

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/15/2014 07:47 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: New Visions for Public Schools, Inc. (U336S140066)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	15	15
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	45	42
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	17
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	18
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Promoting STEM Education		
1. CPP 1	5	4
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Implementing Academic Standards		
1. CPP 2	2	2
Total	107	98

Technical Review Form

Panel #7 - 2014 TQP Grant Review - 7: 84.336S

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: New Visions for Public Schools, Inc. (U336S140066)

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:

Proposed project will provide a Teacher Residency Program that will train and prepare approximately 150 secondary school teachers to educate students to college- and career-ready standards and teachers as well as transform 10 public high schools over the next five years into Professional Practice Centers that will prepare new teachers for high-need secondary schools and support other schools in becoming teacher residence sites. Applicant also provides documentation on teacher retention from current teacher residency project.

Applicant mentions the proposed project development of Professional Practice Centers will operate as an ancillary of a new initiative by the New York City Department of Education, the Learning Partners Program, which formalizes in structure a cross-school learning. Applicant states that the proposed project will result in system change or improvement through the Project Professional Practice Centers' support of partner schools in becoming teacher residency sites, and thus advance system-wide change while increasing program sustainability.

Applicant states the development of Professional Practice Centers that will operate as ancillary of a new initiative by the New York City Department of Education, the Learning Partners Program, which formalizes in structure a cross-school learning. Project Professional Practice Centers will support two partner schools in becoming teacher residency sites, and thus advances system-wide change while increasing program sustainability.

Weaknesses:

N/A

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:

Applicant mentions the proposed project theory of action, which is demonstrated through implementation of the PPC model, expanding upon the UTR, MASTER, and Learning Partners Program, where projects build the capacity of mentor teachers and prepare strong novice teachers who are proficient in implementing data-driven inquiry, internationally benchmarked college-and career-ready standards in their classrooms. These project outcomes will drive improved student academic performance in accordance with current research as cited by Applicant.

Applicant provides a Professional Practice Model showing teacher professional development to begin with an 18-month Resident Teacher Preparation and induction program encompassing summer training supervised clinical experience in ELA, Math, Science, TESOL, Sped, co-teaching with skilled mentors; with induction comprised of a practicum seminar and field supervision; the next is mentor training and development which consists of a 20-hour training course on best practices, on-going training through monthly coaching and quarterly full-day meetings. Resident Teachers also receive 9-18 hours of IHE coursework focusing on increasing pedagogical content knowledge and effective strategies for teaching, and upon completion of program of training receive a Masters Degree. Teachers will be prepared and build their skills alongside master practitioners during an intensive residency year, and novice teachers continue to develop across the grant period through residency, co-teaching, and solo classroom teaching.

Applicant's proposed project offers program activities that foster training for teachers through a residency program, with the establishment of Professional Practice Centers that will prepare new teachers for high-need secondary schools and support other schools in becoming teacher residency sites. The program offers a training continuum for teachers through their initial preparation and training in the teacher residency program, and then becoming certified highly qualified teachers being developed into peer leaders who will train other teachers in the newly established Professional Practice Centers.

The proposed project is a collaborative one, with the Applicant in partnership with Hunter College of New York City and

the New York City Department of Education. The partners of this project support and help maximize the effective of the project services by proving project services to help increase the number of well-prepared certified teachers through IHE coursework, pre-service training, promotion of cross-school collaborative learning of successful teaching strategies, implementation of system-wide change across the NYC schools, and assisting in building the foundation for program sustainability and expansion.

The Applicant mentions having support since 2009 from its partner Hunter College, and have raised significant funding along with rich in-king services to support the work of teacher residence. Funding included grants from the TQP and Transition to Teaching programs and significant investments from the Carnegie Corporation of New York, the W Clement and Jessie V Stone Foundation and the Simon Brothers Family Foundation. Foundations have supported since the initial cohort began in 2009 and Applicant states foundations continue to be significantly invested in the success and sustainability of this kind of program. Applicant mentions having also received support from other partners for this work to include Urban Teach Residency United, the 100Kin10 network, New Schools Venture Fund, NYC Dept. of Education. Applicant supplies letter of support for and long-term commitment to the proposed project from many of these partners. Applicant states that partners have made progress toward developing a long-term financial plan for program sustainability and expects in a future time a decrease in project support costs and in costs of evaluating the program. Applicant mentions identifying additional postsecondary partners to support the residence program as well as being in other additional resources. Applicant also mentions that in the future residence schools could use existing school budget allocations to cover the costs of training school-based mentors or for supporting PPC site directors.

