

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/19/2014 10:48 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** University Corporation at Monterey Bay (U336S140037)

**Reader #1:** \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	15	15
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	45	40
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	20
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
<b>Promoting STEM Education</b>		
1. CPP 1	5	5
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
<b>Implementing Academic Standards</b>		
1. CPP 2	2	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>100</b>

# Technical Review Form

Panel #8 - 2014 TQP Grant Review - 8: 84.336S

Reader #1: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: University Corporation at Monterey Bay (U336S140037)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Significance

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

### Strengths:

(i) The applicant clearly demonstrates that the proposed TQP will allow the teacher education program to expand and permanently establish a co-teaching model of clinical practice, pre-service teacher preparation for high-needs schools. The proposed project will allow the applicant to build capacity and work with 10 school districts in rural and remote settings that stretch over 200 miles. Each of the high need schools serve children of Mexican heritage who are place-bound by poverty and low-wage agricultural employment. (pgs. 2-4)

(ii) The applicant clearly demonstrates that the collaboration between CSUMB and Cal Poly will result in improvements in teacher education for rural, remote school districts located a great distance from the two main campuses. (pgs. 5-6) Without the assistance from TQP grant the university would not be able to provide the staffing and logistical infrastructure to meet the needs of the rural, remote districts between the two campuses. The proposed project will serve as a model for the other 21 universities in the CSU system, many of which have rural and remote schools that lie between them and services are not available for the rural regions. The proposed project will result in logistical improvements in the consistency of support services and expense sharing in rural settings with the goal of operating a high-quality teacher preparation continuum in rural and remote schools. (pgs. 6-8)

(iii) The applicant has effectively demonstrated that the proposed project is being developed to improve the knowledge and skills of teachers in subject matter and new pedagogies in STEM Education. The STEM related teacher education training program is needed to develop the capacity of rural schools to meet the CCSS and NGSS standards. (pgs. 8-10) The applicant in collaboration with the partner districts identified the frequently and most severe teaching needs were the following areas: (1) meeting the needs of English language learners, (2) filling hard to staff science subjects in physics, chemistry, and geology, (3) supporting unique needs of students with disabilities, and (4) equipping district teachers to address CCSS, particularly in math. As a result of the identified needs, the applicant appropriately indicated that at the completion of grant funding, the goal will be to increase the number of highly qualified science, math and special education teachers prepared at Cal Poly and CSUMB by 10% and to increase the percentage of under-represented credential candidates in all programs by 10%. (pgs. 9-11)

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:** 15

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design**

- 1) The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project.
- 2) In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the extent to which the proposed project consists of a comprehensive plan that includes a description of:
  - i) The extent to which the proposed project is supported by strong theory (as defined in this notice).
  - ii) The extent to which the training or professional development services to be provided by the proposed project are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services.
  - iii) The extent to which the proposed activities constitute a coherent, sustained program of training in the field.
  - iv) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services.
  - v) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates that it has the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the grant, including a multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan; the demonstrated commitment of any partners; evidence of broad support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers unions) critical to the project's long-term success; or more than one of these types of evidence.

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

**Strengths:**

(i) The applicant effectively demonstrates that the proposed project has been grounded in a set of high-leverage, effective teaching practices garnered from empirically based, research supported practices including the work of C. Danielson. (pg. 2) The SIOP model for English language learners and other sources are aligned with teacher education training reform efforts. Additionally, the applicant will focus the teacher preparation curricula on a year-long intensive clinical experience using the co-teaching model, supported by research identified by the NCATE. The theory based enhancements to the curriculum programs provide a well developed continuum of effective teaching practices and clinical training. (pgs. 13-15)

(ii) The applicant effectively demonstrated that high-quality and relevant professional development will be offered to existing teachers as well as teacher residents. The applicant will utilize professional development opportunities to support partner districts with credentialing of existing teachers. This program will be of immense support for rural counties where no other opportunities are available. (pgs. 14-15) For example, in the first year of the grant, the applicant will offer professional development including incentives (stipends and housing support) for teachers from rural and remote partners

to attend on campus-based professional development offering. In the following years, professional development will continue at both campuses. In an effort to reach teachers in the more remote areas of the service region, the applicant will also explore ways to deliver professional development online. (pg. 16)

