

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/07/2018 11:59 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: AZ Board of Regents on behalf of Arizona State University (U336S180020)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Services		
1. Project Services	15	14
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	40	39
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	25	25
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	19
Sub Total	100	97
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Promoting STEM ED w/a focus on Computer Science		
1. CPP 1	3	3
Promoting Effective Instr. in Classrooms & Schools		
1. CPP 2	3	2
Novice Applicant		
1. CPP 3	2	0
Sub Total	8	5
Total	108	102

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Teacher Quality Partnership - 1: 84.336S

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: AZ Board of Regents on behalf of Arizona State University (U336S180020)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services

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

(i) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services.

(ii) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project reflect up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.

(iii) The extent to which the training or professional development services to be provided by the proposed project are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services.

Strengths:

i. Arizona State University is building on strong existing partnerships with 17 high-need LEAs. Existing partnerships will be heightened in areas of recruitment (Educators Rising and Future Teachers of America) and enhanced clinical experiences. Additional partners include the Arizona Department of Education (certification, standards, and assessment), and community colleges through outreach programs (e27-28; 30). Previous funded opportunities (Noyce, TQP) have been obtained by the partnership (e33).

Changes determined as necessary to the existing program have been discussed with partners from 20 school districts in monthly meetings. Six of these partners have committed (Letters of Support) to piloting various parts of the project, if funded (e54). Collaboration is also shown through the assessment of needs using discussions of stakeholders during a conference, quarterly governance meetings, and monthly superintendent meetings (e31; e83-e85).

ii. A review of literature was conducted and effectively used to inform partners of research-based practices of promise. For instance, a change to a team-based approach of preparing educators is not being utilized and is supported by research by such noted experts as Darling-Hammond and Luczak (e36).

iii. The applicant proposes to build on a successful iTeachAZ model with key components of integrating theory and practice, co-teaching, on-site supervision, student achievement, and building partnerships. This program and the year-long, integrated internship have paved the way to strong partnerships with the schools involved with this proposal (e37).

Candidates are currently required to be involved in clinical experiences while taking methods coursework. These experiences have candidates working with children of diverse needs and background (e-41).

A two-year induction for new teachers and professional development activities for in-service teachers using the specialization modules enhance knowledge and skills in specialized areas proposal (e41-e42).

Each of the above activities are of sufficient length, quality and intensity to bring about improvement in practice that is the overarching outcome of this proposal.

Weaknesses:

- i. Input into the Needs Assessment appears to be limited to superintendents, MLFTC faculty and staff, principals, and HR directors. It appears that input from mentors and candidates was lacking in the preparation of the needs assessment (e83).
- ii. No weaknesses noted.
- iii. No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 14

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the extent to which the proposed project consists of a comprehensive plan that includes a description of:

(i) The extent to which the proposed project demonstrates a rationale (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).

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

(iii) The extent to which the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance.

(iv) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for this competition.

Strengths:

i. A rationale has been provided and is supported by changes identified as needed in the iTeachAZ model which is a research-based model. The needs assessment with feedback from partners, and program evaluation are provided. Components of the program appear to have been well-reviewed with changes based upon the supports listed (e43-e46; e55-e58).

ii. Table 2/3 clearly specifies measureable goals, objectives, outcomes and annual measures of the proposals (e58; e60-e61). The specificity of the objectives and measurements should allow complete implementation and appropriate evaluation. For example, Goal 2.1 states that the applicant will improve curriculum alignment with diverse educational settings and the applicant will measure that alignment with a rubric. The project, encompassing alignment, recruitment, and curriculum renewal and retention elements, is very doable in a five-year timeline. Modules can be utilized long after Federal funding has ceased.

A Logic Model exists that outlines the inputs, outputs, and short-, long-, and midterm outcomes of the project (e94). Outcomes are specific and measureable. Also provided are reasonable assumptions and external factors that may affect the project. For example, professional learning opportunities, especially in STEM, CS, special education, ELL and literacy will be provided with a mid-term result of obtaining a micro-credential in specific topics and end results of collaboration and faculty enhancement (e94).

iii. Program capacity and the ability to yield results are aided by built-in up-front costs for the development of modules, the use of research-based practice and information from a strong needs assessment, and match that covers some personnel and development costs.

iv. The use of modules for pre-service and in-service teachers is a unique and innovative way to heighten educators' knowledge and skills. The project uses a blended approach and integrated clinical experiences that combines theory and practice (e62).

