

NEW MEXICO HIGHLANDS UNIVERSITY

NATIONAL PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND
ESL ENDORSEMENT PROGRAM

AWARD #T195N070370

YEAR TWO

PERFORMANCE REPORT

SUBMITTED TO:

THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
400 MARYLAND AVENUE, SW
MARY SWITZER BUILDING
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20202-6510

PROJECT OFFICER: RODRICK S. VANPELT

EXTERNAL EVALUATOR:

LORENZO ARAGON, PH.D.
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION, 249 UCB
UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO
BOULDER, CO 80309

ABOUT THE CESDP

The Center for the Education and Study of Diverse Populations (CESDP) at New Mexico Highlands University (NMHU) is located in four offices across Northern New Mexico. CESDP staff has nationally recognized expertise in support of the education of diverse populations. Specialty areas include SIOP training, bilingual, Indian (Native American), rural, and migrant education. Additionally, the center provides technical assistance, professional development, parent involvement, and evaluation services in the areas of school reform and literacy/reading.

Reporting Consultants

The External Evaluator, Dr. Lorenzo Aragon, Research Professor, University of Colorado at Boulder authored this report in collaboration with the CESDP.

CESDP Contact and Mailing Address Information:

Española, NM

Dr. Rodolfo Chavez,
Title III Project Director
New Mexico Highlands University
(NMHU)
705 La Joya Street, Suite C
Española, NM 87532
505-426-2273
505-747-7250 fax
1-866-587-2558 toll free

Las Vegas, NM

Dr. Paul E. Martinez CESDP
Principal Investigator, Title III Project
NMHU
Box 9000
Las Vegas, NM 87701

U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report Cover Sheet (ED 524B) OMB No. 1890-0004
Check only one box per Program Office instruction. Exp. 10-31-2007
[☒] Annual Performance Report [☐] Final Performance Report

General Information

1. PR/ Number #: T195N070370 2. NCES ID#: _____
(Block 5 of the Grant Award Notification - 11 Characters.) (See Instructions - Up to 12 Characters.)
- 3 Project Title: National Professional Development and ESL Endorsement Program
(Enter the same title as on the approved application.)
4. Grantee Name (Block 1 of the Grant Award Notification): New Mexico Highlands University
5. Grantee Address (See Instructions.)
6. Project Director Name: Dr. Rodolfo Chávez Title: Project Director
Ph #: 505-426-2273 Fax #: 505-747- 7250
Email Address: rchavez@cesdp.nmhu.edu

Reporting Period Information (See Instructions.)

7. Reporting Period: From: 07/01/08 To: 05/30/09 (mm/dd/yyyy)

Budget Expenditures (To be completed by your Business Office. See instructions. Also see Section B.)

8. Budget Expenditures:

	Federal Grant Funds	Non-Federal Funds (Match/Cost Share)
a. Previous Budget Period		
b. Current Budget Period		
c. Entire Project Period (For Final Performance Reports only)		

Indirect Cost Information (To be completed by your Business Office. See instructions.)

9. Indirect Costs
- a. Are you claiming indirect costs under this grant? ☒ Yes ☐ No
- b. If yes, do you have an Indirect Cost Rate Agreement approved by the Federal Government? ☒ Yes ☐ No
- c. If yes, provide the following information:
Period Covered by the Indirect Cost Rate Agreement: From: ___/___/___ To: ___/___/___ (mm/dd/yyyy)
Approving Federal agency: ☒ ED ☐ Other (Please specify): _____
Type of Rate (For Final Performance Reports Only): ☐ Provisional ☐ Final ☐ Other (Please specify) _____
- d. For Restricted Rate Programs (check one) -- Are you using a restricted indirect cost rate that:
☒ Is included in your approved Indirect Cost Rate Agreement?
☒ Complies with 34 CFR 76.564(c)(2)

Human Subjects (See Instructions.)

10. Annual Certification of Institutional Review Board (IRB) Approval? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A

Performance Measures Status and Certification (See Instructions.)

11. Performance Measures Status
- a. Are complete data on performance measures for the current budget period included in the Project Status Chart? ☒ Yes ☐ No
- b. If no, when will the data be available and submitted to the Department? ___/___/___ (mm/dd/yyyy)

12. To the best of my knowledge and belief, all data in this performance report are true and correct and the report fully discloses all known weaknesses concerning the accuracy, reliability, and completeness of the data.

Dr. Need for you to put appropriate name and title here

Name of Authorizing Representative

Title

Signature: _____ Date: ___/___/___

U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Executive Summary

OMB No. 1890-0004
Exp. 10-31-2007

T195N070370

The **Master of Arts Degree and ESL Endorsement Program** will complete its second year of funding on June 30, 2009. The project is being implemented by The Center for the Education and Study of Diverse Populations (CESDP) at New Mexico Highlands University (NMHU), in partnership with eight high needs school districts in northern New Mexico.

This project is meeting the original Invitational Priorities established by the Office of English Language Acquisition (OELA) in the following ways. First, the project is providing a Master of Arts degree program, specifically targeting services for teachers in isolated and rural school districts in northern New Mexico (Priority 1). Second, project staff and New Mexico Highlands University faculty are in the process of developing mechanisms for acquiring post-training data on the effectiveness of program graduates in order to determine the impact of the project on the academic achievement and English language development of Limited English Proficient (LEP) students (Invitational Priority 2). Third, the Project Director, along with New Mexico Highlands University faculty has, for the past two years embedded State content standards and State English proficiency standards into each of the courses in the Master's degree program at NMHU (Invitational Priority 3).

