

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/06/2018 10:01 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Kansas State University (U336S180046)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Services		
1. Project Services	15	15
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	40	35
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	25	25
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	19
Sub Total	100	94
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	100

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Kansas State University (U336S180046)

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:

Project KSTEP-UP requires partners in K-12 and postsecondary education and geographically diverse partners to be effective (e24-e26). The proposed partners for this project (i.e., Kansas State Department of Education, KSU College of Education, KSU College of Arts and Sciences, Kansas City Community College, Seward County Community College, USD 500 Kansas City Kansas Public Schools (KCKPS), and USD 480 Liberal Public Schools) are appropriate. The applicant plans to implement teacher preparation curricula that focus on continuous improvement of new teacher effectiveness in teaching skills through working with school districts (e26). In this way, the program will be responsive to local needs.

Research has shown that similar types of early college high school interventions are effective for student achievement and graduation. The applicant also cites evidence that integrating clinical experiences into the program can increase prospective teacher success (e26). KSU requires that all portions of teacher education are research-based (e28) coursework is aligned with State Content Standards and Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC). KSTEP-UP elements are also aligned with practices shown effective in studies evaluated by What Works Clearinghouse reviews (e49).

The new KSTEP-UP early college high school pathway is of sufficient intensity and duration to lead to changes in teacher graduation and recruitment (e26-e28). The clinical portion of the program (including use of SWIVL to record teaching, expert feedback, conversations with experts, reflection), coursework, capstone project, and two-year induction is sufficiently structured to promote learning and growth (e27-e28, e37).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

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 project has a strong focus on bringing the programs to participants to make them more accessible through addressing factors such as distance elasticity, and community ties (e39). This focus seeks to make college more accessible for students in these diverse and high need areas while giving students the opportunities to train locally and address local needs for diverse teachers (e39).

Project goals, outcomes, and activities are clearly specified (e39-e52). Many of the outcomes are clearly measurable (e.g., KSTEP-UP graduates participating in two years of induction, Certification in ESOL, KSDE licensure in elementary education) (e45).

Grant funding is intended to build the pathway that will continue operation after funding ceases (e52). In this way the project is designed to build capacity.

The approach is exceptional in that it combines: 1) a local focus to recruit participants from diverse high needs districts, 2) an early college high school component to give students support in high school and help them receive college credits and graduate, 3) a clinical component, 4) rigorous teacher training, and 5) a partnership between K-12 districts, local community colleges and an R1 institution.

Weaknesses:

It is unclear how some of the outcomes will be measured, such as “A revised, year-long clinical experience will provide a sustained and high-quality preservice clinical education program to further develop teaching skills of all prospective teachers.” Or “Weekly seminars led by Clinical Instructors aligned to specific needs of partner districts and high-need LEAs, Praxis test prep”. It is unclear in cases such as this whether the applicant is measuring whether these things are developed, attended, or measured in terms of quality (e39-e52).

Reader's Score: 35

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 management plan timeline (e54-e58) clearly list the personnel responsible for each project task, a rough timeline for when the task will be completed, as well as milestones to measure completion.

After federal funding ceases, the applicant will have a developed and revised teacher education program infrastructure (e58) as well as cohorts of participants trained using this program to teach in local districts. The applicant also asserts that cost savings from training and retaining local teachers will offset some of the costs of the project (e59), making it more sustainable.

The resources and support presented to support KSTEP-UP are considerable and are planned to continue after funding ends (e59-e60). Many of the resources, including technology catalyst and Midwest Equity Assistance (MEAC) Resource Library, are housed at KSU (e59-e60).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

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:

The applicant proposes both summative and formative evaluation to assess both project success as well as measure quality of implementation (e62). Some of the outcomes are measured with standardized test scores, licensing exams, or institutional data and so will be reliable and valid (e65).

The applicant presents a timeline complete with evaluation methods that illustrates that evaluation will occur throughout the project (e63). The applicant intends to collect data from various sources and use triangulation to strengthen the veracity of results (e64). The applicant intends to use pre-post data to measure change in some outcomes. The applicant intends to use reasonable methods to analyze the qualitative portions of the evaluation.