Weaknesses:

- i. The needs assessment to determine focus of modules would benefit from input from principals and teachers. It is not clear where the Superintendents surveyed gleaned their information from to determine module focus (e52).
- ii. No weaknesses noted.
- iii. No weaknesses noted.
- iv. No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 39

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan**1. In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

(i) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

(ii) The potential for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing program of the agency or organization at the end of Federal funding;

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

Strengths:

i. The applicant has a long track record of innovation, successful funding, and achievement of goals established for their programs. This fact, coupled with a sound management plan will help the applicant achieve the goals of the project on time and within budget (e62-e64).

Key personnel are in place to manage the project and appear to have the appropriate credentials needed to fulfill their roles. The PI is assisted by six co-Is with responsibilities for fulfilling varying aspects of the project and a Program Manager. For instance, Maddin will oversee the workforce development components of the project (e94-e345; e63-e64). Partners from the Teachers College and the content colleges appear to be well-versed as they develop modules for inclusion in the program (e64).

A timeline of activities is provided with elements being front-loaded to help ensure sustainability. Activities within the timeline appear to be reasonable. Use of pilot modules and experiences in the first year with a small cadre of partners is a promising component as assessments can be made and changes implemented prior to full implementation in year two (e65).

ii. Aspects of the proposal will be incorporated into the existing iTeachAZ program. Federal funding will be used initially to prepare the modules, for planning the extended clinical experiences and professional development modules for mentor teachers. For these reasons, the potential to incorporate all aspects of the program and maintain the program following completion of Federal funding is present (e65-e66).

iii. Resources are appropriate to meet the goals and objectives of the project. Physical resources and facilities are available to the project team (e66-e68). Partner schools have a record of working with the applicant to ensure clinical settings are appropriate and to provide input to the lead personnel. The Teachers College appears to have a strong working relationship with the content colleges. Cost sharing is appropriate.

Weaknesses:

- i. No weaknesses noted.
- ii. No weaknesses noted.
- iii. No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers:

(i) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes.

(ii) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.

Strengths:

i. An internal evaluation will be conducted by a qualified manager. An internal data management system (Tk20) and iTeachAZ dashboard are in place. Data Days will be used for project team review (e68).

Externally, the UOEEE, with ample experience evaluating Federal programs, will administer evaluations and surveys of courses, students, and faculty to determine effectiveness. The analyzed data is used to support program accreditation (e35).

A feedback loop is in place with an annual written report being produced and distributed (e69).

The use of multiple evaluation system and central data management, and a planned feedback loop should assure that evaluation is dedicated, relevant, valid and reliable.

ii. A detailed overview of assessments for each goal was provided. The evaluation plan includes both qualitative and quantitative data. A constant comparative method will be employed (e70-e71).

Data-sharing agreements will be utilized to retrieve and disperse relevant data and analyses to the appropriate partners (e71).

Weaknesses:

- i. No weaknesses noted.
- ii. There appears to be little specific mention of assessment of the induction phase of the project (e42).

Reader's Score: 19

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Promoting STEM ED w/a focus on Computer Science

1. **Projects designed to improve student achievement or other educational outcomes in one or more of the following areas: science, technology, engineering, math, or computer science. These projects must address the following priority area:**

Increasing the number of educators adequately prepared to deliver rigorous instruction in STEM fields, including computer science, through recruitment, evidence-based (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1) professional development strategies for current STEM educators, or evidence-based retraining strategies for current educators seeking to transition from other subjects to STEM fields.

NOTE:

How does an applicant demonstrate that its proposed strategy for professional development and retention strategy for current STEM educators is evidence-based?

1. Submitting a citation of a study that is (1) focused on a STEM-focused professional development or retraining strategies, (2) relevant to the proposed project, and meets at least the design standards set forth in the "Promising Evidence" definition; OR
2. Submitting a "Logic Model" that (1) identifies the STEM professional development or retraining strategy of the project and (2) is informed by research or evaluation findings that suggest the project component is likely to improve "Relevant Outcomes."

Strengths:

The proposed project provides pre-service and in-service teachers with STEM-CS offerings and specializations that will prepare them to be more highly qualified teachers. Diversified clinical experiences will be offered earlier in pre-service education and learning will be personalized by using modules. A STEM-CS specialization will be designed and aligned to national STEM standards and Computer Science standards being developed by the Arizona Department of Education. A logic model was provided that showcase methodology for increasing the number of educators in STEM and computer science fields (e94).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority - Promoting Effective Instr. in Classrooms & Schools

1. **Projects that are designed to support the recruitment or retention of educators who are effective and increase diversity (including, but not limited to, racial and ethnic diversity).**

Strengths:

Coursework and clinical experiences will incorporate 21st Century learning skills. Instruction will be grounded in research-based ideas and delivered using blended technologies. Integrated Modules will be developed that personalize learning to enable educators to build on strengths and gain knowledge and skills in specialty areas.

