

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/14/2014 10:55 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Wesley College (U336S140040)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	15	13
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	101

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - 2014 TQP Grant Review - 2: 84.336S

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Wesley College (U336S140040)

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 plan demonstrates that the project's model is intended to share and disseminate to build local capacity by providing, improving and the expansion of services to students and for preparing more teachers for teaching in high-need content areas. The proposed plan details the significance of using K-12 standards, teacher preparation standards, State aligned teacher performance metrics, and the state's induction and mentoring system. The project will collaborate for recruitment of highly qualified minority students into the teacher training programs. These recognized components along with building principals in the area district and schools, will lead to successful close relationships, successful student teaching experiences and will result in highly trained graduates who can positively impact student learning in high needs area in the district. (pgs. 2,4)
- (ii)The "Bridge the Professional Gap" project identifies the need to provide area first-generation students with resources and programs to improve educational attainment. The planned program will improve the graduation rates, as well as decrease the dropout incidences. The teacher quality partnership will be used to design, implement and evaluate a collaborative professional development model consisting of activities, strategies, research and proven models that promote effective teaching for all of the targeted students. The incorporation of the University's five intended outcomes links the knowledge, skills, and dispositional elements in the framework to pre-service teacher performance are defined as change agents for educational reform throughout their career. (pgs. 4-6)
- (iii) The plan includes detailed efforts that will enable the applicant to pursue more collaboration with the high-need LEA partners and the teacher preparation programs at the universities. The applicant uses research data that contends that they need to do a better job of recruiting and retaining minorities in the major because they are the teachers who are best suited to teach in the area's high needs schools. The plan states that the students have academic promise but they have challenges to persist due to many factors. The project aims to increase enrollment of minorities in the education program through an intensive support program that will improve success of the minority pre-service teachers. The teacher preparation plan proposes to use a three-point recruitment and retention plan that includes to identify academically qualified potential minority STEM or Education majors and offer them opportunities for dual enrollment in their senior year of high school' recruit STEM majors for entry in the teacher education 5th year residency program.

Weaknesses:

(i) No weakness noted

(ii) The plan lacks factual information to validate barriers that identifies the targeted population or identifies at-risk factors that can hinder successful performance expectations of the teacher preparation program.

(iii) No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 13

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 project created a comprehensive plan to identify, recruit and select teacher program participants based on their need for teacher preparation services, their desire to attend postsecondary education, and their ability to meet eligibility requirements. The applicant states that the project is grounded in research relative to teacher preparation, teaching situations that contribute to success or failure, and effective practitioners, which are basis for the project design. The plan also details the inclusion of other research programs (InBRE, EPSCoP, CAEP, INTASC) for developing a model for teacher preparation that bridges the professional gap between preparation and practice for prospective participants. (pgs. 2-3)

(ii) The plan coordinates with the university education department whose role is supporting and servicing teacher participants to ensure they receive comprehensive services. The project focuses on clinical partnerships which are intended to create, implement and evaluate sustainable relationships for supporting professional growth. The student teaching experience enables pre-service teachers to train with on-site clinical faculty, using data-driven decision making, as well as teach content aligned with Core Curriculum State Standards, and use- instructional strategies for diverse and special needs learners. The 7 years of pre-service teacher performance and the data collected is expected to enhance the participant's student teaching placement and permanent employment possibilities. The merging of the extended student teaching experience for training and professional development services will provide training in merging of teaching assessments, extended mentoring experiences, and extensive collaboration with LEAs to recruit, identify and support student teachers who are suited for work in their high school areas, including STEM programs. (pg. 4-5)

(iii)The teacher preparation program has comprehensive year round services to meet the needs of the participants and aims to attain specific measurable outcomes from the projects implementation. The program, activities, services and interventions are described in the plan and how they will occur to ensure the intended outcomes. The proposal outlines the rigorous academic year, which consists of components of college and career readiness courses, academic tutoring, and course selection assistance for postsecondary education, college preparation including application and financial aid, and individualized academic instructions. The student teaching experiences, academic, cultural and enrichment events, are expected to teach the participants what it takes to succeed in college, how to benefit from life-long learning and how to benefit from exposures that covers and measures all proficiencies at multiple points in the program. (pgs. 4,5)

