

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/02/2018 12:07 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Sam Houston State University (U423A180155)

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	25	22
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Sub Total	100	97
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Promoting STEM Education/Computer Science		
1. CPP1	3	3
Sub Total	3	3
Total	103	100

Technical Review Form

Panel #10 - Supporting Effective Educator Development - 10: 84.423A

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Sam Houston State University (U423A180155)

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 services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services.
- (4) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project are focused on those with greatest needs.
- (5) 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.

Strengths:

"The program follows an evidence-based pre-service teacher training and novice teacher induction model" is a five-year program that leads to a master's degree in education. The program already operates with on evidence-based practices supported by sound research from WWC studies (p. e25). The project is complex, comprehensive and well established.

The graduate program is clearly of quality, intensity and duration which pays close attention to the transference of skills learned in the program to the classroom (p. e32.and p. e550).

The University has established relationships with LEA's in place (p. e30) that also has plans for collaborative training with principals and model teachers to insure the success of the extended residency. The program serves those with greatest need of students in poverty and a lack of academic success (e. 43). Providing and educating pre-service teachers in quality, comprehensive program that will focus on retention in areas of high turnover.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

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 extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and to the anticipated results and benefits.

(3) 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.

(4) 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 program already partners with 9 LEA's serving 240 schools and 19,250 teachers combined with the multidimensional undergraduate and graduate degrees provide great potential for improvements in teaching and learning (e. 43-44). "Through this project's broad reach, we will improve traditionally underserved LEAs' access to we11-prepared novice teachers and position these LEAs to improve student academic achievement" p. e44).

The costs benefit- long term (p. e46) and budget request for a project like this make it appropriate (p. e593). Given the potential that the project can meet its goals of retention of highly effective novice teachers and the trainer of trainer models built in the project support sustainability (pe. 47). Dissemination of project results will be through the traditional methods of academia (p. e48). In addition to research, the project leaders plan to publish in practitioner journals of professional associations nationally and in the state (p. e49).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

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 management plan thoroughly aligns the objectives with outcomes and measures (Figure 1, pages e49-53). Responsibilities are provided by well qualified personnel (p. 54) for administration and feedback for continuous improvement, resting with the leadership team and stakeholders (p. 54). The plan includes frequent meetings of the leadership team focused on continuous improvement based on data collected (p. e54) using the CIPP model for program evaluation.

Weaknesses:

Page e53, incorrect date for approval of proposal by the graduate school's executive council.

The project's timeline and milestones were not developed in the narrative (p. e53-54). The management plan was too generally developed for the proposal and should have been more specific in regard to the responsibilities and alignment with the objectives. (p. e54-55).

Reader's Score: 22

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.

(4) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on Relevant Outcomes.

Note: Applicants may wish to review the following technical assistance resources on evaluation: (1) WWC Procedures and Standards Handbooks: <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Handbooks> (2) "Technical Assistance Materials for Conducting Rigorous Impact Evaluations": <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/projects/evaluationTA.asp>; and (3) IES/NCEE Technical Methods papers: http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/tech_methods/. In addition, applicants may view two optional webinar recordings that were hosted by the Institute of Education Sciences. The first webinar discussed strategies for designing and executing well-designed Quasi-Experimental Design Studies and is available at: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Multimedia.aspx?sid=23>. The second webinar focused on more rigorous evaluation designs, discussing strategies for designing and executing studies that meet WWC evidence standards without reservations. This webinar is available at: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Multimedia.aspx?sid=18>.

Strengths:

The logic model is forms the basis for the evaluation design which will incorporate the extensive collection of qualitative data (p. e56) for formative assessment. The research questions reflect the mixed method research design provide for both extensive qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis. All meet WWC standards except where indicated in the research questions with reservations. (p. 57). The method of evaluation is closely aligned to the outcomes as they are expressed in the research questions (pages e57-60), integrating measurement instruments used by the state education department which have well established validity and reliability as explained in the project narrative (pages e60-63).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 20

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Promoting STEM Education/Computer Science

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

Increasing the number of educators adequately prepared to deliver rigorous instruction in STEM fields, including Computer Science, through recruitment, Evidence-Based 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:

Provides partial focus of STEM within the structure of the graduate program as reflected in Goal 1 (p. e33) "promote STEM+C education through recruitment of STEM+C teachers" (p. e33).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/02/2018 12:07 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/24/2018 08:09 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Sam Houston State University (U423A180155)

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	25	24
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Sub Total	100	99
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Promoting STEM Education/Computer Science		
1. CPP1	3	2
Sub Total	3	2
Total	103	101

Technical Review Form

Panel #10 - Supporting Effective Educator Development - 10: 84.423A

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Sam Houston State University (U423A180155)

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 services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services.
- (4) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project are focused on those with greatest needs.
- (5) 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.

Strengths:

The project calls for an exceptional approach to teacher preparation by providing school-based field experiences with school-based professional development (p. e24).

