

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/12/2014 12:50 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Cal State L.A. University Auxiliary Services, Inc. (U336S140060)

**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	45
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	20
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
<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>107</b>

# Technical Review Form

Panel #11 - 2014 TQP Grant Review- 11: 84.336S

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

Applicant: Cal State L.A. University Auxiliary Services, Inc. (U336S140060)

## 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:

(a)(i) The applicant clearly demonstrates that the proposed project is likely to build local capacity to provide, improve, or expand services that address the needs of the target population. The applicant indicates that the target University and its partners request a total of \$11,064,077 over five years to expand the scope of the Urban Teacher Residency, a field-based teacher preparation and credentialing program designed to equip future teachers to close the achievement gap in the three partnership school districts. The applicant indicates that after five years of success through their first Teacher Quality Partnership (TQP) grant, the target University is proposing to expand and transform LAUTR to become the primary preparation model within the Charter college of Education (CCOE). The applicant demonstrates that the proposed project will include the following three strands of teacher residency preparation: secondary mathematics and science (the original strand); secondary special education; and a blended program of elementary education and special education. The applicant clearly indicates that each strand will integrate a specialization in STEM, leading to a state preliminary teacher credential and a Master's degree in Integrated STEM Education. During the five-year grant, the applicant will graduate and place 275 new teachers trained in STEM disciplines. The applicant indicates that it will work closely with the State Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) to ensure that all candidates meet the requirements for both teacher certification and induction. It is significant that residents will be prepared and credentialed to teach in an urban classroom within 12 months and attain a Master's degree in Integrated STEM Education within 18 months. (pp. 1-7)

(a)(ii) The applicant clearly demonstrates that the proposed project will result in system change or improvement. The applicant clearly demonstrates that the foundation of the residency model includes long-term clinical learning experiences for teacher education students, created in partnership with local schools and districts. The applicant indicates that through the use of the first TQP grant formative and summative assessments from the evaluation partner, WestEd, the applicant has been able to refine and strengthen the proposed LAUTR-TI model. This proposed model will target recruitment of high-performing seniors in undergraduate programs and create greater understanding of philosophy and practice among course instructors, mentor teachers, and field coordinators; and create projects, aligned with the Common Core State Standards (CCSS), for every course to ensure application of theory within residency classrooms. (pp. 1-7)

(a)(iii) The applicant clearly demonstrates that the proposed project will prepare personnel for fields in which shortages have been demonstrated. The applicant describes three residency strands, each with an integrated STEM focus, which were determined as the target population for new teachers through a needs assessment with each of our partner districts. The applicant clearly indicates that each district expressed common needs—a shortage of secondary math and high school teachers, and a need for teachers in secondary special education and elementary education with strong

backgrounds in STEM. (pp. 4-7)

**Weaknesses:**

(a)(i) No weaknesses were identified.

(a)(ii) No weaknesses were identified.

(a)(iii) No weaknesses were identified.

**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:**

(b)(i) The applicant clearly describes a comprehensive plan that includes a description of how the proposed project is supported by strong theory. The applicant describes a rationale for the proposed process, product, strategy, and practice that includes a logic model. The applicant clearly aligns the situation (present LAUTR 2009-14), inputs (LAUTR-

TI 2014-19), outputs, outcomes/impact, and evidence in the logic model. (pp. 7-11)

(b)(ii) The applicant clearly demonstrates that 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. The applicant indicates that courses will focus on standards-based teaching, teaching students with special needs (including participation on individualized education program teams), teaching ELLs, literacy within the content area, advanced content methods, STEM courses, curriculum and assessment design, effective classroom management, cultural competency, community engagement, and teacher leadership and PLCs. (pp. 25-27)

(b)(iii) The applicant clearly describes the proposed activities that constitute a coherent, sustained program of training in the field. The applicant thoroughly describes the year-long supervised field experience in site schools, with residents placed in cohorts and paired with mentor teachers who provide close guidance to residents to build their skills, knowledge, and capacity to effectively teach by the end of the residency experience. (pp. 12-24)

(b)(iv) The applicant clearly demonstrates that the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services. The applicant clearly describes the five-year project, the Urban Teacher Residency Transformation Initiative (LAUTR TI), which is a collaborative partnership of the target University; the Center for Collaborative Education; Families In Schools; WestEd; and three urban public school districts. (pp. 30-32)

