

**U.S. Department of Education - EDCAPS  
G5-Technical Review Form (New)**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/01/2015 12:13 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: New Teacher Center (U367D150007)

Reader #1: \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	10	6
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design & Services	35	30
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	15
<b>Adequacy of Resources</b>		
1. Sustainability	15	15
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	18
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	84
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness</b>		
<b>CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness</b>		
1. CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness	1	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	1	0
<b>CPP3: Promoting STEM Education</b>		
<b>CPP3: Promoting STEM Education</b>		
1. CPP3: Promoting STEM ED	2	2
<b>Sub Total</b>	2	2
<b>CPP4: High-Need Students</b>		
<b>CPP4: High-Need Students</b>		
1. CPP4: High-Need Students	4	3
<b>Sub Total</b>	4	3
<b>Total</b>	107	89

# Technical Review Form

Panel #7 - 2015 SEED Peer Review - 7: 84.367D

Reader #1: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: New Teacher Center (U367D150007)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Significance

1. The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project. In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

- (1) The significance of the proposed project on a National Level.
- (2) The potential contribution of the proposed project to the development and advancement of teacher and school leadership theory, knowledge, and practices.
- (3) The importance or magnitude of the results or outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project, especially improvements in teaching and student achievement.

#### Strengths:

The proposed project will serve a large number of teachers and students. The formulation of the project is based on existing research and should advance the field.

#### Weaknesses:

The proposed project targets two districts within two large states that are identified as chosen because of their large high-need and diverse populations, however, inside of very diverse states, these districts are actually not as high need as state averages. Additionally, a larger national impact may be felt by involving more than two districts. More information about the coaching model being used would help to inform the advancement of theory, knowledge, and practice.

Reader's Score: 6

### Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design and services of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design and services of the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

- (1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified, aligned, and measurable.
- (2) The extent to which the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students.
- (3) The extent to which the training or professional development services to be provided by the proposed project will be of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services.
- (4) The extent to which the proposed project will prepare personnel for fields in which shortages have been demonstrated.
- (5) The extent to which the proposed project will focus on serving or otherwise addressing the needs of disadvantaged individuals.

#### Strengths:

The applicant provides specific goals and objectives for the project. The entire project is data driven. A tiered model should provide appropriate supports to teachers with varying levels of expertise and experience. The proposed project is

of sufficient intensity and duration. The applicant makes a case for addressing fields with shortages and disadvantaged individuals.

**Weaknesses:**

The goals focus on measurable increases, however, the applicant may wish to specify exactly what measure will show these increases. The applicant should consider providing information on the actual content to be used in the various tiers of support/coaching for teachers.

**Reader's Score: 30**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan**

**1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project and of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan and the project personnel, the Secretary considers:**

**(1) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director, key project personnel, and project consultants or subcontractors.**

**(2) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.**

**(3) The extent to which the proposed management plan includes sufficient and reasonable resources to effectively carry out the proposed project, including the project evaluation.**

**Strengths:**

Personnel have longstanding experience working for the New Teacher Center. A timeline for activities is provided that identifies the roles of the persons responsible for completion.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant may consider aligning the management plan by goals or objectives to show how each task relates to the project goals as a whole. The applicant should also consider identifying milestones for each of these key tasks. The budget appears high in relation to the fact that only two districts are receiving support. Additionally, much time is devoted to start up for a project that already appears to have roots underway.

**Reader's Score: 15**

**Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources**

**1. The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources to continue the proposed project after the grant period ends. In determining the adequacy of resources and the potential for utility of the proposed project's activities and products by other organizations, the Secretary considers:**

**(1) The extent to which the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance.**

**(2) The extent to which the proposed project is likely to yield findings and products (such as information, materials, processes, or techniques) that may be used by other agencies and organizations.**

**(3) The extent to which the applicant will disseminate information about results and outcomes of the proposed project in ways that will enable others, including the public, to use the information or strategies.**

**Strengths:**

The use of participants as leaders will assist in widespread dissemination of project efforts. The applicant mentions a plan to disseminate nationally and has an established network of dissemination efforts. The transfer of ownership is a strength of this section.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 15**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation****1. The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers:**

