

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/14/2019 11:48 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: University of North Carolina at Charlotte (U336S190004)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	40	38
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Resources	20	17
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	18
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	17
Sub Total	100	90
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. STEM/Computer Science	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Invitational Priority		
Invitational Priority		
1. Promise Zones	0	0
Sub Total	0	0
Total	105	95

Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - Teacher Quality Partnership - 6: 84.336S

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: University of North Carolina at Charlotte (U336S190004)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

(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 for meeting statutory purposes and requirements.

Strengths:

- The proposal clearly demonstrates the collaboration of the University of North Carolina at Charlotte and Cabarrus County Schools (e17, e52-e53). The collaboration is evident in both the design, proposed leadership structure (e56-e58), as well as the continuous feedback model that exists for input from all organizations. For example, the partners have co-designed the teacher residency model to leverage faculty expertise in partnership with district teacher mentors to create a coherent experience for teacher residents (e35-e36). This is a strength of the proposal as it leverages the expertise from both researchers and practitioners to inform the development and implementation.
- The proposal clearly outlines five primary goals, each with aligned objectives, strategies, milestones and performance measures (e21-e27). The goals presented are specific and measurable and align the outcomes of the proposed residency program to meet the articulated community needs for the North Carolina school partners. For example, the proposal articulates that the fifth goals associated with improving teacher candidate performance through coursework, support of cohort structure, and mentoring/induction support as measured through teacher performance assessments and student learning outcomes. This exemplifies the connection between the residency program and student outcomes, which is a noted strength of the proposal.
- The proposal includes a clear goal associated with recruiting candidates of color for high needs teaching areas, and comprehensive set of strategies and milestones for achieving that outcome (e21). The strategies for recruitment demonstrate a comprehensive set of actions to recruit and select high caliber candidates, which is noted as a strength for the proposal.
- The proposal clearly defines the coursework for teacher candidates in Goal #3, which demonstrates a clear alignment of objectives to practical learning opportunities and high-leverage teaching practices (e23). The inclusion of these practical strategies within the program, was a noted strength as it prepares teachers with skills to be successful in their future classrooms.
- The proposal presents a comprehensive literature review of the relevant research that supports the design of the project. The inclusion of national data regarding high STEM teacher attrition, paired with North Carolina local data builds a coherent demonstration of need (e27). Additionally, the inclusion of national data for teacher attrition in high poverty schools and recruitment challenges for teachers of color (e28) justifies the diverse strategies included within the proposal.
- The project demonstrates an intensive needs assessment that has been completed by the partners in

preparation for the development of this proposal (e29, e82). The project design informed by data collection from multiple stakeholder groups including teachers, professors, and candidates (e29). The robust data set creates a sound foundation for a successful program design that meets the needs of all partners.

- The proposal clearly details the significance of the project through the investigation of the shift to high leverage practices (e30) in lieu of strictly theory-based coursework. The inclusion of university faculty professional learning is a strength of the proposal, as it allows a mechanism to educate professors on the theory of action (e30).
- The partners have worked together for the past two years (e29) to redesign the teacher education program, demonstrating a commitment to the shifts in instruction that are proposed. This demonstrates sustainability beyond the grant award period.
- The proposal presents a comprehensive sustainability plan through a commitment of funds for ongoing mentoring beyond the federal award period (e50-e52). Additionally, the inclusion of a clear dissemination plan (e54-e55) increases possible replication of the model in other partnerships.

Weaknesses:

- The proposal includes a clear goal associated with recruiting candidates of color for high needs areas, and a comprehensive set of strategies and milestones for achieving that outcome (e21). However, it is not clear what the target is for enrollment of those individuals. The proposal would be stronger with the inclusion of targets related to the number of teachers they expect to recruit in relation to this goal.

Reader's Score: 38

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

1. The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources for the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

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

(ii) The relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project.

