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

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/03/2018 08:54 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: High Point University (U336S180027)
Reader #1: **********

		Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions			
Selection Criteria			
Quality of Project Services			
1. Project Services		15	14
Quality of Project Design			
1. Project Design		40	35
Quality of the Management Plan			
1. Management Plan		25	23
Quality of the Project Evaluation			
1. Project Evaluation		20	20
	Sub Total	100	92
Priority Questions			
Competitive Preference Priority			
Promoting STEM ED w/a focus on Computer Science			
1. CPP 1		3	3
Promoting Effective Instr. in Classrooms & Schools			
1. CPP 2		3	3
Novice Applicant			
1. CPP 3		2	2
	Sub Total	8	8
	Total	108	100

Technical Review Form

Panel #7 - Teacher Quality Partnership - 7: 84.336S

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

Applicant: High Point University (U336S180027)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services

1. **In determining the quality of project services of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

   (i) 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.

   (ii) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project reflect up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.

   (iii) 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.

Strengths:

(i)

- The applicant provides evidence that the lead institution High Point University has a solid reputation for teacher preparation programs (e.g., National Council on Teacher Quality). North Carolina Agricultural and Technology (NC A&T) has a solid background in the science fields (largest producer in the nation for STEM graduates of color) as well as being a Historically Black University. Both of these partners can provide strong program curriculum to the project as well as a means to recruit a diverse group of participants (p. 8 – 9).

- The Guilford County Schools (a partner in the proposed project) has existing teacher preparation programs (Beginning Teachers Support Program) that include trained mentors that could either be utilized or refined for the residency and induction programs (p. 9).

(ii)

- The applicant describes incorporating a practice-based model, supported by research, coupled with multiple trained staff members (e.g., mentors, university supervisors, etc.) who could provide feedback and support. This model could provide opportunities for residents to practice what they are learning and could support ongoing development and improvement. The 6-prong approach is detailed, which could allow for residents to experience a true scaffolded learning model (p. 11).

- Both the cohort and growth model, also based in research (e.g., 89% teachers retained), has shown to be impactful as former residents shared that they felt supported. By including these models, the program could provide a means for the participants to continuously reflect on their own growth as a teacher over time (p. 12).

(iii)

- The applicant described how residents will teach every day in the spring semester of the residency. This could provide substantial real-world experiences that could increase the resident's self-efficacy before graduating the program (p. 13).
- A strong program component described is how residents will visit other content classes, which could add to their experiences and could increase their perspectives about teaching (p. 13).

- The applicant has identified a wide variety of other curriculums (LEGO, Robotics, etc.) and opportunities for residents to get first-hand experience in learning and teaching real-world applications of STEM with diverse groups of students. These opportunities could generate interest for the student and the residents as well. Many of these

experiences could spark future ideas for the residents' strategies in the classroom (p. 17).

• The applicant has described their means to build support and communication amongst resident cohorts that has been intentionally designed with both informal and formal (e.g., online platforms, summer institutes) means to interact. This could help residents feel included and less isolated as they build social support networks (p. 17 – 18).

• A combination of data sources (e.g., NC Teacher Working Conditions Survey, New Teacher Focus Groups) to assess growth in the first two years and multiple layers of support are identified to the new teacher including an assigned mentor, a lead mentor, and a retired master teacher. As a result, new teachers could be given an ongoing stream of support and feedback. This could also provide an easy avenue for new teachers to ask questions and seek help when needed. (p. 19 – 20).

Weaknesses:

(i) and (ii)

• No weaknesses noted.

(iii)

• One day per week in the fall semester will provide opportunities for residents to see mentors teach; however, because the residents do not see lessons taught each day, the lessons the residents observe could feel disconnected and there could be missed opportunities to see how mentor teachers connect lessons and materials for students (p. 13).

• It is not clear how a one-time 4-hour mentoring training will be sufficient for the critical responsibilities mentors are taking on with residents (p. 15).

Reader's Score: 14

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. **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 demonstrates a rationale (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).

   (ii) The extent to which the goals, objectives and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable;

   (iii) The extent to which the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance.

   (iv) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for this competition.

Strengths:

(i)

• The logic model and rationale provide a strong basis for the design. Facets are based on research, past outcomes (e.g., retention rate of 89%) and lead to specific short- and long-term outcomes (appendix G and p. 20 – 21).

