

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/14/2014 09:02 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: CSU, Chico Research Foundation (U336S140023)

Reader #1: *****

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

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: CSU, Chico Research Foundation (U336S140023)

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 proposed PRISMS Project: Promoting Rural Improvement in Secondary Mathematics and Science, focuses on meeting the needs of low-income, high-need schools in the target 38,000 square-mile rural region. The applicant provides data indicating that two of the partner districts are eligible for the Rural Low-Income Schools (RLIS) Program, and one qualified for the Small Rural Schools Achievement (SRSA) Program. The applicant indicates that the student populations of the partner schools range from 59% to 81% qualifying for the free and reduced school lunch program, and show higher levels of diversity than in rural school in the target region. The applicant clearly indicates that the proposed project will build local capacity through the pre-baccalaureate Next Generation Math Teachers (NGMT) Program, which is designed to provide the partners with a new type of teacher they need for departmentalized middle schools or self-contained classrooms who are prepared in content, concepts, pedagogy, and clinical experience to support middle school level students' math achievement. The applicant indicates that partner LEAs will build local capacity in teachers' knowledge and skills in integrating content literacy and instructional applications of technology, and supporting struggling students, including ELLs, and those students with special needs. (pp. 4-6)

(a)(ii) The applicant clearly demonstrates that the proposed project will result in system change or improvement. The applicant indicates that the pre-baccalaureate Next Generation Math Teachers (NGMT) program and the Residency in Secondary Education (RiSE) teacher residency programs represent systemic change and improvement and will have the effect of promoting more change in subject matter and credential programs and in the partner LEAs. The applicant indicates that the NGMT program, in its emphasis on conceptual understandings and specific math curriculum and pedagogy appropriate to the target age group (grades 7-9) represents a shift in how math faculty look at preparing teachers and it acknowledges the critical role of clinical experience with school-based educators. The applicant indicates that the development of RiSE will require the comprehensive re-envisioning of the Single Subject (secondary) Credential Program as a master's level program; the revising of program curriculum to address content and pedagogy; the reconfiguration of classes and the development of more field-based assignment to strengthen academic content and clinical practice; and the building of the residency experience around the co-planning/co-teaching model. (pp. 6-8)

(a)(iii) The applicant clearly demonstrates that the proposed project will prepare personnel for fields in which shortages have been demonstrated. The applicant indicates that their partner and regional LEAs face teacher shortages in areas such as STEM and special education due to shrinking tax bases and resources and the inability to pay salaries

comparable to urban districts. The applicant indicates that the primary goal of the PRISMS Project is to increase the availability of highly effective teachers interested in teaching in rural schools, particularly in the high-demand, shortage areas of STEM and special education. The applicant indicates that the plan to prepare 80 new foundational level math teachers and 100 new secondary STEM, language arts, and special education teachers will meet the needs of partner districts and increase the hiring of excellent teachers across the region. The applicant also indicates that the PRISMS Project will also contribute to the key role being played by the target University System in preparing 15,000 elementary and 15,000 secondary teachers in STEM subjects in support of the national 100Kin10 Coalition. (pp. 8-9)

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) 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) or the Northeast and Island's REL Skill Builder Workshops (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 provides a clear rationale for the proposed process, product, strategy, and practice that includes a Logic Model. The applicant provides a Logic Model that shows how the PRISMS Project will leverage a variety of resources and inputs to build the project components through collaborative activities with partners to achieve intermediate and long-term outcomes to address the issues in the target area. The applicant clearly aligns resources/inputs, program components, activities, intermediate outcomes, and long-term outcomes in the Logic Model. (pp. 9-12)

