

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/14/2014 12:13 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Boston Plan for Excellence in the Public School Foundation (U336S140088)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	15	15
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	45	43
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	19
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	17
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
<b>Promoting STEM Education</b>		
1. CPP 1	5	5
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
<b>Implementing Academic Standards</b>		
1. CPP 2	2	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>101</b>

# Technical Review Form

Panel #10 - 2014 TQP Grant Review- 10: 84.336S

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

Applicant: Boston Plan for Excellence in the Public School Foundation (U336S140088)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Significance

1. 1) The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project.
- 2) In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:
  - i) The extent to which the proposed project is likely to build local capacity to provide, improve, or expand services that address the needs of the target population.
  - ii) The likelihood that the proposed project will result in system change or improvement.
  - iii) The extent to which the proposed project will prepare personnel for fields in which shortages have been demonstrated.

### Strengths:

This project is attempting to meet growing human capital needs in Boston. LEA partner schools are fairly new but showing student achievement gains. LEAs have aggressive expansion plans and will need hundreds of new teachers in the next five years. Target student population's demographics are presented; they are majority African American, Latino, and receive FRPL.

The applicant is working on a teacher pipeline. Successful results from earlier TQP grant are provided around teacher diversity, retention, student achievement, etc., to show the project's impact. The applicant is concentrating its efforts in autonomous schools to support and build coherence in the model. Teacher induction is differentiated.

The applicant articulates clear theoretical principles and approach of courses that support mathematics, EL, and science teaching and learning. Applicant is targeting STEM teachers of color.

### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses

Reader's Score: 15

### Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

- 1) The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project.
- 2) In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the extent to which the proposed project consists of a comprehensive plan that includes a description of:
  - i) The extent to which the proposed project is supported by strong theory (as defined in this notice).
  - ii) The extent to which the training or professional development services to be provided by the proposed project are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice

among the recipients of those services.

iii) The extent to which the proposed activities constitute a coherent, sustained program of training in the field.

iv) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services.

v) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates that it has the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the grant, including a multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan; the demonstrated commitment of any partners; evidence of broad support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers unions) critical to the project's long-term success; or more than one of these types of evidence.

**Note:** In order to address this criterion, applicants are encouraged to develop logic models to demonstrate their project's theory of action. Applicants should connect available evidence of past history of successful outcomes to their logic models. Applicants may use resources such as the Pacific Education Laboratory's Education Logic Model Application ([www.relpacific.mcrel.org/PERR.html](http://www.relpacific.mcrel.org/PERR.html)) or the Northeast and Islands REL Skill Builder Workshops ([www.relnei.org/events/skill-builder-archive.html](http://www.relnei.org/events/skill-builder-archive.html)) to help design their logic models. In addressing this criterion, applicants are also encouraged to connect the project design to the intended impact of the project, including an explanation of how the project will affect the preparation, placement, retention, induction, and professional development of teachers, and ultimately student achievement. Finally, applicants are encouraged to discuss the role and commitment of each partner and how the IHE and LEA(s) plan to sustain their partnership beyond the life of the grant.

#### **Strengths:**

The applicant provides a clear and actionable theory of action: "If autonomous schools hire and retain diverse teachers who have the skills and dispositions that Network residency programs develop in their residents, and organize them well into a coherent instructional system, high-need students (regardless of special education status or English language development level) will thrive, demonstrating gains in achievement."

A tremendous amount of research (e.g., Bryk) is presented that support the applicant's theory of action and project design. The applicant also cites the success of its earlier efforts, along with outcomes relative to the teacher residents, as well as students. A logic model with specific activities, inputs, outputs, and outcomes is provided. It is clear that the applicant and its partners have thought through components of their program and aligned each component to outcomes. Activities are coherent and appropriate for the target teaching and student population. For example, the applicant describes in detail the rigorous performance assessments for residents, the roles and responsibilities for clinical teacher educators, the recruitment and selection process, coaching and feedback for residents, and collaborative professional practices. There is coherence and alignment in the project design with rubrics, coursework, coaching, and performance assessments.

Applicant plans to provide annual stipends for residents, as well as for mentor teachers, and there is a rigorous selection process for mentor teachers, who also receive training and professional development.

This project illustrates strategic partnering of an IHE with autonomous charter schools. The roles of partners are clearly outlined. There is commitment to raising matching funds to sustain the project beyond the life of the grant. UMass Boston has already committed \$2M.

#### **Weaknesses:**

The applicant could have provided a more detailed description of the professional development activities for residents and their mentor teachers.

