

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/02/2018 01:12 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Virginia Commonwealth University (U423A180105)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	35	34
Significance		
1. Significance	20	19
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	25	25
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
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 #7 - Supporting Effective Educator Development - 7: 84.423A

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Virginia Commonwealth University (U423A180105)

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 lead institution, Virginia Commonwealth University, is recognized as a research university with very high research activity and community engagement. The exceptional approach is based upon the National Center for Teacher Residencies Seven Principles of Teacher Residencies combined with the New Teacher Center mentoring program (p. 6). These two elements create a strong foundation for potential program success.

A substantial number of teachers, three hundred and thirty eight, will be recruited, supported, and prepared for the classroom (p. 8). This includes special education teachers, which was noted as a strength of the proposal.

Table 4 (p. 18-19) details both residents' (participants) and the coaches' preparation and support including three semesters of master's coursework for residents and 10 full days of training for coaches. In addition, the math and science professional development plans 40-hour summer institutes while the provisionally licensed teachers received 45-contact hours of courses. This was noted as significant duration to achieve the outcomes proposed.

The proposal partners with Richmond and Petersburg school districts, which serve a large percentage of economically disadvantaged students. Additional data presented in Table 1 (p. 2) justify the areas of high-need in these communities.

Weaknesses:

Although there is a reference to 8 bands of teacher groups in the abstract, page 10 of the project narrative only details 4 bands. The proposal would benefit from clarification in regards to the number of grade-banded groups to be served.

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 includes letters of support from many congressional representative and state education leaders, demonstrating a strong base of support and commitment to the project.

Overall, there is a strong commitment to sustainability that is demonstrated throughout the proposal.

The results will be disseminated locally, regionally, and nationally. Presentations will be given at the Virginia Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, American Educational Research Association, Association of Science Teacher Educators, and National Council for Teachers of Mathematics (p. 25). The variety of communities addressed in the dissemination plan was noted as a strength of the proposal.

Weaknesses:

While Table 5 illustrates the break out of number of educators served/impacted, relating these figures back to the budget such as cost per person or student impact would assist with the determination of reasonable costs. The proposal would be strengthened by explicitly addressing these costs.

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 proposal's table 6 summarizes clearly defined project goals and objectives with measurable outcomes. Additionally, the table includes responsible parties and a timeline, demonstrating a clear management plan. The color-coding for the measurements of outcomes identifying primary and secondary data is straightforward (p. 26-28), and was noted as a strength.

A four-member Teacher Preparation Inspection team will review coaching sessions, syllabi, and conduct interviews. Additionally, stakeholder meetings will also be held once a year. The leadership team will meet once a month to monitor, review, and revise the management plan. An advisory board will be created to review evaluation data (p. 29). This comprehensive feedback cycle was noted as a strength, allowing the program mechanisms for continuous improvement.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

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:

Although the Metropolitan Educational Research Consortium (MERC) is listed as an independent research center, it is based within the VCU School of Education and has experience conducting evaluations. The evaluation will conduct a quasi-experimental design with baseline equivalence used for students and teachers as matched groups to meet WWC with reservations.

The proposal's table 8 (p. 38-40) concisely summarizes the various data types and multiple data sources as they relate to the evaluation questions (p. 32-33).

The team plans to implement surveys and focus group interviews to capture feedback from the student participants, which was noted as a strength of the proposal.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

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 one-week summer professional development institutes will focus on the teaching of mathematics and science for 360 elementary and special education teachers, with 60 provisionally licensed STEM teachers to become fully licensed. There will be ongoing support for the participants after the completion of the program for two years.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/02/2018 01:12 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/02/2018 03:29 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Virginia Commonwealth University (U423A180105)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	35	34
Significance		
1. Significance	20	19
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	25	24
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Sub Total	100	97
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Promoting STEM Education/Computer Science		
1. CPP1	3	3
Sub Total	3	3
Total	103	100

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Virginia Commonwealth University (U423A180105)

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 includes plans to recruit, prepare, support, and retain teachers including both preservice teachers who are students of the university and inservice teachers (e19). The project will build on the current TQP grant (e254, e26). The project will serve inservice teachers in the grade bands of K-2, 3-5, middle school, high school, and include special education teachers (e19). The project has the potential to place effective teachers in these high-needs areas.

