

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/02/2018 01:04 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: ALDER GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION (U423A180028)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	35	35
Significance		
1. Significance	20	18
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	25	25
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	17
Sub Total	100	95
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Promoting STEM Education/Computer Science		
1. CPP1	3	3
Sub Total	3	3
Total	103	98

Technical Review Form

Panel #6 - Supporting Effective Educator Development - 6: 84.423A

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: ALDER GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION (U423A180028)

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:

- (1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition.
- (2) 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.
- (3) 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.
- (4) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project are focused on those with greatest needs.
- (5) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.

Strengths:

The applicant clearly identifies an exceptional approach to the specific priority on page 9 that will ensure clinical preparation of teacher candidates through a mentor and resident role in a team teaching environment that provides coursework, job placement, and an apprenticeship.

The proposed Students First project's greatest strength is the full year teaching approach that bridges the theory – practice gap in a manner that will enhance the needs of student learners as stated on page 15.

The applicant proposes on page 17 or e38, multiple partners available to assist in maximizing the project's effectiveness through signed agreements and financial commitments. A multiple partnership approach could increase the likelihood that the project will yield successful outcome for students.

On page 19 or e40, the applicant identifies specific targets that will be utilized such as recruiting and training needs, as well as targeting high needs student populations that will be identified for the project. By focusing on these areas and increasing the teaching pipeline in the STEM areas, many students should benefit from improved instruction in the Science fields.

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses noted in this section.

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

- (1) The importance or magnitude of the results or outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project, especially improvements in teaching and student achievement.
- (2) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and to the anticipated results and benefits.
- (3) 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.
- (4) The extent to which the results of the proposed project are to be disseminated in ways that will enable others to use the information or strategies.

Strengths:

On page 23 or e44, the applicant explains that the most important outcome will be a research-based model for teacher preparation designed to ensure the development of effective teachers as well as a computer science teacher residency program.

The applicant provides an extensive analysis that justifies why the costs are reasonable on page 25 or e46 by comparing the cost of traditional higher education programs with the cost of high turnover among teachers, the \$1,500 cost per participant clearly denotes an effective cost related to the proposed benefit of the program.

The applicant suggests dissemination methods such as journals, articles, newsletters, meetings, video calls, retreats, teacher education networks, research groups and blogs on page 26 or e47 that represent a variety of techniques all carefully designed to ensure widespread dissemination of the project details and results.

Weaknesses:

It is not clear if or how long the partner schools will continue the funding support after the grant funding ends as stated on page 25 or e46 since the applicant only referenced the notion that partner LEAs would provide financial contributions to support Adler Teacher Residency's operation, however, there are no specific details regarding the level of expected financial support long term.

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 the following factors:

- (1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.**
- (2) 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.**
- (3) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.**

Strengths:

The applicant includes goals, objectives and outcomes for the proposed project on page 28, such as team teaching preparation approaches as well as teacher retention strategies for high needs schools that are designed to improve student achievement.

On page 33 or e54, the proposal includes responsibilities, timelines, and milestones that are appropriate and designed to monitor the accomplishments of the program such as cyclical recruitment, progress monitoring and assessments.

The applicant does include a mechanism for continuous feedback through interim reports, quarterly meetings, collaborative work, and staff teams as indicated on page 34 or e55 which should be sufficient for project success since the feedback results in shared learning opportunities, better teacher preparation, and thus improved student outcomes.

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses noted in this section.

