

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/14/2019 05:26 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: California State University, Dominguez Hills Foundation (U336S190023)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	40	39
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Resources	20	20
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	20
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	18
Sub Total	100	97
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. STEM/Computer Science	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Invitational Priority		
Invitational Priority		
1. Promise Zones	0	0
Sub Total	0	0
Total	105	102

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - Teacher Quality Partnership - 4: 84.336S

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: California State University, Dominguez Hills Foundation (U336S190023)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(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 for meeting statutory purposes and requirements.

Strengths:

(i) The applicant defines in detail the seven principles of high-quality residency programs. These are based on research and suggest that the proposed project is likely to improve relevant outcomes. The applicant aligns each of the principles to the REAL project model. The applicant also builds on the residency model for urban teachers developed by California State University, Dominguez Hills (CSUDH) that was established using TQP grants in 2009-2014. The REAL project will build on those earlier efforts. (Page e19 and Logic Model)

(ii) The proposed project is based on four specific goals that support the building of the project. Each goal is also supported by specific and measurable objectives. For example, to meet Goal I on recruiting and preparing teachers, objective 1 is to have residents each earn single-subject credentials in math, science or English and master's degrees. This objective is clearly measurable, and both the goal and objective will provide for success of the project. (Page e44-45)

(ii) The path that is established by the applicant in the Logic Model includes well aligned Short Term and Long-Term Outcomes. For example, teachers will gain knowledge of micro-credential topics, implement those lessons using that knowledge and then teachers will articulate if they are confident and satisfied with their ability to teach those topics. This alignment will provide a path to success for the project. (Page e22)

(iii) By building a Student Teaching Pipeline for Urban Schools, Strengthening Career Pathways, Improving Teacher Preparation, an Influencing the Field, the Residency for Equity through Action and Learning (REAL) project will be building capacity in the schools, the institutes of higher learning and to the region. These efforts will provide sustainability of the project. (Page e46-47)

(iv) The proposed project represents an exceptional approach for meeting statutory purposes and requirements by including the offering of six micro-credentials. Also, the project provides an innovative model for supervision that has well-trained expert teachers complete the supervision instead of college personnel. This project will train master (mentor) teachers to evaluate other mentor teachers' residents, not their own mentees. This effort will improve the quality of supervision and ensure it is informed by the context of schools' challenges and circumstances. These efforts are unique

and uncharted. (Page e21, e48 and Logic Model)

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses:

- (i) No weaknesses noted.
- (ii) One of the goals is to integrate the arts into the STEM curriculum; however, the applicant does not clearly define the strategies that will be used to produce that outcome. (Page e37)
- (iii) No weaknesses noted
- (iv) No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 39

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

1. The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources for the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

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

(ii) The relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project.

Strengths:

(i) The applicant's organization will support the proposed project. For example, the university will be providing the residents the university's advanced fabrication equipment and Summer Academy facilities. The Green Dot CA and the partner schools will include financial resources of \$4,000 per resident and \$3,000 per master teacher. These efforts are adequate for the support of the program. (Page e50 and budget narrative)

(ii) The partners in the project demonstrate commitment in the proposed project. For example, the Cal State Dominguez Hills Institution will provide clinical experiences that meet the goals of the project. (Page e50-51). Other committed partners are the Green Dot Public Schools California. This partner is a consortium of high-need LEAs that will provide the sites for mentors, supervisor, and residents. (Pages e53-54)

Weaknesses:

- (i) No weaknesses noted.
- (ii) No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

Strengths:

(i) The management plan for this proposed project is clearly identified and includes the role and description of the roles that are to be played by each of the key personnel members. This will assure that the responsibilities are met in a timely manner. For example, the instructional coaches will be responsible for facilitating seminars, observations and Professional Development training. The qualification of the each key person is appropriate for the completion of the project. The resumes outline qualifications that demonstrate the strength of the key personnel working with this grant such as the strength of the Project Director and her extensive experiences with grants similar in size and scope of the REAL project. (Page e55-57 and Resumes, Pages e152-210)

(i) The management plan includes specific details of the milestone activities and the time frame for those activities. For example, the activities to convene the Council of Advisors will be the responsibility of the Project Director and will begin on November 19 and continue quarterly. Those responsible for completion of the activities are clearly delineated. For example, Monthly Seminars will be lead by instructional coaches and the LEA New Teacher Liaisons. Timelines are specific and include bi-weekly, weekly, and quarterly intervals. These steps will accommodate the success of the project (Page e58-59)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted for (i) and (ii).

