

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/15/2014 02:06 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The University of North Carolina at Greensboro (U336S140055)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	15	15
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	45	43
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	20
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Promoting STEM Education		
1. CPP 1	5	5
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Implementing Academic Standards		
1. CPP 2	2	
Total	107	103

Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - 2014 TQP Grant Review - 5: 84.336S

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: The University of North Carolina at Greensboro (U336S140055)

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 extent to which this project will build local capacity is high. A strength of this project is initiating systemic change in each of the 23 teacher education areas at UNC and the direct impact on 300 teacher candidates each year during the grant. The focus is not just on the School of Education but with the other STEM related schools at the university as well. Implementation of the grant goals is expected equally among each participating school at the university. There is a strong likelihood that the proposed project will result in system change. Of equal significance is the fact the university is partnering with two surrounding school districts. The project's underlying goal is to increase technology integration in teacher preparation classes, which will also be expected within the various practicum and student teaching experiences. Also noteworthy is the embedded coaching and PD that will be provided to the districts' schools that participate. This is a combined effort to improve the skill sets of the university faculty, the teacher candidates, and the the district personnel involved with the grant.

Weaknesses:

None noted

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

It is noteworthy that this grant focuses on TPACK and SAMR theory, which moves beyond the every day expectations of increasing access into depth of understanding (p.1). Throughout the project description was a comprehensive approach to PD for the teacher candidates, university faculty, and inservice teachers from the partnering school districts. UNC builds upon the use of four coaches from their previous grant who will be assigned to delivering PD at the schools. Built into the PD plan is cooperation from the respective school districts so PD is co-facilitated. This is important when asking inservice teachers to change their instructional approaches by using technology to transform student tasks. This application included a well designed logic model.

The literacy strand was explained well as it applies to elementary education teacher candidates (p.24).

The development of makerspaces at the university is an excellent strategy for immersing teacher candidates of various contents into intentional collaboration. Funding makerspaces at the partnering schools will align these efforts and add strong resources to the districts (p.27).

Technology enabled observation, supervision, and coaching was described well in the proposal and will improve clinical experiences. The use of video repositories and simulated classrooms will also give teacher candidates and inservice teachers opportunities for discussion and direct, low stakes practice (p.18).

Yearlong clinical experiences and early opportunities for classroom observation are a strength of this application (p.29).

Weaknesses:

More evidence to support the sustainability (criterion v) of this grant proposal would be helpful.

Reader's Score: 43

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

A strength of the proposal is the existing Teachers Academy Council of Program Coordinators, with representatives from all five different schools that offer teacher education programs. This policy-making organization will help coordinate and manage the proposal (p.37).

All key personnel related to this grant have robust resumes and related background experiences. The Dean's expertise in literacy is noteworthy and should impact the revised curriculum changes as explained.

The proposed timeline is ambitious and comprehensive (p.41) with clear responsibilities and outlined tasks. A feedback loop is built in to all proposed reforms and is integral to each objective.

Weaknesses:

None noted

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

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

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

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

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

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

Note: In addressing this criterion, applicants are encouraged to include a plan for how the project s evaluation will address the TQP Grant Program performance measures established by the Department

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

Strengths:

The proposal identifies an independent evaluator who will provide formative assessment throughout the duration of the grant (p.45). Opportunities for graduate students in the UNCG to conduct data analysis with oversight by the independent evaluator is equally strong. Quantitative data for evaluation purposes (p.45)

Weaknesses:

None noted

Reader's Score: 20

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Promoting STEM Education

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

The collaboration between 23 teacher education programs at the university and the participating schools in the two school districts is very thorough. The proposal describes in detail how STEM candidates receive content instruction from the relevant schools and faculty within the university (pp.35-36). In addition, the university's diversity in enrollment will likely increase the number of groups typically underrepresented. The emphasis on innovative makerspaces (p.23) at both the

university and partner schools will provide hands-on experiences for teacher candidates and inservice teachers. This proposal provides opportunities for 400 hours of practicum throughout the teacher education program prior to a year-long clinical experience (p.28). The suggested plans for quality and sustainable professional development for teacher candidates, inservice candidates, and cooperating teachers is excellent.

Weaknesses:

None noted

Reader's Score: 5

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Implementing Academic Standards

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

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

b) Strategies that translate the standards into classroom practice.