Well thought out opportunities to build on lessons learned from TFA and grow a program to address similar needs (p. e25). The differences are notable in the duration and quality of the professional development, starting with the pre-entry phase before admittance to the program (p. e27).

Recruitment opportunities are strengthened by the pool of those committed to education through SHSU College of Education teacher certification program (p. e29).

Bridging the gap between theory and practice is a strong target goal (p. e38).

Recognizing the strong need to involve school principals in the improvement process is strong with the principal's academy (p. e44).

The basis for professional development plans includes personalization through training and mentoring which strengthens addressing needs of preservice teachers (p. e36).

Partnerships include a variety of sources, but ones that are complementary of one another: 4+1 TEACH coordinators, partner LEAs, Babble Lab (CTI and STEM+C camp and the humanities focus) (p. e40-41).

The focus will be on districts with the greatest need based on Title I status and those with difficulty attracting and retaining teachers in hopes to see an increase in student performance (p. e43).

Weaknesses:

none 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 extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and to the anticipated results and benefits.
- (3) 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.
- (4) 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 project demonstrates a strong desire to create a pipeline of teachers who are committed to serving in underserved communities. Student achievement is linked to having qualified, certified teachers in positions to begin and end the school year, rather than long-term subs (p. e44).

Cost of the program outweighs the costs absorbed when teachers leave the profession (p. e45). 4+1 TEACH works to reduce the costs of partnering with LEAs annually (p. e46).

Strongly built partnerships are the foundation for sustainability (p. e47).

The plan outlined in the proposal addresses the need to be able to implement practices after the Federal funding by putting elements in place which could be low cost and effective professional development facilitated by partner LEAs, such as personalized PLPs and Train the Trainer models (p. e47).

The dissemination plan includes avenues to inform policy and practice in the fields of teacher preparation and partnerships (p. e48).

Weaknesses:

none 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:

Objectives match goals and are measurable and are all related to the plan of recruiting and training teachers for underserved areas while partnering with LEAs (p. e49-53).

The management plan (table) outlines responsibilities, responsible parties, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks (p. e555-556).

Progress will be monitored through discussions between responsible parties to grow the program and make adjustments needed for success. These discussion groups also include an Advisory Board to address input and process evaluation and a group to discuss retention efforts. The various groups are well thought out and in line with the project goals and desired outcomes (p. e54-55). Groups lead in informing with feedback toward continuous improvement.

Weaknesses:

The narrative is general regarding specifics of responsibilities. Details are lacking. For example, the process for data analysis and reflection cycles could have been elaborated on and more details given to support the tables (p. e54).

Reader's Score: 24

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.

(4) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on Relevant Outcomes.

Note: Applicants may wish to review the following technical assistance resources on evaluation: (1) WWC Procedures and Standards Handbooks: <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Handbooks> (2) "Technical Assistance Materials for Conducting Rigorous Impact Evaluations": <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/projects/evaluationTA.asp>; and (3) IES/NCEE Technical Methods papers: http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/tech_methods/. In addition, applicants may view two optional webinar recordings that were hosted by the Institute of Education Sciences. The first webinar discussed strategies for designing and executing well-designed Quasi-Experimental Design Studies and is available at: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Multimedia.aspx?sid=23>. The second webinar focused on more rigorous evaluation designs, discussing strategies for designing and executing studies that meet WWC evidence standards without reservations. This webinar is available at: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Multimedia.aspx?sid=18>.

Strengths:

The plan calls for internal and external evaluation, both to be evidence-based and related to key outcomes to meet WWC standards (p. e55).

The leadership team will be responsible for monitoring the program implementation and evaluating project outcomes (p. e55).

The project allows for a qualified external evaluator who will also assist the leadership team with formative assessment (p. e56).

Research questions are thought out and match to the project goals (p. e57-60). Multiple data sources allow for multiple data points to analyze (p. e60).

Weaknesses:

none noted

Reader's Score: 20

Priority Questions**Competitive Preference Priority - Promoting STEM Education/Computer Science**

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

Increasing the number of educators adequately prepared to deliver rigorous instruction in STEM fields, including Computer Science, through recruitment, Evidence-Based 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:

High school camps with Computational Thinking as a focus (p. e34), the mention of STEM+C camps for students, and the focus on STEM (p. e33) shows thinking and preparation to support STEM and CS education.

Weaknesses:

The details throughout the project proposal could have tied to STEM and CS more clearly. For example, how the parts of the process support STEM education at a greater degree could have been more clearly detailed.

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/24/2018 08:09 PM

Status: Draft

Last Updated: 06/24/2018 11:08 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Sam Houston State University (U423A180155)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	35	34
Significance		
1. Significance	20	20
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	25	24
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	18
Sub Total	100	96
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Promoting STEM Education/Computer Science		
1. CPP1	3	3
Sub Total	3	3
Total	103	99

Technical Review Form

Panel #10 - Supporting Effective Educator Development - 10: 84.423A

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Sam Houston State University (U423A180155)

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 services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services.
- (4) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project are focused on those with greatest needs.
- (5) 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.