(ii)

• Goals and outcomes are specific and measurable. Additionally, baseline measures (e.g., Program 1: 73% met growth) are included as well as initial desired outcomes (e.g., Program 1: at least 75% score proficient) and then any potential changes going forward (e.g., Project 1: each year decrease by 10% below baseline the number of teachers without state licensure; p. 23 – 24). This provides a strong basis of planning for the project.

(iii)

• The application describes recruiting and developing 100 qualified new teachers. This seems to be a substantial number that could provide capacity and yield results that extend beyond the funding period.

(iv)

• The applicant describes how the cohort structure was intentionally designed to facilitate both network support within the cohort and to provide flexibility in delivering the program elements (p. 25). For example, the size of the cohort could allow flexible scheduling of the coursework as well as an ability to customize course content.

• Key program residency elements described include course work for working with diverse learners, use of a tested portfolio, and video recordings. These elements could add depth to the clinical experience and could allow residents to reflect on their practice (p. 28).

• Because both Masters programs are preexisting and offer a rigorous course of study and requirements (p. 28 – 29), this could provide strong coursework that could effectively help prepare residents.

• A wide variety of experiences are identified in the clinical experience that could add valuable perspectives for new teachers (e.g., observing other grade levels, school board and main office functions, students with disabilities and limited English proficiencies, etc.; p. 30).

Weaknesses:

(i)

• No weaknesses noted.

(ii)

• No weaknesses noted.

(iii)

• The information provided in the application does not adequately describe how the program will continue once the funding ends besides restating the components of the program and that it will yield 100 qualified new teachers (p. 24 – 25).

(iv)

• The applicant describes that the residents will be recruited based on criteria including strong verbal skills; however, the application process described does not include any elements that allow a candidate to demonstrate this skill (p. 26 – 27).

Reader's Score: 35

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. 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 potential for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing program of the agency or organization at the end of Federal funding;

(iii) The adequacy of support, including facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources, from the applicant organization or the lead applicant organization.

Strengths:

(i)

• Key personnel (e.g., program manager, co-project director, etc.) are identified with strong and appropriate background in education (e.g., 32 years in education), STEM, and teacher preparation experiences. Each position is also

clearly defined and identifies the minimum requirements for the positions not currently filled. Overall, this provides a strong, clear personnel plan and could make it easy to begin activities if funded (p. 31 – 36).

- Timelines (e.g., beginning 11/18, weekly), milestones (e.g., begin residency program), and personnel (e.g., evaluator) are included (Table 4). This provides a strong basis for the project's plan.

(ii)

- The applicant states the intent of the project is to further refine existing educational cohort models and build-in additional structures, which the applicant provides evidence that these models have already been successful (high teacher retention rates and certification rates) with these same organizations (e.g., HPU; NC A&T). Because of this ongoing work and refinement, these models could lead to continued work beyond the end of funding (p. 40).

(iii)

- The application details facilities (e.g., university office spaces, furniture), resources (e.g., technology), and committed matched funds (e.g., overload salaries) for the project. Needed resources including personnel (e.g., project director) have been clearly identified and could lead to effective support of the grant efforts (p. 41 – 43).

Weaknesses:

(i)

- It is unclear how the FTE identified for both the project director and co-project director, identified at .2 and .05, respectively, will be sufficient to oversee the grant project and complete their stated responsibilities (i.e., managing day-to-day operations; supervising project staff; p. 32).
- Two months are listed for modifying the residency program for STEM. It is unclear how this amount of time will be sufficient especially since this will occur when activities for starting the program will also be completed (p. 37).

(ii) and (iii)

- No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 23

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers:

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

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

Strengths:

(i)

- The use of multiple statistical methods including quasi-experimental design, the use of propensity scores for statistically matched control groups, and hierarchical linear modeling to account for nesting within schools and classrooms could allow for a rigorous quantitative design that could produce more valid and reliable outcomes (p. 44).