Strengths:

Not applicable

Weaknesses:

Not applicable

Reader's Score:

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/15/2014 02:06 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/15/2014 04:09 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The University of North Carolina at Greensboro (U336S140055)

Reader #2: *****

	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	20
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Promoting STEM Education		
1. CPP 1	5	5
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Implementing Academic Standards		
1. CPP 2	2	0
Total	107	100

Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - 2014 TQP Grant Review - 5: 84.336S

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: The University of North Carolina at Greensboro (U336S140055)

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's focus of the program is to increase the depth of understanding technology of its teachers (page 2). The model focuses on the teacher's understanding of the technology content so that students can be taught regardless of individual learning needs and socioeconomic status. In this way, the program expands services to the target population.
- (ii) Based on information provided in the narrative, the program will result in systems change or improvement (page 3). Clearer details emerge to determine how improvements will be sustainable within the program. For example, training is affected in a new generation of teachers. This will be sustained as teachers demonstrate skills within the targeted classroom settings.
- (iii) Further information is provided in this part of the narrative to determine how the targeted school districts identified the need for teachers prepared in this area. Specifically, within the logic model, the applicant provides general statements that "practicing teachers, teacher candidates and P-12 students must develop skills to adapt and integrate emerging technology in their learning and professional practice"; this provides the specifics within the logic model or "significance" narrative to quantitatively describe shortages or lack of skills among existing teachers. Data used from the self-study with previous teachers (page 11) to design the project.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

(i) The applicant describes theory and research that supports its program (pages 4-5). Specifically, the applicant uses supportive information for integration of technology. The applicant states that the Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPACK) framework has been widely applied and that it demonstrates the complex intersection of content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge and knowledge of technology (pages 5-6). Research from 1999 and 2013 support the digital visualization for inquiry-based learning about climatology. These citations provide strong theory that supports the project design.

(ii) The applicant inculcates the use of technology through the curriculum and in practices (page 16). Its goals for the program are curriculum reform, strengthening the clinical experience, and increasing recruitment and retention activities (pages 16-34). Each goal is supported with specific activities. For example, the applicant will use mixed reality simulations; gaming and virtual worlds; and technology enabled observation, supervision and eCoaching integrated into the reformed curriculum. As these are incorporated throughout the teacher preparation program, project services are of sufficient quality and duration.

(iii) No strengths were noted.

(iv) Partners include the colleges of education and arts and sciences within the university, two local education agencies and a grant entity funded by the National Science Foundation (page 35). Each has committed to providing space and support to the program. For example, one LEA will have four elementary schools serve as clinical sites for the program (page 36).

(v) No strengths were noted.

Weaknesses:

(iii) It is unclear how training and program modules will be sustained once teachers enter the field in general or start teaching at the targeted school systems in particular (page 34). The narrative states that both LEAs recognize the need for technologically savvy teachers, but the narrative is silent on how the LEA partners will ensure additional training on new technologies once teachers are in the field. The applicant states that the LEAs will provide facilities for professional development activities related to the project; however, this involvement appears limited to ensuring the depth of technological knowledge for teachers.

(v) It is unclear how the project will be sustained once funds are ended (pages 35-36). Roles and commitments of the partners are not described past the length of the project. It is unclear, for example, how the partners will support any upgrades to technology that will be used within the school systems and the subsequent training of teachers.

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 is adequate to achieve project goals and objectives (pages 37-44). Project personnel are designated with specific tasks that align with objectives, activities and timelines. The project will use program faculty from both colleges to ensure deliverables. Project tasks are clearly defined for those responsible.

(ii) The qualifications and relevant training experiences are described for key personnel (pages 37-40). For example, the project director/principal investigator has served as the dean of education since 2011. Credentials for teaching faculty are relevant for administering the core content courses.

(iii) Within the management plan, there are opportunities for feedback and continuous improvement (page 44). For example, the program faculty, project director, the director or assessment and internal evaluation team will evaluate the effectiveness of recruitment and retention activities. Specifically, they will make improvements as indicated by data review.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were 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 methods appear appropriate for the project activities (pages 45-49). Specifically, the methods are aligned with the applicant's logic model containing its goals and activities. Tracking teacher performance and using record of technologies including use of markerspace are examples of appropriate methods described.

