

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/14/2014 01:17 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Montclair State University (U336S140078)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	15	15
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	45	43
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	15
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	16
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	96

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Montclair State University (U336S140078)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

Strengths:

The applicant has completed a needs assessment and discusses the fact that the partnering district has more ineffective teachers in the district than the state average. The project would address this need. Additionally, the project targets secondary STEM, special education, and early childhood. Teachers will be recruited into these shortage areas through a cost-of-living stipend and waiver of tuition in exchange for a three-year commitment to teaching in high-need subject areas.

The coordination of efforts of the IHE and district is likely to improve system. The project seeks to create a culture of inquiry and continuous improvement in the district, for example, through use of action research and professional learning communities. Themes guiding the program are community, collaboration, and continuous improvement.

Weaknesses:

None

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 design is informed by other residency programs and the applicant's previous experience. NMUTR has been in place for five years. This iteration of the project will expand on previous accomplishments by continuing to offer residency and induction and adding early childhood and special education components with a focus on STEM.

Project includes a comprehensive clinical apprenticeship, rigorous graduate coursework and cohort structure, and unique community-based summer experiences for residents. The three components of residency include classroom immersion (with experienced teachers), instructional rounds (similar to medical rounds), and group seminars (for mentors, residents, and faculty). There is coherence in the project model and activities. Project will use the "cluster" model for early childhood and secondary level students, working in particular with "hub" schools, where coursework will take place, as well as having students placed there for residency. Residents will do a "collaborative inquiry" to examine educational practice (action research).

It is notable that professional development will be provided for mentors/coaches to support their knowledge, skills, and attitudes for successful mentoring. Building mentor capacity is important in improving resident experiences.

Cost-of-living stipends for admitted residents and a waiving of a portion of tuition in exchange for a three-year full-time teaching commitment in high-need subject areas are incentives for potential participants.

There has been a history of collaboration among the partners. There is evidence that the project is sustainable beyond the life of the grant. There are in-kind services and additional resources available for the project. For example, NPS will contribute one-third of residents' stipends and will provide facilities and maintenance for classes. MSU will commit matching funds for professional development. The Geraldine R. Dodge Foundation will provide matching funds for action research groups.

Weaknesses:

The applicant could have benefited from a more thorough discussion of its theory of action and conceptual framework, spelling out how each part is aligned to respective outputs and short-, mid-, and long-term outcomes. The logic model and conceptual framework will be developed during Year 1.

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

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

i) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

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

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant provides a detailed timeline of activities and respective personnel responsible, by year (divided by semesters).

Personnel have relevant training and experience at the IHE and at the district. An Advisory Council made up of relevant personnel will make decisions: the two co-PIs, the MSU NMUTR lead, the residency Project Director, the NPS Executive Director of Strategic Initiatives, the NPS Chief Talent Officer, the NPS Executive Director of Staffing and Recruitment, the principals of the hub schools, the Dean of the MSU College of Education and Human Services, the Dean of the MSU College of Science and Mathematics, the NPS teacher liaisons, and the Director of the MSUNER. Bi-weekly meetings and phone conversations will be utilized to review evaluation issues.

Weaknesses:

Although personnel involved have the appropriate credentials, experience, and training to manage the project, the project lacks a comprehensive continuous improvement plan. The applicant could have benefited from outlining how and what information will be used to plan improvements to the project.

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:

An independent research and evaluation center, the Center for Research and Evaluation on Education and Human Services (CREEHS) will conduct the program evaluation of the NMUTR. In collaboration with the NMUTR Advisory Council, CREEHS will plan program evaluation, including instrument development and refinement, data collection, and dissemination. CREEHS is experienced in this type of program evaluation, is well situated within the IHE, and includes researchers and evaluators on its staff.

For each project goal, applicant provides research questions, objectives, and performance measures they will utilize to evaluate the program. Data will include qualitative and quantitative data. Methods are feasible to the extent that the student data are available from district.

The applicant states that their evaluation findings will be communicated with project staff on a consistent basis at bi-weekly in-person meetings and through ongoing telephone and email communications.

