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

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: California State University, Dominguez Hills Foundation (S423A200003)
Reader #1: **********

		Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions			
Selection Criteria			
Quality of Project Design			
1. Project Design		35	35
Significance			
1. Significance		20	20
Quality of the Management Plan			
1. Management Plan		20	20
Quality of the Project Evaluation			
1. Project Evaluation		25	25
	Sub Total	100	100
Priority Questions			
Competitive Preference Priority			
Promoting STEM Education/Computer Science			
1. CPP1		3	3
	Sub Total	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority			
Fostering Knowledge and Promoting Development			
1. CPP2		2	2
Spurring Opportunity Zone Investment			
1. CPP3		5	5
	Sub Total	7	7
	Total	110	110

Panel #1 - SEED - 1: 84.423A

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

Applicant: California State University, Dominguez Hills Foundation (S423A200003)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

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

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

   (3) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.

   (4) The potential and planning for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing work of the applicant beyond the end of the grant.

   Strengths:

   Plans to recruit and support new teachers as they enter the workforce are thorough. The three goals to: (1)Recruit, support, prepare and retain high-quality K-8 teachers with STEM expertise in high-need schools in partner LEAs; (2) Increase the STEM expertise of educators and school leaders in high-need K-8 schools in computer science and other cutting edge STEM topics via micro-credentials and (3) Share project best practices and replicate in other settings are aligned with the grant notice (e14). The applicant has presented a well outlined plan to provide services, certifications, and pathways to high-need students in both Los Angeles South and East.

   The applicant has described in detail plans to recruit new teachers and encourage stakeholders to earn multiple-subject credentials. This unique plan addresses current teacher shortages within the LEAs and provides opportunities for the teachers to earn knowledge that will allow them to be marketable while also equipping them with skills to increase student achievement. Plans to create a full-time program where students complete coursework within one year is ambitious and can be achieved with project funding. Also, efforts to pay a stipend to recruits and request commitment of four years of service will assist districts with locating instructors who are willing to invest in the community and will assist with preventing high teacher turnover (a18).
   Within the application are clear plans to recruit a diverse cohort from within the community and provide mentorship and support throughout their learning journey (e38-41). The applicant has described an intensive program that will provide over 610 hours of training, support and feedback (e39). Plans to provide mentors that are accessible at the campus level demonstrates an understanding that relevant guidance is vital to new teacher success (e42). The rationale to support LA South and East is supported with the presented achievement information that indicates that over 60% of students in these schools are not proficient in math, science and English (e40-41). It is evident from the description that the LEAs are in need of highly effective teachers.

   Current supports are effectively described. Mentioned in the application are successful efforts from CSUDH to prepare teachers to teach single subjects. Plans to expand on this design and provide teachers with pathways for multi-subject credentialing within the current Lab School structure are justified (e41). Efforts to also ensure that elementary teachers have an advanced knowledge base will ensure that students can be exposed to high-ordered project-based learning in

elementary grade levels (e31, e42). Plans to build upon current mentorship model and seek mentors currently working at the campus is both cost beneficial and identifies a new campus leaders (e42).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 35

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. **The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project. In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

   (1) The importance or magnitude of the results or outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project, especially improvements in teaching and student achievement.

   (2) The potential contribution of the proposed project to the development and advancement of theory, knowledge, and practices in the field of study.

   (3) The extent to which the results of the proposed project are to be disseminated in ways that will enable others to use the information or strategies.

   Strengths:

   Teacher preparation and mentorship are key focal points of the submitted application. If implemented effectively, both can assist the new recruits with increasing student achievement in the high-need schools. Plans to provide professional development by preparing more elementary recruits to obtain multi-subject micro-credentials is unique and will ensure that teachers are marketable beyond current needs of the district. (e44). This focus on high-quality preparation will encourage student problem-solving earlier in elementary grades (e45).

   The design of the new accelerated pathway program to prepare teachers in one year will be cost effective and time saving (e46). This new concept, if successful, can revamp student teaching training programs nationwide. Plans to recruit interns that are from the community adds to the current body of research on investing into the community and cultural responsiveness.

   The applicant has provided information on current practices of disseminating information to the public. It is commendable that CSUDH is committed to produce at least two publications after years three and five of project implementation (e47). Plans to present at conferences throughout the nation and to create papers and publications are aligned with the grant notice (e47).