(ii) The evaluation methods are appropriate to the goals of the program (page 45-49). Specifically, the applicant will use quantitative measures of both short-term outcomes and long-term outcomes of the project through gathering data from and about participants. Project outcomes are evaluated using such metrics and strategies such as improvement in teacher candidate performance and observation of graduates' classrooms (page 46).

(iii) Since the evaluation measures are guided by the project's logic model, the methods will deliver feedback to project administrators for determining progress. For example, progress toward curriculum reform will be provided in summer (Goal 1) and June of each year for curriculum revision (objective 1) (page 47).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were 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:

a) The applicant provides evidence of this activity. The applicant promotes STEM education by systematically integrating existing and emerging technologies into the teacher preparation programs. Within the program, the applicant provides opportunities to use technology in completing course requirements.

b) The applicant expects to draw from the university population since it includes members of underrepresented groups. For example, the university enjoys a high population of women and minority undergraduate students (page 4). Summer programs will be used to encourage enrollment.

1) The applicant provides evidence for this priority (page 3). Specifically, STEM content faculty in Arts and Sciences will work with School of Education faculty to develop and present professional development to assure that both teacher candidates and in-service teachers have strong content knowledge and technology skills (page 3).

2) The applicant will provide STEM Guides for utilization in other content courses (page 3). Specifically candidates will use these guides in science or math methods courses. These will be supported by faculty in both colleges.

3) Field based opportunities are described in partnership with two local education agencies. The applicant lengthens the clinical experience. The applicant moves the clinical experience to an earlier phase of the program.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were 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 were noted.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not address this priority. Moreover, it is unclear if the project design is aligned with international or multi-state commonly held standards. It is unclear if the applicant's model included such information in its design. This information is unclear in the narrative.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/15/2014 04:09 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/19/2014 11:35 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The University of North Carolina at Greensboro (U336S140055)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	15	15
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	45	42
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	20
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Promoting STEM Education		
1. CPP 1	5	5
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Implementing Academic Standards		
1. CPP 2	2	0
Total	107	102

Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - 2014 TQP Grant Review - 5: 84.336S

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: The University of North Carolina at Greensboro (U336S140055)

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's proposed project is clearly likely to build local capacity to provide, improve, or expand services that address the needs of the target population. The project proposes to develop and implement a transformational model for teacher preparation where candidates, university, and school-based faculty, integrate existing and emerging technologies into Pre-K-12 instruction to ensure that students have the knowledge and skills to become lifelong learners and productive workers in the 21st century (pgs. 6-8).
- ii) The applicant's proposed project sufficiently illustrates the proposed project will result in system change or improvement. The applicant notes presently the state of North Carolina's (NC) Board of Education (NC) has a goal of every teacher having skills to deliver 21st Century content in a 21st Century context with 21st Century tools and technology that guarantees student learning. North Carolina student learning goals have been revised, all teacher education programs have been revised to align with the new standards. (pgs.10). Furthermore, the applicant believes the integration of technology in teacher education programs by UNCG faculty will offer more options to future educators enabling them to encourage and support the adoption of new and more effective approaches (pgs. 11-12).
- iii) The proposed project will clearly prepare personnel for fields in which shortages have been demonstrated. The applicant indicates the plan to work with the community and local industry to identify workforce needs and then seek opportunities for career exploration, internships and certification programs that align with community's economic needs (pg. 13-14).

Weaknesses:

- i) None noted.
- ii) None noted.
- iii) None noted.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

i) The applicant clearly demonstrates a plan which is supported by strong theory. The applicant indicates a theory which technology-enabled observation provides pre- and in-service teachers or groups of teachers opportunities of real world models of best practice, citing a Hendry & Oliver, 2012 theory, looks like through electronic visits, carried out via web based videoconferencing.

ii) The applicant clearly illustrates 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. (pgs. 7-8,). The applicant provides a logic model which lays out professional development objectives for the proposed project. The applicant's professional development activities will consist of creating alternative delivery models including a web-based professional learning community where teachers access just-in-time professional development clips, share lesson plans and resources, and engage in model lessons. The applicant also indicates they plan to build capacity and expand professional development opportunities for all Greensboro County School (GCS) employees, including administrators and classified employees (pg. 13).

