

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/06/2018 10:37 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The University of Central Florida Board of Trustees (U336S180044)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Services		
1. Project Services	15	12
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	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 #1: *****

Applicant: The University of Central Florida Board of Trustees (U336S180044)

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 applicant stressed the collaboration of partners using an Enhanced Partnership Model (e18) and planned for meetings. The partners are already involved in similar work, and the new project is a natural extension of their trajectory (e19). Partners from the school and HEA will be used to support sustained learning as prospective teachers are supervised (e24).

The learning modules to be constructed by project personnel will be based on evidence-based practices reviewed by the What Works Clearinghouse, and so will have strong evidence of effectiveness (e20). The applicant also intends that these modules meet university, district, and state requirements (e20), and address the needs of students with disabilities, mathematics content standards, and English learners (e21).

The training is of sufficient quality (i.e., evidence-based and presented in ways that have been successful in past research) and duration (i.e., 1 year) to lead to improvements (e26).

Weaknesses:

Since the learning modules are not yet developed, it cannot be determined whether they will be both evidence-based and up-to-date, and it is not clear how some of the mathematics mentioned will be integrated into the training (e20-e21).

The applicant did not address the intensity of the intervention (e25).

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:

The applicant talks about problems in education, which they call gaps, and then states how this program will address those gaps (e27-e33). In doing this the applicant makes it thoroughly clear how this program will improve these situations and fill these gaps.

The applicant clearly specified several goals: 1) recruiting prospective teachers from diverse backgrounds and mid-career professionals (e33-e35); 2) developing, trying, using, evaluating, and disseminating an Enhanced Partnership Model to rigorously improve learning for diverse mathematics learners (e35-e37), and 3) retaining and developing teachers and administrators through their careers using various types of supports and then disseminating the successful model (e37-e40). The applicant connects inputs to activities and outcomes in their logic model and also discusses short-term, intermediate, and long-term outcomes (e88). This makes the connections between project goals, objectives, and outcomes clear.

The project builds on the current duties of UCF employees and faculty (e40) and uses non-project resources. The applicant also plans to integrate the Content Enhancement Modules into coursework and professional development. The project is highly sustainable.

The approach is exceptional in the partnership and collaboration between the partners in this project, the focus on disciplinary literacy and 21st century skills, the integration of content, and support from preservice education through induction (e41-e42).

Weaknesses:

Though the applicant stated goals and objectives, they were not quantifiable targets to meet for these goals and outcomes. The desired level of improvement was not expressed (e34).

The pedagogical strategies that the applicant plans to use are not clearly delineated (e27-e42).

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:

Project responsibilities are clearly allocated to project personnel (e41-e42). The management plan includes planning for bi-monthly meetings to further collaboration (e43), which will strengthen the team's ability to achieve project goals. The objectives presented in this section clearly match the program goals presented elsewhere (e33, e35, e37, e43-e44). The management plan in table 2 clearly shows the timeframe that activities are planned for (e44-e50).

The program builds on current standards and requirements in the state (e50-e51) and the applicant also plans to integrate the Content Enhancement Modules into coursework and professional development that will be ongoing. This indicates great potential for the incorporation of these activities into the organization at the end of funding. The project has also secured letters of support and continued commitment from partners (e51, e160-e176), which reiterates the applicant's intent of sustaining the program.

UCF's resources will be made available to all partners (e51-e52), including an Education Complex, computer laboratories, one-on-one computer and statistical support, office space, instructional space, library, and video production facilities. Adequate resources will therefore be made available to all partners.

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:

Many data sources are institutional records or state standardized tests and so should be very reliable (e89-e92). Participant content knowledge will be measured using a measure (MKT) that has been used and found useful in past research (e89, e56). The project will use repeated measurement of many outcomes so that growth can be seen. The applicant intends to use a reliable and valid measure of student knowledge: the Florida Standards Assessments (FSA) Mathematics Test (grades 3-8) and i-Ready Diagnostic for Math (grades K-12) (e57).

The applicant intends a randomized controlled trial, the highest quality research design (according to What Works Clearinghouse) standards for isolating and measuring the effect of an intervention (e53-e56). The randomization method (randomly generated list after assigned to blocks) is adequate to produce true randomization and maintain the strength of the design. The control group is a business-as-usual control that will be an appropriate comparison to determine whether these new aspects (i.e., applied, inquiry-based performance tasks; and an enhanced internship) are effective.