Weaknesses:

Although Applicant mentions Partners having made progress toward developing a long-term financial plan for program sustainability, and expects, in a future time, a decrease in project support costs and costs of evaluating the program, Applicant provides no documentation for commitment to financial support of project beyond the grant period.

Reader's Score: 42

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:

Applicant provides a clearly defined management plan with specific timelines and milestones for program rollout, recruitment, training, support and evaluation, along with a clear budget focus. Applicant provides program strategies for resident and school recruitment, training for teachers and mentors, induction support, identifying Learning Partner host school and evaluations and continuous improvement aspects of the project with major objectives, personnel, benchmarks, and specific times provided. Applicant gives clearly defined responsibilities for person project personnel for carrying out and accomplishing the project tasks.

Applicant provides the roles and responsibility of key personnel in the project, with partners collaborating on program oversight and implementation. Applicant will be responsible for fiscal management of the grant. Project will be led by a project manager with oversight from Applicant's Director of teacher certification. Other key personnel include three program officers PPC site directors, and a Program Coordinator. Key personnel are listed as V. President for Talent Development, Director of Teacher Certification, Project Manager (1.0), Program Officer/Administrator, two Program Officers, a Program Coordinator, Program Coordinator, Talent Development Program Coordinator, Professional Practice Center Site Director Data Analyst, and Hunter Associate Dean and Instructor. Key personnel are all experienced in their role responsibilities.

Applicant will conduct various formative assessments to determine effective and alignment of project program with goals and objectives. These include interviews with School administrators, PPC coordinators and facilitators to discuss the impact the program will be having on schools and faculty, with discussions/feedback on ways to address any changes that need to be made.

Weaknesses:

Applicant mentions there being ongoing formative feedback (p. 49), however, specific dates/times for feedback as well as dissemination of results of formative assessments are not specified.

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:

Project proposed research plan is a mixed-methods design where quantitative elements assess impact of the expanded model on schools, teachers, and students – and explores links between implementation, teacher effectiveness and performance, and qualitative elements, which include case studies, portray learning and contextualize findings as schools become PPCs or LPP partners, sharing responsibility for teacher development. Evaluation will use a quasi-experimental design. Data will be collected utilizing instruments such as interviews, student surveys, case studies, and student test scores.

Project evaluation will utilize a combined theory of change and outcomes-based model approach, allowing defining of components and school conditions as schools transform into PCCs and self-replicate. Applicant mentions research questions that include outcome-related questions, implementation-related questions, and questions exploring connections between implementation and outcomes to be investigated in the evaluation of project outcomes.

Applicant gives various methods evaluation for obtaining data for formative assessments, and states that the independent evaluator will provide ongoing formative feedback, assist in annual performance reports and support dissemination activities. (p.49)

Weaknesses:

Applicant does not clearly described or distinguished from the formative and summative evaluations; Applicant does not give specific times when the independent evaluator will provide feedback from formative assessments or what specific activities will occur to disseminate the results.

Reader's Score: 18

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:

Applicant mentions that proposed project encompasses a collaboration among several partners, each of whom have distinct roles in this teacher residency program, which consists of 150 Resident teachers, 40 of whom are STEM teachers (p.28). For example, Applicant's mentions some Partners' roles as providing rigorous teacher preparation in a Masters degree program, and the State public school system that supporting multiple pathways to increase the number of certified, effective teachers.

Applicant mentions that each resident teacher will develop pedagogical skills for teaching in the STEM fields with focus initially on teacher practices that are shown to enhance students' academic discourse strategies and productive struggle in Math and Science, all aligned with the standards and current research.

Weaknesses:

Applicant does not mention STEM dedicated research or lab work experiences or specifics.

