

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/14/2014 12:01 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Virginia Commonwealth University (U336S140017)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	15	11
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	45	41
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	20
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	19
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Promoting STEM Education		
1. CPP 1	5	4
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Implementing Academic Standards		
1. CPP 2	2	0
Total	107	95

Technical Review Form

Panel #10 - 2014 TQP Grant Review- 10: 84.336S

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Virginia Commonwealth University (U336S140017)

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 needs the applicant is attempting to address are a STEM and special education teacher shortage and high turnover in urban schools. The current proposal builds on and expands an earlier model of the project.

The project will not only train new teachers but also improve the effectiveness of veteran teachers who work with the residents. The project also "helps to increase the number of NBCTs in RPS by preparing them for the National Board process. In fact, RPS has agreed to accept all RTR graduates into its National Board cohort as soon as they are eligible to seek this advanced certification." This has the potential to create systemic change to the extent that the project is sustainable.

Weaknesses:

The UTR model, "a year-long, medical-style residency that allows candidates to scaffold their learning through an extended period of well-supervised clinical practice guided by both university faculty and master teachers who jointly provide instruction", is not very different from most traditional teacher education programs that the applicant credits for high teacher turnover. The applicant could have benefited from a more thorough assessment of the realities in urban school conditions that actually lead to high teacher turnover.

Reader's Score: 11

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 Island's REL Skill Builder Workshops (www.relnei.org/events/skill-builder-archive.html) to help design their logic models. In addressing this criterion, applicants are also encouraged to connect the project design to the intended impact of the project, including an explanation of how the project will affect the preparation, placement, retention, induction, and professional development of teachers, and ultimately student achievement. Finally, applicants are encouraged to discuss the role and commitment of each partner and how the IHE and LEA(s) plan to sustain their partnership beyond the life of the grant.

Strengths:

The applicant provides a logic model with a discussion of short-, mid-, and long-term outcomes. Principles guiding the project are presented and form the basis of the theoretical model.

The collaborators have worked together for decades and have established Professional Development Schools in the metro-Richmond area. Residents are placed in cohorts within each host school. Resident recruitment efforts target minority students so they mirror the students they will be teaching.

Proposal has commitment from the business community, along with funding streams from the IHE, local districts, and state government. Applicant will not be applying for matching fund waiver.

Weaknesses:

The proposal's theory is somewhat flawed in its assertion that traditional teacher education programs have failed to ensure teacher retention.

Activities of the project are not very different from the traditional teacher education program activities.

Provisional hires were not addressed adequately.

Reader's Score: 41

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

- 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:

Timeline and milestone for the project are outlined in detail, along with persons responsible for each component. Personnel responsible for program management have relevant training and experience with responsibilities outlined.

Continuous improvement efforts are described based on surveys and focus groups with residents, CRCs, and principals. The RTR Leadership Team meets monthly to review formative assessments.

Weaknesses:

None

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

Evaluation and data collection plans are outlined in the Appendix, mapped to program objectives, along with clear indicators. Both formative and summative evaluations will be used for ongoing assessments and modifications.

Data for evaluation will be gained from program participants and stakeholder groups, as well as data from VCO, like teacher attrition and student achievement from RPS. The evaluation will include a longitudinal quasi-experimental study of the four cohorts.

Weaknesses:

Applicant could have provided more detailed plans for the quasi-experimental study.

Reader's Score: 19

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:

This project plans to build a pipeline of STEM teacher candidates.

Weaknesses:

Applicant has not included hands-on and inquiry-based experiences.

Reader's Score: 4

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Implementing Academic Standards

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

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

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

Strengths:

None

Weaknesses:

VA Standards of Learning (SOL) are not internationally benchmarked standards, and the state hasn't adopted CCSS.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/14/2014 12:01 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/13/2014 02:42 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Virginia Commonwealth University (U336S140017)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	15	15
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	45	45
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	20
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Promoting STEM Education		
1. CPP 1	5	3
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Implementing Academic Standards		
1. CPP 2	2	0
Total	107	103

Technical Review Form

Panel #10 - 2014 TQP Grant Review- 10: 84.336S

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Virginia Commonwealth University (U336S140017)

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 applicant clearly describes the needs within the teaching profession for additional highly-qualified STEM and special education teachers. They include both research conclusions and their own regional needs among the local school districts. There is a high demand for teachers who have the technical ability to teach students. (pgs. 3-5)

The project will clearly change the systemic process within the university, as well as offer the state a new model for teacher prep. The applicant builds upon their previous successful teacher project and plan on enhancing it with the current needs including STEM and SE. (pgs. 5-7)