The program is unique for three reasons. First, the program is offered in Española, New Mexico, thus alleviating the 180-mile round trip drive to the NMHU main campus in Las Vegas, New Mexico. A second unique feature of the program is that practicum has been embedded into courses. This assures that theory learned in university courses is being practiced in classrooms with second language learners. Furthermore, by embedding practicum in classes, faculty is provided first hand opportunities to observe the degree to which teachers provide services to their LEP students. Finally, the summer institutes have provided program participants opportunities to share teaching strategies that are working in their specific classrooms while learning best practices from experts in the field.

In year one, thirty (30) Cohort 1 teachers were selected for the program. Program records shows that, of the 30 teachers selected in year one, all 30 teachers continued in the program in year two. These 30 teachers are on track and will earn their Master of Arts degree spring semester of 2010. Because the selection process worked so well when selecting Cohort 1 students, project staff will utilize the same process when selecting an additional 30 Cohort 2 teachers spring semester of 2010. Once selected, Cohort 2 years will complete their program of study summer semester of 2012. As a result of this project, 30 teachers from northern New Mexico will have earned a Master of Arts degree with emphasis in bilingual/ESL education. More importantly, each graduate from this program positively impact over 300 English Language Learners over the next ten years.

Design Used to Evaluating This Program

The evaluation design proposed in the original application and used in year two is the Context, Input, Process and Product (CIPP) evaluation model. The model's core concepts of evaluation are denoted by its acronym, CIPP; evaluation of a program based on Context, Input, Processes, and Products. In this model, **Context** evaluation assesses the needs, problems and positive aspects of a program to help program staff determine whether program goals and objectives are being met and to provide information to partner agencies (IHE and partner LEAs) about the effectiveness of the project. In this project, **Input** evaluation was used to assess whether alternative approaches should be used in the evaluation process and the cost-effectiveness of the project in meeting the needs of the targeted group affected by the program. **Process** evaluation was used to assess the implementation of project activities and to judge whether the activities are leading to successful completion of the intended outcomes. Finally, **Product** evaluation will be used to identify and assess overall outcomes, both intended and unintended, to help project staff and partners assess the project's ability in meeting the training needs of teachers, thus positively affecting LEP students' ability to speak, read and write in English and to do well on standardized tests in all areas of the curriculum.

In year two, the evaluator visited the project site, surveyed selected program participants about their satisfaction/dissatisfaction with the program, met with NMHU professors to assess their commitment to the program and met with Project Staff (Director and P.I.) to provide them feedback on the degree to which the program is meeting the goals and objectives, as stated in the original application (see page 12 of the original application). As a result of these meetings and on-site visits to the project site, the evaluator gathered the information necessary to assess the degree to which the program is meeting its stated objectives. Questions addressed during the evaluator's visits to the project site in year two included:

- 1) Were the needs, as specified in the original application, being addressed in this project?
- 2) Was the budget being spent, as stated in the original application?
- 3) Was the service design executed competently and/or modified as needed during year two?
- 4) Did the project staff provide teachers on site professional development opportunities?

This goal of this report is to provide information to the Office of English Language Acquisition (OELA) so they may determine whether project staff is utilizing federal funds, as requested and to determine whether project staff is providing quality services to teachers in the partner school districts. Furthermore, this report provides information about: 1) teachers' understanding of research-based ESL teaching strategies; 2) teachers' success in coursework; 3) their satisfaction with program management; 4) their ability to utilize learned skills from university courses with LEP students in real classroom settings; and, 5) to assess whether program staff is meeting the goals and objectives of the project. This report assures the Office of English Language Acquisition that project staff, in collaboration with New Mexico Highlands University faculty, is achieving its goal and objectives, as stated in the original application.

Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart

PR/Award # (11 characters): T195N070370

SECTION Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

1. Project Objective ☐ Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

Performance Measure 1.5	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The percentage of in-service teacher completers who complete certification, licensure, or endorsement requirements in LEP instruction as a result of the program.	GPRA	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			*N/A				

*N/A = Not Applicable **at this time**

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

This project is presently in its second year of funding. Cohort 1 students were selected in the fall of 2007 (year one) and began coursework spring semester of 2008. At the writing of this report, students have completed seven of the twelve courses required for the Master of Arts degree in Curriculum and Instruction with emphasis in bilingual/ESL education. In the fall semester of year one, the Project Director Dr. Chavez, revised course syllabi; ensuring that K-12 standards and assessments, including English language proficiency standards, were embedded into all courses in the M.A./endorsement program. Prior to the delivery of each of the courses, Dr. Chavez met with the course instructors to provide discuss how K-12 and English language proficiency standards were embedded into each of the courses within each of the program. Furthermore, discussions were held concerning the practicum requirements embedded into each of the courses.

GPRA Measure 1.5 asks projects to report on the percentage of in-service teacher completers who completed certification, licensure, or endorsement requirements in LEP instruction as a result of the program. It is not possible to report on this measure at this point, as the 30 students in this project will not graduate until spring semester of 2010. This data will be reported in year three, as 30 students are on track to graduate at the end of the spring semester of 2010. That same semester, the Director will begin the process of selecting an additional 30 Cohort 2 students, who will begin their program of study in the summer semester of year three. Cohort 2 students will then complete their program of study summer semester of 2012.

**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart**

PR/Award # (11 characters): T195N070370

SECTION Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

1. Project Objective ☐ Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

Performance Measure 1.6	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
The percentage of in-service teacher completers who are providing instructional services to LEP Students	GPRA	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			* N/A		N/A		

*This GPRA measure can not be reported on in year two, as there are no program completers at this time.

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

GPRA Performance Measure 1.6 asks for data on the percentage of in-service completers who are providing instructional services to LEP students in the target school districts. The teachers selected to participate in this project are practicing teachers, however, these individuals have not completed their Master's degree and therefore, can not be considered program completers. These 30 teachers entered the program in the spring semester of the first project year and, to date, have completed a total of seven courses in the program. Records indicate that all thirty teachers in Cohort 1 are on track to graduate by the end of the spring semester of 2010 and will then be considered program completers. Therefore, GPRA Performance Measure 1.6 will be provided in the year three, Annual Performance Report.