   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 the following factors:

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

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

(3) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

Strengths:

On pages e48-49 is a detailed chart with measurable goals and objectives that are aligned with the performance measures provided within the appendix. Plans to recruit a diverse class of new interns are aligned with the goals of the project to support learning in high-need schools where the majority of the enrollees are students of color are justified. Also, goals to have 85% of interns pass CalTPA on first attempt are ambitious and can be achieved through participation in the rigorous year-long internship program (e169).

Described plans that CSUDH will be the lead applicant and fiscal agent are clear (e49). Plans to create an 18-member operations team that will meet weekly to over-see the day-to-day operations of the project will ensure project tasks are accomplished (e50). The table provided on pages e51-52 provides explicit details on the key personnel and their responsibilities. Also included in the application is a project timeline that addresses each activity and the staff members responsible for oversight (e52-54).

Creation of a Council of Advisors with participation from both an internal and external evaluator will assist leadership with long-range objectives.

Plans for the PI to make quarterly reports to the Council of Advisors to provide continuous feedback are reasonable (e55). Efforts to collect feedback are appropriate. Various collected feedback mentioned includes: student data, feedback from lab observations, surveys, interviews and focus groups (e55). Plans to create monthly reports and modify implementation throughout the project are aligned with the project notice.

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:**

   (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the WWC standards with or without reservations as described in the WWC Handbook.

   (2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

   (3) The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible

Strengths:

CSUDH has designed formative and summative questions to evaluate each project goal. Plans for the evaluator to utilize a quasi-experimental design to address teacher practice, retention and student achievement are justified. Efforts to use data from project implementation to compare that with teachers in similar teaching assignments and demographics are described to meet the WWC standards and provide an opportunity to ensure that the goals are both practicable and relatable (e55-59).

Vital research has been identified to lead project evaluation by serving as the external evaluator (e55). Plans to meet quarterly to assess the project progress are justified. Efforts for the external evaluator to provide monthly reports to leadership teams are appropriate.

Plans to convene quarterly to host data meetings will serve as an effective resource of summative data (e59). The guiding questions pertaining to teaching practices are aligned with the grant goals and provide a clear focus to implementation. Future plans to analyze teacher practices upon completion of the grant will provide promising evidence on teachers' overall thoughts of the project and can provide insight on why outcomes were or were not met.

Performance measures are included on pages e168-171. Plans that 90% of recruits will commit to teaching for four years is ambitious and demonstrates that the applicant will strive to reach all participating within the program. Providing opportunities for over 850 teachers to complete micro-credentials over a three-year period is commendable. Collection of diverse data is apparent. The applicant has included 12 quantitative and qualitative data sources that will assist with evaluating the outcomes of the project (e60-61).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 25

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Promoting STEM Education/Computer Science

1. **Projects designed to improve student achievement or other educational outcomes in science, technology, engineering, math, or Computer Science. These projects must address 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:

    Plans to recruit elementary teaching interns with advanced skill STEM knowledge are unique. SCUDH has provided evidence that it is committed to increase increasing student achievement in LAUSD by providing support to high-need students (e14). Creating opportunities for in-service teachers to earn micro-credentials in multiple subjects, including computer science, within three years are aligned with the grant notice.

    Weaknesses:

    No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority - Fostering Knowledge and Promoting Development

1. **Projects that are designed to support projects likely to improve student academic performance and better prepare students for employment, responsible citizenship, and fulfilling lives, including by preparing children or students to:**

   (i) Develop positive personal relationships with others.
   (ii) Develop determination, perseverance, and the ability to overcome obstacles.
   (iii) Develop self-esteem through perseverance and earned success.
   (iv) Develop problem-solving skills.
   (v) Develop self-regulation in order to work toward long-term goals.

   Strengths:

   The applicant has noted that APPLE candidates will strengthen their own social-emotional skills and learn how to build these in their students through year-long training and practice, following guidelines from the Collaborative for Academic, Social and Emotional Learning (e14). The social-emotional learning competencies included on pages e34-35 that will be embedded within the professional development are thoroughly described, can improve student academic performance and prepare students for future success.

   Weaknesses:

   No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 2

Competitive Preference Priority - Spurring Opportunity Zone Investment

1. **Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate the following:**

   (a) The area in which the applicant proposes to provide services overlaps with a QOZ, as designated by the Secretary of the Treasury under section 1400Z-1 of the Internal Revenue Code (IRC). An applicant must—

   (i) Provide the census tract number of the QOZ(s) in which it proposes to provide services; and

   (ii) Describe how the applicant will provide services in the QOZ(s).

