

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/06/2018 10:22 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Bowling Green State University (U336S180041)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Services		
1. Project Services	15	14
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	40	36
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	25	22
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	19
Sub Total	100	91
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Promoting STEM ED w/a focus on Computer Science		
1. CPP 1	3	3
Promoting Effective Instr. in Classrooms & Schools		
1. CPP 2	3	3
Novice Applicant		
1. CPP 3	2	0
Sub Total	8	6
Total	108	97

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Teacher Quality Partnership - 2: 84.336S

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Bowling Green State University (U336S180041)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services

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

(i) 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.

(ii) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project reflect up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.

(iii) 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.

Strengths:

BGSU is an appropriate partner in this area because of its previous history of successful professional development programs (e26-e27). The LEAs are appropriate partners because they have a need for trained teachers in difficult-to-staff areas (e.g., math, science, special ed, and ELL instruction) (e24, e54).

Some of the professional development will use targeted virtual reality teaching simulations so that teacher can practice and receive coaching and feedback (e33). The intervention will include a lesson study component, a practice that has both recent and older research to support its efficacy (e34-e35), as well as other frameworks like Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) (e48), which are based on research evidence. The formal text for the professional year portion of the intervention (i.e., Visible Learning for Teachers), focuses on educational research and research-based instructional practices (e37). This indicates a focus on using research-based teaching and enabling educators to judge research they encounter in the future. Universal Design for Learning will also be incorporated into the PD, which will increase the use of evidence-based practices in the PD (e44). The PD also intends to help teacher candidates learn how to gather information to be culturally responsive and address their students' previous knowledge, experiences, and abilities (e47-e48).

The professional development services proposed will also be offered to mentors, teachers, and administrators to encourage a supportive culture and community for the intervention (e28, e56). These services will be offered to teacher candidates and new teachers at several points: during their education, during clinical practice, and during induction programs (e31), which will make for appropriate duration and frequency.

In the initial year of the program, sophomores will participate in a weekly 2-hour learning community for a semester (e56) in addition to their usual clinical hours. This learning community will continue into the junior year and then preservice teachers will be provided with summer PD (e56). The novice teachers will also have an opportunity to be mentored and experience simulation IEP meetings (e56-e57). All mentors will participate in Danielson framework training (e57). This level of training seems adequate in quality and duration.

Weaknesses:

Because the professional development has yet to be designed (e28, e36-e37), it is not possible to fully assess the adequacy of the PD.

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the extent to which the proposed project consists of a comprehensive plan that includes a description of:

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

The project's impact logic model (e108) does explicate the connections between project goals, activities, proximal objectives, and distal objectives adequately. The logic model does reflect research (e.g., lesson study, simulations) that supports the project design being effective.

The objectives of the program are clearly stated (e24). The applicant plans to measure several things that are aligned with project goals, these outcomes are clearly specified in Table 7 and measurably from school records, interviews, and other sources (e69-e71).

The program will build on the BGSU's capacity, such as using a similar process and stream for recruitment as the already in progress "teacher match" (e53) and BSGU intends to develop modules that can be integrated into their teacher education program as well as curriculum that can be used in other PD contexts. These actions will yield results that extend beyond the period of financial assistance.

The approach is exceptional in that it: 1) Addresses improving knowledge for both those training to be teachers and novice teachers, 2) trains mentors in each building so that new and novice teachers are supported in their development, 3) uses research-based approaches of lesson study, simulation, and reflection to help novice teachers integrate evidence-based methods into their practice; and 4) offers microcredentials.

Weaknesses:

Though the curriculum will have already been developed, there are no supports or explicit plan for expanding the in-service PD program to other districts after the completion of federal assistance.

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

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

(ii) 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;

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

Strengths:

The applicant does delineate the roles of each key member of personnel (e59-e62, e67, e68, e208-e223). The applicant does present a timeline with major deliverables (e68).

Since the IMPACT project builds upon preexisting programs (such as “teacher match” and existing pre-teacher preparation programs at Toledo, Springfield, and Perrysburg) (e53), the intervention will continue after funding ceases because infrastructure and processes are already in place.

The applicant does discuss the resources available from the College of Education at BGSU (e67), as well as time and personnel allocation, and data security plans.

The applicant has resources from a school of education that is already doing some similar work, which saves on many costs. In addition, they have budgeted appropriately for supplies like access to the virtual reality environment, laptops, equipment to run the virtual reality, etc. (e217-e218, e223).

