

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/18/2019 12:16 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Claremont Graduate University (U336S190044)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	40	40
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Resources	20	11
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	14
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	19
Sub Total	100	84
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. STEM/Computer Science	5	0
Sub Total	5	0
Invitational Priority		
Invitational Priority		
1. Promise Zones	0	0
Sub Total	0	0
Total	105	84

Technical Review Form

Panel #8 - Teacher Quality Partnership - 9: 84.336S

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Claremont Graduate University (U336S190044)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

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

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

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

(iv) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach for meeting statutory purposes and requirements.

Strengths:

- The project specifies a rationale in its logic model (e58), which adequately describes the relationships between its inputs, program components (activities and objectives), and outcomes (short-, medium-, and long-term).
- Outcomes are clearly specified with percentages and are measurable in that they consist of counts from institutional data or planned measures (e58).
- The project is designed to build capacity in that it extends from Claremont Graduate University's existing teacher education internship model (e27) and recruits CGU graduates (e52), by providing another pathway (a residency model) (e28) that places new teachers in schools with a demonstrated commitment to social justice (e29). This placement of teachers with social justice training in schools with a social justice mission is designed to yield results that extend past federal funding (e29).
- The curriculum of the proposed project is exceptional in that it is evidence-based in both teaching and content (e29-e31), and its focus on recently developed Social Justice Teaching Competencies and Dispositions (e33) during the 18-months of coursework and 10-months of teacher residency (e38).

Weaknesses:

- No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 40

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

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

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

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

Strengths:

- The applicant adequately describes the personnel and matching money that will be committed to this project from the partners (e88-e89, e55-e56).
- Each partner is relevant to the proposed project. The partners are a university with a teacher training program (Clairmont Graduate University) and a charter school network in Los Angeles (Alliance College Ready Public Schools), which are appropriate partners for a project to get more teachers competent in social justice in these schools that service low income students (e19-e21).

Weaknesses:

- The applicant did not discuss facilities, equipment, and supplies from the applicant organization or the lead applicant organization.

Reader's Score: 11

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

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

Strengths:

- Project personnel are sufficiently experienced to fulfill project tasks (e55-e56).
- The applicant details the responsibilities of personnel (briefly on e55-e56, e127-e129; and in more depth e21-e22) so the applicant makes clear who will be doing what tasks.
- The applicant plans formative evaluation (e59) and meetings that will give project leadership data to determine whether they are moving in the right direction to meet project goals on time.

Weaknesses:

- The applicant did not adequately connect project personnel responsibilities with timelines and milestones for completing project tasks or describe them in sufficient detail so we do not have a clear idea of when personnel are expected to complete tasks or what connected milestones will be.
- Milestones for fellows in the program are presented (e38-e39) while project milestones are not.

Reader's Score: 14

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

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

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

Strengths:

- Summative project data will come from reliable and valid sources such as institutional records containing teacher hiring and student achievement data (SBAC) (e60, e62).
- Formative and summative evaluation methods are appropriate to provide feedback on program implementation and determine the outcomes at the end of the program (e59). A quasi-experimental approach is appropriate to show changes in student learning that are due to the implementation of the program (e59) and the applicant intends to show appropriate care in making sure that the groups are similar at baseline (e60).
- The scope of the data collection and feasibility of the evaluator getting access to and analyzing the data is appropriate for the project goals (e61-e62).

Weaknesses:

- Since the formative survey has not yet been developed, we cannot determine the reliability and validity of the measures (e62).

Reader's Score: 19

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

Strengths:

- N/A

Weaknesses:

- N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Invitational Priority - Invitational Priority

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

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

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

Strengths:

- N/A

Weaknesses:

- N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/18/2019 12:16 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/17/2019 06:13 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Claremont Graduate University (U336S190044)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	40	37
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Resources	20	10
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	17
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Sub Total	100	84
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. STEM/Computer Science	5	0
Sub Total	5	0
Invitational Priority		
Invitational Priority		
1. Promise Zones	0	
Sub Total	0	
Total	105	84

Technical Review Form

Panel #8 - Teacher Quality Partnership - 9: 84.336S

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Claremont Graduate University (U336S190044)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

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

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

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

(iv) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach for meeting statutory purposes and requirements.

Strengths:

The project area has high LEA(s) and schools which are in desperate need of attracting and retaining quality teachers to reach their population of under-represented, low-income, minority students. Narrative states that these schools are segregated by income, racial and ethnic inequalities. Currently, teachers in that area are not adequately supported and prepared to succeed. Because of these factors, there is a high turnover of teachers at Alliance schools. (e25)

There is great evidence in this narrative that the residents in this cohort will receive exemplary support concerning instruction, pedagogy, and social justice. Through this project, residents will gain an understanding of the strengths and needs of the communities they will be serving. These measures will help to improve outcomes for these high needs students.

