

**Case Studies of Current and Former Grantees Under the Title
III National Professional Development Program (NPDP)**

Interview Protocols

IHE Staff

IHE Staff (Current) Interview Protocol

Draft 5/14/12

Grantee:	Interviewer:
Interviewee(s):	Date/Time:

Note to Interviewer:

- *Instructions to interviewers appear in italics.*
- *Numbered and lettered questions are all meant to be asked. Bulleted items are possible responses and may be used as probes—the interviewer would not necessarily ask about all of these.*
- *Because of the open-ended nature of some questions, the respondent may answer a later question in the course of answering an earlier question.*

Introduction

Thank you for taking the time to speak with me today. Just as a reminder, this interview is for a study of the National Professional Development Program (NPDP), which is funded by the U.S. Department of Education. The Department is interested in learning more about the approaches being used by grantees to improve the preparation of pre- and in-service teachers to work with English Learners (ELs). The purpose of the interview is to gain more details about how the project is being implemented, what you are finding successful, and what challenges you are encountering. We will ask you questions about your role in the project, the project’s history and goals, your partners, the structure and content of the program, the effects of the program on your institution, and any information you have on former participants.

You signed a consent form which stated that our reports will associate your responses with your funded project but not with you as an individual. In addition, to capture the large amount of data your responses will provide, your interview will be recorded. The audio record may be shared with others within our study team for purposes of analysis but will not be shared outside the study team. All data that we collect from you will be stored on a password-protected computer network and destroyed at the conclusion of the study.

We know that you are very busy, so we’ve made an effort to collect as much information as possible through available documents. We’ll sometimes reference that information during the course of the interview to confirm that our information is correct.

This interview will take about 60 minutes, including time for follow-up.

Do you have any questions before we begin?

Role of the Respondent

Most questions in this protocol will ask you about the activities undertaken with funding specifically from the NPDP. We ask that you focus your responses on those activities specifically. We also ask that you let us know if, at any time, you are referring to the overall teacher education program more generally.

1. Could you please describe your role in the NPDP-funded project?
 - a. How long you have been involved in the project?
2. What are your day-to-day activities in support of the NPDP grant?
 - a. Approximately what percentage of your time in a given month is spent on these activities?

History, Goals, and Context of the Project

3. Were you involved in the development of the project and its design? *[If yes]* Please describe the nature and extent of your involvement.
4. What were the needs that led to the development of the project?
 - Examples/prompts: a new state requirement that all pre-service teachers have specific preparation in EL curriculum and instructional needs; a district or several districts identified a need for PD in a particular approach to meeting the needs of ELs, e.g., SIOP; change in performance on state tests highlighted need for additional PD in an instructional approach; a recognition that knowledge of EL needs should be shared across instructional teams, including school psychologists, paraprofessionals, etc.
5. What are the goals and objectives of the project?
 - Examples/prompts: to upgrade pre-service or in-service teachers' skills, to certify pre- or in-service teachers in bilingual education or English-as-a-Second language, to develop or refine curricula, to train university faculty, to prepare general education teachers, to reach paraprofessionals or other school staff such as teacher mentors, school psychologists, etc.
6. *[If interviewee indicates multiple goals]:* From your perspective, are some goals a greater priority than others? Which ones and why?
 - a. Amongst the partners (within and outside the university), is there a shared sense of the priorities of the different goals? Please explain.
7. *[If interviewee indicated strong involvement in design]:* Was there any research or were there other influences that were helpful in developing the project's goals and strategies? For example, are the goals and strategies selected based on any empirical data? Please describe.