   Strengths:

   Within pages e36-37 are the census tract number of the 35 schools located in Qualified Opportunity Zones.

   Plans to promote equity in recruiting and supporting increasing student achievement are mentioned throughout the application. Plans to prepare recruits to work with high-need students of color are justified (e35).

   Weaknesses:

   No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: **5**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/24/2020 11:08 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: California State University, Dominguez Hills Foundation (S423A200003)
Reader #2:   **********

		Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions			
Selection Criteria			
Quality of Project Design			
1. Project Design		35	35
Significance			
1. Significance		20	20
Quality of the Management Plan			
1. Management Plan		20	19
Quality of the Project Evaluation			
1. Project Evaluation		25	25
	Sub Total	100	99
Priority Questions			
Competitive Preference Priority			
Promoting STEM Education/Computer Science			
1. CPP1		3	3
	Sub Total	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority			
Fostering Knowledge and Promoting Development			
1. CPP2		2	2
Spurring Opportunity Zone Investment			
1. CPP3		5	5
	Sub Total	7	7
	Total	110	109

Technical Review Form

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

Applicant: California State University, Dominguez Hills Foundation (S423A200003)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

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

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

   (3) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.

   (4) The potential and planning for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing work of the applicant beyond the end of the grant.

   Strengths:
   - The applicant's proposal provides a compelling case through demographic information and educational statistics as to the need to increase the number of multiple subject teachers and a proposed program to begin to address the challenge. (e29)
   - The applicant's proposal demonstrates their competency to obtain and manage past grants by providing results and outcomes from prior grants including: Transition to Teaching 2006, 2009, 2011 (secondary, university intern); Teacher Quality Partnership 2009 and 2014 (secondary, residency); and 2016 New Generation of Educators Initiative grant from S. G. Bechtel, Jr. Foundation to design an elementary residency pathway. The design for this grant project is scaffolded by the results and outcomes of the prior grant activity. (e17)
   - The applicant's proposal demonstrates a unique and innovative model including an innovative Lab School, mobile fabrication lab to provide opportunities for teachers to obtain hands-on training in state of the art STEM instruction as well as the teacher support institute to provide extensive professional development and support to the novice teacher. (e18)
   - The applicant's proposal acknowledges the increasing cost of higher education and provides a viable cost-effective model for student completion of the alternative certification teacher training through an accelerated internship model that provides funding incentives to alleviate financial barriers to participation. (e18, e23)
   - The applicant's proposal demonstrates a strong evidence for the need for multiple subjects teachers to provide strong STEM educational foundation for elementary and middle school students (p. e20) and a unique plan for how to recruit and train teachers in a supportive environment in a cost effective way (e18)
   - The applicant's proposal demonstrates a detailed and rigorous recruitment plan to increase the number of "home grown" nontraditionally certified STEM teachers in elementary and secondary schools in high-need and low-resourced schools. (e17, e23)
   - The applicant's proposal is strengthened by the comprehensive model for support for first year teachers, including the use of expert teachers as mentors for novice teachers and more than 600 hours of teacher training and support. (e24, 39)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score: 35

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. **The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project. In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

   (1) The importance or magnitude of the results or outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project, especially improvements in teaching and student achievement.

   (2) The potential contribution of the proposed project to the development and advancement of theory, knowledge, and practices in the field of study.

   (3) The extent to which the results of the proposed project are to be disseminated in ways that will enable others to use the information or strategies.

   Strengths:

   •   The applicant's proposal provides concise and substantive information about how the proposed project will increase the competency level of STEM teaching in elementary and secondary schools as well as how these teachers with additional certifications will increase the instructional expertise of the school thereby increasing student achievement (e43)

   •   The applicant's proposal demonstrates how the professional development offered to both teachers and administrators will increase the STEM and SEL competences of the teachers and in turn support the educational outcomes of students. (e45)

   •   The applicant's proposal demonstrates the use of the College of Education internship component to provide an accelerated pathway for credentialing that can serve as a model for public institutions the increase the number and training of alternative certification program participants (e46)

   •   The applicant's proposal demonstrates access to multiple teaching credentials including multiple subjects, science, math, and computer science through a development of the TFA –like model with a 4 year commitment to teach in the assigned area. (e43)

   •   The applicant's proposal demonstrates robust and diversified strategies for dissemination including conference presentations at local, regional and national conferences, journal publications written by faculty, annual reports, project reports by the external evaluator and publication of best practices. (e47)

   Weaknesses:

   No weaknesses identified.

