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

# Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** The Orchard Foundation (U336S180007)

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

|  | | Points Possible | Points Scored |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Questions** | | | |
| **Selection Criteria** | | | |
| **Quality of Project Services** | | | |
| **1.** Project Services | | 15 | 13 |
| **Quality of Project Design** | | | |
| **1.** Project Design | | 40 | 40 |
| **Quality of the Management Plan** | | | |
| **1.** Management Plan | | 25 | 25 |
| **Quality of the Project Evaluation** | | | |
| **1.** Project Evaluation | | 20 | 20 |
| | **Sub Total** | 100 | 98 |
| **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 | 104 |

# Technical Review Form

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

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

**Applicant:**  The Orchard Foundation (U336S180007)

**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:**

   (i)
   • The applicant lists each partnership (e.g., LEA Cenla) and fully describes their contributions (e.g., 10 school personnel in-kind) and participation (p. 32 – 38). Additionally, the applicant provides evidence (e.g., preparing 51 residents qualified in content knowledge) that these partnerships have been ongoing and have produced strong results in the areas of teacher preparation (e.g. Central Louisiana Academic Residency for Teachers CART; p. 38).
   (iii)
   • The applicant describes a comprehensive sequence of coursework (that already exists, e.g., summer I: 9 graduate hours including Instructional Planning), additional training opportunities (e.g., nine half day sessions), a structured mentoring component during residency, and 1-1 coaching during induction that is designed to support new teachers. These program elements could lead to qualified teachers who persist in their positions (p. 41 – 44).

   **Weaknesses:**

   (ii)
   • The applicant describes utilizing project components taken from two programs (Philadelphia Teacher Residency and CART); however, the applicant does not adequately describe the research or evidence associated with the programs, so it is not clear why these models were selected (p. 38 – 39).

**Reader's Score:**      13

**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:**

(i)
• 	The logic model (appendix G) and the six planks (e.g., cohort groups) listed are fully described and include descriptions of all facets of the proposed program (p. 4- 5).

(ii)
• 	Goals and objectives are all specific and measurable (e.g., retain 90% of graduates during the first three years; p. 27 – 28). For each goal, the applicant describes multiple objectives that are fully described and include specific targeted numbers and timelines (e.g., recruit 44 participants who will complete the project in 15 months).
(iii)
• 	The applicant provides evidence of a systematic and ongoing training program for the coaches. Training will include professional development on collaboration and pedagogy as well as how to provide quality feedback to new teachers. With this development and training of personnel (i.e., coaches) within the schools, coaches could potentially continue these responsibilities beyond the funding period.  This could build capacity within the schools where the coaches are located (p. 25).
• 	The applicant provides descriptions of multiple partnerships with the schools and the state (e.g., Believe and Prepare) that are providing significant matched in-kind funds. The applicant states that the program will have access to continued funds from these sources beyond the funding period (p. 28 – 29).

(iv)
• 	The applicant fully describes a comprehensive selection criteria for participants including a multi-stage interview process (p. 8). This could lead to selecting qualified participants for the program.

• 	The applicant describes specific mentor training as well as opportunities for program personnel to observe and provide feedback to mentors. The program requires that all mentors have a National Board certification (p. 10), which could result in strong, qualified mentors who will be able to support residents (p. 9).

• 	The applicant provides research-based evidence (i.e., Wright-Harp & Cole) that the Five-Tier mentoring model has been used previously (e.g., National Science Foundation) and produced successful outcomes (p. 14). This provides a strong rationale for incorporating the model into the program.

• 	The applicant described the residency program (i.e. partnering a resident with a mentor who teaches in the STEM fields) and identified that suitable mentors in the STEM discipline may not be available for the residency; therefore, the applicant described a backup plan of using highly qualified teachers in other content areas (p. 10).

