

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/07/2018 03:48 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: University Enterprises, Inc. (on behalf of CSU Sacramento) (U336S180055)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Services		
1. Project Services	15	15
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	40	40
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	25	23
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	19
Sub Total	100	97
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	0
Sub Total	8	6
Total	108	103

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Teacher Quality Partnership - 2: 84.336S

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: University Enterprises, Inc. (on behalf of CSU Sacramento) (U336S180055)

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:

Sacramento State is an appropriate partner because of their high level of success with teacher training (e26-e27). The partner districts already have partnership experience with Sacramento State and are high need, which increases the chance of a successful partnership both because of previously build working relations as well as motivation to address their high need (e27).

The proposed curriculum will be based on California Standards for Professional Learning (e30) as well as from successful, evidence-based portions of other projects (e34). The applicant also intends that the instructional team will conduct action research on questions related to urban teacher preparation as part of the intervention (e30). The structure and variety of practices (lesson study, summer institute, coaching, seminars, book talks) are evidence-based best practices (e31).

The project plans 76 hours of professional development over 5 years (including 4 hours per month in lesson study in years 2 and 3), which is of sufficient duration and intensity (summer institutes as well as monthly face to face sessions, lesson study, and coaching) to lead to improvements (e30).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 15

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:

The program's logic model (e84-e86) connects the four program goals (recruitment, improving prep and professional development, hold Sac State multiple subject teacher preparation program accountable for graduates to meet certification, and licensure requirements, and improve student achievement) to activities, outputs, short term outcomes, and medium and long-term outcomes. In this way, the project demonstrates a rationale.

The goals, objectives and outcomes are clearly specified and measurable. Table 2 (e40) presents project outcomes as clearly quantified and measurable things.

The STEM POWER program builds on existing practices (e.g., EduCorps) (e24). Some of the practices such as the two-year induction programs are funded by the state (e28). The project builds on an already established partnership that will continue after the period of funding ceases (e44).

The applicant claims exceptionality through the combination of three components in the transformation of a teacher prep program: 1) the cooperative interdisciplinary, intersegmental team; 2) effective professional learning based on research evidence; and 3) and a change in teacher prep culture (e4-e49). The applicant plans for the interdisciplinary, intersegmental team to coherently and collaboratively work together to revise the teacher prep program and induction program (e45).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 40

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:

Personnel are clearly experienced and have been given project roles based on that experience (e50, e56-e59). The project timeline and management plan (Table 3 e51-e54) connect due dates and project teams to tasks and activities.

The applicant plans that the teacher preparation and development program, which after the project will be more aligned with California Content Standards, will continue after the end of funding (e55). The applicant also acknowledges that through the course of the project, project personnel will learn a great deal and become more effective in preparing teachers, skills that they will use after the end of funding (e55).

The project intends to use few new resources and instead rely primarily on personnel time (e56). This is appropriate given

that this project builds on already established partnerships and programs.

Weaknesses:

Most activities and tasks are the responsibility of teams rather than individuals which may be an issue of misspecification or in practice lead to diffusion of responsibility if there is no one person held responsible.

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:

Some project outcomes are measured using data from institutional sources and program documentation that has high reliability and validity (e60-e61) and reports on relevant outcomes. The applicant intends to use triangulation with participant self-report data to increase the reliability and validity (e61), which is best practice when multiple data sources are used.

The applicant intends to measure process, program effectiveness, and performance measures (e59). Process measures will measure adherence and whether the program is on track in terms of deliverables and benchmarks (e60). Effectiveness will be measured using PD feedback and participant surveys with the instructional team, new and future teachers, and induction program coordinators. The focus will be on amount of program growth, instructional effectiveness of graduates, coherence of the program, and new teacher preparedness (e60). Performance measures will focus on quantifiably measuring the success of project objectives (e139-e150). These measures are feasible and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the project. The applicant has a plan for how data will be analyzed and what kind of statistical tests will be run (e61-e63).

Weaknesses:

Since the induction program coordinator survey, teacher pipeline partner survey, and project artifact analyses are yet to be developed, it cannot be fully determined whether they are valid and reliable (e60-e61).

Reader's Score: 19

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 STEM POWER project intends to integrate STEM content with evidence-based strategies to give teachers greater knowledge of teaching these subjects while they're in their teacher preparation and induction (e16, e63-e64).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

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's recruitment plan includes participants from minority groups (e16, e84, e64-e65). One of the ways they plan to do this is through developing Future Teacher Clubs (with funding from the College Futures Foundation, US DOE, and National Science Foundation), which have shown success in increasing the number of prospective teachers, particularly underrepresented students, entering the teaching profession. Because Sacramento State is a Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI) and an Asian American, Native American and Pacific Islander Serving Institution (AANAPISI), the applicant also plans to target recruitment there (e35).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were found.

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:

No strengths.

Weaknesses:

The applicant states that they are not a novice applicant in the application materials (e14).