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 the following factors:**

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

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

(3) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

Strengths:

• The applicant's proposal describes a strong and diverse leadership team including university, public school partners that have a track record of managing successful grants with a formalized partnership with detailed roles and responsibilities. (e49)

• The applicant's proposal demonstrates a robust management plan and timeline for activities including weekly meetings of the 18 person operations team during the inception of the project. Key members of the leadership team, including representatives from CSUDH, LD South, LD East and LAUSD Human Resources department. Specific current organizational employees are identified, project responsibilities delineated and timelines established. The clusters of leadership from each partner organization provides a strong infrastructure for project management. (e51)

• The project proposal includes both formative feedback through weekly meetings to address project progress. Feedback will be received from the Council of Advisors, program participants, evaluators and stakeholders. (e55)

Weaknesses:

The applicant's proposal could be strengthened with a more robust treatment of the evaluation procedures that will be conducted within the program to assess the quality of the program. The proposal mentions data and surveys but more detail is needed for this criteria to be full addressed (p. e55)

Reader's Score: 19

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

   (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the WWC standards with or without reservations as described in the WWC Handbook.

   (2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

   (3) The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible

   Strengths:

   • The applicant's proposal demonstrates an extensive evaluation plan with multiple sources and various timeframes. The project evaluation quasi-experimental study to examine the project research questions of assessing teaching practices, student achievement and teacher retention is designed to meet WWC standards. (e55)

   • The applicant's proposal demonstrates the use of prior evaluations, which are already validated with moderate to high levels of inter-rater reliability and predictive validity across studies (e60)

   • The applicant's proposal includes both formative evaluations to provide the operations team with information about the progress toward outcomes. Various stakeholders will provide this information including the Council of Advisors,

program evaluators, program faculty, students, and partners. (e59) Summative evaluations will be conducted during key points on the project timeline by the project evaluators. (e56)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score: 25

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Promoting STEM Education/Computer Science

1. **Projects designed to improve student achievement or other educational outcomes in science, technology, engineering, math, or Computer Science. These projects must address 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's proposal demonstrates a recruitment process and program structure that increases the exposure of undergraduates, both STEM majors and those students who had a high level of science and math knowledge, to the teaching profession. (e29)

   • The applicant's proposal demonstrates a specific micro credential in Computer Science (e26) using an accelerated certification option through a College of Education internship, thereby providing an innovative and cost effective option for "home grown" teachers to enter the profession. (e31)

   • The applicant's proposal clearly demonstrates how the rigorous recruitment model, math and science micro-credentials focusing on project-based learning, the clinical lab experiences including extensive lesson planning and pedagogy support and the mentoring support, will directly impact the educational outcomes of the students. (e32).

   Weaknesses:

   No weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority - Fostering Knowledge and Promoting Development

1. **Projects that are designed to support projects likely to improve student academic performance and better prepare students for employment, responsible citizenship, and fulfilling lives, including by preparing children or students to:**

   (i) Develop positive personal relationships with others.
   (ii) Develop determination, perseverance, and the ability to overcome obstacles.
   (iii) Develop self-esteem through perseverance and earned success.
   (iv) Develop problem-solving skills.
   (v) Develop self-regulation in order to work toward long-term goals.

Strengths:

• The applicant's proposal demonstrates a thorough treatment of how the training will improve the social emotional learning of the teachers and how they will affect the learning of their students. (e35)

• The applicant's proposal demonstrates a clear connection of how increasing the social-emotional learning of the students will affect other areas of learning including long-term goals and becoming productive citizens. (e35)

• The applicant's proposal provides a clear connection between the cognitive skills evaluated using the CASEL Socio Emotional learning competencies and the non-cognitive skills highlighted in this Competitive Preference Priority. (e33)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score: 2

Competitive Preference Priority - Spurring Opportunity Zone Investment

1. Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate the following:

(a) The area in which the applicant proposes to provide services overlaps with a QOZ, as designated by the Secretary of the Treasury under section 1400Z-1 of the Internal Revenue Code (IRC). An applicant must—

(i) Provide the census tract number of the QOZ(s) in which it proposes to provide services; and

(ii) Describe how the applicant will provide services in the QOZ(s).

Strengths:

• The applicant's proposal will reach almost 70 elementary and middle schools in the QOZs as well as cultivate "home grown" teachers from these areas. (e36).