Weaknesses:

As some measures (e.g., the online survey) are still to be constructed, their reliability and validity cannot fully be assessed.

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:

The project intends to recruit from STEM programs (i.e., Girls Researching Our World [GROW], and Exploring Science, Technology and Engineering [EXCITE]) partnered with KSU (e33). KSTEP-UP participants will also participate in earning computational thinking micro-credentials (e33).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

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 project plans to recruit students from underrepresented populations through recruiting from diverse schools (e.g., KCK and Liberal) (e41); supporting culturally responsive, community-based events (e41); and using social media and local gathering points to disseminate program literature (e42).

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 found.

Weaknesses:

The applicant indicated on their application materials that they were not a novice applicant (e14).

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/06/2018 10:01 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/07/2018 05:41 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Kansas State University (U336S180046)

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	35
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	25	25
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	15
Sub Total	100	90
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	96

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Kansas State University (U336S180046)

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:

Project KSTEP-Up encompasses a variety of institutions and partners throughout the state, namely: Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE), KSU College of Education (KSUCOE), KSU College of Arts and Sciences (KSUAS), Kansas City Kansas Community College (KCKCC), Seward County Community College (SCCC), USD 500 Kansas City Kansas Public Schools (KCKPS), and USD 480 Liberal Public Schools (page e21); and the ability of this project to bring together such a wide swath of partners shows it will have the power and support to be able to succeed. The 'buy-in' from these educational entities is strong.

Kansas State University is classified by the Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Ed as R1: Highest research activity (Carnegie, 2014). The KSUCOE faculty are charged by the University Provost and the Office of the Dean of the College of Education to include an empirically-based and scientifically-valid research component to all faculty agendas and require all components of teacher education to be research-based (page e28). As a result of this focus, the applicant is assumed to be well-versed in integrating up-to-date knowledge from both research and effective practice.

Quality, intensity and duration are all sufficiently addressed (pages e35 – e37), with efforts such as individualized and job-embedded PD through microcredentials, etc.

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 KSTEP-UP project approaches this work around both equity and opportunity (page e37), providing the rationale for the proposal.

Each KSTEP-UP student's experience will be uniquely enhanced with the integration of a SWIVL robot, aimed to document classroom experiences and allow the reflective process to be enhanced (page e31).

Weaknesses:

While goals are outlined (pages e39 – e49), many are not quantified, leaving the desired outcomes vague and often transactional in nature. For example, "Faculty and student surveys" (page e48), "Observations and surveys from Clinical Instructors, mentor teachers, KSUCOE graduates, and administrators (page e48), etc., thus providing insufficient detail in this area.

Reader's Score: 35

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 management plan (page e54) provides a clear breakdown of roles and responsibilities, defined responsibilities, timelines, and more, thus demonstrating strength in the area of the quality of the plan.

The "grow your own approach" (page e58) takes a unique approach to maximizing the empowerment of community members, resulting in the likely continued work and impact within this community.

The KSUCOE Catalyst Technology Center (page e60) provides an innovative space that allows the integration of technology.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were 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:

KSU's Office of Educational Innovation and Evaluation will lead the project evaluation and has significant experience with this type of work (leading more than over 32 US DOE funded projects) (page e62).

Weaknesses:

While the Logic Model is detailed and descriptive, it lacks the specifics around outcomes (i.e. references throughout to "increase" but not to what or by how many) (page e61). Example: Increased student achievement, Increased access, etc.

Reader's Score: 15

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 project includes strategies to recruit individuals to teach in rural communities and teacher shortage areas, including STEM, Special education and English learners (page e42)

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:

Specific strategies to recruit a diverse pool of participants, including strategies to recruit mid-career professionals from other occupations, are included (page e61).

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:

The applicant indicated that they were not a Novice Applicant (page e14).

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/07/2018 05:41 PM

Status: Submitted

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

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Kansas State University (U336S180046)

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	36
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	25	25
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	17
Sub Total	100	93
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	99

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Kansas State University (U336S180046)

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 some evidence of partner collaboration in addressing common needs of the target schools (p. 3). This demonstrates evidence of examining data to determine needs, and working across geographic areas to meet those common needs. Additionally, modeling the proposed project after the KSDE Kansas Can vision illustrates a plan to align goals and approaches in order to address specific needs (p. 4).

