

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/15/2014 02:11 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Illinois State University (U336S140070)

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 #5 - 2014 TQP Grant Review - 5: 84.336S

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Illinois State University (U336S140070)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

Strengths:

This proposal addresses each of the above criteria thoroughly. Specific strengths of this proposal include the university partnerships with three major urban school districts and nine community partners. recruiting, training, inducting, and retaining 500 new teacher candidates is ambitious yet needed to fulfill the demands from the participating school districts. Although ISU is located centrally, it plans to heavily support and work closely with the three large school districts that surrounds the university (p.5). It is noteworthy that ISU plans to develop an urban education center specifically targeted at meeting the unique needs of the partner school districts (p.9). The partner school districts have committed to institutionalizing the efforts of the URBAN CENTER once this grant is completed (p.6).

Weaknesses:

None noted

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

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

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

Note: In order to address this criterion, applicants are encouraged to develop logic models to demonstrate their project's theory of action. Applicants should connect available evidence of past history of successful outcomes to their logic models. Applicants may use resources such as the Pacific Education Laboratory's Education Logic Model Application (www.relpacific.mcrel.org/PERR.html) 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:

This proposal addresses each criterion comprehensively. It is evident from the narrative that a makeover of the university preparation program will take place in partnership with three school districts and nine community organizations. There are extensive strengths of this proposal. A few that are noteworthy include: the use of edTPA to assess teacher candidates' readiness to teach (p.26), paying mentor teachers a substantial stipend of [REDACTED] to attend 40 hours of mentor training to improve their roles as cooperating teachers (p.31), and effective literacy strategy integration across all content (p.29). The future of the project is promising as a result of partners committed to institutionalization of the project with a promise to use their own funds (p.6). The inclusion of a logic model (p.14) thoughtfully outlined the short and long term goals of creating an URBAN CENTER.

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:

The proposal comprehensively addresses each criterion in the Management Plan. A strength of the plan is the use of six work teams to ensure all program goals are met (p.36.). Equally important are the key personnel listed. It is noteworthy that partner districts are included in these key roles so it truly is a representative partnership. The overall organization will be led by a Governance Panel (p.36), which includes six teacher representatives and three administrators from the districts along with other key personnel. It is noteworthy that three new Community Managers (p.46) are planned (one for each partnering district) that will serve as the point person for implementation. This will ensure existing school district personnel are not tasked with more work to implement this grant.

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:

This proposal comprehensively addresses each criterion in Project Evaluation. Plans for using an independent evaluator is a strength of this proposal (p.50-51). The components of the project evaluation clearly align with the proposal's goals and should provide valuable quantitative and qualitative data. To evaluate student achievement, multiple measures will be used avoiding the dependence on a high stakes testing (p.56). Also noteworthy is the effort to gather data from students and parents using periodic surveys with open-ended questions (p.59).

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:

This proposal thoroughly addresses the criteria for promoting STEM education. The collaboration among faculty outside the School of Education is a strength ensuring teacher candidates receive strong content knowledge. Also noteworthy is the intentional sequence to add early and multiple field-based instructional experiences. Teacher candidates begin in their freshman year with authentic experiences in the partnering urban districts and culminates with a traditional 16-week student teaching or a year-long placement. In addition to the increased frequency of practicum hours throughout the four year program, placements in varying grade levels are required (p.23). This should result in increased confidence of new teachers.

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:

This proposal thoroughly addresses each criterion in the implementation of academic standards. The narrative clearly outlines intentional course alignment with the CCSS. Throughout the narrative, standards-based best practices are integrated into all proposal components.

Weaknesses:

None noted

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/15/2014 02:11 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/15/2014 04:09 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Illinois State University (U336S140070)

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 #5 - 2014 TQP Grant Review - 5: 84.336S

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Illinois State University (U336S140070)

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 establishes a program as result of extensive need analysis of the partnering school districts and data gathered on the target population (pages 5-10). As a result of this work, the applicant establishes the URBAN CENTER that will address these needs. The center establishes a distance education component. The URBAN CENTER will create an integrated, comprehensive system of urban teacher recruitment, preparation, induction/mentoring, and retention to strengthen a pipeline model that will recruit and prepare 500 high-quality teachers for the schools in the highest-need districts in Illinois where teacher attrition is endemic and student achievement remains persistently low as compared to state and national averages (page 5).