Weaknesses:

Targeted recruitment and retention activities to support increases in future teaching populations of underrepresented groups is not well-defined (e29-e30). For instance, it would have been helpful for the applicant to elaborate on specific details of the recruitment of unrepresented populations rather than stating that marketing and recruitment strategies will be implemented.

Reader's Score: 2

Competitive Preference Priority - Novice Applicant

1. Projects submitted by applicants that meet the definition of novice applicant at the time they submit their application.

NOTE:

The lead applicant must meet all three requirements to earn CPP 3 points:

1. Has never received a grant or sub-grant under the TQP program; and
2. Has never been a member of a group application (i.e. in a TQP eligible partnership); and
3. Has not had an active discretionary grant from the Federal Government in the five years before the deadline date for applications under the program.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not meet all requirements to receive points.

Reader's Score: **0**

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/07/2018 11:59 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/06/2018 02:48 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: AZ Board of Regents on behalf of Arizona State University (U336S180020)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Services		
1. Project Services	15	14
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	40	40
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	25	25
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Sub Total	100	99
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Promoting STEM ED w/a focus on Computer Science		
1. CPP 1	3	3
Promoting Effective Instr. in Classrooms & Schools		
1. CPP 2	3	2
Novice Applicant		
1. CPP 3	2	0
Sub Total	8	5
Total	108	104

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Teacher Quality Partnership - 1: 84.336S

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: AZ Board of Regents on behalf of Arizona State University (U336S180020)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services

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

(i) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services.

(ii) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project reflect up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.

(iii) The extent to which the training or professional development services to be provided by the proposed project are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services.

Strengths:

i. The applicant offers a compelling plan for working collaboratively with partners to make sure the work funded under this grant will promote effective instruction (e30). Specifically, this project – project REW – will partner with 18 school districts, which include 65 high-need schools as part of the partnership (e31). In addition, the applicant makes clear that these collaborative relationships have been in place for some time, which should allow for improved communications and coordination of efforts between all the partners involved (e30-e35).

ii. The applicant outlines a strong evidence base that speaks to the need for revising how we approach teacher preparation (e.g., e35-e36; Ingersoll & May, 2012). Additionally, the applicant offers Barrett & Arnett's 2018 study as evidence in support of their team-based approach to project REW (e36).

iii. The quality of the applicant's plan is demonstrated via prior success in graduating well-prepared teachers (e23), and the components that have been key features up to this point will continue to be used in project REW. For example, a close relationship with prospective teachers and their mentors (e37) with added support from university faculty who work together closely during a year-long clinical residency. Additionally, aspiring teachers receive targeted feedback based on a research-based rubric.

Weaknesses:

i. The project partnership appears to draw very heavily on superintendent input; it would have been beneficial for the district needs to be articulated from a broader group of stakeholders (e83-85).

ii. No weaknesses noted.

iii. No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 14

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the extent to which the proposed project consists of a comprehensive plan that includes a description of:

(i) The extent to which the proposed project demonstrates a rationale (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).

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

(iii) The extent to which the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance.

(iv) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for this competition.

Strengths:

i. The applicant's project design is built around a thoughtful "needs assessment" conducted with the project partners, and grounded in current evidence (e52, e53, e55 and Appendix G). For example, the project team asked superintendents which topics for professional learning might be important to include in project REW. One design element involves offering earlier clinical experiences, so that aspiring teachers have opportunities to reflect on linkages between theory and practice earlier in their training.

ii. The project plan includes efforts to track and report on all measures required by the competition (e.g., GPRA measures, e58 and Table 3 e60 and e61). Multiple measures are offered for each of the project's three main goals.

iii. The project team asserts that the comprehensive and exceptional program they plan to offer via project REW will be attractive enough to draw sufficient numbers of students to enroll. Although this position might seem overly optimistic, the application makes a strong case for the project team being highly sensitive to their regional clientele (districts, schools, and prospective teachers).

iv. Project REW offers a strong plan for how they seek to incorporate multiple exceptional features into the program offered to their students: competency-based, clinically-rich, use of learning modules, and a focus on personalization and specializations (e62).