**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart**

PR/Award # (11 characters): T195N070370

SECTION A - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

1. Project Objective ☐ Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

Objective 1: From August 1, 2007 through December 31, 2007, develop an on-site M.A. and bilingual/ESL endorsement program, ensuring that K-12 standards and assessments, including English language proficiency and content standards are embedded into all program courses.

1.a. Performance Measure – Year 1	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Review of program course syllabi to determine whether K-12 standards and assessments, including English language proficiency standards were embedded into program courses.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			*8/8	100		8/8	100

*Represents the number of courses in which ELD Standards were embedded

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

This Master of Arts degree and bilingual/ESL endorsement program involves 12 hours of coursework in Curriculum and Instruction and 24 hours of TESOL courses. In combination, the 36 hours of course work will earn program participants the M.A. degree in Curriculum and Instruction and the New Mexico endorsement in bilingual/ESL education. Objective 1 states that project staff will ensure that K-12 and English language standards are embedded into courses. This objective was accomplished in year one. In year one, Dr. Chávez, in collaboration with the P.I., Dr. Paul Martinez, reviewed the New Mexico Content Standards, Benchmarks, and Performance Standards in English Language Development (ELD) and cross-referenced the standards with courses in the endorsement program to determine where ELD standards should be embedded. Once the courses were cross-referenced with ELD Standards, Drs. Chávez and Martinez presented their work to other NMHU professors for approval. Additions to courses were accepted by professors in Curriculum and Instruction and Bilingual/ESL education. As a result of project staffs' work, professors who teach courses in this program are now required to reference and teach to the ELD standards, as written into course syllabi.

The overall goal of the project is that two Cohorts of 30 teachers earn a Master of Arts degree and an bilingual/ESL endorsement. At the writing of this second year report, 30 teachers have completed four semesters of graduate studies and are on track to graduate at the end of the spring semester of 2010. An additional thirty teachers will be recruited spring of 2010 and will begin their program of study in the summer of the third project year.

Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart

PR/Award # (11 characters): T195N070370

SECTION A - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

1. Project Objective ☐ Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

Objective 2: From October 1, 2007 through December 15, 2007, recruit 30 Cohort 1 teachers and from January 1, 2010 through May 30, 2010, recruit 30 Cohort 2 teachers.

1.a. Performance Measure – Year 1	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Review of documents showing the process used in selecting Cohort 1 students for the program. In addition, students were surveyed to determine satisfaction with the program. Finally, registrations for fall semester of Cohort 1 students were reviewed.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		30	30/30	100%	30	30/30	100%

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

Records show that 30 teachers from the partner districts were selected to participate in this program. To the credit of this program and its staff, records show that all thirty Cohort 1 teachers continue in the program. To date, these thirty practicing teachers have completed a total of seven courses and are on track to graduate at the end of the spring semester of the third project year. As stated in the original application (see page 12), Cohort 1 teachers will complete two courses spring semester of 2009, two courses fall semester of 2009 and one course in the summer of 2010. At the end of this semester, Cohort 1 participants will complete the required comprehensive examination and will then earn the Master of Arts degree.

The selection of Cohort 2 teachers will begin in January of year three. It is projected that, by the end of the spring semester of year three, project staff, in collaboration with district personnel, will have selected an additional 30 teachers to participate in Cohort 2. In order to select the most interested and qualified teachers for this program, Dr. Chavez will explain program requirements to teachers from each of the eight partner districts. Teachers accepted to the program must agree to: (1) teach in classrooms with high LEP counts; (2) to serve as mentors to other teachers in their building and in their respective district; and, (3) to agree to participate in the summer training. Teachers will be asked to complete an application. In this application, teachers will be asked to provide the following information: 1) general information about themselves; 2) reason(s) why they wanted to participate in the program; and, (3) to describe their commitment to working in a classroom with LEP students. In addition to the essay, teachers will be asked to submit two letters of recommendation from school staff who possessed knowledge of their work with students, especially second language learners. A Selection Committee, consisting of the project P.I. and Project Director, New Mexico Highlands University professors, New Mexico State Department of Education personnel, and LEA administrators will meet to select program participants.

Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart

PR/Award # (11 characters): T195N070370

SECTION A - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

1. Project Objective ☐ Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

Objective 3: From January 1, 2007 through August 30, 2012, offer courses that accommodate program participants' work schedules

1.a. Performance Measure – Year 1	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Review of documents showing students' registration and the location of courses each semester.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

To the credit of the Dean of the School of Education, Dr. Martinez was assigned in year one to work alongside the Director, Dr. Chávez as an Advisor to students in this program. This commitment by the School of Education was extended into year two. Throughout years one and two, Dr. Martinez was involved in planning students' schedules and in setting up on site courses so that project participants would not have to travel long distances to attend classes. Dr. Martinez has agreed to be actively involved in the recruitment of Cohort 2 students and will attend recruitment meetings in January of year three.

A review of year two files indicated that all 30 students were registered for courses during the fall and spring semesters of year two. During the on-site visits in year two, the evaluator met with Dr. Martinez to discuss his future work with the project. According to Dr. Martinez (and as demonstrated in student records), all Cohort 1 students are on track to graduate by the end of the spring semester of year three. Furthermore, Dr. Martinez demonstrated his commitment to this project by stating that he will be involved in the recruitment and selection of Cohort 2 teachers for this Title 3 program.

Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart

PR/Award # (11 characters): T195N070370

SECTION A - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

1. Project Objective ☐ Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

Objective 4: Within one year of graduation, place teacher graduates in instructional settings that serve language numbers of LEP students (GPRA Requirement).

