

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/17/2019 09:45 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Research Foundation of CUNY on behalf of Lehman College (U336S190048)

**Reader #1:** \*\*\*\*\*

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

# Technical Review Form

Panel #6 - Teacher Quality Partnership - 7: 84.336S

Reader #1: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: Research Foundation of CUNY on behalf of Lehman College (U336S190048)

## 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 successfully demonstrated that the proposed project rationale is aligned with evidence-based research and cited several sources. For example, the applicant indicated that the proposed project is aligned with the evidenced-based research of the Danielson framework. The framework and research on the Danielson teacher residency model have been deemed strong for the positive outcomes in implementing the teacher residency co-teaching model. The inquiry-based learning model also emphasizes the critical need for effective professional development, which is included in the project design. The applicant indicated that professional development will be grounded in several guiding principles: duration, collaboration, and inquiry to ensure that the program supports and sustains professional learning communities for graduates of the program, including both novice and second stage (Year 3-10). (pgs. e19-23)

(ii) The applicant provided clearly defined goals, objectives and performance outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project and they include reasonable performance measures. For example, the applicant indicated that the project will prepare 100 fully credentialed teachers and over 70% will remain in high need schools for a minimum of three years. An associated objective is aligned with each goal. For example, to achieve the goal of preparing 100 teachers, the applicant will collaborate closely with partners, including Teacher Opportunity Corps and NYC Men Teach, to recruit and incentivize undergraduates from diverse backgrounds to consider teaching as a career, and the measurable outcome is that in each of Years 2-5, the project will recruit a cohort of 25 Bronx-residents from under-represented groups to teach math and science in high-need P-12 classrooms and 92% of the participating students from the previous grant reporting period will persist in the program (or complete) in the next grant period. (pgs. e20-22)

(iii) The applicant successfully demonstrated that the proposed project design has the potential to build capacity and maintain the project beyond the period of Federal financial assistance. For example, the applicant will partner with schools in the geographical area of interest and recruit teachers from the same Bronx neighborhoods. The model will likely build interest and commitment from the community to support the schools and recruit candidates. Other sustainable program components include the engaging pre-service teachers in observation and participating in effective instruction at the host-school sites. In addition, the host schools will receive research-based professional development prior to receiving pre-service teachers to increase capacity for demonstrating high-quality instruction. Each cohort of 25 pre-service teachers will be assigned in learning teams of at least five (5) pre-service teachers for each host school site to leverage the

capacity-building for high quality mentoring and preparation and learning how to utilize the co-teaching model. The model's strength is the small learning team approach, which means teams will have a built-in support system as they complete their program, as well as opportunities to contribute and interact with others in the class and sharing ideas from their experiences. (pgs. e23-25)

(iv) The applicant provided an exceptional and unique approach for meeting the statutory purposes and requirements for the program. For example, the project will engage participants in a full year residency in a high need school simultaneously while candidates are completing a graduate course of study. The cohorts will work as co-teachers in high-need partner schools and complete a master's program in bilingual early childhood, bilingual childhood, secondary mathematics, or secondary science; qualify for a NYSED teaching certificate; and earn a computer science micro-credential by the end of the summer following the residency. The approach to teacher residency training is effective because residents are matched with an experienced teacher with the skills and knowledge for mentoring residents based on their content area and grade level. Residents receive formal and informal feedback from their mentor teachers, residency program staff, university faculty and other support staff. In addition, mentor teachers and building administrators in partner schools will receive a minimum of 50 clock hours of intensive training that aligns with project goals and NYCDOE Connected Practices in Supporting Students with Disabilities and Engaging in Culturally Sustaining Practices. (pgs. e 22-24)

**Weaknesses:**

- (i) No weaknesses noted.
- (ii) No weaknesses noted.
- (iii) No weaknesses noted.
- (iv) No weaknesses noted.