Weaknesses:

Though applicant lists all the data collection instruments (e.g., focus groups, interviews), there isn't a detailed timeline of when data would be collected. Planning for this would ensure that periodic assessment of progress is possible.

Reader's Score: 16

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Promoting STEM Education

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

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

b) Increasing the number of individuals from groups traditionally underrepresented in STEM, including minorities, individuals with disabilities, and women, who are teachers or educators of STEM subjects and have increased opportunities for high-quality preparation or professional development.

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant is targeting secondary STEM and early childhood and special education with emphasis on STEM. Provide living stipends and tuition waiver for commitment will contribute to retention of these residents in the high-need subject areas.

Weaknesses:

None

Reader's Score: 5

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Implementing Academic Standards

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

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

b) Strategies that translate the standards into classroom practice.

Strengths:

State has adopted Common Core State Standards. Both teacher preparation and student learning are based on rigorous standards.

Weaknesses:

None

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/14/2014 01:17 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/12/2014 02:35 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Montclair State University (U336S140078)

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

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Montclair State University (U336S140078)

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 has clearly articulated how this project will directly meet the needs of the identified school district. These include: high poverty urban district; low proficiency scores; high turn-over of teachers; lack of highly qualified teachers; diverse population of students; and 92% are minority. (pgs. 2-23)
- ii. The applicant proposes to update their previous project and modify it based on previous experiences. They intend to incorporate the residency component and other strong methodologies within the traditional existing teacher prep programs. This will ultimately have an impact on improving the overall program and become a part of systemic programming.
- iii. The applicant clearly identifies special education, early childhood education, and math and science as the targeted areas for teachers.

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:

- i. The applicant clearly incorporates the results of previous teacher education grants and projects that they have conducted over the years. They include references and citations to support the evidence and research that helps to document and support their strongly developed teacher development programming.
- ii. The applicant provides well-organized and clearly developed professional development program activities, a schedule during the year, and summer programs, each organized according to role, including mentors, project staff, residents, and other participants.
- iii. The overall plan for this project is presented as a comprehensive support for the Newark Schools Teacher plan, the NJ standards, and a variety of other state and national guidelines. The applicant clearly aligns their program with all of these requirements. Ultimately, they will deliver a solid teacher education program that will prepare certificated teachers and highly qualified teachers.
- iv. The applicant clearly identifies partners within the university, including a variety of departments beyond the College of Education who will provide rigorous content areas including special education, early childhood, math, and science.

The applicant identifies a number of partners who will be providing resources, monies, and opportunities for all of the residents to observe and learn about what happens at their location during the rounds of summer when teachers candidates are able to learn more regarding the community. In addition, candidates will participate during the summer in community-related activities and will have an opportunity to interact with a variety of community agencies and organizations.

- v. The applicant provides a detailed discussion about how they will work with the school district to incorporate additional

funds and resources from complementary grants. The applicant identifies those activities that will be implemented by the partners and provided with in-kind services. The applicant provides a detailed listing of additional sources of monies and resources that will be incorporated into the future support of this project after the federal funding has ceased.

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:

i. The applicant provides an outstanding discussion regarding the overall implementation and supervision of this project. There is a detailed discussion regarding how each goal will be implemented, including goals and objectives and project activities. There is a detailed timeline containing all of the relevant information that helps to demonstrate how the project will be accomplished.

ii. Key project staff are identified, and brief descriptions of their background and job responsibilities are presented. In the appendices, there are detailed resumes and vitas for these staff members.

iii. The applicant discusses how periodic performance feedback will be used to inform the ongoing monitoring of progress towards accomplishment of the project benchmarks. This is major component of the evaluation process. (pgs. 38, 45-46)

The applicant discusses how the evaluation process will utilize these: Reporting Methods: Results from the evaluation will be used to monitor the project's progress toward meeting its objectives and will prompt recommendations for program improvement. Evaluation findings will be communicated to project staff on a consistent basis at bi-weekly in-person meetings and through ongoing telephone and email communications. Evaluation results will be formally summarized and presented in annual performance reports and local evaluation reports, which will be completed at the end of each program year. In these reports, the evaluator will present quantifiable, descriptive and analytic findings, as well as a narrative explanation of the data and interpretation of findings. P.46