The systemic changes will happen at the university, as they revise all of their existing teacher licensure programs by incorporating many of this project's activities. It will also impact the school district and provide additional resources and support during the first two years of the induction of the new teachers. (p.7)

The applicant provides specific data to identify the local needs in STEM and special education. They also provide data regarding teachers leaving the field. (p.6) This project will target 15 candidates in STEM and 15 in SE, per year during the five years of the project. In addition, this project will begin to create a pipeline, by targeting both middle and high school students who show promise in STEM areas a career orientation to STEM and other areas of need within the district. (p. 27)

The applicant has done an outstanding job of describing the needs of the community and the needs of the teacher prep programs, and has identified specific project objectives that will help to alleviate these shortages and provide a turnaround to help improve the academic performance of the

Weaknesses:

None noted.

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 applicant clearly provides references, citations, and research to demonstrate how they have implemented a new master's level social studies teacher project over the past years. (pgs.7-8) The applicant highlights those areas of concern and best practices that they have learned over the years. This new project will build upon the successes and try to minimize the weaknesses.

The applicant has been a member of the urban teacher improvement group for years. They have contributed their evaluation data and academic scores to be a part of the national studies, all of which have been very successful and have demonstrated growth and effectiveness over the years. In addition, these projects continue to identify best practices for teacher education programs.(pgs. 11-14)

The applicant provides a well-documented and comprehensive logic model, which clearly provides a linkage and process between the needs assessment /input, project activities, short-term outcomes, mid-term outcomes, and long-term outcomes. (p.12)

The project begins with a rigorous recruiting and selection process that will assure that the best possible candidates will

be selected for this project.

Both the university staff and the school district mentoring teachers will be provided with a variety of professional development activities to get them into the overall project process. Throughout the project, there will continue to be lots of opportunities for both additional PD and continuous and ongoing communications between all stakeholders and participants. (pgs. 13-15)

Student participants will be provided with a specific course outline that will provide them with the content and skills needed in order to become an outstanding, and highly-qualified teachers. In order to provide the content specialties, the College of Education will use their partners within the College of Humanities and Sciences to assist in the teaching of content. (pgs. 18-23)

Throughout the narrative it becomes very clear how the applicant has clearly incorporated theory, best practices, evaluation studies and other information regarding how to become a highly qualified urban teacher.

The identified partners are clearly providing specific services that will enhance the pre-service experiences of the education students, faculty, and the mentor teachers. In addition, this includes two years of induction follow-up PD, technical support, and other opportunities to meet monthly and to share and discuss experiences among themselves and with their mentor teachers.

In addition, community related partners are providing resources and opportunities for all teacher candidates. Some of these include discounts on rental of apartments within the target communities, as well as both financial and other resources to complement this overall project. The applicant has clearly described the level of contributions they have received over the years, both in grant funding and local community and business and industry contributions. They clearly demonstrate the strength of their support and commitment and how they will sustain this project in the future without Federal funding. (pgs. 25-27)

Weaknesses:

None noted.

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 applicant provides a detailed project timeline, organized by goals, objectives, and specific activities. Within each category, they clearly articulate who is responsible, the actual timeline, and the major milestones or accomplishments over the project. (pgs. 34-36) The applicant includes details within the narrative to better understand what is happening within the timeline chart.

The applicant provides details regarding senior level person and what their major responsibilities are with the overall implementation of this project. There are details regarding their specific education, training, and experiences that best qualifies them for this project position. (pgs. 36-42) To further support these comments and bios, the applicant includes detailed vitae and/or resumes in the appendices.

Within the discussion of staff positions, there are clearly identified staff from the local school district and what their qualifications are and how they will support and provide a liaison between the project, the university and the school district.

In the budget narrative, each senior person and category of staff are detailed as to their level of participation during the academic year and during the summer term, as well as the changes over the five years of the project (budget narrative). This provides an outstanding picture of how much each person will be expected to contribute to the overall project, and it helps to demonstrate how they will be able to successfully implement and provide support services and technical support, as well as instructional support for all participants, stakeholders, and staff.

The applicant clearly describes the management structure and implementation based on the goals of the project, the specific objectives, and the activities. They clearly articulate how each activity will be supervised and accomplished by project staff and stakeholders.

The applicant clearly discusses and reiterates the continuous and ongoing meetings and organization between university faculty, school district mentor teachers and resident participants, all of which will have monthly opportunities for a variety of meetings. There will also be monthly PD activities for all to participate in.