Strengths:

- The proposal presents the inclusion of resources from the partner institution through a budget justification table (e147-e158). Additionally, resources are addressed in the logic model (e92). The resources presented are comprehensive and clearly align with the needs of the project. The resources are being used thoughtfully, recognizing an attention to sustainability with future use of scholarships and reduced program fees (e50-e52).
- The partners have included letters of support (e124-e34) from each of the partner institutions. Each letter outlines their commitment to the project with specific partner responsibilities, demonstrating their understanding of their commitment to the implementation and success of the project.
- The engagement of community members from each of the partner organizations in the needs assessment to create the comprehensive solution is a noted strength of the proposal (e29). Each of the partners have an investment and input into the project design, which demonstrates a commitment to the implementation and potential success of the project.

Weaknesses:

- The proposal does not provide a narrative specific to the adequacy of support, including facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources, from the applicant organization or the lead applicant organization (e50). The lack of narrative related to this required element was a noted weakness, as it makes it unclear that the project has adequate resources to be successful.

Reader's Score: 17

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

(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.

Strengths:

- The proposal clearly presents a management plan that addresses roles on taskforces (e52) related to each of the proposed goals and objectives. Each taskforce incorporates a continuous feedback model from practitioners to inform the project work. This level of detail creates a strong foundation and path for the execution of the project toward the intended goals and is noted as a strength.
- The proposal clearly presents key project personnel and their qualifications (e56-e58, e93-e121) and demonstrate the capacity and expertise of the leadership for the project. The leadership team represents for all partners and bring a diversity of expertise related to teacher education, local school district, and STEM learning. The prior experience working with STEM in K-12 and prior grant management experience were noted strengths.
- The proposal notes that relationships and communication about teacher preparation is currently in action and that will continue beyond the grant period (e50-e52). The establishment of these communication channels and strategies from planning are viable approaches to ensuring project outcomes are accomplished.

Weaknesses:

- The key project personnel appear to have multiple existing projects and responsibilities (e56-e58, e93-e121). It was not clear that the personnel had capacity to achieve the management plan as stated. The inclusion of FTE commitments of the existing personnel did not appear to meet the needs of the plan as designed.

Reader's Score: 18

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(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 presents an evaluation plan that meets the What Works Clearinghouse Design Standards with Reservation (e68). The design includes both qualitative and quantitative data and seeks to evaluate both the teacher residency design as well as impact on student learning. This comprehensive approach was noted as a strength to the proposal.
- The proposal engages an external evaluator, Horizon Research Inc. to complete evaluation on each of the five goals of the proposal. The use of multiple tools and measures demonstrates a comprehensive data set and evaluation of the proposal. The qualifications of the evaluator (e63) as well as the plan for multiple measures were strengths of the proposal (e66-e69).
- The proposal presents a comprehensive table that outlines the measures and timeline associated with each of the five key research questions. The table clearly demonstrates how multiple data sets will be used for analysis (e66-e69).

Weaknesses:

- The proposal does not clearly describe the methodology for establishing the matching groups that will be used for evaluation in the quasi-experimental matched study. This methodology is key to the study and warrants additional details to establish if the process is rigorous to inform possible outcomes (e66).
- Additionally, the proposal lacked information about the sample sizes that would be used in the evaluation process, as well as the effect size that was being used as a benchmark for success (e66-e69).

Reader's Score: 17

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

- 1. Projects designed to improve student achievement or other educational outcomes in computer science by increasing the number of educators adequately prepared to deliver rigorous instruction in STEM fields, including computer science, through recruitment, evidence-based professional development strategies for current STEM educators, or evidence-based retraining strategies for current educators seeking to transition from other subjects to STEM fields.**

Strengths:

- The proposal includes explicit goals, strategies and measures associated with recruitment of mathematics teachers for computer science (e21-e22). The focus on expanding credentialed teachers for computer science by engaging mathematics teachers is a noted strength of the proposal.
- The proposal clearly details a residency program that has aligned the curricular redesign to the K-12 Computer Science Framework (in alignment with local policy). The use of a national resource to inform the work of preparing computer science teachers is a strength of the proposal (e32).

Weaknesses:

- No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Invitational Priority - Invitational Priority

1. An applicant may address one or both of the following priority areas:

Propose to serve children or students who reside, or attend TQP project schools, in a qualified opportunity zone as designated by the Secretary of the Treasury under section 1400Z-1 of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended by the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act (Pub. L. 115-97). In addressing this priority, an applicant must provide the census tract number of the qualified opportunity zone for which it proposes to serve children or students and describe the extent to which the applicant will serve individuals in the Qualified Opportunity Zone(s). OR

Demonstrate in its application that it has received or will receive financial assistance from a qualified opportunity fund under section 1400Z-2 of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended by the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, for a purpose directly related to its proposed project. In addressing this priority, an applicant must identify the qualified opportunity fund from which it has received or will receive financial assistance and describe the extent to which the applicant will use the financial assistance for its proposed project.