The project narrative provides adequate evidence that all partners are working together to solve this issue so that quality teachers can help improve student achievement for these children. Research shows that when students know their teachers understand them and their cultural background, academic scores improve. This program will provide very specific training for these residents to meet the needs of these under-represented students.

This new project is built on the successes, assets, and resources of a previous project called CGU Teacher Education Program. (e19) Because the Claremont Fellows project will be built from the strong foundation laid in the existing CGU internship program and will be using best practices from that program, there is good possibility that this project will also be successful. (e27) Key points that will be duplicated in this project include the strong relationships between faculty and the personalized and exemplary support provided to the interns.

The program is based on compelling research. (e31) It is organized around the core teaching components of critical social justice, classroom ecology, content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge and planning. Because these documents have been piloted previously with a cohort already, there is great possibility that this program will provide best practices for the residents. Fellows will emerge equipped with the skills necessary to implement effective teaching practices, continue learning while teaching, and they will be able to use all the data they receive to inform, adjust approaches and improve their efficacy over time.

A very well-designed logic model is embedded into this project. Because the work plan is so well designed, there is a high likelihood the outcomes will be successful. (e58)

The narrative provides detailed information on why this model is considered an exceptional approach. It is based on research and practice. It shows that students can succeed if the strong links between teaching, the pupil's learning, and redesigning instructional approaches to effectively plan for the special needs of this cultural group are all intertwined.

The work plan on page (e38) is well detailed. It provides the timeline, group, coursework, and the milestones. Having a clear plan is important for the overall success of the grant.

The process is data driven and will use the data to make continuous improvements, thus driving continuous improvement and build capacity beyond the funding period.

There is evidence that this project could continue beyond the funding period. The narrative shows that the project will produce a pipeline of support and effective teachers for the Alliance Schools. It will also provide a network of Fellows and professionals for ongoing professional development and scholarship opportunities. (e21)

The coursework provides key instructional components that will help introduce Fellows to important teaching ideas and practice.

There is adequate evidence that the program is grounded in practice-based teaching preparation, has rigorous curriculum, and continuous support for these teachers based on the logic model. Because this graduate coursework has both theory and practice, and also provides culturally sustainable practices there is evidence that the needs of all learners are supported. (e20)

The narrative provides evidence that the mentors are highly qualified. The specifics concerning how these mentors will be selected are located on pages (e50) and (e51). There is adequate evidence that the project has given thought to the requirements for these mentors. Research does show that mentors have a significant impact on the success rate for these teachers.

There is evidence that the clinical practicum has been well thought out. Specifics are located on page (e45). Through this program, educators will have the opportunity to learn from, with, and in practice.

The induction program is detailed in the narrative on page (e51). This program will help the Fellows to share evidence-based practices that best supports high needs students from this area.

There is thorough evidence that the program has stringent criteria in place for these candidates to enter this program. Multiple layers of criteria are listed in the narrative on page (e54).

Narrative provides adequate information on the 2-year induction program which will help to enrich these teachers and to help them improve their practice.

The narrative supplies adequate information on the one-year living wage. (e20) These extra funds will help those residents to focus on their studies and their career instead of having to go to a part-time job to make extra money to live on.

The narrative thoroughly describes the living wage and also the stipend repayment policy. (e54) This stipend will become important so that the residents don't have to get a part-time job, as well as teach and go to school.

Weaknesses:

The narrative provided a limited explanation as to how the program will be marketed to the possible residency candidates.

Reader's Score: 37

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

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

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

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

Strengths:

All letters from partners state they are invested in the goals of this project. The partners are in full support. The chart on page (e38) shows that there are in kind resources and also time allocated from various agencies and people.

Weaknesses:

The reader could not find an explanation of the facilities, equipment, or supplies that would be used.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

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

Strengths:

The narrative provides evidence of clearly defined roles for all parties and clearly delineated responsibilities. This will help so that the milestones and the goals will be accomplished on time and within budget. (e55)

The qualifications of the PI and other key personnel shows they are very qualified to administer a grant of this magnitude. Many of the key players have experience with grants.

There is evidence that this management team will use communication through various meetings throughout the year to

provide continuous improvement to the process. This will help so that the grant will be successful and will be completed within budget. (e59)

The meetings planned by this management team will be informed through data and will engage in data-driven planning to keep the project moving forward. (e59)

Weaknesses:

The narrative needed more specifics concerning the project milestones and timelines.

The workplan should be complete with a very specific timeline to show that progress is being made and that the outcomes are being achieved on time and within budget.

Reader's Score: 17

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

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

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

Strengths:

The narrative supplies evidence that there is a clear plan to share the data with key stakeholders. This is important so that programmatic changes can be discussed. (e59) By using the data they can improve the progress and effectiveness of the grant. They can also use that data to make revisions and reforms so that they can complete this project within time and budget.

The narrative supplied a chart to show the timeline of the evaluation activity on page (e62).