**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:**

(i) The applicant clearly demonstrated that the proposed project will have the necessary support and resources to effectively implement the project. The university has committed to providing facilities, offices, equipment and other resources for the program. For example, the TQP program will be located in the Center for School/College Collaboratives, which also houses other teacher education programs and support services. The TQP project director will have an office in the Center complex, and project support staff will be located there as well. The Principal Investigator has an office on the floor below the Center. The College provides phone service, Internet connections, and e-mail service as well as staff computers. The academic computer center has over 225 computers in 8 classrooms and at least 100 computers are contained in an open area available to students. The Education Room contains K-12 curriculum materials and the ERIC

microfiche collection for student use. During the summer the space is used to host elementary school children for week-long summer mathematics camps. In addition, the lab will be used for professional development activities. The resources provided by the university will provide supplemental and in-kind support that will not be provided through grant funds. The support ensures the project will have the resources needed for successful program implementation. (pgs. e 34-39)

(ii) The applicant effectively demonstrated partner commitment for the proposed project to ensure the program is successful. Letters of support are provided in the Appendix. For example, the Bronx Institute and Center for School and College Collaboratives will offer STEM-oriented college access programs and professional development for resident and teachers. The applicant has long-standing collaborations with the Bronx Zoo, the Botanical Gardens and the American Museum of Natural History and they will provide candidates with rich experiences that help them to capitalize on community assets. Metis will collaborate and engage in evaluation activities including surveys and interviews/focus groups, as well as documentation review and tracking of participation in the program. The partnering schools will identify at least five mentor teachers and willing to participate in at least 50 clock hours of professional development during the summer that will focus on: co-teaching; standards-based instruction; formative assessment, and STEM pedagogical content knowledge and serve as host teachers for pre-service candidates who will complete a full year residency in their classrooms. The applicant will also partner with community organizations such as, Mouse.Org and they commits to partnering with Lehman College to leverage existing computer science content and digital badging infrastructure on the Mouse Create online platform to deliver up to 50 hours of blended professional learning for pre-service teachers in the LUTE-STEM residency cohort during each year of the grant. The partner support for the project indicated a clear strategic vision for the goals of the program and how they can offer opportunities to advance the goals of the program. (pgs. e35-38)

**Weaknesses:**

- (i) No weaknesses noted.
- (ii) No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 20**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan**

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

**(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:**

(i) The applicant provided a detailed management plan demonstrating how the program will meet the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget. The management plan included clearly defined lines of responsibility, a reasonable timeline and milestones for accomplishing project tasks. For example, in the Fall of 2019 the applicant will begin the search process to hire key staff members. Also, during this timeframe that program will identify host school site project liaisons and meet with the Advisory Panel members to start the planning process for the project. The applicant indicated the process will start to identify candidates and the milestone is when they have at least 50 possible applicants. The management plan provided a clear scope of the project with aligned deliverables, such as tasks and activities that clearly demonstrated how the applicant will monitor the implementation of the project. The applicant clearly aligned the management plan with processes, procedures and tasks that were discussed in the narrative. (pgs. e39-47)

**Weaknesses:**

(i) No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 20**

**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 reasonably provided evidence that the project will undertake an evaluation by external evaluators. The applicant has aligned the proposed evaluation with methods of evaluation that will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes. For example, the evaluation design includes implementation and outcome components. The implementation of evaluation activities will track the extent to which grant activities are being carried out as planned and provide formative data to inform project management about the quality of implementation, identify problems needing immediate attention, and generate recommendations for improvement. (pgs. e51-60)

(ii) The applicant provided an appropriate evaluation plan that explains how the methods of evaluation are appropriate to measure the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the project. The applicant will engage in an outcomes evaluation to measure how activities and program components have met desired outcomes, addressed performance objectives and GPRA measures, and the academic performance of the students in the classroom. The applicant presented clearly, via a table, the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the project, along with the data sources that will be used to evaluate progress made toward meeting these outcomes. For example, the applicant indicated that over the course of the program, LUTE-STEM will prepare four cohorts of diverse pre-service teachers through a rigorous program of study with specialized content and pedagogical knowledge in STEM areas, leading to the Computer Science micro-credential at Lehman College. The proposed outcome is that least 92% of students in each of the four cohorts will earn a Master's Degree. (pgs. e51-60)

**Weaknesses:**

(i) No weaknesses noted.