(b)(v) The applicant clearly 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. The applicant thoroughly describes the collaboration and support from the following partnerships: California State University Los Angeles, Charter College of Education; Center for Collaborative Education; Families in Schools; Los Angeles Unified School District; Montebello Unified School District; and Alhambra Unified School District. The applicant clearly indicates that the partnership is committed to establishing a broad base of funding over the grant period to ensure the development of a sound financial base to continue and sustain the proposed program. The applicant clearly demonstrates that each core partner organization is committed to the sustainability of the proposed project and will continue to provide in-kind staffing support to continue the proposed activities post-grant completion, as well as engage in building a sustainable financial model. The applicant presents a clear multi-year financial and operating model (7/1/19-6/30/20). (pp. 30-33; e198)

**Weaknesses:**

(b)(i) No weaknesses were identified.

(b)(ii) No weaknesses were identified.

(b)(iii) No weaknesses were identified.

(b)(iv) No weaknesses were identified.

(b)(v) No weaknesses were identified.

**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:**

(c)(i) The applicant clearly describes 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. The applicant demonstrates that the initiative has multiple partner organizations and each partner has made specific commitments to the proposed project. The applicant demonstrates a clear management plan with an alignment of goals, objectives, milestones, timeline, lead individual(s) responsible, and the benchmarks of the proposed project. (pp. 38-40)

(c)(ii) The applicant clearly describes the qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the following key project personnel: two Co-Principal Investigators; STEM Expert and Faculty Program Coordinator for the Elementary/SPED; Faculty Program Coordinator for the Secondary Math & Science (single subject) strand; Faculty Program Coordinator for the Secondary SPED (single subject SPED); Project Director and Induction Director; Recruitment Director; Field Director; Elementary/SPED Specialist; and Special Education Field Coordinator. (pp. 33-37)

(c)(iii) The applicant demonstrates that the performance feedback and continuous improvement are integral to the design of the proposed project. The applicant demonstrates that a Project Management Team (PMT), facilitated by the Co-PIs, will plan each step of the project, check on project progress, and refine project activities based on the ongoing feedback from WestEd. The applicant indicates that the PMT will meet twice per month, with structured agendas for each meeting. A key task of the PMT will be a quarterly review of all project activities, timeline, and deliverables to ensure that the project is on schedule and to make appropriate adjustments, if needed. (p. 37)

**Weaknesses:**

(c)(i) No weaknesses were identified.

(c)(ii) No weaknesses were identified.

(c)(iii) No weaknesses were identified.

**Reader's Score: 20**

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

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:**

(d)(i) The applicant clearly demonstrates that the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes. The applicant clearly describes the evaluation approach that will be objective- and performance-driven, and include mixed methods utilizing both quantitative and qualitative data and models. The applicant indicates that the impact of teacher residency programs on teacher quality and student achievement is of importance to the target University and to the target University Chancellor's Office. The applicant clearly describes the following measure related to teacher preparation - GPRA Short-Term Performance Measure 1: Persistence: the percentage of program participants who were not scheduled to graduate in the previous reporting period and persisted in the postsecondary program in the current reporting period. The applicant clearly describes the following measure related to graduation and certification - GPRA Performance Measure 1: Graduation: the percentage of program completers who attain initial certification/licensure by passing all necessary certification/licensure assessments and attain a Master's degree within two years of beginning the program. The applicant clearly describes the following measure to assess passing of initial and necessary certification/licensure assessments for GPRA Performance Measure 3: Improved Scores - the percentage of grantees that report improved scaled scores on assessments for initial State certification or licensure of teachers and the HEA measure, improvements in the pass rates and scaled scores for initial state certification or licensure of teachers. The applicant will assess measures of retention, specifically, teacher retention in the first three years of a teacher's career (90%), an HEA measure, and three GPRA measures: Short-Term Performance Measure 2: Employment Retention: the percentage of beginning teachers who are retained in teaching in the partner high-need LEA one year after being hired by the LEA; Performance Measure 2: Employment Retention: the percentage of beginning teachers who are retained in teaching in the partner high-need LEA three years after being hired by the high-need LEA; and Efficiency Measure: Employment Retention - the cost of a successful outcome where success is defined as retention of the teacher in the partner high-need LEA three years after the teacher is hired by the high-need LEA. The applicant will assess the alignment with GPRA Performance Measure 4: Student Learning - the percentage of grantees that report improved aggregate learning outcomes of students taught by new teachers, including the calculation of the learning outcomes of students taught by LAUTR graduates, as well as select teacher outcomes resulting from participation in LAUTR, using a QED. (pp. 41-50)