(ii)

- The plan is comprehensive and includes statistical design (e.g., t-tests), measures (EVAAS) and variables already identified. Additionally, a detailed plan outlining tasks, measures, and outcomes tied to evaluation goals are included (Table 6).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Promoting STEM ED w/a focus on Computer Science

1. **Projects designed to improve student achievement or other educational outcomes in one or more of the following areas: science, technology, engineering, math, or computer science. These projects must address the following priority area:**

   Increasing the number of educators adequately prepared to deliver rigorous instruction in STEM fields, including computer science, through recruitment, evidence-based (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1) professional development strategies for current STEM educators, or evidence-based retraining strategies for current educators seeking to transition from other subjects to STEM fields.

   NOTE:

   How does an applicant demonstrate that its proposed strategy for professional development and retention strategy for current STEM educators is evidence-based?

   1. Submitting a citation of a study that is (1) focused on a STEM-focused professional development or retraining strategies, (2) relevant to the proposed project, and meets at least the design standards set forth in the "Promising Evidence" definition; OR

   2. Submitting a "Logic Model" that (1) identifies the STEM professional development or retraining strategy of the project and (2) is informed by research or evaluation findings that suggest the project component is likely to improve "Relevant Outcomes."

   Strengths:

   • HPU will recruit undergraduates to the program by offering opportunities to take graduate level coursework their senior year (pg. 2). Once students have started this coursework, it could lead to students wanting to continue.

   • Partnerships with other universities and colleges (e.g., NC A&T) could provide a larger number of potential recruits (p. 3). NC A&T is the largest Historically Black University producer of STEM graduates.

   • Professional learning opportunities (e.g., robotics challenge), additional STEM trainings, an engineering curriculum focusing on project-based learning, and availability of advanced coursework could provide foundational and advanced training for new teachers (p. 2 – 3).

   Weaknesses:

   No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority - Promoting Effective Instr. in Classrooms & Schools

1. **Projects that are designed to support the recruitment or retention of educators who are effective and increase diversity (including, but not limited to, racial and ethnic diversity).**

   Strengths:

   • The applicant will provide reduced tuition costs for residents who participate in the program in exchange for teaching in districts once they have completed the program. This could provide incentives for students of color to participate (p. 4).

- The applicant describes using their stated partnerships with other universities and colleges (e.g., NC A&T) that could provide a larger number of potential recruits (p. 3).

- The applicant identified ongoing and consistent support (e.g., residency and induction) through the first years of teaching, which could likely help to retain this diverse population of new teachers (p. 5 – 6).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority - Novice Applicant

1. **Projects submitted by applicants that meet the definition of novice applicant at the time they submit their application.**

   NOTE:

   The lead applicant must meet all three requirements to earn CPP 3 points:

   1. Has never received a grant or sub-grant under the TQP program; and

   2. Has never been a member of a group application (i.e. in a TQP eligible partnership); and

   3. Has not had an active discretionary grant from the Federal Government in the five years before the deadline date for applications under the program.

Strengths:

- The applicant states that they have never received a grant or sub-grant under the TQP program; and have never been a member of a group application (i.e. in a TQP eligible partnership); and have not had an active discretionary grant from the Federal Government in the five years before the deadline date for applications under the program (p. e27).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/03/2018 08:54 AM

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/02/2018 10:10 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: High Point University (U336S180027)
Reader #2: **********

		Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions			
Selection Criteria			
Quality of Project Services			
1. Project Services		15	14
Quality of Project Design			
1. Project Design		40	37
Quality of the Management Plan			
1. Management Plan		25	23
Quality of the Project Evaluation			
1. Project Evaluation		20	20
	Sub Total	100	94
Priority Questions			
Competitive Preference Priority			
Promoting STEM ED w/a focus on Computer Science			
1. CPP 1		3	3
Promoting Effective Instr. in Classrooms & Schools			
1. CPP 2		3	3
Novice Applicant			
1. CPP 3		2	2
	Sub Total	8	8
	Total	108	102

Technical Review Form

Panel #7 - Teacher Quality Partnership - 7: 84.336S

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

Applicant: High Point University (U336S180027)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services

1. **In determining the quality of project services of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

   (i) 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.

   (ii) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project reflect up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.

   (iii) 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.

Strengths:

(i) The proposed partnerships are well designed to meet the expectations of the project (e28-30). Each partner has a clear role and meets a specific need within the proposed project. While there are only three partners, collectively they can cover the needs of the project. Specifically, HPU serves as a lead partner managing the project and providing the training for participants. NC A&T provides support for the STEM focus and also provides an emphasis on under-represented populations. Guilford County Schools is an appropriate high-need district.