Reader's Score: 25

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:**

- (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the WWC standards with or without reservations as described in the WWC Handbook.**
- (2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.**
- (3) The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.**
- (4) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on Relevant Outcomes.**

Note: Applicants may wish to review the following technical assistance resources on evaluation: (1) WWC Procedures and Standards Handbooks: <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Handbooks> (2) "Technical Assistance Materials for Conducting Rigorous Impact Evaluations": <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/projects/evaluationTA.asp>; and (3) IES/NCEE Technical Methods papers: http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/tech_methods/. In addition, applicants may view two optional webinar recordings that were hosted by the Institute of Education Sciences. The first webinar discussed strategies for designing and executing well-designed Quasi-Experimental Design Studies and is available at: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Multimedia.aspx?sid=23>. The second webinar focused on more rigorous evaluation designs, discussing strategies for designing and executing studies that meet WWC evidence standards without reservations. This webinar is available at: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Multimedia.aspx?sid=18>.

Strengths:

The proposed quasi-experimental outcome analysis method of evaluation will provide evidence of the project's effectiveness that meets the WWC standards with reservations as stated on page 36 or e57 through the use of three identified Research Questions designed to measure results.

The applicant will use various methods and data sources to provide periodic performance feedback which should assist in achieving the outcomes stated on page 37 or e58, using both quantitative and qualitative data, gaps will be identified and data collected, thus, resulting in continuous improvement efforts.

Weaknesses:

On page 36 or e57, it is unclear specifically what qualifications or expertise the independent evaluator will possess or if the evaluation methods employed will result in valid or reliable outcomes since the applicant only indicated its intent to hire an independent evaluator and provided no detailed information regarding the evaluator.

Reader's Score: 17

Priority Questions**Competitive Preference Priority - Promoting STEM Education/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 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 applicant includes an emphasis on a STEM Academy and Computer Science Pathway programs on page 14 or e35. The Academy and Pathway programs will promote STEM and Computer Science development in the classroom and significantly increase the number of students in STEM Careers upon completion of the program.

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses noted in this section.

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/02/2018 01:04 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/29/2018 11:41 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: ALDER GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION (U423A180028)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	35	33
Significance		
1. Significance	20	20
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	25	23
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	14
Sub Total	100	90
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Promoting STEM Education/Computer Science		
1. CPP1	3	3
Sub Total	3	3
Total	103	93

Technical Review Form

Panel #6 - Supporting Effective Educator Development - 6: 84.423A

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: ALDER GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION (U423A180028)

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:

- (1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition.
- (2) 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.
- (3) 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.
- (4) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project are focused on those with greatest needs.
- (5) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.

Strengths:

- 1a. The proposal clearly outlines the problem of practice (the need to provide teacher candidates with a more effective clinical experience without jeopardizing student learning) and outlines a strong, well thought out intervention to address this problem (pg. e30).
- 1b. The proposed approach clearly is aligned with competition priorities including AP1: Supporting Effective Teachers and CPP: Promoting STEM Education. The proposed project also will create the first computer science residency in the country.
- 1c. The proposed approach includes not only a well-designed innovation to address teacher pre-service support but also includes induction support to the teacher once in a position (pg. e33).
- 2a. The proposal does a nice job of aligning the proposed strategies with the strategies identified in the qualifying study of TFA practices.
- 3a. It was evident in the proposal, the long and successful track history among the project applicants to building partnerships to support the work. In fact, the partnership between Alder and BPE seemed designed to maximize on both organizations strengths - Alder with the residency model and BPE's strength in the area of STEM education (pgs. e38-39).
- 4a. The applicant did a nice job of evidencing that the proposed project would focus on those with the greatest needs by partnering with districts that have high percentages of students from free and reduced lunch (pg. e39).
- 5a. The proposal identifies the strategy to recruit and preparing teachers that looked like and come from the same background as the students served, which is an effective strategy to working with the needs of the target population (pg. e40).

Weaknesses:

- 4a. Although the proposal addresses how the project will serve a high-need population, the proposed plan in the GEPA Section 427 is not detailed on how the project would provide equitable access or eliminate or break down barriers to participation (pg. e13).
- 5a. Although the proposal addresses the retention rate of ATR teachers, it only gives the 3 year retention rate (pg. e42). The inability to retain teachers after 3 years is the biggest compliant on alternative teacher preparation programs. As

such, seeing a 4 or 5 year retention rate for ATR and BTR teachers would have provided better evidence on the ability of this proposed strategy to really address the teacher shortage issue.