The professional development programs will additionally assist partner districts with preparing teachers for the implementation of the new Common Core State Standards (CCSS) and Smarter Balanced Assessments. Partner districts indicated they need the support for teachers to help them understand the new standards and adapt to the new and different expectations. Through the proposed project, the university program will work with teacher leaders within the partner districts to design and offer professional development workshops to support CCSS and NGSS. The inclusion of teacher leaders from high need partner districts in both the planning and implementation phases of the professional development has the potential to ensure local, onsite support will be available to schools throughout the year. (pg. 1)

(iii)The applicant clearly demonstrates that the proposed training program will provide a continuum of sustained program activities and training to develop effective teacher educators. For example, the applicant is proposing to establish a teacher residency program that includes a yearlong rural schools residency that leads to a Master of Arts in Teaching degree in 18 months. (pg. 15-18) The newly developed Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) degree program will require the creation of new courses in advanced curriculum and assessment, research based effective instructional practices, literacy in the content area, and research methods. The creation of a new degree program will provide an opportunity for the university to tailor fit the program to meet the identified needs of the high-need rural schools.

The program will include only graduate level courses and as residents finish the residency year, they will move on to the first year of induction with support from the same mentors that supported the residency. This model increases the likelihood of coherent continuum of expectations and skills in effective teaching practices. Teacher candidates participating in the proposed program will be placed in year-long rural Teacher Residency and will start the program in cohorts during the summer while placed with a cooperating teacher in a public summer school. In the afternoons, residency candidates will take coursework and be advised as a cohort. Summer courses will include classroom culture, classroom management, instructional planning, educational psychology, and methods of instruction for teaching with LEP students. (pg. 17)

Both universities will partner with local districts to closely align evaluation of pre-service and in-service teachers. The evaluation for the pre-service teachers will be closely aligned with the district's teacher evaluation. By adopting and embedding a new research-based teacher effectiveness framework within the pre-service program, there is close alignment with the expectations and evaluation measures throughout all local districts. (pg. 18)

(iv)The applicant has effectively demonstrated the proposed TQP project will involve several partnerships. The applicant which includes three university campuses will partner with 11 rural school districts. The applicant has demonstrated throughout the proposal that the partnerships are established and ongoing relationships. (pg. 19) The partner school districts will provide pre-service mentoring and teacher residency placements. The university teacher education programs have selected and trained teacher leaders to serve as co-teachers and mentors. The co-teaching approach provides ample opportunities for close connections between pedagogy courses and field experiences. Additionally, partner school districts benefit from university faculty providing support to classroom instruction, both to the resident and to the hosting cooperating teacher.

(v)The applicant effectively demonstrates that the proposed project has the potential for continuation beyond the grant funding period. The applicant has proven prior years of experience existence with the school districts and indicated that the long term success of the project and continuing operations beyond the period of federal funding have been built into the work plan, the project timeline, and the budget of the program. For example, the budget will decline in support for residency stipends from federal sources following the third year of operation which reflects the intent to make the residencies attractive and less dependent on stipends to attract teacher candidates to rural schools. Currently, CSUMB requires candidates near its campus to complete a co-teaching placement of equal duration to a residency without offering stipends.(pg. 20) Additionally, the applicant provided letter of support from the school districts. The letters indicated the partner schools appreciate the university programs and the relationships has helped them with recruiting teachers for high-need rural schools.

**Weaknesses:**

(v) While the applicant has demonstrated a commitment to continue serving the rural schools, the applicant provide a limited strategy for program continuation beyond the grant period. The applicant indicated that funding from the TQP program will provide the needed resources to travel and expand services to the remote geographical locations. More discussion was needed to determine how the universities would support the travel to the locations without the grant funds.

**Reader's Score: 40**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan**

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

(i) The applicant provides a comprehensive management plan for ensuring the achievement of the goals and objectives for the proposed project. The management plan was clearly aligned with project goals, objectives, activities, and implementation tasks. The applicant effectively demonstrate the responsible parties for meeting objectives, a timeline for each activity, and a benchmark or milestone for each activity for each objective. (pg. 20-21) The applicant will utilize contracted or subcontracted partners to implement locally based services at the school districts. Due to the remote geographical locations, use of locally based personnel is an excellent idea. For example, teacher education faculty, cooperating mentor teachers, university supervisors, and program participants will work together to develop the teacher education curriculum.