1.a. Performance Measure – Year 1	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Unable to assess this objective, as students are in their second year of study.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			N/A				

*This objective can not be reported, as Cohort 1 teachers have not graduated from the program.

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

This objective cannot be measured at this time, as program participants are only in their second year of study. Data for this objective will be provided in the years three and five. While specific data can not be provided to determine whether this objectives has or has not been met, the evaluator had an opportunity to survey project participants and to ask them whether there program of study was providing them the information they needed to provide quality services to LEP students. Without exception, all 30 teachers reported that, as a result of this program, they felt better prepared to teach English language lessons to students and to provide students meaningful content lessons through the sheltering of lessons.

Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart

PR/Award # (11 characters): T195N070370

SECTION A - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

1. Project Objective ☐ Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

Objective 5: In June of the second project year, design a study to collect post-training data on the effectiveness of program graduates and completers.

1.a. Performance Measure – Year 1	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
This objective is being measured via a survey that is presently being conducted of Cohort 1 students.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			N/A				

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

While this objective can not be measured in year two, plans call for the P.I. and Project Director, in collaboration with the external evaluator, NMHU faculty and the Department of Public Education staff, to begin the process of designing a system for gathering data in June of 2009. This research design, via a survey, will gather qualitative data to determine the degree to which professional development opportunities are positively impacting the academic and English language growth of LEP students. Questions asked of Cohort one teachers will be revised, as needed, and will be used when collecting data from Cohort 2 teachers. It is projected that the P.I. and the Project Director will use information gained from focus group interviews and surveys to write research-based articles which will be submitted for publication. Furthermore, findings from the study will be shared with New Mexico's Public Education Department, who in turn, will share results with other IHEs in the region.

Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart

PR/Award # (11 characters): T195N070370

SECTION A - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

1. Project Objective ☐ Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

Objective 6: Each summer of each project year, hold a two-day summer Institute and offer training to all staff from each of the partner LEAs.;

1.a. Performance Measure – Year 1	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Registrations of individuals who attend the each summer institute and evaluation forms of each of the sessions.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			50/50	100	*TBD		

*This objective cannot be measured at this time, as it will occur in June of the first project year.

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

This objective was met in June of the first project year. At the writing of this Annual Performance Report, the Project Director, in collaboration with the Principal Investigator, revised the training needs survey form to assess the professional development needs of teachers in each of the partner school districts. The surveys were sent to the ELA Directors from each school district on April 22, 2009 so that each of the school administrators may survey their staff to determine their particular training needs. Surveys are due back to the Director by May 15, 2009. The returned surveys will be used as the basis for the summer's training agenda.

In the original application, it was hoped that program participants would assume the role of trainers for the Summer Institutes. In year one, participants were polled to assess their interest in becoming trainers. This process was again conducted in year two. Interestingly, Cohort 1 teachers unanimously stated that they did not feel they were ready to assume the role of trainer at the summer institute. Therefore, consultants will be hired to provide this professional development for the Summer Institute in the summer of year two. Interestingly, the focus group interview with Cohort 1 teachers revealed that in all cases, Cohort 1 participants described ways in which they were serving as trainers in their particular district. When asked why they did not feel comfortable serving as trainers at the summer institutes, teachers reported that they felt more comfortable working with other teachers they knew and preferred working with small groups of teachers versus large groups of individuals.

**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)**

PR/Award # (11 characters): T195N070370

GPRA INDICATOR

The Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) indicator for programs funded under National Professional Development (NPD) programs is as follows: ***A least 6,000 teachers will complete high quality professional development programs each year.*** The National Professional Development GPRA Performance Measures include six measures. Performance Measures 1.1 through 1.4 do not relate to this particular project and therefore, are not addressed in this Annual Performance Report. The following two Performance Measures are addressed in this proposal.

Measure 1.5 The percentage of in-service teacher completers who complete certification, licensure, or endorsement requirements in LEP instruction as a result of the program.

Measure 1.6 The percentage of in-service teacher completers who are providing instructional services to LEP students.

GPRA Measure 1.5 requests information on the number of in-service **completers** who have completed the requirements for the ESL endorsement. This project can not report on this measure at this time, as Cohort 1 teachers will not complete their program of study until the end of the spring semester of 2010. GPRA Measure 1.6 requests information on the number of in-service teacher **completers** who are providing instructional services to LEP students. While the teachers in this program have not completed their program of study, All 30 participants in this project are presently providing services to LEP students. It is projected that these 30 participants will become the “teacher leaders” in their buildings and district.

Survey Results – Year 2

In April of year two, the evaluator conducted a focus group interview with participants to determine their satisfaction with the program and to determine whether they felt courses provided them strategies needed so that they may provide quality educational experiences to LEP students. Prior to the focus group interview, Cohort 1 students were asked to answer the following questions. The table below provides survey results.

Directions: On a scale of 1 – 5 (1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree), please place a check in the box that best describes how you feel about each question.