The applicant provides details on a variety of advisory committees that work at the university level, school district level, and the statewide level. There is much participation between the participants, staff, and administrators. There is also sharing between the committees and providing continuous and ongoing feedback, updates, data reports, and evaluation studies.

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 applicant identifies a well-qualified, internal evaluator, and discusses her experiences and relationship to the university and the school district. There are additional evaluation staff identified, and they too are well qualified, based on their brief bios and the detailed resumes and vitae in the appendices. (p. 42)

There is a well defined evaluation plan, which involves several different approaches that focus on immediate information needs and longer-term outcomes in an effort to measure program effectiveness. They discuss how it will include both descriptive and comparative design elements, as well as quantitative and qualitative methods of data collection to provide for a comprehensive assessment of the program. (p. 43)

The applicant clearly defines specific data collection variables according to the project goals, objectives, and specific activities. These include what is collected, how it will be collected, how it will be analyzed, and what answers it will provide to the overall evaluation and discussion about effectiveness and success, as well as academic improvement among the students in the school district. (pgs. 43-50)

The applicant clearly articulates the required GPRA performance measures and how these results will be used annually to provide continuous progress monitoring for the project. Additional measures will be used as the applicant continues the implementation of this project and conducts a longitudinal study to measure success and effectiveness over the years of the project. There are continuous and ongoing meetings and reporting to discuss the data collection and use the evaluation reports for changes and modifications as needed within the project.

In the appendices, there are additional charts that help to fully understand how the evaluation design will be used to improve this project, as well as inform the Urban Teacher Residency United, non-profit network, with additional rigorous data for their continuing longitudinal research study into the effectiveness of implementing teacher residency programs.

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 applicant has included the CPP1 suggested checklist, and they have clearly articulated each of the categories and how they have met them according to their proposal. It is obvious that they have target areas of need within the community, as well as nationally. They clearly discuss institutional collaboration between the College of Education and the School of Humanities and Science. They clearly discuss how residents will have opportunities of taking higher order STEM courses from experts in the field, as well as learning urban-based methodologies from again, experts in the STEM teaching fields

Weaknesses:

The applicant has not discussed hands-on or inquiry-based STEM experiences. They do not discuss research or laboratory experiences. There is no discussion regarding early and multiple field-based activities.

Reader's Score: **3**

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Implementing Academic Standards

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

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

b) Strategies that translate the standards into classroom practice.

Strengths:

None noted.

Weaknesses:

The Virginia SOL does not qualify for this criteria.

Reader's Score: **0**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/13/2014 02:42 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/18/2014 12:30 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Virginia Commonwealth University (U336S140017)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	15	15
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	45	44
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	104

Technical Review Form

Panel #10 - 2014 TQP Grant Review- 10: 84.336S

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Virginia Commonwealth University (U336S140017)

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 applicant fully addressed the likelihood that the proposed project will result in system change with detailed strengthening measures related to the content knowledge of Special Education (SE) teachers. The applicant focused on piloting and refining a new SE track, building a pipeline of STEM candidates, recruiting and preparing 120 highly qualified SE teachers qualified in SE, mathematics, science, and English.

The applicant focused on how important and significant longitudinal data are needed to show effectiveness in increasing teacher retention and student achievement in critical shortage areas. Longitudinal data will be dispersed among the stakeholders as mechanisms of examining agreeable levels of communication. (e27)

The applicant documented that blended theory and practice through an extended period of well-supervised clinical practice under the tutelage of master veteran teachers and providing at least two years of post-residency support will prepare students well for the realities of urban classrooms and will help in teacher retention in RPS.

The proposal provides appropriate activities to promote system change. Thorough review of the proposal indicates the applicant is not only preparing effective new teachers but is also improving the effectiveness of veteran teachers who have an opportunity to discuss and provide feedback on classroom, lesson plans, teaching strategies, and instruction. In reading the application, the applicant has a strong commitment to increase the knowledge and skills gained by serving as a mentor to residents that will remain in the schools as these individuals continue to serve as teacher leaders. (e28) Veteran teachers will become resources for new teachers as they come into contact with project graduates.

The applicant was strong and focused on the intent to build a local capacity by impressing upon the community the necessary boundaries and specifics needed to make this project successful. The VCU and RPS have a rich history of working together to facilitate the educational success of students and the development of teachers and leaders. The applicant detailed the Metropolitan Educational Training Alliance (META), a partnership between four local school districts (including RPS) and VCU, established to promote student learning by improving the preparation, effectiveness, and retention of high- quality teachers. RTR is a mature partnership that builds on this long history of VCU and RPS working together to improve outcomes for students. The applicant had been successful in other grants and will use the knowledge, skills, and dispositions collected during that time to strengthen the project goals and objectives. (e20)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

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:

Through well throughout details of the field program such as finding sites welcoming to residents and business partners providing unique learning experiences the use of past successes are the recruitment tools to bring in future highly qualified effective teachers to the deserving areas. (e32) The criterion is fully addressed with the RTR's mission to increase student achievement by recruiting, preparing, and supporting outstanding teachers for RPS who are committed to social justice and the elimination of educational inequities. (Appendix H provides a listing of all program components that are described below.)