(ii)

The applicant effectively demonstrates that the proposed key personnel are appropriately training and have relevant experiences to implement and administer the TQP program. The project director for example is a full professor in the School of Education and has many years of experience working with teacher education training. He will chair the core management team and is the person who is responsible ensuring the achievement of project goals and objectives delineated in the work plan. (pg. 21-23) Other members of the core management team will also serve as key personnel. Each person brings a wealth of experience and knowledge to the program in the field of teacher education. The management team will be joined by the external evaluator, WestEd, and a representative of iResult LLC Research. (pg. 24)

(iii) The applicant has effectively demonstrated that strategic plans are in place to receive and react to performance

feedback to ensure continuous improvements are addresses over the life of the project. For example, the management team will be joined by the external evaluator, WestEd, and a representative of iResult LLC Research. The team will meet bi-monthly during the grant implementation phase of AY 2014-2015, and quarterly in the preceding years. (pg. 21)

Additionally, the applicant will develop an Executive Council to include educational leaders from county offices of education and partner LEAs. The executive council includes the external evaluator and a senior leadership member of each high need LEA. It will also include an academic dean representing the College of Arts and Sciences at each of the two universities, and/or the department chairs of the content area subjects for which teacher education program revisions are taking place. (pg. 23) Each team member will share in reporting on progress in the achievement of goals and objectives. The executive council will meet once each year to review progress in the achievement of project goals and objectives. The council will determine the direction of future activity and it will direct the management team to take necessary actions to achieve goals and objectives of the project. The management team will then direct each campus or funded LEA unit to take actions needed. Through this process of delegating, reporting, evaluating, and revising, a continuous cycle of project evaluation and continuous improvement will guide the work of the project.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 20**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

(i)The applicant indicated that the project will secure the services of an external evaluator to conduct the evaluation. The applicant has effectively developed relevant and evaluation methods to ensure valid and reliable performance data aligned with project outcomes. (pg. 23) For example, For new teachers, WestEd will collect results from teacher evaluation protocols compiled by human resource departments of the ten partner districts, a process which will be formalized with data sharing MOUs between WestEd, CSUMB, Cal Poly, and the partner LEAs. HEA also requires

measures regarding hiring, subject areas taught, and the extent to which teachers are placed in high-need areas and schools. The evaluation approach will also employ a quasi-experimental design (QED) to assess whether the initiative results in improved teacher and student outcomes relative to traditional teacher preparation and induction programs. WestEd will compare findings on performance measures for CSUMB/Cal Poly participants with national and state standards of excellence in teacher preparation as well as with outcomes of other credentialing. The CSU Center for Teaching Quality (CTQ) will provide the evaluation with comparison group data for teacher candidates at the CSU and state levels. (pg. 21) The evaluation methods are appropriate and have the potential to yield valuable results to determine project effectiveness.

(ii) The applicant effectively demonstrates that strategic evaluation methods are in place to measure the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the TWP project. For example, to gauge progress on recruitment and selection, the applicant will assess project measures on recruitment targets; selection rates; candidates from underrepresented groups; candidates with STEM- and education-related backgrounds (based on prior employment, career path, major, advanced degrees, and granting institutions); GPA; and California Subject Examination Test results. In the final year of the evaluation, the applicant will use the QED to address whether the CSUMB/Cal Poly model is more effective at preparing teachers than traditional teacher preparation programs. Waiting until the final year of the evaluation will allow the applicant to pool data from all available appropriate cohorts to increase the sample size. (pg. 23)

(iii) The applicant clearly demonstrates that appropriate evaluation methods are in place to ensure performance feedback is assessed periodically and used to indicate progress toward achieving intended outcomes. WestEd will collect valid and reliable data on the proposed goals, objectives and outcomes of the program in accordance with the requirements of GPRA and HEA. Some of the data for the evaluation will be collected directly from the CSUMB/Cal Poly program. For data about teacher candidates, new teachers, and student learning, WestEd will collect results from teacher evaluation protocols compiled by human resource departments of the ten partner districts, a process which will be formalized with data sharing MOUs between WestEd, CSUMB, Cal Poly, and the partner LEAs. The evaluation results will be shared by the evaluator and used to discuss project performance against the intended outcomes. (pgs. 23-25)

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 20**

**Priority Questions**

**Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Promoting STEM Education**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant effectively addressed Competitive Preference Priority One. The applicant will be developing the knowledge and skills of teachers in subject matter and new pedagogies emphasizing STEM education. The applicant will develop the capacity of rural schools to meet the CCSS and NGSS. At meetings with superintendents of all partner districts, and in their response to a needs assessment survey, the areas of need identified most frequently and as most severe were the following: (1) meeting the needs of English language learners, (2) filling hard to staff science subjects in physics, chemistry, and geology, (3) supporting unique needs of students with disabilities, and (4) equipping district teachers to address CCSS, particularly in math. (Abstract-pgs. 1-10)

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

**Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Implementing Academic Standards**

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

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

b) Strategies that translate the standards into classroom practice.