Strengths:

- The proposal notes an intent to qualify for the invitational priority (e17).

Weaknesses:

- The proposal does not provide clear evidence that the TQP project schools are located within an opportunity zone as described by the priority. Additionally, the proposal lacks a clear articulation that it has received or will receive financial assistance from a qualified opportunity fund. As neither of these priority areas are addressed and supported with evidence, it is not clear how the proposal qualifies for this invitational priority.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/14/2019 11:48 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/14/2019 11:57 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: University of North Carolina at Charlotte (U336S190004)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	40	38
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Resources	20	14
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	16
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	18
Sub Total	100	86
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. STEM/Computer Science	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Invitational Priority		
Invitational Priority		
1. Promise Zones	0	
Sub Total	0	
Total	105	91

Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - Teacher Quality Partnership - 6: 84.336S

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: University of North Carolina at Charlotte (U336S190004)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

(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 for meeting statutory purposes and requirements.

Strengths:

- Strong program design that includes the goals of filling teacher vacancies in high need schools serving economically distressed communities, improving teacher candidate preparation, increasing teacher retention, and improving teacher performance. (e20-27)
- This grant, in conjunction with partner school district, has identified potential openings for the graduate when they finish their licensure requirements, which provides the school district with a way to know which positions might be filled, and the student will know they have a job. (e21-27)
- Coursework for the students is online, and in order to make sure the online courses are of good quality, the courses are created through certified appropriate online programming. (e21-27)
- Grant has a three-tiered plan for retention of students in their program that includes boot camps, coaching, and professional development. (e43)
- Mentorship training to ensure they are providing the appropriate services to pre-service teachers. Training is through a Teacher Education Institute. (e25)
- This proposal chooses to focus on depth of fewer skills instead of simply covering everything minimally. Grant writers listened to the school personnel that made the recommendation to focus on the practical hands-on skills and listening to their needs is important. (e21-27)
- This TQP grant focuses on STEM and mastery of the computer science standards. The proposal recruits in computer science major classrooms and moves further to make sure residents are able to meet the standards of computer science. (e21-27)

Weaknesses:

- Small program with an outcome of 36 students which is only 10% of the need of the school district partner. (e21-27)
- * This proposal includes math and science, but it also includes other areas that are not high needs areas. Since the grant is requesting that high needs areas be the priority, the grant proposal should recruit primarily for math and science and have a goal to have a certain percentage of the participants work towards becoming math and science teachers.

(e22)

Reader's Score: 38

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

1. The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources for the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

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

(ii) The relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project.

Strengths:

- College of Education already includes a Center for STEM Education and has an Office that provides which oversees clinical placements and has relationships with surrounding schools, and the Urban Education Collaborative that provides a hub for research on urban school improvement. Resources appear already available for many of the initiatives and the grant provides the framework. (e147)
- Partner district provides substitutes opportunities to students and is guaranteeing positions upon graduation (e122) The school district is a long-time collaborator with the College of Education and by providing opportunities for tutoring, but also having some of their teachers teach courses at the university level within the College. (e62)
- Online courses will be created using the online program certification (e34). This resource provides a guide to ensure the courses are of good quality for the teacher candidates.

Weaknesses:

- No one person is well vested in the project. Perception is it must supplement other activities, which is fine, but it may also be funding other activities. This needs to be clarified. (e148)
- Resources are available but they are scattered across two Colleges within Centers with little explanation of which individual in that Center or College might be doing to support the grant. and one school district, with only a vague method of tracking. (e58)

Reader's Score: 14

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

(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.

