

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/19/2014 02:30 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: University of Colorado Denver (U336S140043)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	15	14
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	45	41
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	15
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	15
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Promoting STEM Education		
1. CPP 1	5	5
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Implementing Academic Standards		
1. CPP 2	2	1
Total	107	91

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - 2014 TQP Grant Review - 3: 84.336S

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: University of Colorado Denver (U336S140043)

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 proposal represents a broad scope across Denver district and 24 high need rural districts. Partnership is ambitious and striving for system change. Goal is to train 340 teachers (220 in DPS and 120 in Rural Districts) in targeted need areas. New infrastructures being proposed to manage and support system changes in a sustainable way is a strength of the proposal. The Design is likely to dramatically increase local and statewide capacity to develop better teachers and impact student outcomes with support services for participants which helps to create a different tone of support and investment and greater passion for a state-wide call. The stated goal of developing capacity for state and national reforms add to significance.

Weaknesses:

It is unclear how diversity goals re: teachers will get met given existing gap and the impact on this gap. (Pg. 23)

Reader's Score: 14

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

Project design is to create a comprehensive program and is supported by strong theory with clear logic models showing pipelines, induction, differentiated/extended support, data/feedback loops and ongoing improvement/agility. The 4-year undergraduate residency describes long-term support and is more than sufficient. Design is clinically intensive throughout 4 years building off success of DTR and offers customized support for different rural needs. This customization to rural needs is a strength of the design.

Design emphasizes the recruitment of local and diverse talent to close the state "teacher diversity gap" (top 10 worst in nation) with support of a full-time Urban Recruiter and additional pipelines like LA's in STEM. Support services for participants create a different tone of support and investment and greater passion for a statewide call. This culture building is a strength.

The proposal has a solid strategy around residency schools and boasts a ripple effect of benefits include developing mentor and teachers with strong adult learning theory.

Integration of structures and funding should be able to continue.

Weaknesses:

Inconsistencies with the NextGen and Colorado State model of teacher evaluation makes the alignment process difficult, especially while running parallel to program implementation. The stated goal of developing capacity for state and national reforms may dilute the focus of an excellent teacher prep program. It is unclear how learning from the panel will be implemented and how student outcomes are measured is unclear.

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 management plan has clear timelines and lines of ownership for goals with a qualified management team. Roles are adequately identified and described. The management plan is sufficient.

Weaknesses:

The proposal describes an ambitious timeline related to the alignment of frameworks, which is critical initial step. Communication among the advisory council does not seem sufficient. Evaluation data is not sufficient and the degree of performance feedback is unclear. Public school student growth is not fully addressed (pg. 51-53)

Reader's Score: 15

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 plan calls for an autonomous Non-Profit Evaluation center to execute evaluation functions with team of evaluators and mixed methods. This is strong. This center will collaborate with Advisory Council and specific evaluation questions are identified and align to program goals.

Evaluation plan will also track performance indicators and align to outcomes-based assessment and teacher effectiveness framework, which is sufficient and demonstrates strong and multiple analysis with varied reporting methods for many representations and greater reliability.

Evaluation plan calls for data not only on performance, but HR systems as well, which is a strength. The plan also specifies the ability to differentiate instruction as a focus is a strength (pg. 158)

Weaknesses:

The proposal leaves open questions around the frequency and depth of communication/collaboration between evaluator and council as separate bodies.

In addition, adjusting student outcome measures across backgrounds and school sites is ambitious given a small sample size (pg. 48) The proposal lacks detail on measuring K-12 outcomes in years 3-5 (Pg. 175).

Reader's Score: 15

Priority Questions**Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Promoting STEM Education****1. Projects that are designed to address one or both of the following priority areas:**

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

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

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

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

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

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

3) Early and multiple field-based instructional experiences for prospective teachers that are structured

to provide exposure to a variety of teaching and learning environments, and that are coordinated and aligned with the teacher preparation curriculum.

Strengths:

The partnership with and pipeline of Learning Assistants to recruit and develop STEM practitioners is strong. 100 LA's as goal is ambitious and feasible.

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score: 5

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Implementing Academic Standards

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

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

b) Strategies that translate the standards into classroom practice.

Strengths:

The proposal builds capacity of existing bodies to infuse reform and alignment of standards into pathways, including a focus on cultural competence and diverse student populations.

Weaknesses:

Benchmarks are state-driven in addition to CCSS so less widely accepted.