- Examples/prompts: was selection of curricula informed by research evidence, have strategies employed been studied elsewhere, do local districts inform on particular needs, are you meeting certain mandates, acting on feedback from teachers trained, university departmental or presidential priorities, etc.
8. Who are the partners in the project within the university? External to the university?
 - a. How do you work with the external partners in your capacity? How do you work with the internal partners?
 - b. For partners within the university, how were the instructors involved in delivery selected or recruited? Are the instructors faculty in the teacher education program, other programs, or other categories of staff? Which ones?
 - Example/prompt: doctoral students, lecturers, and non-tenured faculty with a clinical or practical emphasis
 - c. Are there any considerations that impacted staff participation in the grant?
 - Example/prompt: competing responsibilities to publish, provide services to the profession, participate in grants.
 9. What has been most successful about the partnership? Least successful? Why? How do you know?

Structure and Content of the Program

10. Could you describe the **target population** of the grant? [*Refer to project abstract and probe on any populations not mentioned*]
 - Examples/prompts:
 - Current teachers or non-instructional staff (such as paraprofessionals, instructional support staff, administrators, student support staff)
 - Pre-service teachers in a teacher preparation program
 - IHE faculty or district staff
 - a. Is the targeted population specializing in BE/ESL or are they teaching in/preparing for general education classrooms?
 - b. Is there a grade- or content area focus targeted by the grant?
 - c. How is the target population grouped to receive the services of the grant?
11. [*If applicable*] Could you tell us a little about the **content focus** of the grant? For example, are the following topics covered:

- o Linguistic training particular to English language acquisition (e.g., language components, learning and developmental factors unique to ELs)
 - o Explicit curricular and instructional strategies/best practices for teaching English to ELs (e.g., methods to build academic English, aligning materials to state standards, course/syllabus revision to meet the needs of ELs)
 - o Subject area knowledge (e.g., how to incorporate language and literacy skills into content such as math, science, social studies)
 - o Cultural or community sensitivity/culturally responsive pedagogy (e.g., strategies for communicating with students and families, culture specific norms or context)
 - o Language learning (e.g., developing proficiency in another language through classes, international field experience)
- a. To what extent is the content focused (e.g., on one of these content areas or on application in a particular setting) or broad (e.g., covering multiple content areas or broadly applicable to any work with ELs)?
- b. [*For any topics identified:*] Could you describe the content in more detail?
- Examples/prompts: Is there training with models or approaches that have been shown to be effective with ELs (e.g., modeling, using graphic organizers, contextualizing, using multiple modes of communication, using SIOP)? What instructional strategies are emphasized as important for EL's acquisition of subject matter? Is data-based assessment of learner needs covered? Differentiated instruction? Are materials of relevance to ELs incorporated?
- c. Does the program focus on preparing teachers for working with students from a particular language group or multiple groups?
12. We'd also like to learn more about the **delivery methods** for the activities undertaken as part of the project. Could you tell us if any of the following methods are used?
- o Stand alone courses delivered on campus or in schools
 - o Infused content across the curriculum or through a sequence of seminars or workshops
 - o Seminars or other settings involving classroom instruction
 - o Workshops or summer institutes
 - o Research opportunities, including action research
 - o Study or discussion groups
 - o Professional learning communities
 - o Practical learning experiences (e.g., hands-on teaching experience)

- o Mentoring or coaching with a focus on joining more and less experienced participants
- o Co-teaching or collaboration with BE/ESL specialists
- o Class observations/visits with a focus on connecting peers
- o Class observations/visits with a focus on evaluation

- o Community awareness experiences (e.g., volunteering in community organizations serving the EL population; working in a refugee center within the school district)
- o Language/cultural immersion
- o International experiences

- o Online learning
- o Use of videos of best practice
- o Use of teacher-developed technology-based tools (e.g., blogs, podcasts, digital archives)
- o Use of other technology (*specify*)

[For each method mentioned]:

- a. Could you tell us a little more about [*name*] method? For example, when and for how long does the activity occur? Who is involved in the delivery (e.g., single instructors, teaching teams, university faculty, district staff, etc.)? Are they stand-alone? If not, how does the different methods relate?
- b. Are any of these delivery methods offered virtually or on-line? [*If yes*] How is that implemented?