The strategy of using a SWIVL robot and recording device to document classroom experiences and promote conversation and reflections about practice represents an innovative approach that has just recently been implemented and studied (p. 11). Research from the National Research Council is included to support the approach of the proposed project (p. 6).

Including long-term, individualized, job-embedded professional development through micro-credentials demonstrates evidence of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services (p. 15). A year-long clinical residency also illustrates evidence of the duration and intensity needed to affect changes in practice (p. 17).

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 based upon research surrounding issues of equity and opportunity (p. 17). Through creation of a more streamlined pathway to college and the teaching career, college becomes more accessible, which can in turn address the teacher shortage needs and the lack of diverse teachers who are effective in the high-need LEAs (p. 19).

Goals within the proposed project are paired with activities that are designed to support progress toward the goal (p. 19). This structure provides clarity and specificity in how each activity corresponds with a goal.

Evidence of potential sustainability beyond the period of federal financial assistance is presented in several ways. For example, the grow your own teacher component within the proposed project has the potential to benefit the partner districts long-term through enhanced methods of providing site-based professional development and an increase in the pool of teachers available (p. 39). Likewise, building a diverse teaching force that reflects the student demographics in the area provides a long-term benefit of increased access to and opportunities for teaching in the immediate community area (p. 32).

Evidence of exceptionality is apparent within the model of the proposed project. For example, underserved populations can experience not only availability of college options but the levels of access and support they need beginning in high school (p. 32). Higher numbers of students could potentially be interested in teaching as a result of the target activities within the proposed project.

Weaknesses:

The goals do not all contain measurable outcomes (p. 19). For example, one of the outcomes is a well-development recruitment plan that targets underrepresented populations (p. 19). It is not readily apparent how this outcome will be measured or what constitutes a well-developed plan. Additional information on the desired level of improvement or specific increases across different populations is needed to fully determine how this will be measured.

Reader's Score: 36

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:

Key project tasks are listed with the person or group of people responsible for facilitating task completion (p. 34-38), which provides clarity in who will be leading that particular component.

The timeline includes milestones for each major task to guide project completion overall (p. 34-38).

The grow your own teacher component within the proposed project has the potential to benefit the partner districts long-term through enhanced methods of providing site-based professional development and an increase in the pool of teachers available (p. 39).

Access to advanced technology, IT support, and current research-based practices on a variety of topics all demonstrate adequate support for the proposed project in a number of different ways (p. 40). Additionally, the Center for Student Success and Professional Services provides guidance for students and teachers throughout their professional programs (p. 40). This support is critical to ensuring that each component in the proposed project is maximized for the benefit of the participants and students.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were 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:

Formative evaluation data will be gathered over the course of the proposed project to inform progress and provide feedback that can be used to improve specific areas (p. 42). Summative data will also be analyzed to determine the success of the proposed project in meeting the established goals (p. 42).

Qualitative and quantitative data will be gathered from multiple sources, including course assessments, observations, surveys, and student achievement data (p. 43). This increases the potential of collecting reliable and valid performance data and assessing relevant outcomes.

The Logic Model includes a thorough description of the goals and outputs (p. 41). This adds clarity in how each component will be assessed as it relates back to the goal.

Weaknesses:

In some cases, the Logic Model is lacking specific details on the desired outcomes. For example, one long-term outcome listed is increased student achievement (p. 41). It is not clear what degree of increase is desired or how this will be compared with the current data.

Reader's Score: 17

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 proposed project includes a STEM component with specific programs, including GROW and EXCITE (p. 13). Building upon these programs and sharing information for recruitment purposes can increase the number of educators adequately prepared to deliver rigorous instruction in the STEM fields.

Each partner LEA will be able to participate in computational thinking in micro-credentials (p. 13). This access provides additional motivation and opportunities for participants to engage in STEM-based training.

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:

Recruitment efforts in the high schools will focus on reaching out to diverse students through Future Teacher meetings with KSUCOE Educational Ambassadors (p. 21).

Family nights with culturally responsive activities for potential students and families to interact with same-culture representatives of the faculty and student populations can also increase the potential of disseminating recruitment information to diverse student populations (p. 22).

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