# SAMPLE

## Project Evaluation 1

Evaluation of the grant will be conducted by the RIS for Social Studies/Library along with the library consultant who has thirty years of library and social studies experience. The RIS for Social Studies/Library and the library consultant will visit each school on a monthly basis to observe the implementation of the literacy program. In addition, they will work closely with the Lead Librarian to ensure that the literacy program is successfully implemented. They will also monitor the professional development activities and lesson plans at each school, and will create survey instruments to evaluate the formative components of the project. This will enable them to provide the librarians with on-going feedback throughout the project which is critical to enabling the schools to make adjustments if necessary and successfully implement the project.

Also, an action research plan will be conducted during the implementation of the project to assess its effectiveness, and will continue until this work is institutionalized. This will help strengthen teaching and learning at the five schools. The following table presents the proposed evaluation methods for each goal and objective.

| **GOALS AND OBJECTIVES** | **OUTCOMES/EVALUATION BY REGIONAL PROGRAM EVALUATOR** | **EVALUATION METHODS** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Goal 1:**  Objective1 | -There will be a positive shift of 5 percentage points in participating students from levels 1-2 (not proficient) to levels 3-4 (proficient) on the K-8 ELA exam as measured by scale scores.  -Improve reading achievement among participating students. | -Analysis of the ELA exam at the participating schools. |
| Objective 2 | -50% of the supplies budget in each school will be used to purchase Spanish and bilingual books. | -Review of book and materials purchased through documentation (e.g., purchase orders) collected by project director.  -Locally developed survey administered to all participating students in the spring of project year. |
| Objective 3 | -Students will have increased motivation for learning and will therefore write more and improve their writing quality. | -Locally developed surveys administered to all participating students.  -Student writing samples |
| Objective 4 | -Increased parent involvement. Training on use of laptops for home use. Workshops on use of technology for research. | -Review of program documentation (e.g., attendance sheets, circulation records) collected by the Lead Librarian.  -Locally developed survey administered to all participating parents in the spring of the project.  -Focus group interviews with librarians, participating teachers,  students and parents. |
| **Goal 2:**  Objective 1 | -Planning and implementation of professional development based on a needs assessment surveys for all participants. -Summer institute and monthly training. | -Review of program documentation (e.g., attendance sheets, circulation records) collected by the Lead Librarian.  -Locally developed survey administered to all participating teachers in the spring of the project |
| Objective 2 | -Combined professional development sessions for all librarians in the region.  -School visitations | -Informal observations and school visits.  -Locally developed survey instruments. |
| Objective 3 | -Training on technology tools for content-based project development | -Pre-post technology skills assessments  -Student portfolios of project work. |

# SAMPLE

## Project Evaluation 2

**Objective 1:** To improve subject matter knowledge and promote the use of research-based instructional practices among mathematics teachers serving students in grades 3-10 in the targeted 27 high needs schools.

| **Benchmarks – Year 1** | **Benchmarks – Year 2** | **Benchmarks – Year 3** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1.1a By June 2005, 90% of teachers of grades 4, 5, 8 and 9 in the target schools (cohort 1) will have participated in a minimum of 60 hours of professional development activities designed to increase their content knowledge and understanding and use of research-based instructional practices. | 1.1b By June 2006, 90% of teachers of grades 3-6 and 8-10 in the target schools (cohorts 1 and 2) will have participated in a minimum of 60 hours of professional development activities designed to increase their content knowledge and use of research-based instructional practices. | 1.1c By June 2007, 90% of teachers of grades 3-10 in the target schools (cohorts 1, 2 and 3) will have participated in a minimum of 60 hours of professional development activities designed to increase their content knowledge and use of research-based instructional practices. |
| 1.2a By June 2005, 10 online courses will have been developed for use by mathematics teachers and coaches for use in grades 4, 5, 8 and 9. | 1.2b By June 2006, 5 additional online courses will have been developed for use by mathematics teachers and coaches in grades 3 and 10. | 1.2c By June 2007, 85% of teachers of grades 3-10 in the target schools and mathematics coaches will report frequent to extensive use of the project-developed online courses and rate these courses highly in terms of their quality and utility. |
| 1.3a By June 2005, 75% of teachers of grades 4, 5, 8 and 9 in the target schools who have participated in a minimum of 60 hours of professional development activities will indicate that they have made moderate to substantial gains in their subject area knowledge and their use of research-based instructional practices, including the integration of technology into subject area instruction. | 1.3b By June 2006, 80% of teachers of grades 3-6 and 8-10 in the target schools who have participated in a minimum of 60 hours of professional development activities will indicate that they have made moderate to substantial gains in their subject area knowledge and their use of research-based instructional practices, including the integration of technology into subject area instruction. | 1.3c By June 2007, 85% of teachers of grades 3-10 in the target schools who have participated in a minimum of 60 hours of professional development activities will indicate that they have made moderate to substantial gains in their subject area knowledge and their use of research-based instructional practices, including the integration of technology into subject area instruction. |
| 1.4a By June 2005, the number of highly qualified and fully certified middle and high school mathematics teachers in Region 1 will increase by 20%. | 1.4b By June 2006, the number of highly qualified and fully certified middle and high school mathematics teachers in Region 1 will increase by 20%. | 1.4c By June 2007, the number of highly qualified and fully certified middle and high school mathematics teachers in Region 1 will increase by 20%. |

**Methods to Evaluate Objective 1:**

A review of program records, including agendas and attendance records from the various project-sponsored professional development activities, transcripts from graduate courses attended by participating teachers for the purpose of attaining certification, and syllabi from the on-line courses developed, will used to assess the attainment of project benchmarks. In addition, a locally developed Staff Self-Assessment Survey will be developed collaboratively by the project evaluator and project staff, which will be designed to assess the extent to which participating teachers believe the project-sponsored professional development activities have enabled them to deepen their knowledge of subject matter content and enhance their repertoire of research-based instructional practices, including the integration of technology into mathematics instruction (in year 3, the Staff Survey will also include items to elicit feedback on the online courses). The Staff Survey, which will be administered in the spring of each project year, will include both forced-choice and open-ended items to gather both quantitative and qualitative data regarding their perceptions of the impact of project-sponsored professional development. It is expected that gains in content knowledge and in the use of research-based instructional practices will be more pronounced among those teachers who receive a higher “dosage” of professional development (i.e., cohorts 1 and 2), and the survey will be designed to enable the evaluator to partition survey results based on the length of time teachers have been in the project. Finally, the project evaluator will observe professional development sessions to gain a deeper understanding of the project’s context, philosophy and approach.