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(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) Both qualitative and quantitative data is collected to assure that there is valid and reliable performance data that is aligned to the outcomes. Quantitative data collected include multiple surveys that will be used in evaluating resident preparation and to obtain feedback from stakeholders. Qualitative data collected include disaggregated analysis of the number of applicants and those who are qualified. Also included in this data collection is the time that it takes to complete the tasks such as time to earn the preliminary credential. Based on the analysis of the compiled data project improvements will be made. (Page e61-66)

(ii) The applicant uses summative evaluation procedures to ensure that performance data is used to support the quality of the project. Included in Table 17 are specific performance measures and data sources for each of the measures. For example, addressing Objective #2: "Residents become effective teachers", the applicant identifies that 100% of residents will maintain GPA of 3.0. That will be measured by project records on an annual basis. These evaluation procedures are carefully aligned to the goals and objectives of the project. (page e61-64)

Weaknesses:

(i) No weaknesses noted.

(ii) The applicant indicates that formative evaluation processes are going to be used; however, in the alignment chart and the narrative, it is not clear how these processes will be used to support relevant outcomes during the on-going processes of the project. Most of the date lines are set for an annual review. More frequent specific feedback would ensure continued improvement. For example, the efforts to evaluate residents becoming effective teachers are reported annually not during intervals throughout each year of the project. (Page e62 and e65)

Reader's Score: 18

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

- 1. Projects designed to improve student achievement or other educational outcomes in computer science by increasing the number of educators adequately prepared to deliver rigorous instruction in STEM fields, including computer science, through recruitment, evidence-based professional development strategies for current STEM educators, or evidence-based retraining strategies for current educators seeking to transition from other subjects to STEM fields.**

Strengths:

The proposed project includes a computer science micro-credential. Their intensity, duration, reliance on best practices and grounding in research are highly likely to improve teachers' practice in computer science and fabrication technology. As a result teachers will deliver rigorous instruction that raises achievement. This effort will also increase the number of teachers who are prepared to deliver instruction in computer science. This effort relies on Project-Based Learning which includes evidence-based professional strategies. (Pages e41, e67-68)

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Invitational Priority - Invitational Priority

1. An applicant may address one or both of the following priority areas:

Propose to serve children or students who reside, or attend TQP project schools, in a qualified opportunity zone as designated by the Secretary of the Treasury under section 1400Z-1 of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended by the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act (Pub. L. 115-97). In addressing this priority, an applicant must provide the census tract number of the qualified opportunity zone for which it proposes to serve children or students and describe the extent to which the applicant will serve individuals in the Qualified Opportunity Zone(s). OR

Demonstrate in its application that it has received or will receive financial assistance from a qualified opportunity fund under section 1400Z-2 of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended by the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, for a purpose directly related to its proposed project. In addressing this priority, an applicant must identify the qualified opportunity fund from which it has received or will receive financial assistance and describe the extent to which the applicant will use the financial assistance for its proposed project.

Strengths:

NA

Weaknesses:

NA

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/14/2019 05:26 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/17/2019 09:48 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: California State University, Dominguez Hills Foundation (U336S190023)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	40	38
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Resources	20	18
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	19
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Sub Total	100	95
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. STEM/Computer Science	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Invitational Priority		
Invitational Priority		
1. Promise Zones	0	
Sub Total	0	
Total	105	100

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - Teacher Quality Partnership - 4: 84.336S

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: California State University, Dominguez Hills Foundation (U336S190023)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:
 - (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 for meeting statutory purposes and requirements.

