a total of 12 credit hours). These courses incorporate the essential components of reading instruction (NRP, 2000), phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and

comprehension) and, as testament to this incorporation, 100% of teacher candidates in these programs pass the GACE in literacy. Literacy courses will be improved by adding screening and diagnostic assessments as part of field-based coursework; thereby, providing opportunities for teacher candidates to assess pupil learning and targeting instruction to improve pupils' reading and writing skills. Other content area courses will be improved by integrating literacy as a focus. This integration will be achieved via peer-coaching among faculty and co-constructed course assignments. This intense focus on literacy for prospective teachers will be mirrored within the PDS network for practicing teachers via University Coaches in Residence (see section 5.2.2 for more detail) and the Summer Partnership Institute (see section 5.1.5 for more detail).

3.3 Developing Faculty Knowledge

Professional development of existing faculty will ensure that the expansion of each program meets high standards for quality and remains sustainable after TQP grant funds expire. Faculty Professional Development will focus on the four focal areas (Special Education, ESOL, technology, literacy). Faculty who teach within the pre-baccalaureate programs will be invited to participate in all faculty professional development offerings (described further in Section 5.3).

3.4 Enhancing understanding of research and pedagogy

Teacher candidates will learn how to use empirically-based practice and scientifically valid research to improve instruction and better support student learning. They will coordinate with practicing teachers to engage in action research and data analysis (in addition to tightly aligning research-based practice in all coursework). The WiMax video observation system (mentioned in Section 3.2) will provide opportunities to match research-based pedagogy to real-time classroom observations. The WiMax system will connect P-12 classrooms with university classrooms. All prospective teachers will conduct a project in which they implement research-

based teaching practices, collect and analyze student achievement data, and improve instruction via differentiation. These projects will be carried out during the year-long clinical experience. In addition, the TIP model will be a mechanism for enhancing teacher candidates' understanding (described further in Section 5.1.3) and prospective teachers will be invited to present their research findings at a summer partnership institute (described further in Section 5.1.5).

The Georgia Framework (University of Georgia, 2004) will be used to evaluate prospective teachers' clinical experiences (see Appendix 1 for details and a sample rubric). This framework was adopted by the Georgia Department of Education and is research-based. The B.S.Ed. programs have adapted the Framework to be a comprehensive and developmental observational tool for classroom teaching. The tool is currently in use and will be up-graded within the NET-Q partnership. One up-grade will be to upload the observational tool as an application that can be used on a hand-held device called the iData. This device will allow for quick feedback and data-driven conversations about teaching.

3.5 Improving Field Experience through Mentoring

High-quality, year-long clinical field placements will be essential to overall program quality and will require strong mentorship from experienced P-12 educators. Teacher socialization has a great effect on beginning teacher learning (Clift & Brady, 2005); therefore, field placements provide fertile ground for nurturing professional learning in prospective teachers. Year-long clinical placements provide extended opportunities for relationship building between prospective teachers and experienced, mentor teachers. The B.S.Ed. programs have historically rotated prospective teachers through five field placements approximately two days weekly for three semesters and five days weekly during a final semester of student teaching. Since increasing the PDS network of high-needs schools over the past five years, more B.S.Ed.

students are more often being placed in PDSs for placements in multiple grade levels. In feedback (surveys, questionnaires, and interviews), these students have indicated that they preferred staying in the same school for an extended period of time. These findings are consistent with research literature that indicates that PDSs provide rich opportunities for prolonged engagement within the field and help prospective teachers understand how high-needs schools serve communities at a broader level than simply classroom instruction (Darling-Hammond, 1995).

In addition to two semesters of 2-day internships, the B.S.Ed. programs will integrate year-long clinical experiences during the final year of the program. Prospective teachers will be paired with a mentor teacher at a school and spend a year at that school for fieldwork and student teaching. These placements will offer opportunities for prospective teachers to develop rich relationships with their mentors, provide training and experience in high needs contexts, and, in many cases, provide a fruitful pool of teacher candidates for hire in high needs partner schools.

Year-long placements will be enhanced through high-quality mentoring via mentor training. Mentoring is essential to teacher retention and high-quality instructional practice (Stanulis & Floden, 2008). Unfortunately, fewer than 1% of beginning teachers participate in high-quality mentoring and induction programs (Smith & Ingersoll, 2004). Yet, with effective mentoring, beginning teachers are more likely to stay in teaching, have better content knowledge, and attain higher student achievement scores (Smith & Ingersoll, 2008; Stanulis & Floden, 2004). Training and preparation is essential to ensuring effective mentoring (Guyton & McIntyre, 1990; Stanulis & Floden, 2008).

Mentors for the pre-baccalaureate programs are currently practicing K-8 teachers, yet they do not necessarily have supervisory training. Some practicing teachers who serve as the

B.S.Ed. programs have a Georgia Teacher Support Specialist (T.S.S.) endorsement. This endorsement requires coursework to address six standards (SEE APPENDIX 3). For the past three years, the Early Childhood Education Educational Specialist Program (Ed.S.), a graduate program for practicing elementary teachers who have already obtained a masters degree, has piloted the incorporation of mentor training via T.S.S. endorsements. Any teacher in the Early Childhood Education Ed.S. program who graduates with an Ed.S. degree also receives a T.S.S. endorsement. All Ed.S. students, as part of their T.S.S. endorsement, serve as mentor teachers for B.S.Ed. students during their mentor training. Pilot results (e.g., prospective teacher feedback forms and surveys) indicate that these trained mentors are more likely to be viewed as “good” or “great” mentors, more likely to initiate changes in prospective teachers’ instructional practices, and more likely to be recommended for future placements than non-T.S.S.-trained mentor teachers. T.S.S.-endorsed teachers receive stipends for mentoring from their districts when they mentor beginning teachers. This is an added benefit to assuring high-quality mentoring. The pre-baccalaureate programs will increase the number of trained mentors over the next five years, with the goal to have 100% of trained mentors.

Given the successful pilot of integrating T.S.S. endorsement standards into an existing graduate program, the NET-Q partnership between GPB and GSU will develop online modules to provide opportunities for more teachers to obtain mentor training and endorsement (described further in Section 5.1). These digital modules will be offered to any teacher in the state; however, GSUs graduate programs can be redesigned to give college credit for any practicing teacher who completes digital mentor training and enrolls in a graduate degree program. This will be a recruitment initiative for GSU’s graduate programs as well as a means to enhance mentor training.

3.6 Integrating PDS Work

The B.S.Ed. program's long history of working with PDSs ensures consistent quality of field placements; however, the quality of field experiences in PDSs will be improved by integrating more field-based courses within PDSs. Professional development schools have provided on-going opportunities to integrate pedagogy and classroom practice to promote effective teaching skills. Over the past five years, the number of field-based courses that have been offered at PDSs have increased from one to five and we foresee that at least one course per cohort will be taught as a field-based course. Course instructors have documented benefits of field-based courses and indicated increased pupil learning (e.g., Dangel et al., 2009). With NET-Q funds, field-based courses may be co-taught by practicing P-12 teachers (Field-based Co-Instructors); teachers will be provided a [REDACTED] stipend for co-teaching alongside a faculty member.

PDS partners are also committed to providing facilities and ensuring high-quality field placements. Field-based placements and courses will be coordinated by a school/university clinical instructor (a 50/50% position funded by both the PDS and the University). More information related to the PDS initiative is included in Section 5.2.

4 Priority 2 and Competitive Preference Priority 2: Post-baccalaureate Program

Enhancements and Teacher and Leader Residency programs

The GSU post-baccalaureate partnership with ASU will offer unique residency programs for urban and rural high need school districts. GSU will provide urban NET-Q teaching residencies in mathematics, science, and special education as well as leadership residencies. ASU will provide NET-Q teaching residencies based on rural district needs in the same areas (mathematics, science, special education).

ASU and GSU's post-baccalaureate residency programs are uniquely situated to enhance the quality and quantity of underrepresented teachers in Georgia through an innovative network approach. In 2008, ASU and GSU produced 32.8% of the minority teachers for Georgia (GPSC, 2009). Without a doubt, GSU and ASU produce diverse graduates and desirable teachers, but the current number of graduates does not satisfy the educator shortages of the state. Moreover, all education programs at GSU and ASU are fully accredited by National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS), and GPSC.

4.1 NET-Q Teacher Residency

The NET-Q Teacher Residency combines reputable, data-driven post-baccalaureate programs with an innovative apprenticeship that will improve prospective teacher recruitment to help alleviate the teacher shortages in high need subject areas. The innovative benefits of the NET-Q Teaching Residency will attract additional applicants from relevant occupations, former military personnel, and under-represented populations. Moreover, the proposed NET-Q Teacher Residency framework integrates the pioneering and quality design features of established residency models such as the Urban Teacher Residency (UTR) through the Academy of Urban School Leadership in Chicago and the Boston Teacher Residency (BTR).

4.1.1 Collaborative Cohort Structure

The NET-Q Teacher Residency will have a cohort structure that enables residents to learn through collaboration (Kesner, Collier, & Meyers, 2003) and co-teaching with highly qualified, experienced mentor teachers. One goal is to establish multiple placements at the same school so collaboration is ongoing and facilitated by physical proximity. However, the number of placements at any particular school will be determined by each school's needs. Systematic cohort

collaboration will occur via CCLCs (see section 5.1.2) focused on research-driven methodology, formative assessment, and problem-based instruction, and evaluation. Through the cohort structure, the residents will have opportunities to share their successes, concerns, and questions with peers, program graduates, and mentor teachers. In addition, the NET-Q Teacher Residency cohorts will be continuously networked through Teachers Learning in Networked Communities (TLINC) provided through a partnership with NCTAF and supported by Pearson Education. Such a community allows residents and mentors to remain continuously connected online, enabling collaboration and coaching through various means of communication.

4.1.2 NCTAF Residency Coalition

The NET-Q Teacher Residency will become part of a small group of “21st Century Teaching Residencies” brought together by NCTAF for technical assistance and collaborative knowledge building. NCTAF will link selected TQP Residency partnership projects together and act as a catalyst for cross-project learning to help all sites become stronger. NCTAF has a national reputation for innovation in support of teaching quality and has been a leading voice in support of teaching residencies for several years. As part of NCTAF’s Residency Coalition, partners will actively participate in webinars and online collaboration with other innovative residency sites, collectively sharing experiences and offering ideas and reflections that will keep the NET-Q Teacher Residency creative, vibrant, and continually improving. As part of the NCTAF Residency Coalition, NET-Q will also have access to NCTAF’s emerging work on collaborative school cultures. The cross-generational teams currently in a pilot by NCTAF are creating a new 21st Century teaching environment where all teachers (candidates, novices, and experienced teachers) work in teams that build on the skills of each member. A 21st Century

Teaching Residency built around this collaborative culture offers an environment that will ultimately enrich the residency experience for all participants.

Through the partnership with NCTAF, teaching residents, mentors, and university faculty will also be participants in a Teachers Learning in Networked Communities online community of support. Building on what has been learned through NCTAF's TLINC grant with the Fund for the Improvement of Post Secondary Education (FIPSE), the NET-Q Teacher Residency will use the TLINC framework to blend face-to-face and online collaboration. These online preparation communities immerse novice teachers in facilitated groups designed for reflective practice with support from their peers, college faculty, and accomplished teachers in the districts where they will work. In addition, they build proficiency with learning technologies and establish the habit of participating in a collaborative teaching culture that teachers will carry with them throughout their teaching careers.¹

4.1.3 NET-Q Teacher Residency Design

The NET-Q Teacher Residency provides effective preservice preparation through innovative and comprehensive structures. Each program is grounded in research and requires content and pedagogical courses that infuse Special Education, ELL strategies, technology, such as the WiMax initiative, and literacy across the content areas. Similar to the pre-baccalaureate programs, supports such as faculty professional development, co-teaching for special education,

¹ As part of the NCTAF Residency Coalition, NET-Q will have the option to work with NCTAF in developing an application to become an AmeriCorps service provider. This would make it possible to ultimately increase the number of residents prepared with the TQP grant by including others supported through the AmeriCorps program. Further drawing on the experiences of the Boston Teacher Residency program, which successfully incorporates an AmeriCorps program in their teaching residency model, creating an AmeriCorps partnership would add value beyond the financial assistance provided to candidates. AmeriCorps has a strong track record of recruiting more diverse populations reflective of the local community, a strong asset to the communities that will be served. NET-Q is pleased to have been selected by NCTAF as a potential coalition partner and participation in this leadership group will help us build and nurture a more powerful Teaching Residency and advance the innovative principles on which the program design is founded.

and co-instruction by K-12 educators in select courses will apply to the post-bacc programs. Highly qualified mentors will be rigorously selected and trained. A dedicated full-time mentor coordinator will facilitate mentor selection and training. The NET-Q Teacher Residency mentor training will be similar to the pre-baccalaureate mentoring model (see section 3.5), including reviewing the needs and development of residents, examining cases, problem-solving, responding, and exploring ways to develop collegial relationships with constructive feedback.

Essential features of renowned UTR and BTR, such as strong cohort structures, highly qualified mentors, year-long teaching apprenticeships, and comprehensive induction are key components of the NET-Q Teacher Residency. Each GSU cohort will have 20 NET-Q teacher residents and begin with two required methodology courses during the first summer semester and continue through the first 3 semesters of the program when residents complete required methodology and apprenticeship credit hours. Residents will benefit from the cohort structure of the programs and through TLINC communication and collaboration, which will continue through induction.

Coursework will support and complement the residents' teaching and experiential learning. Unlike the UTR model, the NET-Q Teacher Residency is designed for residents to remain in the classroom five days per week with coursework occurring after school. Several courses will offer site-based instruction, co-instruction by P-12 educators, and co-instruction with special education faculty. As a result, residents will benefit from authentic learning with educators who are experienced in content area instruction and special education. Courses will emphasize pedagogical approaches that are grounded in research, supported by inquiry, and formative assessment and embedded with ELL strategies. All Teacher Residents will complete inquiry projects grounded in formative assessment during the year-long clinical experience. In

addition, the TIP model will be implemented to enhance Teacher Residents' research knowledge and skills and Residents may disseminate research findings at the Summer Partner Institute (see Section 5.1.5). At GSU, each year the content focus of the teacher residency program will alternate to ensure the schools will be able to hire the participating number of teachers. Thus, the first residency year will be mathematics, the second year will be science, the third year will be mathematics, and the fourth year will be science. In addition, the 20 NET-Q Teacher Residencies through GSU will be divided between middle and high schools based on school and system hiring needs and objectives. In an effort to support rural schools through a partnership with ASU, four residencies per year within rural high need counties will emulate the structure of the NET-Q Teacher Residency at GSU. Furthermore, the Georgia Framework for Teaching (University of Georgia, 2004) will be used to evaluate Residents' teaching proficiencies.

4.1.4 High Quality Mentor Training and Recruitment

During the second semester of the NET-Q Teaching Residency, the year-long clinical teaching experience begins by establishing mentor relationships with a trained and experienced teacher at a high need school. Experience shall be measured as years of service. Mentors must be highly qualified in their content areas. Furthermore, the mentor teachers will be chosen based on their ability to satisfy the Georgia T.S.S. endorsement selection criteria as follows: (a) at least three years of successful teaching experience, (b) exhibit a positive attitude toward the teaching profession, (c) have excellent interpersonal skills, and (d) demonstrated effective classroom instructional skills and strategies. Training will occur via GPB modules and face-to-face sessions. NET-Q is taking an innovative and data-driven approach to our Mentor-Intern dyads by investigating outcomes of TIPs related to the degree of match using the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator-Form M (MBTI, 1998). Mentors will also be provided opportunities to secure relevant

endorsements through the PDS network, such as TSS, ESOL, reading, and gifted endorsements. After qualifying as a mentor, the PDS network will selectively partner teaching residents with high quality mentors for the year-long clinical experience.²

The MBTI is one of the most widely used psychological tests today (Gardner & Martinko, 1996; Offerman & Spiros, 2001) in several areas including academic advising and career counseling (Johnson, Johnson, Murphy, Weiss, & Zimmerman, 1998), and leadership development (Kiel, Rimmer, Williams, & Doyle, 1996). Tzeng, Outcalt, Boyer, Ware and Landis (1984), Carlyn (1977), and Gardner and Martinko (1996) support the psychometric structure and validity of the MBTI as a self-report instrument.

4.1.5 Selection of Teacher Residents

Recruiting individuals from underrepresented populations to teach in high need partnership schools, rural communities and teacher shortage areas (including mathematics, science, and the instruction of limited English proficient students) will be emphasized. Recruitment will focus on mid-career professionals from other occupations, former military personnel, and recent college graduates with a record of academic distinction. Partner districts will assist with recruitment through their various communities and communication resources.