(ii) The proposal effectively embeds the planned activities in a relevant research base (e30-33). Specifically, the proposal outlines a series of practice-based approaches such as modeling, spaced learning, varied learning, and coaching and feedback (e32).

(iii) The proposal outlines a comprehensive range of services and supports for participants (e33-41). For example, the proposal includes multiple STEM-focused training opportunities such as STEM Saturday Academies and summer enrichment camps (e38). The proposal includes graduate training plus a one-year residency period (e33). The overall number and scope of services is extensive and past evidence indicates it is likely to be effective (e41).

Weaknesses:

(i) No weaknesses noted.

(ii) No weaknesses noted.

(iii) The proposed plan for training mentors covers a range of topics such as policies, instructional procedures, classroom management, and more (e36). However, the time allotted is a total of four-hours which may be insufficient to ensure appropriate quality.

Reader's Score: **14**

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. **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 demonstrates a rationale (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).

   (ii) The extent to which the goals, objectives and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable;

   (iii) The extent to which the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance.

   (iv) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for this competition.

Strengths:

(i) The proposal has a clearly defined rationale, demonstrated in part by a comprehensive logic model (e114). The basic theory of action is to recruit a cohort of prospective teachers, increase their skills through graduate coursework, mentorships, and ongoing support (e41-e43). This approach is reasonable, comprehensive, and logical.

(ii) The goals and associated objectives are specific and measureable (e43-45). In most cases the proposal includes specific outcome expectations and/or clear baseline information. For example, Goal 1 is to increase the total number of teachers and is measured by the percentage of total participants who pass all necessary licensing exams within one year (e43).

(iii) The proposal's primary sustainability plan is based on using grant funds to build an infrastructure that will become institutionalized (e45-46). This is appropriate for program components such as course work and program structure.

(iv) The proposal effectively addresses the priorities of the competition throughout the narrative (e78). The five major elements of the application's approach are logical, thorough, and well defined. In addition, the proposed plan to recruit and train 100 teachers represents exceptional value if successful (e46).

Weaknesses:

(i) No weaknesses noted.

(ii) No weaknesses noted.

(iii) The proposal does not address sustainability for multiple aspects of the proposal, such as stipends, which represent over half of the grant funds (e7).

(iv) No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 37

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. **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 potential for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing program of the agency or organization at the end of Federal funding;

(iii) The adequacy of support, including facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources, from the applicant organization or the lead applicant organization.

Strengths:

(i) The proposed management structure includes a leadership team that is broad and diverse (e52) and represents a potentially effective approach to ensuring feedback and guidance from all partners. The proposal's timelines, milestones, and areas of responsibility are clear and thorough.

(ii) The applicant demonstrates a past history of incorporating similar program activities into ongoing partnerships (e61). The applicant references conducting similar activities with seven other districts.

(iii) The application provides a clear description of the support to be provided by the lead organization (e62-63). The applicant proposes sufficient facilities support, including space, furniture, and equipment. For example, the applicant details the range of furniture and equipment to be provided and also include travel support as part their matching contribution.

Weaknesses:

(i) The level of effort for many key positions is low relative to the assigned duties. The members of leadership team and co-director have 0.05 FTE, the induction coaches are 0.05 FTE, program manager is at 0.20 FTE, and university administrators are 0.10 FTE (e52-56).

Reader's Score: 23

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. **In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers:**

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

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

Strengths:

(i) The applicant proposes two evaluation approaches, an analysis of fidelity and a quasi-experimental evaluation analysis (e64). Using a formative and summative approach is reasonable and appropriate and can provide valid and useful results.

(ii) The impact study proposes to compare student outcomes for program and non-program teachers (e65). The design includes propensity matching for students and an appropriate analytic approach (e65, e67). In all, the planned evaluation is thorough and appropriate and sufficient detail is provided to indicate that it is feasible.

Weaknesses:

(i) No weakness noted.