13. Have you received any support related to your role in the project? Please describe the scope of this support.

- a. [*If yes*] Was this support helpful to you in your role in preparing teachers to work with ELs?
- b. [*If no*] What type of support, if any, would have been helpful?

14. Have you worked with other faculty to support this project or each other's roles in this project?

- Examples/prompts: co-developed new courses, team-taught courses, participated in staff development, published related papers, produced training manuals, secured related grants

15. How would you characterize the needs of participating pre- and/or in-service teachers?

- Examples/prompts: need or desire knowledge and skills in language development, content acquisition, cultural sensitivity, etc.

16. What would you say have been the most successful aspects of your project?

- a. How would you describe that success? Do you have a brief anecdote that you could share that exemplifies this success?
- b. What do you think were the factors that contributed? What evidence have you seen to support that?

16. What, if any, have been some of the challenges in implementing the project?

- Examples/prompts: lack of buy in by faculty in higher education institution; challenges in hiring experienced trainers or mentors; lack of participation by target population

Grant Outcomes

17. Have you seen any changes in the overall teacher education (pre- or in-service) program as a result of the NPDP grant? Please describe those changes.

- Example/prompts: changes in course requirement, modification of syllabi, or changes in the sequence of required course, practical or field experiences required; recruitment of applicants; entry requirements, degrees or level of degrees offered; assessment of pre- or in-service teachers and follow up; collaboration across arts and science and education departments collaboration between schools or districts and higher education institution.

18. How has the grant affected your own work in preparing teachers to work with ELs?

19. What changes, if any, have you seen in participants' level of knowledge and performance with regard to instruction of ELs, based on their participation in the grant activities? Please describe.

- Examples/prompts: feedback from surveys that indicate students feel better prepared; reports from principals and teachers that graduates are skilled and prepared to work with ELs; etc.

Follow-up

20. To your knowledge, has the university or program followed up with participants after they have left your program? *[If yes]* How?

- Examples/prompts: in the context of the grant reporting requirements, surveying graduates, using data from state records, following up with PD participants or new teachers, conducting observations of participants following conclusion of project, etc.

a. What has been learned?

21. If you did not follow up with students, why?

Wrap Up

22. Is there anything else you'd like to tell me that might help decision makers who are trying to improve the NPDP program and increase its impact?

That's all the questions I have. Thank you very much for participating in the study.

Thank you so much for your time!

IHE Staff (Former) Interview Protocol

Draft 5/14/12

Grantee:	Interviewer:
Interviewee(s):	Date/Time:

Note to Interviewer:

- *Instructions to interviewers appear in italics.*
- *Numbered and lettered questions are all meant to be asked. Bulleted items are possible responses and may be used as probes—the interviewer would not necessarily ask about all of these.*
- *Because of the open-ended nature of some questions, the respondent may answer a later question in the course of answering an earlier question.*

Introduction

Thank you for taking the time to speak with me today. Just as a reminder, this interview is for a study of the National Professional Development Program (NPDP), which is funded by the U.S. Department of Education. The Department is interested in learning more about the approaches being used by grantees to improve the preparation of pre- and in-service teachers to work with English Learners (ELs). The purpose of the interview is to gain more details about how the project was implemented, what you found successful, and what challenges you encountered. We will ask you questions about your role in the project, the project’s history and goals, your partners, the structure and content of the program, the effects of the program on your institution, and any information you have on former participants.

You signed a consent form which stated that our reports will associate your responses with your funded project but not with you as an individual. In addition, to capture the large amount of data your responses will provide, your interview will be recorded. The audio record may be shared with others within our study team for purposes of analysis but will not be shared outside the study team. All data that we collect from you will be stored on a password-protected computer network and destroyed at the conclusion of the study.

We know that you are very busy, so we’ve made an effort to collect as much information as possible through available documents. We’ll sometimes reference that information during the course of the interview to confirm that our information is correct.