All candidates who meet GSU's College of Education and departmental admissions criteria are invited to take part in the NET-Q Teacher Residency interview process. Applicants must have a minimum 3.0 undergraduate grade point average. Official college and university transcripts will be evaluated to determine whether each applicant satisfies content area

² An effective working alliance between mentor and resident is essential for productive professional development, as much time is spent between the mentor teacher and resident. In her study of teacher resistance to school reform, Kise (2005) found that teachers' strengths and beliefs as educators could be linked directly to the teachers' learning and personality styles. It follows then that a personality-compatible working mentoring dyad is desirable for the creation of a viable, effective, and meaningful mentorship.

requirements for admission. Applicants must also submit (a) two letters of recommendation including one academic or professional letter, (b) a resume, and (c) other requirements that may be specified by the faculty. Applicants must provide a writing sample on a topic related to teaching in high needs school, scored based on content and clarity. Applicants are interviewed by university faculty members from the College of Education and the College of Arts and Sciences in collaboration with NET-Q school representatives. The residency program will consider applicants who display positive dispositions toward high-poverty schools as evidenced by satisfactory scores on an adapted Haberman “Star Teacher Interview” (Haberman, 1995; The Haberman Educational Foundation, 2009). Admission decisions will be communicated by early May. Required coursework will begin in June with new residents having an option to attend May semester elective classes.

4.1.6 Teaching Residency Terms and Conditions

The resident salary shall be a living wage of [REDACTED] for a period of one year. The application for salary will satisfy the federal grant and university/state requirements as follows:

- The applicant must provide proof of U.S. citizenship or be a permanent resident.
- The applicant must agree to serve as a full-time teacher for a minimum of 3 academic years immediately after successfully completing the 1-year teaching residency program.
- The teaching resident must fulfill the requirement by teaching in high-need school and teach a subject or area that is designated as high need by the partnership and submit verification of his or her teaching and the preceding requirements with the district.
- Each year of service the teaching resident must provide the partnership an official certificate (verified by the LEA’s chief employment administrative officer for service at the beginning and/or completion of each year or partial year of service).

- The certification and graduation components of the programs meet or exceed the requirement of being highly qualified teachers and the service obligation will not begin until Residents become fully certified teachers.
- Applicant must comply with the requirements set by the partnership if the applicant is unable or unwilling to complete the service obligation. Should a teaching resident not meet his or her service obligation, the interest rate that applies to repayment of all scholarship support will be “the prevailing rate [established by the U.S. Treasury] at the time a repayment schedule is established.”

4.2 Leadership Residency

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Development of Leadership Programs

GSU offers a GPSC-approved educational leadership program and will partner with five school districts to develop a leadership residency that would meet the unique needs of the urban environment. GSU’s leadership program aligns with Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards and the *Georgia Leader Keys*, state-level educational leadership standards (www.georgiastandards.org). GSU has demonstrated commitment and ability to collaborate with local school districts to develop and implement a unique urban leadership residency program that includes the following academic and clinical components:

- Developing data-driven professional learning communities.
- Creating a climate with a focus on student achievement, teacher professional development and effective instructional leadership skills.
- Understanding the teaching and assessment skills to support classroom instruction.
- Managing resources to improve student achievement and ensure a safe school environment.

- Engaging and involving parents, community members and other community stakeholders.
- Using current research and best practices in urban principal and leader preparation and quality.
- Supervising interactions between prospective school leaders and faculty.
- Integrating of pedagogy and practice to promote effective leadership skills for an urban school district.
- Mentoring and induction for new school leaders.

A variety of course deliver options will be used, including online courses, alternate locations, and acceleration options.

This program will have a total of five residents for a full release, one-year residency. There will be one resident for each of five school districts. Individuals who qualify for these resident positions will be selected by the school district in collaboration with university leadership faculty. Qualified candidates will have demonstrated a consistent level of leadership competence as reflected in quarterly, performance based evaluations.

4.2.1 Professional Learning Community (PLC)

The five residents will meet monthly as a PLC. This learning group will be facilitated by the Leadership Residency Program Coordinator and university leadership faculty. Through discussions, reading, case studies, and projects, residents will develop an understanding of the power of PLCs. They will engage in performance-based activities where PLCs are discussed, created, and used in actual school settings for the purpose of addressing curricular, instructional, student management, and/or school culture/climate issues. The PLCs will have a problem-solving orientation based on issues that are identified through the relevant data and information.

They will explore theories behind various means to create and maintain a climate that is conducive to productive PLCs and the professional development of teachers.

4.2.2 Coursework

Residents will participate in a year-long sequence of coursework leading to the Georgia Specialist in Education degree and performance-based certificate. This program will be offered using a closed cohort model and will be structured with classes being offered as outlined in the course structure document (Attachment I). The content of the courses will be consistent with local, state, and national standards.

University coursework will involve a number of performance assessments. Each performance assessment promotes the knowledge base of leadership and supports the areas of need outlined by the school district. The following briefly outlines how two of these assessments support teacher development:

- (a) In the problem-based leadership project (see Appendix 4), leader candidates will identify elements of organizational theory, human dynamics, and the complexity or organizational culture in order to inform a specific problem in their schools or districts. Upon analysis of the problem, leader candidates will identify needed changes within the school organization and to justify the recommendations for those changes.
- (b) In the GPS professional development project (see Appendix 4), leader candidates will demonstrate working knowledge of the Georgia Performance Standards and will apply principles of curriculum design in order to help teachers develop effective performance-based assessments that are aligned to appropriate GPS.

As a part of their coursework, leader candidates will work with teachers to identify and apply principles of curriculum design in the curriculum analysis project (see Appendix 4).

Throughout the course of the project, they will consider curriculum development and evaluation in order to assess a school reform model or other curriculum package. They will help teachers focus significantly on issues of purpose and mission and the degree to which the curriculum of their school supports the intended purposes of the school and district.

Throughout the coursework and the clinical experiences of the residents, there will be discussions and problem solving involving the management of time and resources. Part of the power of the clinical experience is that the clinical supervisor as well as the university faculty will have the opportunity to observe the residents in action and will be able to provide meaningful feedback on the use of time and resources. Rather than the discussions simply focusing on the management of time and resources, they will focus on the use of time and resources in a manner that will increase the likelihood of the school's success.

Leadership Residency candidates will be trained on practices related to creating cultures which support broad-based community engagement. This training will create a bridge between theory and the practice to be demonstrated during the clinical experience. Additionally, the Leadership Residency will provide opportunities for leader participants to engage parents, community members, and other stakeholders in critical aspects of their work.

4.2.3 Clinical Experiences

All placements will be in high needs schools. Additionally, sites will also require stability in leadership, a baseline for parental/community support, high teacher retention, improving student achievement data, reputation for innovation and organizational readiness to support a resident. Over the course of one year, residents will be placed in two school sites to collaborate within varied leadership styles and to develop and demonstrate leadership competence in varied settings.

A one-year clinical experience provides residents with real-world experience exposing them to the following leadership performance standards: Curriculum, Assessment, Standards-based instruction, Data Analysis, Organizational Culture, Professional Learning and Development, Performance Management and Process Improvement, Managing Operations, Leading Change and Relationship Development. The Leadership Residents practice and demonstrate proficiency in leadership skills representing typical experiences of educational leaders.

The Leadership Residency experience will be an individualized clinical experience and is not intended to be “shadowing.” Residents will serve as key members of their Clinical Supervisor’s leadership team. Residents will attend all district level meetings related to the position to which they are aspiring (principal meetings, senior leadership meetings, board meetings, etc.). Clinical supervisors will be deliberate in planning (in coordination with Leadership Residency Coordinator) experiences that are critical to preparing the resident for taking on the role.

Throughout their year-long experience, residents’ portfolios will evidence competencies in each of the performance domains. The portfolio will feature project-based evidence that demonstrates a project management approach to a real-life issue/project in the school or department. Evidence projects will be implemented in the setting and include all aspects of the project management cycle from needs assessment to evaluation.

4.2.4 Support Team

Each resident will receive a support team. This team will include: Clinical Supervisor (existing Principal), Leadership Residency Program Coordinator, University representative, and the Resident Mentor. The team will meet with the resident on a quarterly basis to review/evaluate

current performance and to set goals. In addition to these meetings, the resident will meet with each member of this team individually on a regular basis. At minimum, the resident will meet with their resident mentor and supervising principal once a week.

To develop relationships between and among the resident support team outside of required meetings, all team members will use *LeaderTracker TM* (www.leadertracker.com), a Georgia Leadership Institute for School Improvement (GLISI) tool that facilitates collaboration and planning between all Leadership Residency support team members and the resident. The website will help all partners track, manage and accredit in-field performance-based professional growth plans. All support team members will use this tool to record all assignments, communications, evaluations, performance documents and portfolios.

During quarterly Support Team meetings, candidates will participate in conversation addressing whether or not the content of the program is meeting their individual needs. This ongoing conversation will take place throughout the course of the program in an effort to ensure that the content is both fluid and relevant to each individual candidate. All experiences undertaken by the candidates will be linked to the standards guiding leadership preparation in the state of Georgia and will be documented in the candidate's leadership portfolio.

4.2.5 Review of Leader Residents

Weekly assessment regarding successful application of leadership knowledge and skills will be conducted by the building-level or district-level supervisor. The building or district-level supervisor will maintain a regular line of communication with the university supervisor regarding the candidate's progress and performance.

The university supervisor will provide a minimum of four visits to evaluate the candidate's ability to apply appropriate knowledge and skills. Weekly assessment regarding

successful application of leadership knowledge and skills will be conducted by the building-level or district-level supervisor. The building or district-level supervisor will maintain a regular line of communication with the university supervisor regarding the candidate's progress and performance.

The Individualized Performance Review Team (IPRT), a committee including their university supervisor, district coach, and two additional district representatives, will meet a minimum of twice every 6 months. All members of the IPRT will examine the candidate's portfolio at the mid-point and at the end of his or her residency. The IPRT must be in place and agreements signed prior to the full acceptance of the candidate into the program. The building or district level supervisor will be a member of the IPRT.

One year following the candidate's completion of the residency program, relevant members of the IPRT will assess the performance of the candidate for program evaluation data. For the purpose of longitudinal program data, GSU will track career trajectories of its graduates by maintaining a database regarding the promotion rate of candidates serving under each building or district supervisor.

4.2.6 Selection of Leader Residents

District partners may desire to use self-evaluation tools as a part of the selection process for residents. These assessments might include, but are not limited to, the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) and the Discovery Leadership Profile for Educators (DLPE). The MBTI will enable to selection committee to be sure that there is a balance of personalities represented among residents. The DLPE is a 360-degree assessment to develop strong leadership ability, create a better understanding of strengths and challenges, enable the learner to see how he or she is viewed by those with whom he or she works, focus on areas of improvement, and create an

action plan for personal development. It consists of 62 items which address leadership skills in the following categories: Direction and Strategy, Follow Through and Accountability, Conflict and Negotiation, Communication, Developing and Mentoring Others, Diversity, Instructional Leadership, Collaboration, Self Management, Teams, Change, Innovation, Student/Stakeholder Service, Integrity and Trust, and Decision Making and Problem Solving. Additionally, up to 10 open-ended questions may be customized as a part of the assessment. The customized questions will be developed to address specific selection criteria. These assessments will be used in the final stages of the selection process.

5 Complementary Initiatives

Complementary initiatives to the priorities will include (1) induction and mentor programs, (2) enhancements to the current PDS partnerships, and (3) professional development of faculty.

5.1 Induction and mentor program

All P-12 practicing and prospective teachers as well as all faculty members in the partnership will be invited to participate in the following induction activities: (1) mentor training and focused endorsement programs via GPB digital learning modules, (2) training to participate in Cross-Career Learning Communities (CCLCs), (3) annual Induction Conference hosted by GSU, and (4) annual Summer Partnership Institute for practicing and prospective teachers (mentors, new teaches, and teacher candidates)

5.1.1 Mentor training via Georgia Public Broadcasting (GPB) digital learning modules

Mentor training provides systematic opportunities for planning and developing mentors (Odell & Huling, 2000). Although little research exists about the best way to prepare mentors (Welch, 2009), case studies seem to concur that training should include (a) a review of the needs

and development of beginning teachers; (b) opportunities to review cases (video, live, etc.), problem-solve, and respond, (c) exploration of ways to develop collegial relationships and deliver constructive feedback. Mentors are increasingly asked to take on a more assessment-oriented role, upholding professional standards and evaluating teacher performance (Carver & Katz, 2004).

GPB will create a digital mentor training program for practicing teachers to enhance the quality of training for prospective teachers via high-quality mentoring in field experiences. GPB Education offers an electronically delivered classroom designed to reach all Georgia learners, and a source for educators to access top-quality media educational products and services. GPB broadcasts educational video programming to every public school, regional library, adult technical education center, youth development center, and public college and university in Georgia, serving more than 115,000 teachers and approximately 1.6 million students via the Web and open-air broadcasts. GPB Education Streaming offers teachers and students a library of more than 7,000 videos and 58,000 video clips – including more than 700 local and state productions – aligned to Georgia academic Performance Standards. Searchable by keyword, content area and grade level, the rich video content and other digital assets enhance curriculum and engage today's students in learning. During the 2008-2009 school year, GPB Streaming was accessed 3.2 million times by Georgia educators to download/stream multimedia content.

The mentor training program will be delivered via the GPB web portal as a series of 20 interactive 30-45 minute modules. These modules will be freely available to any Georgia teacher, thus supporting not only metro teachers but also rural teachers. Content for the modules will be developed collaboratively by GPB communications specialists and IHE faculty. Similar to the IRIS Center (www.iris.vanderbilt.edu) or the Annenberg Foundation (www.learner.org)

modules, the mentor-training modules will provide rich video clips that provide opportunities to witness authentic teaching contexts and support learning through webinars and web-based tutorials. Feedback and approval from the GPSC will be sought as the modules are developed. GPSC approval will allow any teacher who completes mentor training to receive a Teacher Support Specialist (T.S.S.) endorsement. T.S.S.-endorsed teachers receive stipends for mentoring from their districts when they mentor beginning teachers. This is an added benefit to assuring high-quality mentoring.

In addition to GPB modules for mentor training, additional training programs will be developed based on school district demand (e.g., Math P-5, English as a Second or Other Language, and Gifted and Talented Math endorsements). One area that is currently in demand across the state is the Georgia Department of Education's new state-wide Teacher Evaluation System, *the Georgia Classroom Analysis of State Standards (CLASS) Keys* (see http://www.doe.k12.ga.us/tss_school.aspx for details). The Georgia CLASS Keys is a coherent, thorough evaluation system that supports the process of continuous school improvement. The CLASS Keys have been developed and are currently being piloted by the Georgia Department of Education. These vignettes and modules can be available to any Leadership Preparation Program in the state; thus, this innovative initiative will provide a cutting-edge resource statewide. These modules will be particularly useful for the Leadership Residency Program sponsored by the Partnership.

5.1.2 Cross-Career Learning Communities

Cross Career Learning Communities are school-based, small, learning communities dedicated to the collaborative analysis of teaching, learning, and assessment practices in the service of increased student achievement. They are not only as a support for the successful

induction and retention of new teachers but also as a vehicle for the delivery of the kind of continual, collaborative, and job-embedded professional development (Hunt, 2009). CCLCs were repeatedly mentioned in the needs assessment with district partners as a desired focus. Columbus State University has requested that their rural district partners and faculty members be involved in CCLC training. In addition to district personnel, GSU prospective teachers and faculty members will be invited to participate in CCLCs alongside GSU's P-12 partners. Previously, NCTAF helped launch the CCLCs and NCTAF will continue to support CCLCs through the NET-Q partnership.

This CCLC induction initiative is undergirded by national teacher retention research indicating that attrition rates for teachers who participate in comprehensive induction activities declines by half (Wang, Odell, & Schwille, 2008). According to Ingersoll and Kralik (2004), the strongest retention rates were associated with the pairing of beginning teachers with teacher mentors working in the same subject area and/or grade level, the provision of common planning time, scheduling of regular and consistent opportunities for collaboration with other teachers, and the formation of professional learning communities. CCLCs are composed of a purposeful mix of university and school faculty members and novice and experienced educators, thus creating a seamless transition from prospective to practicing and providing support to beginning teachers through their first critical years. They are situated in high-need schools in districts in the metropolitan Atlanta area and are designed to reduce the high rates of teacher turnover that typically occur there. The charts in Appendix 5 describe an induction model that is not only consistent with current research on professional development, teacher retention, and student achievement, but also addresses sustainability and capacity building for LEAs beyond the scope and timeline of the TQP grant.