Reader's Score: 43

### Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. 1) The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project.

2) In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

i) 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.

ii) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.

iii) The extent to which performance feedback and continuous improvement are integral to the design of the proposed project.

**Note:** In order to address this criterion, applicants are encouraged to include in the application narrative a clear, well thought-out implementation plan that includes annual timelines, key project milestones, and a schedule of activities with sufficient time for developing an adequate implementation plan, as well as a description and qualifications of the personnel who would be responsible for each activity and the level of effort each activity entails. Applicants may also describe how the partnering organizations will communicate and coordinate in order to achieve project goals.

#### Strengths:

The applicant provides detailed key annual milestones with related tasks, timelines, and responsible parties. BPE has experience managing grants and has successfully managed several high-impact federal grants, including Transition to Teaching, Investing in Innovation, and Teacher Quality Partnership grants.

The project has a steering committee with leads and representatives from each partner. Personnel have qualifications, and include both management and research consultants, like [REDACTED].

Applicant will generate feedback through surveys and focus groups with residents, principals, graduates, and students, as well as data from residents' performance and student achievement. Structured communication is built into the project through monthly convening of all partners.

#### Weaknesses:

It is unclear why the Network needs a "planning year."

Reader's Score: 19

### Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. 1) The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project.

2) In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers:

i) The extent to which the methods of evaluation provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes.

**Note:** In response to this selection factor, applicants are encouraged to include data on student learning.

ii) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.

iii) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

**Note:** In addressing this criterion, applicants are encouraged to include a plan for how the project's evaluation will address the TQP Grant Program performance measures established by the Department under the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (GPRA), as well as the measures established in section 204(a) of the HEA. (The specific performance measures established for the overall TQP Grant Program are discussed under Performance Measures in section VI of this notice.) Further, applicants are encouraged to describe how the applicant's evaluation plan will be designed to collect both output data and outcome data, including benchmarks, to monitor progress. Finally, each applicant is encouraged to select an independent, objective evaluator who has experience in evaluating educational programs and who will play an active role in the design and implementation of the project's evaluation.

**Strengths:**

Applicant presents long-term (quasi-experimental and VAM) and formative progress monitoring (TQP performance measures) evaluation plans.

Method of evaluation includes non-experimental qualitative measures like surveys, in addition to the quantitative exam pass rates, job placement, and retention. The applicant outlines its performance targets, data sources, and external evaluator to assist with evaluation. In order to conduct the long-term outcomes study utilizing data from Boston Public Schools and/or the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, the applicant plans to contract with an external evaluator like the Harvard's Center for Education Policy Research, which has extensive experience in partnering with districts, foundations, and IHEs to conduct large scale studies.

**Weaknesses:**

Not all teachers will have VAM scores given their grade level, subject matter, and student population. Experts in the field are backtracking now about the validity and reliability of VAM. The applicant could conceptualize the impact of its teacher residents broadly and consider using other student outcomes to determine teacher resident effectiveness.

**Reader's Score:** 17

**Priority Questions**

**Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Promoting STEM Education**

1. Projects that are designed to address one or both of the following priority areas:

a) Increasing the opportunities for high-quality preparation of, or professional development for, teachers or other educators 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 or educators of STEM subjects and have increased opportunities for high-quality preparation or professional development.

**Note:** Applicants that respond to Competitive Preference Priority 1 and Absolute Priority 1 are still required to implement the required reforms within the whole teacher preparation program, as reflected in sections (a) and (b) of Absolute Priority 1.

In responding to this competitive preference priority, applicants are encouraged to include the following elements in their proposed projects:

1) Institutional collaboration to ensure that students in a college of education who intend to teach STEM

courses have access to courses that build appropriate content knowledge. Such students should have access to course sequencing that is equal to the course sequencing for other STEM majors outside the college of education.

2) **Emphasis on hands-on and inquiry-based STEM experiences for prospective teachers, including dedicated research or laboratory experiences, STEM discipline-specific pedagogical instruction, and explicit instruction in the interdisciplinary connections between learning sciences and STEM instruction; and**

3) **Early and multiple field-based instructional experiences for prospective teachers that are structured to provide exposure to a variety of teaching and learning environments, and that are coordinated and aligned with the teacher preparation curriculum.**

**Strengths:**

Alumni will have access to two post-master's certificates for STEM teachers: "Improving Science Content Learning for ELLs" and "Teaching of Mathematics to ELLs."

