

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/02/2018 01:09 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: New Teacher Center (U423A180077)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	35	35
Significance		
1. Significance	20	19
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	25	22
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	19
Sub Total	100	95
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Promoting STEM Education/Computer Science		
1. CPP1	3	1
Sub Total	3	1
Total	103	96

Technical Review Form

Panel #7 - Supporting Effective Educator Development - 7: 84.423A

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: New Teacher Center (U423A180077)

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 proposed project's approach includes improved clinical experience for pre-service teachers, enhanced recruitment and hiring, and retention strategies for pre-service teachers and alternate certification teachers by targeting two areas of deficits: deficient clinical experience and inadequate instructional support. The proposed project intends to use a mentoring approach based upon the Glazerman study (p.2) and the Schmidt et al study (p. 3) use of the NTC TI model. Additionally, the project will focus training and mentoring cooperative teaching arrangements, alignment, and supporting alternative certification teachers without experience with a support net (p. 5-7). This is an exceptional approach to the priority as it blends mentoring and instructional support to meet the needs of new teachers.

Cooperative Teachers will receive 4 days (32 hours) of professional development aligned with the NTC's Teacher Induction model. Mentors will receive 64 hours of training. Additional time for cooperative teachers and mentors will be in facilitated forums. The professional development is sufficient in quality, intensity, and dispersed across the grant timeline.

The New Teacher Center will be collaborating with Chicago Public School and Miami-Dade County Public Schools. These partners have previously collaborated and achieved success.

Both of the partner school districts have a high percentage of students in need. In Chicago Public Schools 80% of the students receive free or reduced lunch. In Miami-Dade County Public Schools, 70% of the students are identified to receive a free or reduced lunch. In addition to student needs, one-third of first year teachers left Chicago Public Schools (p. 13)

The proposal provides specific research citations to suggest that teacher are less likely to leave if provided mentoring and coaching (p. 13). This creates compelling evidence that the project design has opportunities to change current teacher and students' outcomes.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

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 proposal estimates a substantial number of students (216,000) would be influenced by the project. The estimated cost of \$885 per student is reasonable given the number of students to be served and anticipated results and benefits (p. 15).

The NTC model transitions program ownership to school districts over the life of the grant. NTC has secured private funding match for Year 1 of the grant, demonstrating a commitment to sustainability.

The proposal presents a strong dissemination plan. NTC has a National Program Leader Network (NPLN) and a National Symposium. In addition, results will be disseminated to conferences and other organizations such as Learning Forward and American Educational Research Association. Additionally, websites and social media will be used to disseminate information to the field.

Weaknesses:

On page 14, the proposal states each district hires about 1,000 prospective teachers anticipating that the project will support approximately 3,000 teachers. Additional detail of how the 3,000 will be selected and placed in the existing partner school districts would strengthen application.

Reader's Score: 19

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 goals and objectives are clearly and succinctly presented (p. 19-20). The use of color in the table helps visually explain the breakout of goals and objectives.

The management plan builds upon previously successful grant management structure including the use of a Project Director, multiple councils (NTC SEED Management Council, SEED Evaluation Council) and a SEED Advisory Committee with planned site visits and monthly forums. Table 1 clearly defines responsibilities timelines, and milestones.

The proposal articulates the intended use of the inquiry cycle (plan, implement, collect data, reflect, plan) to support feedback and continuous improvement. A real-time dashboard with leading indicators will be used to detect and diagnose areas of improvement providing the opportunity to make changes in implementation quickly.

Weaknesses:

The applicant provides incomplete measures proposed on p. 19 for first two objectives of Goal 1. The proposal would be strengthened by expanding definitions of measure such as focus on instructional skills to provide more specificity.

A large percentage of the identified Project Director's time specifically devoted to grant. NTC high-level administration identified as leads with large percentage of responsibility. This is a weakness because the administrators may not have enough to focus on the grant given their other job responsibilities.

Reader's Score: 22

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:

groups will lead to research that may be submitted to the WWC. There is an established timeline of data collection through the grant lifetime. The intermediary data collection provides opportunities for feedback and restructuring during the implementation of the grant.