	1	2	3	4	5
1. The courses I've taken in the M.A. program are providing me information about how I should embed K-12 standards and assessments and English language proficiency standards in the classes I teach in my district?	0	0	2	8	20
2. The courses offered through the program are offered at times that coincide with my work schedule?	0	0	7	4	19
3. As a result of courses within the program, I am becoming better prepared to meet the needs of my English language learners?	0	0	0	5	25
4. How valuable was the summer "Sheltered Instruction, SIOP Institute"?	0	0	2	15	13
5. How would you rate the professor's you've had so far in your program?	0	0	3	13	14
6. How would you rate the Project Director's management of the project?	0	0	3	9	18
7. I am able to use what I am learning in courses with my children in my classroom?	0	0	0	8	22

Thirty program participants responded to the survey. Results clearly indicated that this project is providing teachers opportunities to learn about content and language standards and how to embed content and language standards into their lesson plans. Furthermore, teachers stated that, as a result of this program, they feel better prepared to meet the academic and linguistic needs of the LEP students. All teachers reported that, as a result of courses, they were better prepared to plan language lessons for their second language learners. Teachers believed that professors were well-qualified to teach classes and were happy with the instruction they were provided. As one teacher stated, "The professors really know how to teach because they can relate to what we are doing with our students in our classroom." Moreover, project participants are very happy with the way this project is being managed. As stated by one student, "There are no surprises in this program. Dr. Chavez and Dr. Martinez have provided us all the information we needed to sign up for classes." Another student stated that Drs. Chavez and Martinez are in constant contact with students. This individual went on to say that Dr. Chavez responds to emails quickly.

According to survey results, teachers stated that the summer institute was a highlight of their program. According to one teacher, "The SIOP Institute made me realize how easy it is to provide quality content instruction to my students. This type of instruction is good for all kids."

In addition to answering the questions on the survey, staff was asked to respond to the following questions. Following are those results. Results are reported as verbatim responses.

1. What are the strengths of the *Masters + ESL Endorsement Program*?

- The quality of professors teaching the classes. They have been really knowledgeable and helpful. The availability of many different courses and times offered per semester is also really helpful and having the CESDP office in my town.
- The program has expanded my knowledge and thinking in education. It has strengthened my ideas as a teacher in the classroom so that I can provide the best for students and as a leader in my school so that I can provide support for other teachers/staff.
- The professors are very dedicated and knowledgeable. They hold us to high standards and accept no less. Collaboration on educational topics is always encouraged. It is through these classes that we are being taught to critically evaluate educational issues, instructional techniques, and leadership roles. Professors encourage us to contact them any time in regards to questions we may have about classes/assignments.
- Dr. Chavez, Dr. Steve Martinez, along with their assistants, have been available to answer any questions/concerns we may have (whether by phone or email). If they don't have the answer they'll get it.
- We have been provided with additional support through workshops on Writing, Technology, and summer training (SIOP model). Plus, the program is tailored for teachers who can attend only in the evenings.
- The strengths are the scheduling and knowledgeable instructors. The Director is extremely helpful.
- The course I have taken thus far relate to what I need to accomplish standards-wise and in the instruction of literacy and content in my classroom. I think that before I stepped into a classroom, these courses would have been appropriate and useful. Now, I consider them necessary to what I am trying to accomplish on a daily basis with my students. I am now in a position to share and lead in the discussion of the content of these courses at my school site.
- The program and its Directors sincerely care about the education of our children. That shows in the thoughtfulness with which they treat the cohort and us as individuals. Unlike previous educational experiences, I am actually learning and enjoying it! The assistance the program provides as far as advising.
- I have learned a lot from the instructors. The Director is very easy to work with. The classes and training have been very appropriate.
- The Masters + program is very flexible and meets the needs of students.
- The location is ideal, the times are convenient and it's free!
- The strengths of the program are that quality of professors teaching the classes. They have been really knowledgeable and helpful. The availability of many different courses and times offered per semester is also really helpful and having the CESDP office in my town.
- Close to home, classes are after work and on weekends, CESDP staff always available, and good class environment.
- The strengths of the Master+ program is the instructors, Dr. Chavez, Dr. Martinez and all his staff are supportive and helpful. They help in a way possible in obtaining your Masters less stressful. The courses are very helpful in applying concepts and strategies in our classroom and to use in future endeavors, if we choose to become an administrator.
- Close to home, classes are after work and on weekends, CESDP staff always available, and good class environment.
- Well educated and knowledgeable instructors and who share similar experience.
- The strength of the program lies in the relationships that are fostered among colleagues and professors to extend learning in and out of the classroom.
- It opened my eyes to the population that I serve so that I can teach them with effective strategies in the classroom and empower them as they become better students.
- It is well managed from the CESDP side of things. Dr. Chavez and Dr. Martinez always are ready and willing to answer any questions and they are very dedicated to getting us through the program. Most of the instructors are very knowledgeable, helpful, and available.
- Well educated and knowledgeable instructors and who share similar experience and prepare the students.
- Dr. Chavez is very supportive he is always emailing us and keeping us up to date about information as it becomes available. He and Steve Martinez are the strengths and backbone of this program.
- The biggest strength is the communication, advisement with the Project Director and management. We are continually being informed on changes in scheduling, workshops, course information etc. We are always wished well in our studies and any questions or concerns are addressed immediately. Dr. Chavez, in my opinion, is doing an excellent job!
- The proximity of the courses to our home. The fact that the courses are free of charge. The fact that we receive stipends at the end of each semester. The instructors have been tremendous.
- It has really opened my eyes to the strategies that are best suited in teaching English Language Learners. I thought that because I was a regular ed. teacher, as opposed to bilingual or dual language teacher, that I wasn't an ESL teacher but I have come to realize that my regular ed. students benefit greatly from the ESL strategies because their English is social English rather than academic language.
- The program is very supportive and positive.

- The strengths are the scheduling, some knowledgeable instructors, working with other teachers.
- The programs has expanded my knowledge and thinking in education. It has strengthened my ideas as a teacher in the classroom so that I can provide the best for students, and as a leader in my school so that I can provide support for other teacher/staff.
- The classes are offered at times and sites that easily fit into my work and family schedule. I am able to attain a Master's Degree and endorsement within a time frame that fits my work and family schedule.
- I have learned a lot from the instructors. The Director is very easy to work with. The classes and trainings have been very appropriate.
- Friendly staff and they are always willing to help one succeed in our classes.