**Weaknesses:**

None

**Reader's Score: 5**

**Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Implementing Academic Standards**

1. **Projects that are designed to support the implementation of internationally benchmarked, college- and career-ready academic standards held in common by multiple States and to improve instruction and learning, including projects in the following priority areas:**

a) **The development or implementation of professional development or preparation programs aligned with those standards.**

b) **Strategies that translate the standards into classroom practice.**

**Strengths:**

Courses are aligned with the Common Core and the Next Generation Science standards. The science courses have been developed with three supporting partners: Harvard Medical School, Roxbury Community College, and the College Board.

The applicant indicates that it "Will use the Common Core Self-Assessment Tool for Higher Education & Teacher Preparation Faculty (McQueen and Wiener, 2014) to analyze and improve our alignment with Common Core."

The applicant also states the following: "Using multiple sources of formative and summative data, including the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) and PARCC results, in addition to observations, daily assignments, student discussions, and other forms of assessment to drive daily and long-term instructional decisions and practices" (p. e23). There are clear and coherent plans to utilize college- and career-ready standards and implement them in the program.

**Weaknesses:**

None

**Reader's Score:** 2

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 08/14/2014 12:13 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/14/2014 05:15 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Boston Plan for Excellence in the Public School Foundation (U336S140088)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	15	15
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	45	30
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	20
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	15
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
<b>Promoting STEM Education</b>		
1. CPP 1	5	5
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
<b>Implementing Academic Standards</b>		
1. CPP 2	2	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>87</b>

# Technical Review Form

Panel #10 - 2014 TQP Grant Review- 10: 84.336S

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

Applicant: Boston Plan for Excellence in the Public School Foundation (U336S140088)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Significance

1. 1) The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project.
  - 2) In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:
    - i) The extent to which the proposed project is likely to build local capacity to provide, improve, or expand services that address the needs of the target population.
    - ii) The likelihood that the proposed project will result in system change or improvement.
    - iii) The extent to which the proposed project will prepare personnel for fields in which shortages have been demonstrated.

### Strengths:

i. The applicant clearly articulates how they will recruit, prepare, and support 260 teachers, significantly improve student learning in the partner LEAs, and use the autonomous afforded to the LEAs to further advance and refine the teacher residency design. (pgs. Abstract, 8,

In addition they clearly explain how this project will significantly improve student learning in their partner LEAs, and use the autonomous afforded to the LEAs to further advance and refine the teacher residency design. (p. 8)

ii. The applicant provides a discussion regarding their Theory which in turn clearly explains how this project will result in systemic change and improvements to the recruitment and training of their teachers. (pgs. 8-10) If autonomous schools hire and retain diverse teachers who have the skills and dispositions that Network residency programs develop in their residents, and organize them well into a coherent instructional system, high-need students (regardless of special education status or English language development level) will thrive, demonstrating gains in achievement.

The applicant explains: 'Autonomy is becoming a necessary precondition of success. That's what we're proving in Boston... We're unleashing the creativity of educators, and working to bring it to scale across the city. Pair this with a talented workforce,' (p.10) They conclude: Autonomous schools are professionalizing teaching.

iii. The applicant has clearly identified that their partner LEAs will provide annual hiring forecasts to Network residencies to ensure they are recruiting and training teachers in the most urgently needed areas, which are currently math, science, special education, English as a Second Language (ESL), literacy, and early childhood, as well as teachers of color.(p.17)

The applicant has clearly noted that partner LEAs will need [REDACTED] new teachers by 2019. They provide details within each of the LEAs and how this number was calculated, including retirements and expansion of programs within the schools, as well as the opening of new schools in the community. (p. 18)

The proposal contains information regarding how they will need to hire 191 new secondary STEM teachers and 104 STEM-strong elementary and early childhood educators. They compare how they have limited STEM certified teachers locally and nationally.(p.19)

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

**Reader's Score:** 15

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design**

1. 1) The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project.

2) In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the extent to which the proposed project consists of a comprehensive plan that includes a description of:

i) The extent to which the proposed project is supported by strong theory (as defined in this notice).

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

iii) The extent to which the proposed activities constitute a coherent, sustained program of training in the field.

iv) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services.

v) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates that it has the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the grant, including a multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan; the demonstrated commitment of any partners; evidence of broad support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers unions) critical to the project's long-term success; or more than one of these types of evidence.