Weaknesses:

The task names presented in Table 6 seem to be missing part of the intended information (e68), which makes it harder to judge their alignment to the measures.

There is little discussion of the resources needed to be provided by the schools themselves beyond teacher time. It is not clear whether there are any needs for supplies or facilities to come from the schools themselves. Specific milestones are not clearly delineated nor is what specific staff would do at any point in time during the grant.

Reader's Score: 22

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers:

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

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

Strengths:

The project plans both formative and summative assessment to help provide regular feedback as well as to document the impact of the project (e62). The formative evaluation will occur with interviews of project faculty, supervising teachers, administrators and project IMPACT teachers to find out more information on the process of developing the curricula, and the most useful improved program outcomes (e63). These measures are appropriate to the development of the successful project and will be helpful for implementation in other contexts.

The research questions for the summative assessment focus on participant improvement (e63-e64), but the applicant also intends to include a comparison group to determine whether the participants in the program improve at a greater rate than preservice or novice teachers that did not participate in the program (e65). This is a more thorough design than their research questions require but will also provide more rigorous information on whether the program is effective.

Weaknesses:

Though many of the data sources will directly and reliably measure relevant outcomes (e65), reviewers do not know enough about the quality of some measures to say that the evaluation methods will provide valid and reliable data. Without more information about the interview protocols, questionnaires, or observation protocol, it is difficult to determine the reliability or adequacy of these measures.

Reader's Score: 19

Priority Questions**Competitive Preference Priority - Promoting STEM ED w/a focus on 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 (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1) professional development strategies for current STEM educators, or evidence-based retraining strategies for current educators seeking to transition from other subjects to STEM fields.

NOTE:

How does an applicant demonstrate that its proposed strategy for professional development and retention strategy for current STEM educators is evidence-based?

1. **Submitting a citation of a study that is (1) focused on a STEM-focused professional development or retraining strategies, (2) relevant to the proposed project, and meets at least the design standards set forth in the "Promising Evidence" definition; OR**
2. **Submitting a "Logic Model" that (1) identifies the STEM professional development or retraining strategy of the project and (2) is informed by research or evaluation findings that suggest the project component is likely to improve "Relevant Outcomes."**

Strengths:

STEM PD (e.g., Math Camp, Robotics cap) will be given to participants who will be teaching those subjects (e52). These PDs will be designed to increase teacher knowledge of the subject matter as well as to teach teacher candidates how to engage their students in the subject matter. The applicant plans to recruit participants from high-need teacher shortage areas (including STEM fields) (e54).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses present.

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority - Promoting Effective Instr. in Classrooms & Schools

1. **Projects that are designed to support the recruitment or retention of educators who are effective and increase diversity (including, but not limited to, racial and ethnic diversity).**

Strengths:

The professional development is designed to improve teaching through giving teachers training on "instruction that meets the unique learning needs of every student" in addition to training in applied practice (e28). The applicant also intends to recruit, hire, and involve diverse individuals and offer cultural sensitivity and ADA training (e13-e14).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority - Novice Applicant

1. Projects submitted by applicants that meet the definition of novice applicant at the time they submit their application.

NOTE:

The lead applicant must meet all three requirements to earn CPP 3 points:

1. Has never received a grant or sub-grant under the TQP program; and
2. Has never been a member of a group application (i.e. in a TQP eligible partnership); and
3. Has not had an active discretionary grant from the Federal Government in the five years before the deadline date for applications under the program.

Strengths:

No strengths.

Weaknesses:

Applicant has received teacher quality grants in the past (e26-e27)

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/06/2018 10:22 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/06/2018 08:51 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Bowling Green State University (U336S180041)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Services		
1. Project Services	15	15
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	40	34
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	25	23
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Sub Total	100	92
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Promoting STEM ED w/a focus on Computer Science		
1. CPP 1	3	3
Promoting Effective Instr. in Classrooms & Schools		
1. CPP 2	3	3
Novice Applicant		
1. CPP 3	2	0
Sub Total	8	6
Total	108	98

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Teacher Quality Partnership - 2: 84.336S

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Bowling Green State University (U336S180041)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services

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

(i) 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.

(ii) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project reflect up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.

(iii) 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.

Strengths:

Bowling Green's "Project Impact" effectively identifies key partners to maximize the effectiveness of its project services, including partners such as Toledo Public Schools (TPS), Springfield Local Schools (SLS), etc. (page e18). Additional evidence of how key partners will be engaged are included throughout the proposal, such as on page e29, where Building Mentor teacher roles are defined.