The use of the randomized control design on student achievement scores should have a detectable impact on student achievement given minimum detectable effect size. In addition, the use of survey data and qualitative analysis will provide feedback on intended outcomes. The project's use of student achievement data, use of replicated surveys with demonstrated reliability, and interview protocols will provide valid and reliable performance data.

Weaknesses:

Applicant does not appear to address how the methods of evaluation will produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet WWC standards with or without reservations (p. 36 -37). The proposal would benefit from the inclusion of additional details to explain the methodology.

Reader's Score: 19

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 vitae of responsible parties include strong STEM background and emphasis to support STEM activities.

Weaknesses:

The proposal could be strengthened with additional narrative and details specific to STEM activities and projects. The activities listed are broad and generalized without being STEM specific.

Reader's Score: 1

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/02/2018 01:09 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/02/2018 03:26 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: New Teacher Center (U423A180077)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	35	33
Significance		
1. Significance	20	19
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	25	24
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	18
Sub Total	100	94
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Promoting STEM Education/Computer Science		
1. CPP1	3	1
Sub Total	3	1
Total	103	95

Technical Review Form

Panel #7 - Supporting Effective Educator Development - 7: 84.423A

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: New Teacher Center (U423A180077)

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 project proposes to train cooperating teachers, mentors of preservice teacher, and teachers that are new to the profession. This approach has the potential to provide long-term support for preservice teachers and teachers new to the profession, which will positively affect the students.

The proposal presents professional development services that are well designed to address the need of preservice and beginning teachers, in addition to the alternative certified teachers during years 2 and 3 of the project. The project will train cooperating teachers and mentors to provide training to the preservice, beginning teachers, and alternative certified teachers (e30-e34) to build capacity in the community.

The mentors and cooperating teachers will receive professional development designed to strengthen their skills in mentoring and coaching (e28-30). This has the potential to continue the effective professional development of preservice, beginning teachers, and alternative certified teachers beyond the grant period, thereby providing the potential for positive experiences and improved outcomes for many teachers and students.

The proposal also includes administrators that will also be trained in ways to support preservice, beginning teachers, and alternative certified teachers (e31). This was viewed as a strength of the proposal, as it addresses improved school leadership.

The timeline for providing the professional development is reasonable to the goals of the project (e44-48).

Both CPS and M-DCPS have signed a Memorandums of Understanding Appendix D, e94-95) and have committed to monitor the implementation of the program through a formative assessment system (e33). This was a strength of the proposal, demonstrating the commitment of the partnering institutions.

The project has the potential to address the need for highly qualified and effective teachers in school districts with a large number of disadvantaged students (e23-36). The project will focus on public schools with high poverty and minority populations (e35).

Weaknesses:

While the professional development plan states that the sessions will emphasize math and science content for teachers assigned to those areas (e24), details of the math and science professional development are not included other than stating that planning lessons grounded in both standards will be included. The proposal would benefit from the inclusion of additional details to demonstrate how the professional development will achieve the improved outcomes that are being proposed.

Additionally, it is not clear if the amount of professional development is adequate since it is stated in minutes per month. For example, the number of minutes per months of professional development provided by mentors for alternative certified teachers is stated as 180 minutes per month. This breaks down to only 36-45 minutes per week even though the mentors are released from classroom duties and will serve about 1.5 mentees. The proposal would have benefited from providing more detail about engagement expectations on the daily or weekly basis.

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:

The project has the potential to continue well beyond the three-year grant, and thereby has the potential to positively affect many teachers and students. The project also has the potential to achieve an aligned, scalable model of support as stated on e36.

The costs involved with this proposal are reasonable and detailed (e9, e99-108). The budget includes funds provided by CPS, M-DCPS, and additional funds from NTC and the Skoll Foundation (e136-317). The cost per student is reasonable at an estimated \$885 (e37).