(ii) No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: **20**

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Promoting STEM ED w/a focus on Computer Science

1. **Projects designed to improve student achievement or other educational outcomes in one or more of the following areas: science, technology, engineering, math, or computer science. These projects must address the following priority area:**

   Increasing the number of educators adequately prepared to deliver rigorous instruction in STEM fields, including computer science, through recruitment, evidence-based (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1) professional development strategies for current STEM educators, or evidence-based retraining strategies for current educators seeking to transition from other subjects to STEM fields.

   NOTE:

   How does an applicant demonstrate that its proposed strategy for professional development and retention strategy for current STEM educators is evidence-based?

   1. Submitting a citation of a study that is (1) focused on a STEM-focused professional development or retraining strategies, (2) relevant to the proposed project, and meets at least the design standards set forth in the "Promising Evidence" definition; OR

   2. Submitting a "Logic Model" that (1) identifies the STEM professional development or retraining strategy of the project and (2) is informed by research or evaluation findings that suggest the project component is likely to improve "Relevant Outcomes."

   Strengths:

   The proposal provides a comprehensive range of activities to increase both the number and skills of STEM teachers in its geographic area (e22-24). The applicant has a partnership with a nearby historically black college and university that will support increased recruitment. The proposal includes multiple training and support activities to increase STEM skills (e23-24) and the partner university itself has a strong STEM focus.

   Weaknesses:

   No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: **3**

Competitive Preference Priority - Promoting Effective Instr. in Classrooms & Schools

1. **Projects that are designed to support the recruitment or retention of educators who are effective and increase diversity (including, but not limited to, racial and ethnic diversity).**

   Strengths:

   The specific partnership with NC A&T, a historically black college and university, provides a strong foundation for recruiting and training prospective teachers and increasing the diversity of the teaching workforce in the area (e24-27).

   Weaknesses:

   No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: **3**

Competitive Preference Priority - Novice Applicant

1. **Projects submitted by applicants that meet the definition of novice applicant at the time they submit their application.**

   NOTE:

   The lead applicant must meet all three requirements to earn CPP 3 points:

   1. Has never received a grant or sub-grant under the TQP program; and

   2. Has never been a member of a group application (i.e. in a TQP eligible partnership); and

   3. Has not had an active discretionary grant from the Federal Government in the five years before the deadline date for applications under the program.

   Strengths:

   The applicant indicates that it meets all three criteria for this priority: it has never received a grant, it has never been a member of a group that has applied, and has not had an active discretionary federal grant within the last five years (e27).

   Weaknesses:

   No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: **2**

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/02/2018 10:10 PM

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/03/2018 12:24 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: High Point University (U336S180027)
Reader #3: **********

		Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions			
Selection Criteria			
Quality of Project Services			
1. Project Services		15	14
Quality of Project Design			
1. Project Design		40	38
Quality of the Management Plan			
1. Management Plan		25	24
Quality of the Project Evaluation			
1. Project Evaluation		20	20
	Sub Total	100	96
Priority Questions			
Competitive Preference Priority			
Promoting STEM ED w/a focus on Computer Science			
1. CPP 1		3	3
Promoting Effective Instr. in Classrooms & Schools			
1. CPP 2		3	3
Novice Applicant			
1. CPP 3		2	1
	Sub Total	8	7
	Total	108	103

Technical Review Form

Panel #7 - Teacher Quality Partnership - 7: 84.336S

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

Applicant: High Point University (U336S180027)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services

1. **In determining the quality of project services of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

   (i) 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.

   (ii) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project reflect up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.

   (iii) 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.

Strengths:

(i) The applicant sufficiently provides a detailed description of services (i.e., Piedmont-Triad Residency Educator Program, MAT in Elementary Education or Secondary Math) to be provided by involving multiple collaborators (i.e., High Point University [HPU], and North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University [NC A&T]) using established rigorous, practice-based teacher education curriculum and high-performing teacher preparation programs. (pp. 22-28)

(ii) The applicant clearly describes the services to be provided by the project. Examples of effective practices include metacognition (Benedict, et al 2016), spaced learning (Bepeda et al, 2008), and varied learning (Tyalor & Rohrer 2010). (pp. 31-32)

(iii) The applicant provides a comprehensive explanation of the professional development services (e.g. teacher mentorship during the residency program) that are of sufficient quality and intensity (i.e., elementary education, secondary math). For example, the training includes full licensure and a master's degree in 18 months, a clinical experience and mentorship for a full academic year, and induction support for the first two years of teaching at a high-need school. (pp. 27-28)

Weaknesses:

(iii) The applicant fails to provide sufficient intensity in regard to the fall residency. For example, during the fall semester participants are only in the school once a week. (p. 34)

Reader's Score: **14**

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. **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 demonstrates a rationale (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).