Weaknesses:

i. No weaknesses noted.

ii. No weaknesses noted.

iii. No weaknesses noted.

iv. No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 40

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

(i) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

(ii) The potential for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing program of the agency or organization at the end of Federal funding;

(iii) The adequacy of support, including facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources, from the

applicant organization or the lead applicant organization.

Strengths:

- i. The applicant has been recognized as an innovative university (e62) and the university has experience managing projects that are similar to the one outlined in the proposal. There is a comprehensive plan in the application, with clear division of responsibilities for the key team members (e63-e64), and a timeline of major activities for each year (e65).
- ii. Project REW will be fully integrated into the teacher preparation program at the college (e64-e65). Over time, the curriculum and practices developed and implemented under this grant will replace the current curriculum and practice. This will allow the applicant to maintain the project developments beyond the funding cycle.
- iii. The application is submitted by a top-tier research university, with strong supports for facilities, equipment, and supplies needed to conduct this work (e.g., meeting spaces, lab spaces, software licenses, trained personnel).

Weaknesses:

- i. No weaknesses noted.
- ii. No weaknesses noted.
- iii. No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers:

- (i) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes.**
- (ii) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.**

Strengths:

- i. The applicant outlines an evaluation plan that includes both internal and external evaluators working to determine how well the project's objectives are being met. There is a plan for formative, as well as summative, evaluation efforts (e69). The formative evaluation findings will be used to inform any necessary revisions to the work. That is, the project partners will continuously explore the program's progress and challenges and use this information to revise the work plan as needed.
- ii. The evaluation plan addresses each of the project's primary goals (e70-e71). Multiple data sources will be used, including: evaluation of the curriculum, self-efficacy questionnaires, participant interviews, focus groups, and collection of satisfaction feedback data from district partners (e70-e71).

Weaknesses:

- i. No weaknesses noted.
- ii. No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Promoting STEM ED w/a focus on Computer Science

1. **Projects designed to improve student achievement or other educational outcomes in one or more of the following areas: science, technology, engineering, math, or computer science. These projects must address the following priority area:**

Increasing the number of educators adequately prepared to deliver rigorous instruction in STEM fields, including computer science, through recruitment, evidence-based (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1) professional development strategies for current STEM educators, or evidence-based retraining strategies for current educators seeking to transition from other subjects to STEM fields.

NOTE:

How does an applicant demonstrate that its proposed strategy for professional development and retention strategy for current STEM educators is evidence-based?

1. Submitting a citation of a study that is (1) focused on a STEM-focused professional development or retraining strategies, (2) relevant to the proposed project, and meets at least the design standards set forth in the "Promising Evidence" definition; OR

2. Submitting a "Logic Model" that (1) identifies the STEM professional development or retraining strategy of the project and (2) is informed by research or evaluation findings that suggest the project component is likely to improve "Relevant Outcomes."

Strengths:

The applicant presents a plan to increase opportunities for aspiring teachers to deepen their content knowledge of computer science. Additionally, the project will include opportunities for educators to earn micro-credentials in computer science (e24, e26-27).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority - Promoting Effective Instr. in Classrooms & Schools

1. **Projects that are designed to support the recruitment or retention of educators who are effective and increase diversity (including, but not limited to, racial and ethnic diversity).**

Strengths:

The applicant offers a strong plan for improving aspiring teachers' training opportunities, with a focus on recruiting students from diverse backgrounds (e.g., e29) as well as training in diverse settings (e.g., digital learning spaces and blended classrooms; e28).

Weaknesses:

The applicant states that the university has existing efforts to support diversity in the educator workforce and offers a plan for increasing diversity in their recruitment. This plan, however, does not offer sufficient detail for how the project team will actually increase diversity.

Reader's Score: 2

Competitive Preference Priority - Novice Applicant

1. Projects submitted by applicants that meet the definition of novice applicant at the time they submit their application.

NOTE:

The lead applicant must meet all three requirements to earn CPP 3 points:

1. Has never received a grant or sub-grant under the TQP program; and
2. Has never been a member of a group application (i.e. in a TQP eligible partnership); and
3. Has not had an active discretionary grant from the Federal Government in the five years before the deadline date for applications under the program.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/06/2018 02:48 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/06/2018 06:25 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: AZ Board of Regents on behalf of Arizona State University (U336S180020)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Services		
1. Project Services	15	14
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	40	40
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	25	23
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Sub Total	100	97
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Promoting STEM ED w/a focus on Computer Science		
1. CPP 1	3	3
Promoting Effective Instr. in Classrooms & Schools		
1. CPP 2	3	3
Novice Applicant		
1. CPP 3	2	0
Sub Total	8	6
Total	108	103

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Teacher Quality Partnership - 1: 84.336S

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: AZ Board of Regents on behalf of Arizona State University (U336S180020)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services

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

(i) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services.