• 	The applicant will provide opportunities for residents to complete coursework online, which will  provide flexibility in placing residents in more schools and in more areas since they are not tied to a particular campus to complete the coursework (p. 12-13).The applicant has identified a research-based framework for observations and feedback as well as performance rubrics (e.g., Framework for Teaching). P.15

• 	The applicant will have participants complete STEM coursework including curriculum that focuses on computational thinking processes. Additionally, participants will teach under the guidance of a STEM teacher, attend additional monthly technology trainings, and have access to appropriate hardware and software in the classrooms. This provides a comprehensive foundation for developing new STEM teachers (p. 18 – 19).

• The applicant fully describes the coaching model and all induction program elements, which include involving the administrators in each facet of the induction program. By including all three partners (i.e., administrators, coaches, and new teachers), this could lead to increased buy-in and ongoing support and communication between the partners (p. 23). Additionally, the applicant describes networking opportunities for coaches that could lead to continued improvement and opportunities for feedback for coaches (p. 23).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:** 40

**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:**

   (i)
   • The applicant fully describes the objectives, timelines and milestones (e.g., recruitment plan implemented by Jan 2019) that could lead to successfully accomplishing project tasks (p. 45 – 50).
   • The applicant fully describes the main roles and identifies the personnel responsible for leading the proposed project (e.g., principal investigator) who have decades of appropriate experience (e.g., 25 years in education) that could lead to successfully accomplishing the goals of the project (p. 54 – 58).

   • The applicant describes the use of a Partnership Outcomes Team (i.e., team comprised of staff from all partners), school visits, reports, and ongoing communication. This could lead to stakeholders being well informed throughout the project (p. 51).

   (ii)
   • The applicant provides evidence that project elements (e.g., cohort support structures) will be integrated throughout the different partnerships, which could lead to systemic change that continues past the funding period (p. 53).
   • The applicant describes a significant amount of matched funds (i.e., $8 million) and a reduced tuition cost for participants. This is a strong evidence of support and commitment to the project from multiple partners and could lead to commitment past the funding period (p. 54).

   **Weaknesses:**

   No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:** 25

**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:**

   (i)
   • The applicant describes using propensity score matching within a quasi-experimental design. This could allow a means to create a statistically matched control group and provide for a more thorough assessment of the outcomes (p. 67).

   (ii)
   • The applicant fully describes and identifies surveys, interviews, and specific assessments to be used in the evaluation plan (e.g., Compass; p. 66 – 67). The applicant fully describes the formative and summative plan, which includes questions of focus, data sources (e.g., Compass scores) and timelines providing a comprehensive foundation for the evaluation plan that could provide valid and reliable data (p. 60 – 65).

   **Weaknesses:**

   No weaknesses 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:**

   • The applicant fully describes the proposed program to recruit, train, and retain STEM teachers in rural Louisiana. The applicant described STEM coursework with evidence of including instruction in effective pedagogy. The applicant will provide residents use of technology in the classroom with year-long opportunities to teach alongside a STEM mentor. This could lead to qualified STEM teachers (p. 16).

• The applicant described additional monthly technology trainings for residents. This ongoing and substantial training could lead to residents using technology in the future in their own classrooms (p. 17).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses 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 applicant described resident training in pedagogy and cultural competence that will be integrated throughout the coursework and residency to build skills in working with impoverished student populations (p. 40). This could lead to teachers becoming more effective with these populations.

   • The applicant described a recruitment plan (e.g., community broadcasts, radio talk shows) that will target specific communities (i.e. Cenla rural communities). The applicant proposes targeting teachers from the partner LEA communities so that teachers who graduate from the program could potentially be similar to students in these communities and could lead to the graduates returning to these communities (p. 7).

   **Weaknesses:**

   No weaknesses 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 are noted.

**Weaknesses:**

•        The applicant does not confirm that they have never received a grant or sub-grant under the TQP program; and have never been a member of a group application (i.e. in a TQP eligible partnership); and have not had an active discretionary grant from the Federal Government in the five years before the deadline date for applications under the program.