Reader's Score: **0**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/07/2018 03:48 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/06/2018 11:19 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: University Enterprises, Inc. (on behalf of CSU Sacramento) (U336S180055)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Services		
1. Project Services	15	15
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	40	40
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	25	22
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Sub Total	100	97
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	0
Sub Total	8	6
Total	108	103

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Teacher Quality Partnership - 2: 84.336S

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: University Enterprises, Inc. (on behalf of CSU Sacramento) (U336S180055)

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:

The applicant outlines a variety of district partners and the robust relationships, including but not limited to the Capital Region Network, targeting pre-service curriculum integration with curriculum from state-mandated two-year induction programs. Additionally, the College of Education, in partnership with the Sacramento County Office of Education, created the Educator Retention Network (page e28). These and other key partners support the potential effectiveness of the project services.

The STEM POWER program cites a variety of up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice, such as Gareth's specific 76-hour Professional Development model, problems of practice, summer institutes, etc. (pages e30 – e31).

Professional learning appears to be of high quality, with examples cited around building upon practices developed in already executed pilot programs (page e32), while intensity is focused upon a specifically timed summer target (page e33), and finally duration is addressed in the creation of firm exemplars and efficacious practitioners (page e34).

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 15

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:

Various components of the STEM POWER program, such as the areas of recruitment, Professional Development, and continuous improvement, seek to ultimately impact STEM instruction with a high focus on literacy (page e37).

Goals, objectives, and outcomes (pages e40 – e43) are highly specific and quantifiable, and demonstrated the feasibility of these goals being measured as a result of implementation.

The program's Logic Model (e84 and e86) connected program goals, outcomes, etc. and sufficiently demonstrated a rationale.

The STEM POWER program (page e24) builds upon existing practices such as the teacher induction program (page e28) that are funded by the state and are sustainable (page e24).

The applicant plans that the intersegmental team will work collaboratively (page e45) to build and develop the teacher induction program.

The project expands previous work in the partnership and focuses on multiple opportunities to build capacity of content knowledge and capacity (page e27);, use of materials will be available to sustain practices (page e28) beyond the duration of the grant.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 40

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:

The management plan to achieve the objectives proposed appears to be adequate and attainable (pages e51 - e54).

The adequacy of support appears to be generally sufficient (page e56); work will continue beyond the funding period. Throughout the course of the project, personnel will develop skills/knowledge that will be implemented with future staff (e55).

Weaknesses:

Most activities and tasks are the responsibilities of teams rather than individuals; there is the potential for this to fall by the wayside (page 51).

Reader's Score: 22

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:

The proposal includes both process measures (fidelity) as well as program effective measures (quality) that will help the Evaluation Team to determine that the project is being implemented as expected, and is delivering the appropriate outcomes as expected (pages e59 – e60).

Some project outcomes (pages e60 – e61) focus on relevant outcomes and provide sufficient evidence of likely success.

Process measures are going to focus on adherence and whether the program is on track (page e60) in terms of areas such as built-in benchmarks.

Performance measures will focus on quantifiable goals (pages e139 – e150) that relate directly to the outcomes of the project.

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:

Sacramento STEM-POWER aims to increase the number of educators well-prepared to deliver rigorous instruction in STEM fields, including Computer Science, through recruitment and evidence-based professional development strategies (page e63)

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 project includes targeted activities designed to recruit and retain educators who are effective and who increase diversity in the teaching labor force (page e64).

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:

None noted.

Weaknesses:

Applicant did not receive points for CPP3.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/06/2018 11:19 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/07/2018 05:44 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: University Enterprises, Inc. (on behalf of CSU Sacramento) (U336S180055)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Services		
1. Project Services	15	15
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	40	40
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	25	20
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Sub Total	100	95
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	0
Sub Total	8	6
Total	108	101

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Teacher Quality Partnership - 2: 84.336S

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: University Enterprises, Inc. (on behalf of CSU Sacramento) (U336S180055)

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:

Evidence of collaboration exists among the partners. For example, through coordination among the partners' teacher preparation programs, STEM instruction can be enhanced for high-need schools (p. 10). Past collaborative efforts between Sacramento State's Teaching Credentials Department and district partners has focused on new teacher recruitment and support, indicating a high potential for continuous collaboration within the proposed project (p. 11). Participation in the Capital Region Network also illustrates evidence of collaboration to align pre-service curriculum with the curriculum in two-year induction programs (p. 11). Further, the College of Education and County Office of Education founded the Educator Retention Network where partner districts participate to gain expertise on teacher retention (p. 11). These collective efforts demonstrate compelling evidence of collaboration among partners to maximize the effectiveness of project services.

The application contains up-to-date research on multi-pronged professional development, which is an important model in support the acquisition of new skills and experiences (p. 13). Additional research is provided to demonstrate the effectiveness of the collaborative nature of lesson student and instructional coaching, which are all facets of the proposed project (p. 14-15).