Applicant does not give specific information on early and multiple field-based instructional experiences structured to provide exposure to various teaching and learning environments, and that are coordinated and aligned with the teacher preparation curriculum

Reader's Score: 4

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:

Applicant mentions that the proposed project seeks to further align Teacher Residents and Mentors' coaching and training to support inquiry and instructional practices that reflect the Common Core State Standards and the Next Generation Science Standards. Project participants will be able to apply the CSS through their exposure to experiences in their own learning in liberal arts and science coursework, allowing them to reproduce learning opportunities for the students they will be teaching.

Proposed project will include professional development strategies that ensure that liberal arts and sciences coursework helps teacher candidates understand how knowledge and skills from the standards are evident in their educational experience. Applicant mentions that Education and Arts and Sciences faculty collaborate in using a variety of strategies to include information sharing, review, analysis, evaluation and modification of content, pedagogy and assessments – as part of a continuous process to strengthen teacher preparation programs and advance graduates' ability to teach to the

new standards.

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/15/2014 07:47 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/15/2014 02:46 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: New Visions for Public Schools, Inc. (U336S140066)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	15	13
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	45	37
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	18
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	18
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Promoting STEM Education		
1. CPP 1	5	3
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Implementing Academic Standards		
1. CPP 2	2	1
Total	107	90

Technical Review Form

Panel #7 - 2014 TQP Grant Review - 7: 84.336S

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: New Visions for Public Schools, Inc. (U336S140066)

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 need for the project were appropriately documented by narrative portrayals that the advent of the Common Core State Standards and the Next Generation Science Standards along with increased attention to STEM learning has resulted in a higher demand for teacher preparation that integrates clinical experience with academic coursework. (p. 6). The need for the project was further documented by descriptive statistics indicating the financial cost of teacher turnover to the city of New York that disproportionately impacts high-needs schools. (p. 8). In addition, data from National Kids Count report indicated that 25% of students in New York City are in poverty and the public schools have a 20% teacher turnover rate (p. e70), reflecting findings from research that school districts need to retain teachers (p. 5).

The applicant clearly documented the likelihood that the project would result in system improvement by providing results of an external evaluation of their project partner's prior successful Teacher Residency project, the Urban Teacher Residency Project that the proposed project will use as a model. That prior project resulted in the students of teachers in the Urban Residency project outperforming students in non-participating classrooms on the state exam for algebra. (p. 3). In addition, teacher retention rates were higher for participating teachers than for nonparticipating teachers with retention rates higher than the city average (p. 1). Most teachers graduating from the program (98 of 113) held positions in New York City high- needs schools in hard to fill content areas of math, science, and special education with 90% of the Residency program teachers still teaching four years after graduation.(p. 4)

The applicant identified the fields of mathematics, science, and special education as areas of teacher shortages (p. 4).

Weaknesses:

Descriptive statistics, such as percentages of the secondary students who qualify for free and reduced price lunch as indicators of poverty and achievement test data from standardized tests were not provided to clearly document the needs in the secondary schools in New York City, the specific target population.

The applicant did not provide research or descriptive statistics documenting science, mathematics, and special education as areas of teacher shortage, particularly for the target area of New York City.

Absent this information, it is not entirely clear that this proposal is addressing the needs of the target population.

Reader's Score: 13

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant appropriately bases the Teacher Residency project on a clear Professional Practice logic model that indicates detailed program inputs and activities leading to short-term, intermediate, and long-term outcomes. Outcomes address relevant inputs and activities in five categories for Resident Teachers, Mentors, and students. (p. 50). The logic model was related to past successes of the program model in prior projects in teacher retention and student achievement and to a theory of action that expands these prior programs. (p. 27-28)

The project will appropriately focus on 10 high-needs high schools in New York City to prepare 150 secondary teachers in an 18 month program with an intensive clinical residency year. Resident teachers will work with a Mentor in a secondary school and coursework for the completion of a Master's degree in education from project partner Hunter College.

Candidates will be recruited in English/ language arts, science, math, special education, Teaching English to Speakers of other Languages, and an additional content area to be identified by the NYCDOE based on their shortage needs. (Abstract).