Strengths:

The applicant provides comprehensive and strong evidence of the high quality of the project design:

1. For example, the project clearly demonstrates a rationale. The foundation for the program is based on models for teacher residencies developed at the National-Louis University in Chicago and the Boston Teacher Residency. Residents in these and other residency programs had impressive three-year retention rates. In addition, the application states that the Center for Teaching Quality describes seven principles of a high-quality residency program and notes how its project includes all of them. Two examples are support to residents once they are hired as teachers and grouping candidates into cohorts to develop a learning community and to promote collaboration. (p. 1)

The project also meets the quality requirements of the TQP program by providing for the improvement of student achievement with the addition of highly qualified teachers recruited from the ranks of recent college graduates who have had academic success and have the disposition and commitment to be successful as urban teachers. The project also calls for the improvement of the quality of the teaching force through a program that integrates education coursework with substantial practice teaching experience, among other components. (p. 5)

2. The goals and outcomes of the project are clear and well specified. For example, the project calls for focused and comprehensive goals to be met including: recruit and prepare highly qualified middle and high school teachers for service in high-need schools; participants are hired and retained in these schools; these teachers will increase student achievement in math, science and English; and the project continues to pay dividends through enhanced partnerships and improved capacities to produce high-quality teachers for urban students. Some examples of the measurables include that a large number of the project's teachers continue to be employed by a partner high-need LEA for three consecutive years; a significant number of participants earn a master's degree in 15 months; and that all participants who complete micro-credentials write high-quality project-based lessons on related topics. (pp. 26-27)

3. The proposed project demonstrates a design that will build capacity and produce results beyond the end of the grant. For example, the project proposes that it will build capacity at the university so it can continue to produce high-

quality teachers in several ways. One is the development of a quality teacher to high needs classroom pipeline. Another is that the project will reinforce the LEA's efforts to build educational leadership and deepen educators' professional practice. Those master teachers trained are likely to become educational leaders, lead professional development, and provide internal educational expertise for the district. Finally, if this newly proposed induction model is successful, the university plans on implementing some of its new features in other teacher induction models. (pp. 28-29)

4. The project has several strong features that represent an exceptional approach for meeting grant goals and requirements. For example, the Teacher Support Institute will provide vital and innovative supports for residents and new teachers, including instructional resources, child care, and individualized coaching and counseling from experienced mentor teachers. Finally, the project calls for a new and thoughtful model for supervision by well-trained, expert teachers from the same school so that supervision reflects current standards and the school and student environment. (p. 30)

Weaknesses:

1. No weaknesses found.
2. The application is lacking in detail about how the program will collaborate with the university arts faculty to integrate the arts into the STEM curriculum to create STEAM for the Lab School. (p. 19). The project description also is vague about the details for inclusion of literacy across the disciplines in its lesson planning work with teachers. (p. 30)
3. No weaknesses found.
4. No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 38

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

1. The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources for the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

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

(ii) The relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project.

Strengths:

1. The application provides an adequate description of the resources that will be provided by the lead organization. For example, the university will provide facilities for the summer academy, workshops and training, the time spent by staff on the proposed Council of Advisors, and other faculty from various colleges to provide expertise. The university will subsidize the cost of instruction for participants with state funds. (p. 31)

2. The application provides appropriate and adequate descriptions of the commitment and relevance of partners in the project. For example, the school district and its schools are contributing financially to ensure project success, including \$4,000 toward stipends and \$3,000 for master teacher stipends. In addition, the district will pay for substitute teachers during master teachers' training. (p. 31)

Weaknesses:

1. The project description is vague about how the university will locate private funding to cover costs related to fabrication lab training and supplies and instructional materials for the lab school. (p. 31)

2. Details are lacking on how the South Bay Workforce Investment Board and the Los Angeles Coalition for the Economy and Jobs will help the project by finding additional support, such as securing funding to expand the micro-credential programs, training more teachers as mentors and supervisors, and expanding the lab schools to serve more students. (p. 36)