The applicant discusses how the history of collaboration has and will ensure the alignment of standards, assessments, curriculum, and procedures across the district and MSU. These relationships and history have led to clear communications and the development of strategies to collaboratively recruit, prepare, and retain high quality teachers. (p 32)

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:

I. The applicant provides a well-written and designed evaluation process. There is a highly qualified external evaluation company identified, that will provide all the required data collections, data analysis, and reports as discussed. (pgs. 39-40)

The measurable and observable goals and objectives all include very specific performance measures which include

baseline data for comparisons, as well as target growth and increases as a result of this project.

The evaluation design clearly discusses how it will include a mixed design, and both qualitative and quantitative data will be collected and analyzed and used to determine whether or not performance measures, and the overall GPRA, has been achieved, and whether or not the project has been successful.

The applicant clearly reiterates the goals, objectives, and performance measures with corresponding, specific evaluation questions. All of these are directly aligned to one another, and the data that will be collected and analyzed is clearly aligned to the evaluation questions. (pgs. 39-43)

ii. Throughout the proposal, it is clearly articulated how student assessment is an integral component of the overall evaluation process. A number of student assessment data will be collected and compared.

iii. As written previously, the applicant clearly articulates how they will use continuous and ongoing feedback and analysis of the data collected to inform stakeholders and project staff of the successes and needs of the project. Continuous feedback and communications is a major component of this project.

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 applicant clearly discusses how they will recruit a diverse group of candidates based on similar backgrounds within the community and from under-represented populations.

The applicant clearly identifies how they will prepare math and science teachers that are in dire need within the school district.

The program activities will include staff from a large variety of departments and colleges within the applicant's program, including math and science.

The applicant discusses how all residency candidates will participate in summer rounds that will allow them a larger variety of experiences within different schools and agencies and organizations within the larger community.

The applicant discusses how the College of Science will provide inquiry-oriented activities for the teacher candidates. (p. 30) A number of partners are identified, including the Science Museum. They will provide a variety of hands-on workshops and experiments in the areas of science, technology, math, and engineering for the teacher candidates to participate in. (p. 24)

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Implementing Academic Standards

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

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

b) Strategies that translate the standards into classroom practice.

Strengths:

The applicant clearly includes a discussion about how they will implement standards-based teacher education programs, including NCATE, and additional accrediting agencies or organizations (i.e. NAEYC, International Baccalaureate, ISTE) (pgs. 32, 38)

The applicant discusses how the school district has begun to implement Common Core State Standards and the Next Generation Science Standards. The applicant clearly incorporates how all of these will be used by their candidates to assist in their actual teaching activities.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/12/2014 02:35 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/18/2014 02:05 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Montclair State University (U336S140078)

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

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Montclair State University (U336S140078)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

Strengths:

The applicant has documented a thorough investigation of the need in the Montclair State University community for highly qualified teachers. The applicant supplied a detailed description of the demographics of the community. This project would be conducted by the university in the largest school district in New Jersey. The applicant targeted community is a high need LEA with a 30.95% poverty rating as calculated by the U.S. Department of Education (U.S. Census, 2009). The proposal includes the thoroughly researched data on the racial/ethnic minority backgrounds of the students living in the projected community for the project. (e20)

The applicant has clearly stated descriptions of the schools participating in the partnership. The proposal clearly identifies the need and the specific challenges the participants face if they choose to participate in this program. Schools chosen are Benjamin Franklin School, Abington Avenue School, Peshine Avenue School, East Side HS, and Arts HS.

The proposal is written to give a clear picture of the environment and nature of the schools targeted by this grant application. (e21) Exceptional data was provided include, but are not limited to, the academic achievement, college/career readiness, and student growth of the partners to address the need for system change or improvement through the successful residency of the participants. (e21)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant has a well-documented logic model to detail the theory of change. The details address the participants, the activities, and the partnership relationships essential to the sustainability of the project goals and objectives. (e57)

The applicant strengthened the proposal by including a comprehensive explanation of how participants will benefit from a variety of networking opportunities built into NMUTR. The applicant details the annual Mentor Teacher Institute held to support the experienced teachers who are serving as mentors and coaches.