5b. The proposal indicates on page e27 that "we recruit heavily from within LEA boundaries" but does not evidence this in the proposal. A targeted strategy to 'grow your own' STEM teachers from these regions could be a really effective approach to not only recruiting but retaining effective teachers.

Reader's Score: 33

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

(1) The importance or magnitude of the results or outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project, especially improvements in teaching and student achievement.

(2) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and to the anticipated results and benefits.

(3) 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.

(4) The extent to which the results of the proposed project are to be disseminated in ways that will enable others to use the information or strategies.

Strengths:

1a. This project addresses three problems of practice – 1) the need to enhance real world teacher training without negatively affecting student learning; and 2) the need to address the teacher shortage in partnering LEAs (which is also a national problem), and 3) the need to diversify the teacher workforce to reflect the student demographics (pg. e30) - and identifies how the innovative and realistic strategy of this proposal can help to address these three problems.

1b. The proposal included the requirement of partnering LEAs to provide annual vacancy projections, which the reader though was a smart approach to assuring that the recruitment and training of candidates matched the needs of partnering LEAs (pg. e45).

2a. On pages e45-46, the proposal outlined the costs of the project (\$15,000 per resident) compared to the costs of teacher turnover in Boston (\$3.3 million annually) and the cost of a master's degree in teacher education (between \$25,000-\$40,000). This makes a strong case for the cost effectiveness of a preventive approach like this.

2b. The proposal also notes that the cost for the project includes development and research costs that would not be a continued cost after federal funding ends.

3a. The project requires partnering districts to sign a MOU that includes a financial commitment to participate in the project (pg. e478). This appears a good strategy to maximize federal resources while also assuring that partnering districts have some "skin in the game" that would assist with the continuation of support for the project after federal funding ends.

4a. The proposal included a large list of related organizations that the applicant organizations would connect with to assist with dissemination of results and also describes the potential that NCTR could offer with disseminating best practices learned through the grant (pgs. e47-48)

4b. The applicant's track record with partnerships to maximize and enhance the work gave her confidence that Alder and BPE would do a good job of maximizing the potential of this project through dissemination (pgs. e50-51).

Weaknesses:

n/a

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 the following factors:

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

(2) 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.

(3) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

Strengths:

1. The proposal clearly laid out goals, objectives, and outcomes that are aligned with the grant priorities and feasible. Aligned with these, the proposal on pg. e49 included clear measurables (e.g., prepare 630 new teachers, 500 new graduates secure positions in partner LEAs, prepare 370 teachers for K-12 STEM or science, prepare 315 teachers of color).

2a. The proposal included a table of the management plan (pg. e54 that included the activity, responsibility and project year milestones.

2b. The applicant did a nice job of evidencing the capacity of the lead organizations to manage and fulfill the grant objectives. The reader was especially impressed with the organizations' national ability to partner with like organizations to fulfill a broaden mission in which each single organization does not have the capacity to fulfill.

3. The applicant did a nice job of evidencing the capacity and existing structure within the lead organization to collect data for continuous improvement feedback cycles (pgs. e55-56). With this already built into the culture of the organization, this culture can naturally be continued with this project and create an iterative process for developing a model that would be fine-tuned throughout the 3-year grant but finalized by year 3.

Weaknesses:

1. While the proposal included clear performance measures, more information was needed on how the benchmarks for the performance measures were selected. For example, with the performance measure, "prepare 630 new teachers, 500 new graduates secure positions in partner LEAs" (pg. e49), it would have been helpful to see data to support the selection of the measures to assure that a high enough bar for measurables is being set.

2. While a management plan was included in the proposal on page e54 the plan was rather simplified and only included the preparation, placement, and co-teaching model activities. It would have been helpful to see a more expanded management plan that included activities around recruitment, induction support, data collection, evaluation, etc.