5.1.3 Teacher-Intern-Professor (TIP) Model and Anchor Action Research

Since receiving the PDS² grant from the U.S. Department of Education in 2004, GSU administrators and faculty have been working with the research directors, teachers, principals, and other personnel of four school systems involved in the partnership to develop the TIP model. The TIP approach grew out of a need that arose from multiple data sources. Current research on beginning teachers states that most do not remain in the field for more than 5 years. Consequently, there is a need to increase teacher retention in the classroom, especially in high-need schools. Data collected from constructed response exercises in the PDS² grant found that student achievement was not significantly increasing for students in participating PDS² classrooms. The TIP approach addresses both of these areas. Student achievement is influenced through the benefit of a TIP group that meets bimonthly to address topics affecting teachers and teaching interns in the classroom. TIP members work together to address these identified areas in their classroom. Teaching interns are given the opportunity to work both with their classroom teacher and university professor to help strengthen their teaching experiences. Anchor Action Research will be integrated into TIP; additionally, practicing teachers within the NET-Q partnership will be encouraged to engage in Anchor Action Research. Fellowships and mini-grants will be provided to support teachers' inquiries.

Roles of TIP participants, steps for establishing the TIP model, and participation requirements are described in Appendix 6.

5.1.4 Annual New Educators Induction Conference

GSU currently hosts an annual New Educators Induction Conference for all prospective and new teachers. This one-day conference began in 2005 and has continued each year, adding a second, alternative Saturday for working teachers in 2007. The conference was developed

originally with a grant support from the Wachovia Foundation and NCTAF as a means to stay in touch with teachers who have attended GSU. Attendance at the conference has increased by at least 30% in the past 3 years and has been opened to all of metro Atlanta teachers. Conference attendees enjoy sessions about stress management, connecting with other educators, differentiated instruction, working with diverse learners, classroom management, connecting instruction and standards, and assessment. With the expanded NET-Q partnerships, attendance to this valuable conference is expected to increase.

5.1.5 Annual Summer Partnership Institute

As part of the NET-Q grant, GSU will host an annual 2-day Summer Partnership Institute for all faculty, graduate students, practicing teachers and leaders, and prospective teachers involved in the partnership. This institute will be conducted using a professional conference format and provide opportunities for sharing research findings, minigrant fellowships and awards, and action research reporting. There will be research and pedagogy strands for professional development for faculty and practicing teachers in the focus areas: Special Education, ELL, technology, and literacy. Practicing teachers will be invited to share innovative strategies and work with faculty members to review grant-related data. All partners, including district and University partners, will be invited to attend. The 2-day institute will provide at least 10 contact hours of professional development for practicing teachers, thus providing the opportunity for them to earn Professional Learning Units (PLUs) through their district administrators toward recertification.

5.2 Enhanced professional development school partnerships

Studies of PDS programs (Castle, Fox, & Souder, 2006; Latham & Vogt, 2007; Lyons, Stroble, & Fischetti, 1997) have shown that PDSs have the capacity to change teacher education,

improve student performance, and reduce teacher attrition. For example, Lyons, Strouble, and Fischetti (1997) documented two cases of PDS programs and presented specific ways that PDS relationships benefited teacher education, including increasing the likelihood of quality school-based teacher preparation experiences. Comparative studies confirmed the benefits that cases such as these have shown. Castle, Fox, and Souder compared over 90 preservice teachers' end-of-program assessments. Data included portfolio presentations and student teaching evaluation forms, which were analyzed using ANOVA (with homogeneity of variance accounted for, given the unequal groups) and qualitative constant comparative analysis. They found that preservice teachers who were educated at PDSs performed significantly higher on classroom instruction, management, and assessment. Likewise, Latham and Vogt (2007) compared graduates of elementary teacher education programs between 1996-2004 who attended PDSs and non-PDSs, inquiring whether "the effects of teacher preparation experiences [influenced] their persistence in elementary education employment" (p. 153). They found that prospective teachers who attended PDSs were significantly more likely to enter and stay in teaching.

PDS partnerships between schools and universities can take many shapes. Evaluations of high-quality PDSs indicate that the partnership should include: (a) intern and field-based course experiences for prospective teachers, (b) collaborative induction for beginning teachers, (c) professional development for experienced, practicing teachers, (d) ongoing opportunities for improved P-12 student learning, and (e) school-based inquiry for student equity and achievement (Dangel, et al., 2009; U.S. Department of Education, 2009). Having worked with PDSs for the past 5 years, the GSU team has found that university involvement in the schools has helped professors relate course content to real-world scenarios and integrate work with children as part of courses through field-based, clinical opportunities (Dangel et al., 2009). The PDS² grant has

also shown positive effects on student learning and teacher retention (U.S. Department of Education, 2009).

The NET-Q grant will enhance the existing PDS partnerships by (1) tailoring services to provide (2) on-going support for practicing teachers.

5.2.1 Tailoring services

To ensure that the partners are serving each other well, the partners (district partners and GSU) have co-created a menu of options for professional development schools. Previously, Georgia State University worked with four urban districts; the NET-Q partnership has increased that network to six urban districts. All six districts were represented a meeting in April 2009 to discuss menu options. The menu will be presented to districts upon NET-Q funding and will be used by districts to select PDS schools from a list of high needs schools. See appendix 7 for a sample menu.

In addition, to tailor services within the partnership, schools that select to be PDSs will respond annually to an online needs assessment for professional development. Based on the school's needs, GSU will provide release time for faculty to serve as University Coaches in Residence. Coaches in Residence will provide content-area focused professional development for P-12 teachers in the form of Professional Learning Groups, on-going coaching, inquiry projects, and workshops. Based on the needs assessment conducted with the urban partner districts, we foresee that high needs areas will be Special Education, ELL, technology, and literacy.

5.2.2 On-going support for practicing teachers

Teachers in NET-Q districts will be supported in multiple ways. The TIP model and Anchor Action Research provide opportunities for practicing teachers to engage in inquiry (see

Section 5.1.3 for details). Teachers can become trained mentors via the GPB training modules (see Section 5.1.1) and participate in CCLC training and groups (see Section 5.1.2 for details). University Coaches in Residence can provide support in targeted areas of need (e.g., special education, ELL, technology, literacy, STEM). Teachers can also be involved with faculty as co-instructors for courses. In addition to teaching courses on-site at P-12 schools, co-instructors from the university and P-12 schools can also be linked via the WiMax video linking system. Finally, the university will offer Pathways scholarships for any practicing teacher who wishes to enroll in graduate programs at GSU. Research affiliated with university-school partnerships will be encouraged.

5.3 Faculty Development Initiatives

Many studies (e.g., Darling-Hammond & MacDonald, 2000; Koppich, 2000; Merseth & Koppich, 2000; Zeichner, 2000) suggest that programs that integrate related strategies across courses and field placements have a greater impact on the initial conceptions and practices of prospective teachers than those that remain a collection of relatively disconnected courses. Until recently, in our own College of Education, many of subjects that focus on differentiated strategies (e.g., exceptional children, special education, English as a second or other language, technology, and literacy) have been treated as separate courses. This can cause incoherence and result in disconnected learning (Darling-Hammond, 2005). However, from anecdotal reports within the College, faculty are inquiring about how to improve their abilities to address changing pupil populations and the need for technology within their own content-focused courses. This is a positive movement toward integration and inclusion.

Faculty in the College will implement a professional development initiative to educate faculty members about how to integrate empirically-based, scientifically valid strategies for

teaching students with disabilities, ESOL, and technology within content areas such as literacy, science, mathematics, and social studies in elementary, middle, and secondary schooling. The initiative will include weekly research colloquia related to PDS and focus areas, the Summer Partnership Institute , faculty participation in CCLCs, and co-teaching opportunities (teaching with P-12 teachers and special education faculty).

PROJECT EVALUATION

6 Overview of Evaluation Approach

The evaluation plan has been integrated into the programmatic activities so as to be an integral part of this project. After discussing the evaluation plan, tables will be presented which include the GPRA performance measures, the TQP performance measures, and the NET-Q program performance measures.

The evaluation plan has been designed to be thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the project. The evaluation plan uses objective performance measures that are directly related to the intended outcomes. We have chosen to use Daniel Stufflebeam's (2000) CIPP Model of Program Evaluation as the overall approach to the evaluation supplemented by aspects of Michael Patton's (2000) utilization-focused evaluation, a logic model (McLaughlin & Jordan, 2004), and Thomas Guskey's (1999) Five Levels of Professional Development Evaluation. The CIPP model organizes program evaluation via four evaluations: context evaluation, input evaluation, process evaluation (formative), and product evaluation (summative). Within the context of the CIPP model, a mixed methods approach will be used. Using a mixed-methods approach allows one to meet multiple purposes or deal with trade-offs one would otherwise be forced to decide upon, such as internal versus external validity.

We emphasize the fifth level of Guskey's approach, which links student achievement outcomes to particular NET-Q interventions and characteristics of interns, residents, and mentor teachers. It is through these approaches built into the project and through dissemination of evaluation results to the Leadership and Coordinating Councils that evaluation results will be used. In particular, the linking of Intern and Resident characteristics to student achievement can help improve the selection of students to enter teacher preparation programs and preparation of teachers.

6.1 CIPP Model.

Each of the four evaluations in the CIPP model are briefly described below. *Context evaluation* is concerned with clarifying the purpose of the evaluation effort and identifying the needs of teachers and other stakeholders which will be monitored on a yearly basis throughout the project. The purpose of the context evaluation is to provide the collaborative team members with information to help clarify and improve the project. *Input evaluation* will examine the resources available to the project such as effective practices, equipment, facilities, financial support, and organizational support which directly relates to level 3 (Organizational Support and Change) of Guskey's Evaluation Model. *Process evaluation* (or formative evaluation) will be conducted during the operation of the program to monitor the extent to which the instructional modules are implemented and document the process by which they were effective. Results of the process evaluation will be used to improve the implementation of grant activities.

Product Evaluation (or summative evaluation) is usually conducted at the end of the program to determine its effectiveness. This evaluation will provide data on the overall success of the project. In particular, the focus of the product evaluation is based on meeting or exceeding milestones on timelines, benchmarks, and yearly growth in expected outputs or outcomes.

6.2 Utilization Focused Evaluation

Two aspects of the utilization focused evaluation approach of Patton will also help guide the evaluation of the NET-Q project. First, an overall logic model has been developed which links the interventions with the outcomes (see Appendix 8) to clarify the relationships of entities to each other in the project. A unique feature of this logic model is the organization of the entities involved by the four evaluation areas of the CIPP model. Second, Patton emphasizes discussing in detail at the planning stage the types of output or outcome result data which would be available for a particular evaluation design to judge the merit of a program with the decision makers regarding the use of the data before the evaluation is conducted. As discussed in the needs section at the beginning of this proposal, input from the stakeholders has been obtained from a variety of sources including published research on educational needs in Georgia; written surveys of teachers; interviews of teachers; numerous conversations between the Director of Evaluation and Research for this proposal and the Directors of Research in school systems; many discussions between the Principal Investigator of NET-Q (also Associate Dean for Partnerships in the College of Education at GSU) and school system leaders; meetings within the last three months between administrators from systems involved with Georgia State University personnel in preparation for writing this grant proposal; and data from the Georgia Professional Standards Commission regarding licensure pass rates, highly qualified teachers in schools, and teacher retention for the school systems involved.

6.3 Guskey Approach

The data sources for the evaluation will be aligned with the five levels of professional development evaluation presented by Guskey. These levels are the following: (1) participants' reactions to the experience, (2) participants' learning from the experience, (3) organizational support and change, (4) participants use of new knowledge and skills, and (5) results in terms of student learning outcomes. Across the objectives in this project, Guskey's levels are covered through data sources such as interviews with key actors in the process, focus groups, classroom observations, written surveys of faculty and

students, and linking results of teacher training and teacher characteristics to student outcomes through experimental or quasi-experimental evaluation designs.

6.4 Linking of the NET-Q Grant to a National Evaluation Effort

The Director of Evaluation and Research for the NET-Q project is currently leading a national effort to obtain quantitative and qualitative data for professional development schools regarding the following: (1) the intern experiences, (2) placement of interns in teaching positions, (3) retention of beginning teachers in teaching for the first 3 years of their careers, and (4) student achievement of students taught by teachers who were previously NET-Q interns. This effort at a collecting data nationally and then summarizing the individual studies through cumulative meta-analysis is sponsored by the Research in Professional Development Schools Special Interest Group of the American Educational Research Association (AERA). Many of the evaluation design aspects of this NET-Q proposal (e.g., including employing TIP Groups, using matched classrooms and comparison schools) are the same in the national PDS effort which has been unanimously endorsed by the leadership group of the AERA PDS SIG. Thus, the evaluation findings of the NET-Q Grant will likely fit according to the topics investigated and the methodology with a national evaluation effort providing dissemination and visibility for the findings in the NET-Q Grant.

7 Overview of Evaluation Approach

Experimental studies and/or quasi-experimental studies for student achievement. Three strong features of the quantitative evaluation are the following: (1) the use of comparison schools and/or classrooms in order to evaluate the student achievement between NET-Q schools and/or classrooms and schools without NET-Q programs, (2) the use of Teacher-Intern-Professor (TIP) Groups for intern teaching experiences and to help assess student achievement, and (3) the linking of intern and teacher characteristics along with instructional approach to student achievement.

NET-Q schools will be matched with comparison schools in the same school systems on proportion of students on free or reduced lunch, previous year's academic achievement, and race/ethnic group taking into account matching methodology discussed by Rosenbaum (2002). For each NET-Q school in the urban school systems, there will be one comparison school (CS); however, in only some of the rural systems will there be enough schools so that matched comparison schools will be available. Nevertheless, some matched comparison schools will be available and matched classrooms will be available for investigating the TIP model.

As previously discussed, each of the urban school systems will have 4 NET-Q schools. A typical configuration is two elementary schools, one middle school, and one high school; however, in some systems needs may indicate a different configuration. In the four rural systems, one system has enough schools so that matching for comparison schools is reasonable. Hence, for the NET-Q Baccalaureate program, there will be 6 urban systems with 4 NET-Q schools each and one rural system with 1 NET-Q school. This provides 25 NET-Q schools and 25 matched comparison schools for the Baccalaureate program.

For the NET-Q resident program, there are five urban school systems and four rural school systems. Thus, the NET-Q resident program has 21 NET-Q schools and 21 matched comparison schools.

In general, the research question being addressed is the following: Is there a mean (or centroid) difference on the Criterion-Referenced Competency Test (CRCT) state-wide standardized achievement tests and the between the NET-Q schools and the comparison schools? As part of the evaluation of indicators of project success, comparisons will be made using statistical analyses (e.g., ANOVA, MANOVA, SEM, Hierarchical Linear Models when appropriate) between student achievement in NET-Q schools and comparable schools without

NET-Q. When feasible, an alternative to the classical data analysis will be analysis employing hierarchical linear models advocated by Raudenbush and Bryk (2002).

All statistical testing will be done with alpha equal to .05. Effect sizes will be calculated for all variables subjected to statistical significance testing.

Evaluation design issues. In designing the evaluation study, attention was given to all the threats listed in Chapters 2 and 3 of Shadish, Cook, and Campbell's (2002) evaluation and research design book titled *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs*. An approach for reducing some threats is *not* to emphasize the interventions so that the resentful demoralization and compensatory rivalry are minimized.

TIP Groups and Their Evaluations

Minigrants and fellowships. Up to 30 minigrants consisting of an average of [REDACTED] per grant will be available for TIP groups to conduct Anchor Action Research. An Anchor Action Research team consists of NET-Q partners, university faculty, and interns who conduct site-based research focused on increasing the academic achievement of K-12 students at either the classroom or school level. These studies originate with the teacher and/or professor where the topics for studies focus on the following: (1) change in instructional practice, and/or (2) change in delivery of the curriculum.

The previous PDS² model used the TIP group approach with 4th grade geometry in a metro-Atlanta school. Using teacher-made tests and comparison classrooms, the mean student scores in the TIP classrooms was statistically significantly higher ($p < .05$) than the scores in the comparison group. The mean difference effect size was greater than 1.0, which is very large according to Cohen's (1987) guidelines for effect sizes where a large effect size is .8. After seeing these results and hearing the very positive presentation by the regular classroom teachers who mentored the interns in the 4th grade classrooms, the Executive Director for Research in that school system said that we "hit a home run." We have subsequently employed the TIP model in a different subject at a different grade level in a different school and also obtained significant results. *The key, we believe, is focusing on a more limited and manageable unit or area of instruction and then facilitating the dissemination and implementation of a*

successful instructional intervention. A lesson that the Director of Evaluation and Research clearly learned in the TIP Group studies was the need for a very supportive initial research and evaluation consultations and workshops with the people involved in the TIP groups before that interventions because many of the TIP group members have limited knowledge of rigorous research protocols.

Anchor Action Research means that the research is concerned with changes in current policies and practices and is anchored through commonalities among the studies in methodology and student academic achievement as outcome variables. A mixed-method design including both (a) a quasi-experimental design (e.g., pretest-post-test design with a control condition) and (b) a qualitative analysis of the classroom context of the action research and the changes in instruction/curriculum is preferred. These specifications for research funded through these minigrants create a commonality, or anchor, across the research projects. Up to 10 of the successful Anchor Action Research projects in any particular year are eligible for additional funding for up to a typical award of [REDACTED]. The purpose of these fellowship awards is to encourage K-12 teachers and university faculty to replicate the successful Anchor-Action Research study and to disseminate the instructional approach in the NET-Q partnership, thus multiplying the effect of successful instructional interventions. Final evaluation reports are required from each TIP Group funded and each TIP Group with Fellowship recipient(s). One of the evaluation team members will read each final report and provide written feedback to the TIP Group or Fellowship TIP Group. A NET-Q program objective is that all reports will be commented on by an evaluation team member within 2 months of receiving the report.