**Reader's Score:**        0

---

**Status:**          Submitted
**Last Updated:**    08/03/2018 08:54 AM

# Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** The Orchard Foundation (U336S180007)
**Reader #2:** **********

|  | Points Possible | Points Scored |
|---|---|---|
| **Questions** | | |
| **Selection Criteria** | | |
| **Quality of Project Services** | | |
| **1.** Project Services | 15 | 13 |
| **Quality of Project Design** | | |
| **1.** Project Design | 40 | 40 |
| **Quality of the Management Plan** | | |
| **1.** Management Plan | 25 | 25 |
| **Quality of the Project Evaluation** | | |
| **1.** Project Evaluation | 20 | 20 |
| **Sub Total** | 100 | 98 |
| | | |
| **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 | 2 |
| **Novice Applicant** | | |
| **1.** CPP 3 | 2 | 0 |
| **Sub Total** | 8 | 5 |
| | | |
| **Total** | 108 | 103 |

# Technical Review Form

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

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

**Applicant:**  The Orchard Foundation (U336S180007)

**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:**

   (i) The proposed partners are appropriate and have a record of prior collaboration. The roles of each partner are well-defined (e51-56) and appropriate to their areas of expertise. The overall partnership plan is well thought out and provides the requisite skills to carry out the project.

   (iii) The proposed services have sufficient intensity and duration. The proposed graduate program is 15 months (e60), and the program provides two years of ongoing support (e25). The graduate coursework is appropriate (e60-61) and the applicant has made adjustments to provide a hybrid experience instead of one that is fully online (e31).

   **Weaknesses:**

   (ii) While the proposal identifies two residency models, the Philadelphia Teacher Residency and the Central Louisiana Academic Residency for Teachers), the proposal does not provide research or other evidence supporting the efficacy of either model.

**Reader's Score:**   13

**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:**

(i) The proposal demonstrates a clear rationale. The logic model (e89) is well specified, including clear outputs, short, intermediate, and long-term outcomes, and appropriate assumptions and external factors. The overall collection of strategies and activities (Train, Transition, Teach) (e25) are logically connected and internally consistent (e23-24).

(ii) The proposal has two major goals and five associated objectives (e46-47). The goals are specific, and the objectives are measurable. In most cases benchmarks are provided, such as retaining 90% of CLIP graduates.

(iii) The proposal seeks to institutionalize parts of the proposed plan. By building courses and programs that can be maintained through business as usual, sustainability is enhanced. The accelerated MAT and the NSU trainings (e47-48) are such programs. The proposal also outlines a general plan for continuation of the induction program by having it absorbed by the local partner school districts (e47-48).

(iv) The proposed project structure of Train, Transition, Teach is relatively straightforward, based on recruiting new teachers, engaging them in graduate instruction, and placing them in high need areas (e49-50). The plan is well defined and structured. One innovative aspect of the proposal is the use of an online graduate program to potentially reduce the barriers created by distance.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:**    40

**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:**

   (i) The proposal contains clear goals and objectives linked to milestones with responsibility indicated at the organizational level (e64-69). The timelines are detailed and comprehensive with appropriate scheduling and a clear flow of work. The proposal also includes a range of accountability measures to support leadership in maintaining the proposed work (e69).

   (ii) The proposal acknowledges that the program as a whole will likely not continue past funding (e71) but that elements of the proposed program may continue. The accelerated MAT and the NSU trainings (e71-72) are sustainable past the end of funding because they will become part of the business as usual work after being institutionalized. The applicant further proposes that local districts can absorb the induction program.

   (iii) The applicant provides $8.8 million in matching support, mostly from the partner school districts (e73, e180).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.


**Reader's Score:**     25



**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:**

    (i) The evaluation plan provides for both a formative and summative approach (e78). This is appropriate for the type of project and can provide valid and useful information. In particular, the summative analytic design is potentially rigorous (e86), using propensity score matching to compare teachers in and out of the program.

    (ii) The proposed evaluation plan is thorough and feasible. The proposal provides a cross-walk between the data to be collected and the project's objectives (e79, Table 5) that provides a strong framework for planning the evaluation work. The proposal also provides clear descriptions of the formative instruments (e84-86) which underscores the effectiveness of the applicant's pre-planning.