   (ii) The extent to which the goals, objectives and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly

specified and measurable;

(iii) The extent to which the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance.

(iv) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for this competition.

Strengths:

(i) The applicant provides sufficient details to support the rationale in the given Logic Model. The Logic Model clearly links inputs to activities and outputs. The applicant provides an example of one input as eligible partnerships (i.e., A&T College of Education, LEAs) linking the recruitment and retention of effective teacher residents that increases racial and ethnic diversity to the output of the number and percentage of prospective teacher residents recruited in each cohort, disaggregated by ethnicity, gender, and STEM field.

The applicant also includes sufficient clarification relating to short- and long-term outcomes back to the overarching vision. The applicant stated that the vision is an innovative, effective teaching residency program that prepares highly-qualified, diverse teachers for success in STEM areas at high-need schools in Guilford County, NC to increase student achievement. For example, the applicant describes a short-term outcome as improved quality of induction and mentoring support and a long-term outcome as increased employment retention within Guilford County Schools. (pp. 41, 114-115)

(ii) The applicant provides a comprehensive description of the goals, objectives and outcomes that are clearly specified, measurable, and includes appropriate baseline data. For example, the applicant identifies a goal to increase recruitment, retention, and training of master's level residency students through the recruitment of graduates of STEM majors or mid-career professionals with STEM content knowledge who attain state certification/licensure within one year of program completion. (pp. 43-45)

(iii) The applicant describes how the project will institutionalize the project for integration with their current teacher preparation efforts. (p. 61)

(iv) The applicant provides a detailed description of the recruitment (i.e. recruiting diverse teachers, rigorous graduate level coursework linked to clinical preparation, criterion based selection for teacher residents), and the approach to the priorities (i.e., integration of pedagogy, and classroom practice and teacher mentoring while also providing a 12 month living stipend and tuition reduction to allow the student to focus on their residency full time. For example, as part of the rigorous recruitment there are targeted sessions for STEM majors that are approved for graduate level equivalence credit. (p. 23)

Weaknesses:

(iii) While the applicant states that they will continually refine their model to ensure impact beyond the grant, the applicant fails to provide a detailed description of how the project will build capacity beyond the initial 100 teachers of this TQP grant or how it will continue to yield results. (pp. 45-46)

Reader's Score: 38

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. **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 potential for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing program of the agency or organization at the end of Federal funding;

(iii) The adequacy of support, including facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources, from the applicant organization or the lead applicant organization.

Strengths:

(i) The applicant provides a detailed description of the management plan and budget with yearly breakdowns to achieve the project on time and within budget. The applicant provides comprehensive SMART goals with milestones, timelines, and person responsible. For example, the applicant lists one milestone to convene the leadership team to plan, hire staff, monitor for continuous improvement with a timeline of 10/18, occurring monthly and that the responsible party is the leadership team. (pp. 58-61)

(ii) The applicant provides a detailed description of how the project will build capacity and yield results beyond the grant by identifying the seamless integration of the PREPARE (Piedmont-Triad Residency Educator Program And Recruitment Efforts) purposes, activities, and benefits into the existing institutional infrastructures upon the conclusion of the TQP program. The applicant provided examples of previous educational delivery cohort models in other focus areas (i.e. school administrator, special education) that have been sustained for years beyond initial funding. (p. 61)

(iii) The applicant provides a detailed description of the adequacy of support for the proposed project to include matching funds. For example HPU has a myriad of resources and matching funds in excess of $2 million to enhance implementations (i.e. facilities, travel, personnel). (p. 63)

Weaknesses:

(i) The applicant has not aligned the amount of FTE allocated for key leadership personnel (i.e. Principle investigator is 2 hours a week, Project Manager is only 1 day a week) with the amount of time necessary to adequately complete the stated duties and responsibilities. (p. 52)

Reader's Score: 24

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers:

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

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

Strengths:

(i) The applicant provides a detailed description of the proposed evaluation model to include a mixed-methods utilization-focused that combines multiple quantitative and qualitative data sources (i.e., NC Licensure/certification documentation, IHE enrollment records) using triangulation thereby significantly enhancing the validity and reliability of the evaluation.