Reader's Score: 18

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

Strengths:

The adequacy of the management plan is well detailed. Personnel vital to the project are named and their qualifications and detailed project responsibilities are thoroughly noted. For example, in Table 15 Key Personnel Roles and Qualifications, it is noted that the PI has a great deal of previous experience in grants like this one, including previous work with an earlier version of the Teacher Quality Program. In addition, the project lead for the partner school district is the chief academic officer there and has an extensive record as an educator and administrator. (pp. 37-39)

Other aspects of the project's management will facilitate program effectiveness and provide ways for stakeholders to give input and guidance into operations and management. The structure seems very likely to ensure that the project will achieve its objectives on time and within budget. Of note is that the district and the university will formalize their partnership with an MOU that details their roles and responsibilities. In addition, the leading partners have a previously developed MOU that allows for the exchange of relevant project data, including student achievement and teacher demographics. This MOU being in place means that important data will be available from the outset. Finally, the plan calls for an Operations Team and a Council of Advisors that will provide support and guidance to the principal investigator, project coordinator, and staff. (p. 37)

Weaknesses:

The role of Loyola Marymount University in the project and its inclusion in every other team meeting needs more explanation and detail. This university also has teacher candidates who are working with the same school districts,

according to the proposal. It seems as if it might be worth considering their involvement in a larger way, or at least explaining why the thinking was on including them on every other meeting. (p. 37)

Reader's Score: 19

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(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:

1. The methods for evaluation of the project are detailed and thorough and will provide solid information on program outcomes. The methods will provide valid and reliable information to improve the program. . For example, the administrative team will use formative quantitative and qualitative evaluation data to assess program status. In their reviews of data and service quality, the team and evaluators will consider which changes should be made immediately and which for the following cohort. Each summer after the end of a cohort period, the team will formally assess the program's effectiveness and recommend improvements. The PI will provide a monthly report to the university's leadership to ensure institutional knowledge and learning. The project coordinators will present to the chairperson of the Teacher Education Division monthly and to others as needed. Through this continuous improvement process, the project appears likely to stay in touch with real time events and achieve its objectives. (p. 42)

2. The methods of evaluation are feasible and appropriate for the goals and objectives of the planned project. For example, a quasi-experimental, longitudinal and mixed-methods design will be employed. The project's formative evaluation goal is to collect and analyze data on the progress of project implementation, with a focus on the quality of training. This will be accomplished through a combination of means, including surveys, interviews, and focus groups with key project players. This feedback will provide understanding of what is working and where adjustments or improvements should be made to ensure that project goals are met. The purpose of the summative evaluation is to understand the extent to which the project goals are achieved and the impact of the project on stakeholders. One important aspect of the summative evaluation will include examining placement of graduates in high-needs schools, their retention in high-needs schools, teacher effectiveness, and student achievement. (pp. 42-43) To measure student performance, a quasi-experimental design will be used to compare standardized test outcomes of students whose teachers were trained in the project to students whose teachers were not. (p. 47) With all these evaluation components and more, the program will likely achieve its goals.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found for 1 and 2

Reader's Score: 20

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. **Projects designed to improve student achievement or other educational outcomes in computer science by increasing the number of educators adequately prepared to deliver rigorous instruction in STEM fields, including computer science, through recruitment, evidence-based professional development strategies for current STEM educators, or evidence-based retraining strategies for current educators seeking to transition from other subjects to STEM fields.**

Strengths:

The application demonstrates a design that will improve student achievement in computer science and STEM. The application details how its proposed computer science micro-credential will increase the number of teachers who are prepared to teach computer science. According to the application, the micro-credential meets the California Commission on Teaching Credentialing's requirements for a supplementary authorization in computer science, thus increasing the number of teachers able to teach computer science. (p. 48) The project cites that the need for middle school math and science teachers in the district is heightened by a relatively new middle school elective being offered, The Community Problem-Solving Learning Lab, a STEM-based course with a three-year span of courses (p. 8)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 5