(ii) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project reflect up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.

(iii) The extent to which the training or professional development services to be provided by the proposed project are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services.

Strengths:

(i) The applicant provides a comprehensive list of partners who will collaborate in order to effectively meet the objective and outcomes of the proposed project. Some of these include internal university and external university partners such as: university federally funded grants for literacy (Teacher Quality Partnership -TQP) and a Noyce grant (National Science Foundation – NSF) for increasing the number of STEM teachers in high needs middle schools. Other internal partnerships include multiple existing programs and departments who will coordinate their efforts. External resources include advocacy groups, 18 partner LEAs, the county superintendent of schools, the state Department of Education (e 30-35).

(ii) The proposal justifies a well - documented list of research regarding successful teaching practices and learning. Some of these include: reasons why teachers leave their jobs, school staffing, creating a job pipeline for teachers, and re-designing teacher preparation programs (e 35-36).

(iii) The proposed project seeks to enhance the already existing one-year iTeachAZ clinical teacher program through the ability to individualize specific programs through the incorporation newly developed program modules tailored to clinical teacher needs. These can be taken at times best suited to each teacher, as well as choices of subject matter modules best suited to each upcoming teacher requirements. Coteaching, reflection, data-driven decision making are some of the trainings the clinical teacher will experience (e37-43).

Weaknesses:

(i) The needs assessment is heavily weighted towards administration and university faculty – and lacks teacher input. The plan would have benefitted from more direct input from mentors, and teachers already in the classroom (e83).

(ii) No weaknesses noted

(iii) No weaknesses noted

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the extent to which the proposed project consists of a comprehensive plan that includes a description of:

(i) The extent to which the proposed project demonstrates a rationale (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).

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

(iii) The extent to which the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance.

(iv) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for this competition.

Strengths:

(i) The applicant bases the proposal on comprehensive information from a needs assessment and logic model. Goals to be met include increased diversity among STEM and Computer Science teacher graduates; increased teacher preparation for working in traditional and non-traditional settings, and improvement in hiring and retention rates in partner schools (e18, 83-85, 94).

(ii) The proposal includes a table which appropriately lists the goals, objectives and measures. Each goal is subdivided into objectives. The objectives list the activities necessary to attain the desired outcome(s), when it occurs, who is responsible, and the benchmarks/milestones. For example, Goal 1 is recruitment of teacher candidates from under-represented populations, and curriculum shortage areas. One of these objectives in Goal 1 is to increase by 7% the number of highly qualified teachers credentialed to teach in fields with existing teacher shortages (such as STEM, Special Education, Agriculture, and computers). Activities, timeline, responsibilities, and milestones/benchmarks then match up to that particular objective. (e61-62, 152-153).

(iii) The project provides a unique way for the program to extend beyond the period of the grant because the applicants purposely designed most of the costs to be start-up – revised clinical experiences and coursework. Further expenses could be covered through tuition of fees for in-service teachers to complete individual modules. Through the ability to individualize student programs, it is believed that this will increase undergraduate enrollment in the teacher education programs (e59).

(iv) The applicant provides an exceptional approach to this competition through the use of innovative learning modules which can be individualized to each particular student's choice of specialization or location (e62).

Weaknesses:

(i) No weaknesses noted

(ii) No weaknesses noted

(iii) No weaknesses noted

(iv) No weaknesses noted

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

(i) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

(ii) The potential for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing program of the agency or organization at the end of Federal funding;

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

Strengths:

(i) The application provides information that the management plan does show clearly defined timelines, (e65) responsibilities and assignments in order to attain the projected outcomes. (e63-64)

(ii) The applicant describes the key personnel as well qualified and in possession of extensive grant experience. The leadership team will take charge of specific goals based on their particular expertise. The Principal Investigator will be responsible for goals two and three and (partnerships and induction), one Co-Principal Investigator will lead goal 1 (recruitment), and the additional co-Principal Investigator will chair the 4th goal (literacy) (e64-69)

(iii) The applicant provides convincing evidence that the new program will eventually replace the iTeachAZ education program, and LEAS have indicated that some of their schools will pilot the new program. Because most of the development of the new program will be based on Federal funding, state and local funding will be able to sustain the project after the grant period ends (e64-65).