The proposed project builds on four years of knowledge and experience in recruiting teacher candidates (called residents) and preparing them exclusively in RPS through an intensive, school-based teacher preparation program based on the UTRU Seven Principles of Teacher Residency. The applicant detailed the seven principles summarized as education theory, learning alongside an experienced mentor, group teacher cohorts, constructive partnerships, service to schools, supporting residents and establishing and supporting differentiated career roles for veteran teacher. These principles are fully embedded in the input column of the RTR Logic Model (Table 3). (e29) The applicant supplied a sample of the input

standards to provide guidance for the project. The applicant listed existing Partnership with RPS and VCU; VCU faculty and RTR staff with expertise in urban teacher prep, effective schools, and mentoring, and clinical resident coaches as collaboration and partnership resources. The applicant has personnel experienced in working with multi-year funded projects. (e231) The applicant has submitted a multi-year budget request to support science fairs, design competitions, and scientific investigations. (e227)

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not address the role of the provisional hires as they relate to the project sustainability. Funding for the current SE pilot was possible because RTR was unable to meet its target of 20 residents per year in the secondary track. The SE track would require participants to complete four semesters of coursework while spending the residency year co-teaching with an RPS master/mentor teacher. However, there were multiple factors which caused the shortfall as high Virginia cut scores and licensure requirements. (e25-26)

Reader's Score: 44

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 summary of the project milestones, timeline, and responsible persons fully addresses the criterion requirement. The applicant will obtain recommendations from VCU and RPS for content specialists to develop the Highly Qualified Institutes (HQIs). The applicant indicates starting and ending times for the project beginning Fall 2014 and ending 2019. The table provided by the applicant under the management plan also presented a complete list of collaborative and cohort requirements with VCU and RPS. The applicant teachers will complete professional exercises that include curriculum design. The applicant identified recruitment timelines. Personnel responsible for the participants included the Virginia Department of Education partners, career coaches, and master teachers. (e54)

The Mentor Coordinator, site Director, and Curriculum Coordinator are the personnel with expertise to resolve the ongoing learning experiences, create a pipeline for performance feedback, and implement the SE pilot track and service learning experiences. Personnel are qualified in professional development for the participants. The participants will be exposed to professional strategies on working in under-performing schools.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

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:

In the evaluation discussion, the applicant documented the Quality of the Evaluation Plan through personnel achievements. It is important to list accomplishments of [REDACTED] as an Associate Professor of Research and Evaluation and that she will direct the implementation of the evaluation of RTR 2.0. [REDACTED] has a Ph.D. in educational research, measurement, and evaluation from Boston College and teaches graduate courses in program evaluation and measurement in the VCU School of Education. In addition to [REDACTED], the evaluation team for the project will include two doctoral students who have evaluation experience and will support [REDACTED] work. (e43)

Recruiting faculty that is grounded in the same goals and objectives of the applicant strengthens the degree of projected success for the participants. [REDACTED] has a successful track record on several funded projects and currently serves as the Principal Investigator on an NIH-funded Science Education Partnership Award (#R25OD010984-05) teacher development grant designed to support instruction delivery of research content and skills in science classrooms.

The applicant detailed the evaluation of RTR/RTR 2.0 is designed to provide performance measures, as well as formative and summative information regarding the critical aspects of program objectives and intended outcomes. Consequently, the evaluation design will focus on both the implementation of the program and on the proposed activities (formative) as well as the expected outcomes (summative).

A seasoned researcher and evaluator will have the tools and knowledge to communicate throughout the project to all members of the applicant team and the community. (e43)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 20

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Promoting STEM Education

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant will bring together a pipeline of STEM candidates at the K-12 and pre-baccalaureate levels that are geared toward building local capacity to identify and support students interested in pursuing a teaching career in STEM fields. The project target participant number is 120 highly effective special education, math, science, and English teachers for RPS high-need schools. (e13)

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:

No strengths.

Weaknesses:

The applicant is proposing to use the Virginia SOLs, which are not internationally benchmarked standards and do not meet the criterion for this project.

Reader's Score: **0**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/18/2014 12:30 PM