- (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.**
- (2) The extent to which the evaluation includes the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data.**
- (3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.**
- (4) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well-implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards without reservations.**

**Note: We encourage applicants to review the following technical assistance resources on evaluation:**

- (1) WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/references/iddocviewer/doc.aspx?docid=19&tocid=1>; and**
- (2) IES/NCEE Technical Methods papers: [http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/tech\\_methods/](http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/tech_methods/).**

**In addition, we encourage applicants to participate in an optional Webinar hosted by the Institute of Education Sciences on March 6, 2015. This Webinar will discuss strategies for designing and executing well-designed Quasi-experimental Design Studies. Applicants interested in participating in this Webinar may find more information at the following Web site: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/event.aspx?sid=37>.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant provides sound research questions that measure both the impact and implementation of this project. This evaluation plan will utilize both qualitative and quantitative data. The plan calls for regular meetings to ensure performance feedback. The applicant has adequately addressed WWC standards without reservations through the use of a randomized control design across treatment sites.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant may consider tying the research questions specifically to the project goals and objectives to more transparently show the alignment.

**Reader's Score: 18**

## Priority Questions

### CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness - CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness

#### 1. Competitive Preference Priority 2: Improving Efficiency (Cost-Effectiveness)

This priority funds projects that will identify strategies for providing cost-effective, high-quality services at the State, regional, or local level by making better use of available resources. Such projects may include innovative and sustainable uses of technology, modification of school schedules and teacher compensation systems, use of Open Educational Resources (as defined in the notice), or other strategies.

**Strengths:**

No strengths noted.

**Weaknesses:**

This was note addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

### CPP3: Promoting STEM Education - CPP3: Promoting STEM Education

#### 1. Competitive Preference Priority 3: Promoting Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Education

(Please only assign a score of either 0 or 2 for this question.)

This priority funds projects that address one or both of the following priority areas:

(a) Increasing the opportunities for high-quality preparation of, or professional development for, teachers of STEM subjects.

(b) Increasing the number of individuals from groups traditionally underrepresented in STEM, including minorities, individuals with disabilities, and women, who are teachers of STEM subjects and have increased opportunities for high-quality preparation or professional development.

In addition, applicants must describe how they plan to measure the impact the proposed project activities have on teacher effectiveness. Applicants must determine teacher effectiveness through a rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation in which performance is differentiated using multiple measures of effectiveness and based in significant part on student growth (as defined in this notice).

**Note:** The Department encourages applicants to provide a thoughtful, in-depth response to the priority area(s) under Competitive Preference Priority 3 to which they are well-suited to respond. Applicants may choose to respond to one or more of the priority areas and are not required to respond to each priority area in order to receive the maximum available points under this competitive preference priority.

**Strengths:**

STEM has been adequately addressed by providing STEM teachers online, content specific support.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 2

**CPP4: High-Need Students - CPP4: High-Need Students**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 4: Supporting High-Need Students**

This priority funds projects that are designed to improve:

- (a) Academic outcomes;
- (b) Learning environments; or
- (c) Both,

For one or more of the following groups of students:

- (i) Students served by Rural Local Educational Agencies.
- (ii) Students with disabilities.
- (iii) English learners.
- (iv) Students in Lowest-performing Schools.
- (v) Students who are living in poverty and are served by schools with high concentrations of students living in poverty.
- (vi) Disconnected Youth or migrant youth.
- (vii) Students who are members of federally recognized Indian tribes.

**Note:** The Department encourages applicants to provide a thoughtful, in-depth response to the priority area(s) under Competitive Preference Priority 4 to which they are well-suited to respond. Applicants may choose to respond to one or more of the priority areas and are not required to respond to each priority area in order to receive the maximum available points under this competitive preference priority.

**Strengths:**

The proposal intended to address high need districts.

**Weaknesses:**

The proposal selects districts and schools that are not necessarily high need and may choose more diverse districts.