The applicant clearly describes the following data elements: program applicant data (undergraduate institution and GPA; CSET results; demographic information); program completer and credential data; school placement data; Teacher Preparation Exit Evaluation results; teacher retention data; teacher performance assessment data; annual Survey of First-Year Teaching Graduates results; and annual Survey of School Principals and Supervisors of First-Year Teaching Graduates results. (p. 50)

(d)(ii) The applicant clearly describes methods of evaluation that are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project. The applicant clearly demonstrates that they will collect and analyze quantitative data on GPRA, HEA, and LAUTR-TI project performance measures; on proposed LAUTR-TI goals, objectives and outcomes; and for a Quasi-Experimental Design (QED), assessing whether the proposed project results in improved teacher and student outcomes. The applicant provides evidence that they will collect and analyze qualitative data to explicate quantitative findings and maintain all data in a longitudinal database to gauge progress and allow for

within- and cross-cohort comparisons. (pp. 41-50)

(d)(iii) The applicant clearly describes methods of evaluation that will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. The applicant clearly indicates that the Project Evaluator, will be responsible for all project evaluation, including providing both formative feedback to use in continuous program improvement, and summative evaluative data. The applicant indicates that a Project Management Team (PMT), facilitated by the Co-PIs, will plan each project step, check on project progress, and refine project activities based on ongoing feedback from WestEd. (pp. 45-50)

**Weaknesses:**

(d)(i) No weaknesses were identified.

(d)(ii) No weaknesses were identified.

(d)(iii) No weaknesses were identified.

**Reader's Score: 20**

**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:**

(A)(a)(1) The applicant clearly addresses Competitive Preference Priority 1: Promoting Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Education by increasing the opportunities for high-quality preparation of, or professional development for, teachers or other educators of STEM subjects. The applicant provides research from The National Science Board (2010) that reports a strong correlation between students who take advanced science and math courses in high school and their enrollment and success in four-year college institutions. The applicant indicates that the Integration in STEM Education Master's degree will involve courses in STEM methods and content knowledge, engineering by design, technology and blended learning, subject area integration across STEM, teaching applications, and the use of satellite data to engage learners. (pp. 18-24)

(A)(a)(2) The applicant provides evidence that the proposed project includes an emphasis on hands-on and inquiry-based STEM experiences for prospective teachers, including dedicated research or laboratory experiences, and STEM discipline-specific pedagogical instruction. The applicant provides evidence that project-based learning will be embedded across all courses, as research has found that hands-on application and construction of learning engages students more fully than teacher-centered instructional practices. The applicant provide evidence that LAUTR-TI's STEM focus will build upon the STEM work already conducted at CSULA. (pp. 18-24)

(A)(a)(3) The applicant describes the field-based instructional experiences for prospective teachers that are aligned with the teacher preparation curriculum. The applicant clearly indicates that both the residency and the coursework will be rooted in the CCTC-approved and research-based California Standards for the Teaching Profession. The framework includes six standards: engaging and supporting all students in learning; creating and maintaining effective environments for student learning; understanding and organizing subject matter for student learning; planning instruction and designing learning experiences for all students; assessing students for learning; and developing as a professional educator with multiple elements under each standard. The applicant provides evidence that the residency will include year-long classroom field experiences that will pair residents with experienced, highly effective mentor teachers to learn teaching skills and knowledge from an effective practitioner. Residents will work in mentor classrooms four days a week, and take courses on the fifth day plus one afternoon per week. (pp. 18-24)

**Weaknesses:**

(A)(a) No weaknesses were identified.