(iv)The program has strong institutional resources and supports and the location allows the teacher preparation program immediate access to administrative offices, testing and assessment, development labs and classrooms, university faculty and LEA partner schools. The university personnel, resources and services, along with the designed assessment metrics will be an enhancement in meeting the needs of the teacher program participants, especially state mandated requirements.

(v)The plan states that an assessment was conducted to determine the resources available to the eligible partnership from integrated funds from related sources and committed funds from partnerships. The plan revealed that there is definite commitment of resources to the activities assisted under the program, including financial support, faculty participation, and time commitment, and to the continuation of the activities when the grant ends. (pg. e64)

Weaknesses:

(i, ii, iii, & iv) No weaknesses noted

(v) The plan lacks detailed plans that includes a multi-year financial and operating model that demonstrates commitment of partners, evidence of broad support from stakeholders, state educational agencies, or teachers unions, which is critical to the project's long-term success.

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:

(i) The proposed project has resources, strategies, and activities designed to support the goals and objectives expected by the project and to create a sustainable model for teacher preparation. The management plan gives details of responsibilities and timelines for the project activities including recruitment strategies that target academically qualified minorities, improve performance measured by academic data, improve performances on teacher Praxis 1 tests, assured teacher retention and graduation, and participation in rigorous school curriculum and increased retention for education majors with rigorous preparation. The annual timelines, activities, project goals, responsible personnel and dates for expected outcomes are described in the plan and are synchronized to the logic model. Each critical element of the program activities depends on results of the participant's assessment of goals and objectives, completed activities, individualized instructions, assessment, evaluations and modifications needed to ensure appropriate academic and personal outcomes.

(ii) The grant manager is responsible for managing the proposed project activities to achieve the goals and well as collecting and analyzing data and communicating with partners and program stakeholders. The key personnel have an extensive background in teacher education, program management, and experience working with low income and first generation students. The grant manager and other project personnel are qualified professionals with the education and relevant training to effectively work the project and service the teacher program participants. There are detailed resume included in the plan that validates the relevant training and experience of key project personnel.

(iii) The proposed project is led by a management team and an external grant evaluator who is involved with the preparation of highly qualified teachers and is responsible for program activities, outputs, outcomes and impact metric results. The plan includes ten well defined activities that can produce feedback on teacher instructional performance through outcomes metrics, tools consisting of rubrics that assess scores and content summaries, and a professional portfolio submitted at the conclusion of student teaching. There will be means for providing formative feedback for ensured continuous improvement through teacher information sessions, group seminars, private meetings with mentors, technology used for taping teacher delivery, and by regular data analysis. The plan is also designed to utilize the Tk20 data management system that requires students to upload a key assessment to construct their e-portfolio and to measure their improvements during their academic career. These performance feedback methods are intended to provide structured feedback to teachers and provides for continuous opportunity for improvement.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. 1) The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project.
- 2) In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers:

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

(i)The evaluation process will consist of an evaluative scorecard that will service as a baseline for measuring the preparation of the program, performance measure, outcome measures, competence measures and report data collections. These evaluative components support formative and summative data processes in order to analyze program services and outcomes on an ongoing basis and then generating yearly reports. These evaluation processes will also provide reviews for progress that allows staff to revise and adjust day-to-day operations as needed. They will allow annual benchmarks for future strategic planning and designed surveys related to indicators for bridging the professional development gap, teacher training, mentor and clinical teacher support, and for training, supporting and retaining highly qualified teachers.