    **Weaknesses:**

    No weaknesses 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:**

The proposal is well-designed to support recruiting and retaining teachers (e25) in STEM fields. The Train, Transition, and Teach approach is a logical model for recruiting and supporting teachers over time. The three steps reflect the logical sequences of recruiting and training new teachers, transition to the districts with induction and professional development support, and then have the teachers become independent. Additionally, the proposal includes standards for ensuring the quality of the participants (e27).

**Weaknesses:**

No substantive weaknesses identified.

**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 proposal focuses on effective instruction by working to increase the skills and knowledge of STEM teachers. One course in the proposed preparation curriculum focuses on supporting rural students (e59).

   **Weaknesses:**

   The proposal does not provide for a systematic approach to recruiting or retaining minority students. The applicant relies upon recruitment from its region which is largely rural. Even if successful this would not increase diversity the workforce and, given that many would come from the same region as the current workforce, could reinforce current disparities.

**Reader's Score:**      2

**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 noted.

   **Weaknesses:**

   The applicant does not provide information demonstrating that it meets all three criteria for this priority: that it has never received a grant, it has never been a member of a group that has applied, and has not had an active discretionary federal

grant within the last five years.

**Reader's Score:**     **0**

---

**Status:**         Submitted
**Last Updated:**   08/02/2018 10:10 PM

# Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** The Orchard Foundation (U336S180007)
**Reader #3:** **********

| | | **Points Possible** | **Points Scored** |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Questions** | | | |
| **Selection Criteria** | | | |
| **Quality of Project Services** | | | |
| **1.** Project Services | | 15 | 12 |
| **Quality of Project Design** | | | |
| **1.** Project Design | | 40 | 40 |
| **Quality of the Management Plan** | | | |
| **1.** Management Plan | | 25 | 25 |
| **Quality of the Project Evaluation** | | | |
| **1.** Project Evaluation | | 20 | 20 |
| | **Sub Total** | 100 | 97 |
| | | | |
| **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 | 103 |

# Technical Review Form

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

**Applicant:**  The Orchard Foundation (U336S180007)

**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:**

   (i)       The applicant provides a detailed description of services (i.e. graduate degree, 15-month residency program) to be provided by involving multiple collaborators (Northwestern State University's Gallaspy College of Education and Human Development (GCEHD), College of Business & Technology (COBOT) Computer Information Systems (CIS) Department) using established curriculum and credential programs with rigorous courses and recruitment programs. (p. 22)

   (ii)       The applicant clearly describes the services to be provided by the project including effective research that supports stringent admission selection process (Denton et al., 2009) and an online accelerated Master's program (Means, et al., 2009). (p.26)

   (iii)       The applicant provides a comprehensive description of the professional development services (mentoring program) that are of sufficient quality and intensity.  These professional development services include rigorous recruitment with stringent admission requirements, 15-month accelerated graduate program, year-long residency and mentor support, and two year induction programs. (pp. 26, 41)

   **Weaknesses:**

   (ii)       The applicant states that the residency is based on other successful residency models (Philadelphia Teacher Residency) but provides no references to determine if the proposed model will lead to improvement in practice.  (p. 57)

**Reader's Score:**       12

**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:**

(i)        The applicant provides sufficient details to support the rationale in the Logic Model which clearly lays out inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes and overarching goals.  The applicant provided an example of inputs (e.g. university faculty) and outputs/activities ( i.e. annually recruit and select residents).  The applicant included various level of outcomes (i.e., short, intermediate, and long term) designed to achieve the overarching goals.  (p. 89)

(ii)        The applicant provides a comprehensive description of SMART goals, objectives and outcomes.  For example, the applicant provides a short-term goal to recruit and prepare 11 residents who meet or exceed NSU's MAT program acceptance criteria. (pp. 46-47)

(iii)        The applicant sufficiently provides a detailed description of how the project will build capacity (i.e. 11 CLIP teachers per year) and yield results beyond the grant by including in-kind support (i.e. $8.8 million in matched in-kind funding, technology).