(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 clearly describes professional learning and development, which will focus on the following five areas: implementing new standards, literacy development, integrating technology, supporting English learners, and meeting special student needs. The applicant indicates that the K-12 faculty and teacher candidates will be supported in the integration of the standards in their planning and teaching by target University staff and K-12 faculty experts and professional development activities of the Northern California Writing Project, the Chico Math Project, the California Science Project-Inland Northern California, the Center for the Advancement of Reading, and the Glenn and Tehama County Offices of Education. The applicant indicates that there is a need for teachers to provide literacy support, including explicit and strategic vocabulary instruction. The applicant indicates that literacy training for pre-service and in-service teachers will be grounded in the work of the Center for the Advancement of Reading (CAR) and the Northern California Writing Project (NCWP). The applicant clearly indicates that teacher candidates will become co-learners with their students and colleagues to develop skills to integrate technology, plan instruction that makes use of emerging technologies and digital texts, and use current technology applications for teaching and learning in their classes and at their schools. The applicant indicates that teachers will learn to support English Language Learners through the following areas of focus: culturally relevant pedagogy, differentiating instruction, and integrating literacy skills across the curriculum. The applicant clearly indicates that both general and special education candidates and in-service teachers will develop knowledge and skills required by teachers to work effectively with students with disabilities. (pp. 11-15; 27-28)

(b)(iii) The applicant clearly describes the proposed activities that constitute a coherent, sustained program of training in the field. The applicant demonstrates that the pre-baccalaureate NGMT program will provide early and continuous field experiences, each linked to seminars or pedagogy courses beginning in the freshman year, continuing through the program and culminating in a student teaching practicum or residency. The applicant demonstrates that the RiSE residency is aligned to graduate-level coursework and field-based assignments and structured around an intensive, full-time co-teaching model with a mentor teacher. (pp. 15; 25-29)

(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 demonstrates that the PRISMS Project is a comprehensive partnership of educational, community and business partners committed to the success of the project as evidenced by letters of support in Appendix G. The applicant clearly describes the collaboration and commitment from the following: major target University partners, three district and six public school partners, education agency and program partners, and business/community partners. The applicant also indicates that the proposed project will be closely aligned with funded grants and scholarship programs that support reform efforts and complement PRISMS. (pp. 15-17)

(b)(v) The applicant indicates that the target University devotes approximately \$3 million annually to the preparation of K-12 teachers. The applicant indicates that University alumni are strong financial supporters and provide funding to meet a variety of needs including student scholarships. The campus is also supported by programs, such as the Center for Teacher Quality, and funding support from foundations including Packard, Bechtel, and Irvine. The applicant indicates that strategies that will ensure institutionalization of project activities and reforms have been built into program planning. The applicant provides a multi-year financial model (7/1/19-6/30/20) that clearly demonstrates that resources will be available to operate the project beyond the length of the grant. (pp. 17-18; Appendix H)

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 thoroughly 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 clearly aligns the goals/actions, timeline, personnel responsible, and benchmarks for the proposed project. The applicant describes the organizational structure of the proposed project that will include the PRISMS Project Advisory Board, the chief decision-making body, which meets two times per year and is composed of key leaders from school district, college and business partners; the NGMT and RiSE Program Planning Committees, who are responsible for revision of curriculum and clinical experiences, evaluation of assessment and feedback data for program improvement and input to the Advisory Board, and ensuring uniform quality in materials designed/produced by the project; and the Admissions Committee who will select teacher residents for each of the four participating districts. (pp. 32-35)

(c)(ii) The applicant clearly describes the qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the following key project personnel: Principal Investigator/Project Director; Director, RiSE Program; Director, NGMT Program; Single Subject Program Coordinator; Special Education Coordinator; SOE Graduate Coordinator; Clinical Coordinator; and CME Grants Coordinator. (p. 36)

(c)(iii) The applicant demonstrates that the performance feedback and continuous improvement are integral to the design of the proposed project. The applicant describes the regular assessment and evaluation of program components of the

proposed project. The target University SOE collects a variety of assessment data each year and reports annually to the Chancellor's Office and to Title II and biennially to the CCTC (the State Teaching Performance Expectations) on the data analysis and implications for program improvement. The applicant indicates that the proposed project is designed to provide timely formative feedback on program implementation to PRISMS partners and to provide quantitative findings. The applicant proposes to share formative feedback through regular project briefings designed to support program improvement. (pp. 36-37)