**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:**

(B)(a) The applicant clearly addresses Competitive Preference Priority 2: Implementing Internationally Benchmarked, College- and Career-Ready Elementary and Secondary Academic Standards. The applicant clearly demonstrates that all three districts have committed to both sets of standards (Common Core State Standards (CCSS) and the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS)). The applicant demonstrates that residents will be thoroughly immersed in CCSS and NGSS, and the standards in the disciplines of mathematics, science, and literacy across the disciplines. (pp. 25-29)

(B)(b) The applicant indicates that residents will learn how to construct CCSS- and NGSS-based curriculum, plan effective instruction and projects to teach to the standards, and design varied assessments. (pp. 25-29)

**Weaknesses:**

(B)(a)(b) No weaknesses were identified.

**Reader's Score:**     **2**

---

**Status:**           Submitted  
**Last Updated:**   08/12/2014 12:50 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/12/2014 04:27 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Cal State L.A. University Auxiliary Services, Inc. (U336S140060)

**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	45
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	20
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
<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>107</b>

# Technical Review Form

Panel #11 - 2014 TQP Grant Review- 11: 84.336S

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

Applicant: Cal State L.A. University Auxiliary Services, Inc. (U336S140060)

## 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 presents activities that could create local capacity to expand and build services that address the needs of the target participants. The applicant will expand an existing program to become the main teacher preparation model at the Charter College of Education (CCOE). An important feature of the model will be the inclusion of social justice within an urban residency, a field-based teacher preparation and credentialing program (p.1 & p.9). The project's goal is to produce 275 exceptional teachers for work in three high-need school districts (p.12).
- ii) The applicant provides strong evidence to support that the proposed project will result in system change or improvement. For example, the applicant intends to change the way teachers are trained by revamping every CCOE teacher preparation program, infuse a STEM curriculum integration model across all teacher preparation strands, and expand the program's reach to other urban districts within Los Angeles County (p.4).
- iii) The applicant describes personnel shortages. The applicant provides up-to date district, state, and national data of issues surrounding the need to train more teachers with knowledge of STEM (p.4). Districts indicate a shortage of secondary math and high school teachers and need for teachers in STEM education.

### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted in this section.

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:**

- i) The proposed project is supported by strong theory. The logic model lists elements of situation, inputs, outputs, outcomes/impact, and evidence. The theory of action contains a social justice, problem-based learning, and STEM integration (p.10).
- ii) The applicant provides professional development services of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration that will lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services. The applicant will rigorously recruit college graduates with strong GPAs. Applicant will engage in a year-long supervised field experience in selected site schools. The applicant will provide a quality curriculum that combines theory and practice, including a field classroom experience.
- iii) The applicant will propose activities that will constitute a coherent, sustained program of training in the field. Candidates will participate in a two-year induction program that will provide support in a cohort-inquiry learning community (p.11). Residents will participate in a 10-month practicum (August -June). The applicant will complete a structured two-year induction program. Also, inducted teacher cohorts will function as professional learning communities (p.16).
- iv) The applicant will provide services that involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services. For example, the applicant provides letters of support from individuals and organizations to support program efforts (Appendix). The proposed project will work with the California State University Los Angeles, Charter College of Education, and Center for Collaborative Education and local school districts (pp.30-33).
- v) The applicant will have an extensive base of funding over the grant period to maintain operation of the project beyond the grant period. The applicant has received a monetary pledge from the Bechtel Corporation. Core partner organizations are dedicated to the sustainability of the proposed project and will continue to offer in-kind staffing support for continuous program activities beyond the grant period (pp.32-33). Also, the applicant presents a multi-year financial and operating model (p.e198).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted in this section.

**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:**

i) The applicant provides an adequate management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clear responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks. The applicant includes in its management plan milestones, timelines, persons responsible for performing tasks, and benchmarks (pp.38-40). The applicant provides a narrative budget that explains costs over the duration of the grant. The budget contains a breakdown of costs for personnel, fringe benefits, contractual, travel, and other costs. The budget reflects the personnel needed to manage the grant effectively. The costs seem reasonable in relation to accomplishing the objectives and performing the planned program activities. There are no unnecessary or unrelated costs that appear in the budget (pp. e210-218).

ii) The applicant addresses employment requirements, including relevant training and experience of key project personnel. For example, the applicant explains the relevant experience of the two co-principal investigators who will oversee project management and coordination. The investigators have experience managing projects (p.33). The applicant provides individual resumes for the project director and key personnel (pp.e80-e196). Also, the applicant provides job descriptions for vacant positions (Appendix).

iii) The timelines will focus on making sure constant improvement for residents, inductees, mentor teachers, course faculty, and program staff. Also, the timelines will allow for progress monitoring, quarterly review of data and the evaluation of the project (p. 40). The project management team lead by the Co-PIS will create action steps to check project progress, and revise project activities based on continuous feedback from the external evaluator. The team will meet twice per month through face-face and conference call meetings and make quarterly review of all project activities, timeline and deliverables for ongoing program success. A semi-annually full day retreat will be held to discuss the findings reported by the external evaluator (p.34).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted in this section.