Reader's Score: 1

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/19/2014 02:30 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/21/2014 08:09 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: University of Colorado Denver (U336S140043)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	15	14
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	45	45
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	18
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	15
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Promoting STEM Education		
1. CPP 1	5	5
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Implementing Academic Standards		
1. CPP 2	2	1
Total	107	98

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - 2014 TQP Grant Review - 3: 84.336S

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: University of Colorado Denver (U336S140043)

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 current project focuses on the recruitment of teachers of color to serve the increasing population of students of color. Specifically, there is a drastic increase in Latino students across the state (p-5) and to meet this more diversity population the need exist to recruit and train more teachers of color. The project also focuses on the increasing gap in academic performance in STEM areas between students of color and White (p-6). To address these issues the grant proposed will develop a Teacher Residency program that will produce highly trained teacher candidates. The program will likely increase the pool of well qualified teachers by focusing on retention and graduation rates of its program participants. To increase retention and graduation rates the grant will provide financial support (p-12) to candidates in the program, which is cited as a barrier to many students of color in completing the teacher education program.

Weaknesses:

A point was subtracted from the significant section due to the fact that the project's fail to adequately address system changes and improvements that can be implemented into the current curriculum. The program is primarily a teacher residency program, and only limited information is provided in the grant (pages 13 and 16) that address curriculum changes.

Reader's Score: 14

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

The current project (undergraduate program) will be based on the successes of the district-led graduate residency program (p-13). The theoretical framework of the project is illustrated in figure 2 on page 12, and fully explained on pages 13, 14 and 15. Great attention is being placed on aligning project assessments with partnering district assessments which will allow project leaders to gather growth data that can be used in the evaluation plan (p-21).

The project recruitment plan is based on multiple sites. These include existing high schools, community colleges, and community-based programs (p-13). The use of multiple sites will definitely increase the pool of teachers of color for this project. The project will also hire an urban recruiter with knowledge and experience in urban communities. This will also help in recruiting a more diverse pool of teacher candidates.

Weaknesses:

None Apparent

Reader's Score: 45

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

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

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

project tasks.

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

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

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

Strengths:

The project does include relevant training and experience to the key personnel that will lead to success. This is illustrated by the flowchart and described in detail on pages 12 and 13.

Project provides a usable timeline that provides quantitative evaluation outcomes (p 35 and 36). These outcomes can provide the bases for monitoring progress and program improvement.

Weaknesses:

No measureable objectives are provided in the timeline. Project does not indicate how that will use the data for program improvements. The project authors only briefly address "Continuous Improvement" in their narrative on pages 21 and 22. The primary focus of their "Continuous Improvement" plan is on retention. Little evidence is provided on how this data will be used to foster curriculum changes.

Reader's Score: 18

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

who will play an active role in the design and implementation of the project s evaluation.

Strengths:

The project provides effective measureable evaluation questions that can be easily quantifiable (p-35 and 36). A mixed method approach will be used in the evaluation. This will provide a more in-depth feedback to all partnerships involved. On the quantitative sides both standardized measures along with survey outcomes will be used. This will increase the validity and reliability of the measures being used. Qualitative measures include focus groups, and interviews. Qualitative measures will add to the clarity of the evaluation.

Weaknesses:

Internal evaluation team was used for the project. On Appendix H-7 “The Evaluation Center Qualification” The Evaluation Center was described. In that paragraph it talks about the center as if it were a part of UCD and School of Education (Also see page 42).

Several self-reported instruments are being used in the evaluation. These types of instruments always cloud the overall effectiveness of the evaluation. The main issue with these instruments in evaluating pre-service teachers is they are influenced by grades. In other words, candidates with higher grade-point-averages will tend to indicate positive experience in teacher education programs. This also works in the negative.

The second concern is the use of pre-post surveys in the evaluation. Pre-Posttest designs always raise issues of reliability.

The evaluation team failed to address how they plan to handle missing data.

In the proposal (p-48) the author indicated that student’s outcome measures will be adjusted by teacher and student background, however the sample maybe too small to subdivide.

The authors talks about the use of validated instruments to measure outcomes of self-efficacy and academic hope. However, no specific instruments are described.

Reader's Score: 15

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:

Project will increase the opportunities for high-quality preparation of, or professional development for, teachers or other educators of STEM subjects. This will be accomplished through the projects multiple sites recruitment plan.

Weaknesses:

None Apparent

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 does implement professional development aligned with those standards.

Weaknesses:

Evidence of strategies that translate the standards into classroom practice not provided.