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. 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 and aligns the goals, priority actions, objectives, and sub-objectives of the PRISM Program. The applicant indicates that it has engaged an external evaluator to design and conduct the independent evaluation of the PRISMS Project, including both the NGMT pre-baccalaureate program and the RiSE program. The applicant indicates that this evaluator has longstanding experience conducting rigorous evaluations of teacher preparation programs in the target State and nationally. The applicant indicates that the evaluation will be based on a data collection and analysis plan designed to report annual descriptive results for program performance measures required under GPRA and the HEA, and to incorporate Quasi-Experimental Design (QED) student to investigate whether the PRISMS residency programs have resulted in improved teacher and student outcomes, compared to traditional teacher preparation programs. The applicant indicates that the data will include the following: program applicant data (undergraduate institution and GPA; results from the State Subject Examination for Teachers (CSET); demographic

information); Target University program completer and credential data; school placement data; results from the Target University Teacher Preparation Exit Evaluation; teacher retention data; teacher performance assessment data; results from the annual Survey of First-Year Target University Teaching Graduates; and results from the annual Survey of School Principals and Supervisors of First-Year Target University Teaching Graduates. (Pp. 37-43)

(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 the project evaluation will include the following: descriptive statistics (annual summaries of the quantitative teacher and student outcomes measures, including the GPRA and HEA performance measures) and quasi-experimental design (an analysis of select teacher and student outcome measures using a QED to address whether the PRISMS pre-baccalaureate and residency interventions are more effective at preparing teachers than traditional teacher preparation programs). The applicant will also collect data on program implementation, including the collaboration among partners, the development of new curriculum, the selection of mentor teachers, and the operationalization of the PRISMS approach. (pp. 43-48)

(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 describes the methods of analyzing assessment data and feedback in the management plan which includes an analysis of assessment data and feedback; an analysis of assessment data and feedback on student performance and perceptions; and an assessment of the effectiveness of recruitment strategies. The applicant indicates that a report of findings on program implementation will be reported to PRISMS partners through semi-annual project briefings to support program improvement. (pp. 47-48)

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 describes the proposed program design that will include Competitive Preference Priority (CPP) 1 - Promoting Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) Education. The applicant clearly indicates that the primary goal of the PRISMS Project is to increase the availability of well-prepared, highly effective and diverse teachers interested in teaching in rural schools particularly in the high-demand, shortage areas of STEM. The applicant ensures that students in the college of education who intend to teach STEM courses will have access to courses that build appropriate content knowledge. (p. 1)

(A)(a)(2) The applicant describes the hands-on and inquiry-based STEM experiences that will be provided for prospective teachers. The applicant provides evidence that candidates for the Residency in Secondary Education (RiSE) Program will complete four-year bachelor's degrees in math or sciences that are specifically designed to develop deep knowledge of content and pedagogy aligned to the new standards, with field experiences, hands-on laboratory experiences, and opportunities for undergraduate research. (p. 1)

(A)(a)(3) The applicant clearly indicates that prospective teachers will experience a variety of teaching and learning environments that are coordinated and aligned with the teacher preparation curriculum. The applicant demonstrates that the Next Generation Mathematics Teachers (NGMT) pre-baccalaureate program will create a new category of math teachers who are specifically and thoroughly prepared through course work and clinical experience to meet both the demands of the CCSS-Math and the specific needs of middle grades (7-9) students, including ELLs and those with special needs. (p. 1)

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 demonstrates that beginning in their undergraduate subject matter programs, prospective teachers will learn about the Common Core or Next

Generation Standards and they will see the integration of those standards into subject-specific pedagogy modeled in their courses. (p. 2)

(B)(b) The applicant indicates that teacher candidates will be required to address the content and standards in their instructional planning and demonstrate effective strategies relevant to the standards in their field-based teaching. The applicant indicates that support for implementing the standards will be provided by faculty experts and professional development activities. (p. 2)

Weaknesses:

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

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/14/2014 09:02 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/14/2014 01:26 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: CSU, Chico Research Foundation (U336S140023)