Project Impact seeks to take an "infusion approach," citing research around same (page e25 – e26) to infuse content into the teacher education program in order to ensure "critical learning is embedded within the core understanding and learning developed throughout the program." Additionally, research is effectively cited when making connections around the current data around teacher preparation programs and the need for Project Impact (page e78), specifically around decreases in the enrollment in and completion of teacher preparation programs.

The proposed project would be carried out over a period of five years, with three clearly defined areas of focus: "interventions delivered during teacher candidate education at BGSU, interventions delivered through meaningful clinical practice integrated within partner districts, and interventions delivered through the ongoing support and PD of induction programs for new teachers" (pages e24 – e25). The long-term approach of the implementation appears to address the need to provide services which are of sufficient quality, intensity and duration, ultimately leading to impact in the field (teachers and ultimately students).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the extent to which the proposed project consists of a comprehensive plan that includes a description of:

- (i) The extent to which the proposed project demonstrates a rationale (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).**
- (ii) The extent to which the goals, objectives and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable;**
- (iii) The extent to which the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance.**
- (iv) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for this competition.**

Strengths:

Goals are explicit and defined early, namely “90% of teacher candidates will graduate and obtain licensure; 80% of these graduates will be hired, many by our partner districts; and 80% of those hired will persist in the district for at least three years” (page e18), demonstrating an awareness that the need for these quantitative measures to drive the plan is key.

The integration of staff with experience around digital badges/microcredentialing and implementing same into the execution of the program (page e32), as well as virtual reality teaching simulations (page e33) presents a unique approach to engaging (often times young, new) teachers to the field, both encouraging student engagement as well as modeling an effective technique for designing content around the needs/profiles of learners.

The program builds on Bowling Green’s capacity using processes for recruitment that are already in place such as the teacher match. The applicant plans to integrate this project into the teacher education program and Professional Development (page e53).

The Project’s Impact Model on page e108 made clear connections between goals, project activities, etc. and supports the project design being effective.

Weaknesses:

The grant application states “it is our aim that all curriculum developed for PD be archived and adapted for curriculum infusion into appropriate programs and courses” (page e28), demonstrating a lack of evidence of results beyond the grant period. Therefore, evidence suggesting the continued impact/results beyond the grant period is not strongly communicated.

Reader's Score: 34

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

- (i) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.**
- (ii) 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;**
- (iii) The adequacy of support, including facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources, from the applicant organization or the lead applicant organization.**

Strengths:

The “Project Management” section of the proposal demonstrates evidence of the potential meeting of objectives both on time and within budget; beginning with the applications/admissions components, as well as defining the three phases of programming “Initial Year, Junior Year, Professional Year” (pages e53 – e56), as well as mentoring components (page e57).

The Project Impact Logic Model (page e108) provides a very clear, detailed plan that includes but is not limited to goals, objectives (proximal and distal). These goals are more specifically defined (page e227) on the “Project Objectives and Performance Measures Information” with quantitative measures, such as 90% of graduates obtaining licensure, as one example.

Weaknesses:

Roles and responsibilities for specific team members are vague (page e46); it was not clear what specific role each person would play in each step of the project.

Reader's Score: 23

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers:

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

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

Strengths:

An Advisory Board will be established, including members of Arts and Sciences departments, PK – 12 educators and administrators (page e27). Key individuals, such as the CEO of Toledo Public Schools, will serve on the Board and provide quarterly updates and also meet one time per year (page e59).

Evaluation has been prioritized within this project, and key questions relating to areas including teacher candidates' persistence, retention of employment with the district partner, impact on students such as students who speak English as a second language and have special needs, etc. are outlined (page e63 – e64).

The proposal makes the distinction around the need for, and describes the work in, both evaluation efforts that are qualitative (participants perceptions and opinions) as well as quantitative (attendance records, historical data, etc.) (page e65) to measure success toward defined goals.

The proposal includes budget support for two part-time graduate students who will work directly with the evaluation team throughout the project on data collection as well as program evaluation (page e66); this request reflects a prioritization of the evaluation component of the proposal and resources dedicated to same.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Promoting STEM ED w/a focus on 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 (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1) professional development strategies for current STEM educators, or evidence-based retraining strategies for current educators seeking to transition from other subjects to STEM fields.

NOTE:

How does an applicant demonstrate that its proposed strategy for professional development and retention strategy for current STEM educators is evidence-based?