**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:**

i) The applicant will provide methods of evaluation that delivers justifiable and consistent performance data on relevant outcomes by using an evaluation approach that is objective- and performance-driven and includes mixed-methods using quantitative and qualitative data and models (REF). The evaluator will gather and analyze quantitative data on GPRA, HEA, and proposed project performance measures. The evaluator will a quasi-experimental design (QED) for evaluating results in improved teacher and student outcomes related to traditional teacher preparation programs.

ii) The evaluator will present annual reports of the quantitative teachers and student outcomes measures to include longitudinal data and GPRA and HEA performance measures. The applicant will collect results from the California Teacher Performance Assessment directly from the teacher preparation program and verify the data form CTQ. The applicant will include data on student learning. For example, the applicant will use a QED to analyze student and teacher outcomes by calculating the learning outcomes of students taught by proposed project graduates, in addition to select teacher outcomes resulting from participation in the proposed project (pp.41-50). The applicant will utilize an experience external evaluator. The Evaluation Research Program at WestEd will serve as the external evaluator. The proposed project has worked with the evaluator in the past (p.31 & pp.41-50).

iii) Goal #4 (pp.17-18) will make sure methods of evaluation provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. For example, school districts will provide program partners with annual teacher employment and retention data. Data on teacher reflections and interviews will be performed annually in the spring to evaluate new teacher satisfaction and program (p.16-17). The applicant will track student success in classes taught by program graduates and compare results to district-wide and school performance levels (pp.16-17).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted in this section.

**Reader's Score: 20**

**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 addresses competitive preference priority (1a)

1. The applicant intends on expanding a master's level teacher credentialing residency program to involve three strands, each with an emphasis on STEM integration that prepares capable teachers for work in three high-need school districts. The program will blend teacher and practice into graduate-level coursework (Abstract, p.e13 & p.18). Stem courses will be taught in the College of Engineering, Computer Science, and Technology (p.20).

2. Residents along with their students will attend a conference that will expose them to federal government agencies (NASA and NOAA) and industry resources that will support scientific-inquiry engagements and expose students to possible STEM careers related to the space industry. The program has partnered with organizations that bring STEM alive in college and K-12 classrooms (p.19).

3. The proposed project will place a focus on experiences for residents that are designed to offer exposure to an array of teaching and learning environments, and that are facilitated and aligned with the proposed program curriculum by placing residents in a year-long supervised field experience. Residents will work in their mentors' classroom four days a week and take courses on Friday. The mentor and residents will participate in several co-teaching experiences, including one teach, one observe and other engagements (p.23).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted in this section.

**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 addresses competitive preference priority #2.

a) The applicant will provide coursework that prepares residents to create their curriculum, instruction, and assessment based on Common Core State Standards and the New Generation Science Standards. The applicant will include STEM courses (p.20) in the curriculum (p.25). Project-based learning and literacy in STEM disciplines will be blended into all courses (p.26).

b) Courses and weekly seminars focused on giving residents' opportunities to apply theory based on knowledge of Common Core Standards and New Generation Science Standards will result in residents being able to translate standards into best practices for use in the classroom (p.26).

**Weaknesses:**

No weakness noted in this section.