iii) The applicant provides ample evidence to substantiate its proposed activities constitutes a coherent, sustained program of training in the field (pgs. 23-29). Some of the proposed activities includes technology enabled observation, supervision, and coaching best practices allows pre- and in-service teachers to capture observations electronically to view later (pg. 20). Other activities includes: self-study and program improvement, the development of partnerships with seven pre-selected high need schools, and revising teacher education programs to include stronger content preparation,

coursework in pedagogy, early internships and one full year of student teaching (pg. 29).

iv) The applicant clearly notes the proposed services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services. The applicant indicates plans to collaborate with schools, coaches and faculty will identify and offer professional development for career status teachers (pg.33).

v) The applicant clearly demonstrates the commitment of any partners. The applicant indicates partnerships with Guilford County Schools and Winston Salem/Forsyth County Schools (pg.35).

Weaknesses:

i) None noted.

ii) None noted.

iii) None noted.

iv) None noted.

v) The applicant fails to demonstrate 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 application does not outline resources to sustain the project beyond the grant period within the narrative.

Reader's Score: 42

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

i) The applicant clearly illustrates a management plan enabling the project to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks (pgs. 37-44). The applicant clearly indicates the School of Education (SOE) is the designated administrative unit for professional education programs at UNCG and the Teachers Academy is the organizational umbrella for all professional education programs on campus. The applicant provides a comprehensive timeline illustrating proposed objectives related activities, a specific timeframe for activities to take place, and persons responsible for carrying out those activities. (pgs. 41-44).

ii) The applicant clearly describes the qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of most key project personnel (pgs. 3-44). The applicant notes the external evaluator has 20 years of experience as an evaluator, researcher, change agent and teacher, and has worked with educational leaders and stakeholders in colleges, universities and schools to promote positive, evidence-based change in education, including serving as the external evaluator for Project ENRICH (pg. 39). The Lead Principal Investigator has been a longtime consultant to the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) reading tests and currently serves as a member of the NAEP Validity Studies Panel. She has also served as a member of an extended work group for the Common Core English language arts standards and is co-editor of two books on implementing the new standards (pgs. 37-38). Resumes and curriculum vitae are provided in the attachments for all key staff.

iii) The applicant provides sufficient evidence of efforts to receive performance feedback and continuous improvement which are integral to the design of the proposed project. The applicant indicates plans to annually assess programmatic activities via focus groups, interviews, observations, and surveys (pgs.34)

Weaknesses:

i) None noted.

ii) None noted.

iii) None noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

i) The applicant clearly provides strong methods of evaluation provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes. The applicant will utilize a firm to conduct evaluation activities for the proposed project. Evaluation data will be used to report to stakeholder groups and the Department of Education. During the second year, the applicant will assess

impact (pgs. 45-49).

ii) The applicant provides a comprehensive description of the proposed methods for evaluation which will allow for a thorough, feasible, and appropriate assessment in relation to the stated goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project (pgs.46-49). The applicant is proposing to assess the effectiveness of recruitment and retention activities by collecting data on the demographics and retention of teacher candidates and new teachers. Data will be compiled and reported annually each June (pg. 49)

iii) The application clearly demonstrates sufficient methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. The applicant provides a comprehensive table of metrics and measures as well as a time table which provides insight into the applicant agency's performance feedback plans (pgs. 46-49).

Weaknesses:

i) None noted.

ii) None noted.

iii) None noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Promoting STEM Education

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

a) The applicant clearly demonstrates a proposed project which exemplifies increasing the opportunities for high-quality preparation of, or professional development for, teachers or other educators of STEM subjects. The applicant indicates a plan to collaborate with the UNCG College of Arts and Sciences, and the UNCG School of Education (pgs. 35-36).

b) The applicant clearly demonstrates a plan for 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 (pg.e90). The plan includes recruiting from: 1) Individuals from under represented populations; (2) Individuals to teach in rural communities and teacher shortage areas, including mathematics, science, special education, and the instruction of limited English proficient students; and mid career professionals.

Weaknesses:

a) None noted.

b) None noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Implementing Academic Standards

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

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

b) Strategies that translate the standards into classroom practice.

Strengths:

a) None noted

b) None noted.

Weaknesses:

a) The applicant did not request this priority

b) The applicant did not request this priority

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/19/2014 11:35 PM