**Note:** In order to address this criterion, applicants are encouraged to develop logic models to demonstrate their project's theory of action. Applicants should connect available evidence of past history of successful outcomes to their logic models. Applicants may use resources such as the Pacific Education Laboratory's Education Logic Model Application ([www.relpacific.mcrel.org/PERR.html](http://www.relpacific.mcrel.org/PERR.html)) or the Northeast and Islands REL Skill Builder Workshops ([www.relnei.org/events/skill-builder-archive.html](http://www.relnei.org/events/skill-builder-archive.html)) to help design their logic models. In addressing this criterion, applicants are also encouraged to connect the project design to the intended impact of the project, including an explanation of how the project will affect the preparation, placement, retention, induction, and professional development of teachers, and ultimately student achievement. Finally, applicants are encouraged to discuss the role and commitment of each partner and how the IHE and LEA(s) plan to sustain their partnership beyond the life of the grant.

**Strengths:**

i. The theory of autonomy was outlined within the significance of this project. In addition the applicant clearly expands upon this and discusses how the field of teacher education has begun to shift away from what some saw as an over-emphasis on theory to focus more intensely on clinical preparation and performance. (p. 25-26)

The applicant continues to discuss how NCATE has had a number of conferences and has recommended the need to 'turn upside down' the existing teacher education programming, that previously had existed. (p. 26)

In addition they have recommended that teacher preparation programs, schools, and districts to partner more deeply and share responsibility for preparing and supporting novice teachers. (p. 26)

The applicant provides research and citations to clearly demonstrate how the positive impact of the residency model on teacher retention, diversity, and hard-to-staff subjects has been well established, by research. (pgs. 26-30)

ii. The applicant mentions that: One of the initiative's core strategies is to "create professional development pathways for early education and care providers to improve their core competencies, credentials, and the quality of education they provide." (p.20)

The applicant further discusses how residents will have access to existing professional development programs, including those funded under Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Individuals with Disabilities in Education Act, and the National Science Foundation. BPE Chief Program Officer [REDACTED] (BTR) and UMass Boston's Chair for Curriculum and Instruction [REDACTED] (TNY) will lead this work, and will share information across the Network both informally and at quarterly Network meetings. (p 36)

They continue that through formal induction programs as well as through alumni community building, the Network will provide the professional support required to improve and sustain cohorts of high quality teachers within partner LEAs. To the extent possible, other teachers in Network LEAs will be invited to participate in these professional development activities. (p. 48)

iii. The overall discussion provides details regarding all of the project activities that are needed in order to provide residents with their teaching experiences and pedagogy.  
NEED to discuss and put more here !!!!

iv. The applicant clearly identifies their partners and what it is they will contribute to this project. They include : BPE, formerly the Boston Plan for Excellence, is the lead partner. Others include:

1. Institution of Higher Education: University of Massachusetts, Boston

a. Teacher Preparation Program at IHE: Teach Next Year

b. School of Arts and Sciences at IHE: College of Science and Mathematics

2. Local Educational Agencies: Boston Green Academy Horace Mann Charter School (District), Dudley Street Neighborhood Charter School (District), UP Academy Charter School of Boston (District), and UP Academy Charter School of Dorchester (District) (Abstract)

v. Resources to Operate the Project beyond the Grant. The Network has established broad support from stakeholders for this project (See Appendix G for Letters of Support). All partners have a commitment to a long-term collaboration and to sharing best practices to increase impact on student learning well beyond the life of the grant. Partner faculties and staff will be directed to focus on this project for the next five years and beyond. (p.50)

#### **Weaknesses:**

iii. Need to discuss and see if there might be something else needed, or missing

iv. The applicant does not clearly provide any schedule of Professional Development activities. There is no indication of any required PD for Mentor Teachers, or for any of the Residents. The only statements were that they will have access to existing PD activities.

v. This project is large and the resources proposed may not be sufficient in order to maintain the level of participation they have demonstrated or proposed.

**Reader's Score: 30**

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

1. 1) The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project.

2) In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

i) 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.

ii) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.

iii) The extent to which performance feedback and continuous improvement are integral to the design of the proposed project.

**Note:** In order to address this criterion, applicants are encouraged to include in the application narrative a clear, well thought-out implementation plan that includes annual timelines, key project milestones, and a schedule of activities with sufficient time for developing an adequate implementation plan, as well as a description and qualifications of the personnel who would be responsible for each activity and the level of effort each activity entails. Applicants may also describe how the partnering organizations will communicate and coordinate in order to achieve project goals.

**Strengths:**

i. The applicant demonstrates their history of successfully implementing a number of previous projects over the past years. (pgs. 51-53) They clearly articulate how they have managed and supervised these programs and demonstrate how they will continue to implement successful projects.