2. How could the program be improved?

- I think that the program is great!
- I think that as the program goes along; the kinks have been ironed out quickly and it will only get better.
- Have more instructors to choose from.
- I trust that all the courses that we take in connection to C & I will be considered value and part of our MA course of studies.
- The only thing that might be improved is possibly providing some more opportunities for the cohort to do something together.
- When the students are nearing the end of the program, it would be helpful if there was a committee assigned to students to guide them through their final projects. This has been difficult to deal with.
- The program can be improved by everyone in the same cohort taking the same courses and more courses offer via ITV.
- Some classes are pretty big. Perhaps smaller classes.
- By providing them with a third classroom so they can schedule more classes.
- I feel that a formalized advisement should be set up at the very start of the program instead of a couple of semesters in. I would have liked to know what classes I should take and when is the timeline to take them.
- I feel the program is very successful and is evolving as obstacles arise.
- More meeting time with the whole cohort on assistance we may have for completing the MA program.

3. Briefly discuss the type of advising that is provided to you by program/university staff.

- The advising has been good. There have been several advisement meetings where Dr. Martinez and Dr. Chavez have been there to help us. They are also very good at responding their email or calls when I have had questions or concerns.
- Dr. Chavez and Steve Martinez are always available either by e-mail or telephone. They are both very helpful.
- We have an Advisory Team through Dr. Chavez, Dr. Steve Martinez, and the Professors we work with. It's great because we submit necessary forms to them and they in turn submit everything to NMHU. They offer us choices and make sure we're following our Program Study for completion.
- I have had advice from Steve Martinez, Aline Harrison, and Dr. Rudy Chavez. They have guided my class schedule choices.
- My advisers have always been at my disposal to help me with questions concerning the program. I am especially grateful to Debbie Fleming and Mary Ann Sandoval at the NMHU campus office at SFCC for their speedy attention to my needs.
- I have been provided advising concerning my class schedule, required course, etc. Also, the instructors and program directors are available for any questions about scheduling, and also provide quite a bit of moral support. We have also been provided writing and technology workshops.
- The advisement that I receive from Dr. Chavez and Dr. Steve Martinez has been great. They have told us how our course of study is going and what classes we needed to take. They have both been real helpful.
- We have had meetings. All the professors have stated that we can email them and set up a meeting.
- Dr. Menzor is advising for the reading classes, Dr. Chavez & Dr. Martinez have reviewed our transcripts and advised us as what course to follow.
- The type of advising this program has provided is that Dr. Chavez, Dr. Martinez and Dr. Harris have met with each one of us individually to talk about what courses we needed, choosing our chair person, what classes are being offered, etc.
- Advising that deals with the courses we need as well as what we have taken. They have also clear up any confusion that we are having.
- I have talked with Dr. Chavez and Dr. Reider about the thesis and program requirements; they are generally very helpful and respond promptly.
- I receive program advisement, class advisement, paperwork advisement in what forms need to be filled in for certain situations that may arise in my educational process. We are continually being informed through meetings or e-

mail from Dr. Rudy Chavez, Steve Martinez and Barbara Reider (instructor). I receive class schedules and updated schedules continually from Natalie Wester along with workshop information. I have been very please with communication and advisement I have received thus far.

- I have met with both Dr. Rudy Chavez and Steve Martinez for advising. We have done this in person and through conference calling. The advising has proven to be valuable.
- The staff is very willing to advise, however, there were some discrepancies between advisors. It may be beneficial to be assigned an advisor at the beginning of the program.
- The program/university staff is very beneficial and informative.
- If anything is offered for our benefit we surely are well informed and it is greatly appreciated by me.

4. Briefly describe the difficulties you are encountering in the program.

- I have not encountered any problems or difficulties with the program. But, there is no communication between Highlands University book store and our cohort so we have ordered books that were wrong three semesters in a row now. This puts us way behind in our studies for individual classes.
- The biggest difficulty I have had in the program is the cost of gas and books. The other thing that has been a bit difficult has been the fact that I haven't taken a college level class in about 6 years!
- Instructors from Highlands are not on the same page when field projects are needing to get done.
- There are not too many problems with this program; I believe Dr. Chavez worked real hard to accommodate everyone as much as possible. So I am real happy with this program.
- I am having a hard time with the work load. Also this semester, there is a lot of confusion regarding our time line to graduate. This semester I'm taking the Research class and it's overwhelming because the class is so large my instructor can't give everybody the help they need. The information is so overwhelming and I've been left to figure it out on my own. It's very stressful. We've had three classes and I'm still lost. Luckily, my professor is trying to get another class in which we can actually use the class time to write. This is the only semester that has been this stressful for me.
- I am blessed that at this time I have not encountered any.
- The difficulties I'm encountering in this program right now is traveling to Santa Fe for most of our courses. It would be helpful and very convenient to have courses offered in Espanola.
- Just the nervous jitters. Also NMHU said they paid me more than what they did and do not want to pay me the stipend for this next semester. But they will unless they can come up with checks that I supposedly signed to cash.
- I don't have a clear understanding of the credits that will transfer; therefore, I am not sure of details basic to my program of study- how many credits do I still need, what is my emphasis area, etc. We were all obligated to the SIOP workshop in the summer, and now, we were told that these credits may not count toward our program. This seems to be a contradiction to what we were told originally.
- Purchasing the books. The program does provide us with a stipend to reimburse us but I would rather they bought the books and gave them to us. It would save me time.
- I don't find any difficulties with the program as of today. I think I am experiencing personal difficulties due to the fact that I have not been in the college "scene" for many years. The program has been very supportive.
- We have very supportive staff that helps with any difficulties that may come about.