(ii) Establishing a center results in system change and improves the existing program. For example, the applicant and its partners have indicated in their letters of partnership, that they are committed to institutionalization of the project and plan to use their own funds to continue the project (page 6). Teachers will begin clinical experiences earlier in their programs.

(iii) The applicant provides evidence that it will prepare personnel to address personnel shortages (pages 11-12). Data is presented to demonstrate need in the targeted school district. For example, substantial shortage of highly qualified teachers exists in Illinois urban public schools. As a district, the partner school district's teacher attrition is 18%. Of those, about 40% transfer to another district school, but a growing number head for suburban districts (page 12).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were 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:

(i) The applicant provides substantial supporting theory to support the aspects of the project design (pages 12-15). For example, research is provided to support the collaboration activities of the project. Specifically, the applicant states that "In their research on educational reform in Chicago, Bryk, Sebring, Allensworth, Luppescu, and Easton (2010) demonstrated that for student achievement to be improved, collaboration needs to occur among teachers, principals, and community partners" (page 12). Other research is provided to support preparing teacher candidates, placing and supporting teacher candidates, and creating and supporting urban teachers.

(ii) The applicant provides substantial evidence that its program is of sufficient duration, intensity and quality for its participants (pages 16-20). For example, the applicant provides professional development through such methods as technological means and year-long experiences throughout their clinical experience. The applicant indicates that all professional development activities, whether focused on pedagogy or academic content, will provide follow-up support in the form of extensive mentoring and coaching, which will enable candidates and teachers to apply the new concepts and strategies they have learned. The mentoring will also be accompanied by reflection and dialogue sessions where candidates, new teachers, and the mentors can explore case material (sometimes in a video format) and specific examples of how instruction can be improved.

(iii) Information is found to support a sustained program of training in the field (pages 16-34). Throughout the substantial narrative, the applicant provides programs throughout the program and beyond. Sustained professional development include training on interventions such as Positive Behavior Supports (PBIS) and Response to Intervention (RtI). Accountability mechanisms are established throughout the program. The applicant summarizes its efforts, "The URBAN CENTER project will be programmatically accountable by undertaking innovative teacher preparation and induction

reforms, resulting in highly qualified teachers in high-need subject areas (special, STEM, bilingual, and elementary education) who will graduate and begin filling these shortages. As such, the project will have major impacts on the quality of in-service teachers within the LEAs. Such accountability of programmatic reforms will ultimately be evidenced through the project's impact in student achievement and teacher retention" (page 34).

(iv) The applicant provides evidence that it will partner with school districts, agencies and schools within the university (page 1, Appendix). Letters indicate support of the efforts of the partnership. Specifically, the applicant will partner with a consortium of high-need schools within these high-need LEAs (Chicago Public Schools District 299 [CPS], Peoria Public Schools District 150 [PSD], Decatur Public Schools District 61 [DPS]); Illinois State University (ISU) a four year public university including its Colleges of Education and Arts & Sciences; and nine community partners (page 1)

(v) Partners have indicated that the project will be sustained after project activities are completed (page 6). The applicant's partners have indicated in their letters of partnership, that they are committed to institutionalization of the project and plan to use their own funds to continue the project. This criterion is substantially demonstrated.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were 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:

(i) The management plan is replete with activities assigned to respective personnel (pages 39-42). The management plan includes tasks, milestones, timelines and designated personnel. The overall management will be undertaken by the Management Team, composed of the Project Director, Assistant Director, ISU Colleges of Education and Arts and Sciences faculty members, teacher candidates, induction coordinators, representatives from each LEA, and each community partner. Work teams will have weekly meetings to manage activities.