The project is led by a steering committee made up of project leads and key representatives from each partner. The project leads are responsible for the overall successful completion of key milestones and activities, on time and within budget, from each partner. (p.52)

The applicant does provide a comprehensive and clearly articulated Timeline, containing all of the required information. (pgs. 53-56) There is a table organized by Objective and contains the frequency of implementation and not the actual timeline. (pgs. 54-56)

ii. Well qualified existing staff are identified. There are brief bios and detailed resumes in the appendices. (pgs 58-63)

iii. The applicant clearly discusses a number of structures to ensure continuous improvement. During the planning year, they will establish a feedback loop with Network LEAs to ensure the residencies are filling LEA human capital needs. The Network residencies continuously collect data for organizational learning. The programs solicit feedback from residents, graduates, principals, and even students through a set of surveys and focus groups throughout the year. (p.56)

The applicant discusses how they will implement continuous coordination among Boston Teacher Quality Network Partners. BPE will host monthly meetings with Network partners to ensure regular communication and progress towards joint goals, and conduct a more formal meeting once each quarter. Agendas for the quarterly meetings will be developed collaboratively, coordinated by [REDACTED], BPE's Chief Program Officer. The purpose of the quarterly meetings will be to ensure consistent communication, to coordinate work across the partnership, and to share best practices and learning. (p. 57)

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

### Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. 1) The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project.

2) In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers:

i) The extent to which the methods of evaluation provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes.

Note: In response to this selection factor, applicants are encouraged to include data on student learning.

ii) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.

iii) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

Note: In addressing this criterion, applicants are encouraged to include a plan for how the project's evaluation will address the TQP Grant Program performance measures established by the Department under the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (GPRA), as well as the measures established in section 204(a) of the HEA. (The specific performance measures established for the overall TQP Grant Program are discussed under Performance Measures in section VI of this notice.) Further, applicants are encouraged to describe how the applicant's evaluation plan will be designed to collect both output data and outcome data, including benchmarks, to monitor progress. Finally, each applicant is encouraged to select an independent, objective evaluator who has experience in evaluating educational programs and who will play an active role in the design and implementation of the project's evaluation.

#### Strengths:

i. The applicant provides a well-designed evaluation design to measure whether or not the project has been successful. They clearly explain the long-term outcomes and the overall performance monitoring of residents.

There are key performance outcomes and measures clearly stated, with specific baseline and comparative data identified for analysis. (p.66)

i. The applicant includes the required performance measures and the required GPRA PM and how they will be analyzed to help determine overall success of the project and growth of the students.

They include clearly written, measurable and observable Performance Measures, Outcomes and data source in order to understand how these will be measured.

The applicant clearly discusses how the evaluation reports and data will be used to help improve and inform all stakeholders about the overall progress of this project.

#### Weaknesses:

The applicant has not identified an external evaluator. There are no details regarding how they will collect the data. Not all of the data collection instruments are provided. The frequency of collect would help to strengthen this evaluation design. A more descriptive discussion between what value-added data is would also help to better understand why it is being

used.

Reader's Score: 15

## Priority Questions

### Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Promoting STEM Education

#### 1. Projects that are designed to address one or both of the following priority areas:

a) Increasing the opportunities for high-quality preparation of, or professional development for, teachers or other educators 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 or educators of STEM subjects and have increased opportunities for high-quality preparation or professional development.

**Note:** Applicants that respond to Competitive Preference Priority 1 and Absolute Priority 1 are still required to implement the required reforms within the whole teacher preparation program, as reflected in sections (a) and (b) of Absolute Priority 1.

In responding to this competitive preference priority, applicants are encouraged to include the following elements in their proposed projects:

1) Institutional collaboration to ensure that students in a college of education who intend to teach STEM courses have access to courses that build appropriate content knowledge. Such students should have access to course sequencing that is equal to the course sequencing for other STEM majors outside the college of education.

2) Emphasis on hands-on and inquiry-based STEM experiences for prospective teachers, including dedicated research or laboratory experiences, STEM discipline-specific pedagogical instruction, and explicit instruction in the interdisciplinary connections between learning sciences and STEM instruction; and

3) Early and multiple field-based instructional experiences for prospective teachers that are structured to provide exposure to a variety of teaching and learning environments, and that are coordinated and aligned with the teacher preparation curriculum.

#### Strengths:

The applicant has clearly requested this cppp in the abstract and within the proposal..

The project clearly discusses STEM related teaching standards and academic performance standards. The College of Science will participate and help to increase the overall rigor of the content. They will provide the content knowledge and information for the students.

#### Weaknesses:

None noted.