For the purposes of linking student achievement to intern, mentor teacher, and situational characteristics, data will be gathered using surveys from mentor teachers, interns, and students. A typical survey for students has been created using mostly items which have shown achievement differences using Rasch scaling in a very large urban school system (see Appendix 9).

The minigrant and fellowship programs help the NET-Q Program meet the requirement of the RFP for teachers and early childhood educators “. . . to understand empirically-based practice and

scientifically valid research related to teaching and learning . . .”. The minigrant program without the fellowships has been very successfully implemented at GSU with its partner schools. We propose to expand the program to include a second year where successful projects are replicated to obtain additional validity and then disseminated to other teachers in the NET-Q Project.

TIP projects will also be employed to evaluate the instructional effectiveness of the real data astronomy projects using telescopes belonging to the Department of Physics and Astronomy at Georgia State University. This is one example of the on-going relationships between the College of Education and the College of Arts and Sciences at Georgia State University.

Constructed response exercises. In at least 6 of the TIP groups each year, existing constructed response exercises will be used as an outcome measure to assess student achievement. This provides an approach to measuring student achievement other than the traditional multiple choice tests. These constructed response exercises have already been developed along with scoring rubrics and specialized software to facilitate judges in the scoring process.

Assessing Interns; Measuring Student Achievement; and Linking Student, Intern, Mentor, and Situational Characteristics to Student Achievement

For both the NET-Q pre-Baccalaureate program and the NET-Q Resident program, the evaluation activities for the NET-Q Grant should focus on people who have been involved with the NET-Q Program. The idea of focusing the intervention on people involved with the program was stated in several places in the RFP. Up to 30 TIP Groups, ideally at least one per NET-Q school, along with at least one comparison classroom for each TIP Group will comprise the primary evaluation study.

In each school system a Research Coordinator, who is an employee of the school system, is appointed to aid in data collection. This person has access to student records and can de-identify student records and create what we have called in the previous research “virtual IDs.” The school research coordinator maintains the list and one duplicate copy which links each student’s real ID to the research “virtual ID” and places the lists in secure locations according to IRB regulations. Attention is also paid to

the number of students in any demographic variable category so that confidentiality is maintained.

Incidentally, this data analysis is easily accomplished by using any statistical program which provides cross tabulations on demographic variables which can quickly reveal small cell counts. Given compliance with IRB procedures, the Research Coordinator can link mentor characteristics to classes. The NET-Q programs will ask interns to rate themselves on a teaching evaluation instrument, typically the Georgia Framework for Teaching. This process will provide each year an *extraordinary* data set of up to 30 TIP Groups, 30 matched comparison groups with instructional interventions linked to characteristics of K12 teacher preparation programs, mentors, interns, students, and student academic achievement. In fact, it may be possible to use Hierarchical Linear Models (HLM) for that data analysis in a meta-analysis (see chapter 7 in Raudenbush & Bryk, 2002). Furthermore, this evaluation study addresses *Competitive Preference Priority 1 for Continuous Program Improvement through Linking Intern and Teacher Characteristics to K-12 Student Achievement*.

Evaluation related to improving Georgia CRCT scores for student achievement and involving university professors, interns, and K-12 faculty in empirically-based practice. When the Director of Evaluation and Research asked school research directors and school principals what results they would like to see from the NET-Q program, many of the school leaders said improved student achievement on the Georgia Criterion-Referenced Competency Tests (CRCTs). For each of the Georgia Criterion-Referenced Competency Tests, there are usually four or five subtests for a subject area at a grade level (see Appendix 10). With 40 residents each year and at least 40 Baccalaureate program interns each year, there will be at least 80 TIP Groups (although most will not have a minigrant for Anchor-Action Research). Each of these TIP groups will be asked to analyze either the previous academic achievement of the current students in a class they are interning in or academic achievement of a previous cohort of students which took that class. Some of the NET-Q schools currently ask their teachers to do this and have purchased specialized student management software to easily permit these analyses. Through coursework in the NET-Q programs, interns and residents will be trained on how to interpret CRCT

scores and especially subtest scores (called domain scores on the CRCT). For the current students in a class, the TIP Group will be asked to identify at least one domain score per student which the student could benefit from more instruction in the area of that domain. For some classes differentiated instruction may be necessary. Data analyses will be conducted to assess whether changes in the identified domain scores increase more than expected in the NET-Q TIP Groups especially when contrasted with similar domain scores in comparison groups. Furthermore, intern and resident characteristics, mentor characteristics, teacher preparation program characteristics, and student achievement on CRCT can all be linked with this approach.

Instrumentation

As data accumulate with the instruments used in this evaluation, both reliability and validity will be assessed when feasible. Described below are existing instruments to be used in the evaluation and a description of rubric scoring for constructed response exercises.

Georgia Teaching Framework and Class Instrument. The Georgia Framework for Teaching will be used for evaluation (see sample rubrics in Appendix 2). The programs have adapted the framework to be observational rubrics.

The Teacher Efficacy Scale. The Teacher Efficacy Scale (Woolfolk & Hoy, 1990), one of the most researched efficacy instruments, measures two aspects of efficacy (self-evaluation of one's ability to bring about positive student change and the belief that students are capable of learning regardless of home environment, motivation and other factors). A synthesis of the recommendations by Zeichner (1993), Cochran-Smith (1991), Weiner (1993), and Haberman (1994) indicates that efficacy is one characteristic of successful urban teachers.

Surveys on Teacher Use of Technology. An existing instrument to assess technology which will be used in the NET-Q Grant is the *Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM) Levels of Use of an Innovation* by Griffin and Christensen (1999). This instrument has been used in several federal grants at Georgia State University and has been helpful for understanding teachers' use of technology. Two other

technology instruments will be employed (see TQP Indicator 4.7.1). In addition, a survey will be developed in conjunction with the Instructional Technology section in the College of Education at GSU to help assess universal design issues and data analyses using technology as it relates to instructional practices. In a later section in this proposal, two new applications for hand-held devices are proposed to improve instructional practices including data analyses in Anchor Action Research.

Qualitative Evaluation Plan

Qualitative research focuses on the accurate description, construction, and contextual factors concerning a situation, event, or lived experience. NET-Q will use Guba and Lincoln's (1989) *Fourth Generation Evaluation* model to inform this component of the evaluation plan. *Fourth Generation Evaluation* provides an innovative and effective framework by which to conduct evaluations in the K-12 school and postsecondary milieus. Central to this approach to evaluation is the realization that myriad human, political, social, cultural, and contextual elements are intertwined and, as such, require an effective epistemic orientation to negotiate and describe accurately the multiple evaluands involved in the NET-Q partnership. Evaluation, as a general practice, entails a shared construction and negotiation of pluralistic viewpoints between the evaluators and evaluands. The constructivist paradigm undergirding the *Fourth Generation Evaluation* model allows for the empowerment and enfranchisement of evaluation stakeholders while providing a definitive, mutually constructed and negotiated action-oriented plan for process improvement and utilization. The following will constitute the major data sources for the qualitative component of the NET-Q partnership.

Interviews and focus groups with stakeholders. An interview and associated protocol guide will be utilized to inform the conduct of structured and semi-structured interviews to capture stakeholder perceptions of the NET-Q partnership. These interviews will last between 45 minutes to one hour and will be held in a private, convenient location for the stakeholder. The number of participating schools in the NET-Q partnership will inform the number of interviews to be conducted each year of the NET-Q partnership. Interviews will center on, but will not be limited to such aspects as perceived impact of the

NET-Q partnership, treatment acceptability of the NET-Q partnership, and dosage issues. Focus group size will be limited to not more than 6 participants per group, as suggested by Morgan (1997). This will prevent excessive participant agreement yet provide adequate coverage and exploration of potential issues and themes raised in the focus groups. As qualitative research generally follows an emergent paradigm, additional modifications to the interview protocol and/or guide will be informed by the addition of relevant data gathered from observations and other focus group/interviews conducted with NET-Q stakeholders.

Observations of NET-Q classrooms. Observations of teachers, interns, and students within the NET-Q classrooms will be conducted on a regular basis by qualitative research staff associated with NET-Q. As with the structured and semi-structured interviews, an observation protocol and/or rubric will be developed to capture classroom pedagogical and ecological factors related to the goals of the NET-Q partnership.

Observer Memoing/Notetaking. As *Fourth Generation Evaluation* is based on shared, mutually constructed and negotiated meanings, the qualitative research staff will memo and take personal notes capturing evaluands' lived experience as filtered through the eyes of the evaluator. These memos will inform the directionality of inquiry as well as document the progression of thought to be member-checked within the focus groups themselves.

Qualitative Data Analysis. Techniques for qualitative data analysis have been suggested by the work of Miles and Huberman in 1994. Raw data will be thematically reduced and coded. In some instances, concept maps will be developed. Where pertinent, data analysis will be linked to current educational policy as is consistent with evaluation methods outlined in Patton in 2001 and Weiss in 1993.

Value-added analysis. The value added approach, which was discussed in a special issue of the *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics* (Spring, 2004) and presented in a book of readings titled *Value Added Models in Education: Theory and Applications* edited by Lissitz (2005), will compare the cost of beginning teacher retention for teachers who went through the NET-Q Baccalaureate and

residency programs with beginning teachers in the comparison schools. A basic description of the approach for making this comparison is given in the discussion of GPRA Indicator 4.1.

Research on Matching Mentors and Interns Using the Myers-Briggs Instrument

Interns and mentors will be asked to take the Myers-Briggs Instrument which, in its most basic form, results in four dimensions with two types in each dimension. Thus, there are 16 possible profiles. Without intervening in the matching process between intern and mentor, pairing will be allowed to take place naturally creating what is known as an “observational study.” At the end of internship or resident year both the intern or resident and the mentor teacher will be asked to fill out a survey to indicate how satisfied they were with their professional and personal interrelationships. This pairing creates dyad data which will be analyzed according to procedures discussed in Kenny, Kashy, and Cook’s (2006) book, *Dyadic Data Analysis*. Taking into account covariates, results may indicate natural pairings where satisfaction is higher.

Hand-Held Real Time Data Device (e.g., idata)

After the first full year of grant implementation, efforts will be made to create two applications on a hand-held device which has real time data connectivity with the Internet. At present, we plan to use the idata device from Apple but as technology develops over the next year, iphone or Google software for at least two other hand-held devices may become more desirable. Two advantages of such hand-held devices are that they allow access to information at essentially anytime and anywhere, and they are especially convenient for data entry when previously stored data bases are helpful. The applications which will be developed to further the overall objectives of this grant are the following: (1) a teaching evaluation instrument (e.g., the Georgia Framework for Teaching) appropriate for supervising interns will be developed as an application for the hand-held real data device allowing for *continuous* feedback to interns regarding their professional practice, and (2) an application will be developed to teach Anchor-Action Research (including basic qualitative approaches) and also provide basic descriptive and inferential quantitative data analysis. With iphone, the Apple Application store can make the applications

which we develop accessible to a nationwide audience, thus using digital media to expand the results of our work which we believe will improve teacher education. Furthermore, this proposal will build on Georgia State University's existing relationship with Apple. (Georgia State University is featured on Apple's front page for an outstanding educational application.)

Bayesian Concepts in Qualitative Research

Although not a major focus of the NET-Q evaluation and research efforts, we propose to develop new methodology for mixed-methods research as a byproduct of the evaluation work in this grant. The new methodology effort will bring some closure to work that the Director of Evaluation and Research has been conducting to use Bayesian statistics for conducting mixed-methods research. In particular, the research agenda is to develop further a mixed-methods approach which combines Bayesian statistics (Press, 2003) with qualitative research (Creswell, 1998, 2003) in the context of teacher quality research. Previously, mixed-methods research was almost always a combination of classical statistics with qualitative research (Tashakkori and Teddlie, 1998). The idea of using Bayesian statistics in qualitative research has been suggested at times in the literature (Buckley, 2004).

Debate concerning combining qualitative and quantitative methodology or research in the same study became known as the paradigm wars of the 1960s to the 1980s. More recently, alternatives such as "multimethod research" (Brewer & Hunter, 1989), "methodological mixes" (Patton, 1990), and "mixed-method methodology" (Creswell, 2003) have offered primarily pragmatic resolutions to the paradigm wars. These solutions to the paradigm wars never provided a complete integration of the quantitative and qualitative methodologies.

To achieve a complete integration of these two methodologies, the final methodological steps in the development of a new research design paradigm, which has several key steps especially regarding how themes enter the analysis, for mixed methods research using Bayesian statistics will be completed within the first 2 years of the grant. The idea is that the qualitative information is used to create a prior belief on a theme (from previous literature or qualitative research) and then combine the prior belief with

data from a survey to yield the posterior distribution. Some of the teacher efficacy data in this grant from the NET-Q schools will be analyzed using this new mixed methodology. Previously, the Director of Evaluation and Research has supervised two dissertations using Bayesian statistics for mixed methods which were successfully defended in 2008. The dissertation by Ogletree (2008) has a small real data example of using Bayesian mixed methods methodology for evaluating teacher efficacy in education using interview data and scores from an efficacy instrument.

Summary

The NET-Q Grant will make a significant contribution to education by presenting a large scale multisite intervention and evaluation of a teacher quality partnership effort with an extensive evaluation plan which includes matched comparison schools. Beyond addressing the four competitive priorities and the one invitational priority, some new developmental work is proposed to be accomplished along the way: the use of Bayesian techniques for development of new methodology for mixed methods studies; the use of portable data devices (e.g., idata, iphone, or a Google application), supporting nationwide distribution, for real time teacher evaluation and to teach and support action research analysis at the classroom level; and the use of the Myers-Briggs Instrument in research to explore the satisfaction of intern-mentor matches. Finally, our major contribution will be to improve teacher preparation leading to higher quality educational opportunities for all children.

Evaluation: Performance Objectives

The performance objectives and their data sources, indicators, targets, timeline, and responsible party are listed in the following order: Section 1: GPRA Objectives, Section 2: TQP Objectives, and Section 3: NET-Q Program Objectives. For each objective, and its associated activities, a performance measure has been specified so that the NET-Q Grant will be accountable for the expenditure of grant funds. With the timeline and responsible party in these charts below, this information contributes to the management plan regarding reporting data for all performance objectives.

The Co-Principal Investigator for Evaluation and Research has met with administrators from the Georgia Professional Standards Commission and an excellent working relationship has been established for this grant. The Georgia Professional Standards Commission maintains all teacher certification records in Georgia along with linking to the subject areas which are being taught by a teacher.

Because there are a large number of required objectives (GPRA and TQP) in addition to the number of NET-Q program objectives for two absolute priorities, this section required a large number of pages to address the indicators. Furthermore, because Atlanta Public Schools is a partner in Absolute Priority One (pre-Baccalaureate) but not a partner in Absolute Priority Two (Residential), most of the objectives below will be evaluated once for Absolute Priority One and again for Absolute Priority Two. To save space in this proposal, each objective is listed only once in the proposal but would be reported on twice in a funded grant so that separate data would be available for Absolute Priority One and Absolute Priority Two because of the partnership's changing. In all instances IRB regulations will be followed.

Section 1: GPRA Objectives. GRPA Indicator 1.1 : Graduation - Percentage of Program

Completers from pre-Baccalaureate Program who "attain all necessary licensure/certification assessments and attain bachelor's degree within six years" .

Data Source	Indicators (Performance Measures)	Targets for Performance Measures	Timeline	Responsible Party
Georgia Professional Standards (GPS) Commission	1.1A Change for NET-Q Group from previous year	3% increase each year in percentage of program completers meeting requirements	September 1 st for previous academic year	Curlette

The plan for pre-Baccalaureate program meets these requirements as discussed previously. Careful monitoring of students in the pre-Baccalaureate by faculty advisors will help meet this objective. The IDs of pre-Baccalaureate program completers within 6 years are matched with list of teachers having licensure by GPS to obtain the total number of program completers having licensure divided by the total number of program completers that year.

GPRA Indicator 1.2 : Graduation Percentage of NET-Q Program Completers from Residency Program who "attain all necessary licensure/certification assessments and master's degree within two years."

Data Source	Indicators (Performance Measures)	Targets for Performance Measures	Timeline	Responsible Party
Georgia Professional Standards Commission	Percentage of NET-Q Program Completers	3% increase each year in percentage of program completers meeting requirements	September 1 st for previous academic year	Curlette

The plan for residency program meets these requirements as discussed previously. Careful monitoring of students in the resident program by faculty advisors will help meet this objective. The IDs of residency program completers within 2 years are matched with list of teachers having licensure by GPS to obtain total number of program completers having licensure divided by the total number of program completers that year.

