

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

Status: Submitted

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

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Urban Teacher Residency United, Inc. (U367D150016)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	10	8
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design & Services	35	30
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	19
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Sustainability	15	12
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	17
Priority Questions		
CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness		
CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness		
1. CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness	1	1
CPP3: Promoting STEM Education		
CPP3: Promoting STEM Education		
1. CPP3: Promoting STEM ED	2	2
CPP4: High-Need Students		
CPP4: High-Need Students		
1. CPP4: High-Need Students	4	4
Total	107	93

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - 2015 SEED Peer Review - 2: 84.367D

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Urban Teacher Residency United, Inc. (U367D150016)

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 long-standing coalition of urban teachers' programs is a strength of this proposal and demonstrates that this project can have a national impact. The new sites identified cover a wide array of cities and demographics.

The retention of teachers is an important topic and a project such as this is likely to yield significant outcomes.

Weaknesses:

More information should have been provided on the basis of the teacher and school leadership theory, knowledge, and practices to determine what contribution this may have. The applicant states that they have recently launched a research and evaluation department but no link is made between what research has found and their preparation manual. There are concerns about the mention of charter schools without indicating what research may have found to support the use of charter schools in this expansion.

More explicit information on how this project will be used to guide teacher and student achievement would have strengthened this section of the proposal.

Reader's Score: 8

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 overall goals of this project are important and relevant and the objectives are aligned to each goal. The proposed project is part of a larger, comprehensive effort to improve teacher quality and retention. The institutes and residency components are strengths of this project. The duration of the proposed model is sufficient to improve practice. The number of perservice teachers targeted is appropriate and should have an impact on fields with shortages and the diversity of the teaching force.

Weaknesses:

The objectives, while linked to the goals, are not specific, and often not measurable. For example, it is unclear how the applicant can measure partners' commitment to all elements of the program (p. 23, 25). While institutes and symposiums can be a useful training tool, if the focus is on preparing teachers to be retained and successful in high-need urban settings, more practical training experiences may be considered. Additionally, more detail about the context of the trainings would have been useful to gauge the quality of the proposed services, particularly at the six sites. It is not clear upon which principles, theories, best practices, or research these trainings are based.

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:

Key personnel and consultants appear to be adequate and have necessary qualifications. This project has a sound and clear management plan that should allow the applicant to achieve the desired objectives on time. The resources available for the project and its evaluation are sufficient and reasonable.

Weaknesses:

The management plan would be improved by identifying milestones to show how each objective will be achieved. This is particularly important for the objectives that are not as clear or measurable.

Reader's Score: 19

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 applicant has demonstrated capacity beyond the federal funding for Kansas City. The resource library should exist beyond the scope of this project.

Weaknesses:

It is not as clear how this project will be sustainable beyond federal funding in St. Paul or UTPB. Since 2/3 of the proposed sites have not been identified, the sustainability of these sites cannot be evaluated. A more detailed plan for sustaining the resources beyond the funding and beyond the partners would have strengthened this proposal.

Reader's Score: 12

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/.

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:

Data sources include multiple sources such as surveys, interviews, and extant data. Table 4 asks appropriate research questions to measure the goals of the project. An appropriate use of qualitative and quantitative data are described. On page 57 the applicant makes a case for ongoing feedback during the evaluation process. The applicant states that they will use random assignment for evaluation whenever possible.

Weaknesses:

Although appropriate research questions are asked, it is not clear how these will be measured through the sources identified, many of which will be self-reported surveys and interviews. More information on the Power Standards rubric would have strengthened this section. The applicant has not fully addressed the WWC standards as they do not have a clear plan for randomized experiments.

Reader's Score: 17

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 proposal prevents costs associated with teacher attrition through the mentoring program.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 1

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 educators will be involved. Expertise in the Next Generation Science Standards was considered in the proposal.

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 applicant adequately addressed supporting high need students.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 4

Status: Submitted

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 05/31/2015 04:40 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Urban Teacher Residency United, Inc. (U367D150016)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	10	10
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design & Services	35	35
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	20
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Sustainability	15	15
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	18
Priority Questions		
CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness		
CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness		
1. CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness	1	0
CPP3: Promoting STEM Education		
CPP3: Promoting STEM Education		
1. CPP3: Promoting STEM ED	2	2
CPP4: High-Need Students		
CPP4: High-Need Students		
1. CPP4: High-Need Students	4	4
Total	107	104

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - 2015 SEED Peer Review - 2: 84.367D

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Urban Teacher Residency United, Inc. (U367D150016)

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 identifies and substantiates the demand for models and implementation support for teacher residency programs as an effective practice to induct, support and sustain new teacher hires. The areas addressed in the residency include Mathematics and ESL teachers, diverse applicants, and focus on high-poverty, low achieving schools. URTU implemented a model that has evolved to be a performance-based and effectiveness-driven, aligned to the standards movement, using best practices in data literacy, and incorporated rigorous assessment of student and teacher performance. (p. e28) Residencies have been identified as a promising innovation by multiple national agencies and groups.