This interview will take about 60 minutes, including time for follow-up.

Do you have any questions before we begin?

Role of the Respondent

Most questions in this protocol will ask you about the activities undertaken with funding specifically from the NPDP. We ask that you focus your responses on those activities specifically. We also ask that you let us know if, at any time, you are referring to the overall teacher education program more generally.

1. Could you please describe your role in the NPDP-funded project?
 - a. How long you were you involved in the project?

History, Goals, and Context of the Project

2. Were you involved in the development of the project and its design? *[If yes]* Please describe the nature and extent of your involvement.
3. What were the needs that led to the development of the project?
 - Examples/prompts: a new state requirement that all pre-service teachers have specific preparation in EL curriculum and instructional needs; a district or several districts identified a need for PD in a particular approach to meeting the needs of ELs, e.g., SIOP; change in performance on state tests highlighted need for additional PD in an instructional approach; a recognition that knowledge of EL needs should be shared across instructional teams, including school psychologists, paraprofessionals, etc.
4. What were the goals and objectives of the project?
 - Examples/prompts: to upgrade pre-service or in-service teachers' skills, to certify pre- or in-service teachers in bilingual education or English-as-a-Second language, to develop or refine curricula, to train university faculty, to prepare general education teachers, to reach paraprofessionals or other school staff such as teacher mentors, school psychologists, etc.
5. *[If interviewee indicated strong involvement in design]:* Was there any research or were there other influences that were helpful in developing the project's goals and strategies? For example, are the goals and strategies selected based on any empirical data? Please describe.
 - Examples/prompts: was selection of curricula informed by research evidence, have strategies employed been studied elsewhere, did local districts inform on particular needs, were you meeting certain mandates, were you acting on feedback from teachers you have trained, university departmental or presidential priorities, etc.
6. Who were the partners in the project within the university? External to the university?

- a. How did you work with the external partners in your capacity? How did you work with the internal partners?
7. What was most successful about the partnership? Least successful? Why? How do you know?

Structure and Content of the Program

8. Who was the target population for the grant activities?
 - Examples/prompts:
 - Current teachers or non-instructional staff (such as paraprofessionals, instructional support staff, administrators, student support staff)
 - Pre-service teachers in a teacher preparation program
 - IHE faculty or district staff
 - a. Was the targeted population specializing in BE/ESL or are they teaching in/preparing for general education classrooms?
 - b. Was there a grade- or content area focus targeted by the grant?
 - c. How was the target population grouped to receive the services of the grant?
9. Could you tell us a little about the specific **content focus** in the activities under the grant? For example, were the following topics covered:
 - Linguistic training particular to English language acquisition (e.g., language components, learning and developmental factors unique to ELs)
 - Explicit curricular and instructional strategies/best practices for teaching English to ELs (e.g., methods to build academic English, aligning materials to state standards, course/syllabus revision to meet the needs of ELs)
 - Subject area knowledge (e.g., how to incorporate language and literacy skills into content such as math, science, social studies)
 - Cultural or community sensitivity/culturally responsive pedagogy (e.g., strategies for communicating with students and families, culture specific norms or context)
 - Language learning (e.g., developing proficiency in another language through classes, international field experience)

- a. To what extent was the content focused (e.g., on one of these content areas or on application in a particular setting) or broad (e.g., covering multiple content areas or broadly applicable to any work with ELs)?
 - b. [*For any topics identified:*] Could you describe the content in more detail?
 - Examples/prompts: Was there training with models or approaches that have been shown to be effective with ELs (e.g., modeling, using graphic organizers, contextualizing, using multiple modes of communication, using SIOP)? What instructional strategies were emphasized as important for EL's acquisition of subject matter? Was data-based assessment of learner needs covered? Differentiated instruction? Were materials of relevance to ELs incorporated?
 - c. Did the program focus on preparing teachers for working with students from a particular language group or multiple groups?
10. What was/were the **delivery methods** for the activities undertaken as part of the project? For example, were there:
- o Stand alone courses delivered on campus or in schools
 - o Infused content across the curriculum or through a sequence of seminars or workshops
 - o Seminars or other settings involving classroom instruction
 - o Workshops or summer institutes

