

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/11/2014 05:18 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: National Louis University (U336S140051)

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	17
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	17
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	101

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: National Louis University (U336S140051)

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:

- Students in the US have consistently scored below average on high-stakes science tests (p.3) and the implementation of the NGSS will induce more rigorous science standards which will increase the likelihood of systematic change and improvement in fields of science and related fields.
- Student achievement is expected to increase as teachers are better trained to teach according to the NGSS, through professional development in which teachers learn inquiry-based and hands-on approaches to teach science in a way that connects to the real world (p. 4-5).
- The current Science Excellence through Residency (SER) program has shown that student achievement has risen in mathematics and science in schools where residency graduates teach (p. 8).
- Adaptive Expertise (p. 10) and Adaptive Cycles of Teaching (p. 11-13) will be utilized to effectively prepare personnel for STEM fields, which increases the likelihood of system change and a rise in student achievement.

Weaknesses:

NA

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

- Thorough plan to train teachers in covering NGSS in the classroom (p.14), which has already shown effectiveness in its pilot (p.15).
- Collaboration between university and school-based faculty is priority; this increases the alignment of all individuals involved and the efficiency of the residency experience (p.15).
- Student progress is at the center of the design of the proposed plan (p. 15).
- A full description of the current model and its successes is provided and used to support the need for and improvements included in the creation of an even more successful collaboration and program.
- Coursework is guided by the Danielson Framework to help ensure consistency and rigor (p. 17).
- A detailed plan for the collaboration between mentor and resident that provides a balance of experiences both observing best practices and independently guiding the class using best practices.
- A strong collaboration between the university, the residents, the teachers, and the mentors is developed and maintained to ensure that consistency in information and experience is maintained throughout the program (p.20).
- Various stages and levels of evaluation are implemented to ensure the effectiveness of all individuals involved in the process (p. 20).
- Recruitment is tailored to reach a diverse population of residents that reflect the diversity of the student population (p. 22).
- The Logic Model (p.39) illustrates a clear connection of current inputs, proposed implementations and changes, and potential outcomes, which all ultimately lead to the goal of student achievement and placement of effective STEM teachers.
- A clear plan of sustainability of the program beyond the grant period is evidenced (p. 40).

Weaknesses:

NA

Reader's Score: 45

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

-Qualifications of key project personnel are clearly illustrated, and resumes of these individuals are included in the appendices.

-An annual timeline with a schedule of activities and key project milestones is clearly evidenced in Table 8 (pgs. 48-50).

Weaknesses:

-Although responsibilities of the key project personnel are evidenced through the "Roles, Responsibilities, and Time Commitments" chart on pgs. 42-43, this chart could be more thorough by providing more details on the actual responsibilities and roles of the key individuals.

Reader's Score: 17

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:

- A clear plan of project evaluation is illustrated in the implementation of a mixed-methods approach of tracking and evaluating effectiveness of all individuals and processes involved in the proposed project (pgs. 45-47).
- The methods of evaluation are appropriate to the goals of the proposed project.

Weaknesses:

- Formative evaluation is not evident throughout Table 8; evaluation is more summative and annual rather than formative, which would make for a stronger evaluation method.

Reader's Score: 17

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 partnership with Illinois Institute of Technology (p.2) will aid in assuring that appropriate STEM courses will be the focus of course content.
- The plan for recruiting diverse candidates is fully described on pgs. 30-31.

Weaknesses:

NA

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:

-National Generations Science Standards (NGSS) will be the framework for all instruction and learning for the proposed plan (p.3).

-Strategies that translate the standards into classroom practice are described (pgs. 32-36).

Weaknesses:

NA

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/11/2014 05:18 PM

Status: Submitted

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

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: National Louis University (U336S140051)

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	17
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	17
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	101

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: National Louis University (U336S140051)

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 narrative proposes the expansion of the Chicago Teacher Residency program with a focus on adaptive learning. The program has already impacted the schools by providing quality STEM teachers and the improvement of student achievement.
- (ii) The main systemic change that the project seeks to implement is a conceptual shift for teachers (page 5) from a content oriented to an adaptive learning environment. For instance the proposal indicates how the focus of this training is on evaluating teachers' actions rather than on the effects of these practices on student learning. The project seeks to provide a strong platform for collaborative improvement of teacher practice.
- (iii) The project has provided data that has supported the critical need for trained STEM teachers in the target area. On page 7, it is indicated how the target school district loses over half of its teachers within a five year period. This high attrition rates is what the project seeks to comprehensively address.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

among the recipients of those services.