**Strengths:**

No strengths. The applicant does not address CPP 2.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant is not requesting CPP2 in the narrative.

**Reader's Score: 0**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 08/19/2014 10:48 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/19/2014 10:48 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: University Corporation at Monterey Bay (U336S140037)

Reader #2: \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	15	15
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	45	40
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	20
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	18
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
<b>Promoting STEM Education</b>		
1. CPP 1	5	5
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
<b>Implementing Academic Standards</b>		
1. CPP 2	2	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>100</b>

# Technical Review Form

Panel #8 - 2014 TQP Grant Review - 8: 84.336S

Reader #2: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: University Corporation at Monterey Bay (U336S140037)

## 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 proposed project is likely to build local capacity in STEM teaching and learning. The project is designed to serve teachers in 10 rural, school districts (pp2-4).

ii

The proposed project is likely to result in system change and improvement in the delivery of professional development services to teachers in rural school districts. The proposed project is providing a residency pathway and a Master's Degree in education (pp5-6).

iii

The proposed project plans to address the shortage of STEM teachers. The applicant's proposed project is designed to prepare teachers to teach STEM disciplines in rural schools (p.7).

### 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](http://www.relpacific.mcrel.org/PERR.html)) or the Northeast and Islands REL Skill Builder Workshops ([www.relnei.org/events/skill-builder-archive.html](http://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 proposed project is well conceived and supported by strong theory. The applicant provides three project objectives and measurable outcomes. The applicant plans to increase the number of credentialed teachers, and ensure that teachers pass requisite assessments. The proposed project is designed to prepare teachers for success using a co-teaching model. The applicant provides a detailed description of demographic data on the target population, and the project is designed to meet the needs of the target population. (pp17-28).

ii

The professional development services to be provided are likely to lead to significant improvements in practices. The proposed project reflects an innovative approach to teacher residencies through its STEM teacher summer research opportunities. The applicant plans to use the edTPA instrument to measure teacher effectiveness as a result of their participation in project activities.

iii

The proposed project represents a coherent and sustained teacher development program. The project plans to prepare teachers for participation in Individualized Education Program meetings in order to ensure their effectiveness in serving students receiving special education services. The applicant has a well-conceived plan for recruiting STEM teachers through its undergraduate early field experience programs (pp30-40).

iv

The applicant demonstrates its commitment to sustain the project to a limited extent.

v

The applicant has attached numerous letters of support demonstrating its commitment from a variety of stakeholders.

**Weaknesses:**

1

none

ii

none

iii

none

iv

none

v

The applicant does not provide a detailed description of how it plans to sustain the project in its current scope and capacity beyond the period of federal funding. More details are needed with regard to the applicant's sustainability plan.

**Reader's Score: 40**

### **Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan**

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### **Strengths:**

i

The applicant provides a thorough management plan that will support timely project implementation. The implementation plan has a timeline, milestones, and persons responsible for implementation (p.e180).

ii

The applicant has identified the members of the core management team. The applicant also describes the members of the executive council. The applicant has attached resumes of key project personnel, all of whom have relevant training and expertise in order to implement the goals and objectives of the grant (pp. 33-38).

iii

Performance feedback is integral to the design of the project. The applicant ensures organizational accountability and continuous improvement through the delegation of roles and responsibilities under the direction of the management team (pp.33-38).

#### **Weaknesses:**

None.

**Reader's Score: 20**

### **Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

i

The methods of evaluation provide valid and reliable performance data on project outcomes. The applicant has identified its external evaluator who has relevant experience in assessment the attainment of project outcomes. (p.52).

ii

The methods of evaluation are appropriate for the goals and objectives of the project. The applicant plans to utilize a quasi-experimental design (p53). The applicant plans to collect data on the following indicators: graduation and certification; candidate recruitment and selection; teacher retention; teacher placement; and student learning outcomes (62-64).

iii

The applicant describes its plan for continuous improvement (p. 65)

**Weaknesses:**

ii

The evaluation plan is not aligned with measurable outcomes. Further details with regard to how the evaluation plan is aligned with measurable project outcomes will result in more robust 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:**

The applicant provides a thorough description of its plan to provide professional development opportunities in STEM areas. The applicant plans to provide STEM experiences for new teachers in rural areas( pp.1-3).