Preservice teachers will participate in a residency where residents co-teach alongside a mentor teacher for an entire year (e28). The mentor teachers will receive mentor-teacher training and participate in monthly mentor forums (e28). The project plans to recruit, prepare, and support 190 new RTR teachers over 3 years and 338 over 5 years (e43). After graduation, the university will continue to support the newly-hired teachers for two years through weekly meeting with a content-specific career coach (e28).

The project will include one-week summer institutes in mathematics and science for elementary and special education inservice teachers in high-needs schools (e19, e31). The inclusion of the special education teachers in the math and science training is unusual, and was noted as a strength of the proposal. The inclusion of this population of teachers has the potential to greatly strengthen the instruction and pedagogical skills of special education teachers and increase the achievement level of special education students in math and science.

Provisionally licensed STEM teachers will have the opportunity to take five courses at the university to gain full licensure (e19). Tutoring in preparation for the Virginia Communications and Literacy Assessment (VCLA) and Praxis Core Math licensure tests will also be offered. The project plans to support 60 provisionally licensed STEM teachers over the course of three years (10 science and 10 math per year) and 100 teachers over five years (e44). Additionally, the provisionally licensed STEM teachers will receive two years on ongoing support from a trained career coach. The coach will meet with the provisionally licensed STEM teachers for a minimum of one hour a week as well as at monthly meetings (e19). Tutoring for Literacy Assessment (VCLA) and Praxis Core Math exams will also be offered for provisionally licensed teachers of the other content areas within the grant partners (45 per year) (e32).

This long-term, sustained support of preservice teachers as well as inservice teachers (e39-40) has the potential to

increase the academic performance of the students as well as increase probability of the school districts retaining these teachers for several years.

The project will partner with the VCU School of Education, the VCU Center for Teacher Leadership, the Metropolitan Educational Research Consortium, the Richmond Public Schools, the Petersburg City Public Schools, the Chesterfield County Public Schools, and the Henrico County Public Schools (e19). Letters of support are provided from the school districts, several entities within the university, state and federal officials, the US Department of Education, and the state department of education (e133-158).

All of the school districts will provide the stipends for the CRCs, the costs of NTC training and monthly mentor forums, the career coaches, and access to the data for the research/evaluation of the project in collaboration with the university (e40). The sharing of costs increases the probability of participation and the success of the project.

Mathematics faculty, science faculty, and classroom teachers will be involved in the development and delivery of the summer institutes (e31). This has the potential to increase the buy-in of the public-school teachers since their colleagues will provide insight into the needs of the teachers.

These preservice teachers will be placed in districts with high minority populations and high poverty rates to meet the needs of struggling students (e19, e26). The demographics of the schools are stated in Table 1 (e23) indicating the need for the project.

The partner school districts have a high teacher turnover rate (e25). Additionally, many of the schools have not met the standards for accreditation (e25). This project and the emphasis on training and retaining effective teachers has the potential to positively affect the current lack of stability in teaching and positively affect student achievement.

Weaknesses:

The proposal states that additional math and science content-based summer professional development institutes will be offered for elementary and SPED teachers. Additionally, the proposal states that the institutes will focus on four grade bands K-2, 3-5, middle school, and high school, but then mentioned eight grade bands (e31). The grade levels to be served in the summer institutes is not clear. In addition, it is not clear if the SPED teachers will be elementary teachers or SPED teachers from all grade bands. Additional details to clarify the intent of the proposal are necessary.

Reader's Score: 34

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 been expanded to include additional school districts (e42), and other school districts and universities have shown interest in the structure of the residency program of the Virginia Commonwealth University (e43). The support of the Virginia General Assembly and the interest of other entities indicates that the residency program has the potential to expand to other universities with RTR serving as a resource.

The budget is described in detail over several pages (e168-189). The budget is reasonable. The non-federal funds for each year of the grant are specified on e189-190.