(ii) The applicant provides extensive information on the key personnel associated with the project (pages 43-47). Qualifications are relevant to conducting project activities. The project director will serve 100% on the project and has experience working with similar projects. Specifically, the director has numerous experience and will serve as urban teacher education "point person" for all undergraduate teacher education across the institution. The project director has coupled public school teaching experience with over 15 years of higher education administration to develop and sustain nationally recognized, collaborative urban teacher preparation partnerships between IHEs, LEAs, and community-based organizations (CBO). Other key personnel such as the high needs special education coordinator have relevant experiences.

(iii) The applicant provides substantial details on how it provides performance feedback fro continuous program improvement (pages 47-48). For example, the quantitative and qualitative results will be shared on a quarterly basis at the Governance Council meetings. Those results will include: equivalent pre-post surveys, feed-back questionnaires, teacher observation protocols, K-12 student test scores, focus groups, and interviews

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were 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:

(i) The methods of evaluation are aligned with project activities. Explained throughout the narrative, the applicant culminates its methods with each of the aspects of the program: partnership outcomes, teacher outcomes and student outcomes (pages 48-49). The applicant will develop internal consistency reliability coefficients for scores obtained from instruments administered during the study will be calculated, reported and are expected to be at least .80 to ensure consistency.

(ii) Methods are feasible to project goals and objectives (page 49-50). With benchmarked data, the applicant establishes feasible and appropriate performance goals. For example, benchmarks and timelines will be set annually to gauge whether the project's activities are meeting the partnership's objectives. Throughout the program, teacher, school administrator, student, parent, and community representative performance will be assessed using such quantitative measures as time-series pre-post questionnaires and surveys; state assessments of academic proficiency, academic content, and assessments of teacher candidates meeting state teaching and learning standards; standardized observation instruments; attendance data; enrollment records; and student standardized test scores (page 50).

(iii) Evaluation methods are described to provide performance feedback (page 50). The Project Director and the Governance Council will receive monthly feedback from the Management Team and the Independent Evaluator to ensure that timely and valid information is provided (page 58). Information will be used in a variety of ways to manage progress towards the project's stated objectives. This process will be repeated each project year and an ongoing feedback loop will be created to ensure progress toward outcomes (page 59). The evaluation methods permit periodic assessment toward progress toward achieving project outcomes.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were 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:

(a) Professional development activities are designated for teachers and other educators of STEM subjects. Specifically, the applicant's URBAN program targets all teachers of urban students to meet the needs of urban school districts. Demonstration is provided in the narrative.

(b) Emphasis for this sub-priority is placed on recruitment efforts (page 19). Specifically, the applicant will recruit from diverse population represented of the targeted service areas. For example, through one local education agencies, student chapters at public high schools provide underrepresented students with post-secondary awareness seminars, including campus visitations, college application, and financial aid workshops.

(1) In meeting this sub-priority, the applicant provides evidence that it will have collaboration to ensure cross pollination of activities in schools of education and arts and sciences (pages 2-3). Specifically, instructional coursework and field-based experiences will be provided to teacher candidates within the applicant's program. For example, in mathematics the teacher candidates will make use of inductive and deductive reasoning and be creative in employing modern technologies that will assist school students to learn key mathematical structures.

(2) The applicant provides ample evidence that it will include hands-on and inquiry-based STEM opportunities for prospective teachers (pages 2-4). For example, mathematics students in the URBAN CENTER will have multiple field-based experiences through their clinical work in the project's three urban school districts to provide exposure to a variety of teaching and learning environments, which are coordinated with the teachers' preparation program.

(3) Early and multiple experiences are embedded into the applicant's project (pages 2-4). Experience occurs throughout the program

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were 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:

(a) The applicant provides ample evidence that its program support the implementation of internationally benchmarked college-and career-ready academic standards (pages 3-4). For example, through the College of Education's various programs, candidates participate in a variety of methods courses with clinical experiences. In these courses, candidates specifically work with common core state standards (CCSS) when designing and teaching standards-based lesson plans. In their courses, teacher candidates are exposed to lesson plan templates and websites that clarify the difference

between the old standards and the CCSS.