Reader's Score: 3

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 06/01/2015 12:13 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 05/29/2015 06:22 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: New Teacher Center (U367D150007)

Reader #2: \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	10	7
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design & Services	35	33
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	20
<b>Adequacy of Resources</b>		
1. Sustainability	15	15
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	18
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	93
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness</b>		
<b>CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness</b>		
1. CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness	1	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	1	0
<b>CPP3: Promoting STEM Education</b>		
<b>CPP3: Promoting STEM Education</b>		
1. CPP3: Promoting STEM ED	2	2
<b>Sub Total</b>	2	2
<b>CPP4: High-Need Students</b>		
<b>CPP4: High-Need Students</b>		
1. CPP4: High-Need Students	4	2
<b>Sub Total</b>	4	2
<b>Total</b>	107	97

# Technical Review Form

Panel #7 - 2015 SEED Peer Review - 7: 84.367D

Reader #2: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: New Teacher Center (U367D150007)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Significance

1. The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project. In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

- (1) The significance of the proposed project on a National Level.
- (2) The potential contribution of the proposed project to the development and advancement of teacher and school leadership theory, knowledge, and practices.
- (3) The importance or magnitude of the results or outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project, especially improvements in teaching and student achievement.

#### Strengths:

The applicant has a history of working with participants on a national stage as evidenced by partnerships in high need urban districts such as Los Angeles, Chicago, and Tampa as well as partnerships with rural districts in Iowa and Wisconsin. (page 8) The applicant clearly demonstrates that this proposed project will continue working with large groups. The proposed project will potentially support 2,700 teachers and 92,000 students in Florida and Texas.

The potential contribution of the proposed project to the development and advancement of teacher theory and practices could be significant. There are currently various models used in instructional coaching with varying degrees of interaction time. The proposed project seeks to determine the factors that influence the effectiveness of instructional coaches as it effects teacher practice and student learning. (page 8) The applicant will implement several coaching models in the two predetermined partner districts. This study could have numerous districts reevaluate the coaching models that they currently have in place.

#### Weaknesses:

The study will be used to determine which "coaching practices will provide greatest leverage in improving teacher effectiveness and what professional development coaches need to be successful." (page 10) It is questionable if the proposed project will likely have a significant national impact based on the small number of school districts being used. The applicant does not clearly describe how the participants will be incorporated in its established network.

Reader's Score: 7

### Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design and services of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design and services of the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

- (1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified, aligned, and measurable.
- (2) The extent to which the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students.

**(3) The extent to which the training or professional development services to be provided by the proposed project will be of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services.**

**(4) The extent to which the proposed project will prepare personnel for fields in which shortages have been demonstrated.**

**(5) The extent to which the proposed project will focus on serving or otherwise addressing the needs of disadvantaged individuals.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant clearly articulates four project goals in the proposed plan. The goals of the proposed project are to increase the effectiveness of participating teachers; student achievement for participant teachers; intensive coaching experiences; and greater capacity for a comprehensive coach based professional development program. The objectives and outcomes are specified and aligned to the goals.

The proposal provides a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning by looking at the variations in instructional coaching methods, interaction time between coaches and teachers, and the effect of professional development of coaches. (page 8-9) These factors have a direct impact on the quality of support given to teachers that could increase the number of effective teachers and retain them in high need schools. If teachers are given solid instructionally focused support and adequate interaction time with coaches, the likelihood that their effectiveness in the classroom increases and students will benefit. The applicant is building on its nearly 20 years of data, research, and program implementation to assist in developing the instructional coach partnerships.

The training and professional development services to be provided by the proposed project clearly demonstrate that it will be of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services. The instructional coaches(IC) participating in the project will receive over 100 hours of training per year in the New Teacher Center (NTC) model. ICs will receive 56 hours of direct professional development support each year in areas such as using formative assessment; supporting effective instruction; coaching and facilitating learning communities; and designing and presenting professional development. The areas of focus should prove beneficial to the ICs as they begin working with teachers in the various tiers of coaching. In addition, the proposed program is prescriptive in the level of support given to the teachers based on their years of experience and professional needs.