(ii) No weaknesses noted.

**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:**

The applicant effectively demonstrated that the proposed project will offer opportunities for participants to incorporate computer science offerings into their classrooms, schools, and after-school programs and meet NYSDOE Computer Science and program completers will earn the advanced certificate in computer science within three years of program completion. The STEM Science, Mathematics, and Technology labs on Lehman's campus will serve as a training hub for residents and mentor teachers. In addition, complementary resource centers will be established in each of the partner schools, making it possible for mentors and residents to conduct design-based research in their own classrooms using state-of-the-art curriculum materials and mobile technology. The STEM program component will provide an avenue for under-represented groups to teach math and science in high-need P-12 schools in the targeted area. (pgs. e60-65)

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:** 5

**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:**

The applicant did not address the Invitational Priority.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant did not address the Invitational Priority.

**Reader's Score:** 0

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 06/17/2019 09:45 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/14/2019 02:59 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Research Foundation of CUNY on behalf of Lehman College (U336S190048)

**Reader #2:** \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	40	38
<b>Adequacy of Resources</b>		
1. Resources	20	20
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	20
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	98
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
1. STEM/Computer Science	5	5
<b>Sub Total</b>	5	5
<b>Invitational Priority</b>		
<b>Invitational Priority</b>		
1. Promise Zones	0	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	0	0
<b>Total</b>	105	103

# Technical Review Form

Panel #6 - Teacher Quality Partnership - 7: 84.336S

Reader #2: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: Research Foundation of CUNY on behalf of Lehman College (U336S190048)

## 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 applicant details 5 clearly stated project goals (pgs. e54 – e57) around the development of a full – year residency model of teacher training. Corresponding objectives are aligned with the goals and will allow for the manifestation of measurable outcomes. Specifically, the goals and objectives provide clear content for the process and outcome components of the logic model (pg. e88) and vice versa. Moreover, the goals and objectives are tied to the evaluation of the project and will drive its implementation. This level of cohesiveness is indicative of a well – designed and well- thought out plan of action to meet the needs of the target population.

An exceptionally strong component of the applicant's project is that training and education will lead to certification in bilingual early childhood as well as qualification for the state computer science micro-credential. This is important because of the large number of English Learners within the partner districts. Having teacher who are skilled at teaching this group of students will assist in reducing achievement and opportunity gaps.

In addition, the applicant includes letters of support from partners who are committed to strategic planning to move more PK-12 resources towards resident supports with a goal of providing the funds needed to sustain the project beyond the period of federal funding.

### Weaknesses:

While the applicant includes a logic model which depicts its theory of change, the applicant does not clearly describe or provide sufficient details related to the rationale for the project. The project narrative does not include information that would indicate that the project is guided by either research or an underlying theoretical or conceptual framework which would support the inclusion of key components of the project.

**Reader's Score: 38**

### **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 proposes to provide an array of resources, including classroom and building space, use of campus labs, the library and the like, (pg. e151) to support project implementation. For instance the applicant asserts, "STEM Science, Mathematics, and Technology labs on Lehman's campus will serve as a training hub for residents and mentor teachers" (pg. e16). Provision of these in-kind resources as well as the letters of commitment documenting this (pg. e151), clearly demonstrate that the lead applicant organization pledges to provide strong support for the project and will ensure that the project is carried out in the manner intended.

Partner school districts also demonstrate ample commitment (as evidenced by the letters of support, pgs. e145-e146; e154) to the project in that they will provide mentor teachers and data for evaluation purposes (pg. e37-e38) and will collaboratively work to develop a plan for sustainability.