There is a chart that shows the project goals, activities, the evaluation methods and the sources of those methods. There is a wide variety of evaluations in the project which include both summative and formative assessments. The formative assessments will help the group to make decisions which will drive the project forward. The summative assessments will help the team to know how close they are to meeting major goals. (e60), (e61) This chart will help to keep the grant on track and the team working to make those continuous improvements.

Measurable goals are on the logic model on page (e58).

Weaknesses:

None identified

Reader's Score: 20

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

Strengths:

None

Weaknesses:

None

Reader's Score: 0

Invitational Priority - Invitational Priority

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

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

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

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/17/2019 06:13 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/17/2019 08:01 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Claremont Graduate University (U336S190044)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	40	37
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Resources	20	12
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	14
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	18
Sub Total	100	81
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. STEM/Computer Science	5	0
Sub Total	5	0
Invitational Priority		
Invitational Priority		
1. Promise Zones	0	0
Sub Total	0	0
Total	105	81

Technical Review Form

Panel #8 - Teacher Quality Partnership - 9: 84.336S

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Claremont Graduate University (U336S190044)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

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

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

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

(iv) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach for meeting statutory purposes and requirements.

Strengths:

(i) The applicant presents a clear rationale for need for permanently credentialed teachers in Alliance College Ready Public Schools Charter School Network to address challenges related to higher teacher turnover rate and demands of working with students with low socioeconomic status, primarily Latinx with many ELs (Abstract; pp. 5-7)

(ii) The applicant provides a thorough, rich description of the proposed project aligned with a logic model which clearly identifies inputs, activities, objectives and outcomes; the proposal presents six goals and also aligns these with research questions, data sources, and proposed analysis methods to inform the project design and implementation. (pp. 2-3; 10-40; 43)

(iv) The proposed project represents an exceptional approach in redesign of coursework, clinical practicum and residency model created to support focus on social justice. It includes thoughtful design of 18 months of coursework and creation of a 10 month-residency with a mentor teacher in cohort model. An imbedded year of ethnographic research will lead to MA thesis. (pp. 20-24; 27-33)

Weaknesses:

(iii) The applicant does not address how the proposed project will build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance. (no page found)

Reader's Score: 37

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

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

factors:

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

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

Strengths:

(i) The project will be supported by strong leadership of two PIs. Dr. Hatkoff has extensive knowledge of the curriculum as a faculty member and program coordinator in the teacher education program and will oversee all project activities while Dr. Ganley serves as Dean of the School of Educational Studies. (p. 37)

(ii) Alliance Charter Schools commits \$730,000 across the five years of the project to assist with funding. (Appendix I)

Weaknesses:

(i) The applicant does not discuss facilities, equipment, supplies and other resources it proposes to support the proposed project. This is of particular concern given the focus on STEM. (no page found)

Reader's Score: 12

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

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

Strengths:

There is a clear plan for the oversight and guidance of progression of the course sequence for graduate students as well as the evaluation components proposed.

The applicant clearly identifies personnel, roles and responsibilities of each and compensation or FTE for each.

Milestones are clearly identified by academic term for coursework, clinical practica, and residency expectations to guide implementation of the proposed coursework, field experiences and residency components of the proposed project. (pp. 37-38)

Weaknesses:

No organizational chart or description is provided to describe the proposed management or communication/coordination structures.

There is no clear management plan detailing how the two PIs would interface with faculty, mentor teachers, and charter

school leadership to facilitate the project.

Reader's Score: 14

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

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

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

Strengths:

(i) The applicant proposes to partner with Dr. Zhang as the external evaluator to design, implement and analyze survey data. A quasi-experimental approach is proposed to assess impact on student learning. The applicant proposes to survey program participants and project stakeholders for formative evaluation data. The applicant proposes creation of a comparison group of teachers hired during the same time period at Alliance Schools to compare to the project group of Claremont Fellows (n=30) beginning in year three to research student achievement data, and teaching effectiveness. Data sources will include survey results, self-assessment logs, frequency counts, t-tests, and regression analyses. The methods of evaluation are clearly presented in a t table on pages 43-44 to demonstrate progression from collection of baseline data to end of project for each evaluation question which will determine the methods. (pp. 41-44)

(ii) There is a detailed description of evaluation which will include both formative and summative approaches; The applicant will convene data meetings twice a year in years 3-5 to support formative evaluation; It proposes use of a participant vs. non-participant comparison group to examine project outcomes for teachers and students. Finally, there is a clear description of evaluation activities and timeline by year. Even though the applicant plans to use an external evaluator, it has provided a rich description of data sources and proposed methods of analyses for each evaluation question, along with a table listing evaluation activities which will occur in each year of funding. (pp. 41-44)

Weaknesses:

(i) Validity and reliability of data cannot be determined as measures have not yet been identified. (pp. 41-44)

Reader's Score: 18

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

Strengths:

not applicable

Weaknesses:

not applicable

Reader's Score: 0

Invitational Priority - Invitational Priority

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

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

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

Strengths:

not applicable

Weaknesses:

not applicable

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/17/2019 08:01 PM