The proposed project will prepare personnel for fields in which there are demonstrated shortages. The applicant recognizes the shortage of teachers in the areas of science, math and special education. The applicant chose to work with the two partner LEAs based on the high need populations in which they serve. These partner districts have had high numbers of vacancies in STEM content areas. The applicant refers to research that indicates that retaining high quality teachers in STEM areas and high needs schools will continue to be a problem. By providing teachers in the targeted group with ongoing, meaningful support with an instructional coach, they are less likely to leave the profession. Teachers will receive intensive support based on their years of experience or level of need, such as being new to a school or grade level. (page 19)

The partner LEAs serve students who are economically disadvantaged as evidenced by the 61% qualifying for subsidized meals.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not adequately describe how the proposed plan will provide support to teachers in a manner to reduce attrition.

**Reader's Score: 33**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan**

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project and of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan and the project personnel, the Secretary considers:

(1) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director, key project personnel, and project consultants or subcontractors.

(2) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

(3) The extent to which the proposed management plan includes sufficient and reasonable resources to effectively carry out the proposed project, including the project evaluation.

**Strengths:**

The applicant clearly provides a description of appropriate staff assigned to the project. Key personnel identified to work on the project will include a Project Director, Project Finance Director, Senior Director of Impact, Evaluation Co- Principal Investigators and Senior Program Manager. (Pages 29-31) Personnel identified for this project appear to be qualified and experienced in the areas related to the project design as evidenced on pages 29-31 and the resumes in the appendix.

The applicant outlines a solid management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget. The applicant will rely on its experience in successfully implementing other federal grants such as a previous SEED and i3 grants to ensure that the proposed plan will be sufficiently managed. The proposed plan outlines effective management practices by ensuring that clear communication occurs throughout the project. For example, the SEED Client Lead Forums will meet monthly to “discuss topics related to implementation across sites, deal with issues of contextualization, and plan cross-site learning.” (Page 32) The timeline provided provides a general outline for the tasks to be completed and the staff responsible. The key personnel’s time dedicated to the project, appear to be sufficient for the responsibilities assigned. (Budget narrative, page e111)

The management plan appears to be sufficient and reasonable. The applicant proposes a budget of \$7,800,498 over the life of the grant to work with 2,700 teachers. The proposed management plan includes costs necessary for successful implementation of the plan. The applicant accounts for costs associated for each phase of the plan (start up, operating, and evaluation.) For example, the startup costs listed include data collections systems, alignment of IT systems in the districts and hiring of Lead Coach positions. (Page 35)

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 20**

**Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources**

1. The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources to continue the proposed project after the grant period ends. In determining the adequacy of resources and the potential for utility of the proposed project's activities and products by other organizations, the Secretary considers:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project is likely to yield findings and products (such as information, materials, processes, or techniques) that may be used by other agencies and organizations.

(3) The extent to which the applicant will disseminate information about results and outcomes of the proposed project in ways that will enable others, including the public, to use the information or strategies.

**Strengths:**

The proposed project is designed to build capacity beyond the period of Federal financial assistance. The partnering LEAs will enter into a formal Memoranda of Understanding with the applicant to promote a solid collaborative partnership. The LEAs will also assume the responsibility for the program implementation over time that will also transfer the costs of program incurred by the applicant. (page 36)

The proposed project is likely to yield findings and products that could be used by other agencies and organizations. The applicant will present the project's findings at its annual symposium as well as publish the information in its materials. The applicant has a national network of education partner organizations that has the potential to reach 60,000 people. The applicant outlines its broad plans to disseminate information about the results and outcomes of the proposed project to allow others to use the information and strategies. The applicant lists what it has done in the past to disseminate information. The applicant states that it will develop a dissemination strategy plan for this project to leverage best practices and mentions options such as proposing to build a library of videos archiving high-leverage pieces of this work as examples that may be used within and shared across LEAs focused on building capacity within the district(s).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 15**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation****1. The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers:**

- (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.**
- (2) The extent to which the evaluation includes the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data.**
- (3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.**
- (4) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well-implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards without reservations.**

**Note: We encourage applicants to review the following technical assistance resources on evaluation:**

- (1) WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/references/idocviewer/doc.aspx?docid=19&tocid=1>; and**
- (2) IES/NCEE Technical Methods papers: [http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/tech\\_methods/](http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/tech_methods/).**