**Reader's Score:** 2

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 08/12/2014 04:27 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/12/2014 02:09 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Cal State L.A. University Auxiliary Services, Inc. (U336S140060)

**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	19
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
<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 #11 - 2014 TQP Grant Review- 11: 84.336S

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

Applicant: Cal State L.A. University Auxiliary Services, Inc. (U336S140060)

## 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 is a large University located in the state of California and plans to provide activities and services in a collaborative partnership with several organizations and three urban school districts. (Page 1) Focusing on its primary teacher preparation model program, the applicant will develop a program with three strands focusing on secondary math and science, secondary special education, and a dual program in elementary education and special education. All strands will have a specialization in STEM disciplines. It will use cohorts of 20 resident students over a five year period. The applicant provides specific information about student demographics which show a high percentage of students of color, English Language Learners, and students with disabilities. The information demonstrates the districts are high need. Overall, the proposed program will increase the capacity of the school districts to provide services for students.
- ii. The applicant describes its program as having a direct impact on 275 teachers that it will graduate and place in STEM disciplines. (Page 1) For each of the strands developed within its graduate program, the applicant is emphasizing the Comment Core Standards as well as revamping the current teacher education coursework, infusing a STEM curriculum integration, and expanding its overall involvement with other districts. The applicant also indicates that the program will collaborate with two other colleges at the University, the College of Natural and Social Sciences and the College of Engineering, Computer Science, and Technology. As a result, the applicant is unifying its efforts to provide highly qualified teachers in districts where there are shortages.
- iii. All districts are high need school districts and report poverty rates ranging from 26.8% to 30.9%. Two of the districts have turnover rates of 1.4% and 2.64%. (Page e69) The third district is reportedly expected to have a large number of teachers leaving due to retirements. (Page 6) In addition, the applicant also cites national studies which indicate that up to 50% of teachers leave the position within the first five years. The program is providing qualified teachers to school districts who have documented current or potential shortages.

### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

## 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 applicant provides a detailed logic model which describes how it will expand and develop its current urban teacher residency program. (Page 10) Based on its experience and pilot program, the applicant indicates that its proposed teacher residency program will aggressively recruit new teachers, develop rigorous selection processes, and provide a year-long supervised residency or field experience. The model supports the various needs of the district as well as the inputs and outputs which the applicant plans to provide. In addition, the model provides specific outcomes it identifies as evidence of the outcomes completion. The logic model is consistent and comprehensive.

ii. The applicant provides four primary goals for the project which proposes to expand the graduate-level credentialing residency program, develop and implement a marketing plan to assist in recruiting and selection of candidates for the program, ensure parent and community engagement in the process, and provide performance feedback and periodic assessment of intended outcomes with stakeholders. (Pages 12 through 18) For each goal, the applicant provides a number of objectives which provide detailed information about the components of the program, the intensity of the activities, and the duration of the process for completion. For example, for Goal 1, the applicant plans to establish a Project Management Team and Advisory Board, create a curriculum committee, use evidence-based lessons learned to strengthen the residency, and hire appropriate staff. The information reflects careful planning and attention to detail.

iii. The applicant describes the resident experience in great detail. (Page 15) It includes the establishment of peer cohorts that will be placed at 10 to 15 school sites. They will be trained in building strong professional learning communities and will participate in a 10 month practicum placement. In addition, the applicant will provide project participants with five semesters of courses and a winter intercession over 18 months enabling them to complete the graduate coursework. The project participants will develop portfolios as well as complete state assessment material which will enable them to qualify as a first-year teacher in the state. Overall, the program represents a coherent and well organized effort.

iv. The applicant describes a strong collaboration among its partners, both internal to the University and in the community. (Pages 30 through 32) In addition to the other colleges in the University, the applicant will collaborate with community organizations such as Family in Schools. This organization will co-construct and teach coursework and assist in developing cultural literacy and strategies for parent and community engagement. The three partnering school districts will also work with the applicant in various approaches. The district will provide the program with resident mentors who will engage in a variety of co-teaching methods with the program participants.

v. The applicant describes the overall commitment to the program and how it will develop a financial base to continue and sustain the program. (Page 32) The base that it wishes to develop will be focused on multiple and varied city, state, federal, and foundation funds. The uniqueness of the model and the benefits are believed to be a primary means of attracting funds and maintaining a sustainable partnership.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses 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:**

i. The management plan includes both the narrative discussion as well as a table which identifies major milestones, timelines, personnel responsible for completion of the milestones, and benchmarks. (Pages 38 through 40) These milestones are directly related to the goals of the project and the objectives that have been presented. For each objective, the applicant provides a number of activities which specifically describe how the project staff will conduct the project. For example, the co-principal investigators have the responsibility to hire the induction director and special education field

coordinator by December 14, 2014. The benchmarks provided are the completion of hiring of staff members. The applicant indicates that it will create a Project Management Team who will assist the co-principal investigators in managing the day-to-day operations of the project.