5. Other information you would like me to know about concerning the program.

- This program has provided me with the opportunity to better myself and grow as a professional. I really appreciate the program and everything the staff of CESDP and Santa Fe offices has done for me.
- I think all in all, the program is a wonderful help to teachers.
- I appreciate the fact that we have people working for grants/funding that support these types of programs. Earning a Master's in Curriculum and Instruction was what I had been wanting to do for some time, but couldn't because of financial or college schedule conflicts due to teaching. There are many educators who value the benefits we have been offered through this funding. I hope continued funding is granted so that others may have the same opportunities.
- The program has been great and I feel that I will be a better teacher after it is all said and done.
- I am very happy that all of the people involved to make this program happen have a real heart for people of northern New Mexico especially teachers. I thank all of you for your hard work and dedication to our students of New Mexico.
- I feel very fortunate to be in this program. I want my master's and this program is making it easier for me to get it. A lot of the teachers are extremely stressed out with the program. I've heard one teacher say she's going to therapy and another told me she's getting migraines. I think we should use class time more efficiently.
- This is an excellent program for people of northern New Mexico who want to make a difference in their districts and classrooms. Thank you.

- This program is effective in assisting educators in becoming highly qualified and to become valuable administrators.
- How can I help out future students in this program.
- I 'm thankful for the opportunity to participate in the program and know that our program directors have our best interest at heart.
- It's a great program and I am excited for the opportunities it is giving me.
- I hope that you will continue to fund this program. I would not have had the opportunity to be working on my master's degree if it were not for Dr. Chavez and I am eternally grateful.
- Everything regarding this program has been an asset in furthering my education. I am very grateful for the wonderful opportunity that this program has given me.
- Besides all of the speed bumps, I really appreciate the opportunity to participate in the program and all of the hard work our directors put into running the project.
- I think that the program is going to help a lot of teachers attain their goals of obtaining a Masters Degree. I have been ever so thankful for the opportunity that this program has given me. Financially I would have not been able to accomplish this dream of my own.
- This program has provided many opportunities that have enabled me to be successful as a teacher.
- I am grateful for this opportunity, but not just for my own education. The children in every one of my present and future classrooms will have a better quality of education.

Conclusions

Results from this survey clearly indicate that students in this program are extremely happy with the Director's management of the project. They are especially happy with the personal support they receive from Drs. Chavez and Martinez. When asked how the program could be improved, most students stated that the program should continue as is and that there was no way to improve an already well-managed program. As one student stated, "I think the program is great!" One student did have a recommendation for program improvement. According to this student, the cohort was too large and she wished she could have more personalized attention from the instructor. While project personnel have taken note of this comment, it is impossible to lower the numbers in this project, as this project was funded to serve 30 students.

When asked to describe some of the problems they faced in this program, the majority of students stated that they had encountered no problems and that they were extremely happy with program management. This was summed up by one student when she said, "I have encountered no problems with the program." This student did go on to say, however, that the problems were not necessarily issues they could control. This student, as well as others, stated that there was a lack of communication between them and other departments on the NMHU campus. For example, one student stated that it was difficult for her to purchase books from the main campus at NMHU. This student stated that book orders have been wrong three semesters in a row and there is tremendous frustration on her part because it takes many weeks to straighten out the problem with books and that by the time they get the right books, they are well into the semester. Other students stated that, while they appreciate the book stipend, they wish books would be ordered for them so that they would be available the first night of class.

In summary, students reported that the problems they face are minimal in comparison to the support they are receiving through this project. According to students, they are fortunate to have this program offered to them on site and are very happy with the personalized attention they are provided by the Project Director and Mr. Martinez.

**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart**

PR/Award # (11 characters): T195N070370

Additional Information/Changes

Like last year, students in this project stated that they did not feel comfortable presenting at the Summer Institute. Students stated that they felt they were just learning the information themselves and needed time to implement what they have learned in their classroom before presenting to others. They further stated that, maybe after completing their degree, they would feel comfortable presenting at the Summer Institute. Given the fact that trainees feel insecure about their abilities to provide professional development to others at the Summer Institute, it is the recommendation of the evaluator that professors/consultants be hired to provide this training. This suggestion is not a change to the project, but a modification to Objective 6.

While the Director, Dr. Rudy Chavez, has worked diligently in year two and has met the goals and objectives during the second project year, it was impossible for him to continue this work without support. Year three is a critical year for program participants, as they will be completing coursework, taking the state bilingual test and completing comprehensive exams. They will therefore need even more personalized attention for the Director. In addition, Dr. Chavez will be very busy recruiting Cohort 2 students in year three. Given the increased workload, it is highly recommended that this project utilize carryover dollars to hire an additional person to assist Dr. Chavez. Since the P.I., Dr. Paul Martinez, is already working closely with Dr. Chavez 10% of the time, and because he is familiar with the day to day operation of the project, it is suggested that, in addition to his 10% in-kind contribution, Dr. Martinez be hired an additional 10% time so that he may assist Dr. Chavez with the day to day management of the project, so that he can become the liaison between the project and NMHU faculty and other NMHU staff and departments and so that he may also assist Dr. Chavez with the recruitment of Cohort 2 students. Dr. Martinez' role is key in developing strong partnerships with administrators in the partner school districts.

Finally, based on numerous conversations with Dr. Chavez, and my own visits, it has become apparent that the project would benefit more from direct involvement by a person charged with helping oversee the fiscal coordination of the project. Ms Fran Mares assumes that role on a very small percentage of her overall FTE and more of her time assigned to the project would greatly enhance the overall management of the Master's program.

**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart**

PR/Award # (11 characters): T195N070370

Budget Information

Over the past project year, the Principal Investigator, Project Director and the Program Staff Assistance, in collaboration with the Office of Contracts and Grants, have closely monitored the project budget. All expenditures, approved by the Principal Investigator and Project Director must also be approved by the Office of Contracts and Grants. This process assures that expenditures are spent in accordance with EDGAR rules and regulations.