**In addition, we encourage applicants to participate in an optional Webinar hosted by the Institute of Education Sciences on March 6, 2015. This Webinar will discuss strategies for designing and executing well-designed Quasi-experimental Design Studies. Applicants interested in participating in this Webinar may find more information at the following Web site: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/event.aspx?sid=37>.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant has demonstrated an adequate approach to ensuring that the evaluation methods are feasible and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project. The applicant will contract with SRI International to conduct an independent evaluation of the proposed project. The proposed evaluation will apply an RCT (randomized controlled trial) design to assess the impact of NTC's comprehensive strategies and processes for the instructional coaching (IC) of new teachers on several outcomes including student achievement. Similar processes will be assessed in this project with identified teachers. (Pages 39-44)

The applicant demonstrates the use of the use of objective performance measures that are related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data. The independent evaluator will collect historical student achievement data (i.e., performance measures) from each district to establish equivalency between treatment and delayed treatment schools at baseline and to control for students' prior achievement, thus producing quantitative data on the project impact. (Pages 40-41) Site visit analysis will produce qualitative data on the project. In winter 2018 (first year implementing the full model), researchers will again visit a sample of 7 schools in each district. The sample will include schools exhibiting promising practices based on the site visits in the prior year, recommendations from coaches/districts, and results from the survey administered in spring 2017 (i.e., performance benchmarks). (Pages 45-47)

The applicant demonstrates how the evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. The independent evaluator for the project will provide formative feedback based on data gathered through surveys, observations, and district- and school-level interviews to inform model refinement. (Page 48) Additionally, the evaluator will participate in monthly calls with each LEA to understand contextual changes and help problem solve and improve processes around evaluation-related issues.

The applicant demonstrates that methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards without reservations. The 2010 Glazerman evaluation of the New Teacher Center (NTC) comprehensive mentoring model fulfills the evidence requirement. The proposed evaluation will apply an RCT (randomized controlled trial) design to assess the impact of NTC's comprehensive strategies and processes for the instructional coaching (IC) of new teachers on several outcomes including student achievement. Similar processes as in the Glazerman evaluation will be assessed in the project with all identified teachers. The WWC single study review of this evaluation determined the study meets WWC evidence standards without reservations. Additionally, the Glazerman study finds a statistically significant favorable impact on student achievement, mathematics, and reading, which is a relevant outcome for the current proposal. The rigorous Glazerman evaluation provides a strong body of evidence that the strategies proposed for this project will show statistically significant favorable impacts on similar outcomes with similar populations. (Pages e15-e16)

#### **Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not specify objective performance measures in a clearly stated manner. An explanation of using student achievement data from previous years as performance measure would help clarify evaluation procedures.

**Reader's Score: 18**

#### **Priority Questions**

##### **CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness - CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness**

##### **1. Competitive Preference Priority 2: Improving Efficiency (Cost-Effectiveness)**

**This priority funds projects that will identify strategies for providing cost-effective, high-quality services at the State, regional, or local level by making better use of available resources. Such projects may include innovative and sustainable uses of technology, modification of school schedules and teacher compensation systems, use of Open Educational Resources (as defined in the notice), or other strategies.**

#### **Strengths:**

The applicant does not address this Competitive Preference Priority.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not address this Competitive Preference Priority.

**Reader's Score: 0**

**CPP3: Promoting STEM Education - CPP3: Promoting STEM Education**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 3: Promoting Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Education**

(Please only assign a score of either 0 or 2 for this question.)

This priority funds projects that address one or both of the following priority areas:

(a) Increasing the opportunities for high-quality preparation of, or professional development for, teachers of STEM subjects.

(b) Increasing the number of individuals from groups traditionally underrepresented in STEM, including minorities, individuals with disabilities, and women, who are teachers of STEM subjects and have increased opportunities for high-quality preparation or professional development.

In addition, applicants must describe how they plan to measure the impact the proposed project activities have on teacher effectiveness. Applicants must determine teacher effectiveness through a rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation in which performance is differentiated using multiple measures of effectiveness and based in significant part on student growth (as defined in this notice).