The applicant indicates that the induction program will be absorbed by the school district and indicated that the online graduate program will be institutionalized through program tuition revenues and increased enrollment numbers due to positive success (pp. 47-48)

(iv)        The applicant provides a detailed description of recruitment practicum, residency, induction and professional development.  For example, the applicant explains that as part of the rigorous recruitment the applicant provides a short-term goal to recruit and prepare 11 residents who meet or exceed NSU's MAT program acceptance criteria.  The applicant states that participants will receive a living wage stipend and reduced tuition, both of which will attract more participants allow students to focus on their residency full time. (pp. 46-48)

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

**Reader's Score:        40**

**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:**

    (i)        The applicant provides a detailed description of the management plan to achieve the project on time and within budget.  The applicant provides comprehensive SMART goals with clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and

milestones.  For example, the applicant lists one activity as developing recruitment materials and provides details on the timeline,  milestones, and responsible parties  (e.g. developed and implement by January 2019, and it is the responsibility of TOF, GCEHD, COBT, CIS and school districts. (pp. 63-69)

(ii)      The applicant provides a detailed description of how the project will build capacity (i.e. 44 new CLIP teachers) and yield results beyond the grant.  The in-kind support includes  $8.8 million in-kind funding, technology (i.e. laptops, software) and supports nearly 100 experienced educators who will be trained to support new teachers that should yield results beyond the grant.  (p.47)

(iii)      The applicant states that the induction program will be absorbed by the school district and that the online graduate program will be institutionalized through program tuition revenues and increased enrollment numbers due to positive success providing impact and longevity beyond federal funding. (pp. 47-49)

(iv)      The applicant provides a description of the adequacy of support for the proposed project including examples such as personnel, salaries, fringe benefits, and tuition reduction. (52)


**Weaknesses:**

None noted.


**Reader's Score:      25**



**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:**

   (i)      The applicant provides a detailed description of the evaluation design to include a mixed-method approach that includes of a formative and summative evaluation design with objectives that will provide valid and reliable performance data including using an external evaluator.  The applicant used a crosswalk table to document the questions, project data source, methods, and timeline. For example, the applicant provides a formative evaluation question, lists the project objective that it supports, identifies the data source and method of collection (surveys and focus group interview), and documents when it will occur (i.e. semi-annually).


   (ii)      The applicant provides a detailed description of the methods of evaluation which are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the project. The proposed design includes the use of mixed methods and a quasi-experimental design.  The applicant provided details of the instruments used to gather data (i.e. graduate survey, mentor survey). (pp. 84-87)


   **Weaknesses:**

   None 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:**

   The applicant provides a sufficient description of the projects design to improve student achievement (i.e. increasing the number of educators adequately prepared in a 15-month accelerated graduate program, year-long residency and mentor support, and two-year induction).  In addition, the applicant states that 44 students will be recruited as residents over the course of the funding, another example of the strength. (pp. 46-47)

   **Weaknesses:**

   None 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 applicant provides a detailed description for how the project will support the recruitment of educators by using several strategies to recruit (i.e. radio, social media, print material) underrepresented populations.

   Moreover, the applicant documents the support for retention to include one specific course that directly addresses Competitive Preference Priority 2. This course will be offered at the beginning of the residency so that CLIPRs are immediately made aware of and prepared to respond to the challenges faced by cultural diversity (i.e. students in rural schools).  The applicant also indicates that the year-long residency will occur in a rural high-need school to ensure that participants have the field experience to put theory into practice. (pp. 13-14, 26, 40)

**Weaknesses:**

None 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:**

   Applicant does not address this CPP.

   **Weaknesses:**

   The applicant does not confirm that they have never received a grant or sub-grant under the TQP program; and have never been a member of a group application (i.e. in a TQP eligible partnership); and have not had an active discretionary grant from the Federal Government in the five years before the deadline date for applications under the program.

**Reader's Score:** 0

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 08/03/2018 12:21 AM