(b) Those strategies translate into classroom practice through review and audit of content delivery (page 5). The applicant provides evidence that this is ongoing improvement. Specifically, The Borg Center within the applicant's network will work with districts and schools through professional development activities focused on teachers candidates and new teachers to conduct an audit of the literacy curriculum, which will serve five primary purposes: comprehensively review all aspects of the elementary literacy curriculum; identify existing strengths of the current curriculum as it is delivered in classrooms; cross-walk literacy curriculum with CCSS; identify areas and needs for curricular improvement in literacy instruction; and, suggest potential actions and resources to assist with curricular improvement.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/15/2014 04:09 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/19/2014 11:38 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Illinois State University (U336S140070)

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 #5 - 2014 TQP Grant Review - 5: 84.336S

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Illinois State University (U336S140070)

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's proposed project is clearly likely to build local capacity to provide, improve, or expand services that address the needs of the target population. The applicant states within the Chicago Public Schools (CPS) System two of the targeted school districts have experienced greater than 100% growth in English Language Learners (ELL) from 2005 to 2012 (pg. 5). The applicant indicates the proposed project will provide increase local capacity by supporting teacher preparation and enhance student achievement, and change the way teachers instruct high-need students (pg. 6).
- ii) The applicant's proposed project will result in system change or improvement. The applicant indicates the Urban Center will create an integrated, comprehensive system of urban teacher recruitment, preparation, and induction/mentoring to strengthen a pipeline model that will recruit and prepare 500 high-quality teachers for the highest-need districts in Illinois (pgs. 1, 20-25).
- iii) The applicant's proposed project will adequately prepare personnel for fields in which shortages have been demonstrated. The applicant states they will be able to close the supply/demand gap in Chicago and downstate urban districts, and they have a history of doing so. The applicant indicates more than 80% of Illinois State University (ISU) graduates are still teaching 5 years after graduation compared to 50% nationally. (pg.11,19)

Weaknesses:

- i) None noted.
- ii) None noted.
- iii) None noted.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Note: In order to address this criterion, applicants are encouraged to develop logic models to demonstrate their project's theory of action. Applicants should connect available evidence of past history of successful outcomes to their logic models. Applicants may use resources such as the Pacific Education Laboratory's Education Logic Model Application (www.relpacific.mcrel.org/PERR.html) 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 clearly illustrates proposed project is soundly supported by strong theory. The applicant cites theory by Amatea, Cholewam, & Mixon, 2012, which states it is only through real-life experiences that teacher candidates, as participant-observers, can develop the ability to reflect on how other cultures function and how the histories of those cultures can have a deep impact on students' views of learning and attitudes towards their futures (pgs.13,15).

ii) The applicant sufficiently demonstrates 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 states the proposed urban teacher preparation project will have four years of clinical experiences and course work of increasing intensity and complexity for teacher candidates, with ample opportunities to develop high-quality skills to teach in high-need urban settings (pgs.15-18). New teachers under the URBAN CENTER have a wide range of intensive professional development (PD) induction experiences. Experiences includes classroom coaching and mentoring by master/experienced teachers who are also teachers in their school building; all day Saturday PD institutes that include literacy, technology, Common Core State Standards (CCSS), and classroom management workshops; and research on how knowledge can most effectively be taught; within school and between district study groups (pg.17).

iii) The applicant clearly illustrates a proposed project with activities that constitute a coherent, sustained program of training in the field. For example, the applicant indicates in the STEP-UP Program, selected fellows will spend four weeks co-teaching with the guidance from experienced mentors to learn about best practices and urban school teaching methodologies. Mentors will include veteran teachers, ISU alumni, partner district staff and ISU faculty. The program will consist of housing with host families within partner cities, transportation, a living subsidy, mentorship, and PD opportunities. (pg.22).

iv) The applicant sufficiently demonstrates proposed services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services. The applicant proposed partners will include: LISC/Chicago, LISC/Peoria (private nonprofits); Enlace-Chicago (community-based nonprofit); Greater Auburn Gresham Development Corporation (community-based nonprofit); North River Commission (community-based nonprofit); The Resurrection Project (community-based nonprofit); Breakthrough Urban Ministries (community development corporation); Latino Policy Forum (private policy and advocacy organization); and State Farm Insurance Company Foundation (business) (pgs. 1, 34-35).

v) The applicant provides minimal evidence demonstrating it has the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the grant. The applicant states all the URBAN CENTER partners are fully committed to the design and has committed its own funds and in-kind resources which abundantly illustrates support for the proposed project and secured resources ensuring sustainability after the grant funding period has ended (pgs.37-38).