GPRA Indicator 2: Employment Retention for Teachers Entering Teaching through the NET-Q Program - "The percentage of beginning teachers who are retained in teaching in the partner high-need LEA or ECE program three years after initial employment".

Data Source	Indicators (Performance Measures)	Targets for Performance Measures	Timeline	Responsible Party
Georgia Professional Standards (GPS) Commission	Percentage of beginning teachers educated through NET-Q Program who are retained in <u>partner</u> high-need LEA three years after initial employment	80% of beginning teachers are retained in a partner high-need LEA	Percentage provided each year starting after year 3 of grant, September 1 st for previous academic year	Curlette

The IDs of Baccalaureate program completers within 6 years are matched with list of teachers having licensure by GPS to obtain total number of program completers having licensure are divided by the total number of program completers that year.

GPRA Indicator 3 - Improved Scores - Percentage of NET-Q Completers who have higher scale scores on GACE (teacher certification test in Georgia) over baseline year (2008-2009 school year).

Data Source	Indicators (Performance Measures)	Targets for Performance Measures	Timeline	Responsible Party
GACE licensure scores from Georgia Professional Standards Commission	Percentage of NET-Q Completers whose GACE (overall) scaled scores are above the mean scaled score for the baseline year on the particular GACE test area certification	1st year - Increase in percentage of completers scaled scores of 2% over baseline year. 2nd year and thereafter, an additional 3% over baseline year. Thus, in 3rd year the performance target would be 8% increase over baseline year.	September 15 th for report	Curlette

In consultation with administrators at the Georgia PSC, the recommended performance indicator are the scaled scores on the last attempt of a candidate to pass the GACE. An examinees overall score is the mean of the primary scaled scores on the GACE. It should be noted that the Department of Education's reporting requirement is "The percentage of *grantees* (italics added) that report improved scaled scores for initial state certification or licensure of teachers." Also, the scaled scores will be reported in a table in the text of the yearly report.

GPRA Indicator 4.1 - Efficiency Measure for Employment Retention Using NET-Q Beginning Teachers versus Comparison School Beginning Teachers - "The cost of a successful outcome where success is defined as retention in the partner high-need LEA or ECE program three years after initial employment" as contrasted to the cost of teacher retention in the comparison schools.

Data Sources	Indicators (Performance Measures)	Targets for Performance Measures	Timeline	Responsible Party
First, retention data from Georgia Professional Standards Commission for each beginning teacher from NET-Q program in partnership and each beginning teacher in comparison schools. Second, cost of hiring and retaining a teacher each year for three years.	Efficiency Cost for Teacher Retention (as defined below)	Efficiencies greater than 1.1 which indicate that the NET-Q Program is more efficient in terms of saving money	October 1 st for previous academic year	Curlette

For reporting purposes, so that data collected by the Department will be on the same scale, financial cost will be considered to be the utility function. The financial costs involved in hiring and retaining a teacher (beyond a benchmark salary provided by the system) for each year of the three years in each school system will be requested and tabulated for each year of the grant from administrators in each school system. In statistics, expected loss (which is a cost) is obtained by multiplying the cost of a loss by the probability of the loss. To obtain an efficiency measure, the first step is to obtain the expected loss table given below to express the expected costs of a teacher leaving.

	Teachers Stay	Teachers Leave -Expected Loss in Dollars
NET-Q Beginning Teachers	No loss	Mean Dollar loss per NET-Q Beginning Teacher who leaves (note: cost to system depends on year teacher left) times the probability that a NET-Q teacher leaves (calculated by year)
Comparison School Beginning Teachers	No loss	Mean Dollar loss per Comparison School Beginning Teacher who leaves (note: cost to system depends on year teacher left) times the probability that a Beginning Teacher leaves (calculated by year)

The cost of teacher retention for one, two, and three years can be obtained from school administrators. The efficiency measure reported will be the following ratio:

Efficiency Cost for Teacher Retention = (the expected mean loss for the comparison schools)/(the expected mean loss for the NET-Q schools).

For example, if the expected cost for losing a comparison school beginning teacher is \$15,000 and the expected cost for losing a NET-Q Beginning teacher is \$5,000, then the NET-Q program is 3 times more efficient regarding teacher retention using cost as the utility function.

Incidentally, cohorts of teachers for each year can be obtained and short term retention rates (1st year retained and 2nd year retained) can be obtained for both the NET-Q schools and the comparison schools. Identification of beginning teachers in the comparison schools can be obtained from PSC and their retention rates can be obtained for one, two, or three years.

Of course, there will be a distribution of cost (loss) per teacher obtained by plotting the cost of each teacher leaving (where the x-axis is the cost in dollars and the y-axis is the frequency). The variability and shape of the distributions for both beginning NET-Q teachers who leave and comparison school beginning teachers who leave will be discussed in the text of each yearly report. These data will be reported in the text of each yearly report.

GPRA Indicator 5.1 - Short-Term Performance Measure 1: Persistence - Percentage of NET-Q program participants who "did not graduate in the previous reporting period, and who persisted in the postsecondary program in the current reporting period".

Data Source	Indicators (Performance Measures)	Targets for Performance Measures	Timeline	Responsible Party
Reports from college departments regarding status of NET-Q program participants	Percentage = 100 times (number of NET-Q participants not graduating in previous year but expected to graduate according to program plan) divided by (No. of NET-Q participants in programs)	Less than 10% do not graduate on-time according to NET-Q program plan	August 15 st for previous academic year	Gwen Benson, Dee Taylor

GPRA Indicator 5.2 - Short-Term Performance Measure 2: Employment Retention - Percentage of NET-Q "beginning teachers who are retained in teaching in the partner high-need LEA or ECE program one year after initial employment" .

Data Source	Indicators (Performance Measures)	Targets for Performance Measures	Timeline	Responsible Party
Georgia Professional Standards Commission	Percentage of NET-Q Beginning Teachers retained after one year	90%	November 15 th for preceding academic year	Curlette

Section 2: TQP Indicators. TQP Indicator 1 - Achievement for all NET-Q prospective and new teachers, as measured by the eligible partnership.

Data Source	Indicators (Performance Measures)	Targets for Performance Measures	Timeline	Responsible Party
Faculty and Administrator Ratings of NET-Q Prospective and New Teachers	Georgia Framework for Teaching areas are 1)Content and Curriculum, 2) Knowledge of Students, 3) Learning Environments, 4) Assessment, 5) Planning and Instruction, 6) Professionalism	3% increase each year in each area	October 15th for previous academic year	Benson, Taylor

The Georgia Framework for Teaching was developed by a Federal Grant and has been adopted by the Georgia State Department of Education, the university system, and school systems for teacher assessment. The Georgia Framework for Teaching employed in this grant provides "...beginning teachers and their leaders/mentors/colleagues: a view of the profession as a complex, highly professional endeavor; an illustration of teachers' knowledge and skills at specific career levels; a vision of the next level of teaching proficiency and how teachers can achieve that level; a career-long map for professional

growth; and an understanding of teaching that is driven by evidence including student work and other artifacts" (Professional Growth Plan, 2007).

TQP Indicator 2.1 - Teacher retention in the first three years of NET-Q teachers' careers.

Data Source	Indicators (Performance Measures)	Targets for Performance Measures	Timeline	Responsible Party
Georgia Professional Standards Commission	Percentage of NET-Q teachers retained after three years in partnership	80%	December 15 th after 3 academic years	Curlette

TQP Indicator 2.2 - Teacher retention in the second year of NET-Q teachers' careers.

Data Source	Indicators (Performance Measures)	Targets for Performance Measures	Timeline	Responsible Party
Georgia Professional Standards Commission	Percentage of NET-Q teachers retained after 2nd year (1st year retention is a GPRA Short Term Objective)	85%	December 15 th after 2 academic years	Curlette

TQP Indicator 3 - "Improvement in the pass rates and scaled scores for initial State certification or licensure of teachers" from NET-Q Grant.

Data Source	Indicators (Performance Measures)	Targets for Performance Measures	Timeline	Responsible Party
GACE data from Georgia Professional Standards Commission	Percentage of NET-Q Completers whose GACE (overall) scaled scores are above the mean scaled score for the baseline year on the particular GACE test area certification	1st year - Increase in percentage of completers scaled scores of 2% over baseline year. 2nd year and thereafter, an additional 3% over baseline year. Thus, in 3rd year the performance target would be 8% increase over baseline year.	July 1 st based on GACE data available at that time from PSC	Taylor

TQP Indicator 4.1 "The percentage of highly qualified teachers hired by the high-need local educational agency participating in the eligible partnership".

Data Source	Indicators (Performance Measures)	Targets for Performance Measures	Timeline	Responsible Party
Georgia Professional Standards Commission	Percentage of highly qualified teachers hired in NET-Q partnership schools (note: this pertains to all teachers hired not just NET-Q teachers)	Increase of 2% per year.	Oct 15 th for preceding academic year	Curlette, Taylor

This TQP Indicator indicates an overall effect on employment of highly qualified teachers in NET-Q schools due to involvement in the NET-Q program.

TQP Indicator 4.2 "The percentage of highly qualified teachers hired by the high-need local educational agency who are members of underrepresented groups".

Data Source	Indicators (Performance Measures)	Targets for Performance Measures	Timeline	Responsible Party
Georgia Professional Standards Commission	Percentage of highly qualified teachers hired in partnership schools from underrepresented groups each year of hiring	Increase of 5% across schools in NET-Q partnership each year for hires from underrepresented groups	Oct 15 th for preceding academic year	Curlette, Taylor

This TQP Indicator indicates an overall effect on employment of highly qualified teachers who are members of underrepresented groups in NET-Q schools due to involvement in the NET-Q program. The PSC has ethnic/race information (with Hispanic considered as in the United States census) for each certified teacher in Georgia. The PSC also has gender for each teacher. The PSC has the school in which

the teacher is based (and proportion of time in school). Based on each NET-Q schools demographic information on teachers, underrepresented groups, if any, for that school will be determined. For example, male teachers in grades 1 to 6 are often an underrepresented group. Thus, hiring in underrepresented groups is expected to increase in part due to the emphasis on recruitment into NET-Q Teacher Preparation programs which are one source of new hires for the NET-Q schools involved.

TQP Indicator 4.3 "The percentage of highly qualified teachers hired by the high-need local educational agency who teach high-need academic subject areas (such as reading, mathematics, science, and foreign language, including less commonly taught languages and critical foreign languages)".

Data Source	Indicators (Performance Measures)	Targets for Performance Measures	Timeline	Responsible Party
Georgia Professional Standards Commission	Percentage of instructional units in high need-academic areas taught by a highly qualified teacher in that area	Increase of 3% each year of highly qualified teachers in high-need academic areas	Oct 15 th for preceding academic year	Curlette, Taylor

The PSC has data linking a teacher with the subject matter being taught (according to federal meta-categories). In discussion with administrators at the PSC, the appropriate statistic to report (as also reported by the State of Georgia in other federal programs) is the Full Time Equivalent which links area of teacher certification with subject being taught for an instructional unit. More specifically, for those classes which require a highly certified teacher, the percentage of time in a typical day that instructional units are taught by a highly qualified teachers in that area will be reported.

TQP Indicator 4.4 "The percentage of highly qualified teachers hired by the high-need local educational agency who teach in high-need areas (including special education, language instruction educational programs for limited English proficient students, and early childhood education)".

Data Source	Indicators (Performance Measures)	Targets for Performance Measures	Timeline	Responsible Party
Georgia Professional Standards Commission	Percentage of instructional units in high need-academic areas (e.g., special education) taught by a highly qualified teacher in that area	Increase of 3% each year of highly qualified teachers in high-need academic areas	Oct 15 th for preceding academic year	Curlette, Taylor

The same description for the method of linking data used in Indicator 4.3 is employed for Indicator 4.4.

TQP Indicator 4.5.1 "The percentage of highly qualified teachers hired by the high-need local educational agency who teach in high-need elementary schools".

Data Source	Indicators (Performance Measures)	Targets for Performance Measures	Timeline	Responsible Party
Georgia Professional Standards Commission	Percentage of highly qualified teachers employed in NET-Q schools	3% increase each year starting with baseline year	October 15 th for preceding academic year	Curlette, Taylor

TQP Indicator 4.5.2 "The percentage of highly qualified teachers hired by the high-need local educational agency who teach in high-need secondary schools".

Data Source	Indicators (Performance Measures)	Targets for Performance Measures	Timeline	Responsible Party
Georgia Professional Standards Commission	Percentage of highly qualified teachers employed in NET-Q schools	3% increase each year starting with baseline year	October 15 th for preceding academic year	Curlette, Taylor

TQP Indicator 4.6 - "The percentage of early childhood education program classes in the geographic area served by the eligible partnership taught by early childhood educators who are highly competent".

Data Source	Indicators (Performance Measures)	Targets for Performance Measures	Timeline	Responsible Party
Internet survey of teachers and administrators in geographic area to identify early childhood education program classes taught and their teachers. Highly competent childhood educators will be identified.	Percentage of classes taught by highly competent childhood educators	3% increase each year after the second year of grant	August 1 st for preceding academic year	Curlette

The geographic area will be defined as the school systems in the partnership. Highly qualified faculty teaching in early childhood education program classes will be compared to all faculty teaching in early childhood education program classes in the geographic area in order to obtain a percentage.

Using software for Geographic Information Systems (GIS), graphs will be prepared to allow visualization of the location of classes taught by early childhood educators who are highly competent or not. This will help in understanding the reach, coverage, any key corridors, and relationships to economic activity and educational resources in the geographic area.

TQP Indicator 4.7.1 - "The percentage of teachers trained to integrate technology effectively into curricula and instruction, including technology consistent with the principles of universal design for learning".

Data Source	Indicators (Performance Measures)	Targets for Performance Measures	Timeline	Responsible Party
Internet Survey of Teachers in NET-Q schools and comparison schools	Percentage of NET-Q teachers above level 3 on CBE.	Increase of 3% per year	August 1 st for preceding academic year	Curlette
	Percentage of non-NET-Q teachers above level 3 on CBE	Increase of 1.5% per year (half of NET-Q teacher increase)		
Interviews and data from two computer usage surveys	Extent to which themes show technology integration	Qualitative Report		

Although this topic is covered in the GACE licensure examination, a separate Internet survey will be conducted of teachers in both the NET-Q schools and the comparison schools (see Appendix 12). First, the *Concerns Based Adoption Model* survey (CBE) Instrument will be employed to obtain a guideline for the degree to which technology is being used by teachers. In addition, specific questions will be asked about technology consistent with the principles of universal design for learning using the *Teacher Proficiency Self-Assessment* by Ropp and the *Teacher in Education Competency Survey* by the International Society for Technology in Education. Then, qualitative research will be conducted with people involved in Teacher-Intern-Professor (TIP) Groups to assess the effectiveness of integrating technology into instruction for NET-Q Interns.

TQP Indicator 4.7.2 "The percentage of teachers trained to use technology effectively to collect, manage, and analyze data to improve teaching and learning for the purpose of improving student academic achievement".

Data Source	Indicators (Performance Measures)	Targets for Performance Measures	Timeline	Responsible Party
Internet Survey of Teachers in NET-Q schools and comparison schools	Percentage of NET-Q teachers above level 3 on CBE.	Increase of 3% per year	August 1 st for preceding academic year	Curllette
	Percentage of non-NET-Q teachers above level 3 on CBE	Increase of 1.5% per year (half of NET-Q teacher increase)		
Qualitative Research with TIP Group members	Extent to which themes show technology integration			

First, the Teacher-Intern-Professor (TIP) Model emphasizes the use of teachers employing data by reviewing Georgia Criterion-Referenced Competency Test (CRCT) scores for students in their classes to identify a "domain" (subtest strand; e.g., computations in mathematics) for emphasis in their instruction. Qualitative data will be obtained from interviews with teachers to better understand their use of data to improve student achievement. Second, open and closed type questions will be asked on an Internet survey distributed to all teachers in both the NET-Q schools and the comparison schools regarding using data to improve teaching and learning.

NET-Q Program Objectives. The following objectives are unique to the NET-Q Program. The NET-Q program level performance objectives with indicators and targets for performance provide data to indicate whether objectives are being met; hence, providing program accountability. Furthermore, these results support formative evaluation and provide observable data to indicate the degree of overall success of the NET-Q project at a particular time during the project's implementation.

Some of the performance objectives are concerned with describing if the activity actually occurred and other objectives are concerned with the effectiveness or quality of the activity. Taken together this information contributes to assessing the worth of the NET-Q Program.

The following numbering system was created to help with organization of the results for the NET-Q Program Level Objectives. In this numbering system there are 3 levels separated by two periods.