The applicant plans to use various qualitative and quantitative data sources and plans to use triangulation to aid interpretation (e62). The evaluation plans both formative and summative assessment (e53). Formative data lends evidence to implementation of the program and areas for possible adaptation while summative assessment lends evidence to whether the program was effective. The project evaluation plan connects evaluation questions, performance measures, people responsible, the data collection methods or sources, and the planned dates of data collection (e89).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

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:

One of the program goals is to use an Enhanced Preparation Model to improve teacher knowledge and skills to "improve learning in mathematics for students with diverse learning needs in HNS" (e16). Part of their evaluation plan measures student achievement and self-efficacy in mathematics using the i-Ready Diagnostic for Mathematics as well as the Florida State Assessment in Mathematics (e90).

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:

One of the project's goals (and outcomes) is to "recruit prospective teachers from diverse backgrounds" (e16, e27-e28). They plan to do this through a multi-faceted recruitment model as well as additional academic support (e28).

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 that their novice status was not applicable in the application materials (e14).

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/06/2018 10:37 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/03/2018 03:49 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The University of Central Florida Board of Trustees (U336S180044)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Services		
1. Project Services	15	12
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	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: The University of Central Florida Board of Trustees (U336S180044)

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 inclusion of national, state, university and school district personnel serving on "Curriculum Committees," called "Technical Work Groups" (page e18), reflect the engagement of appropriate partners to ensure the effectiveness of project services. The process allows for regular sharing, progress monitoring, etc. among partners.

Best practices from the What Works Clearinghouse have been researched and integrated into the program design, critical areas beyond academics (such as Culturally Responsive Teaching) are emphasized throughout.

Weaknesses:

While research is cited around the need for high quality educational programs for diverse services (page e25), the proposal does not adequately describe areas such as intensity and how this will ultimately lead to the drastic change in practices and therefore impact on these populations as a result of the project.

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:

Gaps, coupled with potential impact of implementation of the project, provide sufficient need/rationale for the proposal; for example Gap 1 identifies the need to develop teachers with diverse backgrounds, particularly as it relates to the demographic background of its students. The proposed solution and impact is to develop a recruitment process which incorporates focusing on diverse and high quality candidates within High Needs Schools (HNS') (page e28).

Evidence exists to suggest that the proposed project will carry on beyond the period of the grant is clear. The combination of "intentional collaboration across educational partners, a sustainability and scale-up plan beginning in year three (that includes reporting, publishing and dissemination of products and knowledge across states and venues), and more (page e19) all demonstrate promise for continued efforts and impact. Additionally, the inclusion of diverse faculty already on staff further demonstrates this potential.

Weaknesses:

The project does not consistently shift its identified gaps and impacts to quantifiable goals. For example, on page e34 targeted recruitment efforts are described and statistics around diverse students are cited, yet no measurable targets are named.

While a focus exists for key priorities in this project (STEM, effective instruction, etc.) exceptional approaches are not necessarily evident (pages e41 – e42).

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:

An exceptional management plan and timeline with key roles/responsibilities (pages e44 – e50), all of which that are linked to objectives of the project, is evident.

With CAEP accreditation policies of the Florida DOE and the instructional priorities of OCPS, as well as Florida's ranking (7 of 87) and letters of support around collaboration, (e50 – e51), the applicant makes a strong case for the likelihood of continued efforts in this work.

Updated facilities, modern technologies, and desire to share and collaborate (e52) all suggest the resources available are more than adequate for the implementation of this program.

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:

The proposal adequately describes both the summative evaluation as well as the formative evaluation questions as demonstrated on page e53. Furthermore, the methods that will be used (pages e54 - e62) are clearly outlined.

The applicant has taken into consideration and planned for feasibility and appropriateness by including plans to integrate the "Joint Committee Program Evaluation of Standards of utility, feasibility, and propriety" (page e62), along with its Logic Model and backward mapped Project Plan.

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 proposed project is designed to recruit, prepare, and sustain highly-effective teachers with specific foci in mathematics and disciplinary literacy to teach and differentiate instruction for students with diverse learning needs in High-Need Schools (HNS) (page e18).

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 project, Enhancing Quality in Teacher Preparation in Mathematics within Urban Partnerships (page e18) seeks to recruit and retain educators who are effective and increase diversity from other careers, including but not limited to racial and ethnic diversity (CPP#2) (page e24).

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:

None noted.

Weaknesses:

Not applicable to this program.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/03/2018 03:49 PM

Status: Submitted

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

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The University of Central Florida Board of Trustees (U336S180044)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Services		
1. Project Services	15	13
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	40	31
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	25	25
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Sub Total	100	89
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	95

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: The University of Central Florida Board of Trustees (U336S180044)

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 partner collaboration through participation in Technical Work Groups (p. 1). This process allows for regular planning, sharing of resources, and progress monitoring of project activities among the partners. Additionally, building components of the proposed project upon current grant-funded activities demonstrates collaboration across projects and with multiple partners (p. 2).