**Note:** The Department encourages applicants to provide a thoughtful, in-depth response to the priority area(s) under Competitive Preference Priority 3 to which they are well-suited to respond. Applicants may choose to respond to one or more of the priority areas and are not required to respond to each priority area in order to receive the maximum available points under this competitive preference priority.

**Strengths:**

(a)The applicant will provide STEM teachers support through Explorations, a selection of facilitated, content specific, online professional development modules. Over eight-week periods teachers engage in 30 hours of an ongoing asynchronous dialogue that assists them in planning and preparing a lesson, teaching and assessing that lesson, reflecting on the outcome and analyzing next steps.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 2**

**CPP4: High-Need Students - CPP4: High-Need Students**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 4: Supporting High-Need Students**

This priority funds projects that are designed to improve:

- (a) Academic outcomes;
- (b) Learning environments; or
- (c) Both,

For one or more of the following groups of students:

- (i) Students served by Rural Local Educational Agencies.
- (ii) Students with disabilities.
- (iii) English learners.
- (iv) Students in Lowest-performing Schools.
- (v) Students who are living in poverty and are served by schools with high concentrations of students living in poverty.
- (vi) Disconnected Youth or migrant youth.
- (vii) Students who are members of federally recognized Indian tribes.

**Note:** The Department encourages applicants to provide a thoughtful, in-depth response to the priority area(s) under Competitive Preference Priority 4 to which they are well-suited to respond. Applicants may choose to respond to one or more of the priority areas and are not required to respond to each priority area in order to receive the maximum available points under this competitive preference priority.

**Strengths:**

One of the overarching goals will be to increase student achievement by increasing the effectiveness of the teachers and coaches who serve the schools in the targeted districts.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not explicitly describe demographics for the schools it will be working with. Although the demographics for the district appear to be high needs, the various schools may not have as high of a percentage of high needs youth.

**Reader's Score:** 2

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 05/29/2015 06:22 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 05/27/2015 07:46 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: New Teacher Center (U367D150007)

Reader #3: \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	10	6
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design & Services	35	30
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	15
<b>Adequacy of Resources</b>		
1. Sustainability	15	15
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	18
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	84
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness</b>		
<b>CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness</b>		
1. CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness	1	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	1	0
<b>CPP3: Promoting STEM Education</b>		
<b>CPP3: Promoting STEM Education</b>		
1. CPP3: Promoting STEM ED	2	2
<b>Sub Total</b>	2	2
<b>CPP4: High-Need Students</b>		
<b>CPP4: High-Need Students</b>		
1. CPP4: High-Need Students	4	3
<b>Sub Total</b>	4	3
<b>Total</b>	107	89

# Technical Review Form

Panel #7 - 2015 SEED Peer Review - 7: 84.367D

Reader #3: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: New Teacher Center (U367D150007)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Significance

1. The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project. In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

- (1) The significance of the proposed project on a National Level.
- (2) The potential contribution of the proposed project to the development and advancement of teacher and school leadership theory, knowledge, and practices.
- (3) The importance or magnitude of the results or outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project, especially improvements in teaching and student achievement.

#### Strengths:

The proposal is interesting in its focus on instructional coaching. The abstract indicates that the NTC will "validate its innovative, research-based, full-release IC model," although the specific model is not presented, especially in that it could be a useful contrast and complement to what is already established. The focus of the proposal is on the professional development of coaches, and the coaching model presented is intended to be contrasted to traditional professional development (p.3).

#### Weaknesses:

The New Teacher Center will focus on a high-need district in Texas and in Florida, and while it already serves a national base of urban and rural sites, it is not clear how the new sites will benefit from and/or be networked into these other sites in order for the proposal to claim national significance. P. 17 mentions the National Teacher Coaching Network, but it is not clear how the named districts are to be woven into this group (the other possibility, given page 15-16, is that the districts are already part of this NTCN, in which case it is not clear what exactly is new – and therefore nationally significant - about what is being proposed).