The first number indicates the particular priority which is being addressed. The possible first numbers are the following:

- 1 = Pre- Baccalaureate Preparation of Teachers (Absolute Priority 1)
- 2 = Establishment of Effective Teaching Residency Programs (Absolute Priority 2)
- 3 = Student Achievement and Continuous Program Improvement (Competitive Preference Priority 1)
- 4 = Development of Leadership Programs (Competitive Preference Priority 2)
- 5 = Rigorous Selection Process (Competitive Preference Priority 3)
- 6 = Broad-based Partners (Competitive Preference Priority 4)
- 7 = Partnership with Digital Education Content Developer (Invitational Priority)
- 8 = Data collected is not specific to any particular program but usually is across more than one NET-Q program

The second number indicates the group(s) which from which data are obtained. The possible numbers for the second level are the following:

- 1 = teachers , interns, university students , or mentors focus
- 2 = K-12 student focus
- 3 = other groups (e.g., administrators, community members)

The third number is represents a unique sequential number within after the first and second levels so that a particular performance objective can be easily referenced.

The abbreviation “Pr” used in the tables below stands for “Program” Objectives which are unique to the NET-Q Program . The abbreviation “CP” Priority used in the tables below stands for “Competitive Preference” Priority.

Although the list below is very extensive, the Director of Evaluation and Research has had over 30 years of experience in evaluating projects. To accomplish this evaluation a complete data collection manual will be developed with specific data collection activities for each performance objective, the person responsible for data collection, the person responsible for data analysis, the person responsible for report writing. All these deliverables will have deadline dates. Two members of the evaluation team will be responsible for monitoring deadlines to insure that high quality results are produced in a timely fashion.

Pr 1.1.1 Pre-Baccalaureate Program (Absolute Priority 1): Number of University Students Enrolled

Data Source	Indicators (Performance Measures)	Targets for Performance Measures	Timeline	Responsible Party
University Professor in charge of NET-Q Pre-Baccalaureate Program	Number of students actually enrolled each year	At least 50 university students per year (note rigorous selection for Pre-Baccalaureate Program is objective Pr 5.1.1)	September 1 each year and February 1 each year for reports of enrollment to Director of Evaluation and Research	Dooley for obtaining number of students admitted

Pr 1.1.2 Pre- Baccalaureate Program (Absolute Priority 1): Number of University Students Enrolled from Underrepresented Populations

Data Source	Indicators (Performance Measures)	Targets for Performance Measures	Timeline	Responsible Party
University Professor in charge of NET-Q Pre-Baccalaureate Program	Number of students actually enrolled each year from underrepresented populations	Of the students to be admitted each year at least 50% of the university students from underrepresented populations	September 1 each year and February 1 each year for reports of underrepresented population enrollment to Director of Evaluation and Research	Dooley for obtaining number from underrepresented population

Pr 1.1.3 Pre- Baccalaureate Program (Absolute Priority 1): Achievement for all NET-Q Interns as measured by their portfolios

Data Source	Indicators (Performance Measures)	Targets for Performance Measures	Timeline	Responsible Party
LiveText Data Management which has portfolios of Interns	Rubric for portfolio evaluation	Rubric of at least “Meets Expectation” for 80% of students	June 1 st each year for report on portfolio evaluation	Taylor with help from Dooley

LiveText is a software program used to manage student data. Although for instructional purposes, professors give individual students feedback on their portfolios, for the purpose of NET-Q program evaluation, a random sample of 10 students’ portfolios will be evaluated for the report.

Pr 1.2.4 Pre- Baccalaureate Program (Absolute Priority 1): Achievement for all NET-Q Interns as measured by a sample of their students’ portfolios

Data Source	Indicators (Performance Measures)	Targets for Performance Measures	Timeline	Responsible Party
LiveText Data Management which has de-identified work samples of K-12 students taught by NET-Q Intern	Rubric for portfolio evaluation	Rubric of at least “Meets Expectation” for 80% of K-12 students’ work	June 1 st each year for report on portfolio evaluation	Taylor with help from Dooley

LiveText is a software program used to manage student data. Although for instructional purposes, professors give individual students feedback on the work of their K-12 students, for the purpose of NET-Q program evaluation, a random sample of 10 university students’ portfolios with K-12 student work will be evaluated for the report.

Pr 1.1.5 Pre- Baccalaureate Program (Absolute Priority 1): Instructional effectiveness of Pre-Baccalaureate Program based on qualitative research

Data Sources	Indicators (Performance Measures)	Targets for Performance Measures	Timeline	Responsible Party
Interviews with key actors (interns, professors, administrators, mentors) and artifacts (course materials, etc.)	Qualitative Report	Qualitative Report	Report available by August 1 st each year	Curlette with support from Taylor and Dooley

Focus questions to guide the qualitative report on the NET-Q program will include questions regarding literacy aspects of the program; special education aspects of the program; endorsements (e.g., ESOL); integration of “technology effectively into curricula and instruction, including technology consistent with the principles of universal design for learning”; “use of technology effectively to collect, manage, and analyze data to improve teaching and learning for the purposes of improving student academic achievement”; understanding “empirically-based practice and scientifically valid research related to teaching and learning”; “implementing an induction program for new teachers”; “providing coaching or mentoring for new early childhood educators; meeting “the specific learning needs of all students, including students with disabilities, students who are limited English proficient, students who are gifted and talented, and students with low literacy levels”; “training in multiple subjects to teach multiple grade levels” for rural communities, as needed; ” techniques for early childhood educators to improve children’s cognitive, social, emotional, and physical environment”; and adequacy of compensation for an intern, faculty member, or K12 mentor for their participation.

Pr 2.1.1 Residency Program (Absolute Priority 2): Number of University Students Enrolled

Data Source	Indicators (Performance Measures)	Targets for Performance Measures	Timeline	Responsible Party
University Professor in charge of NET-Q Residency Program	Number of students actually enrolled each year	40 university students as stated in proposal per year with 20 of 40 in Special Education (Note: Rigorous selection for Residency Program is objective Pr 5.1.2)	Sept. 1 each year & Feb. 1 each year for reports of enrollment to Director of Evaluation and Research	Feinberg for obtaining enrollment numbers

Pr 2.1.2 Residency Program (Absolute Priority 2): Number of University Students Enrolled from Underrepresented Populations

Data Source	Indicators (Performance Measures)	Targets for Performance Measures	Timeline	Responsible Party
University Professor in charge of NET-Q Residency Program	Number of students actually enrolled each year from underrepresented populations	Of the 40 students to be admitted each year at least 50% of the university students from underrepresented populations	September 1 each year and February 1 each year for reports of underrepresented population enrollment to Director of Evaluation and Research	Feinberg for obtaining underrepresented enrollment

Pr 2.1.3 Residency Program (Absolute Priority 2): Achievement for all NET-Q Interns as measured by their portfolios

Data Source	Indicators (Performance Measures)	Targets for Performance Measures	Timeline	Responsible Party
LiveText Data Management which has portfolios of Interns	Rubric for portfolio evaluation	Rubric of at least "Meets Expectation" for 80% of students	June 1 st each year for report on portfolio evaluation	Taylor with help from Feinberg

LiveText is a software program used to manage student data. Although for instructional purposes, professors give individual students feedback on their portfolios, for the purpose of NET-Q program evaluation, a random sample of 10 students' portfolios will be evaluated for the report.

Pr 2.2.4 Residency Program (Absolute Priority 2): Achievement for NET-Q Interns in Middle-Secondary Programs (Mathematics and Science) and Special Education Programs as measured by a sample of their students' portfolios

Data Source	Indicators (Performance Measures)	Targets for Performance Measures	Timeline	Responsible Party
Sample of Student portfolios some of which may not be in LiveText	Rubric for portfolio evaluation	Rubric of at least “Meets Expectation” for 80% of K-12 students’ work	June 1 st each year for report on portfolio evaluation	Taylor with help from Feinberg

Although for instructional purposes, professors give individual students feedback on their portfolios, for the purpose of NET-Q program evaluation, a random sample of 12 students’ portfolios will be evaluated for the report.

Pr 2.1.5 Residency Program (Absolute Priority 2): Instructional effectiveness of Pre-Baccalaureate Program based on qualitative research

Data Sources	Indicators (Performance Measures)	Targets for Performance Measures	Timeline	Responsible Party
Interviews with key actors (interns, professors, administrators, mentors) and artifacts (course materials, etc.)	Qualitative Report	Qualitative Report	Report available by August 1 st each year	Curlette with support from Taylor and Feinberg

Focus questions to guide the qualitative report on the NET-Q program will include questions regarding literacy aspects of the program; special education aspects of the program; endorsements (e.g., ESOL, mathematics); integration of “technology effectively into curricula and instruction, including technology consistent with the principles of universal design for learning”; “use of technology effectively to collect, manage, and analyze data to improve teaching and learning for the purposes of improving student academic achievement”; understanding “empirically-based practice and scientifically valid research related to teaching and learning”; “implementing an induction program for new teachers”; and meeting “the specific learning needs of all students, including students with disabilities, students who are limited English proficient, students who are gifted and talented, and students with low literacy levels”;

adequacy of compensation for an intern, faculty member or K12 mentor for their participation; “rigor of the graduate level coursework”; and adequacy of the cohort model.

Pr 3.2.1 Student Achievement and Continuous Program Improvement (CP Priority 1): Criterion-Referenced Competency Test (CRCT) Student achievement in NET-Q classrooms compared with classrooms at the same grade level in matched comparison schools to obtain student achievement data over time for continuous program improvement.

Data Source	Indicators (Performance Measures)	Targets for Performance Measures	Timeline	Responsible Party
CRCT Test Scores of NET-Q classes and matched control school classes along with teacher variables (highly qualified, underrepresented group, gender, certifications (e.g, ESOL)) and situational variables (rural versus urban classroom, academic subject)	CRCT standardized mean difference effect sizes for NET-Q classrooms with comparison classrooms	Standardized mean difference effect size of .2 in favor of the NET-Q classrooms	Schools receive CRCT data in mid-summer. Obtaining data and conducting data analyses will be completed by Nov 30 th each year	Curlette

As previously described, the major thrust of the evaluation design was creating matched comparison schools and linking student achievement to teacher and intern characteristics. Classes at the same grade level in comparison schools will be selected in order to compare CRCT student achievement of a class taught by a NET-Q intern or resident placement to comparison classes in the matched comparison school. The Research Coordinators working with NET-Q in each system can provide CRCT data typically by domain (usually four or five subtests with the academic area being tested). This will show the effect of teachers on student learning for both the NET-Q Teachers and Comparison School Teachers. The data will be captured from year-to-year. In addition standardized mean difference effect sizes will be calculated to compare a NET-Q classroom for both the pre-Baccalaureate or Resident Programs with the mean student achievement of comparison group classroom using cumulative meta-

analysis procedures. Cumulative meta-analysis allows for an on-going accumulation of effect sizes over time and permits relating effect sizes to other characteristics describing the educational situations (see Chapter 19 titled Cumulative Meta-analysis in Sutton, Abrams, Jones, Sheldon, and Song’s book on *Methods for Meta-analysis in Medical Research*). These data will provide for the continuous improvement of the NET-Q programs. Furthermore, with way more than 50 NET-Q classrooms and 50 comparison group classrooms, the sample size is sufficient to consider analyzing the data using HLM models.

Pr 3.2.2 Student Achievement and Continuous Program Improvement (CP Priority 1): TIP Group student achievement using teacher-made tests in NET-Q classrooms and CRCT tests in NET-Q classrooms as well as comparison group classrooms will be used to link student achievement to instructional, teacher, and student characteristics to obtain student achievement data over time for continuous program improvement. (Note: In the appendix there is a 41 item student survey which will be available for TIP group studies in order to obtain the student’s perspective regarding instructional activities. Most items on the survey have been associated with changes in student achievement in a large urban school system. Also, in the mini-grants, the university and K-12 faculty are encouraged to include a qualitative research component.)

Data Source	Indicators (Performance Measures)	Targets for Performance Measures	Timeline	Responsible Party
CRCT Test Scores of NET-Q classes and matched control school classes along with teacher variables (highly qualified, underrepresented group, gender, certifications (e.g, ESOL)) and situational variables (rural versus urban classroom, academic subject). For TIP group classrooms, a student survey will frequently be employed.	CRCT standardized mean difference effect sizes for NET-Q classrooms with comparison classrooms	Standardized mean difference effect size of .2 in favor of the NET-Q classrooms	Schools receive CRCT data in mid-summer. Obtaining data and conducting data analyses will be completed by Nov 30 th each year	Curlette

As previously described, the major thrust of the evaluation design was creating matched comparison schools and linking student achievement to teacher and intern characteristics. TIP Group student achievement uses not only Criterion-Referenced Competency Test (CRCT) Student achievement but also pretest and posttest teacher made tests in TIP classrooms (see Popham's support for randomized equating of pretest and posttests by randomly assigning Test Form A and Test From B to students for pretest and posttest for classroom level research). Thus, this approach uses *multiple measures of student achievement* because students are not only evaluated on CRCT multiple choice tests but teacher-made tests which typically will contain other item formats such as constructed response. For selected grade levels, constructed response items with scoring rubrics are available for TIP studies from Georgia State University. For each TIP Group Study, individual IRBs for that particular study will usually be necessary because each TIP group has are necessary to obtain because of uniqueness regarding instructional interventions and outcome measures. Typically, the PI or Co-PI of a Mini-grant for a TIP study will be responsible for obtaining the IRB for that study. Due to the logistics of TIP groups, the first year of NET-Q interventions will have approximately 10 TIP groups with the goal being to expand to up to 30 TIP groups per year by the last year of the grant. Classes at the same grade level in comparison schools will be selected in order to compare CRCT student achievement of a class taught by a NET-Q intern or resident placement to comparison classes in the matched comparison school. The Research Coordinators working with NET-Q in each system can provide CRCT data typically by domain (usually four or five subtests with the academic area being tested). This will show the effect of teachers on student learning for both the NET-Q Teachers and Comparison School Teachers. The data will be captured from year-to-year. In addition standardized mean difference effect sizes will be calculated to compare a NET-Q classroom for both the pre-Baccalaureate or Resident Programs with the mean student achievement of comparison group classroom using cumulative meta-analysis procedures for both CRCT test scores and teacher-made tests. *Cumulative meta-analysis allows for an on-going accumulation of effect sizes over time and permits relating effect sizes to other characteristics (student, teacher, intern, instructional) describing the*

educational situations (see Chapter 19 titled Cumulative Meta-analysis in Sutton, Abrams, Jones, Sheldon, and Song’s book on Methods for Meta-analysis in Medical Research). These data will provide for the continuous improvement of the NET-Q programs. It is our experience with TIP groups previously that K-12 faculty in TIP groups become more involved in literature reviews relevant to the instructional intervention, learn more about measurement and conducting action research, and become involved in data-based decision making.

Pr 4.1.1 Leadership (CP Priority 2): Number of University Students Enrolled

Data Source	Indicators (Performance Measures)	Targets for Performance Measures	Timeline	Responsible Party
University Professor in charge of NET-Q Leadership Program	Number of students actually enrolled each year	5 university students as stated in proposal	September 1 each year February 1 each year	Hayward Richardson

Pr 4.1.2 Leadership (CP Priority 2): Number of University Students Enrolled from

Underrepresented Populations

Data Source	Indicators (Performance Measures)	Targets for Performance Measures	Timeline	Responsible Party
University Professor in charge of NET-Q Leadership Program	Number of students actually enrolled each year from underrepresented populations	Of the 5 students to be admitted 3 university students from underrepresented populations	September 1 each year February 1 each year	Hayward Richardson

Pr 4.1.3 Leadership (CP Priority 2): Leadership for Change in a Diverse Society L-6 Performance

Assessment

Data Source	Indicators (Performance Measures)	Targets for Performance Measures	Timeline	Responsible Party
Portfolios collected in university leadership classes for NET-Q students	Assessment Rubric for Diverse Society in Appendix	All respondents receive at least “Meets Expectations” on Assessment Rubric	Jan 15 and June 15 each year	Hayward Richardson

Pr 4.1.4 Leadership (CP Priority 2): Curriculum Analysis Project

Data Source	Indicators (Performance Measures)	Targets for Performance Measures	Timeline	Responsible Party
Portfolios collected in university leadership classes for NET-Q students	Assessment Rubric for Curriculum Project in Appendix	All respondents receive at least “Meets Expectations” on Assessment Rubric	Jan 15 and June 15 each year	Hayward Richardson

Pr 4.1.5 Leadership (CP Priority 2): GPS (Georgia Performance Standards) L-6 Performance

Assessment

Data Source	Indicators (Performance Measures)	Targets for Performance Measures	Timeline	Responsible Party
Presentation of Standards Based Development Activity by NET-Q student	Assessment Rubric for GPS Presentation in Appendix	All respondents receive at least “Meets Expectations” on Assessment Rubric	Jan 15 and June 15 each year	Hayward Richardson

Pr 4.1.6 Leadership (CP Priority 2): Problem-Based Leadership Project

Data Source	Indicators (Performance Measures)	Targets for Performance Measures	Timeline	Responsible Party
Written description of an actual problem in NET-Q student’s school	Assessment Rubric for Problem definition and resolution	All respondents receive at least “Meets Expectations” on Assessment Rubric	Jan 15 and June 15 each year	Hayward Richardson

Pr 4.1.7 Leadership (CP Priority 2): Interviews with key teachers and administrators in NET-Q university student who is a school leader in his/her school

Data Source	Indicators (Performance Measures)	Targets for Performance Measures	Timeline	Responsible Party
Interviews conducted by NET-Q Evaluation Staff	Qualitative Report	Qualitative Report	July 30 each year	Curlette

For each interview, examples of the focus questions which will be asked are the following: Is there a data-driven learning professional learning community within your school?; Is the climate conducive to the professional development of teachers?; Is the climate conducive to improving student learning?; Does (NET-Q leader’s name) “use data to evaluate teacher instruction and drive teacher and student learning?; Does (NET-Q leader’s name) “manage resources and school time to improve student academic achievement “?; How well? Is the school environment safe? Please explain? Additional questions will be generated with wording similar to requirements in the RFP. Written notes from the interviewer will be available for summarization. Qualitative interviewing techniques will be employed, including for instance follow-up questions and requests for examples . A summary qualitative report will be prepared by July 30th each year.