For example, the applicant indicated that the formative and summative data, reported in aggregate and disaggregated groupings (i.e. levels, sites) and that the summative evaluation will include final outcomes across all cohorts answering the questions of how well the program impacted our long-term outcomes. For example, the applicant states that evaluation findings will be included in quarterly, mid-year and end of year reports (i.e. survey briefs, snapshots related to specific program goals). (pp. 64-68)

(ii) The applicant provides a detailed description of the methods of evaluation which are thorough, feasible and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the project including the use of mixed methods, a quasi-experimental design as well as triangulation using descriptive statistics. The applicant indicated that though a prior power

analysis, the study had enough power to test for statistically significant programs effects. A data collection table is provided that links the source of the data, the time period of collection, the analysis method, responsible parties, and what goal or objective it measures (i.e. school rosters, teacher placement and retention for 1-3 years), addressing the goal related to retention rate of residency teachers. (pp. 64-71)

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Promoting STEM ED w/a focus on Computer Science

1. **Projects designed to improve student achievement or other educational outcomes in one or more of the following areas: science, technology, engineering, math, or computer science. These projects must address the following priority area:**

   Increasing the number of educators adequately prepared to deliver rigorous instruction in STEM fields, including computer science, through recruitment, evidence-based (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1) professional development strategies for current STEM educators, or evidence-based retraining strategies for current educators seeking to transition from other subjects to STEM fields.

   NOTE:

   How does an applicant demonstrate that its proposed strategy for professional development and retention strategy for current STEM educators is evidence-based?

   1. Submitting a citation of a study that is (1) focused on a STEM-focused professional development or retraining strategies, (2) relevant to the proposed project, and meets at least the design standards set forth in the "Promising Evidence" definition; OR

   2. Submitting a "Logic Model" that (1) identifies the STEM professional development or retraining strategy of the project and (2) is informed by research or evaluation findings that suggest the project component is likely to improve "Relevant Outcomes."

Strengths:

The applicant provides a sufficient description of the projects design to improve student achievement by increasing the number of educators (i.e. 100 teacher residents) with rigorous instruction through evidenced-based professional development (i.e. Lego Education training, Engineering is Elementary Curriculum) which will be of benefit to new teachers by allowing them to practice developing skills in STEM classroom applications.

The applicant provides strategies to transition students in STEM fields into the MAT program, specifically offering STEM majors during their junior year an opportunity that would allow them to take up to four courses their senior year that are approved for graduate level equivalence credit in the approved MAT program. This is great incentive to attract non-education STEM majors into education. (pp. 22-24)

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority - Promoting Effective Instr. in Classrooms & Schools

1. **Projects that are designed to support the recruitment or retention of educators who are effective and increase diversity (including, but not limited to, racial and ethnic diversity).**

   Strengths:

   The applicant provides a detailed description for how the project will support the recruitment of educators by using several strategies (i.e. side-by-side recruitment at career fairs with both HPU and NC A&T). The applicant also indicated the use of robust recruitment activities (i.e. using on-campus interviews or campus information tables). (pp. 24-27)

   Weaknesses:

   None noted.

Reader's Score: **3**

Competitive Preference Priority - Novice Applicant

1. **Projects submitted by applicants that meet the definition of novice applicant at the time they submit their application.**

   NOTE:

   The lead applicant must meet all three requirements to earn CPP 3 points:

   1. Has never received a grant or sub-grant under the TQP program; and

   2. Has never been a member of a group application (i.e. in a TQP eligible partnership); and

   3. Has not had an active discretionary grant from the Federal Government in the five years before the deadline date for applications under the program.

   Strengths:

   The applicant indicates that High Point University will serve as the lead fiscal agent and as such has never received a grant or subgrant under the TQP program, been a member of a group application in an eligible TQP partnership and had an active discretionary federal grant in the five years before the deadline date. (p. 27)

   Weaknesses:

   The applicant fails to indicate whether it has ever received a Federal Grant.

Reader's Score: **1**

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/03/2018 12:24 AM