

# **EED Renewal Technical Review Form**

*US Department of Education*

---

**Division of Effective Educator Development (EED) Grant Review  
2021 SEED Renewal  
Application Technical Review Form  
(CFDA 84.423A)**

---

<b>Applicant Name:</b> <b>Alder Graduate School</b> <b>Reviewer 2</b>	Application Number U423A18 0028
---	------------------------------------

Summary Ratings		
	Maximum Points	Score
<b>A. Quality of Evaluation Plan</b>	25	25
<b>B. Quality of the Project Design</b>	25	25
<b>C. Strategy to Scale</b>	25	25
<b>D. Adequacy of Resources</b>	25	23
<b>Selection Criteria Total Score</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>98</b>

## **A. Quality of Project Evaluation (up to 25 points)**

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

- (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation provide for examining the effectiveness of project implementation strategies.
- (2) 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.

(Maximum Points 25)

Reader's Score:

**Strengths:**

(1) The applicant provided a detailed account of the ongoing evaluation being conducted by the American Institute of Research (AIR). The evaluation includes two studies: the first study examines the program's fidelity of implementation, and the second study examines impacts on teacher and student outcomes. The evaluation effectively demonstrated that the methods of evaluation is examining the effectiveness of project implementation strategies. (pgs. 12-17) For example, data was presented that focused on the impact of the team-teaching approach on student learning in mentor-resident classrooms during the year the resident trains to become a teacher. As well, the applicant is focused in the evaluation on understanding the impact of the preparation model on retention of graduates; and understanding the consistency and variations in the program impacts across various contexts, geographies, and populations. The renewal grant will allow American Institutes for Research (AIR) to expand its evaluation, adding depth to understanding of the program's implementation and its impacts. (pgs.7-10)

(2) The applicant effectively demonstrated that the project evaluation consist of a mixed-methods evaluation that will provide evidence of program effectiveness using objective performance measures that are related to the outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative. For example, the quasi-experimental design will examine program impact and will measures from standardized test scores, outcomes on teacher retention, quality of mentor-resident matching, perceived usefulness of the seminars and courses, and perceived utility of the program in improving learning and instruction. (pgs. 1-6) The applicant indicate that COVID has made it challenging to collect teacher instructional data and student achievement data for 2019-2020. Due to the pandemic, AIR was forced to pivot from teacher observations using the CLASS rubric to student surveys that could be collected virtually to examine graduates' instructional practice. AIR recently administered Tripod's 7Cs survey to students of Alder graduates who completed their residency year in 2018-19 (Cohort 1) or 2019-20 (Cohort 2) and students of novice comparison teachers (non-Alder graduates with two or less years of teaching experience). AIR is in the process of analyzing the data to determine if the study that will meet WWC standards with reservations, AIR will collect and analyze all available student achievement data from the 2018-19 and 2020-21 school years (the 2019-20 school year will be omitted as most districts did not administer state assessment during the first year of the pandemic). (pgs. 10-13)

**Weaknesses:**

(1) No weaknesses noted.

(1) No weaknesses noted.

**B. Project Design (25 points).**

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

- (1) The extent to which the design for implementing and evaluating the proposed project will result in information to guide possible replication of project activities or strategies, including information about the effectiveness of the approach or strategies employed by the project.
- (2) 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.

(Maximum Points 25)

Reader's Score:

**Strengths:**

(1) The applicant indicated that in the first three years of the initial grant the project had success in recruiting and preparing 497 new teachers, 76% of which are teachers of color and 82% of which teach STEM subjects. Based on the strong results the applicant is preparing to replicate and disseminate the codified team-teaching student-centered practices to recruit, prepare, and retain a diverse pipeline of effective teachers to work in underserved LEAs in California, Massachusetts, and Tennessee, meeting human capital needs and serving as a model of teacher education. This new partnership ensure long-term sustainability of the model beyond project funding by fully embedding this model into our ongoing programs. (pgs. 7-10)

(2) During the renewal grant period, the applicant is proposing to continue to partner with K-12 LEAs to build the capacity and systems to scale from serving 20 LEAs in 2020-2021 to 40 LEAs by 2022-2023, which will increase their chances to yield results beyond the grant as they grow to serve 50+ LEAs at full scale by 2024-2025. The applicant indicated the key benefits to examining these additional cohorts, networks, and additional years will allow them to examine the impacts of residents on much longer-term impacts. It will also provide more statistical data to detect group effects due to the larger sample sizes available when pooling effects across more cohorts. (pgs. 10-15)

**Weaknesses:**

- (1) No weaknesses noted.
- (1) No weaknesses noted.