Invitational Priority - Invitational Priority

1. **An applicant may address one or both of the following priority areas:**

Propose to serve children or students who reside, or attend TQP project schools, in a qualified opportunity zone as designated by the Secretary of the Treasury under section 1400Z-1 of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended by the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act (Pub. L. 115-97). In addressing this priority, an applicant must provide the census tract number of the qualified opportunity zone for which it proposes to serve children or students and describe the extent to which the applicant will serve individuals in the Qualified Opportunity Zone(s). OR

Demonstrate in its application that it has received or will receive financial assistance from a qualified opportunity fund under section 1400Z-2 of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended by the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, for a purpose directly related to its proposed project. In addressing this priority, an applicant must identify the qualified opportunity fund from which it has received or will receive financial assistance and describe the extent to which the applicant will use the financial assistance for its proposed project.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/17/2019 09:48 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/14/2019 08:42 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: California State University, Dominguez Hills Foundation (U336S190023)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	40	40
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Resources	20	20
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	20
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Sub Total	100	100
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. STEM/Computer Science	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Invitational Priority		
Invitational Priority		
1. Promise Zones	0	0
Sub Total	0	0
Total	105	105

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - Teacher Quality Partnership - 4: 84.336S

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: California State University, Dominguez Hills Foundation (U336S190023)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(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 for meeting statutory purposes and requirements.

Strengths:

(i) The proposed models-based project, Residency for Equity through Action and Learning (REAL) is built around two model programs – National-Louis in Chicago and the Boston Teacher Residency. REAL also builds on a previous residency model for urban teachers (CSUDH – TQP 2009) program. (e190). Included in the REAL project are the 7 research-based principles of a high-quality residency program. For instance, a few principles of the 7 principles that REAL incorporates in its project design are (1) the combined theory of rigorous master's coursework with increasing levels of practice in a 1-year program, (2) residents are assigned to a trained mentor teacher who is fully credentialed, tenured and has 4 + years' experience, (3) new two-year induction program with trained, experienced induction mentor and PLC in cohorts, (4) opportunities to become master teachers, mentors, and University supervisors of student teachers, and (5) earn micro-credentials in key education topics. Because of students' performance of TQP teachers, and the positive impact on teacher retention in high need schools in a TQP program, this model, with modifications that improve upon past effort, is proposed. (e21)

(ii) In Table 14 (e44-45), the project's goals, objectives, and performance measures are clearly articulated, detailed, aligned, and measurable. As an example, Goal 1 is "Recruit and prepare highly-qualified middle and high school teachers in subjects matched to the needs of students in high need Green Dot California schools." Objective 1 is "REAL residents each earn single-subject credentials in math, science or English and master's degrees. The performance measure 1a - Recruit and enroll qualified participants in 4 cohorts of 30 each; and for 1c. Residents earn preliminary single subject credential within 1 year of program completion – 96%; 98% earned credential in more than one year. Additionally, Table 14 includes the actual participant numbers for each sub-objective. Example: for sub-objective 1a, "recruit and enroll qualified participants in 4 cohorts of 30 each, the total count for participants is 120." (e44-45) Additionally, the Logic Model (e22) reflects measurable outcomes – short term, intermediate and long term.

(iii) Goal 4 (e45) of the project addresses the extent to which the program design builds capacity and yields results beyond the grant period. Training master teachers to lead professional development activities, making the project's coursework available through the College of Extended & International ED for REAL, and making micro-credentials widely available through the College serve as examples of outcomes and results from innovative components implemented in the project that will extend beyond the project. As cited by the applicant, by developing and implementing a comprehensive

residency and induction program that focuses on training and preparing teachers to deliver computer science and STEM instruction in high-need areas, teachers will go on to train others and become educational leaders in their field of expertise. The evaluation results related to high-need urban schools will advance the research and body of knowledge as it is published and shared in various educational venues. The applicant's presentation of the various programs such as clinical training and mentoring, professional development and other educational training activities, the new teacher induction and the coursework is well laid out, succinct and thorough. The applicant provides in Tables thorough explanations, timelines, and/or activities and follow-up with the explanation of student's coursework with the required list of courses for students. (e28-54)