The findings from this grant have several avenues for dissemination. CPS and M-DCPS will participate in NTC's NPLN as well as a virtual and physical community of practice between the LEA partners and 23 other NPLN district members (e39-40). Additionally, CPS and M-DCPS have the opportunity to participate in NTC's annual Symposium (e40). Findings from the grant will be presented at conferences sponsored by organizations such as Learning Forward, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, and American Educational Research Association (e40). SRI in collaboration with NTC will develop articles for multiple scholarly journals (e40). The robust dissemination plan was noted as a strength of the proposal.

Weaknesses:

The project will train about 3,000 teachers (e20, e105), yet only about 1000 will be hired by each LEA involved (e36). It was unclear where the additional teachers would be employed, which created a challenge for determining the full significance of the project. Additionally, no strategies for retention of the teachers hired and served are discussed. The inclusion of these strategies would strength the proposal.

Reader's Score: 19

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 goals of the project are clearly outlined (e40-42) and have the potential to positively affect many teachers. SRI, an external evaluator, will be involved to determine if the goals are achieved, the budget is followed, and reported findings are accurate (e42, e101).

The timelines and milestones are clearly defined (e44-48) with further clarifications on pages e111-114. The key personnel and their roles are clearly stated (e100-101) for the project management team. Additionally, further evidence of the qualifications of NTC personnel is provided in their vitas (e124-135).

The proposal articulates that feedback to the districts is ongoing and frequent as detailed on e57—58. Formative feedback will be gathered through surveys and interviews. Monthly site visits will be held to discuss implementation of the project or issues that may arise (e44). This was a strength of the proposal, as it allows for iteration on the project design to address community needs.

The project evaluation will feature a randomized controlled trial to address key impact and implementation questions (e51).

Weaknesses:

There appears to be a large number of administrative personnel involved in the project. Many of the administrative personnel have several existing duties, which may hinder them from devoting sufficient time to this project.

Reader's Score: 24

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 project has employed an external evaluator who will provide continuous feedback throughout the project to allow for adjustments. An impact study will be conducted. The external evaluator is highly qualified and will allow CPS and M-DCPS to determine the effectiveness of the project.

The evaluation plan involves treatment and control teachers. Cooperating teachers will develop the data collection instruments during year 1, specifically the preservice teacher survey and the implementation fidelity measures (e111). This methodology was noted as a strength of the proposal.

A timeline for the collection and evaluation of the data is provided (e113) and includes several opportunities for the participants to receive feedback during the project.

Weaknesses:

Due to the possibility of student schedule changes and students moving into or out of the districts, WWC standards may not be met based on student data and teacher performance (e50, 59). The proposal would be strengthened by including additional details about the methodology used to address these factors.

The types of measures used to determine the level of achievement of outcomes is not specific, and additional details would strengthen the proposal.

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:

Several of the personnel involved with providing the professional development sessions are trained in providing professional development specific to math and/or science (e123-135). This has the opportunity to address the needs of STEM educators.

Weaknesses:

The project proposes to align the professional development with state and national standards for writing, math, and science (ELA, Math, NGSS) (e30). While the national science standards are specified (NGSS), the national math and ELA standards are not specified. It is not clear if the math standards from the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM) or the standards from Common Core will be implemented.

While the project states a focus on STEM (e105), the strategies concerning the professional development for STEM are not specified. The proposal would be strengthened by including specific professional learning strategies that are specific to STEM fields and teachers.

Reader's Score: 1

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/02/2018 03:26 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/02/2018 01:21 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: New Teacher Center (U423A180077)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	35	35
Significance		
1. Significance	20	19
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	25	24
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	19
Sub Total	100	97
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Promoting STEM Education/Computer Science		
1. CPP1	3	2
Sub Total	3	2
Total	103	99

Technical Review Form

Panel #7 - Supporting Effective Educator Development - 7: 84.423A

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: New Teacher Center (U423A180077)

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 New Teacher Center is a partnership with Chicago Public Schools and Miami-Dade County Public Schools to provide professional development to educators who work with academically, culturally and socioeconomic diverse populations. The project addresses Absolute Priority 1 and the Competitive Preference Priority by identifying two areas of focus in teacher preparation; recruitment and retention: clinical experiences and support for pre-service teachers (PSTs); and inadequate instructional support for new teachers, especially alternative certification (Alt Cert) teachers. The proposal has identified areas that are well documented in the research and literature - preservice and in-service support for new teachers that lead to retention and effective teaching. The proposal considers the mentors, cooperating teachers, administrators, and others who are involved in the early experiences of student teachers, preteachers and those in the first years of teaching. These early experiences are key to building a foundation for future success.