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

(i) The proposal has provided a justification of the project in the theoretical model as presented in the logic model. The project is based on the "Adaptive Learning" which changes the focus from content mastery of a few areas, to constantly learning new areas. The proposal has on pages 13-14 provided a research base to the project design.

(ii) The project has provided details about the project model and design. The proposal has explained how the ACT curriculum will be implemented with a pilot testing. The CTR program design is practice-centered and supports technology with a strong interconnection of student learning and teacher learning. The project will integrate pedagogy, practice and teaching mentoring; engage residents in rigorous graduate-level course work; expose residents to learning alongside mentor teachers; provide for professional collaboration and development; and recruit and provide for the LEA a pool of well-trained, qualified and diverse group of STEM teachers.

(iii) The project has a good structure in its recruitment/selection strategies, residential experiences, induction support and professional development, and evaluation. The proposal has aligned state requirements to CTR coaching requirements, and has outlined the top priorities of the program that ultimately are reflected in student achievement.

(iv) The project has strong partnership with the Illinois Institute of Technology and the Chicago school district. The project design clearly explains the roles and responsibilities of these partners and how their activities constitute the project.

(v) The project design is strong and the proposal has a strong sustainability plan. The proposal has stipulated how the project partners have in the past supported and provided resources for similar initiative. The project design has shown how the professional development and teacher preparation, being of critical importance will have a buy-in with the partners.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses.

Reader's Score: 45

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

(i) The project has a strong management plan that has two purposes: one is to achieve the objectives, and second is to continue to build the residency collaborative partnership for sustainability. The project plan is laid out through project goals on page 30. The project timeline of activities for each year are also discussed.

(ii) The project will be implemented by a group of qualified personnel. The profiles of the executive advisors, project management team is provided. On page 42, the staff time commitments and their project responsibilities are clarified. The project has adequate qualified staff for implementing the activities.

(iii) The project has provided for some feedback mechanism. The plan was to have quarterly meetings of the executive advisors and the core leadership team will focus on review of measurable progress, and discuss students' achievement.

Weaknesses:

The project does not seem to have a strong monitoring plan, and a description of the leadership responsibilities.

Reader's Score: 17

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

(i) The project has a strong evaluation plan. The project will hire the services of an independent evaluation consultant who is qualified and trained. The evaluation will use a mixed-methods approach which tracks benchmarks to achieving measurable goals. Evaluation questions are stipulated on page 45, and the entire evaluation timeline is stipulated through the life of the project. A hall-mark of the evaluation plan is the establishment of an advisory committee.

(ii) The project evaluation plan is detailed and provides information about use of standardized instruments to collect data including surveys, interviews, evaluations of summer institute and other activities. The proposal has provided on pages 48-50, a detailed timeline aligning project objectives, related project activities, benchmarks/milestones, evaluation activities, and the year when it will be held.

(iii) The project evaluation plan has suggested in the planned activities, and advisory committee as well as a form of formative evaluation.

Weaknesses:

The evaluation plan as not provided much details about how the evaluation outcomes will be used for programmatic change. The plan does not provide information of how often, except annually, will the formative evaluation data provided to project administrators.

Reader's Score: 17

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Promoting STEM Education

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

The proposal has provided a brief but effective overview of the STEM priority in the project. The project design presents a cohesive program of high-quality preparation and professional development for high-quality teachers. The project activities include targeted recruitment of diverse candidates with strong science capacity, and then implement a practice-based teacher preparation curriculum. Project partners will collaborate for the STEM priority.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses.

Reader's Score: 5

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Implementing Academic Standards

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

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

b) Strategies that translate the standards into classroom practice.

Strengths:

The project will use the Next Generation Science Standards that were developed from reviews of science education programs internationally. The standards approach science education through cross-cutting concepts making it relevant. Pages 32-36 detail how these standards will be implemented in the classrooms.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses.

Reader's Score: 2

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/09/2014 03:36 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: National Louis University (U336S140051)

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	17
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	17
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	101

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: National Louis University (U336S140051)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

Strengths:

The project provides a clear needs analysis concerning the Chicago Public School system, and its under-served populations. Page 6 and 8. Many of the students served by this project are from low-income families, African American and Hispanic descent. The documentation provides a statement of evidence that this project is based on a similar, successful project, which has helped to improve student achievement. Page 6.

The narrative draws a parallel between U.S. statistics and under-performing schools, and what is happening in Chicago Public Schools. For example, over half of the teaching staff leaves every three years. Page 7.

The narrative states that over the past 10 years, the CTR has worked to address issues of teacher quality and teacher stability through an innovative teacher preparation program. Page 7. There is evidence concerning the effectiveness of that residency program in addressing both the issues of teacher quality and teacher retention.