(ii)The plan includes designed project evaluation metrics that outline significant education department-wide evaluation protocols to ensure programs are rigorously evaluated. The use of these metrics will allow evaluation of leadership development, strategic planning, measurement and analysis, personnel survey responses, process management and detailed outcomes. The evaluation plan examines measurable ways of determining if progress is actually achieved. The benchmarks, timelines and expected progress toward the goals are defined along with the responsible key staff.

(iii)The quantitative and qualitative data collection for measuring expected outcomes (focus groups, peer reviews, observations, surveys, reports, benchmarks, tracking) will provide feedback on services, objectives, and performance from teacher participants, university personnel, STEM department partners, and others involved in the project. The combination of methods will yield findings of useful information for understanding the impact of the teacher preparation program on students and used for further student progress.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 20

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Promoting STEM Education

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

The project identified a critical need to strengthen the district to prepare teachers in STEM and to ensure underrepresented groups and females are prepared to enter STEM fields. It also revealed that teachers have limited expertise in science, engineering and technology instruction, along with students not meeting math achievement targets. Based on these results, the project incorporates the STEM initiative and the plan demonstrates a design that provides the much-needed pipeline of talent to teach the students in the STEM program. The plan includes professional developed curriculum to ensure rigorous and engaging instruction in math, technology tools for teaching and learning, infusion of new disciplines to be used in every classroom, metrics to measure the success of STEM's program, hiring qualified teachers and the availability of supportive staff and program specialists. Through the use of these resources which are adopted by the DE Science Coalition, students are expected to build skills needed to meet or exceed STEM state level standards and proficiency. (pgs. 40-43)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 5

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Implementing Academic Standards

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

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

b) Strategies that translate the standards into classroom practice.

Strengths:

The applicant did not address this priority.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not address this priority.

Reader's Score:

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/14/2014 10:55 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/19/2014 09:15 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Wesley College (U336S140040)

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	18
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	18
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Promoting STEM Education		
1. CPP 1	5	2
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Implementing Academic Standards		
1. CPP 2	2	
Total	107	93

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - 2014 TQP Grant Review - 2: 84.336S

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Wesley College (U336S140040)

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 proposed project demonstrated its intent to build capacity and result in change and improvement by aligning the College of Education targeted outcomes toward closing the professional development gap to the human resource and management needs of the local education agencies, which included the hiring, development, and retention of effective teachers (pg. 17-18).

The Project Design includes a complex analysis and reflection of existing College of Education strengths and challenges. For instance, efforts to use grant funding to sustain capacity for implementing best practices, such as, requiring teacher candidates to critique their own video-taped lessons and gathering insight on the needs of at-risk students by working with a Boys and Girls club, demonstrates authentic engagement necessary to respond to critical issues in education (pgs. 22-23).

Wesley College's proposed project used an efficient, multi-dimensional approach to impact change in education by recruiting more minorities into the field, preparing candidates to teach STEM content, and assisting local education agencies with their performance management goals (pgs. 18).

The project indicated that 40% of the students entering the College of Education are first generation, minority college students with lower academic attainment rates. The university's efforts to use multiple approaches to address this issue in order to prepare more high needs students for careers as teachers in STEM areas was reflected in its "Bridging the Professional Gap model" and intended future partnerships with schools.

Weaknesses:

N/A

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:

The applicant proposes to reform professional development for teachers by offering job-embedded professional development designed to enhance teachers' pedagogical skills required for teaching common core standards is timely, relevant, and critical for supporting teachers in their efforts to demonstrate proficiency on state teacher performance assessments tied to student achievement. (pg. 22)

The grant application specified that Wesley College has developed a goal related to creating a model for partnering with local educational agencies and institutions of higher learning as a means of increasing recruitment and retention of highly qualified teachers. This effort is further enhanced by the university's development of a structure for productive discourse through the use of reform-based documents, research, and training manuals. (pg. 19)

The project design included a description of ways in which personnel from local school districts will serve as resources to ensure that outcomes identified in this grant application are met. Goal #2 of the project identifies a memorandum of understanding that will be agreed upon by Wesley College and local school systems. Further, a letter of support from the chief of the Delaware Department of Education, director of human resources at a charter school principal, and chair of education department at a local college were included in the grant application. (pgs. 34; 42; 79-84)