(iv) The university has an extensive list of resources available to project participants. Some examples of these resources include meeting spaces, laboratories, libraries, and access to computers. Other resources include digital software licenses, video conferencing, and professional recording equipment (e65-67).

Weaknesses:

(i) The applicant requested a waiver of some matching funds – there did not appear to be clear evidence to show how the program will be changed if the waiver is not granted (e93).

(i) No weaknesses noted

(ii) No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 23

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers:

(i) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes.

(ii) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.

Strengths:

(i) The application provides clear evidence that both internal and external evaluations will be conducted. The internal evaluator will conduct assessment of whether goals, outcomes, and measures have been reached. Additionally,

there is already in place a monitoring system for the existing teacher preparation program, and the university iTeachAZ data dashboard. The “external” evaluation will be conducted by the University Office of Evaluation and Educational Effectiveness (UOEEE). Although housed at the university, the UOEEE has extensive experience in evaluating national education grants. They will monitor both qualitative and quantitative data. Results from the annual evaluations will be used to make any necessary modifications to the program (e68-69).

(ii) Evaluation methods were appropriately tailored and focused to each specific goal in the project. Both qualitative and quantitative data will be used to assess whether goals have been met. Some of the methods include the edTPA to measure teacher candidate performance, surveys with teacher candidates about their opinions regarding teaching in high needs schools, teacher reviews based on Danielson Observation Tool, and numbers of diverse candidates who actually enter the program (e70-71).

Weaknesses:

(i) No weaknesses noted

(ii) No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 20

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Promoting STEM ED w/a focus on Computer Science

1. Projects designed to improve student achievement or other educational outcomes in one or more of the following areas: science, technology, engineering, math, or computer science. These projects must address the following priority area:

Increasing the number of educators adequately prepared to deliver rigorous instruction in STEM fields, including computer science, through recruitment, evidence-based (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1) professional development strategies for current STEM educators, or evidence-based retraining strategies for current educators seeking to transition from other subjects to STEM fields.

NOTE:

How does an applicant demonstrate that its proposed strategy for professional development and retention strategy for current STEM educators is evidence-based?

1. Submitting a citation of a study that is (1) focused on a STEM-focused professional development or retraining strategies, (2) relevant to the proposed project, and meets at least the design standards set forth in the “Promising Evidence” definition; OR

2. Submitting a “Logic Model” that (1) identifies the STEM professional development or retraining strategy of the project and (2) is informed by research or evaluation findings that suggest the project component is likely to improve “Relevant Outcomes.”

Strengths:

The applicant has explicitly shown that computer use is a daily necessity (Google and Gallup 2015) - and the project intends to add a Computer Science specialization in order to address the lack of and need for computer science education. (e26) The university plays a leading role in attempting to bring computer science education all K-12 students in the state. The proposal offers a reimagination of how candidates in the education program can individualize their programs; teacher education majors will select from a variety of modules in order to complete their training (e35-36). University/education faculty will create modules which specifically focus on topics in Computer Science that clinical students can use for a Computer Science specialization (e26-28, 48).

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority - Promoting Effective Instr. in Classrooms & Schools

- 1. Projects that are designed to support the recruitment or retention of educators who are effective and increase diversity (including, but not limited to, racial and ethnic diversity).**

Strengths:

The project provides a thorough plan which focuses on producing effective teachers (and increase their numbers). These teachers will be able to tailor their career preparation through the use of individual modules (examples include some on literacy, competency-based learning, project-based learning in digital spaced, blended instruction and others). (e29). Efforts to increase diversity include marketing tailored to underrepresented groups, collaborating with the Arizona Teachers Academy (which will offer scholarships for a commitment to teach in high need schools), and making agreements with community colleges for offering four-year degree programs at lower tuition rates. (e29-30)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority - Novice Applicant

- 1. Projects submitted by applicants that meet the definition of novice applicant at the time they submit their application.**

NOTE:

The lead applicant must meet all three requirements to earn CPP 3 points:

- 1. Has never received a grant or sub-grant under the TQP program; and**
- 2. Has never been a member of a group application (i.e. in a TQP eligible partnership); and**
- 3. Has not had an active discretionary grant from the Federal Government in the five years before the deadline date for applications under the program.**

Strengths:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/06/2018 06:25 PM