Recruitment efforts are extensive, including a video, networking with other organizations and programs, word of mouth, online advertising, a website, job boards, and social media. Applicants will be selected through a five-stage selection process.(p. 11)

The professional development plan is extensive and of sufficient intensity and duration to lead to improvements in practice. After completing school visits, Residents are matched to Mentors with input from each of them, as well as project staff. The residency begins with Resident Teachers meeting for 15 hours with Mentors in the summer prior to their training, participating in summer school tutoring, and completing online professional development in teaching English Language Learners. Residents work full time in Mentors' classrooms with gradually increasing responsibilities for one academic year, and complete coursework for the Master's degree during summers and during two academic years (p. 15-16). During the second summer, Residents participate in readiness workshops to become teachers of record and receive induction support by practicum seminars and field supervision with a school-based Mentor and a Field Supervisor. Mentors receive ongoing professional development with monthly meetings for school based cohorts and quarterly full-day meetings to problem solve about mentoring challenges and receive coaching best practices from coaches who observe twice a month and debrief with Mentor-Resident pairs. (p. 20).

The project appropriately builds on efforts from project partners, including Hunter College to provide the Master's coursework that has been revised based on past collaborations with New Visions and the NYC Department of Education to supply Mentors and placements and pay the Residents' tuition. (p. 33-34).

The applicant has appropriate plans to sustain the project through several mechanisms and sources such as using a Learning Partners strategy to increase the capacity of schools to serve as residency sites of pre-service teachers and to hire new staff to serve in project management capacity to train Mentors, site directors, and residents and support recruitment and selection. The applicant anticipates that schools could use their own budget allocations to cover the costs of training school-based Mentors and supporting site directors. In addition, the applicant has a history of soliciting and receiving grant funds from other federal programs and private foundations. (p. 35-36).

Weaknesses:

The quality of the professional development is difficult to judge. Little is known about the content of the professional development for Residents or Mentors. The curriculum at Hunter College for the Master's program; the Danielson Framework for Teaching and observation rubric which will serve as basis for observations over the induction year; the practicum seminars; and the Residency Essential Workshops were not well described in terms of focus and content. The Mentor Competency Rubric by which Mentors will be evaluated and guided that will be included in the 20 hours of professional development for Mentors was not described (p. 20) and the Defense of Learning was also not clearly described (p. 22).

Project activities are not sufficiently described as sustained and coherent. Although general areas of coursework for the Master's degree were identified, such as developing Resident Teachers' pedagogical content knowledge, inquiry strategies, and classroom management, the content of the curriculum was not differentiated for years one and two to indicate an appropriate sequence or how courses would build on each other or how they would be related to the content of other professional development. (p. 18).

The applicant did not identify other future funding sources at the state or federal level or identify local businesses or community partners or private foundations that could potentially support aspects of the project past the funding years.

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 role responsibilities were clearly identified and appropriate for specific project personnel, including the Project Manager and the Program Officer. (p. 37-38). The management plan included a relevant timeline that indicated strategies, timelines, objectives, personnel responsible, and benchmarks. (p. 39-40).

Key project staff are appropriately qualified for their role responsibilities. For example, the Project Manager has prior experience as senior program officer in the teacher certification unit of New Visions. The Director of teacher Certification has been in that role and led the design and implementation of the prior project and served as principal investigator for a multi-year professional development school standard project. (p. 42)

Evaluation and continuous improvement is planned for each year of the project by conducting implementation studies and modifying the program based on evaluation results with annual evaluation reports. (p. 40).

Weaknesses:

The timelines for project activities were not reported on an annual basis, but were provided as yearly ranges rather than specific months or weeks of each year. (p. 39-40). Some of the benchmarks, such as new mentor training in the spring and monthly professional development sessions were actually strategies or activities. (p. 39).

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 evaluation will be conducted by an independent evaluation team with extensive experience studying school reform efforts which will avoid the bias of an internal evaluation. The evaluation will use a quasi-experimental design and compare treatment schools with those that were not involved in the project. A process from the professional literature will be used to develop valid implementation indexes to assist in identifying factors most closely linked to teacher and student outcomes. (p. 44). Other valid measures will include the students' state Regents scores and achievement test data from state adopted measures. (p. 46).