1. Submitting a citation of a study that is (1) focused on a STEM-focused professional development or retraining strategies, (2) relevant to the proposed project, and meets at least the design standards set forth in the "Promising Evidence" definition; OR
2. Submitting a "Logic Model" that (1) identifies the STEM professional development or retraining strategy of the project and (2) is informed by research or evaluation findings that suggest the project component is likely to improve "Relevant Outcomes."

Strengths:

Recruitment of teacher candidates in high-need fields will be prioritized, with a "cohort will be limited to those students in a program of study for high need teacher shortage areas (including mathematics, science, special education, and the instruction of limited English proficient students). Priority for cohort given to underrepresented students, students designated from LEA high school teacher education program, military and second career candidates" (page e54).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority - Promoting Effective Instr. in Classrooms & Schools

1. **Projects that are designed to support the recruitment or retention of educators who are effective and increase diversity (including, but not limited to, racial and ethnic diversity).**

Strengths:

On pages e13 – e14, Bowling Green outlines seven explicit activities aimed at recruiting and retaining diverse educators, with initiatives such as offering transportation vouchers for those relying on public transportation, and hiring individuals who are multi-lingual, or possess a disability, to serve on various aspects of the team.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority - Novice Applicant

1. **Projects submitted by applicants that meet the definition of novice applicant at the time they submit their application.**

NOTE:

The lead applicant must meet all three requirements to earn CPP 3 points:

1. Has never received a grant or sub-grant under the TQP program; and
2. Has never been a member of a group application (i.e. in a TQP eligible partnership); and
3. Has not had an active discretionary grant from the Federal Government in the five years before the deadline date for applications under the program.

Strengths:

No strengths were noted.

Weaknesses:

Not applicable to this program.

Reader's Score: **0**

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/06/2018 08:51 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/07/2018 03:03 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Bowling Green State University (U336S180041)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Services		
1. Project Services	15	15
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	40	37
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	25	20
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Sub Total	100	92
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Promoting STEM ED w/a focus on Computer Science		
1. CPP 1	3	3
Promoting Effective Instr. in Classrooms & Schools		
1. CPP 2	3	3
Novice Applicant		
1. CPP 3	2	0
Sub Total	8	6
Total	108	98

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Teacher Quality Partnership - 2: 84.336S

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Bowling Green State University (U336S180041)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services

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

(i) 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.

(ii) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project reflect up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.

(iii) 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.

Strengths:

The application includes evidence of effective collaboration among partners. For example, BGSU provides STEM support and training through the Northwest Ohio Center for Excellence in STEM Education (p. 29). The partner districts in their letters of support demonstrate collaboration in various ways including identifying appropriate field placement experiences, CMT's, mentors and observers for the preservice teachers (p. e181).

Relevant research is provided to support effective practice in the services offered within the proposed project. For example, current and relevant research supports the use of micro-credentialing to recognize the completion of formal and informal learning (p. 10). Induction teachers participating in the proposed project will have opportunities to earn digital badges (p. 10). Virtual reality teaching simulations and a focus on content literacy are also supported by current research and represent key activities within the proposed project (p. 11, 17).

Support and professional development are provided in multiple ways throughout the project. Professional development will be provided before and during the professional year for teacher candidates, along with intensive site-based clinical practice and coursework, and a three year induction support system (p. 2-3). This training and sustained support represent sufficient intensity and duration to lead to improvements in practice.

High quality professional development offered over several years increases the likelihood of participants implementing new practices. Each area of focus within the project is supported with research and examples of effectiveness to indicate a potential for improving the practices of the participants in the project (p. 13-14).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the extent to which the proposed project consists of a comprehensive plan that includes a description of:

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

The rationale for the proposed project is illustrated through the Logic Model. The Logic Model provides connections between overall goals, activities, and objectives to meet the needs identified among the schools and potential project participants (p. e108).

The proposed project is based upon five objectives to provide direction and consistency throughout the life of the project (p. e18). The application contains specific measures aligned with corresponding data sources to support progress toward meeting the objectives.

Through intensive training and clinical support, the proposed project is likely to build the capacity of the participants in STEM instruction and other key areas over time (p. 4). The curriculum developed within the project is likely to yield results beyond the funding period as it will be infused into the existing programs and courses offered (p. 6). This represents a commitment to continuous growth and a support structure to meet needs identified among the target population.

The structure and intensity of the proposed project represents an exceptional approach in that it is multi-faceted and provides opportunities for participants to expand their content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, licensure, and collaboration opportunities centered around a STEM foundation (p. 8). Additional components of effective teaching are interwoven throughout the life of the project. Some examples include literacy assessment and interventions (p. 20), differentiation (p. 23), and Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (p. 26). Collectively, the intense training in each area can improve practices and student outcomes.