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:

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the WWC standards with or without reservations as described in the WWC Handbook.

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

(3) The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.

(4) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on Relevant Outcomes.

Note: Applicants may wish to review the following technical assistance resources on evaluation: (1) WWC Procedures and Standards Handbooks: <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Handbooks> (2) "Technical Assistance Materials for Conducting Rigorous Impact Evaluations": <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/projects/evaluationTA.asp>; and (3) IES/NCEE Technical Methods papers: http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/tech_methods/. In addition, applicants may view two optional webinar recordings that were hosted by the Institute of Education Sciences. The first webinar discussed strategies for designing and executing well-designed Quasi-Experimental Design Studies and is available at: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Multimedia.aspx?sid=23>. The second webinar focused on more rigorous evaluation designs, discussing strategies for designing and executing studies that meet WWC evidence standards without reservations. This webinar is available at: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Multimedia.aspx?sid=18>.

Strengths:

- 1a. One of the strengths of the proposal is the intent to pilot a new teacher residency model. As such, the evaluation would determine if the model is successful and can/should be replicated.
- 1b. The evaluation includes both implementation fidelity as well as an outcome analysis aligned with WWC standards (pg. e57). The evaluation design will use mixed methods of both qualitative and quantitative data, including reliable and evidenced-based instruments such as the CLASS instrument for classroom observation.
- 2a. Another strength of the evaluation is that the LEAD organizations both already have a strong track record of collecting data on their candidates, including outcome data (pg. e55). This will assist with the strength of the evaluation and ease of assisting the evaluator with obtaining the data needed.
3. The applicant did a good job of aligning the methods of evaluation with the three research questions, which included RQ 1 (measuring fidelity of implementation) and RQ 2 and RQ 3, which are measuring intended outcomes of the project (pgs. e57-e63).

Weaknesses:

- 1a. The evaluator was not already selected and instead would be selected after the grant is awarded (pg. e57). Without this information, it was hard to ascertain the qualifications of the evaluation staff to fulfill the evaluation plan and that the evaluation methods and activity in the proposal can be fulfilled if the grant is awarded.
- 1b. The evaluation plan did not include a power analysis of the sample size needed for the evaluation to ascertain that it meets WWC standards and that attrition of the anticipated 7% might not be problematic.
- 4a. Since this project spans multiple states, more information was needed on the standardized tests that would be used to evaluate student outcomes. Specifically, it was not clear if the three participating states use the same standardized test or how the evaluator will compare outcomes with different standardized assessments.
- 4b. It is unclear if other assessments will be used in non-tested subjects.

Reader's Score: 14

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Promoting STEM Education/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 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:

This whole project is focused on preparing more STEM teachers for high-need partnering LEAs. Page e42 states the clear intent that “through this project, ATR and BTR will prepare 370 effective K-12 STEM teachers (half of which will teach grades 6-12) and develop and implement the country’s first computer science teacher residency program.

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: **3**

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/29/2018 11:41 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/02/2018 02:51 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: ALDER GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION (U423A180028)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	35	35
Significance		
1. Significance	20	20
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	25	25
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	18
Sub Total	100	98
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Promoting STEM Education/Computer Science		
1. CPP1	3	3
Sub Total	3	3
Total	103	101

Technical Review Form

Panel #6 - Supporting Effective Educator Development - 6: 84.423A

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: ALDER GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION (U423A180028)

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:

- (1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition.
- (2) 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.
- (3) 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.
- (4) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project are focused on those with greatest needs.
- (5) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.

Strengths:

Applicant successfully demonstrates that resident teachers who were prepared with their team teaching approach ultimately had high achieving students, remained in the teaching profession longer, and were more effective than non-tenured teachers who did not participate in their residency program. (pp. e26 – e30)

Applicant's project matches successful applicants of color with students of color due to research evidence that this serves their students with the greatest needs. (p. e27)

Proposed project provides in-depth and sustaining Professional Development and support for resident teachers with selective admissions, intensive pre-service training, apprenticeship during the summer, and a mentor teacher.