**Weaknesses:**

None.

**Reader's Score: 5**

**Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Implementing Academic Standards**

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

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

**b) Strategies that translate the standards into classroom practice.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant provides a detailed description of its adoption of the Common Core State Standards. (p.2)

**Weaknesses:**

None

**Reader's Score: 2**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 08/19/2014 10:48 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/19/2014 10:48 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** University Corporation at Monterey Bay (U336S140037)

**Reader #3:** \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	15	15
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	45	40
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	20
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	17
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
<b>Promoting STEM Education</b>		
1. CPP 1	5	5
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
<b>Implementing Academic Standards</b>		
1. CPP 2	2	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>97</b>

# Technical Review Form

Panel #8 - 2014 TQP Grant Review - 8: 84.336S

Reader #3: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: University Corporation at Monterey Bay (U336S140037)

## 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) Citing relevant research St. Cloud State University in Minnesota (2010) (p.e21), NCATE's blue ribbon panel report, Transforming Teacher Education Through Clinical Practice (p.e19), and the SIOP Development for English Learners (p. e19), the project proposes to disassociate from traditional teacher preparation and "permanently install the co-teaching model of clinical practice" (p. e21). The project not only has the capacity to increase pre-service teacher effectiveness, but will also increase the effectiveness of veteran collaborating teachers through its partnership and practice of co-teaching.
- (ii) The project focuses upon rural areas that might not otherwise be served and provides collaboration and support to create a sustained endeavor (p.5). The model will result in a higher rate of CCSS being applied at a high level in STEM areas. (iii) In response to needs assessments and other research cited, the project provides high levels of content area training in science and mathematics. Furthermore, the project supports the pedagogical means necessary to teach English language learners and students with disabilities (p.e22). Addressing both the content and the differentiated learning needs of this diverse group of learners will dramatically lead to a closure of the learning gap, if properly implemented.

### Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 15

### Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

- 1) The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project.
  - 2) In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the extent to which the proposed project consists of a comprehensive plan that includes a description of:
    - i) The extent to which the proposed project is supported by strong theory (as defined in this notice).

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

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

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

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

**Note:** In order to address this criterion, applicants are encouraged to develop logic models to demonstrate their project's theory of action. Applicants should connect available evidence of past history of successful outcomes to their logic models. Applicants may use resources such as the Pacific Education Laboratory's Education Logic Model Application ([www.relpacific.mcrel.org/PERR.html](http://www.relpacific.mcrel.org/PERR.html)) or the Northeast and Island's REL Skill Builder Workshops ([www.relnei.org/events/skill-builder-archive.html](http://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) Relevant literature that indicates strong theory toward teacher preparation is noted, such as NCATE's blue ribbon panel report, *Transforming Teacher Education Through Clinical Practice and Sparks' Designing Powerful Professional Development for Teachers and Principals* (p.e59). The research into professional development has been applied in offering teachers sustained opportunities to "try new skills and knowledge in the classroom with support through academic coaching" (p.e59). Teachers in the program are provided support through ongoing mentorship and support that extends beyond the traditional semester-long practicum (p.e60). This is a unique undertaking because it affords teachers the opportunity to tackle long term challenges and participate in ongoing authentic learning in which they can apply the experiences they learn to each future task along the course of the clinical experience. This is not a readily available aspect of traditional teacher preparation models. (ii) The proposal includes the participation of content area faculty outside of the schools of education (p.e30) to help teachers become more effective within their content area (specifically science in this instance). This stands apart from traditional teacher preparation programs in which education majors take fewer content area classes in order to fit their pedagogy classes and clinical experience into their schedules. Infusing content area specialists, and ensuring that teachers (such as science teachers) receive the same level of course rigor and training as content area majors (such as chemists) will result in teachers who have higher levels of content-specific knowledge. The program is unique in that it doesn't sacrifice content area classes in order to make room for education classes. (iii) The program includes teacher mentorship, new teacher training, mentor training, and feedback and assessment that will result in teacher growth is noted. Collaboration is a key component of the cohort model suggested (p.e61).