• The applicant's proposal provides data and evidence of how the goals and objectives of the project will support the students that attend schools in the affected area by increasing the number of qualified STEM teachers in the elementary and middle schools, increasing instructional leadership and providing opportunities for teacher professional development through micro-credentials. (e37)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/24/2020 11:30 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: California State University, Dominguez Hills Foundation (S423A200003)
Reader #3: **********

		Points Possible	**Points Scored**
Questions			
Selection Criteria			
Quality of Project Design			
1. Project Design		35	32
Significance			
1. Significance		20	18
Quality of the Management Plan			
1. Management Plan		20	20
Quality of the Project Evaluation			
1. Project Evaluation		25	25
	Sub Total	100	95
Priority Questions			
Competitive Preference Priority			
Promoting STEM Education/Computer Science			
1. CPP1		3	3
	Sub Total	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority			
Fostering Knowledge and Promoting Development			
1. CPP2		2	2
Spurring Opportunity Zone Investment			
1. CPP3		5	5
	Sub Total	7	7
	Total	110	105

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - SEED - 1: 84.423A

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

Applicant: California State University, Dominguez Hills Foundation (S423A200003)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

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

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

   (3) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.

   (4) The potential and planning for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing work of the applicant beyond the end of the grant.

   Strengths:

   1) The narrative states clear research on the need for traditionally underrepresented groups to become educational staff and provides a sound overview of how they will increase recruitment to their program (e10). This provides a good basis for the development of the professional development program and how the applicant will focus on the teachers who teacher the public-school students with the most needs.
   The narrative states clearly the overall system that will be used to increase training and the school district that will be their partner which effectively established the overall program needs in the targeted area (e14). The professional development program provides good methods to provide school-specific training with the micro-credentials to help teachers receive training designed to meet their public-school student needs.

   The narrative provides clear development of the STEM nature of the training from the development of micro-credentials in various STEM areas (e25-e29). The narrative's micro-credentials will give teacher access to training designed to increase their understanding of STEM concepts that will allow their students to make better progress in understanding these concepts.

   The narrative gives an adequate rationale for how the applicant's overall system of training should transfer to other LEAs by developing how LAUSD (Los Angeles Unified School District) was planning to use this training system. This shows the basic methods by which teacher training would be done (e29) in term of moving it to other schools not a part of the initial program.

   2) The narrative states very clear goals for the number of K-8 teachers to be trained in STEM for high-needs campuses (e.g., 150 in 3 years and 200 over life of the grant), which provides a clearly measurable outcome for the program (e14). This provides effective methods to focus the professional development on these grade-levels to provide the public-school students with greater understanding of these concepts to increase their overall academic development.

   The narrative further states clear overall extended general staff development in terms of micro-credentialing (e.g., 680

educators in 3 years and 950 over the life of the grant) which provides a clearly measurable outcome for the program (e14).

The narrative provides sound development of how the applicant has a history of providing effective training that has improved outcomes (e37-e38). The development of the history provides a clear framework for the projected changes that the current professional development system will bring to the targeted schools.

The narrative states how other funded programs have provided outcomes that are desired by this specific grant program (e37-e38), which clearly established that the applicant had the experience and skills to provide effective teacher training. This provides adequate methods by with the overall program will be able to be sustained and have larger impact on educational outcomes in the state.

3) The narrative provides clear research links to the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) at the level of moderate evidence (e14, e17). The two studies that met WWC moderate evidence are Glazerman et al, 2006 and Turner et al, 2012 which were math-focused (e17). The narrative has an adequate development of how these students were in the development of the overall professional development program.

The narrative states a sound rationale of how the applicant's non-traditional systems for training teachers would allow underrepresented groups to meet their life-needs while becoming certified teachers (e17-e19). This will increase the pool of qualified teachers in the targeted schools by increase the numbers of people who could become well-trained teachers.

The narrative has sound goals and needs (e.g., recruiting and training new K-8 STEM teachers, the rationale for the targeted schools need for trained staff, the reasons for the training program to target non-traditional staff, etc.) which shows a sound overall rationale for the program (e19-e26). The narrative's development of goals tied to state outcome measures provides how the applicant will be able to objectively determine the effects of this professional development.

The narrative provides sound development of the various training programs (e.g., summer, first year, etc.) which effectively demonstrates the applicant's ability to craft training systems for this program (e38-e40). The range of methods of increasing the understanding and skill-set of the teacher along with the micro-credentials will result in a system that raising the overall quality of the teachers for these targeted public-school students.