Currently this applicant identifies itself as the only nonprofit devoted to “ensuring the quality, sustainability and expansion of residencies throughout the country.” The findings from this project and their past work will inform teacher and leadership development theory, knowledge and practices. The application provides numerous examples of the experience and success from the current residency programs that serve as key drivers in the teacher effectiveness movement with proven results in retaining teachers and improving student achievement.

The applicant will launch the initiative with the publication of Clinically Oriented Teacher Preparation, “the first study in the nation that curates promising practices in clinical preparation in traditional and alternative settings.” (p. e30) Using the findings in the current residency program, the addition of residency sites identified in the project, and evaluation of the initiative, the knowledge base around what works in teacher preparation and retention efforts will be valuable to the national teacher education efforts.

The applicant will add nine high quality programs with up to 450 newly prepared effective teachers, and up to 450 additional trained mentors to serve urban and rural districts with both public and charter schools. They describe the project impact of 117,000 students in the Redefining Preparation project as “monumental.”

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses seen.

Reader's Score: 10

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 identifies and explains the goals, objectives, and outcomes in the Redefining Preparation project. A table is provided on page 339 that details the project goals and objectives. They list four goals and include multiple objectives and outcomes for each goal. The goals are aligned to the project significance and are measurable.

Using their experience and lessons learned in the New Site Development Program (NDSP), the applicant details the plans for their project. Working with teams from the three initial sites selected for year one, a series of institutes will be held to support each site in their creation of the critical framework for the project. The institutes allow time for the site teams to develop, share, and receive feedback on the essential program documents, guidelines and framework of their residency program. The design allows districts to focus on their unique needs rather than a cookie cutter model. While each site will look a little different, the framework is clearly identified in the narrative accompanied with support from past success.

The applicant clearly details five institutes that will focus on vision, partnerships, assessment and evaluation, core components of the residency model, new site development program, recruitment and selection of effective residents, mentors and training sites, design of the residency year curriculum, and assessment of program readiness to launch. The details provided on each of these institutes shows thorough, insightful and critical elements of the roll out of this project. Institute designs for year two and site support for year three of the project are also included, demonstrating forward thinking, preparedness, and understanding of the needs of this implementation. This reviewer is very impressed with the level of detail and specificity provided for the project and the clarity of the proposal.

The applicant will be invited to join the Next Generation Network once they have completed the program objectives. The network is involved in a movement that proves and promotes the efficacy of the residency model nationally and with policy and decision makers. The network provides dynamic and responsive programming to the needs of their members, specifically identifying robust advocacy and marketing to create sustainability of teacher residency programs, developing and tracking promising practices from the field and policy landscape, create network members who prioritize knowledge creation, acquisition, and sharing.

Identification of the Critical Learning Initiative and development of a resource library demonstrate a commitment to supporting and expanding the information around teacher residencies as a critical model that can transform teacher induction and success in high needs and low achieving urban areas.. Programs outside of the UTRU network are taking advantage of the resources and sharing of knowledge of best practices for this type of preparation, making their findings and resources available beyond the network.

The applicant identifies the residency model was created to serve the district, address teacher shortages and/or quality concerns in areas of highest need, prepare teachers for hard-to-fill teaching areas, and designed based on district's needs assessments. Initial implementation and support beyond the project completion demonstrate the applicant's commitment to the results for the partners in the project. Resources to support and sustain the project are clearly identified which will set the stage for longer retention and increased efficacy. Participants in the program often become mentor teachers as they become master teachers and even move into leadership positions with a strong understanding of effective teacher

behavior and practice.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses seen.

Reader's Score: 35

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 project has highly qualified personnel from UTRU, American Institutes for Research (AIR), and the partnering residency programs. Expertise in residency programs, partner senior district leadership, and evaluators of the project are developing the staffing structure of the project. The chart on page e50 clearly summarizes the qualification of key personnel, the responsibilities they have for the project, and their relevant qualifications. UTRU also identifies "several ambitions externally funded projects which support the project plan and align with the goals and outcomes of the Redefining Preparation initiative.

An extensive and complete management plan is included in Table 3 that identifies each goal and spells out the year one, two, and three activities as well as the persons responsible to implement the activities. The detail clearly demonstrates an understanding of the resources, personnel, and partners required to successfully implement the project.

The applicant has selected AIR as an expert consultant in the design and evaluator of the residency program. Information is shared about the knowledge of educator effectiveness reform by the AIR team as well as AIR's experience in mixed-methods educational residency valuations in URTR's network.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses seen.

