

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/11/2014 05:44 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: California State University, Dominguez Hills (U336S140042)

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 #12 - 2014 TQP Grant Review- 12: 84.336S

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: California State University, Dominguez Hills (U336S140042)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

Strengths:

- The proposed plan provides statistics that support its likelihood to build local capacity to provide, improve, or expand services that address the needs of the target population (p.3-6).
- The through plan detailed by the proposed project (pg.8) suggests that it will result in system change or improvement.
- Thorough description of plans that will prepare personnel for fields in which shortages have been demonstrated is evident (pgs. 9-10).

Weaknesses:

NA

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:

- The proposed project is thoroughly supported by strong theory (pg.11).
- 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 (pg. 11-14).
- The proposed activities constitute a coherent, sustained program of training in the field. Pages 14-39 provide a thorough description of four particular program goals and the activities, milestones, and program resources that will be utilized in their meeting of those goals.
- The services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services, as evidenced on pgs. 39-40.
- The applicant thoroughly demonstrates that it has the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the grant (pgs. 40).

Weaknesses:

NA

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:

- The management plan fully describes its 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 (pgs.41-43).
- The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel are included (pg. 44-45) and their resumes are included in the appendices.
- Performance feedback and continuous improvement are demonstrated to be integral to the design of the proposed project (p.46).

Weaknesses:

NA

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

- The methods of evaluation provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes (pgs. 46-48).
- The methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project (pgs. 48-49).
- The methods of evaluation provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes (pgs.49-50).

Weaknesses:

NA

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:

-Students eligible to enter this residency will already have bachelor's degrees in a STEM subject area, strengthening their STEM content knowledge (p. 1).

-Hands-on, inquiry-based approaches are utilized throughout the education courses taken by residents (p. 1).

-Details of field-based instructional experiences are provided, including 80 hours of observations that are made before being admitted to the program (p. 1).

-Evidence of CSUDH's diverse student body provides evidence that groups underrepresented in STEM will be targeted (p. 2).

Weaknesses:

NA

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 implementation of Common Core State Standards as the criteria for improving instruction and learning is evidenced (p. 3).

-The use of NGSS, beginning 2015-2016, is outlined (p. 3).

Weaknesses:

NA

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/11/2014 05:44 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/09/2014 06:15 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: California State University, Dominguez Hills (U336S140042)

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 #12 - 2014 TQP Grant Review- 12: 84.336S

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: California State University, Dominguez Hills (U336S140042)

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, as a minority working institution, and accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education and they will partner with the Los Angeles School District, the nation's second largest district. The significance of the project lies in the ability not only to address the low academic levels of target area schools by providing quality certified and trained teachers, but also address the critical shortage of STEM teachers in the area.
- (ii) The main systemic change that the project seeks to implement is an alternative by strengthening a third pathway to a teaching credential, alongside student teaching and internship. The project will produce 105 highly qualified teachers with deep theoretical understanding of teaching and commitment to high-need schools.
- (iii) The project has provided data that has supported the critical need for trained teachers in the STEM area. The project thus addresses the problem in both in the short term by providing STEM teachers, and by systemic change in the long-term by providing rigorous alternative teacher preparation methods.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses.

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) The proposal has provided a justification of the project in the theoretical model as presented in the logic model. A reformed design from the previous year's residency program will enable potential teachers to have masters' degrees before starting their teaching career, which enables for content mastery.

(ii) The project has provided details about the project model and design. The design increases the rigor and frequency of activities gradually. The project uses a comprehensive coursework and clinical preparation through induction. The credentials masters' course is blended without sacrificing the quality of intervention. The proposal has provided a detailed description of the duration, standards foci, the early field experiences, residency, the clinical experience, professional development, induction and masters with their frequency and intensity.

(iii) The project has a good structure in its recruitment/selection strategies, residential experiences, induction support and professional development, evaluation and institutionalization. The project goals are broken down into aligned activities and extraordinary details are provided of how each objective is a part of the project overall model.

(iv) The hallmark of this project is the extraordinary partnership that is involved in the development of the project. The main partners: the applicant, the Los Angeles School District and the other organizations such as Troops to Teachers are described, their roles in the project are clarified and documented.

(v) The project design is strong and the top leadership of all partnering organizations have supported the institutionalization of the changes in the teacher preparation program. The proposal has actually provided evidence of the monetary advantages derived from the implementation of the project activities, and how it will impact sustainability.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses.

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 project has a strong management plan with a complete list of project key staff and the hierarchy. A complete list of project time-line with the main project activity, the responsible persons, the time frame and the annual changes, if any, are indicated.

(ii) The project will be implemented by a group of qualified personnel. The profiles of the project manager/PI, the program coordinator, residency coordinator, coordinator of professional learning community and professional development academy, assessment coordinator, and coordinator of induction are provided with appropriate qualifications, expertise and time-commitments

(iii) The project has provided for feedback mechanism. The PI meets the project team every week, and the coordinating council regularly to discuss progress and challenges. There is a clear reporting structure to ensure clear communication.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses.

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 project has a strong evaluation plan. The evaluation is planned as a comparative longitudinal mixed-methods formative and summative evaluation design. The proposal has provided a list of all evaluation measures aligned to project objectives.

(ii) The project evaluation plan is detailed and provides details of data mechanisms, data collection and sources, and how the comparison will take place. The analyses methods are stipulated. An experienced external evaluation working with the project staff will enable an objective, but feasible evaluation process.