The project has the potential to continue past the grant funding period due to the collaboration with the school districts and the university in supporting the training of each group of teachers. The VCU School of Education will offer a cohort rate for RTR residents (e190) per the Daire letter of support (e142-143), which indicates the commitment of the VCU School of Education to provide services to participants at a decreased cost. Additionally, the school districts are funding the cost of the CRC stipends, NTC training and mentor forums, and career coaches (e40). Henrico County Public Schools and Chesterfield County Public Schools will also be providing the \$18K resident stipend for each of their residents as stated in the letters of support from Kamras, Newsome, Kinlaw, and Lane (e190). This level of monetary support indicates the commitment of the university and their partner school districts to the sustainability of the project after the grant funding period ends.

Results of the project will be shared at state and national conferences as well as in research and practitioner journals (e46). The project design includes strategies that other entities can use to implement this model within their unique settings (e47), and the university is willing to serve a resource for other entities interested in replicating the program (e43). Therefore, the project has the potential to be disseminated to several universities within the state of Virginia or other states.

Weaknesses:

The projected cost per participant is not included. This information needs to be presented clearly to support the consideration of if the resources requested are reasonable in regards to possible outcomes.

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 project goals, workplan, objectives, and outcomes are clearly stated and are measurable. Table 6 (e47-49) provides detailed milestones, a timeline, the persons responsible for activities, as well as data collection sources for preservice teachers, inservice teachers, and students. The data collection sources include coaching participation log, classroom videos, interviews/focus groups, surveys, math and science content knowledge and pedagogical concept inventories, resident-mentor dyad weekly logs, classroom assessments, state assessments, and retention data.

The budget for the project costs is reasonable.

Key personnel are qualified to manage the project. Many of the personnel involved have managed grants in the past and are currently managing other grants (e51-52, e74-129). Human resources directors from the schools are included in the management plan, which has the potential to increase the attainment of the hiring and retention goals of the project.

The leadership team will meet monthly to monitor the progress of the project. The team will review ongoing formative assessment and evaluation data to determine needed revisions to program components. An advisory board consisting of

the RTR director, the SEED director for each public-school partner, VCU representative, and liaisons for each partner school district will be created to discuss the data and possible changes to the program (e50-51). Including the public-school personnel in the advisory board has the potential to provide valuable feedback from the viewpoint of the onsite personnel.

Weaknesses:

The role of the SEED director for each public-school partner is not clear. Also, it is not clear who will serve as a SEED director for each public-school partner and whether the SEED director for each public-school partner will be from RTR or the school district. There is no mention of a SEED director for each public-school partner except in the feedback section (e51). The proposal would be stronger if the role of these positions was fully described.

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 evaluation will be conducted by the Metropolitan Educational Research Consortium (MERC), an independent research center based within the VCU School of Education (e52). MERC seems qualified to evaluate the project since it has experience with conducting evaluations and applied research with school districts, other universities, nonprofits, and state agencies (e52).

The evaluation will include a mixed method design that includes a quasi-experimental study with a matched sample of teachers (e53-54). The research questions are stated (e53-54), and the evaluation will follow WWC guidelines (e54). Data sources are clearly outlined in Table 8 (e59-61) and include sources that are valid and reliable.

The evaluation includes surveys and focus group meeting of the public-school students, which has the potential to increase the effectiveness of the program over time (e62).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are noted.

Reader's Score: 20

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:

STEM work at VCU has been recognized at the national level, and the organization has disseminated this work locally, regionally, and nationally (e46). The project will include one-week summer institutes in mathematics and science strengthen the STEM content knowledge and pedagogical skills of elementary and special education teachers in high-needs schools (e19). The emphasis on math and science content and pedagogy throughout the professional development, coursework, and coaching will improve student achievement in STEM related courses.

The provisionally licensed STEM teachers will have the opportunity to be fully licensed (e32, e44), leading to the potential to develop more STEM educators to meet the needs of local school partners.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/02/2018 03:29 PM

Status: Submitted

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

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Virginia Commonwealth University (U423A180105)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	35	34
Significance		
1. Significance	20	19
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	25	24
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Sub Total	100	97
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Promoting STEM Education/Computer Science		
1. CPP1	3	3
Sub Total	3	3
Total	103	100

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Virginia Commonwealth University (U423A180105)

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 proposal addresses a plan to recruit 190 new teachers (K-12) in partner districts with demonstrated needs for science instruction. The applicant will partner with local high needs districts as well as specific schools in surrounding communities. The plan will strengthen the teaching of math and science for 360 elementary and special education teachers. The plan described how grade bands will provide the specific focus targeted at different age ranges. The project will support 360 teacher in 3 years and over 600 in 5 years. The proposal addresses shortage area of teachers in high needs schools along with professional development for deeper knowledge of the content.