Reader's Score: 1

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/21/2014 08:09 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/19/2014 01:55 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: University of Colorado Denver (U336S140043)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	15	15
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	45	40
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	15
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	16
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Promoting STEM Education		
1. CPP 1	5	5
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Implementing Academic Standards		
1. CPP 2	2	1
Total	107	92

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - 2014 TQP Grant Review - 3: 84.336S

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: University of Colorado Denver (U336S140043)

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 NxtGEN Teacher Preparation is likely to build local capacity by recruiting 100 additional students to take STEM general education courses. P19

The program will address the achievement gap in students of color, which are 79% of the school population by recruiting and preparing a diverse teaching workforce through additional courses, mentoring and financial assistance. P. 22

It will also address the need to fill 21% of the 5,000 teaching positions this year through extensive recruitment such as high-school and community college pipelines. P.22 ,32

They will recruit and train a diverse cadre of teachers that now has only 15% teachers of color and with language diversity. P. 23

In addition the program will address the needs of the rural high school programs through online courses.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

The NxtGEN Teacher Preparation is likely to build local capacity by recruiting 100 additional students to take STEM general education courses. P.19

The program will address the achievement gap in students of color, which are 79% of the school population by recruiting and preparing a diverse teaching workforce through additional courses, mentoring and financial assistance. P. 22

It will also address the need to fill 21% of the 5,000 teaching positions this year through extensive recruitment such as high-school and community college pipelines. P.22 ,32

They will recruit and train a diverse cadre of teachers that now has only 15% teachers of color and with language diversity. P. 23

In addition the program will address the needs of the rural high school programs through online courses.

Weaknesses:

Although there is significant, even admirable emphasis on cultural and linguistic issues, there is little/no mention of teaching public school pupils with learning disabilities in this section, which is a weakness.

Public School student achievement is briefly discussed but procedures to track their progress is unclear.

The amount requested in the grant appears excessively high. With the matching funds it seems to say that it will cost about \$17 million to prepare 340 teachers or \$54,000 per teacher. (See budget in appendix) This coupled with the opinion that there is insufficient information to demonstrate that the applicant has the resources to operate the project beyond the grant period equals a major weakness.

Tracking the acronyms is extremely difficult throughout the application. The applicant should repeat the full names

frequently or provide a list of acronyms for the reader.

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:

There are multiple activities that appear well grounded and roles defined within worthy goals and objectives. The years that each activity will take place are included in Table 14, pp. 51-53.

The qualifications of the primary project personnel are described and appear suitable. P. 54-58.

Weaknesses:

The level of effort for the many activities is not described. Pp 51-53.

There is not a goal or objective to address pupil growth. Pp 51-53

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

This reviewer finally found on p.158 in appendix that participants will be evaluated to determine their abilities to differentiate instruction to meet needs of all pupils, including special ed, English language learners and gifted and talented. If this is followed through, it becomes a strength.

The literacy skills of "students" (not defined as to whether this applies to the college students or the public school students) will be studied and monitored but both are good.

The Logic Model describes inputs, activities, outputs and outcomes. It is a thorough description of the teacher preparation program along with yearly timelines. P. 164 in appendix

The evaluation timeline lists major evaluation activities and yearly timelines data collection and analyses gathered from the School of Ed and from the partner districts and BOCES. They will evaluate teacher effectiveness but will look at costs/benefits, policy, needs, coursework in math and science and ECE pp 171-173.

Weaknesses:

This evaluator found a brief line item on p. 172 regarding the assessment of K-12 learning in years 3,4,5. There is little if any further information in regard to public school learning/outcomes and how they will be measured.

On p. 60 an evaluation question asks if program participants are more effective in raising student test scores than other CO teachers.... This is an important question but needs to have more information and explanation of data collection and analysis and whether the sample size is sufficient.

Reader's Score: 16

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Promoting STEM Education

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

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

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

Note: Applicants that respond to Competitive Preference Priority 1 and Absolute Priority 1 are still

required to implement the required reforms within the whole teacher preparation program, as reflected in sections (a) and (b) of Absolute Priority 1.

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

STEM courses will be augmented by employing 100 STEM learning assistants, 20 each year. They will help pre-service teachers with their science and math courses and will enhance teacher preparation in these subject areas P. 19

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 5

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Implementing Academic Standards

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

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

b) Strategies that translate the standards into classroom practice.

Strengths:

Objectives are in place to develop faculty, align courses with standards, and support and advocate for ECE policy. P. 20
There is an objective to create a University Teacher Education Coordinating Council to ensure strong content preparation. P.20

Weaknesses:

Adequate information on standards was not found.

Reader's Score: 1

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/19/2014 01:55 PM