The evaluation methods are thorough and appropriate for the goals of the project. Both qualitative and quantitative data will be collected that address input and output questions that address the GRPA measures for Resident Teachers and assess the impact of the Residency program on students' achievement. A fidelity analysis will be conducted to characterize the implementation across sites. Appropriate data analysis plans for quantitative data include repeated measures analysis of variance and t tests to explore grade differences, analysis of covariance, and Pearson correlation coefficients to examine the association between grades and Regents scores. (p. 48). Appropriate qualitative data, such as focus groups and interview data will be analyzed by thematic content analysis (p. 47).

Five Implementation-related evaluation questions address assessing program fidelity and school conditions that mediate effects and address participants' perceptions of the teacher development model and program. (p. 45). The evaluator will provide ongoing formative feedback and assist in preparing annual performance reports (p. 49).

Weaknesses:

Although the applicant claims that the survey instruments to be used in the evaluation are valid measures, no information is provided about the type of validity or reliability that has been established on these measures, no reliability coefficients are provided, and the survey items are not described. (p. 46). Conducting a factor analysis on survey items will address construct validity, but will not establish internal consistency reliability as the applicant states. (p. 49). No methods were described for establishing reliability, such as test-retest or split half administration.

Formative evaluation that would allow for periodic assessment and project improvement was not clearly described and distinguished from summative evaluation by evaluation questions or data collection methods. It is unclear how data will be

used to review project progress and the process to make any needed changes in the program is not described.

Reader's Score: 18

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 intends to create a Teacher Residency program in New York City that targets the need to provide well prepared teachers in mathematics and science who can address Next Generation Science Standards and Common Core State Standards. The applicant will train 150 new teachers in high-needs public schools and pattern the program after a prior project model that focused on Mathematics and Science Teacher Residency for high needs secondary schools, MASTER, funded by the National Science Foundation. (p. 2, 6, 29). In the third year of the TQP grant, the partner, Hunter College, will integrate math and science Residents into the model and graduate 40 STEM Residents by the end of the grant period with 17 graduating after the first year and 18 the second year. (p. 30)

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not address how Residents would have access to the same courses and course sequencing as STEM majors outside the college of education, how the STEM experiences in science would be hands on or inquiry based and relate to other subjects in an interdisciplinary way or describe how the program will include early field-based experiences in STEM.

Reader's Score: 3

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 has a history of implementation of the Common Core State Standards and standards aligned instruction inspired by the Literacy Design Collaborative frameworks and Math Design Collaborative frameworks as modules to orient teachers to the standards. Mentor and Resident Teacher training will support the use of inquiry and instructional practices that reflect the Common Core State Standards and the next Generation Science Standards.

Prior grants from private foundations and a federal Investing in Innovation grant enabled the applicant to develop Common Core aligned course design in mathematics. (p 31). The applicant intends to develop standards aligned curricula in science that reflect the Common Core State Standards and the Next Generation Science Standards. (p. 32).

Weaknesses:

The curriculum for science is not yet developed to be in alignment with the Next Generation Science Standards or the Common Core State standards making it difficult to judge how well the curriculum will reflect state and national standards.

Reader's Score: 1

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/15/2014 02:46 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/15/2014 02:52 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: New Visions for Public Schools, Inc. (U336S140066)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	15	15
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	45	41
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	19
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	18
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Promoting STEM Education		
1. CPP 1	5	3
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Implementing Academic Standards		
1. CPP 2	2	2
Total	107	98

Technical Review Form

Panel #7 - 2014 TQP Grant Review - 7: 84.336S

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: New Visions for Public Schools, Inc. (U336S140066)

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:

New Visions (NV) has a long and successful track record of addressing the barriers to success for NYC high needs secondary students. NV has employed a variety of strategies that include the development of new schools, improving principals, expanded uses of data to assess and improve instruction. They serve a student population of 46,000. NV has the experience, strategies, and success rate to do this work. p3

With a goal of training and placing 150 new residency teachers in 10 public high schools over the next 5 years, there is a strong potential for system change. p2

The recruitment and selection of new residency teachers will take place hard-to staff areas: special education and STEM. p6. This should prepare teachers for areas with known shortages.