The applicant partners with LEAs to receive annual hiring projections in order to recruit and train teachers in order to serve the students with the greatest needs.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted in this section.

Reader's Score: 35

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

- (1) The importance or magnitude of the results or outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project, especially improvements in teaching and student achievement.
- (2) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and to the

anticipated results and benefits.

(3) 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.

(4) The extent to which the results of the proposed project are to be disseminated in ways that will enable others to use the information or strategies.

Strengths:

The proposed project successfully indicates that the results of their teacher residency programs will be improvement of teacher training for our most vulnerable students. (p. e44)

The applicant demonstrates that their costs per teacher resident is reasonable especially when contrasted with the typically high cost of current teacher turnover. (p. e45)

The applicant acknowledges the initial support of Federal Funds and addresses this with the expectation of financial support from participating LEAs that will ultimately replace the Federal Funds. (p. e46)

Successful dissemination begins with the fact that three states are participating in this project. Ongoing, the applicant demonstrates plans to network at conferences, publish journal articles, network at conferences, utilize social media and share lesson plan templates. (p. e47)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted in this section.

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 the following factors:

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

(2) 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.

(3) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

Strengths:

The proposed venture presents three goals, four objectives, and ten outcomes that are specific and easily measurable. (p. e49)

The applicant portrays Alder's long-running success and positive track record which indicates a superior management plan that will come in on time and on budget. Activities, responsibilities, and milestones are extremely specific for project realization. (p. e50)

The applicant presents an impressive continuous improvement plan that includes inquiry and feedback from every level and direction of their project. (p. e55)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted in this section.

Reader's Score: 25

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:

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the WWC standards with or without reservations as described in the WWC Handbook.

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

(3) The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.

(4) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on Relevant Outcomes.

Note: Applicants may wish to review the following technical assistance resources on evaluation: (1) WWC Procedures and Standards Handbooks: <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Handbooks> (2) "Technical Assistance Materials for Conducting Rigorous Impact Evaluations": <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/projects/evaluationTA.asp>; and (3) IES/NCEE Technical Methods papers: http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/tech_methods/. In addition, applicants may view two optional webinar recordings that were hosted by the Institute of Education Sciences. The first webinar discussed strategies for designing and executing well-designed Quasi-Experimental Design Studies and is available at: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Multimedia.aspx?sid=23>. The second webinar focused on more rigorous evaluation designs, discussing strategies for designing and executing studies that meet WWC evidence standards without reservations. This webinar is available at: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Multimedia.aspx?sid=18>.

Strengths:

The applicant proposes utilizing data from the first two years in order to provide them with performance feedback and periodic assessment.

The applicant presents three positive research questions with intended outcomes that address self-assessment of their proposed project. (p. e58)

The proposed research project examines both quantitative and qualitative data. (p. e58)

The applicant's methods of evaluation address all aspects of the project indicating that they prepared to respond to any and all project variances. (p. e59)

Weaknesses:

The external evaluator has not yet been selected and this may have a significant negative impact on the Project Evaluation process. There is no way to tell the what the external evaluator's qualifications might be and this lowers the quality of the evaluation plan.

Multiple states do not all use the same standard assessment and, therefore, it will be challenging to compare the student outcomes using different assessments.

Reader's Score: 18

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Promoting STEM Education/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 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:

Applicants recruit new teachers from STEM industries. (pp. e34 – e35)

Proposed project positively impacts students in STEM content areas due to their extensive training in engaging their students through inquiry. (p. e35)

Proposed project plans to increase the amount of rigorous instruction in Computer Science with well-trained teacher residents. (p. e20)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted in this section.

Reader's Score: **3**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/02/2018 02:51 PM