Weaknesses:

It is not readily apparent what specific outcomes are expected for each objective. Specific outcomes would help clarify what level of growth is expected for each objective.

Reader's Score: 37

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

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

(ii) 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;

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

Strengths:

Some of the major project tasks have a designated start and finish projection (p. 46). This provides clarity and direction in the overall timeline for completion.

The Logic Model provides connections between overall goals, activities, and objectives to facilitate overall project progression (p. e108).

Evidence of sufficient facilities, equipment, and supplies is included in the form of active learning classrooms, technology equipment and programs, and adequate seating and display mechanisms (p. 45). This collaboration between the university and partner schools demonstrates support and collaboration for meeting logistical needs.

The proposed project includes evidence of sustainability once funding has ended. By integrating the professional development experiences for professional year students and induction professionals into the core curriculum at the university, there is potential to continue use of the model at the end of the five years (p. 3). Further, the way in which previous grants have been implemented and have impacted changes to existing programs demonstrates a method of sustaining new initiatives beyond the initial funding period (p. 5). For example, the Inclusive Early Childhood licensure program, has been integrated into the organization and studied over time to determine effectiveness (p. 5).

Weaknesses:

Some of the roles and responsibilities for the specific deliverables are vague. For example, all tasks are assigned to the Project PI, BGSU faculty, or the evaluation team (p. 46). It is not clear from this information which specific tasks will be performed by each staff member at a given time interval.

Specific milestones are not clearly delineated. As a result, it is not readily apparent what steps are needed for each project task, when they should be completed, and who will oversee the finished product.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation**1. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers:**

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

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

Strengths:

Interviews with participating faculty, supervising teachers, administrators, and teachers in the field can provide useful data to inform progress toward desired outcomes (p. 41).

Qualitative and quantitative data are included in the evaluation process to ensure multiple data sources are considered and different measures of effectiveness are embedded in the evaluation (p. 43). Online and face-to-face data collection can inform progress from multiple angles.

The application contains specific measures aligned with corresponding data sources, population from which data will be collected, and timelines to facilitate a thorough and informative process for evaluating each desired outcome (p. 47-48).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Promoting STEM ED w/a focus on 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 (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1) professional development strategies for current STEM educators, or evidence-based retraining strategies for current educators seeking to transition from other subjects to STEM fields.

NOTE:

How does an applicant demonstrate that its proposed strategy for professional development and retention strategy for current STEM educators is evidence-based?

1. **Submitting a citation of a study that is (1) focused on a STEM-focused professional development or retraining strategies, (2) relevant to the proposed project, and meets at least the design standards set forth in the "Promising Evidence" definition; OR**
2. **Submitting a "Logic Model" that (1) identifies the STEM professional development or retraining strategy of the project and (2) is informed by research or evaluation findings that suggest the project component is likely to improve "Relevant Outcomes."**

Strengths:

Specific instruction in STEM, including math camps, robotics camps, and mentoring in computer science for girls in grades 5-8 within the proposed project demonstrates a targeted effort to increase knowledge and instructional practices in the STEM areas (p. 29-30).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority - Promoting Effective Instr. in Classrooms & Schools

1. **Projects that are designed to support the recruitment or retention of educators who are effective and increase diversity (including, but not limited to, racial and ethnic diversity).**

Strengths:

The proposed project indicates intentions to provide admission priorities to underrepresented students, military and second career candidates (p. 32).

Specific strategies are included indicating intentional efforts to recruit and retain educators who are effective and increase diversity. For example, the applicant proposes to offer transportation vouchers for partners of the program and participants who must use personal or public transportation to attend grant meetings, activities, and workshops, as needed and if available (p. e14).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority - Novice Applicant

1. **Projects submitted by applicants that meet the definition of novice applicant at the time they submit their application.**

NOTE:

The lead applicant must meet all three requirements to earn CPP 3 points:

1. **Has never received a grant or sub-grant under the TQP program; and**
2. **Has never been a member of a group application (i.e. in a TQP eligible partnership); and**
3. **Has not had an active discretionary grant from the Federal Government in the five years before the deadline date for applications under the program.**

Strengths:

It is indicated on the application that the applicant is not a novice applicant (p. e14).

Weaknesses:

It is indicated on the application that the applicant is not a novice applicant (p. e14).

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/07/2018 03:03 PM