**C. Strategy to Scale (up to 25 points).**

The Secretary considers the strategy to scale for the proposed project. In determining the strategy to scale for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The feasibility of successful replication of the proposed project, if favorable results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of populations.
- (2) The mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

(Maximum Points 25)

Reader's Score:

**Strengths:**

(1) The applicant effectively demonstrated that due to the success of the current project they are ready to scale-up and extend the work with a renewal award. The current partners have been success with integrating the model into their programs and will continue to operate it for years to come. Thus, in the renewal, they will be looking to support other teacher preparation programs to implement the team-teaching model. While the current focus has been on student learning in the mentor-resident classrooms during the resident's year of preparation, now they are looking to learn more about the effect of the team-teaching model on student learning in graduates' classrooms and in mentor teachers' classrooms the year following the team-teaching year. (pgs. 10-14) Through the renewal grant, Alder will continue to partner with BPE, and add two additional partners - Memphis Teacher Residency (MTR) and National Center for Teacher Residencies (NCTR) to help them achieve their goals and to support replication of promising strategies and information. This project is primarily focused on continuing to scale the successful aspects from the first three years of the grant, while also continuing to evaluate and improve the team-teaching approach based on the needs and learning from implementing it in new contexts. (pgs. 10-14)

(2) The applicant indicated that some of the methods of broad dissemination will include presentations at eight regional and national conferences and at professional associations (such as American Educational Research Association (AERA), Association of Teacher Educators, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE), and Southwest Educational Research Association), and developing white papers and/or blog posts for our various communications channels. They also intend to publish articles in practitioner publications, and we will draft a scholarly article to publish in an education journal in partnership with AIR. NCTR will partner with Alder, BPE and MTR to develop a model for sharing learnings and activities with additional teacher preparation programs. NCTR has a national network of 32 teacher preparation programs which they support to continuously improve their programs. Through this project, NCTR will design and launch a Critical Learning Initiative (CLI), which is a network improvement model where five teacher preparation programs will engage with the team-teaching model and integrate practices and learnings into their models. (pgs. 14-16)

**Weaknesses:**

- (1) No weaknesses noted.
- (2) No weaknesses noted.

**D. Adequacy of Resources (up to 25 points).**

The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The potential for continued support of the project after Federal funding ends, including, as appropriate, the demonstrated commitment of appropriate entities to such support.
- (2) The potential for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing program of the agency or organization at the end of Federal funding.

(Maximum Points 25)

Reader's Score:

**Strengths:**

(1) The applicant effectively demonstrated that Alder and BPE have a longstanding and ongoing commitment to recruiting and preparing a diverse and effective teacher pipeline to best serve high need schools. The project proposed is at the core of the missions for each organization and the work will continue well beyond the timeframe of the project. (15-20)

(2) The applicant indicated with proposed funding, partner LEAs will be able to plan, launch, scale and/or improve their residencies, creating efficiencies important for sustainability. The codified improvements to the model and the effective strategies will become fully embedded and all stakeholders will continue using the model long after the end of federal funding. (pgs. 19-25)

**Weaknesses:**

(1) The applicant indicated that there is an upfront investment cost to developing, evaluating, and improving this model in teacher preparation and the costs will decrease over time and the project is an innovation on the existing model which should not, long term, add ongoing operating costs. However, the applicant did not provide any evidence of committed financial support for any of the new partners.

# **EED Renewal Technical Review Form**

*US Department of Education*

---

**Division of Effective Educator Development (EED) Grant Review  
2021 SEED Renewal  
Application Technical Review Form  
(CFDA 84.423A)**

---

<b>Applicant Name: Alder Graduate School of Education</b>	Application Number U423A180028
---	-----------------------------------

Summary Ratings		
	Maximum Points	Score
<b>A. Quality of Evaluation Plan</b>	25	25
<b>B. Quality of the Project Design</b>	25	23
<b>C. Strategy to Scale</b>	25	22
<b>D. Adequacy of Resources</b>	25	23
<b>Selection Criteria Total Score</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>93</b>

## **A. Quality of Project Evaluation (up to 25 points)**

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

- (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation provide for examining the effectiveness of project implementation strategies.
- (2) 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.