#### **Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 20**

### **Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan**

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

**(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 applicant's management plan and timeline (pg. e43 – e51) provide a comprehensive view of project tasks and delineates how and when milestones will be achieved and also describes project activities and persons responsible for various tasks. The applicant also includes a chart that clearly indicates responsibilities, level of effort and appropriate qualifications of key personnel which is, indicative of a management team that has the expertise, experience and knowledge to carry out the project efficiently – on time and within budget. Specifically, the principal investigator who will oversee the project, has the requisite experience and knowledge and is well qualified to serve in this capacity as she has served as Principal Investigator on a previous Teacher Quality Partnership grant project (e43). This will serve well in the management and implementation of the project.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:** 20

**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 applicant presents a good plan to provide data on project outcomes formative and summative evaluation procedures. The plan is good because it is not only assesses the extent to which desired outcomes are achieved but it will also assess the implementation of the project to evaluate the extent to which processes are being carried out as planned and are leading to desired outcomes (e 52).

The applicant does a very good job of clearly outlining the goals, objectives and activities to meet those goals, in the chart found on pages e54-57 of the proposal. The goals and objectives are nicely tied to the evaluation questions, which is most appropriate as this will lead to the collection of useful valid and reliable related data. (pg. e53-e54). The methods of the evaluation (i.e., data collection, data sources,) are appropriate for this design and will likely yield important data that can be used for continuous improvement of the project. Specifically, collecting qualitative data via "focus groups with LUTE-STEM participants" and "surveys of LUTE-STEM participants" will provide clear data related to goals and evaluation questions about the extent to which participants feel supported and adequately prepared as a result of project participation (e54- e57).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**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:**

The applicant includes training which will lead to a computer science micro credential. According to the applicant, after training and education, “completers will be able to incorporate computer science offerings into their classrooms... and meet NYSDOE Computer Science for All professional development requirements”. This is sufficient because teachers will have adequate training to be effective in computer science classroom Further, though the micro-credential will serve as an entry point to Lehman’s computer science advanced certificate program, the applicant will also provide graduate course work to support achievement of the advanced credential as well (pg. e20).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:** 5

**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:**

The applicant does not address this priority.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not address this priority.

**Reader's Score:** 0

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 06/14/2019 02:59 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/17/2019 09:34 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Research Foundation of CUNY on behalf of Lehman College (U336S190048)

**Reader #3:** \*\*\*\*\*

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

# Technical Review Form

Panel #6 - Teacher Quality Partnership - 7: 84.336S

Reader #3: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: Research Foundation of CUNY on behalf of Lehman College (U336S190048)

## 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:

- Expectation that mentor teachers and residents will attend annual full day professional development conferences which emphasize content area literacy. The new knowledge gained from this training will extend results beyond the period of Federal financial assistance.
- The assignment of a full time faculty member that serves as a site coordinator for each host school that will work closely with mentor teachers to ensure the residencies reflect the US PREP model. (e-26) This support represents an exceptional approach for meeting the purposes and requirements by having an individual who is a faculty member and well versed in the PREP model supporting mentor teachers and able to promote the fidelity of the PREP model's use.
- Highly qualified host school teachers and administrators will be invited to co-teach or teach the content and methods courses in the Lehman College teacher preparation program of study. This has been put into place based on research stating that this leads to greater teacher retention and more effective classroom instruction(e-26) building capacity and yielding results beyond the period of Federal financial assistance.
- Research study groups composed of mentor teachers and graduates in years 3-10 will develop and utilize video-tape analysis as data sources in addition to student work samples and test scores. (e-26). There is such power in authentic classroom research. As a form of reflection those involved can think through their strategies as well as learn from their colleagues with the goal of increasing student achievement. Having ownership in the research rather than simply being told "how to do things" will help with teacher buy in and again yield results beyond the Federal financial assistance.
- The proposed project is designed to foster collaborative relationships between Lehman professors, partnering school administrators, mentor teachers, and LUTE-STEM graduates with the intent of being sustained beyond the five years of the grant. (e-31). This collaboration among various stakeholders helps build a system of supports as well as raise awareness of issues that might arise.
- Lehman College has long-standing relationships with the Bronx Zoo, Botanical Gardens, and American Museum of Natural History (e-32) which has strengthened the STEM curricula and provides candidates with rich experiences to help capitalize on community assets, thus demonstrating the ability of the organization to utilize community resources in innovative ways.
- The applicant has developed a list of goals with supporting objectives that with identifies data sources that are clearly defined and measurable (e-54 through e-57). An example is the goal of designing and implementing sustainable

induction and retention programs with an objective of developing and implementing a rigorous induction program aligned with NYCDOE priorities, and will collaborate with partners to provide activities and supports that promote program retention. The outcome states that 72% of program completers from Cohort 1 will be employed by a host high-needs school or equivalent school for three consecutive years after initial employment, measured through project documentation, focus groups, and surveys.T

- The proposed project demonstrates a rationale by addressing the conditions that currently exist in the Bronx versus New York City, New York State, and the United States (e-73) and the need for preparation and retention of effective teachers (e-74).