Strengths:

The approach to providing teacher education and support to undergraduates via a four-year program is potentially very effective in providing for a well prepared, effective, and potentially stable teacher workforce (e23-24). The components (selection/support) of the projected program have research-based effectiveness outcomes (e25) that reinforce the potential impact of implementation.

The teacher retention record of SHSU demonstrates effectiveness in this area that can assist in addressing this objective of the proposed initiative (e27).

The recruitment and support procedures described on pp. e29-30 are research based (commitment, high performers) and should contribute to achieving retention, effectiveness, and student achievement objectives.

The substitution of "residency" vs. student teaching address problems associated with entry of teachers into the provision and should contribute to an increase in qualified teacher into those LEAs served (e30).

SHSU's experience in collaborating with targeted LEAs is documented (SHIPS, e30) and provides for k-12 campus instruction. This addresses issues related to access/applicability that should help the program achieve its goals. Goal 4 (e40-42) specifically address the participation and responsibilities of each project partner.

The principals described on e32 regarding effective coach (concentrated, explicit, modeling, etc.) are supported by research findings and should allow the project to implement effective coaching.

The project targets LEAs with 60% economically disadvantaged students (e43) with 49% performing below grade level and a high percentage of new teacher (see also Table 3, e553; Table 4, e554).

Weaknesses:

The time management required to complete a M. Ed. and complete a first year of teaching is not addressed in this proposal and may limit the ability of the proposed project to achieve this outcome (e24).

Reader's Score: 34

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 extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and to the anticipated results and benefits.**
- (3) 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.**
- (4) 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 project will serve a relatively large number of participants (292 teacher candidates, 300 mentors, 200 principals, 2,200 students) in high need districts with a research-based approach to addressing teacher effectiveness and retention.

Cost per teacher candidate (\$13K) appears reasonable based on need, numbers served, and expected outcomes (e46).

The proposal provides for LEAs assuming responsibility for developing PLP's which would become a part of the practice of the district (e47). Activities in the proposal will also be incorporated into the existing SHIPS operation (e48).

Multiple dissemination outlets are described/proposed (e48-49) and the evaluator is expected to prepare at least one WWC standard level to be published in a peer reviewed journal.

Weaknesses:

None.

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:

Figure 1 (e45-53) presents a coherent list of project goals, objectives, and outcomes with are accompanied with specified measures (see also management plan Table 5, e555 for implementation milestones).

Pre-planning for project management (e53-54) provides for a quick initiation of project activities and a leadership team (dean, director, coordinators) is in place.

Procedures are established for providing feedback/improvement (e54) that should prove effective in monitoring/modifying program implementation.

The connection of the external evaluator to the leadership team is identified on e56 and should be effective is providing feedback information.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not detail the project timeline sufficiently to understand the progression of implementation across the multiple sites. This may provide confusion across partners as they actualize proposed components.

Reader's Score: 24

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.

(4) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on Relevant Outcomes.

Note: Applicants may wish to review the following technical assistance resources on evaluation: (1) WWC Procedures and Standards Handbooks: <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Handbooks> (2) "Technical Assistance Materials for Conducting Rigorous Impact Evaluations": <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/projects/evaluationTA.asp>; and (3) IES/NCEE Technical Methods papers: http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/tech_methods/. In addition, applicants may view two optional webinar recordings that were hosted by the Institute of Education Sciences. The first webinar discussed strategies for designing and executing well-designed Quasi-Experimental Design Studies and is available at: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Multimedia.aspx?sid=23>. The second webinar focused on more rigorous evaluation designs, discussing strategies for designing and executing studies that meet WWC evidence standards without reservations. This webinar is available at: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Multimedia.aspx?sid=18>.

Strengths:

Table 6 (e557) provides for a succinct summary of the evaluation timeline that will assist in implementing evaluation activities and assuring valid/reliable data.

The research questions in Table 7 (e558) and on pp.e57-60 along with the logical model (e578) provide a sound basis for evaluation of the project's activities/outcomes and will aid in the understanding of any findings.

The validity and reliability of the proposed measures are addressed substantially on pp. e61-63 and are acceptable and

appropriate measure for the evaluation of this project.

Weaknesses:

Treatment teachers are selected for invitation/admittance to the program from the top fifty percent of their class by GPA. The comparison group selection should be selected from a similar high performing gpa population rather than only controlling for teaching experience as proposed(e57).
The applicant's procedure may result in baseline inequivalence.

Reader's Score: 18

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Promoting STEM Education/Computer Science

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

Increasing the number of educators adequately prepared to deliver rigorous instruction in STEM fields, including Computer Science, through recruitment, Evidence-Based 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 proposed STEM-C high school camp and Computational Thinking/integration across curriculum component of (e34) contribute to both recruitment of STEM teachers and the increase in STEM skills across all teachers.

Weaknesses:

None.

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Draft
Last Updated: 06/24/2018 11:08 AM