Weaknesses:

- i) None noted.
- ii) None noted.
- iii) None noted.
- iv) None noted.
- v) 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:

i) The applicant clearly demonstrates a comprehensive 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 (pg. 41-42)

ii) The applicant describes the experience of key project personnel that is aligned with the tasks that are to be undertaken. The applicant states the Development Associate Professor presently teaches courses with an emphasis on urban education that contain high concentrations of pre-service teachers to better prepare them for urban and underserved areas. Additionally, the applicant states the Project Director has over 15 years of higher education administration experience as well as experience in developing and sustaining nationally recognized, collaborative urban teacher preparation partnerships between IHEs, LEAs, and community-based organizations (pgs. 43-48).

(iii) The applicant clearly demonstrates performance feedback and continuous improvement plans which will be integral to the design of the proposed project. The applicant states quantitative and qualitative results will be shared on a quarterly basis at the Governance Council meetings. Results to be shared will include: equivalent pre-post surveys, feed-back questionnaires, and teacher observations (pgs. 47-48).

Weaknesses:

i) None noted.

ii) None noted.

iii) 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:

i) The applicant provides a number of methods of proposed project evaluation, which can provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes. The applicant proposes to assess partnership collaboration outcomes, teacher candidate and new teacher outcomes, in addition to student outcomes (pgs. 48-59).

(ii) The applicant clearly demonstrates methods of evaluation which are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project. For example, the applicant states proposed quantitative measuring tools will include pre-post questionnaires and surveys; state assessments of academic proficiency, academic content, and assessments of teacher candidates meeting state teaching and learning standards; standardized observation instruments; attendance data; enrollment records; and student standardized test scores. Qualitative assessments will include interviews, focus groups, portfolios, LiveText, written reports, journals, minutes, course unit plans, lessons, and materials (pgs. 49-51).

(iii) The applicant clearly describes methods in which the evaluation will provide performance feedback. The applicant states the Management Team and the Independent Evaluator will be responsible for conducting the project's evaluation activities in a timely manner. Baseline data for summative assessments will be collected at all partnership school sites when each school year begins: October of 2014 of the first year, and August in following years (pgs. 52-59).

Weaknesses:

i) None noted.

ii) None noted.

iii) 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:

a) The applicant clearly describes a plan for increasing the opportunities for high-quality preparation of, or professional development for, teachers or other educators of STEM subjects. The applicant states the Faculty in the College of Education will collaborate with Arts and Sciences faculty to ensure individuals intending on teaching STEM courses in mathematics and sciences will build appropriate content knowledge. The STEM courses will align to Common Core State Standards (CCSS) and professional development (PD) with strategies which will translate standards into practice (pg. 2-3, 26-32).

(b) The applicant clearly demonstrates a plan for increasing the number of individuals from groups traditionally underrepresented in STEM. The applicant indicates the Chicago Teacher Pipeline's (CTP) programs has assisted with the Latino student enrollment over the past 10 years at ISU. Student chapters at public high schools provide underrepresented students with post-secondary awareness seminars, including campus visitations, college application, and financial aid workshops. (pgs. 19-20).

Weaknesses:

a) None noted.

b) 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:

(a) The applicant clearly demonstrates a plan for the development or implementation of professional development or preparation programs aligned with internationally benchmarked, college- and career-ready academic standards held in common by multiple States. For example, teacher candidates are exposed to lesson plan templates and websites that clarify the difference between the old standards and the CCSS (pgs. 3-4)

(b) The applicant clearly demonstrates proposed strategies that translate the standards into classroom practice. The applicant states interns will be supported and mentored by effective teachers through a process of socialized induction which has been shown to increase teacher retention when such induction and support for beginning teachers is provided (pgs.23-24).

Weaknesses:

a) None noted.

b) None noted.

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/19/2014 11:38 PM