Reader #2: *****

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

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: CSU, Chico Research Foundation (U336S140023)

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. For example, the applicant will build local capacity by providing its partners with a new type of teacher suitable for departmentalized middle schools or self-contained classrooms who are well-equipped in content, concepts, pedagogy and clinical experiences to enhance middle school level students' math success. The partner LEAs will develop local capacity to support their in-service teachers' knowledge and skills in creating Common Core Standards and NEW Generation Standards, blending content literacy and instructional application of technology, and supporting students that may include ELLS and special needs students (pp.6-7).
- ii) The applicant provides strong evidence to support that the proposed project will result in system change or improvement. For example, the applicant will deliver activities that will impact change in subject matter and credential programs and the partner LEAs. The proposed program will offer rigorous preparation in math and math pedagogy to provide a solid foundation for K-12 students to seek higher levels of math and science success in high school and beyond (pp.6-7).
- iii) The applicant describes personnel shortages. For example, the applicant makes a strong case for providing highly qualified and diverse teachers to meet personnel shortages in special education and STEM in rural areas. The applicant provides current data on the need to serve students with disabilities (pp.8-9). The proposed project will serve 80 new-foundational level math teachers, and 100 new-secondary STEM, language arts and special education teachers to meet the needs of its partner districts. The proposed project will contribute to helping the state prepare 15,000 elementary and secondary teachers in STEM subjects in support of the national 100Kin10 Coalition (p.9).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted in this section.

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) or the Northeast and Islands REL Skill Builder Workshops (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 meets the indicated criteria by describing how the proposed project is supported by strong theory by providing a logic model. The logic model lists elements of resources, inputs, program components, activities, and intermediate and long-term outcomes (p.12). The logic model shows how the proposed project will influence a range of resources and inputs to build the project elements. The applicant through collaborative actions with partners will yield outcomes to address issues of teacher shortages in high demand fields, the need to create new learning standards, and the need of quality professional development engagements (p.11).

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 provides a variety of professional learning and development activities with an emphasis on areas, such as implementing new standards and literacy development (p. 11). For example, the Northern Carolina Writing Project (NCWP), Center for the Advancement of Reading (CAR) and other organizations will provide support in the integration of the standards (Common Core State Standards and New Generation Science Standards) in instruction for residents and K-12 faculty. NCWP and CAR will assist content area and teacher preparation faculty teams to guarantee a strong focus on literacy and comprehensive modeling of literacy development across disciplines in coursework and clinical experiences (pp.12-13). The applicant will perform annual evaluations of their professional development activities using data collected from surveys, field observation, and

interviews (p.15).

iii) The proposed project's activities constitute a coherent, sustained program of training in the field. For example, proposed project will offer early and ongoing field work linked to seminars or pedagogy courses starting in the 1st year, continuing through the program and culminating in a student teaching practicum or residency. The residency component is aligned to graduate-level course work and field-based activities and formed around a comprehensive, full-time co-teaching model which includes a mentor teacher (p.15).

iv) The applicant provides services that involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services. For example, the applicant provides several letters of support and commitment from school district partners, educational community, state, business organizations, and others to support program efforts (Appendix G). The applicant will collaborate with the College of Communication and Education, the School of Education, the Liberal Studies program, and other university departments and college (p.15-17).

v) The applicant addresses resources to manage the project once Federal assistance has ended. For example, the applicant indicates the university will commit financial assistance annually to the preparation of K-12 teachers. A strong alumni financial support is in place. The university will offer a wide-array of support services and resources in the form of technology and equipment (pp.17-18).The applicant provides a multi-year financial model that shows that resources will be in place to continue the program after the grant funding has ended (Appendix H 3)

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. Also, the applicant provides in the management plan benchmarks (pp.33-35). 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, travel, equipment, supplies, contractual, 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.e96-102).