Weaknesses:

In regards to theory, a basic description of social constructivism was provided. However, general statements on how this theory related to the goal of the educational department were shared without a clear connection to how the theory will be translated to the reforms proposed in this project (p. 20)

The proposed program intends to engage teacher graduates in three years of induction seminars as a means of meeting the needs of minority and first-generation teachers. With this in mind, the grant lacks specificity on how teacher graduates will be held accountable for participating in the seminars or whether incentives will be used to improve the likelihood that they will attend (pg. 9).

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:

The "Comprehensive Management Plan Chart" extends accountability by juxtaposing timelines with key milestones and measures for each goal. Further, communication coordination is identified, which directly ties to plans for a formative feedback loop designed to improve teacher efficacy. (pgs. 24-27)

The grant application specified that feedback would be collected from students during their first and second year of induction. This strategy will strengthen the university's efforts to collect graduates' perceptions over time for program improvement. (pg. 23)

The applicant identified a plan for designing a formative feedback process, in collaboration with the Delaware Department of Education, institutions of higher education and local education agencies. The plan included an intent to provide this feedback to new teachers during the induction process, which directly aligns to the goals the project.

Weaknesses:

The grant application lacked specificity on the individual who will provide key oversight and who will possess the expertise for ensuring that issues related to minority recruitment, development, and recruitment concerns are met, as expressed in project goal #3 (pgs. 2, 28-29)

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 grant application specified that reliable performance data will be derived from a variety of key data points including internal departmental measures, student growth and teacher evaluation measures, and the state score cards. Combined collection and analysis of measures demonstrates intent to thoroughly assess the outcomes of the project. (pgs. 46-52)

In regards to the feasibility of the proposed evaluation methods, several formative and summative metrics were identified in the grant application to provide performance feedback to stakeholders. Further, Wesley College's Department of Education demonstrated awareness in the narrative that Delaware's teacher evaluation and accountability results will either enhance or impede its long-term goals. Focused attention on merging department performance metrics with state teacher and student performance results to support change and improvements demonstrates a thorough analysis of issues that will impact future teachers. (pg. 11)

The project specified Wesley College's intent to work with LEAs to identify a metric for the professional portfolio that students will submit to program officials. This effort points to the university's attempt to create authentic assessments of students' performance that is respected by colleagues in partner organizations. Further, a plan for designing a formative feedback process, in collaboration with the Delaware Department of Education, institutions of higher education and local education agencies included plans to provide feedback to new teachers during the induction process, which directly aligns to the goals of the project. (pg. 38-39)

Weaknesses:

The evaluation plan lacked a specifying targeted metric for evaluating first generation, minority students' perception of Wesley College faculty's, programs, and university's partners, including school systems. For example, a qualitative measure that derives at issues related to university's high attrition rate among specific student populations was not clearly identified. (pg. 31-37)

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:

In terms of increasing the number of individuals from underrepresented groups, Wesley is positioned well to address a gap within the state of Delaware to create a pipeline to prepare individuals to teach in STEM areas due to its research-based, collaborative efforts. The grant application identified key actions, related to goal #3 to recruit and retain academically qualified STEM graduates.

Weaknesses:

In regards to increasing opportunities for high quality preparation, the grant application lacked revealing specific details regarding the STEM curriculum.

The grant application included a listing of 12 Career Ready Practices. However, it is unclear how these practices will be incorporated to facilitate high quality STEM teacher preparation and assessed formatively within STEM courses or other learning experiences. (pg. 53-55)

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:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/19/2014 09:15 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/15/2014 02:55 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Wesley College (U336S140040)

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	15
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	18
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Promoting STEM Education		
1. CPP 1	5	2
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Implementing Academic Standards		
1. CPP 2	2	
Total	107	94

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - 2014 TQP Grant Review - 2: 84.336S

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Wesley College (U336S140040)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

Strengths:

The proposal seeks TQP support to deepen its existing partnerships with LEAs, with respect to hiring and training onsite clinical faculty, redesigning pre-service curricula regarding data-driven decision making, teaching literacy across content areas, and instructional strategies for diverse students and special needs learners; aligning candidate assessments with local and state assessments of educator effectiveness; initiating full-year culminating field experience; and collaborating with their LEA partners to recruit, prepare and support candidates well-suited to teach in high needs schools and including STEM subjects.