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 applicant builds upon research showing “clinically-based, cohort model of teacher development fosters increased collaborative learning and teacher satisfaction with in turn leads to increased retention levels.” (p. e59) The effectiveness of the UTRU programs has attracted the interest of numerous foundations and external entities who are able to provide funding beyond the grant to sustain the effort. Partners are identified in the proposal for each site.

From the beginning of their involvement and interest in the teacher residency model, UTRU demonstrates and has been committed to codifying the model and standards of quality, sharing best practices among partners and beyond, and consulting with organization to provide shared learning. The results of this project will inform research, provide video of effective residency practices, and potentially drive and improve student achievement.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses seen.

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/.

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 identifies AIR as the evaluator and a multiple-methods evaluation design will be used. The goal is to provide the partner sites and UTRU both formative and summative feedback about the implantation and impact of the programs. Extensive use of surveys and interview methods will occur as well as extant analysis to answer the research questions. Extant data will include: human resources data, program data, student achievement data, and where available, teacher effectiveness data.

The evaluation plan looks to capture perspectives of the program participants and partners throughout the project.

Student achievement data will be utilized in the evaluation as well as human resource data to understand the impact of the program.

A clear picture of the research questions and data sources is provided in Table 3 on page e67. The chart looks at the questions from stakeholder perspectives, implementation and teacher and student outcomes. The survey, interview and extant data will be analyzed using the Rasch model for ordered categories in order to create scale scores. The team will later disaggregate the results by teacher and principal characteristics.

Weaknesses:

The evaluation plan is not a random control trial methodology.

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 did not address this priority.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not address this 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:

This project will prepare personnel for fields in which shortages have been demonstrated, primarily math and science at their partner sites. Site plans include training early career scientists and mathematician, bilingual educators to teach secondary STEM and bilingual content, recruiting diverse teachers from underrepresented populations to serve in high-needs schools.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses seen.

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 applicants identified their target sites as schools serving high-needs, high-poverty families, and English learners. The recruitment of new teachers into the residency program will place the residents in these schools with strong support from the project over the first three years of their teaching.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses seen.

Reader's Score: 4

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 05/31/2015 04:40 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/01/2015 06:02 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Urban Teacher Residency United, Inc. (U367D150016)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	10	10
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design & Services	35	30
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	19
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Sustainability	15	13
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	19
Priority Questions		
CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness		
CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness		
1. CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness	1	1
CPP3: Promoting STEM Education		
CPP3: Promoting STEM Education		
1. CPP3: Promoting STEM ED	2	2
CPP4: High-Need Students		
CPP4: High-Need Students		
1. CPP4: High-Need Students	4	4
Total	107	98

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - 2015 SEED Peer Review - 2: 84.367D

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Urban Teacher Residency United, Inc. (U367D150016)

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 Urban Teacher Residency United proposal demonstrates a strong national significance to advancing the communities understanding about school based teacher preparation (e27). The strong foundation of existing research on the cohort and job-embedded model is clearly articulated (e22-e26), and the proposal seeks to articulate specific implementation models that would allow for advancement in teacher preparation theory, knowledge and practices. The inclusion of public and charter schools in the St. Paul Public Schools expands the model beyond current implementation efforts. Additionally, the partnership with University of Texas of the Permian Basin takes the cohort residency to a Hispanic-serving institution, broadening the research base associated with this model. The proposal demonstrates a clear intent to improve teacher effectiveness through targeting teacher preparation, demonstrating a strong importance to building an increased understanding and implementation of this model in new communities to broaden the research base for the national community. The Urban Teacher Residency presents a comprehensive approach to improving our understanding of developing teacher effectiveness starting at teacher preparation, and would be a benefit to the community.

Weaknesses:

There were no weaknesses noted in the proposal in regards to significance.

Reader's Score: 10

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 Urban Teacher Residency United proposal presents a clear set of goals (e18-e20) for the improvement of teacher efficacy through teacher preparation residency model implementation. The proposal outlines goals and further details in relation to specific objectives and outcomes (e39-e41) that demonstrate strong specificity and alignment. The majority of the outcomes are based on achievement of set numbers of educators completing the residency program within the scope of the sites defined with the proposal. The proposal presents a clear data set associated with the needs associated with the three existing partner sites demonstrating shortages of highly-qualified educators and the impact it has on the high-needs populations within those communities (e45-e49). The data set is comprehensive, addressing needs for both students and teachers with bilingual skills and strong STEM learning backgrounds.

Weaknesses:

The proposal would have benefited from the inclusion of a more detailed timeline (such as the inclusion of a proposed timeline similar to the e477-e481 model presented for the October 2014 project launch included in appendices) beyond the timeline outcome in figure 2 (e37). The alignment of a specific project timeline associated with the goals and objectives would strengthen the proposal to translate the goals into actionable steps and demonstrate capacity to deliver on those services throughout the project in addition to the final outcomes.