(iv) The REAL project includes innovative strategies, approaches, and/or new components in the project design such as developing home-grown teachers who are ethnically similar to their students and committed to urban education. Another innovative approach embedded in the project is the increased emphasis on quality clinical experience through observation and participation before admission and during the credential program in the lab school and residency. Including a focus on literacy and writing integrated across the content areas- plus a literacy micro-credential is a new component of the project, as well as offering micro credentials in computer science, and fabrication lab technology. The project proposes to integrate into the project inclusive practices such as next generation science standards and project-based learning. Other innovative approaches and practices mentioned in the application are: clinical experience with trained mentor teachers for the residents; establishing lab schools at the middle and high schools; creating teacher support institutes and professional learning communities; and, literacy across the content areas to include integrating technology into the curriculum, as well as the Fabrication lab technology. (e 29-48)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted for (i) – (iv).

Reader's Score: 40

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

1. The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources for the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

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

(ii) The relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project.

Strengths:

(i) The project has ample support and resources which includes a Teacher Resource Center that is fully equipped with fabrication equipment for making instructional material as well as equipped with state-of-the-art printing and scanning equipment. The Center is also staffed with technical support. The facilities will be used on Saturdays as labs established for Green Dot Middle Schools and High Schools. Another shared resource is the school district will house clinical labs and provide classrooms for specific credentials and master's courses. (e29) The University will provide facilities for training workshops, academies, time and expertise from university faculty. Shared financial support from Green Dot includes stipends of \$4000 per resident and \$3000 per master teacher as well as paying for substitute teachers as needed. The

University will provide facilities for the Summer Academy, workshops and training. (e49)

(ii) Letters of support matched financial commitment and resources serve as evidence of partnership commitment to the project. The University has a five-year history of collaborating with the Green Dot school district for which five middle schools and four high schools form the consortium of high needs schools for this project. At the University, the various Colleges that are working and collaborating to develop, prepare and provide services for this project include College of Education, College of Arts & Science Humanities, College of Natural & Behavioral Sciences, and College of Extended & International Education. (e50-51-54) Project endorsements from the Los Angeles Coalition for the Economy and Jobs, South Bay Workforce Investment Board, CEO and principals at Green Dot LEA, as well as letters of support from California State University serve as evidence of partner commitment and support for the successful implementation of this project. (e183-210) The Budget also indicates the strong commitment and financial support for the project. For instance, for the PI & Project Director (50% FTE), there is a one-to-one match - Grant: 25% FTE, Match: 25% FTE - Match Source: CSUDH-State Funds (Through the California State University Chancellor Office-CSU. Another example is the Lab School Administrators (2) from LEA, Grant: 0% FTE, Match: \$20,640, and the Match Source: Partner LEA.

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted for (i)-(ii).

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

Strengths:

(i) CSUDH will serve as the lead for this project and fiscal agent. The project proposes to establish two teams -a Council of Advisors for support and guidance to key personnel, and Operations teams comprised of Green Dot LEA and CSUDH responsible for day-day operations. The composition of the two teams was discussed as well as the qualifications of members. The roles and responsibilities were clearly articulated for key personnel in CSUDH and Green Dot to include position, responsibilities and qualifications and percentage of time allocated to the project. (e55-57) Statements in the application addressed progress reporting and oversight responsibilities. The applicant provided a very detailed, self-explanatory Table 16 (Project Milestones and Timelines) that outlined, quite thoroughly, the project activities, staff responsible and timelines. (e58-59) Based on a review of resumes, key personnel are appropriate for their positions and related responsibilities. The well-defined Milestones and Timelines Table as well as the experience and expertise of key personnel and time allocation serve as assurance that the project goals will be met on time and within budget.

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted for (i).