With regard to building local capacity, the project will address the applicant's self-identified weakness (p. 8) – “a lack of continuity between what candidates learn in the college program and what they encounter in the school setting.”. The applicant proposes to redesign the preservice curriculum, include clinical faculty earlier, college faculty coaching clinical faculty in clinical supervision skills, and induction support for three years upon program completion.

The applicant candidly emphasizes that the retention rate of its candidates of color from freshman year through to program completion is of considerable concern. They have a focused action plan to address this high priority concern, that includes recruitment of highly qualified high school students of color into early admission/dual enrollment at the college, recruiting successful STEM majors at the college into a fifth year MAT residency program in STEM teaching, and creating targeted recruitment and support systems for minority education majors.

Equally commendable, the applicant is candid about the need to address a challenge commonly encountered in teacher preparation of a mismatch between the teaching practices and philosophies of cooperating educators and those espoused by the program. They propose to use grant funds to strengthen their capacity to identify and recruit cooperating educators compatible with the program's philosophy and goals.

The applicant's third and final key need is to strengthen induction support so that their program completers score more highly on the state of Delaware's new “report card” for teacher education programs.

Weaknesses:

None identified.

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:

With regard to the extent to which the proposed project is supported by strong theory, the applicant cites solidly relevant research regarding key factors shaping teacher recruitment and retention rates (narrative pp. 12-14).

With regard to the extent to which the professional development is of sufficient quality, duration and intensity to lead to improvements in practice, the applicant proposes to implement full-year culminating field experience. This will be complemented by attention to improved selection of cooperating educators, more attention to matching cooperating educators' philosophies and practices to those of the program and individual candidates, more professional development for cooperating educators in evidence-based clinical supervision, and use at multiple points of robust formative evaluation evidence for candidate assessment and program assessment and improvement.

With regard to the extent to which the activities represent a coherent, sustained program of training, the project design is well detailed, with strong alignments between needs and goals, goals and targeted outcomes/metrics, and those metrics and the activities to be carried out.

With regard to the extent to which the services involve collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the project's effectiveness, the applicant emphasizes will bring its LEA partners firmly into the process of revising its curricula to address the perceived disconnection "between our performance expectations and those of our LEAs, resulting in intended gains with respect to very clearly delineated outcome metrics" (narrative p. 18).

With regard to the extent to which the applicant demonstrates it has support resources to operate the project beyond the grant period, the applicant notes both its track record of success (thus speaking to resources it brings to the project) as well as its "weaknesses" for which it seeks commensurate grant resources to put in place appropriate remedies.

A general strength of the proposal is its considerable clarity and detail concerning the metrics by which project success will be assessed. These metrics are thorough and fully aligned with the applicant's documented needs and project goals.

Weaknesses:

With regard to the extent to which the proposed project is supported by strong theory, it is not clear whether the applicant is familiar with the body of research regarding a wide array of supports that many such as TRIO programs have found effective in significantly improving recruitment and retention. The applicant references the "academic and emotional support strategies which have been found to be successful by Stanford University and University of Texas educational psychologists and faculty" but a bit more detail on what these support strategies are and how they will be carried out and institutionalized would be very helpful.

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:

With regard to the adequacy of the management plan, it offers a pleasing alignment between the project's self-assessed, strongly evidenced priority needs, project goals, outcomes, activities and metrics for formatively and summatively assessing the project. In addition, the applicant demonstrates convincing commitment to utilizing multiple sources of relevant evidence to formatively assess and continuously refine its implementation efforts.