Evidence suggests a past history of success of Sacramento State in partnership innovations and high quality urban teacher preparation (p. 15). Building the capacity of the participants in the proposed project to assess needs and target them with specific strategies has a great potential to impact long-term improvements in practice (p. 16). With two additional years added to the proposed project, sufficient time and intensity are evident in the five-year timeframe (p. 17).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 15

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:

The rationale for the proposed project is presented with clear research and connections between the research and proposed activities (p. 19). The Logic Model reflects the connections between the STEM Power project, recruitment, professional development, cycles of improvement, diversity, and the strong capacity to teach literacy rich STEM education to all students (p. 20). This approach suggests there is coordination throughout the project and improvements are possible as feedback is garnered to ensure that participants benefit (p. 21).

The proposed project contains four overarching goals to drive the initiatives (p. 9). The goals are clearly connected to corresponding objectives (p. 23). Further, measurable outcomes are specified in order to track progress and monitor needs as the proposed project is implemented (p. 23-26).

The proposed project expands previous work of the partnerships and focuses on multiple opportunities to build the capacity of participants, both in terms of content knowledge and in instructional strategies (p. 27). Both components are critical for establishing learning and changes in practice over time. Use of materials developed through the project activities will be available to sustain learning experiences beyond the period of Federal financial assistance (p. 28).

The multi-pronged approach to professional development represents exceptionality in supporting the priorities of the competition through summer institutes, peer and expert coaching, academic year professional learning sessions, STEM-POWER exemplars, and instructional videos (p. 31). Instructional coaching and reflective practice enable participants to examine specific instructional practice and reflect upon their effectiveness.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 40

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:

Thorough descriptions are provided for members of the Leadership Team and the Professional Learning Team (p. 32-33). Evidence shows that each member is qualified and has the expertise to facilitate project tasks.

An overall timeline is provided indicating each goal and objective and which tasks are necessary to accomplish each objective (p. 35-37). This adds clarity and an overall vision for how the project will be facilitated to completion.

Some evidence is presented to suggest a potential for incorporating project activities and benefits into the ongoing work of the university. For example, university faculty will restructure Sacramento States teacher preparation program content so it better aligns to the California Content Standards (p. 38). This alignment supports relevance and can facilitate a common language between prospective teachers and teachers currently teaching in public schools.

Further, incorporating the newly developed instructional materials into the daily work of the participants also represents a method of sustaining the benefits and resources of the proposed project into the ongoing work of the organization once Federal funding is complete (p. 38).

Evidence shows that equipment purchases will be made to support the development of instructional video exemplars and the creation of recruitment and outreach materials (p. 39). This will allow for the creation of new resources that can be sustained over time.

Partners are fully equipped with equipment, meeting facilities, and other resources that will be used in the proposed project (p. 39). This support will be helpful in facilitating professional development and other project tasks throughout the life of the project.

Weaknesses:

activities have the Leadership Team as the responsible party. With various members of this team, it is not readily apparent who specifically from the team will be charged with ensuring the task is completed (p. 35).

Some of the milestones are stated in vague terms, making it difficult to ascertain all of the activities that are necessary to reach that particular milestone. For example, one task is listed as create instructional materials (p. 35). This task entails a great deal of planning, drafting, editing, collaboration, and revisions. It is not clear how specifically the materials will be developed and which specific staff members are responsible for completing each step.

Reader's Score: 20

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:

The application suggests a variety of evaluation tools that will be used to collect data and assess the effectiveness of activities within the proposed project (p. 44). For example, new and future teacher surveys, teacher assessments, program exit surveys, teacher pipeline partner surveys, summer institute surveys, classroom observations, and professional development surveys will all be used to inform progress and effectiveness of project tasks (p. 44). A variety of data can increase the perspectives from which to view effectiveness.

Qualitative data and quantitative data will be analyzed to provide greater insight into the impact of the project on different variables (p. 44-45). For example, increased interest by students in teaching careers will be measured using an analysis of qualitative and quantitative data, including student surveys and increased program application rates (p. 45). Using both data sources can provide additional information and insight into the effectiveness of this part of the proposed project.

Each goal has associated evaluation methods and instruments, which indicate a thorough approach to evaluating all components of the proposed project (p. 44-45). Data are feasible and likely to yield useful results in each area assessed.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were 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:

Recruitment and professional development activities focus on STEM fields, including computer science, to increase the number of educators who can effectively deliver instruction in these areas (p. 46).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were 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:

Recruitment efforts are focused on strengthening the pipeline from diverse high schools in Sacramento into the teacher preparation program (p. 48).

Increasing interest in teaching careers through Future Teachers Clubs, career exploration events, and program extensions including the Masters of Arts in Teaching, can help transform the program and attract and retain educators who are effective and increase diversity 9p. 48).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were 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:

It is indicated on the application that the applicant is not a novice applicant (p. e14).

Weaknesses:

It is indicated on the application that the applicant is not a novice applicant (p. e14).

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/07/2018 05:44 PM