With a focus on differentiation and concrete learning opportunities with manipulatives and algebraic thinking represents some evidence of general research-based practices in mathematics (p. 4). Further, the application references current research on teaching a diverse student population, disciplinary literacy, and the social context for learning (p. 5-6). This relevant research can help inform decision making within the project to best meet the needs of the high-needs schools.

Sustained, job-embedded professional development can potentially lead to improvements in practice due to the ongoing nature of the support that contains relevant feedback to address situations as they occur in real-time (p. 9).

The application includes evidence of the potential to provide high-quality professional development with leadership and instruction from the professors and instructional coaches participating in the training portion of the project (p. 9).

Weaknesses:

Specific details regarding how manipulatives will be used to enhance conceptual development and problem solving in mathematics are not readily apparent. Research connecting mathematics strategies designed to engage students with diverse learning needs could accentuate the series of project activities. Further, descriptions of how specifically algebraic reasoning support will be interwoven throughout the project activities could illustrate how the strategies connect to student learning of mathematics content needed for success in future mathematics courses (p. 4).

Sufficient evidence regarding the duration and intensity of the professional development services is lacking (p. e25). As a result, it is not clear to what extent they will lead to improvements in practice.

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 clearly established with data illustrating the magnitude of the teacher shortage, changing needs and demographics, dropout rates, and student achievement data (p. 10-11). The multi-faceted recruitment model and professional learning experiences within the proposed project have the potential to address the needs established.

Overall goals are presented to guide the focus of the project as a whole (p. 16, 18, 20).

Evidence of potential sustainability is shown in several ways. For example, dissemination and publishing of tools and knowledge can increase access to project resources beyond the period of federal funding (p. 23). Coordinating the proposed project activities with the ongoing work of the university professors and staff also expands the possibility of sustaining the results over time (p. 23).

The experience and expertise of the partners in the proposed project demonstrates the potential to provide high-quality professional development and sustained support with a focus on rigorous mathematics and disciplinary literacy (p. 25). Providing support across different phases, including preservice, certification, and induction is important for establishing systemic changes in practice (p. 25).

Weaknesses:

The goals established within the application are not clearly connected to specific objectives and measurable outcomes. It is not readily apparent what the desired levels of improvement are for each corresponding goal (p. 16, 18, 20).

Evidence of exceptionality in the approach could be expanded with a thorough description of how content knowledge in the target areas will connect with pedagogical knowledge and translate into student achievement. Strategies that will be employed to strengthen the rigor of the mathematics teaching practices are not clearly delineated (p. 4).

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:

A detailed list of activities is included to correspond with each objective helping to clarify what tasks are involved and when each is expected to occur (p. 27-33). The milestones provide evidence of a plan with incremental steps to ensure completion. A thorough description of the key roles and responsibilities demonstrates evidence of planning and paints a clear picture of who is responsible for ensuring that project activities are on track to finish according to the timeline (p. e44, e50).

The proposed project builds upon existing work of the project partners, which increases the potential for sustaining the activities and benefits into the ongoing work of the organizations at the end of the funding period (p. 33). Evidence of support from local and national partners can promote dissemination and sustainability of the knowledge and resources (letters of support).

Access to a renovated educational complex with enhanced technology capabilities demonstrates evidence of adequate facilities and equipment provided by the university (p. 34). Staff expertise and cutting edge digital tools are other key areas of support that can strengthen the overall project activities (p. 35).

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 and summative data will be collected to assess the effectiveness of the proposed activities (p. 36). Multiple data sources can increase the likelihood of collecting valid and reliable data.

Use of a randomized controlled trial demonstrates a thorough and feasible approach to assessing the effectiveness of the proposed project (p. 37). Pre- and post-tests will further provide insight into the learning experiences for each participant (p. 39).

The three project goals are evaluated regularly, which ensures a thorough and ongoing approach to monitoring effectiveness (p. 45).

Changes can be facilitated using feedback gathered from various sources (p. 47). This process can lead to program improvements throughout the life of the proposed project.

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:

The overall project goals contain a focus on rigorous mathematics to enhance teaching practices and impact student achievement (p. 25).

Student performance in mathematics will be measured using the i_Ready Diagnostic for Mathematics and the Florida State Assessment in Mathematics (p. e90). This demonstrates plans to monitor mathematics content knowledge over time and analyze results.

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:

Providing support across different phases, including preservice, certification, and induction is important for establishing systemic changes in practice (p. 25).

National dissemination of resources and knowledge acquired during the proposed project activities can enhance recruitment and retention efforts of educators (p. 23).

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