 - o Research opportunities, including action research
 - o Study or discussion groups
 - o Professional learning communities

 - o Practical learning experiences (e.g., hands-on teaching experience)
 - o Mentoring or coaching with a focus on joining more and less experienced participants
 - o Co-teaching or collaboration with BE/ESL specialists
 - o Class observations/visits with a focus on connecting peers
 - o Class observations/visits with a focus on evaluation

 - o Community awareness experiences (e.g., volunteering in community organizations serving the EL population; working in a refugee center within the school district)
 - o Language/cultural immersion
 - o International experiences

 - o Online learning
 - o Use of videos of best practice

- o Use of teacher-developed technology-based tools (e.g., blogs, podcasts, digital archives)
- o Use of other technology (*specify*)

[For each method mentioned]:

- a. Could you tell us a little more about [name] method? For example, when and for how long did the activity occur? Who was involved in the delivery (e.g., single instructors, teaching teams, university faculty, district staff, etc.)? Were they stand-alone? If not, how did the different methods relate?
 - b. Were any of these delivery methods offered virtually or on-line? If yes, how was that implemented?
11. Did you receive any support related to your role in the project? Please describe the scope of this support.
- a. [If yes] Was this support helpful to you in your role in preparing teachers to work with ELs?
 - b. [If no] What type of support, if any, would have been helpful?
 - c. Did you work with other faculty to support this project or each other's roles in this project?
 - Examples/prompts: co-developed new courses, team-taught courses, participated in staff development, published related papers, produced training manuals, secured related grants
12. How would you characterize the needs of participating pre- and/or in-service teachers?
- Examples/prompts: need or desire knowledge and skills in language development, content acquisition, cultural sensitivity, etc.
13. What would you say were the most successful aspects of your project?
- a. How would you describe that success? Do you have a brief anecdote that you could share that exemplifies this success?
 - b. What do you think were the factors that contributed to this success?
14. In general, could you describe the challenges to improving the quality of pre- and in-service teacher education for preparation of teachers to work with ELs.
- Examples/prompts: issues with level of faculty knowledge or experience, research base in the field, practical opportunities available, competing demands, time requirements, etc.

15. How were these issues addressed through the NPDP-funded project?
16. What, if any, were some of the challenges in implementing the project?

Grant Outcomes

17. Did you see any changes in the overall teacher education (pre- or in-service) program as a result of the NPDP grant? Please describe those changes.

- Examples/prompts: changes in course requirement, modification of syllabi, or changes in the sequence of required course, practical or field experiences required; recruitment of applicants; entry requirements, degrees or level of degrees offered; assessment of pre- or in-service teachers and follow up; collaboration across arts and science and education departments collaboration between schools or districts and higher education institution

18. How did the grant affect your own work in preparing teachers to work with ELs?

19. What changes, if any, did you see in participants' level of knowledge and performance with regard to instruction of ELs, based on their participation in the grant activities? Please describe.

- Examples/prompts: feedback from surveys that indicate students feel better prepared; reports from principals and teachers that graduates are skilled and prepared to work with ELs; etc.

Follow-up

20. To your knowledge, did the university or program follow up with participants after they left your program? [*If yes*] How?

Examples/prompts: in the context of grant reporting requirements, surveying graduates, using data from state records, following up with PD participants or new teachers, conducting observations of participants following conclusion of project, etc.

- a. What was been learned?

21. If you did not follow-up with students, why not?

Wrap Up

22. Is there anything else you'd like to tell me that might help decision makers who are trying to improve the NPDP program and increase its impact?

That's all the questions I have. Thank you very much for participating in the study.

Thank you so much for your time!