The narrative gives specific examples (e.g., 5-week national summer institute, one-on-one meetings for mentoring and advice, etc.) of the various methods by which the training needs of the schools' teachers would be met (e39-e40). The blending of these various professional development training methods will assure that some form of training will meet each teacher's needs.

The narrative gives sound examples of unmet school needs that the applicant's training system would address promoting increases in academic and SEL performance of the school students, along with the increased knowledge and skills the teachers would gain from the training (e40-e41). The overall professional development program provides multi-methods of increasing the trained teacher's ability to meet their public-school student's needs.

4) The narrative effectively links the applicant's overall design to ways that infrastructure would be created that would allow for the overall training methods to be sustained beyond this grant's funding (e23-e25). The building of the range of activities will allow the applicant to have a bank of professional development training resources that will be able to be continued beyond any one grant's funding thorough either local resources or a fee system.

The narrative states adequate rationale for how the applicant's system of training would be cost effective for the teachers of the various LEAs. The narrative's development of the overall training system is sound. (e41-e43) The range of training activities (e.g. micro-credentials, conferences, mini-events, etc.) will provide a good mix of training methods that should allow all trainees to have several items that align with their learning needs.

The narrative gives good examples of how items like their Lab School (e43) would be linked as a place that teachers

would be able to see training items implemented. The lab-nature would allow new training methods to be tried and the results of new methods to be determine in more of pilot setting which than could be taken to the overall professional development training system once positive results were know.

Weaknesses:

1) The narrative does not fully develop with the teachers personally paying the costs for the micro-credentials (e.g. $4,848 stated) or if all the LEAs would provide salary increases to allow for a 4-year pay-off of these costs (e.g. Compton Unified was example of giving $1,199 pay raise). Further, the applicant does not state if this increase in salary would be assured for the teachers given the shortfalls that are happening with virus in local taxes. This additional information is required to understand the willingness of the teachers to self-fund this part of the professional development.

2) None were noted.

3) None were noted.

4) The narrative does not clearly develop how extra applicant's staff (e.g. one-on-one lesson development, coaching, etc.) would be maintained beyond the grant's funding (e24-e25), in terms of the numbers of ongoing teachers who would be seeking this training and the funding that they would develop for the applicant.

Reader's Score: 32

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. **The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project. In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

   (1) The importance or magnitude of the results or outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project, especially improvements in teaching and student achievement.

   (2) The potential contribution of the proposed project to the development and advancement of theory, knowledge, and practices in the field of study.

   (3) The extent to which the results of the proposed project are to be disseminated in ways that will enable others to use the information or strategies.

   Strengths:

   1) The application gives clear measures of the number of teachers to be fully trained (e.g., 150-200 committed to teach at high-needs schools), the number of students taught (e.g., 12,250-16,240 in Title I schools), and the teachers who will earn micro-credentials (600-900 teachers) which provides objective measurable outcomes for all aspects of the program. (e43-e45)

   2) The narrative develops an adequate rationale for how this program would increase the alternative method for non-traditional students to become teachers in an accelerated manner (e45-e46). This system of bring more people into the schools with different pathways into education will increase the quality of the teaching staff. This will also increase numbers of qualified teachers that can work with the at-risk public-school students.

The narrative states sound research base for the overall research framing that the applicant used for the development of the program (e46). This linking to research is the start of build a professional development system that meets WWC guidelines for the creation of methods that are proven to have positive outcomes for public-school students.

3) The narrative states a sound system for dissemination of general information about the program using the STEM Education Conference done by CSUDH's California STEM Institute for Innovation & Improvement (CSI³) and the Center for Innovation in STEM Education (CISE), which effectively shows how within the state they would be able to inform others. The narrative also states that they will seek to present at other conferences (both state and national). The narrative states that staff will seek to publish and present on the program based on the historical similar efforts of the university staff. This gives an adequate overall system to provide information concerning the effects of the program. (e46-e47)

Weaknesses:

1) None were noted.

2) The narrative provides limited methods of increasing the knowledge base developed about the program's increased teacher training effectiveness (e.g., university would have better methods of preparing teachers based on objective measures). The narrative does not specifically state the plan for publishing and/or presenting information concerning the effects of this program beyond that staff has a history of doing this. The specific development of the publication plan allowing for the level of knowledge in the field to be increased in either a scholarly and/or practitioner manner in specific terms, is lacking. The methods of developing new or better theories concerning teacher preparation are lacking. (e46)

3) None were noted.