With regard to the qualifications, training and experience of key project personnel, from the appended vitae it appears that the project's two co-managers possess expertise, training and skill relevant to the project. The assignment of a full-time

person, only 20% of whose time would be financed by the grant, is a strength both in terms of committing the requisite time for effective administration of liaison responsibilities with the LEAs (see narrative pp. 28-29), and in terms of the likelihood that the applicant will be able to institutionalize this position's funding upon expiration of the grant.

With regard to the extent to which performance feedback and continuous improvement are integral to the project, the applicant is thorough in detailing the metrics by which project outcomes will be assessed, has a system in place which it appears to be continuously striving for data-driven decision making, and clear plans for utilizing formative evaluation feedback on its progress toward achieving project outcomes to guide implementation.

Weaknesses:

The proposal serves as a thorough self-assessment study that would prove most useful for national accreditation and state approval and might benefit from a bit more elaboration regarding how the activities will be sequenced – e.g., the specific steps by which a crosswalk for all programs' curricula and candidate performance against INTASC standards' learning progressions and CAEP's SPA standards by program (narrative p. 24) will be developed. The narrative describes somewhat generally for each activity, the personnel responsible, and the partner communication and coordination entailed for each activity (narrative pp. 24-27). It is thus difficult to fully assess the institution's capacity to implement the activities.

With regard to the qualifications, training and experience of key project personnel, from the appended vitae it appears that one of the project's two co-managers has fairly extensive experience managing large scale grants such as that proposed here while the other's experience is with much smaller grant projects.

Of greater concern is that one-eighth of each of the co-manager's time will be financed by the grant and it is unclear whether and to what extent the applicant will commit an additional portion of their time to the many demands of administering this comprehensive project. More information generally on the time commitments of all key project personnel would have been very helpful to support how the objectives of the proposed project would be completed on time.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

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

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

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

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

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

Note: In addressing this criterion, applicants are encouraged to include a plan for how the project s evaluation will address the TQP Grant Program performance measures established by the Department under the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (GPRA), as well as the measures established in section 204(a) of the HEA. (The specific performance measures established for the overall TQP Grant Program are discussed under Performance Measures in section VI of this notice.) Further, applicants are

encouraged to describe how the applicant's evaluation plan will be designed to collect both output data and outcome data, including benchmarks, to monitor progress. Finally, each applicant is encouraged to select an independent, objective evaluator who has experience in evaluating educational programs and who will play an active role in the design and implementation of the project's evaluation.

Strengths:

With regard to the extent to which the methods of evaluation provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes, the metrics for which data are to be collected, analyzed and used are clearly delineated for every project outcome (see narrative pp. 37). Wherever feasible and appropriate, the metrics are largely quantitative and, in each case, are clearly defined, and the sources from which the data will be gathered also are detailed.

The methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project. The evaluation plan is fairly comprehensive, clear, detailed and actionable.

Weaknesses:

The applicant notes briefly (see narrative p. 31) that "Wesley College has contracted to have an annual evaluation conducted on the following metrics". It is unclear which entity or person is conducting this formative evaluation and whether the evaluator is to have an external or internal evaluation relationship with the applicant. It is also unclear as to what expertise the (possibly external) evaluator has in conducting such comprehensive evaluations, and what resources and time commitments are being invested for them to conduct this evaluation successfully. This information would be helpful to fully assess the robustness of the otherwise thorough evaluation plan.

Reader's Score: 18

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Promoting STEM Education

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

The overall robustness of the project design may well yield positive gains in candidates and newly inducted graduates to utilize instructional and content pedagogy aligned with and conducive to provide gains in P12 students' CCSS outcomes.

Weaknesses:

There is not a clear enough emphasis on either STEM or CCSS outcomes in the proposal (narrative pp. 37-42) to assess with confidence the likelihood of significant gains in these regards.

Reader's Score: 2

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:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/15/2014 02:55 PM