The applicant adequately describes the goals of the Mentor Teacher Institute as a support mechanism for the project and increased successful retention. Through the thorough discussion of the Mentor Teacher Institute the applicant has revealed the elements for building knowledge and skills for teaching in NPS. Teacher residents, new teachers (after the first two years), experienced teacher mentors/coaches, MSU faculty, and school administrators will continue to participate in the annual MSUNER summer conference. The conference gives participants opportunities to share their learning and accomplishments with each other and to learn from those attending from other districts.

The applicant has a comprehensive description of activities supporting the participants through nationally recognized partnerships and consortiums. Preparation and vetting of accomplishments of the graduates will start at the first semester of the program. The focused and detailed plans for improvement in practice for the beginning residents will come from the benefit of attending sessions led by recent residency graduates, as well as sessions led by highly experienced teachers from among the 30 school districts that comprise the MSUNER.

To maximize the effectiveness of partner services, partner commitments are well outlined to appropriately sustain the program. In spring 2015, in partnership with Rutgers-Newark, MSU will host an annual conference with other residencies throughout the country. (e49)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were found.

Reader's Score: 45

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

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

i) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

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

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant has a comprehensive plan focused on the future cohorts institutionalized during the residency program. The applicant detailed timelines by cohorts and by year and objectives. The detailed explanation of learning communities and their design support the application attention to planning and benchmark activities. (e35)

The applicant has well written plans for future cohorts to be part of an institutionalized residency that is part of the larger teacher education program. The applicant clearly defines thorough methods of sorting participants to create three learning communities. The applicant fully addresses the collective feedback and communication between cohort groups to design and create instructional activities.

The performance feedback is a well-staffed comprehensive process with qualified personnel experienced in mixed method data collection and in collaborating with district and school administrative staff. The applicant will use complete program overall formative data to communicate continuous improvements throughout the project cohorts

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant has a well written evaluation plan. The applicant has fully addressed how the team will implement responsible personnel to gather valid data on team accomplishments. The applicant has well defined data collection points of interest to the project that include program, school district, and university progress points. The applicant has a complete plan for using data feedback as a means of distributing findings to participants, and stakeholders

The applicant has fully addressed the comprehensive procedures of using existing data collections systems. The information gathered from the systems is highly focused on the program goals, objectives, and program performance measures throughout the multi-year process. (e63)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 20

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Promoting STEM Education

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

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

b) Increasing the number of individuals from groups traditionally underrepresented in STEM, including minorities, individuals with disabilities, and women, who are teachers or educators of STEM subjects and have increased opportunities for high-quality preparation or professional development.

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant has a well written, conceptualized plan to prepare teachers or other educators as highly effective STEM teachers. The applicant has fully addressed the need for STEM teachers. They also thoroughly recognize that these teachers must be professionally developed to be highly effective STEM teachers. The residency program has fully addressed this need by incorporating highly recognized national and state standards as the foundation for designing the partnership curriculum and discipline specific pedagogical instructional strategies for the participants.

To fully address the knowledge and content level needed for highly qualified STEM teachers, the applicant established recruitment requirements that requires participants to have a strong background in designated program areas to support become a successful STEM teacher. (e27)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 5

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Implementing Academic Standards

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

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

b) Strategies that translate the standards into classroom practice.

Strengths:

The applicant adequately discusses the promotion of recognized Common Core Standards for teacher preparation that has been evidenced in other funding and rewards for excellence. (e1) The project proposed fully addresses the need for participants to participate in structured learning environments guided by highly qualified personnel.

The applicant has addressed the ability for future teachers to understand and practice classroom assessment in the STEM classroom by exposing them to collecting, managing, and analyzing data while they are in the multi-year program. (e35) This comprehensive approach will give participants will inclusive instructional strategies which will afford the future STEM teacher participants Common Core State Standards and the Next Generation Science Standards as the frame work for systematic improvement. The applicant has included in the curriculum of the participants data on documented gaps in schools in order for them to analyze the data and frame lesson designs in a guided environment. (e40)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/18/2014 02:05 PM