In addition, it would be helpful to have additional details around the six residency programs to be established in years 2 and 3 of the proposal. The challenge with not having those sites identified at the time of proposal, it makes it challenging to see how the sites will extend the learning of the residency program to meet the needs of additional communities and/or how those sites will be partners to the existing partners identified in Texas, Kansas City, and St. Paul. Without those sites identified, it is also challenging to see how the programming will address shortages and needs of disadvantaged individuals specific to those sites.

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:

This proposal presents a comprehensive management team (e50-e51) that demonstrates expertise in teacher residency, specific STEM-based learning for K-12 education, and evaluation needs for the proposal. The management team also identifies partners at the existing site partners for year one, demonstrating infrastructure for the implementation of this grant for the first three sites. The inclusion of the partners from Texas, Kansas City, and St. Paul is to be applauded for the inclusion of partners in design and leadership of the overall project. The management plan has a clear set of objectives aligned to the goals of the project, with specific personnel roles identified within the plan (e54-e57). The inclusion of MOU's with the specific partners and Urban Teacher Residency United is a thoughtful effort to codify the partnership and expectations for laying the foundation for positive outcomes (e58). The proposal demonstrates sufficient and reasonable resources to be able to effectively carry out the proposed project, including the project evaluation.

Weaknesses:

The management plan provides objectives specific to goals on a yearly timeline. It would be helpful to see those objectives and timelines include more detail about incremental objectives within the year of implementation to provide additional evidence of planning associated with the delivery of this particular proposal.

Reader's Score: 19

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 project details a clear plan for sustainability in two of the three sites identified as partners for year one of the teacher residency proposal. The Kansas City residency site has engaged partners with the Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation to provide initial funding and provide community contacts for future commitments to the residency site (e60). The Texas residency site also has additional funding sources through grants already in place with the institution specific to teacher preparation and attracting high quality talent (e62). The St. Paul public schools program is still working on developing the strong partnerships for sustainability (e61), with commitment from Urban Teacher Residency United to help them establish those relationships. The proposal clearly identifies deliverables associated with a video library of classroom instructional practices, engagement with policymakers through the creation of white papers, and quarterly press releases associated with findings (e63).

Weaknesses:

The concerns for this proposal exist for sustainability of the six partners that have not yet been identified. The evaluation of the sustainable nature of those sites is not possible at this time, making it challenging to speak to the sustainable nature of the proposal for two-thirds of the proposed sites. Additionally, it was unclear if the video resource library (e63) that was being created would be shared with the larger community as an open education resource, or whether the intent was to only make it available to partners within the residency network. Clarity around the intent of availability of this and other resources produced by the project would be helpful. Finally, it would be helpful to see dissemination plans specific to community presentations and engagement in conferences and journals to increase the spread of outcomes associated with the project and increase replication potential. The proposal included previous research article outcomes, but there was not a specific articulation of plans for a similar effort around this research.

Reader's Score: 13

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/.

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:

This proposal meets the What Works Clearinghouse Design Standards with Reservations. The use of multiple sites and large sample sizes is a benefit to the research associated with each site to inform the outcomes of the project. The research includes survey data from multiple stakeholders (e64-e65) to inform both the outcomes as well as the implementation process for the partner sites. The project states it will use propensity-score matching (e70) to gather outcomes specific to the implementation of the program. The proposal details a comprehensive approach by an external evaluation partner (AIR), and details the process for producing data sets specific to the teacher residency model to inform the community.

Weaknesses:

It would be helpful to see the tools associated with the surveys proposed for the teacher self-evaluation to determine the efficacy and appropriateness of the evaluation relative to the outcomes. This proposal meets the What Works Clearinghouse Design Standards with Reservations, as it does not have a group membership that is determined by a randomized process.

Reader's Score: 19

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 proposal addresses improving efficiency through the cost-savings associated with retaining teachers in the school/district and preventing costs associated with teacher attrition that cause district costs for retraining and mentoring. The proposal successfully addresses this priority and receives full points for this competitive preference.

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses noted in regards to competitive preference priority for efficiency.

Reader's Score: 1

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 proposal addresses the focus on STEM fields for selection of educators to be involved in the teacher residency program at the sites identified. Additionally, the project management team includes individuals with expertise in Next Generation Science Standards and other STEM related standards and curriculum. The proposal clearly meets the objectives states in the competitive preference priority.

Weaknesses:

There were no weaknesses identified for this aspect of the proposal.

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 presents a clear data set associated with the needs associated with the three existing partner sites demonstrating shortages of highly-qualified educators and the impact it has on the high-needs populations within those communities (e45-e49). The data set is comprehensive, addressing needs for both students and teachers with bilingual skills and strong STEM learning backgrounds.

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses associated with this element of the proposal.

Reader's Score: **4**

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/01/2015 06:02 PM