This teacher residency program has a history of teacher residency work beginning in 2009 with positive results on external evaluations. It includes the Professional Practices Center (PPC) approach in targeted schools that prepares large number of teachers, mentor training, clinical and academic experiences, coaching, and placement and support for graduates. In this program there is a culture of cooperation and learning which supports improvement and growth. These previously strong program results support future program work in this area. p1,p6

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:

Theory of action includes the use of the PPCs in creating new teachers who can use data and standards effectively to support strong professional practice throughout a school. The outcomes of such a theory include increased student performance and retention of teachers. There are research citations to support this theory of change; this supports its credibility. p27

The key design features in an 18-month teacher residency program include student enrollment in a master's program at Hunter's College, a one-year clinical residency at a PPC school, mentoring support from the assigned classroom teacher and the PPC model for schools, otherwise known as teaching hospitals. The tables found on p.14 and p.15 show the type of activities (opening activities, modules, coursework, products) that support the key design. This design holds together and can be sustained based on the structures in place. pp9-10

Partners for this effort includes NV, Hunter College, City University of NY, NYC DOE and the PPC schools. NV has successful track record in doing this work, Hunter College has a rigorous approach to teacher preparation and a large supplier of teachers. They believe in a clinically rich teacher education program. NY DOE has actively participated in program planning and pays new teacher student tuition. pp33-34

The financial plan for this program is sound and specifically described in the proposal. NV and Hunter have received grants from the Teacher Quality Partnership, Transition to Teaching and from prominent national foundations for large sums of money. This support is expected to continue in the future. p35

Weaknesses:

The professional practice model found on p50 is overwhelming textwise, doesn't include an impact category and is difficult to tie to the theory of change.

Reader's Score: 41

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 chart that contains the roles and responsibilities of key staff and their responsibilities is detailed and comprehensive. It provides the full picture of program management, and roles/responsibilities include representation from a variety of partners. pp37-38

The strategies, timeline, objectives, personnel and benchmarks chart is easy to follow and includes complete information. pp39-40

The key personnel qualifications provide an overall list of key staff titles and their work experiences. These personnel are more than qualified to do this work. pp41-42

Weaknesses:

The continuous improvement is implied, but not stated in this proposal. Examples from the proposal include: "Program revisions have taken place previously based on data." "Formative feedback will be provided." This is not enough information to fully understand their continuous improvement plan.

Reader's Score: 19

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 external evaluation firm, Rockwell et al which has a track record of school reform efforts, will conduct the evaluation. Evaluation experience in this topic area is a plus. Similar evaluations included the UTR and MASTER programs. p43

There will be a mixed methods design with qualitative and quantitative elements quasi-experimental approach (matched schools), certainly appropriate for the areas being evaluated—students outcomes, teacher retention, impact of model in schools on stakeholders, stakeholder perceptions, connections between implementation and outcomes. Use of theory of change and outcomes based model (research based) will be used for an in-depth look at implementation. There will be access to data because of a partner relationship with Hunter, NYCDOE and New Visions. The use of an implementation index for determining fidelity is brilliant. This a feasible and complete evaluation based on the goals. There is use of What Works criteria for baseline equivalence. pp43-48

Weaknesses:

Description of GPRA and HEA work is brief and vague: “work with partners to meet GRPA and HEA requirements.”
p49This is not enough information to be certain that NV has a plan for addressing these measures.

Reader's Score: 18

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:

New Visions Accessing Algebra through Inquiry Work—algebra, geometry, trigonometry, Living Environment are STEM-like resources. Students do participate in inquiry models. There is an integrated program of coursework. Field experiences for students are apparent. p30

Weaknesses:

It is uncertain if the STEM learning experiences for students are explicit and have the interdisciplinary connections between learning sciences and STEM instruction.

Reader's Score: 3

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:

Use of national science standards and CCSS in professional development is apparent. Standards are translated into classroom practice.

Weaknesses:

None

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/15/2014 02:52 PM