(iii) The project evaluation plan has a strong feedback mechanism. Formative data is collected, triangulated, and through the year, sourced through multiple qualitative and quantitative strategies. The evaluators will provide regular feedback to project staff with more detailed feedback and discussion of findings at mid-year and in annual reports.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses.

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 proposal has provided a detailed discussion of how it will address competitive priority 1. The project has through its design focused on institutional collaboration, and hands-on inquiry-based STEM professional training of teachers. Moreover, the project outlines field-based instructional experiences for the trainees. As a minority serving institution, the project will use targeting recruiting strategies to recruit, select and train a diverse group of participants. (pages 1 & 2).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses.

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 project will use the Common Core Standards, which are internationally benchmarked for college and career-readiness; world-wide about 10 countries use them. The project objectives and outcome measures are aligned to these standards. Also, the project design seeks to translate the standards into classroom practice by matching students with master teachers who are trained and practitioners of the common core in their fields. (pages 2 & 3).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/09/2014 06:15 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/09/2014 03:31 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: California State University, Dominguez Hills (U336S140042)

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 #12 - 2014 TQP Grant Review- 12: 84.336S

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: California State University, Dominguez Hills (U336S140042)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

Strengths:

The project narrative provides evidence that this project, STAR, is very likely to build local capacity to improve services that address the needs of the target population in Los Angeles County. This population was described on pages 2-3. Test scores show that this population is performing behind their peers. Pages 6 and 9. CSUDH's diverse student body involves groups traditionally underrepresented in STEM. Page 2. The end result of this project will result in credentialed candidates that will be teaching in urban schools which houses the populations of multilingual, multicultural students. Page 4. The narrative states that this project will provide a larger pipeline of high-quality teachers for urban schools which will help to raise achievement.

Because this program is based on lessons learned from previous projects, it is highly likely that this project will result in systematic change. Page 5. STAR is based on a 2009 TQP grant. Page 7.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

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 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:

The project narrative provided referrals to major pieces of research which informed the document. Page 12.

The narrative provided extensive evidence that this training is of sufficient quality, intensity and duration, which will lead to improvements for residents, school districts, and university partners. The model was documented on page 7 and 8.

The narrative provided evidence of a very extensive recruitment and marketing program to reach STEM underrepresented groups. Page 2.

The program provides a sustained program of training for the residents and effective professional development for the mentors. The goals and objectives were very specific and clearly designed. Page 16 and 47. Many charts were included to give us a thorough picture of the course schedule, the schedule for the residents, and other professional development training. Pages 20, 22, 23, 28, and 32.

The narrative provides SOME evidence that this applicant has thought about the operation of the grant beyond the length of the granting period. It was documented on page 37 that the project will develop an online repository of lessons, materials, video cases, etc. for teacher training that will be assembled for use during the teacher training and beyond the grant period. Page 37.

A logic model for this project was included on page 10 which provides the working components of this project.

The project is based on models for teacher residencies developed at the National-Louis University in Chicago and the Boston Teacher Residency. Page 11. Both of these programs had high teacher retention rates after three years. Page 11.

A chart comparing the distinctive elements of a residency program, as stated by The Center for Teaching Quality, against that of the STAR Project. The STAR Project aligns with that model. Page 12. This project is also based on lessons learned from previous 2009 TQP grant project. A chart on page 14 documents how the new project is slightly different and the benefits that will be noted because of those changes. Page 14. Another example to be noted, on page 18 of the narrative, it stated that the PI learned through that experience that qualified candidates often needed help to pass the CSET test. STAR will now offer test preparation help for those requesting that assistance. Page 18. Because of those changes, it is highly likely that this project will result in systematic change. Page 5, 14.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

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:

There are defined roles and responsibilities for the management structure provided, as well as a project timeline of activities and the staff responsible on page 41-43.

The qualifications for all key personnel was included. The credentials and experience is more than adequate. The PI has experience directing large government grants which include grants from NSF, Noyce Foundation, and the Department of Education. Page 43. There is evidence that the management will complete this project within the allotted time and the budget allocated.

The narrative also provided evidence that there will be continuous feedback so that the program can be improved as it evolves. Page 45 and 46. There is evidence on page 49 that the evaluations will provide feedback and permit periodic assessment of the project progress. This will help to strengthen the project and will help to iron out any challenges.

The PI will disseminate the project's progress toward its goals, lab school best practices, promising practices by mentors and residents, and promising practices by STAR teachers.

Because the goals, objectives, and measures are clearly stated on page 47 and 48, it is likely that the project will be completed on time and within budget.

Weaknesses:

None Noted

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

The narrative states that the applicant has hired an independent, objective evaluator, who has over 20 years in education and extensive experience with pre-service and in-service teacher development. Page 50. She will work closely with the STAR team to implement the evaluation, including finalizing the design, data collection, and the analysis and reporting. Page 50.

The documented methods of evaluation for this project will provide valid and reliable performance data on the relevant outcomes. Page 48 – 49. The methods for this evaluation were feasible and appropriate for the goals and objectives. It will consist of a mixed formative and summative evaluation design which will provide feedback to STAR and will help to guide and improve the project. Page 46. A chart of the Summary Goals, Objectives, and Measures were found on page 47.

Weaknesses:

NONE NOTED

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 document provides a very thorough and extensive statement concerning how this project relates to STEM. Pages 1 & 3.

Weaknesses:

None Noted

Reader's Score: 5

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Implementing Academic Standards

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

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

b) Strategies that translate the standards into classroom practice.

Strengths:

The document provides a very thorough and extensive statement concerning NGSS and Common Core on page 2 & 3.

Weaknesses:

None noted

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/09/2014 03:31 PM