Budget Expenditures-Year 2

The following table provides information on expenses incurred by the project over the second project year. The reader of this document should note that the table includes carryover dollars from year. The table also provides projected encumbrances for the month of June.

**Budget Expenses – Second Project Year
July 1, 2008 through May 15, 2009**

Category	Approved Budget Plus Yr. 1 Encumbrances	Dollars Spent Year 2	Encumbrances	Expenditures Plus Encumbrances	Surplus/Deficit
Salaries	126,259.47	87,959.46	16,739.55	104,699.01	21,560.46
Fringe	33,334.22	27,140.85	0	27,140.85	6,193.37
Travel	18,900.00	7,367.31	572.00	7,939.31	10,960.69
Contractual	24,811.18	12,000.00	0	12,000.00	12,811.18
Supplies	5,110.14	2,235.33	1,380.54	3,615.87	1,494.27
Other Direct Costs	6,107.96	6,954.98	224.20	7,179.18	-1,071.22
Total Direct Costs	214,522.97	143,657.93	18,916.29	162,574.22	51,948.75
Indirect Costs	17,161.76	10,711.46	1,513.30	12,224.76	4,937.00
Stipends	28,950.00	25,900.00	0	25,900.00	3,050.00
Tuition	88,269.00	53,160.00	0	53,160.00	35,109.00
Totals	348,903.73	233,429.39	18,916.29	253,858.98	95,044.75

The first column in the table above lists each line item that was approved for this project plus carryover dollars from year one. Column two lists the dollar amount for each budget category that was approved for the second project year. Column three provides information on the dollars spent in year two, in each approved category as of May 15, 2009. Column four lists the projected encumbrances for the remainder of the second project year (June 30). Column five lists the total spent to date, plus the projected encumbrances. Finally, column six shows the projected budget deficit or surplus in each line. According to figures from the Office of Contracts and Grants, it is projected that there will be a carryover of ____.

Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart

PR/Award # (11 characters): T195N070370

Program Highlights– Year Two

The project is to be commended for meeting its program goal and its six program objectives in year two. Furthermore, Dr. Rudy Chavez has proven to be an exceptionally gifted Director, as demonstrated by the information gathered from students. In addition to meeting all of its goals, the following are program highlights from year two.

Highlights

- ✓ The Director demonstrated exceptional leadership in year two. Students were especially happy with the personal one-on one attention they were provided in year 2.
- ✓ Students again were appreciative of the fact that they did not have to travel 180 miles to the main campus of NMHU to complete their degree. They were happy with the one-to-one guidance they are being provided by the Director and their advisor, Dr. Steve Martinez.
- ✓ The students stated that the Summer Institute was very beneficial and that they are looking forward to this years Summer Institute.
- ✓ In addition to the personalized attention they are receiving from project staff, students stated that they were especially grateful for the financial support provided by this project. An overwhelming number of students stated that they would not be able to complete this program without this support.
- ✓ Tutorial support from project staff has been a plus, however, additional staff will need to be hired to assist in this area. As stated in this document, it is highly recommended that the P.I. devoted an additional 10% of his time to this project and that his time be paid by the carryover dollars.
- ✓ Opportunities to practice learned skills in real classroom settings via practicum experiences continues to a plus for this program. This will be impossible if Dr. Chavez is not provided additional support. Therefore, it is highly recommended that Dr. Martinez be hired an additional 10% time so that he may further support the Director.

**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart**

PR/Award # (11 characters): T195N070370

Overall Program Recommendations

This project may be considered an exemplary program in that it is providing an on-site Master of Arts degree program to teachers from isolated school districts in Northern New Mexico. Without this on-site training model, these teachers from isolated school districts would not have the opportunity to complete their Master of Arts degree and endorsements in bilingual/ESL education. Following are the recommendations for this already well-designed program.

- Year three is very critical for Cohort 1 students, as they will be completing the state bilingual test, the comprehensive examination and coursework. It will be impossible for the Director to assist all students, to supervise practicum and to recruit Cohort 2 students without additional support. Therefore, it is highly recommended that carryover dollars be used to hire Dr. Paul Martinez an additional 10% time to assist Dr. Chavez.
- Program participants stated that they are not happy with the communications from departments on the NMHU campus. If this project hires Dr. Martinez 10% time, he can become the liaison between students and NMHU staff and faculty, thus avoiding difficulties students are presently experiencing.
- Year three is a critical year in that, in addition to their teaching responsibilities, Cohort 1 teachers will be completing comps, thesis and coursework. It is critical that the Director be visible in the school districts so that he may serve as a support to teachers. This can only happen if the Director is provided additional support.
- Because this is a decentralized project nearly 100 miles away from the main campus of NMHU, coordination of all fiscal matters requires the interface between the Fiscal Coordinator Fran Mares and the Business office on main campus. It is recommended that the current Administrative Assistant position be reduced to .50FTE and the remaining .50% be assigned to Project Fiscal Coordinator Fran Mares. This would give Dr. Chavez and the project more fiscal expertise and make the overall coordination of the grant more effective.

Closing Remarks

I would like to thank the Director and P.I., Drs. Rodolfo Chávez and Paul Martinez for the excellent job they did in preparing for my on-site visits. All records requested were easily accessible to the evaluator, making it very easy to assess the degree to which this project is meeting its goal and six project objectives.

Like last year, this evaluator was impressed with the excellent record-keeping used by project staff. In addition, students and other NMHU staff were available throughout each of the site visits and were more than willing to provide the evaluator the necessary information needed in order to complete this evaluation report. In closing, I believe this project to be a model project. The Office of English Language Acquisition can rest assured that this project is meeting GPRA measures and is spending its dollars, stated in their original application.