

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

Interview Protocols

Project Directors

Project Director (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, your expectations for the project’s sustainability, and how you are following up with 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 90 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. How was the project initiated? Why?
 - a. What were the needs that led to the development of the project?
 - Examples/prompts: new state requirement that all pre-service teachers have specific preparation in EL curriculum and instructional needs; 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. How would participants in this project identify it? Is there a name for the NPDP-funded project or its activities that would be consistently recognized by the participants?
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, is there a shared sense of the priorities of the different goals? Please explain.

7. Was there any research or were there other influences that were helpful in developing your 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, are you acting on feedback from teachers you have trained, on university departmental or presidential priorities, etc.
8. How do your project activities fit within the broader context of teacher education policy related to ELs in your state?
 - a. To what extent are the project's goals driven by state legislation? NCATE accreditation recommendations? [*These may have been offered as an influence in the prior question.*]
9. Who are the partners in the project and how were they identified? [*Refer to list of partners and prompt if any are not mentioned.*]
10. What are the partners' roles in the project?
 - a. Do the partners provide input in terms of planning? Delivery? Managing or monitoring? If so, please describe that input.
 - b. What are the mechanisms for coordinating activities amongst the partners?
11. What has been most successful about the partnership? Least successful? Why? How do you know?

Structure and Content of the Program

12. 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?

13. [If applicable] For your work with current teachers or non-instructional school staff, what is the **content focus** of the professional development to prepare or assist them to work with ELs?

a. Examples/prompts:

- 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?

14. [If applicable] For your work with pre-service teachers in a preparation program, what is the content focus in the teacher preparation courses and activities to prepare them to work with ELs?

a. 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)
- b. 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)?
- c. [*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?
- d. Does the program focus on preparing teachers for working with students from a particular language group or multiple groups?
15. 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 and [*if there is more than one population targeted in the grant*] for which population:
- 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 do the different methods relate?
 - b. Are any of these delivery methods offered virtually or on-line? [*If yes*] How is that implemented?
16. Why were this (or these) delivery method(s) and content focus chosen? What is the rationale for these design choices?
17. How are participants for the project selected and how are their needs assessed?
18. How would you characterize the needs of participating pre- and/or in-service teachers?
19. 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?
20. 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.

b. How are these issues addressed through the NPDP-funded project?

21. What, if any, have been some of the challenges in implementing the project as a whole?

- 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

22. Over the period of the grant, have there been any changes to the project as initially planned?

- Examples/prompts: changes in leadership; changes in partners; changes in state requirements or state teacher supply needs

Grant Outcomes

23. In what ways has the collaboration through this project affected your program or the other partners, like the school district?

- Examples/prompts: planned courses together; recruited teachers to work in the department; set up networked learning site; sought additional grants to fund aspects of the program; holding regular meetings; faculty from arts and sciences and education collaborating on content, advising, and observation, etc.

24. Have there been any changes to the overall teacher education program (relating to pre- or in-service teachers) 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.

a. Would you consider those changes targeted or more systemic? Why?

25. What factors or conditions supported the program's ability to make these changes?

26. Did you encounter any barriers when making these changes? *[If yes]* What were those barriers, and were you able to overcome them?

27. Were there other changes that you had wanted to make but were not able to? Why?

28. Please tell us about how you have evaluated the grant's implementation for reporting to the funders or otherwise. For example, what data were collected and how? What did you learn

about what is working well or what could be improved? Has that been documented outside of the reports to the funders?

29. How would you assess the instructional effectiveness of those who have completed the program?

Sustainability

30. Does the project have a funding source other than the NPDP?

31. What strategies or approaches are you using to sustain changes that have occurred as a result of the NPDP grant?

a. How successful have these strategies or approaches been? Why?

b. Which activities have you been able to sustain and why?

32. How has information about the project been disseminated, and what has been the response from the community?

Follow-up

33. Have you followed up with participants after they have left your program? *[If yes]* How have you followed up with them?

- 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 do you seek to learn about them?

b. Do you have a sense of the extent of their work with ELs or their perceptions of the impact of the project on their work with ELs or in teaching generally?