By providing strong support strategies, such as job embedded professional development, educators will have a strong and supportive induction process to the field. These strategies are particularly vital in high need schools with a diverse student population as well as in content areas in high demand. The proposed model utilizes studies that show a positive impact upon student achievement (i.e., Glazerman et al-- reviewed by WWC and found to meet the evidence; and Schmidt et al-- submitted but not yet reviewed by the WWC). Long-term support is provided, which will aid in retention and inductions into the field of education.

The professional development provided is comprehensive in that sustained and ongoing training is provided to those who are first in line to work with new educators- cooperating teachers and mentors. The model considers alternative certified educators and STEM educators specifically, as these may be the most underprepared for the rigors of the classroom. The partner districts face challenges in the recruitment and retention of highly prepared educators, which this model will address. Both districts are large with high poverty and high minority enrollment (i.e. 80% of CPS students and 70% of M-DCPS students are identified to receive a Free or Reduced Lunch. pg. 35) and face challenges with student achievement. This model will work with educators who serve these students to prepare and support their entry into the classroom with a focus on retention- a link that is well documented in the research as an effective strategy for student success.

Weaknesses:

There were no weaknesses noted.

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 plan provides a strong foundation for new teacher preparation and support through those who directly work with them such as mentors, cooperating teachers, and administrators. These support systems are vital and evidence based for retention efforts. The model projects that over 3,000 educators and 216,000 students will be affected by these efforts and strategies. The proposal considers how the district will leverage and build ongoing capacity through funding sources as well as building the infrastructure both during the program implementation as well as after the grant concludes.

Dissemination efforts are broad based and will be shared via conferences, other professional programs, local and national forums, and academic publications. The research and data on the model will be shared with other partners such that best practices and effective strategies can serve as hallmarks for other programs

Weaknesses:

The proposal acknowledges that providing a strong induction and professional support will enhance retention and effective teaching, but does not clearly address how these teachers may be lured away into higher paying and less challenging districts. The proposal would be strengthened by addressing these topics related to retaining trained

Reader's Score: 19

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 model outlines two overarching goal, with objectives, specific measures, that form a cohesive and tightly crafted approach. The management plan includes several layers of a management teach (i.e., management council, SEED evaluation council, SEED advisory team). The timeline and milestones provides an overview of how part of the management team will work in concert with others to facilitate the program goals. The roles of the key leaders are defined with the scope and depth of responsibilities made clear. The evaluation plan is detailed with each aspect specifically defined for how the program is implemented. Teacher observations, surveys, and student achievement outcomes are considered in the evaluation with a specific focus upon the impact- power of each phase. The use of a random and treatment group for evaluation is a strength of the model. Goals are clear with formative feedback incorporated into the process.

Weaknesses:

The model seems top heavy with several layers of administrative oversight. It was unclear what value was added through these multiple layers of administration. The proposal would be strengthened by including more details specific to this need and justification.

Reader's Score: 24

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 use of random and treatment groups along with rigorous statistical processes for evaluation is a strength of the proposal. The emphasis upon the power of the selected outcomes (factors) to address which has the most influence upon teacher retention and effectiveness as well as student achievement is an important question for the research field. The outcome data and insights will be useful for other models of performance in the future.

Weaknesses:

The specific types of tools and information to be collected are not overtly evident. The proposal would benefit from additional details related to tools and data collection.

Reader's Score: 19

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:

A focus upon all new teachers with specific support for STEM and alternate routes to education is clearly aligned with the SEED program.

Weaknesses:

It was not evident what types of strategies would be tailored for STEM and alternate routes to education training. This detail would have added depth to the proposal and made the link to evidence based practices more overt.

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/02/2018 01:21 PM