Pr 4.1.8 Leadership (CP Priority 2): Induction Program for New School Leaders

Data Source	Indicators (Performance Measures)	Targets for Performance Measures	Timeline	Responsible Party
Interviews of New School Leaders Regarding Induction Activities	Report of Activities of Induction Program	Qualitative Report	July 30 each year	Hayward

Pr 5.1.1 – Rigorous Selection Process (CP Priority 3): Selection Process for Students in Pre-

Baccalaureate Program

Data Source	Indicators (Performance Measures)	Targets for Performance Measures	Timeline	Responsible Party
NET-Q Pre-Baccalaureate Program Co-PI	Report describing selection process	Qualitative Report	April 30 th each year	Curlette

The report describing the selection process must provide standardized test scores for admission (e.g., SAT) if they are required, appropriate GPAs, and results of interviews, if appropriate. Methods to ensure a rigorous selection process should be stated. The number of candidates applying, and the number of candidates applying from underrepresented groups should be reported. The number admitted should be reported, and the number of candidates admitted from underrepresented groups should be reported. The report will be reviewed by the Director of Evaluation and Research.

Pr 5.1.2 – Rigorous Selection Process (CP Priority 3): Resident Program

Data Source	Indicators (Performance Measures)	Targets for Performance Measures	Timeline	Responsible Party
NET-Q Resident Program Co-PI	Report describing selection process	Qualitative Report	April 30 th each year	Curlette

The report describing the selection process must provide standardized test scores for admission (e.g., GRE) if they are required, appropriate GPAs, and results of interviews, if appropriate. Methods to ensure a rigorous selection process should be stated. The number of candidates applying, and the number of candidates applying from underrepresented groups should be reported. The number admitted should be reported, and the number of candidates admitted from underrepresented groups should be reported. The report will be reviewed by the Director of Evaluation and Research.

Pr 5.1.3 – Rigorous Selection Process (CP Priority 3): Selection Process for Student in

Leadership Program

Data Source	Indicators (Performance Measures)	Targets for Performance Measures	Timeline	Responsible Party
NET-Q Leadership Program Co-PI	Report describing selection process	Qualitative Report	April 30 th each year	Curlette

The report describing the selection process must provide standardized test scores for admission (e.g., GRE) if they are required, appropriate GPAs, and results of interviews, if appropriate. Methods to ensure a rigorous selection process should be stated. The number of candidates applying, and the number of candidates applying from underrepresented groups should be reported. The number admitted should be reported, and the number of candidates admitted from underrepresented groups should be reported. The report will be reviewed by the Director of Evaluation and Research.

Pr 6.3.1 – Broad-based Partners (CP Priority 4): The number of business and community partners who have activity participated with the NET-Q Program.

Data Source	Indicators (Performance Measures)	Targets for Performance Measures	Timeline	Responsible Party
PI for NET-Q	Report naming partner and describing the partner's participation with NET-Q	10 partners at end of 1 st year. Increase of 2 additional partners each subsequent year. Report should indicate "significant" involvement for each partner.	July 30 th each year	Benson

Pr 7.3.1 – Digital Education Content Developer (CP Priority - Invitational): Georgia Public

Broadcasting will help develop and distribute ESOL instructional support for university students and teachers to obtain ESOL Certification.

Data Source	Indicators (Performance Measures)	Targets for Performance Measures	Timeline	Responsible Party
Qualified Expert in Teaching Area External to Partnership Reviews Media Produced	Report evaluating media product	High quality media product	Three months after product is released or significant revision is released	Taylor

Pr 7.3.2 – Digital Education Content Developer (CP Priority - Invitational): The number of

university students and teachers enrolling in Georgia Public Broadcasting ESOL instruction who obtain certification.

Data Source	Indicators (Performance Measures)	Targets for Performance Measures	Timeline	Responsible Party
Georgia Professional Standards Commission.	Number of ESOL certificates awarded	100 certificates per year starting at end of third year.	Report due August 1 for preceding academic year	Taylor

Pr 7.3.3 – Digital Education Content Developer (CP Priority - Invitational): Georgia Public

Broadcasting will help develop and distribute one additional certification Instructional support in a content area (e.g., Mathematics) for university students and teachers.

Data Source	Indicators (Performance Measures)	Targets for Performance Measures	Timeline	Responsible Party
Qualified Expert in Teaching Area External to Partnership Reviews Media Produced	Report evaluating media product	High quality media product	Three months after product is released or significant revision is released	Taylor

Pr 8.2.1 – Across more than one NET-Q Program (CP Priorities 1 and 2): University students in either the Pre-Baccalaureate Program or the Resident Program, through Teacher-Intern-Professor Groups teach astronomy using interaction with real data generated on request to K12 students.

Data Source	Indicators (Performance Measures)	Targets for Performance Measures	Timeline	Responsible Party
TIP Group focusing on astronomy	Teacher-made tests	Teacher grades at least 80% of students as meeting expectations	October 1 st each year for the preceding academic year	Miller

Pr 8.1.2 – Across more than one NET-Q Program (CP Priorities 1 and 2): Research report is produced relating dyads of Intern and Mentor number of matches on Myers-Briggs (MBTI) to ratings of their professional and personal satisfaction with the mentor mentee relationship in TIP groups.

Data Source	Indicators (Performance Measures)	Targets for Performance Measures	Timeline	Responsible Party
Interns and mentors in Baccalaureate and Resident programs who take the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) instrument and indicators of satisfaction	A research report is written	Research report relating dyads of Intern and Mentor number of matches on Myers-Briggs (MBTI) to ratings of satisfaction is produced.	First report at end of third academic year. Yearly report thereafter.	Curlette

Pr 8.1.3 – Across more than one NET-Q Program (CP Priorities 1 and 2): Research report is produced for new methodology for a mixed method research design paradigm (describing data collection and analysis) using Bayesian approaches as applied to NET-Q educational data.

Data Source	Indicators (Performance Measures)	Targets for Performance Measures	Timeline	Responsible Party
Prior Beliefs on Teacher Efficacy from interviews and quantitative teacher efficacy survey	A research report is written	Research report discusses Bayesian mixed method research paradigm and has example using teacher efficacy	First report at end of third academic year. Yearly report thereafter.	Curlette

Pr 8.1.4 – Across more than one NET-Q Program (CP Priorities 1 and 2): Application software is written and goes live on Internet for using a Hand-Held Real Time Data Device (e.g., idata, iphone, Google app and corresponding device) for evaluating teaching (for Interns or Beginning Teachers).

Data Source	Indicators (Performance Measures)	Targets for Performance Measures	Timeline	Responsible Party
Expert is hired to evaluate product	Report is written describing satisfaction with product and usage of product	Report	Beta version goes live at end of second year with first report in December of third year. Full application goes live at end of third year with report in the following July.	Curlette

Pr 8.1.5 – Across more than one NET-Q Program (CP Priorities 1 and 2): Application software is written and goes live on Internet for using a Hand-Held Real Time Data Device (e.g., idata, iphone, Google app and corresponding device) for teaching and collecting data for Anchor Action Research.

Data Source	Indicators (Performance Measures)	Targets for Performance Measures	Timeline	Responsible Party
Expert is hired to evaluate product	Report is written describing satisfaction with product and usage of product	Report	Beta version goes live at end of second year with first report in December of third year. Full application goes live at end of third year with report in the following July.	Curlette

Pr 8.1.6 Pre-Baccalaureate and Resident Programs: Teacher retention for teachers participating in Cross Career Learning Communities (CCLCs).

Data Sources	Indicators (Performance Measures)	Targets for Performance Measures	Timeline	Responsible Party
List of teachers participating in CCLCs is given to Georgia PSC to see if teacher is within the NET-Q partnership	Percentage of teachers in CCLC which are teachers next year	75%	Report available by December 1 st each year for preceding academic year	Taylor

A slightly lower percentage is stated as target because the CCICs do not necessarily have only teachers trained through NET-Q.

Pr 8.1.7 Pre-Baccalaureate and Resident Programs : Interviews of selected participants in Cross Career Learning Communities (CCLCs).

Data Sources	Indicators (Performance Measures)	Targets for Performance Measures	Timeline	Responsible Party
Interviews of selected teachers in CCICs	Qualitative Report	Qualitative Report	Report available by October 1 st each year for preceding academic year	Curlette

Pr 8.1.8 All Programs : NET-Q Leadership Consortium activities

Data Sources	Indicators (Performance Measures)	Targets for Performance Measures	Timeline	Responsible Party
Minutes of annual meeting of Leadership Consortium	Report of minutes	Report of minutes	Report available by July 1 st each year for preceding academic year	Benson

SIGNIFICANCE

8 SIGNIFICANCE

As indicated in the Needs Assessment (Section 2), the NET-Q Partnership is committed to addressing the needs of partner districts and the state of Georgia. Partners indicated needs in Special Education, ELL, technology, and literacy; therefore, all preparation programs and complementary initiatives will address these areas. In response to teacher shortages in Georgia, the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia (USG) calls for 20,000 new teachers by 2020 (USG, 2009). The state of Georgia has indicated a special need for teachers from underrepresented groups and high-quality teachers for Special Education and ELL at all levels and in STEM areas at the secondary level. According to USG data, Georgia will need to produce 2,060 middle school and high school teachers of life sciences, chemistry, earth sciences and

physics by next year. Yet, in the 2008 academic year, only 90 science teachers were prepared in Georgia. Similarly, Georgia has a 14% shortage of fully certified mathematics teachers (GPSC, 2009). The NET-Q partnership between GSU and historically Black and 2-year colleges will aid in recruitment of underrepresented groups. Selection requirements in all programs will ensure that candidates have the background knowledge to teach in high needs areas (e.g., STEM). The NET-Q programs are designed to alleviate the educator shortages in urban and rural secondary schools by supplying highly qualified teacher and leadership residents. Over the next 5 years, the NET-Q partnership will prepare more than 1,030 teachers and leaders to fulfill those needs.

Teacher and leader programs will build on proven ways to maintain quality while also creating innovative enhancements. The cohort model, known to decrease feelings of isolation and increase feelings of trust, will be in place in all programs. Professional development schools, known to show positive effects student learning and teacher retention as well as provide excellent training for prospective teachers (Dangel et al., 2009; Darling-Hammond, 1995; U.S. Department of Education, 2009), will be an essential element to all preparation programs involved in the NET-Q partnership. In addition, the PDS relationship enables the university faculty to serve on school leadership teams. Similarly, partnership leaders will serve on NET-Q committees (see Implementation and Management Plan.) Darling-Hammond et al. (2009) report that effective induction activities are characterized by professional development that is ongoing, sustained, intensive, and focused on teaching and learning. Similarly, professional development for prospective and practicing teachers in NET-Q will be carried out through innovations such as the TIP, University Coaches in Residence, Summer Partnership Institute, and CCLCs—each providing on-going and sustained collaborations among pre- and in-service professionals.

The NET-Q partnership is committed to building local capacity for systemic change and improvement. The partnership has expanded the previous PDS² network to include 2 additional urban, 23 additional rural school districts, and 4 university partners. Findings of a previous study of the PDS² partnership indicate that the presence of CCLCs in schools was correlated with a teacher retention rate of 86%, compared with a baseline rate of 63%. Findings related to the TIP model indicate that our PDS² partnerships improved student achievement in all targeted content areas. The expansion afforded by NET-Q will spread PDS² improvements in teacher retention and student achievement. The NET-Q district partners will benefit directly as they hire well-prepared teacher candidates from GSU and its partners. In fact, over the past 5 years, 33 elementary teacher candidates from GSU who have been placed in PDSs have accepted jobs in those high-need schools. This is especially notable because the PDS sites serve “high need” populations that require highly qualified teachers.

The NET-Q partnership will provide benefits for an extensive and expanding audience, beyond the partnership. For example, training for K-12 mentor teachers will be offered through the GPB digital modules and these will be freely available to all teachers throughout the state of Georgia for years after the TQP grant. Integrating state licensing and endorsement standards provides a means for teachers to receive stipends from their districts, thus creating locally supported incentive to participate in training.

To sustain funding and support dissemination of findings NET-Q will a broadcast program to highlight the Georgia State University Professional Development School network developed by the College over the past 6 years. This 60-minute program will be developed for multiple audiences, including the general public, businesses, and foundations. We foresee that this program could be used to build capacity for future funding. The program will (a) feature

how the PDS network has had a positive impact on student achievement and teacher retention in high-needs schools; (b) identify key instructional issues (e.g., English acquisition for new immigrants, overcoming detrimental effects of poverty) effectively addressed by the PDS; (c) focus on how the network reaches out to neglected areas in the state (e.g., rural); (d) address how the PDS network aids in creating a globally competitive educational system in Georgia; and (e) detail the international reputation and presence of the PDS network.

MANAGEMENT PLAN

9 Quality of Personnel

Dr. Gwen Benson is the principal investigator for the project. She is the Director of the Alonzo A. Crim Center for Urban Educational Excellence and the Associate Dean for School and Community Partnerships in the College of Education at GSU. She has taught in urban schools and has been a public school administrator.

Dr. William L. Curlette is a co-principal investigator. He has served as director of the College of Education's Educational Research Bureau and as a professor of measurement and statistics for many years. He has conducted the evaluation of many similar projects.

Dr. Caitlin McMunn Dooley is a co-principal investigator. She is an assistant professor in the Department of Early Childhood Education at Georgia State University. She has participated as an evaluator and researcher on several large sponsored studies. Her articles appear in peer-reviewed, national teacher education and literacy journals. Currently, she teaches field-based courses in PDSs and courses involving practitioner research.

Dr. Joseph Feinberg is also a co-principal investigator. He is an assistant professor in the Department of Middle-Secondary Education and Instructional Technology at Georgia State University. Dr. Feinberg has taught in public schools, has published several peer reviewed

journal articles, and has contributed chapters in relevant books. During the past 4 years, he has served as site coordinator in a PDS high school.

Dr. Hayward Richardson is an assistant professor in the Department of Education Policy Studies, where he teaches and mentors students in Educational Leadership. He has worked in public schools as a teacher, principal, and district superintendent.

Dr. Susan Ogletree is Director of the Educational Research Bureau in the College of Education, and she has served as Interim Dean for Research. She has taught, conducted research, and served as a principal in P-12 schools.

Dr. Dick Miller is Chair of the Department of Physics and Astronomy. He has received grants from NASA and NSF and has worked collaboratively with the College on Education on various P-12 initiatives. Dr. Miller has published numerous articles and edited book chapters.

Dr. Dee Taylor will be the project director. She is currently Project Director for the PDS² grant, which is ending September 30, 2009. She has worked in two of the partner school districts, and she was a district-wide curriculum coordinator for reading and language arts. She has taught at the university level, and she has experience in urban schools as teacher, principal, and executive director of professional development.

Dr. Benson will be responsible for the overall project while Dr. Taylor will be responsible for day to day operations. Dr. Bill Curlette is Research Director and is responsible for all the evaluation of the project, along with Dr. Ogletree who is responsible for accountability and assessment. Dr. Dooley will be responsible for reform of pre-bac programs and development of digital content with GPB. Dr. Feinberg will be responsible for middle and secondary program reforms and teacher residencies. Dr. Hayward Richardson will be responsible for Leadership Residencies.

Dr. Beth Calhoon will serve as Special Education Coordinator and will be responsible for facilitating the Special Education Residencies and selection of co-teachers to teach selected courses in post-bac programs. Other faculty members serving in various capacities have worked in teacher education and/or urban schools. The faculty represents all COE departments, all levels of education and all content areas. Faculty from Arts and Sciences are also included through minigrant research opportunities and professional development activities.