(Maximum Points 25)

Reader's Score:

**Strengths:**

- (1) Plan is in place to evaluate the program with American Institute which will complete two studies: one examining the program's fidelity and the other impact on teacher and students (p.5). Increased the number of LEA to better show the impact on the model.

**Weaknesses:**

No Weakness noted

**B. Project Design (25 points).**

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

- (1) The extent to which the design for implementing and evaluating the proposed project will result in information to guide possible replication of project activities or strategies, including information about the effectiveness of the approach or strategies employed by the project.
- (2) 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.

(Maximum Points 25)

Reader's Score:

**Strengths:**

- (1) Incorporating a new partner in Memphis Teacher Residency Program that is currently completing similar work add an additional collaborative partner (p.7). This partnership increases the diversity of schools and districts involved in the project.

**Weaknesses:**

No weakness noted

**C. Strategy to Scale (up to 25 points).**

The Secretary considers the strategy to scale for the proposed project. In determining the strategy to scale for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The feasibility of successful replication of the proposed project, if favorable results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of populations.
- (2) The mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

(Maximum Points 25)

Reader's Score:

**Strengths:**

- (1) Variety of districts have been invited through the Memphis, Boston and California Schools (p. 13, 15).
- (2) Will disseminate information through National Center for Teacher Residency, Deans for Impact, Foundation groups along with presenting at conferences (p.17).

**Weaknesses:**

- (1) Some dependence on LEAs for recruitment, launch and scaling of projects when funding is not provided by the grant.

**D. Adequacy of Resources (up to 25 points).**

The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The potential for continued support of the project after Federal funding ends, including, as appropriate, the demonstrated commitment of appropriate entities to such support.
- (2) The potential for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing program of the agency or organization at the end of Federal funding.

(Maximum Points 25)

Reader's Score:

**Strengths:**

- (1) Several committed partners to the grant after funding is exhausted.

**Weaknesses:**

- (1) Community and other partners committed to supporting the grant with human capital but did not mention financial support after the grant has ended (p. 18).



# **SEED Renewal Technical Review Form**

*US Department of Education*

---

**Division of Effective Educator Development (EED) Grant Review  
2021 SEED Renewal  
Application Technical Review Form  
(CFDA 84.423A)**

---

<b>Applicant Name: Alder GSE</b>	Application Number U423A180028
----------------------------------	-----------------------------------

Summary Ratings		
	Maximum Points	Score
<b>A. Quality of Evaluation Plan</b>	25	25
<b>B. Quality of the Project Design</b>	25	25
<b>C. Strategy to Scale</b>	25	24
<b>D. Adequacy of Resources</b>	25	23
<b>Selection Criteria Total Score</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>97</b>

## **A. Quality of Project Evaluation (up to 25 points)**

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

- (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation provide for examining the effectiveness of project implementation strategies.
- (2) 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.

(Maximum Points 25)

Reader's Score: \_

**Strengths: (pgs. 10-13)**

(1) The applicant has partnered with AIR as an external researcher to study the impacts of the program across different cohorts and school years. Table B2 on page 10 clearly indicates the increase in cohort participants and the anticipated sample for this extension. AIR will get the opportunity to extend the evaluation for long-term student academic achievement outcomes as well as consider the newly added outcome of teacher retention that can be examined for the effectiveness of this program (pg. 11). The incorporation of mentors into this residency training model to examine the effectiveness is also proposed has the potential to add detail and effectiveness evaluation since that crucial piece of this work has had mixed results in the evidence (pg. 12). Multi-level regression modeling and the use of propensity score matching to create comparison groups will allow this research to potentially reach the WWC rating of Meeting Standards with Reservations (pg. 12). This entire evaluation project will significantly add to the research on teacher professional development and retention. The increase of LEAs and teachers in the model through this extension will increase the power in order to better detect impacts of this model on the chosen outcomes (pg. 11).