ii. The applicant identifies the key personnel for the project in terms of the two co-principal investigators.( Page 33) One of the co-investigators is an associate professor at the University and has served as the curriculum director in an earlier project. The second co-investigator has worked with one of the three partner school districts in a similar program and has designed administrative and teacher leadership development programs. He has also served as a state education administrator in Massachusetts. In addition to a brief description of their backgrounds, the applicant also provides detailed resumes. Additional personnel are also described by the applicant. All personnel have the appropriate backgrounds and educational experience to manage the project and attain the goals.

iii. In the management plan, the applicant includes as Goal IV the activities that seek to ensure continuous program improvement for all participants, including residents, activities, mentor teachers, course instructors, and partners. (Page 40) Included in the goal are provisions to provide data concerning the project, conduct interviews and collect reflections from teacher participants, and provide formative data for use by the project management team to develop programs.

**Weaknesses:**

i. The applicant does not identify any management roles for the partnering school districts. It is unclear if they have any decision making functions in the day-to-day management roles in the project. More information is needed on how conflicts are resolved and allocation of responsibilities are resolved with the various partners. More specific information in terms of time lines are also needed. The management plan lacks specific times for the completion of the various management activities.

ii. No weaknesses found.

iii. No weaknesses found.

**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:**

- i. The evaluation plan will be conducted by an external evaluator and will include a mixed methods approach. (Page 41) Both quantitative and qualitative data will be collected and analyzed using appropriate descriptive and analytic statistical processes. All data will be collected and included in a longitudinal database which will enable the evaluator to gauge progress and allow for comparisons between cohorts and other groups. Annual summaries will be provided and will be focused on the objectives of the project.
  
- ii. The evaluation activities will be focused on recruitment and selection candidates, the preparation program itself, graduation and certification outcomes, placement, and retention. (Page 44) The project staff and evaluator will collect data which are focused on specific performance measures aligned for each of these areas. For example, for the areas of graduation and certification, the evaluator will look at improved scores and the percentage of participants that report improved scores on assessments for the initial state certification license.
  
- iii. The applicant indicates that the plan will address GPRA requirements and will analyze both student and teacher outcomes. (Page 45). The applicant reports that its performance measures will identify the percentage of teacher participants that report improved aggregate learning outcomes of students. Such information will be gathered by the evaluator who will develop a data sharing method of understanding with the various stakeholders in order to report the information gathered by the project.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses found.

**Reader's Score:      20**

**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:**

Priority Area "a":

1. The applicant indicates that it has established an internal partnership across three different colleges at the University. (Page 5) The partnership includes the College of Education, the College of Natural and Social Sciences, and the College of Engineering, Computer Science, and Technology. The applicant indicates that several major programs in math and science will be integrated into the teacher education program and improve the overall math and science offerings.
2. The applicant indicates that it will provide early experience for students through the integration of STEM methods and content knowledge, engineering by design, technology and blended learning, subject area integration, and the use of satellite data. (Page 20) These activities will increase the content knowledge and skills of the residents which will result in their ability to teach STEM topics in a more integrative and inclusive fashion.
3. The applicant describes its year-long classroom residency program in which the project participants will work in a mentor classroom four days a week and take courses on the fifth day. (Page 23) The residency is expected to be 200 hours and will include collaborative efforts in various classroom situations.

**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:**

- a. The applicant indicates that its proposed program is based upon the California Standards for the Teaching Profession. (Page 23) In addition, the graduate-level coursework is designed to prepare future teachers based on the Common Core State Standards as well as the Next Generation Science Standards. (Page 25) The coursework focuses on standards-based teaching, students with special needs, and applying advanced content methods in all STEM areas.
- b. The applicant indicates that the program seeks to enhance the ability of its participants to teach using methods which reflect standards on which coursework is developed. (Pages 25 through 27) The program is designed to apply theory into practice in their classrooms using project-based learning programs as well as emphasizing a strong focus on literacy in the STEM disciplines.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses found.

**Reader's Score:** 2

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 08/12/2014 02:09 PM