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (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) Virtual Research (VR), a research and evaluation consulting firm with experience in research designed, customized survey and instrument design, and additional evaluation tools will be used to conduct the formative and summative evaluation for the project. The project proposed to use a quasi-experimental, longitudinal, and mixed methods to evaluate the implementation and outcomes of the project which should yield useful and reliable data and results. (e60-64) The project uses a solid approach to the collection and analysis of data related to the project's implementation through formative evaluation, which will entail review of project records, surveys, interviews and focus groups with key participants. Likewise, use of summative evaluation to collect data on understanding the extent to which goals are achieved and the impact of the project is a solid approach because it will capture data from teacher placement, effectiveness, and student achievement. The project evaluation is ambitious in that it also is conducting a quasi-experimental design study which involves the use of comparison groups and will be used to compare standardized test outcomes of students who have had the treatment and who have not.

(ii) The evaluator proposes to use existing validated tools and instruments such as surveys, observation rubrics, interview and focus group instruments, and develop additional ones should the evaluation warrant it. Also provided, is a very well-defined alignment of goals, objectives and data sources represented in Table 17. (e43-45) According to the applicant, feedback and reporting will be conducted monthly to ensure that evaluation activities are responsive to the project's implementation and self-correct, as needed. Also, VR will produce an annual evaluation report highlighting key findings, challenges and best practices. Another key feature mentioned in application is an anywhere/anytime availability and access to evaluation results and information via the project's websites. (e65)

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted for (i)-(ii).

Reader's Score: 20

Priority Questions**Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1**

- 1. Projects designed to improve student achievement or other educational outcomes in computer science by increasing the number of educators adequately prepared to deliver rigorous instruction in STEM fields, including computer science, through recruitment, evidence-based professional development strategies for current STEM educators, or evidence-based retraining strategies for current educators seeking to transition from other subjects to STEM fields.**

Strengths:

The project proposes to create opportunities for teachers to earn a micro-credential, particularly in computer science, to increase the number of teachers prepared to deliver rigorous instruction in computer science in high need schools within Green Dot LEA. The micro-credential is a series of seven graded 2-hour courses.

As cited by the applicant, the micro-credential meets the California Commission on Teaching Credentialing's requirements for supplementary authorization in computer science.

On the subject of micro-credentials, the applicant states that "the intensity, duration, reliance on best practices and grounding in research are highly likely to improve teachers' practice in computer science, fabrication technology, inclusive practices such as special Ed, literacy, Next Generation Science Standards and project-based learning. As a result, teachers will deliver rigorous instruction that raises achievement. " (e41)

The requirements for the micro-credential are modeled after curriculum recommendations for K12 computer science from the Computer Science Teachers Association and the International Society for Technology Education. Each model will be followed by a pedagogy session so that teachers also learn how best to deliver the content. Pedagogy will emphasize project-based lessons. With faculty and classmates, teachers will develop lessons, teach them, assess student work, reflect, modify the lessons and reteach them like a lesson study cycle.

The applicant cites that teachers will gain knowledge about computer science and learn how to teach the content in grade 6 through 12 classrooms, with emphasis on using project-based learning (PBL). The applicant provides research data and evidence from various studies on project-based learning improving student learning. Other research studies are provided by the applicant that support the use and effectiveness of using project-based learning to teach computer science.

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Invitational Priority - Invitational Priority

1. An applicant may address one or both of the following priority areas:

Propose to serve children or students who reside, or attend TQP project schools, in a qualified opportunity zone as designated by the Secretary of the Treasury under section 1400Z-1 of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended by the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act (Pub. L. 115-97). In addressing this priority, an applicant must provide the census tract number of the qualified opportunity zone for which it proposes to serve children or students and describe the extent to which the applicant will serve individuals in the Qualified Opportunity Zone(s). OR

Demonstrate in its application that it has received or will receive financial assistance from a qualified opportunity fund under section 1400Z-2 of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended by the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, for a purpose directly related to its proposed project. In addressing this priority, an applicant must identify the qualified opportunity fund from which it has received or will receive financial assistance and describe the extent to which the applicant will use the financial assistance for its proposed project.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/14/2019 08:42 PM