Reader's Score: 18

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

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

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

   (3) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

   Strengths:

   1) The narrative states clearly the various goals of the program with sound objectives along with outcomes and objectives. The narrative gives several well-defined items for each of the goals. The objective items to be measured are clear and easy to determine the measures. (e48)

The outcomes and measures are clear and aligned to the goals effectively. The systems for determining the effects of the training are very sound and will allow the applicant to determine in a timely manner the effects of their training program. (e48-e49)

2) The narrative states a clear system of management from the CSUDH's lead role and the relationship with the LEAs in which they would create the MOUs, the formalized partnership agreements, convene the operations team, etc. (e49e-50) This management system will allow the program to be managed in effective manner that will have the ability to provide services in timely and cost-effective manner.

The narrative has clear MOUs with the roles of each organization effectively defined by providing members of the LEAs to sit on the operations team, provide data on the public-school students, meeting quarterly in safe manner for the advisory team to provide data and engage in programs updates/improvements, etc. (e49-e51) The narrative provides the general staff input from the LEAs allowing them to select specific staff members. The narrative state clear roles for the applicant's staff in leading the development of MOUs and the running of the various committee meetings.

The management team from the various organizations is clear and will assure that all stakeholders have a voice in the short- and long-term management of the overall program. (e49-e50) The blending of the applicant and the schools will provide methods that all organizations long-term goals will be able to be reached.

The narrative has a good framework for the day-to-day and long-term operations of the program that can be done virtually. (e50-e51) This will assure that even if the virus mandates changes in the day-to-day operations of the professional develop the applicant will be in a position to continue the program.

The specific duties and roles of the key personnel are very clear and each of these staff qualifications to engage in their respective role was clearly stated. (e51-e52) This development of these items assures that the items stated in the narrative will be able to be done in the real world.

The narrative states a very clear timeline with responsible staff for each of the activities (e52-e54) which provides an extremely clear 5-year plan for the overall program. The timeline provides a very sound overall flow to the training and the development of the professional development program.

3) The narrative clearly states the role of the Principal Investigator (PI) that shows how they will direct the overall program (e55). The PI will be able to provide overall leadership to the professional development while having overall sound management of the various aspects of the program. The PI will be able to use the other resources of their origination in the management of all aspect of the program.
The methods by which the PI informs the other CSUDH faculty and staff are clear and will allow for effective operations of the overall program (e55). The narrative states clear methods that the standard procedures of the organization will be used well in the management of this program.

Weaknesses:
1) None were noted.

2) None were noted.

3) None were 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:**

   (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the WWC standards with or without reservations as described in the WWC Handbook.

   (2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

   (3) The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible

   Strengths:

   1) The narrative states sound evaluation questions that are objectively measurable and will allow the effectiveness of the overall program, along with specific activities, to be determined. (e56) The predicted outcomes will give the applicant a clear baseline to determine the effects of the program.

   The narrative gives clear formative and summative evaluation questions (e.g. - paraphrased - How is the program implanted across cohorts, What effects is micro-credentialing having on general teacher professional development, what are the content area public-school student results, etc.) that will guide the development of short-term and long-term assessments of the program. (e56)

   The narrative states that a quasi-experimental design will be used and follow the WWC standards for determining the effects of the program. (e56) This level of research will allow the applicant to move their finding into a study that meet the WWC goal of proving research to objective show benefits.

   The narrative gives sound overall design for the comparison teacher groups that will be created (trained versus non-trained), based on 100 trained and 300-400 comparison non-trained. Also, the narrative gives a clear development of the effect size and overall evaluation systems to be used, which effectively shows the level of thought placed into the evaluation. (e56-e57)

   The narrative develops a sound evaluation system for each of the research questions and provides rationale for each of these questions in details that allow for clear understanding of their overall analysis. (e57-e58)

   The narrative provides sound analysis details and a basic research base to establish effective systems to determine the effects of the training. (e58-e59) These questions provide a clear framework for determining the effects of the program.

   2) The narrative states an adequate system to share the evaluation data with stakeholders (e59) which gives a basic framing of how the analysis data will be given and used. They have a system of quarterly updates that would give the stakeholders timely information about the effects of the overall program and the specific activities (e59). These items will provide methods to assure that the stakeholders have understanding of the effects of the professional development on the public-school students' outcomes.

   3) The narrative states sound and clear sets of data that are both quantitative and qualitative, and effectively shows how these data will determine the effects of the training program (e59-e60). The range of data collect assures that all aspects of the professional development program will be able to be assessed.