34. If you have not followed up with participants, why not?

Wrap Up

35. 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!

Project Director (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, how the project has been sustained, and how you followed up with 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 90 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. How was the project initiated? Why?
 - a. 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.
3. 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.
4. *[If interviewee indicates multiple goals]:* From your perspective, are some goals a greater priority than others? Which ones and why?
 - a. Amongst the partners, is there a shared sense of the priorities of the different goals? Please explain.
5. Was there any research or were there other influences that were helpful in developing your project's goals and strategies? For example, were 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, are you acting on feedback

from teachers you have trained, university departmental or presidential priorities, etc.

6. How did your project activities fit within the broader context of teacher education policy related to ELs in your state?
 - a. To what extent are the project's goals driven by state legislation? NCATE accreditation recommendations? [*These may have been offered as an influence in the prior question.*]
7. Who were the partners in the project and how were they identified? [*Refer to list of partners and prompt if any are not mentioned.*]
8. What was most successful about the partnership? Least successful? Why? How did you know?

Structure and Content of the Program

9. 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. 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?
10. [*If applicable*] For your work with current teachers or non-instructional school staff, what was the **content focus** of the professional development to prepare or assist them to work with ELs?
 - a. 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)

- 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)
- b. 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)?
- c. [*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?
- d. Did the program focus on preparing teachers for working with students from a particular language group or multiple groups?
11. [*If applicable*] For your work with pre-service teachers in a preparation program, what was the content focus in the teacher preparation courses and activities to prepare them to work with ELs?
- Examples/prompts:
 - 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)

- 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?
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 were used and [*if there is more than one population targeted in the grant*] for which population:
- Stand alone courses delivered on campus or in schools
 - Infused content across the curriculum or through a sequence of seminars or workshops
 - Seminars or other settings involving classroom instruction
 - Workshops or summer institutes

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

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

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

 - Online learning
 - 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?
13. Why were this (or these) delivery method(s) and content focus chosen? What was the rationale for these design choices?
14. 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? What evidence did you see to support that?
15. How were participants for the project selected and how are their needs assessed?
16. How would characterize the needs of participating teacher candidates and/or teachers?
17. 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.
- a. How were these issues addressed through the NPDP-funded project?
18. What, if any, were some of the challenges in implementing the project as a whole?
- 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
19. Over the period of the grant, were there any changes to the project as initially planned?
- Examples/prompts: changes in leadership; changes in partners; changes in state requirements or state teacher supply needs

Grant Outcomes

20. In what ways did the collaboration through this project affect your program or the other partners, like the school district?

- Examples/prompts: planned courses together; recruited teachers to work in the department; set up networked learning site; sought additional grants to fund aspects of the program; holding regular meetings; faculty from arts and sciences and education collaborating on content, advising, and observation, etc.

21. Were there any changes to the overall teacher education program (relating to pre- or in-service teachers) 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.

a. Would you consider those changes targeted or more systemic? Why?

b. Have these changes been sustained over time?

22. What factors or conditions supported the program's ability to make these changes?

23. Did you encounter any barriers when making these changes? *[If yes]* What were those barriers, and were you able to overcome them?

24. Were there other changes that you had wanted to make but were not able to? Why?

25. Please tell us about how you evaluated the grant's implementation for reporting to the funders or otherwise. For example, what data were collected and how? What did you learn about what worked? Has that been documented outside of the reports to the funders?

26. How did you assess the instructional effectiveness of those who completed the program?

Sustainability

27. Did the project have a funding source other than the NPDP?

28. What strategies or approaches are you using to sustain changes that have occurred as a result of the NPDP grant?

a. How successful have these strategies or approaches been? Why?

b. Which activities have you been able to sustain and why?

29. How was information about the project been disseminated, and what was the response from the community?

Follow-up

30. Did you follow up with participants after they left your program? [If yes] how did you track them?

- 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 did you seek to learn about them?
 - b. Do you have a sense of the extent of their work with ELs or their perceptions of the impact of the project on their work with ELs or in teaching generally?

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

Wrap Up

32. 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!