**Weaknesses:**

- The reviewer did not note any weaknesses in the quality of the project design.

**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:**

- Key community partners supporting this project include Mouse.org, who will provide the microcredentialing for the program, USPREP, a coalition of 15 universities transforming teacher preparation through quality clinical programming, and NYCDOE who will contribute to the initiative through representation on the advisory panel (e-38 through e-39). This demonstrates adequacy of support from other resources.
- Lehman college demonstrates adequate facilities offering a computer center with support staff, The Lehman Library with periodicals and books specific to education as well as internet connection availability, Academic Center for Excellence with tutors to assist with papers, Math Lab offering free tutoring, Mathematics Education Lab used for math education undergraduate and graduate work, Science Education lab and EdTpa lab support. The Lute Resource Center and student services are also available to support (e-36 through e-37). The applicant demonstrates the ability to provide adequate resources and supports for residents as they encounter struggles throughout their program. This assistance and guidance will facilitate the residents' ability to complete the program successfully and gain the necessary knowledge to be successful in practice.

**Weaknesses:**

- The reviewer did not note any weaknesses with the adequacy of resources.

**Reader's Score:** 20

### **Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan**

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

**(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 management plan indicates the milestones to be achieved, each noted with a roman numeral, and then the responsible individual for each and every milestone noted. There is no question as to who will be addressing each milestone. Timelines have been put in place as well. The detail of the management plan clearly identifies defined roles and responsibilities with a timeline that will allow for the project tasks to be completed if followed (e-39 through e-42). Having a high quality management plan streamlines communication and will help to keep the project running on time and within the proposed budget.

#### **Weaknesses:**

- The reviewer did not note any weaknesses with the quality of the management plan

**Reader's Score:** 20

### **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:**

- Two external consultants will work closely through the process to ensure coordination of activities and evaluate the LUTE-STEM implementation and outcomes (e-51) providing reliable performance data on relevant outcomes.
- A formal outcomes evaluation will be conducted through Metis Associates, and independent research and consulting firm headquartered in NYC with lots of experience in this area (e-51). Having an independent evaluator will help the validity and reliability of the evaluation data.
- The project evaluation is strengthened by its use of quantitative and qualitative data from various sources (e-54) to measure the extent to which the program has met project and GPRA outcome measures which will improve effectiveness and provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes.
- The program will utilize numerous data sources which include quantitative and qualitative data (e-54). Benefits of using both types include a deeper understanding of the topics as well as analysis that is numerical, with clear results that are hard to misinterpret providing valid and reliable performance data.

**Weaknesses:**

- The reviewer did not note any weaknesses in the quality of the project evaluation.

**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:**

- The micro-credential will be earned by all the residents that complete the master's program which will allow the LUTE-STEM completers the ability to incorporate computer science offerings into their classrooms, school, and after-school programs. This micro-credential will be an entry point to Lehman's computer science advanced certificate (e-16) leading to an increase in the number of educators adequately prepared to deliver rigorous instruction in STEM fields.
- The establishment of STEM labs in the partner schools will open up the possibility for mentors, residents, and students to utilize technology tools in the classroom (e-16) improving student achievement and educational outcomes in computer science.
- The use of micro-credentialing is an innovative way to provide clear evidence about what the learner knows, has done, and should be able to continue to do with its value in that it has been credentialed by the institution demonstrating a high-quality response to the CPP1.

**Weaknesses:**

- The researcher did not note any weaknesses in competitive Preference Priority 1.

**Reader's Score: 5**

**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:**

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 06/17/2019 09:34 PM