10 Implementation and Management Plan

Project activities began during Spring 2009 (not part of the grant funding). The Dean of the College of Education, the PDS Design Team and P/12 superintendents or designees were invited to attend a breakfast to discuss the impact of our Professional Development Schools Grant (PDS²), which is in the last year of funding. The breakfast meeting also provided an opportunity to discuss the upcoming TQ Partnership Grant competition and review the priorities. District representatives were asked if they were interested in submitting a partnership proposal. There was unanimous interest and a follow-up meeting was scheduled to solicit district input and provide information on district needs. Additional input was received at our annual PDS Spring Retreat, which includes a half day of sessions around the PDS work in schools and an afternoon planning sessions for current and new partners. GSU participants included COE professors from all departments, A&S content faculty, and key administrators (COE department chairs, associate deans, and the Dean). School participants included directors of professional development, principals, and other school administrators and teachers.

In the fall of 2009, all NET-Q councils and working communities will be formed and members will meet to refine the grant implementation plan, including specific objectives, timelines and responsibilities. The NET-Q Leadership Consortium will be comprised of

superintendents/designees, deans, NET-Q design team, human resources directors, research directors, professional development directors, community partners, NCTAF, GPB, and 2-year and 4-year higher education institution partners. The following is a list of other councils and committees that will be formed to address various priorities of the proposal:

- PEF Advisory Council (P-12 Partners-already formed) required in COE/A&S Bylaws to provide feedback on educator preparation programs
- NET-Q Design Team responsible for day-to-day activities of the project
- Pre-Bac /Post-Bac Reform Committee responsible for project activities addressing **Absolute Priority I**
- Teacher Residency Committee responsible for project activities addressing **Absolute Priority 2**
- Leadership Residency Committee responsible for project activities addressing **Competitive Preference Priority 2**
- Induction Committee responsible for new teacher induction through Cross Career Learning Communities (**across Priorities**)
- Digital Content Design Committee responsible for project activities addressing **Invitational Priority (partnership with digital content developer)**
- Evaluation and Research Committee responsible for project activities addressing **Competitive Preference Priority 1 (Student achievement and continuous program improvement)**
- Recruitment/Scholarship Committee responsible for project activities addressing **Competitive Preference Priority 3 (rigorous selection process)**
- Triple A Team (Administrative Action Assistants)

- University Content Specialists Committee
- PDS Professional Development Service Committee

Each of the committees will be represented by a coprincipal investigator and the Project Director. The responsibility of each committee will be outlined and clearly articulated.

Each district will be provided a District Research Coordinator to support all research efforts related to the NET-Q Grant, including collection of teacher surveys, TIP model data and student achievement data. The 50/50 School/University Clinical Instructor will coordinate TIP in PDSs sites, recruit and disseminate TIP mini-grant information, teach one course/supervise interns/students teachers on site, and facilitate field placements.

The content specialists will work with schools throughout the year and serve as a broker between the schools and the university to address the needs of the school. A needs assessment will be conducted at each school to guide planning for in-service professional development and teacher recruitment. In the spring of 2010, all plans for the 2010-11 school year will be finalized. The induction plan for working with beginning teachers also will be finalized. Mentor training will begin summer 2010. Teacher residency and leader residency recruitment efforts will begin in Fall Semester 2009. School system partners will collaborate with university partners to determine mentors and placement sites. Representatives from all higher education institutions and Human Resources representatives from the school systems will meet as a committee (Recruitment and Scholarship Committee) to determine the schedule for informational sessions for both undergraduates and career changers. Information regarding sessions will be publicized on each of the partner colleges/universities' web-sites, local newspapers, campus publications, distribution of flyers throughout the school communities, local media (radio and television), churches, and other community organizations (i.e., 100 Black Men of America, Boys and Girls

Clubs, Atlanta Housing Authority, GPB, fraternities and sororities). All partners will work together to develop the components of the screening process which will include the application, interview (including pre-assessment instruments) and the selection process. The first cohorts of 20 teacher residents, 20 special education residents and 5 leader residents will be selected by the beginning of Spring Semester 2010 and will begin course work Summer Semester 2010.

Recruitment of the second cohort will begin Fall Semester 2010 and future cohorts will follow the same sequence. Career changers will complete their program of study within 4 semesters depending on individual needs. Undergraduate candidates will complete a traditional teacher education program with reforms in progress. All candidates will participate in field experiences in PDSs.

Each summer beginning in 2010, Cross Career Learning Community (CCLC) training will be provided for participating school districts with follow-up meetings with trained facilitators throughout the year. The Induction Committee will meet regularly to evaluate progress and make future plans for training and follow-up.

Priority: AP1 = Absolute Priority 1. AP2 = Absolute Priority 2. CPP=Competitive Preference Priority IP=Invitational Priority

SPRING-SUMMER 2009

Project Activity	Outcomes	Key Participants	Responsibility
Convened COE TQP Steering Committee All Priorities	Clarify new statute and differences Determine COE and partners' implications for change Coordinate partnership meetings Launch grant writing teams/champions	PDS Committee members	Dee Taylor

<p>Host Breakfast meeting with area P-12 superintendents/designees, College of Education Dean, and PDS Design Team</p> <p>ALL Priorities</p>	<p>Review Lessons Learned from PDS²</p> <p>Discuss “What We Know to Date about TQP Statue</p> <p>Gain interest and input for next steps</p> <p>Determine commitment to continue in next phase of partnership</p>	<p>P/12 School superintendents/designees</p> <p>COE Dean, PDS Design Team</p>	<p>Gwen Benson Dee Taylor</p>
<p>Conduct and host Needs Assessment and Partnership Planning Luncheon; (Partners’ Key Designees, College of Education, COE Research leaders)</p> <p>All Priorities</p>	<p>Review TQE statute and district needs</p>	<p>P/12 partners, university faculty/administrators</p>	<p>Gwen Benson Dee Taylor</p>
<p>Conduct Annual Spring PDS Retreat</p> <p>All Priorities</p>	<p>Share knowledge regarding PDS2 outcomes</p> <p>Discussion and review needs assessment and plans for TQP-NETQ</p>	<p>P/12 partners, university faculty/administrators, higher ed partners</p>	<p>Dee Taylor</p>

FALL 2009

Project Activity	Outcomes	Key Participants	Responsibility
<p>Select members for all NET-Q councils and working committees: NET-Q Leadership Consortium, Advisory Council(s), design teams, research-evaluation team, university liaison committee, Triple A Team (administrative action assistants), etc.</p> <p>All Priorities</p>	<p>Each partner will have at least one member on the Leadership Consortium</p> <p>All other committees and teams will include appropriate representation</p>	<p>P/12 partners, higher ed faculty, NCTAF, GPB, community partners</p>	<p>Gwen Benson Dee Taylor</p>

Project Activity	Outcomes	Key Participants	Responsibility
<p>Schedule and host meeting with NET-Q councils and working committees: Leadership Council, Advisory Councils (including representation from all members of the partnership), design teams, research-evaluation team, university liaison committee, Triple A Team (administrative action assistants), etc.</p> <p>All Priorities</p>	Refinement of grant implementation plan	P/12 partners, higher ed faculty, NCTAF, GPB, community partners	Gwen Benson Dee Taylor
<p>Recruit teacher and leader residents</p> <p>AP2, CPP2, CPP3</p>	Residency announcement developed and disseminated for recruitment of applicants	P/12 partners, higher ed faculty, recruitment & scholarship committee	Dee Taylor Joe Feinberg Hayward Richardson Beth Calhoon
<p>Select target schools and control schools from participating high needs districts</p> <p>AP1, AP 2, CPP2</p>	School applications submitted to the partnership and agreed upon by the partnership	P/12 partners, Design team, research committee	Bill Curlette Dee Taylor
<p>Meet with research directors and human resources directors regarding project implementation</p> <p>All Priorities</p>	Input from school districts on project implementation and evaluation design gathered	P/12 research directors, human resources directors, project evaluation team	Bill Curlette Gwen Benson Susan Ogletree Dee Taylor
<p>Host NET-Q Drive-In Conference to update district/school needs and research interests</p> <p>All Priorities</p>	Accurate and updated needs assessment generated, including research interests	P/12 partners, higher ed faculty	Gwen Benson Dee Taylor All Co-PIs

Project Activity	Outcomes	Key Participants	Responsibility
Establish on-line Professional Development Network AP2, CPP1	A method developed to enable an appropriate match between professional development needs and coaches in residence	P/12 partners, higher ed faculty	Dee Taylor Caitlin Dooley
Begin Pre-Bac Reform activities/Post-Bac Reform activities AP1, AP2	Year I reform activities reviewed for implementation	P/12 partners, higher ed faculty/-administration	Caitlin Dooley Joe Feinberg Dee Taylor
Identify new teachers for induction activities CPP1	List of new teachers in partner districts compiled for initial contact	P/12 partners, higher ed administrator	Induction Committee Dee Taylor
Meet with University coaches in residence AP1, AP2	Needs of districts shared with Content Specialists	P/12 content supervisors, higher ed content specialists	Dee Taylor Joe Feinberg Caitlin Dooley Beth Calhoon
Recruit Co-instructors, site coordinators and 50/50 university/district faculty, and TIP Coordinators AP1, AP2, CPP1	Personnel recruited for Fall, 2010 positions	P/12 partners, higher education faculty/-administrators	Dee Taylor Joe Feinberg Caitlin Dooley Beth Calhoon
Host New Educators Induction Conference CPP1	New Teacher from partner districts and others will attend conference at GSU	P/12 partners, higher education faculty/-administrators	Gwen Benson Dee Taylor
Develop and disseminate mini grant applications AP1, AP2, CPP1	School District and university partners will submit applications for mini grants	P/12 partners, higher ed faculty	Dick Miller
Contact Hard Labor Creek Observatory (HLCO) to schedule summer professional development CPP1	Complete plans for Year 1 activities with HLCO	P/12 partners, higher ed faculty	Dick Miller

SPRING 2010 (JANUARY – MAY)

Project Activity Key Participants	Outcomes	Key Participants	Responsibility
Recruit additional faculty to work with Fall Residencies AP2	Faculty hired for fall residencies	Higher education administrators and faculty	Gwen Benson Joe Feinberg Hayward Richardson Beth Calhoon
Place undergraduate interns in selected schools AP1, CPP3	Fall placements completed	P/12 partners, higher education faculty/administrators	Caitlin Dooley
Complete interview and selection of residents AP2	Residents selected for all teacher residencies and all leader residencies	P/12 partners, higher education faculty	Joe Feinberg Hayward Richardson Beth Calhoon
Complete selection of mentors teachers/leaders and school placements for residencies AP2	List of school sites and mentor teachers for fall placements completed	P/12 partners, higher education faculty/administrators	Joe Feinberg Hayward Richardson Beth Calhoon
Continue Pre-Bac Reform activities AP1	Implementation of Pre-bac reforms in progress	PEF advisory committee, higher ed faculty/administrators	Caitlin Dooley
Begin development of Endorsements and other digital content with GPB IP, CPP4	Endorsement development in progress	Digital content design committee, GPB	Caitlin Dooley
Collect baseline data on student learning CPP1	Baseline data collected for evaluation model	P/12 research directors, higher ed research committee	Bill Curlette
Select minigrant awardees AP1, AP2, CPP1	Mini grant awardees notified	P/12 partners, higher ed faculty	Dick Miller
Plan summer CCLC Facilitate Training AP1, AP2, CPP1	Sites, dates, and locations selected for Summer trainings	Induction committee, P/12 partners/-administrators	Susan Taylor Connie Parrish

SUMMER 2010

Project Activity	Outcomes	Key Participants	Responsibility
Host Retreat with all partners to update and refine project implementation framework All Priorities	Partners will be aware of all past activities and upcoming implementation activities for Year 2 of the project	ALL	Gwen Benson Dee Taylor
Facilitate mentor training AP1, P2, CPP1	Mentors will receive training and meet residents prior to arrival of Fall placement in schools	P/12 partners, higher ed faculty	Dee Taylor Caitlin Dooley Joe Feinberg Beth Calhoon
Facilitate CCLC Training AP1, AP2, CPP1	CCLC training will begin for Metro Districts and rural districts	P/12 partners, higher ed faculty	Susan Taylor Connie Parrish
Begin professional development activities to meet identified school needs CPP1	Summer professional development activities will be offered for local school partners	P/12 partners, higher ed faculty	Dee Taylor Content Specialists 50/50 site coordinators
Facilitate HLCO study trips CPP1	Summer study trips offered as professional development	P/12 partners, higher ed faculty and students	Dick Miller

AUGUST 2010-MAY 2011, AUGUST 2011-MAY 2012, AUGUST 2012-MAY 2013

Project Activity	Outcomes	Key Participants	Responsibility
Placement of GSU interns at selected school sites AP1	PDS Model implemented	P/12 Partners, higher ed faculty	Caitlin Dooley Joe Feinberg Beth Calhoon
Recruitment and placement of Teacher and Leader Resident at selected sites AP2, CPP2	Residency Model implemented	P/12 partners, higher ed faculty, Recruitment and scholarship committee	Joe Feinberg Hayward Richardson

Project Activity	Outcomes	Key Participants	Responsibility
Work with NCTAF to begin Teacher Residency learning communities AP2	Georgia Teacher Residents are connected with other residents around the country through T-LINC	P/12 partners, higher ed faculty, teacher residents, host teachers & Induction Committee	Dee Taylor Joe Feinberg Beth Calhoon Hayward Richardson
Select Pathways Scholars for summer Assistantship positions CPP1	Pathways Scholars are notified of selection and prepare for summer session.	P/12 partners, higher ed faculty	Gwen Benson Dee Taylor
Coordinate Training for Mentor teachers AP1, AP2, CPP1	Mentors are prepared for fall placements	P/12 partners, higher ed faculty	Caitlin Dooley Joe Feinberg Beth Calhoon
Implementation of CCLC Induction model is continued AP1, AP2, CPP1	CCLC Training scaled up for all districts urban and rural	P/12 partners, higher ed faculty/administrators & Induction Committee	Susan Taylor Connie Parrish
Implementation of ongoing professional development for higher ed faculty and P-12 faculty CPP1	Higher education faculty receive professional development to update their knowledge and skills	Higher education faculty/administrators	Gwen Benson Dee Taylor Caitlin Dooley Joe Feinberg
Continue implementation of Pre-bac and Post-bac reform efforts AP1	Reform efforts completed in Year 2	Higher ed faculty/administrators, PEF Advisory Committee	Caitlin Dooley Joe Feinberg
Continue development, refinement, and course offerings with digital content provider GPB IP, CPP4	Endorsement completed and offered to interested districts in Year 3, 4 and 5	P/12 partners, higher ed faculty, Digital content committee, GPB	Caitlin Dooley

Project Activity	Outcomes	Key Participants	Responsibility
Collect data on student learning, participant satisfaction, needed changes, teacher retention CPP1	Data provided for evaluation of student learning and teacher retention	P/12 research directors, evaluation and research committee	Bill Curlette
Design Team Weekly Meetings All Priorities	Design Team will remain updated on all project activities and make changes as necessary	Member of the Design Team	Gwen Benson Dee Taylor
Advisory Council quarterly meetings All Priorities	Advisory Council will remain updated on all project activities and provide feedback as necessary	Advisory Council members	Gwen Benson Dee Taylor
Develop and disseminate fellowship applications AP1, AP2, CPP1	Fellowship applications will be submitted and awardees selected	P/12 partners, higher ed faculty	Dick Miller

SUMMER 2011, SUMMER 2012, SUMMER 2013

Provide professional development for higher ed faculty and P-12 faculty CPP1	Higher education faculty receive professional development to update their knowledge and skills	Higher education faculty and administrators	Gwen Benson Dee Taylor Caitlin Dooley Joe Feinberg
Facilitate Mentor Training AP1, AP2, CPP1	Mentors will receive training and meet residents prior to arrival of Fall placement in schools	P/12 partners, higher ed faculty	Dee Taylor Caitlin Dooley Joe Feinberg Beth Calhoun
Perform Data Analysis CPP1	Data analysis will provide indicators of project effectiveness and/or modifications	Evaluation and research committee	Bill Curlette Susan Ogletree
Offer Summer Partnership Institutes CPP1	All partners will have opportunity to learn from each other regarding project priorities	P/12 partners, administrators, higher ed faculty	Dee Taylor Caitlin Dooley Joe Feinberg Beth Calhoun

Project Activity	Outcomes	Key Participants	Responsibility
Implement CCLC facilitator training and support AP1, AP2, CPP1	CCLC Training and refresher trainings will be offered for participating school districts	P/12 partners, higher ed faculty, CCLC trained facilitators	Susan Taylor Connie Parrish
Provide Pathway Scholar advanced degree opportunities CPP1	Pathway scholars will receive summer assistantships in advanced degree programs	P/12 partners, higher ed faculty, recruitment scholarship committee	Dee Taylor