(2) Both comprehensive quantitative and qualitative outcomes have been incorporated in this rigorous mixed methods evaluation model (pg. 10). Quantitative data is collected from retention data from district records and student achievement data from student records (pg. 10). Qualitative data is collected from surveys already developed by AIR on perceptions of this new model and feedback on the coaching and mentor approach (pg. 11) as well as the successes and challenges of implementing this PD.

**Weaknesses:**

(1) No weaknesses noted.

(2) No weaknesses noted.

**B. Project Design (25 points).**

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

(1) The extent to which the design for implementing and evaluating the proposed project will result in information to guide possible replication of project activities or strategies, including information about the effectiveness of the approach or strategies employed by the project.

(2) 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.

(Maximum Points 25)

Reader's Score: \_\_

**Strengths: (pgs. 6-9)**

(1) The applicant has successfully recruited new teachers of color and STEM-focused teachers which can be examined for replication (pg. 6). The applicant has collected information and codified the team teaching, student-centered approach (pg. 6). The applicant has also documented how to deliver personalized attention to students, differential instruction, and reflective teaching practices which can be replicated with the proper supports and dissemination (pg. 7). Due to COVID delays, there is no current research on the effectiveness of team teaching on student academic achievement outcomes, however those are proposed in the extension of this project (pg. 10).

(2) The application currently serves 40 LEAs and is projected to extend to 80 LEAs (pg. 13). This program design expansion speaks to the strong project design and interest from others in continuing this work. There are multiple partners who have committed to expansion throughout their networks (pg. 16). Additionally, the host institution has committed to changing its policies and practices to incorporate a central component of team teaching in their professional teacher preparation programs (pp. 19-20).

**Weaknesses:**

(1) No weaknesses noted.

(2) No weaknesses noted.

**C. Strategy to Scale (up to 25 points).**

The Secretary considers the strategy to scale for the proposed project. In determining the strategy to scale for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The feasibility of successful replication of the proposed project, if favorable results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of populations.

(2) The mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

(Maximum Points 25)

Reader's Score: \_\_\_\_\_

**Strengths: (pgs. 13-17)**

(1) The codification of the team teaching and mentoring approach to teacher preparedness (pg. 6) as well as the incorporation into a formal graduate curriculum (pg. 19) builds the foundation for replication to other settings and populations. The emphasis this evaluation placed on STEM teachers and teachers of color (pg. 6) will translate easily for replication to other LEAs and other underrepresented teacher populations. The program has strong potential for feasibility into other settings and with other populations.

(2) The host institution and AIR have pledged to use their network to disseminate the findings. The network and individual-style approach for others to adopt and mark the effectiveness of professional development for new teachers (pg. 17) will support the further development of this initiative. The ability to adapt this model to incorporate teacher retention speaks to the potential for further development and replication of this model (pg. 11).

**Weaknesses:**

(1) The incorporation of highly qualified and experienced mentors that are well-versed with the team-teaching model has the potential to undermine the potential scale-up of this project. The plan for the recruitment of teachers by other partner institutions needs to be more detailed to fully support scale-up.

(2) No weaknesses noted.

#### **D. Adequacy of Resources (up to 25 points).**

The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The potential for continued support of the project after Federal funding ends, including, as appropriate, the demonstrated commitment of appropriate entities to such support.

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

(Maximum Points 25)

Reader's Score: \_\_\_\_

#### **Strengths: (pgs. 17-20)**

(1) The current proposal has dedicated support by the partners after the end of this federal funding. Each of the partners has committed personnel and policy adaptation that will ensure that this project continues (pg. 16). MTR is committed to recruiting 90 new teachers for their residency program. LEAs are listed on page 15 with a demonstration of the student demographics presented. NCTR will support the pilot of this model as well through the commitment of students in their residency program.

(2) The team-teaching approach is being incorporated into the graduate curriculum and program improvements for the host institution (pg. 17). The application does state that this intervention is completely aligned to the mission of the professional educator preparation program (pg. 17) and has already fully adopted this into their formal graduate program. There is an implication that other graduate programs will be looking for ways to adopt this into their formal education experiences as well.

#### **Weaknesses:**

(1) No financial supports were addressed in the application by the partners to promote the website with the reports and steps on how to implement this model. Additional funds might be dedicated to replication research reports and the continuation of data collection and analysis.

(2) While the host institution has committed to incorporating this, there is no mention in the application of this being an intervention under consideration for other graduate schools of education or independent teacher preparation agencies.