The narrative states that there are student gains in schools and classrooms where there are resident graduates.

The narrative provides some evidence that this project has the likelihood to build local capacity, based on the history of the former project upon which this new grant is based.

A chart showing student achievement in both math and science, before and after the project implementation was provided as evidence on page 9.

There is also a table showing the number of teachers who remain in the Chicago system after the residency program.

This data provides evidence that the project will provide services that address the needs of the target population. Page 27

Weaknesses:

NONE LISTED

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 measurable goals of the SER- Science Excellence through Residency project were provided on page 30. The narrative that followed provided the actions to help accomplish these goals.

SER builds on the foundation of one of the country's longest standing and largest teacher residency programs. It grew out of synergies between two previous federal grant projects. Page 12. This project builds on those successes. The project is also informed by educational research. Page 12. The narrative does a nice job of describing how the information from those projects can be leveraged to improve science instruction. Page 14. Those strategies include scaffolding curriculum that leads toward attainment of scientific literacy, and a rigorous residency program that extends through induction. The narrative also explained ways in which this new project will be an improvement over the other projects. Page 20 documents the strong, active link between university and classroom frameworks as a major change which will help to improve the traditional models of university of supervision during the student teaching process.

A small pilot concerning the Literacy and Science ACT curriculum has already been completed, and though the analysis is still underway, the narrative states that those teachers who were involved with this approach had a deeper understanding of the core teaching practices, and research backs up this statement. Page 15.

The narrative provided a timeline for the graduate-level course work on page 17.

The proposal provided clear criteria for selecting mentor teachers on page 18 and information concerning their roles and responsibilities on pages 18 and 19. The CTR induction coach criteria was posted on page 26. The criteria for both positions is rigorous. This will help so that these candidates will have quality coaching throughout the entire experience. The theory of action, which is the basis underlying the SER project, was explained in detail on page 10. A logic model for this project was provided on page 39.

The marketing program to recruit candidates was well fleshed out on page 22. This will help to ensure that the candidate pool represents the students that will be served. Page 22.

Information on the professional development involved with this program was shared on page 25, 36-37.

Thorough criteria for the teacher resident candidates was provided on page 28, as well as a repayment schedule for

failure to meet the commitment on page 29.

There is some evidence, based on previous grant projects, that this project will be sustained after the grant period on pages 40.

Weaknesses:

None Listed

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:

A timeline, complete with goals, project objectives, related project activities, milestones, and evaluation activities were added on pages 48-50. A table which contains the roles, responsibilities and time commitments was found in the narrative on page 42. These two pieces of information will help so that the project will be completed on time and within budget.

The management plan provides advisory oversight by the executive administrators and core leadership team to make sure the data on teacher and student learning are gathered to help guide continuous improvement of both the pre-service and induction preparation. Pages. 41, 48-50.

The qualifications of key personnel was found in Appendix F. The key personnel are well qualified for their positions and corresponding responsibilities. The PI for the project has previous experience dealing with large federal grants in the area of teacher quality.

Weaknesses:

The narrative did not supply enough information concerning the monitoring plan for the project activities. The reader would liked to have seen the people in charge of each activity listed in the management plan.

Reader's Score: 17

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 project narrative states that an independent evaluator has been hired. Page 43. The evaluator has extensive history in evaluating federal grants in STEM areas including National Science Foundation. Evaluation data will include data generated through the implementation of the ACT. This formative assessment data will be analyzed and the results will be synthesized for interim and annual reports to move the project forward. Page 44 and 46.

Information was supplied concerning the major evaluation activities that would be carried out. Page 45. It included the instrument to measure student and resident learning along with the year that it would be carried out. Page 45 – 47. It was supplemented by a chart on pages 48 and 49 which also listed the project goal, objective, related activities, milestones, evaluation activity, and the year the evaluation would take place. These measures of evaluation are feasible and appropriate for the goals provided in the narrative.

Weaknesses:

The narrative did not supply enough evidence concerning the frequency of the formative assessment. The documentation looked like it was done only annually. Page 46

Reader's Score: 17

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 promotion of STEM through this program was mentioned on page 1. On page 2 of the narrative, the PI provided evidence of how STEM and the NGSS would be dovetailed to design and implement teachers with an expertise in Science.

Weaknesses:

None Listed

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 narrative provided evidence that the project supports CPP2. The documentation is complete. The implementation of benchmarks and standards were mentioned on page 1. On pages 2 through 4 of the narrative, the PI provided evidence of how the teachers would utilize the standards, and how that professional growth equated with empowering great leaders and educators.

Weaknesses:

None Listed

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/09/2014 03:36 PM