

Evaluation Focus	Information Required	Sources of Information	Methods of Data Collection
ACCOUNTABILITY – Did the project conduct the <i>activities as outlined</i>?			
<p><i>Professional Development</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Was training provided to help every teacher become highly qualified? ◆ How many teachers participated in the NBPTS preparation? ◆ How many teachers and faculty participated in the universal design seminars? ◆ How many participated in the leadership academies and leadership cohorts? ◆ Was professional development provided on data-based decision making? ◆ Were research-based programs expanded to the PDS schools? ◆ How frequently did mentor teachers and new teachers communicate? ◆ Did all new principals have mentors? <p><i>Pre-service Teacher Preparation</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Did advisors meet regularly? ◆ Were teacher and faculty liaisons identified and did they meet regularly? ◆ Were joint supervision protocols established? ◆ Were college classes co-taught on site? ◆ How many students were placed in shared clinicals? ◆ How many pre-service teachers used technology to document their teaching proficiency? ◆ Did supervising teachers, teacher educators, and faculty collaborate in the clinical experiences? ◆ How many candidates participated in technology mediated discussions? 	<p>Evidence that each of the objectives and activities were completed; count data</p>	<p>Project records and reports, curriculum materials, observations</p>	<p>Document review, interviews, observations and record keeping forms</p> <p>Collected by internal evaluators and project personnel</p>

<p>Technology Integration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Was technology training delivered and how many attended? ◆ Was the assistive technology training conducted and how many attended? ◆ Was the assistive technology lab established, including portable lab technologies? <p>Curriculum Development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Were model curriculum units developed? ◆ Were arts and music programming expanded and integrated in the academic programs? <p>Community Alignment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Were the Future Teachers clubs operational and enrolling the target numbers? ◆ Were the summer workshops and tutoring sessions held and how many attended? ◆ Were pre-service teachers exposed to information related to a broader range of issues that affect urban students? ◆ Were school leaders connected with leaders in high poverty-high performing schools? <p>Logistics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Were the governance structures organized on time and with the appropriate representatives? ◆ Was the web site set up? 			
---	--	--	--

Evaluation Focus	Information Required	Sources of Information	Methods of Data Collection
EFFECTIVENESS – How well were the activities accomplished? (incorporates levels 1 & 2 of Kirkpatrick model – satisfaction and learning)			
<p>Professional Development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ What were the perceptions of those involved in mentoring activities? ◆ How many teacher aides, etc. achieved certification? ◆ What were advisor perceptions of the effectiveness of networking? ◆ How effectively did teacher and faculty liaisons feel the PDS operated? ◆ What were teacher perceptions of the professional development activities? ◆ Were there changes in teacher beliefs and attitudes? ◆ Did professional development participants learn the materials they were taught? ◆ How well did teachers adapt research-based practices in the classroom? ◆ How satisfied were trainees with the mentor training? ◆ How effective did participating principals feel the leadership academies were? ◆ Did participants learn what they were intended to learn at the leadership academies? ◆ How did cohort students rate the program? ◆ What was their pass rate on the administrative test? <p>Pre-service Teacher Preparation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ How well did participants feel the shared supervision model worked? ◆ How well did candidates perform in clinical experiences? ◆ What were student and teacher perceptions of the shared clinicals? 	<p>Measures of reactions, learning, knowledge, opinions, attitudes, perceptions, skills, and characteristics</p>	<p>Faculty, Teachers, Administrators, Pre-service candidates, classroom observations</p>	<p>Surveys, questionnaires, attitude scales, tests, reflection documents, classroom observations, review of online discussions, review of curriculum</p> <p>This data will be collected by the internal evaluation team and project personnel.</p>

<p>Technology Integration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Were students and faculty able to select appropriate assistive technologies to help students with learning needs? ◆ To what extent did teachers integrate technology into their curriculum? ◆ What percent of the time was the assistive technology or portable lab being used? <p>Curriculum Development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ How well were curriculum units aligned to the standards? ◆ To what extent were universal design concepts integrated into curricula? ◆ How well did teachers integrate arts and science curricula into the classroom? ◆ How many teachers accessed the content modules and incorporated them? <p>Community Alignment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ What percent of tutored students passed the examinations? ◆ What percent of students participating in the summer workshops applied to be admitted to teacher preparation? ◆ Did pre-service teachers know more about issues that affect learning in urban schools? <p>Logistics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ How did project participants perceive the governance model to be working? 			
--	--	--	--

Evaluation Focus	Information Required	Sources of Information	Methods of Data Collection
IMPACT – Did the project make the desired difference? (incorporates levels 3 & 4 of Kirkpatrick - changes in behavior and ROI)			
<p>Professional Development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Did faculty knowledge of urban issues improve? ◆ Did teacher retention rates improve? ◆ Did teacher performance ratings improve? ◆ Did at least 25 Rockford teachers become nationally certified? ◆ Were all teachers in the PDS designated as Highly Qualified Teachers? ◆ Did administrator performance ratings improve? ◆ To what extent did principals use data in school improvement plans? ◆ What percent of administrative cohort participants passed the state administrative examination? ◆ What percent of administrators trained were placed in leadership positions in the district? ◆ Did the percent of diverse or underrepresented administrators increase? <p>Pre-service Teacher Preparation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Did teacher candidates improve their content knowledge as evidenced by pass rates on the content examinations? ◆ Were teacher candidates able to select appropriate technologies for integration into instruction? ◆ Did all teacher candidates pass the assessment of practices in teaching? ◆ Did all teacher candidates provide evidence that they could design and teach lessons aligned to standards and that address diverse learning needs? 			

<p>Technology Integration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">◆ Were faculty and current teachers able to successfully integrate technology into 25% of their lesson plans? <p>Curriculum Development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">◆ <p>Community Alignment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">◆ Did at least 75% of the students in the PDS schools meet or exceed standards?◆ Was there an increase of at least 25% in diverse and underrepresented applicants meeting standards for admission into teacher preparation and completing their preparation successfully?◆ Did at least 50% of teacher candidates recruited from Rockford return to the city to teach? <p>Logistics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">◆ Was the shared governance model viewed as effective by at least 75% of the partner group members?			
--	--	--	--

Project REAL Program Evaluation Model

Evaluation Focus	Information Required	Sources of Information	Methods of Data Collection
ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT			
<p>What structures, policies or events in the organization or environment helped or hindered the project in accomplishing its goals?</p>	<p>Documentation of contextual and environmental factors</p>	<p>Teachers, teacher candidates, faculty, project personnel, documents, evaluator</p>	<p>Focus groups, interaction between external evaluator and project staff and participants, documents</p> <p>This data will be sought by the external evaluator during annual visits to the project. Primarily qualitative methods will be used.</p>
UNANTICIPATED OUTCOMES			
<p>What changes occurred as a result of the project that were not planned or expected?</p>	<p>Documentation of unplanned or unexpected results or changes that occur for individuals, groups, or systems</p>	<p>Participants, stakeholder groups, project personnel, documents, evaluator</p>	<p>Statistical data, focus groups, observation, evaluator, project staff, participants interaction, document analysis</p> <p>External evaluator will look for outcomes at annual quantitative data review and via annual qualitative observations & interviews.</p>

This document was created with Win2PDF available at <http://www.daneprairie.com>.
The unregistered version of Win2PDF is for evaluation or non-commercial use only.