ii) The applicant addresses employment requirements, including relevant training and experience of key project personnel. For example, the applicant provides a list of primary staff listed by their roles (p.36). The applicant provides individual resumes for the project director and key personnel. The resumes provide details on key personnel's education level and professional work experience. It is evident that personnel have the relevant skills and expertise to carry out the activities associated with the grant (Appendix F 2).

iii) The timelines provide specific procedures for guaranteeing feedback and constant improvement. For example, the applicant collects an array of assessment data each year and reports annually to the university's Chancellor's office and to Title II and biennially to the CCTC on data analysis and implications for program improvement (p.37). The applicant indicates that stakeholders will regularly meet to discuss progress toward goals, objectives and outcomes. The applicant clearly describes how it will keep stakeholders, and others informed of program activities, as the proposed project will review and discuss findings with their LEA partners to make sure continuous improvements (p.37 & Appendix H).

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 provides methods of evaluation that delivers valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes. For example, the applicant provides a table that shows goals, priority actions, objectives and sub-objectives of the

proposed program. The evaluation will be created to gather data to comprehend and evaluate progress against the established goals and objectives. For example, the applicant will collect data from current sources, including GPRA and HEA enrollment, academic success, and retention (pp.37-38).

ii) The applicant details methods of evaluation that are systematic, feasible, and suitable to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the anticipated outcomes. For example, the applicant will use descriptive statistics to provide annual summaries of the quantitative teacher and student outcomes measures described above, including GPRA and HEA performance measures. In the last year of the evaluation, the applicant will perform analysis of select teacher and student outcome measures using a quasi-experimental design (p.43). A quasi-experimental approach will allow for a comparison within and across cohorts. The applicant identifies SRI Education, a division of SRI International as the external evaluator.

iii) The applicant addresses several methods of evaluation that will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. For example, the residents, faculty, and administrators will be asked open and closed-ended questions about their experiences. First-year teachers and their supervisors will be invited to access the strengths and weaknesses of components of the teacher program. The applicant provides a sample of the questionnaire (Attachment I). The applicant will report findings on program implementation to partners through semi-annual project briefings to support program improvement (p.48).

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 will focus on increasing the availability of quality teachers interested in teaching in rural schools in the shortage area of STEM. For example, the applicant will provide well-prepared math teachers through course work and clinical experiences that meet the needs of middle grades (7-9) students, including ELLS and special needs students. The majority of candidates will complete four-year bachelor's degrees in math or science that are particularly designed to create more knowledge of content and pedagogy aligned to the new standards, with field experiences, hands-on laboratory experiences and activities for undergraduate research (p.1). The applicant will make sure residents who intend to teach STEM courses have access to courses that expand appropriate content knowledge. For example, the majority of candidates will complete four-year bachelor's degrees in math or science that are particularly designed to create more knowledge of content and pedagogy aligned to the new standards (p.1).

(2) The proposed project will place an emphasis on hands-on and inquiry-based STEM experiences by including field experiences, hands-on laboratory experiences, and activities for undergraduate research. The applicant will provide hands-on experiential learning related to real-world problems (p.1). The proposed program will place an emphasis on instruction using emerging technologies for students to use

when engaging in inquiry and model based learning to demonstrate comprehension of new ideas (p. 10).

(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 high-need academic subject areas and high-need elementary and secondary schools (p.42). Also, residents' clinical experience will include tutoring, after-school programs and math classrooms (p.22).

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 internationally benchmarked, college and career-ready standards (p.2). For example, during undergraduate, teacher candidates will be provided an opportunity to learn about Common Core or Next Generation Standards and view the integration of those standards into subject-specific pedagogy modeled in their courses (p.2). The applicant will provide workshops that will support subject matter and faculty in revising courses to reflect the new standards. Faculty in the partner districts will engage in professional development and networking activities to make sure that clinical experiences are aligned to the new standards. Several professional partners such as the Northern California Writing Project and the Chico Math Project will provide faculty experts and professional activities (p.2).

b) Residents and faculty will have access to several resources and strategies for implementing CCSS and NGSS standards into classroom practice through MERLOT Teaching Commons and the CSU Digital Ambassadors (pp.2 & 13). Several professional partners such as the Northern California Writing Project and the Chico Math Project will provide faculty experts and professional activities that provide strategies to translate standards into classroom practice (p.2).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted in this section.