The expand teacher residency model cites research, and builds upon 8 years of teacher residency and best practices of the National Center for Teacher Residency and New Teacher Center.

The selection into the program is outlined and includes GPA, a written application, and demonstration of lesson with district personnel included as part of the process. This rigorous selection process was noted as a strength of the application.

The plan describes a new model of induction for preservice educators. Participants are able to obtain a masters and co-teach for a year with master NTC trained mentor teachers. The participants will continue to receive support during the first two years of teaching, which is the most critical years for building success and retention. Additionally, those with a provisional license can take the five required courses and participate in test taking workshops for required state licensure tests. The provisionally licensed will be provided a career coach with one hour a week of support.

Data of the school demographics (e23) illustrates the need for teacher training particularly in Richmond and Petersburg. Letters of support including state and federal organizations are included. Stipends of provided by districts, speaking to the potential for sustainability of the project. =

Weaknesses:

The grade level bands described were not clear and seemed to contain conflicting numbers throughout the proposal (e31). This needs to be addressed so that the proposal is coherent in the presentation of the program structure.

Reader's Score: 34

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 teacher residency builds off 8 years of prior experience and is recognized as a long-term strategy for teacher training and support.

The project has funding and support from the VA General Assembly.

The grant will help to evaluate and align the model to WWC efforts for a valid and reliable plan. The proposal articulates that evidence of success from this program can serve as a resource to others with similar cohort efforts across the nation. The plan will prepare, train and support 190 residents (teachers) over 3 years and 338 over 5 years.

The proposal demonstrates involvement and commitment of district partners including funding, career coaches, and stipends for residents of \$18,000 per year. This commitment provides sustainability and replication potential beyond the grant period.

The dissemination efforts include hosting a statewide residency, presentations at national and local conferences such as NSTA and NCTM, and publications in journals. The dissemination plan was noted as a strength.

Weaknesses:

The cost per participant not clear (pg. 5), and warranted additional details to be able to support the justification that the costs are reasonable to the proposed outcomes.

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 project goals, objectives, milestones, timeline, and person(s) responsible are outlined on the chart on page e47. Project outcomes and data collection such as surveys, focus groups, student performance on reading, math, and science are described.

The feedback processes for sharing information are articulated, and demonstrate a continuous feedback cycle. A week-long assessment by the teacher preparation team will review course syllabi, review coaching sessions, interview stakeholders, hold stakeholder meetings once a year to review data, and seek suggestions. The current model has been revised to support the residents such as a summer teaching academy, and ongoing interaction with districts prior to placement to better prepare residents for transition to teaching.

The key personnel are well qualified with experience and prior roles that directly align to the work of the project. An advisory board will be formed and lists liaisons with each partner district, which was noted as a strength.

Weaknesses:

The specific targets of performance would have added depth and would quantify targets. This specificity would not only strengthen the proposal, but it would clarify the link between evaluation and outcomes.

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:

A strong independent research evaluation team is described. The team clearly has experience, and credentials for evaluating this project. The evaluators have the technical resources and infrastructure to conduct evaluation with fidelity. MERC personnel are experienced and knowledgeable with prior evaluation of similar federal grants.

The evaluation is a quasi-experimental design with a mixed method of qualitative and quantitative data sources. The

evaluation will follow a cohort of new teachers for 3 years and will compare the data with a matched sample of teachers who did not participate. The plan articulated four evaluation questions to guide the evaluation (e53). Formative and summative approaches are utilized and include content assessments, surveys, interviews, teacher gain in knowledge each year, trends in math and science achievement, and interviews with students (e35). A comparison model with power analysis of factors is a strong approach in the evaluation (e55).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

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 specific focus on STEM with ongoing support for new and in-service teachers will aid in retention and improve student achievement. The focus upon knowledge and practice is a strength of the proposal.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 3

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