The proposal states (p. 9) that this is insufficient clarity around the role of instructional coach. It would be helpful to know more about the specific coaching model that is being promoted. Based on the description on P 10, it appears that this is a proposal more to research the components of an effective Instructional Coaching model than to promote one. It would be helpful to articulate "coaching support" p. 12 in terms of instructional focus/"academic press."

Reader's Score: 6

### Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design and services of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design and services of the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

- (1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are

clearly specified, aligned, and measurable.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students.

(3) The extent to which the training or professional development services to be provided by the proposed project will be of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project will prepare personnel for fields in which shortages have been demonstrated.

(5) The extent to which the proposed project will focus on serving or otherwise addressing the needs of disadvantaged individuals.

**Strengths:**

The goals for the two target districts are aligned with FL and TX standards.

The description of the Coach PLS professional development curriculum (p. 22-26) provides a comprehensive model for coach development that is integrated with school leadership. The use of the Formative Assessment and Support system gives coaches useful tools for capturing teacher practice and student responses for teacher reflection and growth.

The NTC Learning Zone and 30 hours/asynchronous model for online teacher learning, and the face-to-face structures for professional development, are significant opportunities for sustained quality teacher development.

Targeted school districts are identified as being high-need.

**Weaknesses:**

The goals and objectives listed outline methods of evaluating the effectiveness of the NTC coaching model rather than explaining the project's design for offering the coaching at the specific sites. Given that (p. 15) Austin has been partnering with NTC since 2008, and Volusia has been involved since 2011-2012, it is not clear that these are new efforts for comprehensive support. It would be helpful to know what impact NTC has already had in these districts, and how this proposal builds on those successes or institutional learning. It is not clear why there would need to be a pre-assessment (p. 17).

Claims for reducing teacher turnover in the specific districts could be better supported. The 2007 Carnegie study is not specifically describing NTC-supported schools and is only general in its support of "planning and collaboration." It would also be useful to understand the turnover rate in the specified school district partners with more detail (for instance, describing the percentages of teacher turnover in key areas, and whether there are issues with finding qualified replacements).

**Reader's Score: 30**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan**

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project and of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan and the project personnel, the Secretary considers:

(1) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director, key project personnel, and project consultants or subcontractors.

(2) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

(3) The extent to which the proposed management plan includes sufficient and reasonable resources to effectively carry out the proposed project, including the project evaluation.

**Strengths:**

The management team at NTC is qualified and new personnel/specifically assigned personnel appear able to manage the additional work represented by this project, particularly in coordinating the evaluation work and the partnership with the external partnerships. The NTC has already received i3 Validation and SEED funding.

The responsibilities and activities in the timeline provided on page 33-34 indicate a clear distribution of responsibilities.

**Weaknesses:**

Clarity is needed in the proposal for the timing and use of start-up costs associated with this project. The NTC is already working with the two districts identified, and the work (MOU agreements and identification of partners) for "start up" seems as if it would already be in place.

**Reader's Score:** 15

**Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources**

**1. The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources to continue the proposed project after the grant period ends. In determining the adequacy of resources and the potential for utility of the proposed project's activities and products by other organizations, the Secretary considers:**

**(1) The extent to which the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance.**

**(2) The extent to which the proposed project is likely to yield findings and products (such as information, materials, processes, or techniques) that may be used by other agencies and organizations.**

**(3) The extent to which the applicant will disseminate information about results and outcomes of the proposed project in ways that will enable others, including the public, to use the information or strategies.**

**Strengths:**

The proposal describes a transfer of ownership (p. 36) and the model is explicitly focused toward reduction of services in the shared program.

Planned dissemination – p. 37 conferences, etc., will share outcomes and findings.

The strategic plans for press/media out reach are smart and should be effective (p. 38).

**Weaknesses:**

none

**Reader's Score:** 15

## Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers:

- (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.
- (2) The extent to which the evaluation includes the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data.
- (3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.
- (4) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well-implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards without reservations.

**Note:** We encourage applicants to review the following technical assistance resources on evaluation:

- (1) WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/references/iddocviewer/doc.aspx?docid=19&tocid=1>; and
- (2) IES/NCEE Technical Methods papers: [http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/tech\\_methods/](http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/tech_methods/).