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/14/2014 01:26 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/14/2014 12:46 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: CSU, Chico Research Foundation (U336S140023)

Reader #3: *****

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

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: CSU, Chico Research Foundation (U336S140023)

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, a large University located in the state of California, is partnered with three school districts, a County office of education, and a community college district. The partnership seeks to improve student academic achievement in rural communities by reforming its teacher education program. (Page 1) It plans to recruit and retain diverse and highly qualified candidates to teach in its schools, especially in STEM and special education areas. In order to do so, it plans to graduate 100 teacher residents who impact on an estimated 12,500 or more rural students. In addition, 80 pre-baccalaureate program participants will be qualified to teach after taking foundation courses in STEM major areas. These teachers will teach students in schools with high poverty levels, ranging from 59% to 81% qualifying for free or reduced federal lunch programs. (Page 4) In addition, the applicant notes that several counties have in excess of 1.4% of teachers with emergency, provisional, or temporary certificates. (Page 5) The applicant plans to build capacity for the University by improving its overall clinical placements which will provide highly qualified teachers for the participating school districts.
- ii. The applicant indicates that it believes its proposed program will result in a major system change and improvement. (Page 6) While increases in a number of students entering STEM programs has increased, many students do not complete those programs. The applicant is proposing to prepare a new type of teacher for the departmentalized middle schools. These new types of teachers will be trained to teach in a self-contained classroom. They will be prepared in content, concepts, and pedagogy, and will participate in clinical experience to support middle school level math content. (Page 5) The plan proposed by the applicant is to allow non-math majors to obtain subject matter competency to teach up to Algebra II or Math III by taking math competency tests. This proposal could increase the number of teachers available as well as provide career opportunities to teachers.
- iii. The applicant is clearly focusing on developing high-quality teachers in the field of mathematics. (Page 7) The proposal seeks to provide assistance for rural and small-town districts who are having difficulty in recruiting and retaining excellent teachers in general but especially in STEM disciplines and special education. The specific plan of the applicant is to prepare 80 new foundational level math teachers and 100 new secondary STEM, language arts, and special education teachers.

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) or the Northeast and Islands REL Skill Builder Workshops (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. Citing studies showing the shortage of math teachers, the applicant is proposing a set of activities and services designed to meet the shortage and apply the Common Core State Standards and the Generation Science Standards to program content. (Page 10) The applicant provides a project logic model which identifies key resources, program components, and activities related to those components. (Page 12) Included in the model are intermediate and long-term outcomes which include the development of new standards, literacy development, the integration of technology, and supporting activities for English Language Learners. The overall model is comprehensive and focused on appropriate outcomes.

ii. The proposed program of services and activities include key learning and development activities that focus on five areas: Implementing new standards, literacy development, technology, English Language Learners, and students with special needs. (Page 11) These programs reflect a strong consideration of a number of major projects being carried out in California and in other areas. These areas also reflect the work of leading researchers as well as organizations such as the Center for Advancement of Reading and the MERLOT Teaching Common Network. As a result, the services and

activities are focused, concentrated, and offered over an extended period of time.

iii. The programs designed by the applicant provide early and continuous field experience as indicated in the pre-baccalaureate Next Generation Math Teacher program, which links seminars and pedagogy courses in freshman year. (Page 15) In the graduate program, the applicant aligns coursework with field based assignments as well as provides a structured intensive, full-time co-teaching model with mentor teachers.

iv. In addition to college personnel and programs, the applicant includes three district and six public school partners. (Page 16) The project also includes educational agencies at the county, state and local level. Other partners include foundations and community organizations. The project will coordinate their efforts and offer them a strong leadership role with a commitment for reform. Overall, the relationships established by the applicant are positive and are direct assistance in achieving the outcomes of the project.

v. The applicant indicates that it has strong support from its partners as well as from its alumni and a variety of other resources that will provide technology equipment and support as well as scholarships. (Page 17) The applicant indicates that its activities have support from the University as well as from a number of external sources that will provide financial funding beyond the grant.