**Reader's Score:** 5

**Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Implementing Academic Standards**

1. **Projects that are designed to support the implementation of internationally benchmarked, college- and career-ready academic standards held in common by multiple States and to improve instruction and learning, including projects in the following priority areas:**

a) **The development or implementation of professional development or preparation programs aligned with those standards.**

b) **Strategies that translate the standards into classroom practice.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant clearly articulates the teaching of Common Core standards. They include a discussion regarding the use of Next Generation of Science Standards. It is clearly discussed, the proposal how these will be incorporated into their curriculum and pedagogy to assist students in achieving these standards.

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

**Reader's Score:** 2

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 08/14/2014 05:15 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/18/2014 01:22 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Boston Plan for Excellence in the Public School Foundation (U336S140088)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	15	15
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	45	45
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	20
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	19
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
<b>Promoting STEM Education</b>		
1. CPP 1	5	5
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
<b>Implementing Academic Standards</b>		
1. CPP 2	2	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>106</b>

# Technical Review Form

Panel #10 - 2014 TQP Grant Review- 10: 84.336S

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

Applicant: Boston Plan for Excellence in the Public School Foundation (U336S140088)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Significance

1. 1) The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project.
  - 2) In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:
    - i) The extent to which the proposed project is likely to build local capacity to provide, improve, or expand services that address the needs of the target population.
    - ii) The likelihood that the proposed project will result in system change or improvement.
    - iii) The extent to which the proposed project will prepare personnel for fields in which shortages have been demonstrated.

### Strengths:

The applicant detailed the target group to be served through this funding. The applicant is focused on supporting 260 teachers. Through the selection process, the applicants set an exceptional process of ensuring 50% of each cohort of residents are people of color. Further commitment ensures that 80% of graduates will teach in high-need LEAs for three or more years. This commitment is a significant representation of the applicant's attention to the needs in urban areas as Boston. (e15)

The applicant's assurance of professionally developing effective teachers with the knowledge, content, values, and dispositions necessary for the students in the target area is supported by the partners chosen for the project. The applicant will partner with the University of Massachusetts-Boston's Teach Next Year (TNY) program. The applicant has formed a partnership with the Boston Teacher Residency, one of the oldest teaching residency programs in the country. The applicant detailed the responsibilities of the legacy groups to validate the recruitment, preparation, and support for diverse cohorts of high quality, long-term teachers. According to the applicant design, four expanding autonomous school districts in Boston will participate in the project. The partners chosen by the applicants have a strong track record in preparing and supporting teachers in Boston. The choice of partners indicates a focused process to continue improving student achievement in the Boston area. (e15)

### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 15

### Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. 1) The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project.

2) In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the extent to which the proposed project consists of a comprehensive plan that includes a description of:

i) The extent to which the proposed project is supported by strong theory (as defined in this notice).

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

iii) The extent to which the proposed activities constitute a coherent, sustained program of training in the field.

iv) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services.

v) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates that it has the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the grant, including a multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan; the demonstrated commitment of any partners; evidence of broad support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers unions) critical to the project's long-term success; or more than one of these types of evidence.

**Note:** In order to address this criterion, applicants are encouraged to develop logic models to demonstrate their project's theory of action. Applicants should connect available evidence of past history of successful outcomes to their logic models. Applicants may use resources such as the Pacific Education Laboratory's Education Logic Model Application ([www.relpacific.mcrel.org/PERR.html](http://www.relpacific.mcrel.org/PERR.html)) or the Northeast and Islands REL Skill Builder Workshops ([www.relnei.org/events/skill-builder-archive.html](http://www.relnei.org/events/skill-builder-archive.html)) to help design their logic models. In addressing this criterion, applicants are also encouraged to connect the project design to the intended impact of the project, including an explanation of how the project will affect the preparation, placement, retention, induction, and professional development of teachers, and ultimately student achievement. Finally, applicants are encouraged to discuss the role and commitment of each partner and how the IHE and LEA(s) plan to sustain their partnership beyond the life of the grant.