#### **Weaknesses:**

(iv): The proposal only minimally addresses necessary collaboration between CSUMB and Cal Poly (p.e62). The cost sharing plan is not described in detail nor is the mechanism that will be used to collaborate. District collaboration is only mentioned in terms of match allocations (p.e62), but not in terms of needs assessments or additional supports the districts will offer. The proposal assumes that collaboration will occur, but it lacks the substance and detail to outline the specifics that have occurred in creating this plan and how that collaboration will continue moving forward.

(v) The project assumes that as residencies become more attractive, the dependency on stipends will decrease (p.e62). The project also states it will create a cost sharing plan and will support expenses for clinical supervisors. How this will occur, however, is not specified. Furthermore, a contingency plan in the event that stipends are still needed, would

strengthen the quality of this application.

**Reader's Score: 40**

### **Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan**

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### **Strengths:**

(i): The management plan includes a clear timeline that is decisive. Responsibilities are indicated by position and key dates within the plan. The plan has clearly defined benchmarks and performance measures to ensure that timelines and actions are properly executed (pp.e169-e187)

(ii) Key personnel, including a project director are clearly named. Furthermore, all staff are clearly trained and qualified as evidenced by narrative data and attached curriculum vitae (p. 103–e113)

(iii) Feedback and continuous achievement are addressed within the plan, allowing for oversight by an executive council, which receives insight and input (p.e67). Throughout the project, the executive council will meet annually to review progress and achievement toward goals. The project empowers the council to determine what future activity is needed and to direct managers to take actions to achieve goals and objectives (p.e67). This process allows for an annual evaluation of the project, its plan, timeline and any unforeseen challenges that might arise with the ability to quickly respond to them before a new cohort begins.

#### **Weaknesses:**

None weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 20**

### **Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

(i) Solid qualitative and quantitative performance data are referenced and implemented throughout the plan, including graduation and certification data, teacher placement, and teacher retention. Student Learning Outcomes are a crucial component of the project, specifically scores from the ELA and mathematics Smarter Balanced assessments twice during each field experience (p.e72). Using this data will assist the project team in determining the impact upon learning that the plan is making, or the lack thereof. (ii) These are valid and reliable measures that will directly correlate to the project's intended outcomes. Furthermore, they provide a quantifiable measure between traditional teacher programs and this project, which will help determine the impact of this project compared to traditional teacher preparation. These include an integrated longitudinal data collection system (p.e73), teacher performance as measured by edTPA (p.e74), and student outcomes impact estimates (p.e78). The inclusion of human resource departments (p.e79) to provide teacher evaluation data will also provide evaluation of the project.

**Weaknesses:**

(ii): The program's three goals are as follows: "Plan and implement teacher preparation program at CSUMB," (p.e40), "Address Absolute Priority I Partnership Grants for the preparation of teachers," (p.9), and "to develop and implement effective mechanisms to ensure that eligible partner districts are able to recruit qualified individuals to become highly qualified teachers," (p.e53). The goals, however are extremely vague and do not provide quantifiable measures to determine if the goal was achieved. For example, one of the objective sub-goals under Goal 2 could state, "75% of graduates will be hired within the district and 80% of those will still be employed after 3 years." This would provide a more measurable goal that can be assessed and more properly aligned to assessment criteria.

(iii) Page e74 states (in relation to program evaluation), "waiting until the final year of the evaluation will allow us to pool data from all available appropriate cohorts to increase our sample size." While this is a good summative measure, it is concerning that this procedure will permit limited periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended goals. Periodic formative assessment measures at least annually would help ensure that the project is properly revised as needed during its implementation and would provide quality feedback to the executive committee aforementioned in the application.

**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 project clearly incorporates high-quality preparation of STEM teachers. Numerous professional learning opportunities, resources, and personnel are incorporated as part of the plan. Further, the project will provide the same level of content area learning to educators in STEM areas as those required for non-education majors (p.e16). This will increase the capacity of the educator and the learning capacity of students.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

**Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Implementing Academic Standards**

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

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

**b) Strategies that translate the standards into classroom practice.**

**Strengths:**

No strengths noted.

**Weaknesses:**

While CCSS are mentioned as part of the application and are stated to be infused into the Goals and Objectives of the application, their practicality and application are not specifically addressed. An intentional application of CCSS is not

planned and delineated, but assumed. A clear plan for implementation of CCSS within the application would strengthen this area.

**Reader's Score:** 0

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 08/19/2014 10:48 AM