The links to the research questions and the data sources are very clear and the narrative gives overall life of the program evaluation system for the years of requested funding (e60-e61) which clearly shows how these two types of data will be used. The narrative gives good methods to use the analysis to improve the program while informing the stakeholders about the outcomes.

Weaknesses:

1) None were noted.

2) None were noted.

3) None were noted.

Reader's Score: 25

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Promoting STEM Education/Computer Science

1. **Projects designed to improve student achievement or other educational outcomes in science, technology, engineering, math, or Computer Science. These projects must address 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 narrative clearly states that the applicant (California State University, Dominguez Hills (CSUDH)) meets Priority 1 by providing teacher from nontraditional preparation and certification pathways methods to be employed by underserved LEAs (Local Education Agency) which gives an adequate rationale (e17).

   The narrative states adequate items (e.g. location of the campuses, demographics on student body of the LEAs, general teachers prepared by applicant, etc.) to establish that they were meeting Preference Priorities 1, 2, & 3. (e17).

   The narrative provides an overview of how STEM computer science (with Math and Science linked) focus will be supported by the overall program through the micro-credential system. The narrative states an adequate course pathway that provides the framing of this teacher training (e.29-e33).

   Weaknesses:

   None were noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority - Fostering Knowledge and Promoting Development

1. **Projects that are designed to support projects likely to improve student academic performance and better prepare students for employment, responsible citizenship, and fulfilling lives, including by preparing children or students to:**

   (i) Develop positive personal relationships with others.
   (ii) Develop determination, perseverance, and the ability to overcome obstacles.
   (iii) Develop self-esteem through perseverance and earned success.
   (iv) Develop problem-solving skills.
   (v) Develop self-regulation in order to work toward long-term goals.

   Strengths:

   i) The narrative states that the Collaborative for Academic, Social and Emotional Learning (CASEL) would address positive relationships (e33), which gives a basic rationale with relationship skills; social awareness (empathy, respect) focus.

   ii) The narrative states in limited format that the CASEL would address determination, perseverance, and the ability to overcome obstacles (e33) which gives a basic rationale with Self-awareness (confidence, optimism, growth mindset) focus.

   The narrative extends the development of this concept to link with SEL (Social Emotional Learning) which shows how the training would aid teachers in developing these skills in their students, because of their learning these skills from the training (e34).

   iii) The narrative states in limited format that the CASEL would address self-esteem through perseverance and earned success (e33), which gives a basic rationale with Self-management (motivating oneself); self-awareness (recognizing strengths, self-confidence) focus.

   The narrative extends the development of this concept with the development of how the training would increase the teacher's ability to self-manage (e34-e35), which shows how ongoing campus training (e.g. Professional Learning Communities - PCLs) would be linked.

   The narrative provides basic development of how Social awareness and Relationship skills would be addressed which gives a basic framing of how the training would allow all the teachers to better understand these concepts and integrate them into their teaching (e35).

   iv) The narrative states in limited format that the CASEL would address problem-solving skills (e33) which gives a basic rationale with responsible decision-making (analyzing situations, solving problems) focus.

   The narrative extends Responsible decision-making to provide a limited framing of how obtaining these skills would improve the teacher's ability to bring these concepts to their students (e35).

   v) The narrative states in limited format that the CASEL would address self-regulation in order to work toward long-term goals (e33), which gives a basic rationale with self-management (impulse control, self-discipline, goal-setting) focus.

Weaknesses:

i) None were noted.

ii) None were noted.

iii) None were noted.

iv) None were noted.

v) None were noted.

Reader's Score: 2

Competitive Preference Priority - Spurring Opportunity Zone Investment

1. Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate the following:

(a) The area in which the applicant proposes to provide services overlaps with a QOZ, as designated by the Secretary of the Treasury under section 1400Z-1 of the Internal Revenue Code (IRC). An applicant must—

(i) Provide the census tract number of the QOZ(s) in which it proposes to provide services; and

(ii) Describe how the applicant will provide services in the QOZ(s).

Strengths:

i) The narrative specifically lists the QOZs for the various schools that would be in the focus areas for developing teachers. The narrative clear states if the school is in the QOZ and/or the students live in QOZ area. (e35-e37)

ii) The narrative adequately states the methods by which the program will provide support for the QOZ schools (e37) which provides a basic understanding of the services to be provided.

Weaknesses:

i) None were noted.

ii) None were noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/24/2020 10:33 AM