**Strengths:**

The applicant appropriately has chosen a theory-based model for executing this project to attract qualified participants that will exit as highly effective teachers. The Standards for Mathematical Practice and Instructional Activities sets the foundation for the project activities. The application is based on current research by Wiggins and McTighe (1998) to adequately support the project. Effective teachers place student understanding and achievement at the center of their teaching. Wiggins and McTighe (1998) describe understanding as more than just knowing and doing. The applicants acknowledge the professional need to develop teachers that can expand daily the ability to use "knowledge and skill in sophisticated and flexible ways." (e20)

The applicant has aligned the project activities with the Common Core, which codifies this idea by defining mathematical proficiency as the synthesis of eight Standards for Mathematical Practice (SMPs) (e20)

Looking forward to creating more replicable models for other diverse groups across the country, the Boston Plan group would become trend setters to support national continued efforts to recruit effective classroom teachers. According to the applicant, the participants will have exposure to significant learning opportunities. The applicant described efforts to increase learning opportunities for students to master both language and content from teachers exposed to strategies for helping students.

The applicant has access to legacy programs as the UMass Boston Center of Science and Mathematics in Context as a bridge between the College of Science and Mathematics and the Graduate College of Education. The existence of this partnership strengthens the exposure for participants. The participants will have an institutional infrastructure already established to promote improvements in science and math education programs. (e21)

The applicant has indicated appropriate curriculum features with a multidisciplinary approach with the collaboration of STEM educators, scientists, mathematicians, and experts in the field of applied linguistics. The participants will be able to take science courses developed by the Boston Science Partnership along with three supporting partners: Harvard Medical School, Roxbury Community College, and the College Board. For example, science courses include Integrating Sciences through Energy, Cell Biology and Genetics, and Environmental, Earth, and Ocean Sciences (e22).

The encouraged development of a logic model detailed by the applicant includes the expected leadership growth, coherent instructional guidance system, learning environments, teachers committed to urban teaching, and teamwork building. The applicant has detailed specific graduation requirements which include 1,700 hours of classroom service and passing the Massachusetts Pre-Service Performance Assessment. (e48)

**Weaknesses:**

No weakness found.

**Reader's Score: 45**

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

1. 1) The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project.

2) In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

i) 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.

ii) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.

iii) The extent to which performance feedback and continuous improvement are integral to the design of the proposed project.

**Note:** In order to address this criterion, applicants are encouraged to include in the application narrative a clear, well thought-out implementation plan that includes annual timelines, key project milestones, and a schedule of activities with sufficient time for developing an adequate implementation plan, as well as a description and qualifications of the personnel who would be responsible for each activity and the level of effort each activity entails. Applicants may also describe how the partnering organizations will communicate and coordinate in order to achieve project goals.

**Strengths:**

Strengths:

The ability to manage the budget of this grant is found in the experiences of the applicant's team members. The personnel for this grant have successfully managed budgets for Transition to Teaching, Investing in Innovation, and Teacher Quality Partnership grants. (e67)

The grant applicants have organized a Network steering committee held responsible for communicating project milestones and completion of activities. This group is also responsible for making sure the project adheres to the planned timeline and is on budget. (e68)

Mentor teachers are written into the application as support mechanisms to follow through on the collaborative efforts of the program's commitment to the participants. The applicant's comprehensive design of activities and collaborations

creates an extensive practice and feedback cycle supported by residents' writing papers and creating portfolios that demonstrate their ability to analyze pedagogical theories within the context of classroom practice. The applicant documented the dual role support of mentor teachers as both mentors and learners themselves, as the team of resident, mentor, and CTE work together to improve outcomes for students. (e55)

The applicant has a well written description of the capacity to carry out this project as evidenced by success in managing several high impact federal grants such as Transition to Teaching, Investing in Innovation, and Teacher Quality Partnership grants. (e67)

The qualifications of the applicants are evidenced in the many opportunities that have allowed the personnel of this project to share their past experiences and successes to support the replication of their instructional strategies. The credentials of the applicants show the training and programs they have conducted to disseminate materials and tools that are effective strategies. The materials and tools the qualified staff has adequately crafted will be available to the participants of the project. (e68)

**Weaknesses:**

No weakness found.

**Reader's Score: 20**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation**

**1. 1) The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project.**

**2) In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers:**

**i) The extent to which the methods of evaluation provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes.**

**Note: In response to this selection factor, applicants are encouraged to include data on student learning.**

**ii) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.**

**iii) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.**

**Note: In addressing this criterion, applicants are encouraged to include a plan for how the project s evaluation will address the TQP Grant Program performance measures established by the Department under the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (GPRA), as well as the measures established in section 204(a) of the HEA. (The specific performance measures established for the overall TQP Grant Program are discussed under Performance Measures in section VI of this notice.) Further, applicants are encouraged to describe how the applicant s evaluation plan will be designed to collect both output data and outcome data, including benchmarks, to monitor progress. Finally, each applicant is encouraged to select an independent, objective evaluator who has experience in evaluating educational programs and who will play an active role in the design and implementation of the project s evaluation.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant provides a detailed evaluation plan that describes how the project will evaluate student achievement. Multiple realistic and learning goals for each student were written into the application based on the Common Core, Next Generation, and Massachusetts Early Learning Standards. The applicant thoroughly explained the evaluation of student

achievement by for example, using multiple sources of formative and summative data, including the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) and PARCC results, in addition to observations, daily assignments, student discussions, and other forms of assessment to drive daily and long- term instructional decisions and practices. (e23)