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 provided by the applicant is comprehensive and well organized. (Page 32) The plan includes both a description of how the project will operate on a day-to-day basis as well as how it will be involved with each partner agency in making decisions concerning the project and its implementation. The plan is supported by a project management timeline which includes specific goals and activities, lead personnel, and benchmarks upon which to determine if the activities have been met. For example, a specific action to meet Goal 1 is to implement the program by August 2015 at which time Cohort 1 will begin coursework and its early field experience. (Page 33)

ii. Included in the plan are the project director and principal investigator. (Page 36) Other personnel include the directors of the two key programs as well as the single subject program coordinator and special education program coordinator. In addition to a brief description in the narrative, the applicant provides detailed resumes for all personnel. The educational backgrounds and qualifications are appropriate for the project and will assist it in accomplishing its tasks and activities.

iii. The applicant indicates that regular assessment and evaluation of the program components is an ongoing aspect of the program. (Page 36) In the project management plan, the applicant includes such activities as: Assess effectiveness of recruitment strategies. (Page 34) This process is done annually by the various recruiters it has included on the database of information and referrals. These activities will ensure that staff will regularly review the feedback and consider potential changes if needed.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses 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:

i. The management plan provided by the applicant is designed to provide an independent assessment of both the Next Generation Math Teachers program as well as the Residency in Secondary Education program. (Page 37) The applicant indicates it will engage an independent evaluator to assist in collecting, organizing, and analyzing the data. Both quantitative and qualitative methods will be included. The final report will use descriptive statistics that address the performance measures required by GPRA and the state agency. The evaluation will include a Quasi-experimental design and will produce both formative and summative feedback.

ii. The applicant provides a table which identifies the specific goals and objectives of the project. (Page 38) For each goal, the applicant provides a statement of priority actions which reflect key activities needed to be accomplished. For objectives, the applicant provides sub objectives which identify specific activities and outcomes it is planning. The

applicant indicates it will create a database which includes applicant data information on student completion, school placement data, exit evaluations, retention, and teacher performance. The applicant will seek to create groups that are equivalent to provide comparison data.

iii. The applicant will collect sufficient qualitative and quantitative data to provide indication that it has achieved its performance outcomes. (Pages 38 and 39) The applicant indicates that the plan will provide timely formative feedback to various stakeholders and partners. That information will be provided through regular project briefings designed to support program improvement. (Page 37) A final summative evaluation will be provided to the US Department of Education, University, and program stakeholders.

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 has designed a program at the pre-baccalaureate level which will enable non-math majors to attain certification to teach math to the middle school level. (Page 18) This proposed program increases the access of interested

teacher candidates to the teaching of math and allows them to become qualified to teach at the middle school level. Overall, this program has a strong focus on the development of content knowledge and effective use of technology in teaching middle school math.

2. The proposed program seeks to take advantage of competent candidates who have an interest in teaching mathematics but may be certified in other fields. (Page 18) This program will allow non-math majors to obtain subject matter competency and prepare to teach mathematics that employs the new Core State Standards. The program will provide courses which develop a deep understanding of mathematics that they will be teaching as well as a strong pedagogical foundation.

3. The applicant indicates that teachers enrolled in the Next Generation Mathematics Teachers program will begin the clinical experience in the first semester and will continue for four semesters. (Page 22) The clinical experience will be combined with a biweekly seminar and will be guided by a mentor teacher or University faculty person.

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. Both the Next Generation of Mathematics Teachers and the Residency in Secondary Education programs address the Common Core Standards as well as the Next Generation Science Standards. (Page 27)

b. The applicant indicates that the standards based programs being proposed will be guided in the classroom through the use of a trained and experienced mentor teacher. (Page 28) As a result, the participants will be implementing standards-based education in the classroom and in their professional learning communities.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/14/2014 12:46 PM