In addition, we encourage applicants to participate in an optional Webinar hosted by the Institute of Education Sciences on March 6, 2015. This Webinar will discuss strategies for designing and executing well-designed Quasi-experimental Design Studies. Applicants interested in participating in this Webinar may find more information at the following Web site: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/event.aspx?sid=37>.

### Strengths:

Evaluation methodology is thorough and feasible.

Extensive and appropriate qualitative and quantitative data will be generated and evaluated.

In terms of meeting WWC evidence standards, the description of random assignment and delayed treatment could result in meeting WWC without reservations, especially for teacher outcomes (p.42) looking at both survey and classroom observation data.

Evaluation of impact (teachers/students) is clearly designed.

### Weaknesses:

The planned measurement of the implementation of the coaching model needs to be more fully specified. The applicant intends to track teacher participation but needs to be more clear about which objectives or goals are being pursued (p. 39)

The implementation studies planned in the proposal will allow SRI to give useful feedback to NTC at the national level; however, the mechanisms for utilizing the information at the district level are not well identified.

**Reader's Score:** 18

## Priority Questions

### CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness - CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2: Improving Efficiency (Cost-Effectiveness)

This priority funds projects that will identify strategies for providing cost-effective, high-quality services at the State, regional, or local level by making better use of available resources. Such projects

may include innovative and sustainable uses of technology, modification of school schedules and teacher compensation systems, use of Open Educational Resources (as defined in the notice), or other strategies.

**Strengths:**

Not addressed.

**Weaknesses:**

Not addressed.

**Reader's Score: 0**

**CPP3: Promoting STEM Education - CPP3: Promoting STEM Education**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 3: Promoting Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Education**

(Please only assign a score of either 0 or 2 for this question.)

This priority funds projects that address one or both of the following priority areas:

(a) Increasing the opportunities for high-quality preparation of, or professional development for, teachers of STEM subjects.

(b) Increasing the number of individuals from groups traditionally underrepresented in STEM, including minorities, individuals with disabilities, and women, who are teachers of STEM subjects and have increased opportunities for high-quality preparation or professional development.

In addition, applicants must describe how they plan to measure the impact the proposed project activities have on teacher effectiveness. Applicants must determine teacher effectiveness through a rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation in which performance is differentiated using multiple measures of effectiveness and based in significant part on student growth (as defined in this notice).

**Note:** The Department encourages applicants to provide a thoughtful, in-depth response to the priority area(s) under Competitive Preference Priority 3 to which they are well-suited to respond. Applicants may choose to respond to one or more of the priority areas and are not required to respond to each priority area in order to receive the maximum available points under this competitive preference priority.

**Strengths:**

The application includes the use of an "Explorations" model which is specifically focused on STEM through scientific inquiry.

**Weaknesses:**

None.

**Reader's Score: 2**

**CPP4: High-Need Students - CPP4: High-Need Students**

## 1. Competitive Preference Priority 4: Supporting High-Need Students

This priority funds projects that are designed to improve:

- (a) Academic outcomes;
- (b) Learning environments; or
- (c) Both,

For one or more of the following groups of students:

- (i) Students served by Rural Local Educational Agencies.
- (ii) Students with disabilities.
- (iii) English learners.
- (iv) Students in Lowest-performing Schools.
- (v) Students who are living in poverty and are served by schools with high concentrations of students living in poverty.
- (vi) Disconnected Youth or migrant youth.
- (vii) Students who are members of federally recognized Indian tribes.

**Note:** The Department encourages applicants to provide a thoughtful, in-depth response to the priority area(s) under Competitive Preference Priority 4 to which they are well-suited to respond. Applicants may choose to respond to one or more of the priority areas and are not required to respond to each priority area in order to receive the maximum available points under this competitive preference priority.

### Strengths:

Efficiency and effectiveness in delivery of professional development of coaches is the clear intent of the project, and high-need schools and students will benefit.

### Weaknesses:

Both school systems appear to have schools that are NOT high-need – it would be useful to better understand how these districts compare to elsewhere in their respective states.

**Reader's Score:** 3

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 05/27/2015 07:46 PM