The applicant has contracted with an experienced group the Harvard Center for Education Policy Research. The applicant plans to obtain data from the Boston Public Schools and provide that data to the Harvard Center and develop a collaboration between the two partners to assess and review the graduates in placement schools, relative to teachers prepared in other programs. (e80) The applicant will study performance toward intended outcomes through the collection of data each year on the achievement outcomes of the students in resident-mentor classes as well as the classrooms of graduates. The data will then be analyzed by the applicant stakeholders to compare the level of success of the graduates. (e84)

The applicant has also designed a format for looking at the student achievement data from the standardized test used on the students in which field placements occur for the participants. (e84) The applicant will also train and give the participants the necessary tools to design their own pre and posttest for the students participating in the partner schools. The pre and post-test will provide benchmarks for the participants to use as feedback in their classrooms as well as for the project to use for evidence of participant success at specific benchmarking points of the project timeline.

#### **Weaknesses:**

The applicant was not clear on how the department will handle data and did not talk about what to do with teacher grade levels for value added and long term feedback.

**Reader's Score: 19**

#### **Priority Questions**

##### **Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Promoting STEM Education**

###### **1. Projects that are designed to address one or both of the following priority areas:**

**a) Increasing the opportunities for high-quality preparation of, or professional development for, teachers or other educators 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 or educators of STEM subjects and have increased opportunities for high-quality preparation or professional development.**

**Note: Applicants that respond to Competitive Preference Priority 1 and Absolute Priority 1 are still required to implement the required reforms within the whole teacher preparation program, as reflected in sections (a) and (b) of Absolute Priority 1.**

**In responding to this competitive preference priority, applicants are encouraged to include the following elements in their proposed projects:**

**1) Institutional collaboration to ensure that students in a college of education who intend to teach STEM courses have access to courses that build appropriate content knowledge. Such students should have**

access to course sequencing that is equal to the course sequencing for other STEM majors outside the college of education.

**2) Emphasis on hands-on and inquiry-based STEM experiences for prospective teachers, including dedicated research or laboratory experiences, STEM discipline-specific pedagogical instruction, and explicit instruction in the interdisciplinary connections between learning sciences and STEM instruction; and**

**3) Early and multiple field-based instructional experiences for prospective teachers that are structured to provide exposure to a variety of teaching and learning environments, and that are coordinated and aligned with the teacher preparation curriculum.**

**Strengths:**

According to the applicant, the project includes an explanation of opportunities for applicants to participate and become hired as highly capable teachers with the right skills, content, and pedagogical knowledge to cultivate the inquiry-based STEM classroom experiences the LEAs are reaching for. The applicant strengthens the proposal by including the recruitment of qualified partners that offer Advanced Placement courses in math and science, as well as dual-enrollment opportunities with local colleges, including the Benjamin Franklin Institute of Technology. Network residencies have built their capacity to attract talented and diverse STEM candidates for these schools and train them in ways that align with LEA needs. (e19)

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses found.

**Reader's Score: 5**

**Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Implementing Academic Standards**

**1. Projects that are designed to support the implementation of internationally benchmarked, college- and career-ready academic standards held in common by multiple States and to improve instruction and learning, including projects in the following priority areas:**

**a) The development or implementation of professional development or preparation programs aligned with those standards.**

**b) Strategies that translate the standards into classroom practice.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant has a focused theory based plan for using partner LEA curricula. The applicant will translate Massachusetts Curriculum Framework and the Common Core standards into classroom practice by looking at multiple scores of formative and summative data. (e23) The applicant will have the participants include the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System and the PARCC results as part of the data analysis strategy. The applicant will guide the participant in the use of classroom data as observations, student discussions, and long-term instructional discussions. Other methods the applicant will model for the participant is the use of selecting assessments that capture academic progress so that teachers can continually revise instructional plans. The applicant approach is adequately designed to allow for feedback and communication between the partners of the project. Participants are included in the communication process. (e23)

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses found.

**Reader's Score:** 2

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 08/18/2014 01:22 PM