Strengths:

- Timeline provides a plan over five years that includes training, implementation and professional development for teacher candidates. The timeline is manageable to meet the outcomes of the grant within the five-year period. (e21-27)
- Objectives meet most of the expectations of the grant with the outcomes aligning with the objectives. Proposal clearly states when each aspect of the grant will take place, who is responsible, and how success will be measured. (e21-27)

Weaknesses:

- Unclear whether the personnel have the capacity to conduct the needs of the grant. With only a small percentage of their time commitment available to manage this grant, perhaps including the number of hours needed to complete the duties as assigned would make this clearer. Or, an explanation of who has duties similar to this on campus already thus taking less time to do this separately for the grant alone. (e148)
- Personnel for the grant are provided many duties given the small percentage they are vested in the grant. Unless these duties parallel similar duties they are already conducting, it would be impossible to complete the expectations outlined in 5% or 8% of one's time (e148-151)

Reader's Score: 16

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(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:

- Use of Horizons Research Inc has 30 years of experience in external evaluation and evaluating K-20 initiatives. (e63)
- Formative research questions focus on quality of partnership, recruitment, clinical experience, coursework, professional development mentoring, cohort model, and the induction program. Summative questions focus on whether goals were achieved and the impact on the programming. Including very specific questions for each type of evaluation provides specific information that can be included throughout the grant, which can be beneficial. (e64-65)
- HRI will be doing a comparative analysis between those who go through this program and those who go through the traditional program at the university which will show the impact this model might have on teacher programs. (e66)

Weaknesses:

- No methodology for evaluating those who are partnered by providing matching funds. Having a tool to evaluate the strength of the partner locations and how they have assisted with implementing the grant would provide great insights for the PI to see what has worked and not worked for the partner. (e66-69)

Reader's Score: 18

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. **Projects designed to improve student achievement or other educational outcomes in computer science by increasing the number of educators adequately prepared to deliver rigorous instruction in STEM fields, including computer science, through recruitment, evidence-based professional development strategies for current STEM educators, or evidence-based retraining strategies for current educators seeking to transition from other subjects to STEM fields.**

Strengths:

- This grant requires STEM fields of study for teacher candidates, which this proposal provides (e22)
- Recruiting using various means instead of just one or two provides a stronger change for success. Opportunities mentioned in the proposal include recruiting in college classes, working with Diversity offices on campus to identify appropriate strategies for recruitment, and organizing recruitment days for prospective students from underrepresented groups (e13, 21-22)
- Use a non-profit organization outside of the university and within the community to help recruit black males into the profession. Profound Gentlemen works specifically to build a community of black male educators (e13, 129)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found

Reader's Score: 5

Invitational Priority - Invitational Priority

1. **An applicant may address one or both of the following priority areas:**

Propose to serve children or students who reside, or attend TQP project schools, in a qualified opportunity zone as designated by the Secretary of the Treasury under section 1400Z-1 of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended by the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act (Pub. L. 115-97). In addressing this priority, an applicant must provide the census tract number of the qualified opportunity zone for which it proposes to serve children or students and describe the extent to which the applicant will serve individuals in the Qualified Opportunity Zone(s). OR

Demonstrate in its application that it has received or will receive financial assistance from a qualified opportunity fund under section 1400Z-2 of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended by the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, for a purpose directly related to its proposed project. In addressing this priority, an applicant must identify the qualified opportunity fund from which it has received or will receive financial assistance and describe the extent to which the applicant will use the financial assistance for its proposed project.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/14/2019 11:57 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/14/2019 08:52 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: University of North Carolina at Charlotte (U336S190004)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	40	38
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Resources	20	15
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	18
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	17
Sub Total	100	88
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. STEM/Computer Science	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Invitational Priority		
Invitational Priority		
1. Promise Zones	0	0
Sub Total	0	0
Total	105	93

Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - Teacher Quality Partnership - 6: 84.336S

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: University of North Carolina at Charlotte (U336S190004)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

(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 for meeting statutory purposes and requirements.

Strengths:

- The applicant proposes a strong project design through a partnership with the Cato College of Education, the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, College of Computing and Informatics and Cabarrus County Schools. These partnerships are key to a resident program that is highly likely to build capacity and yield results. (pg. e35).
- The rationale includes a comprehensive two-phase innovative delivery of the course work delivery and residency. The curriculum is robust and rigorous; phase I includes 16 credits of coursework and Phase II 14 credits which leads to a master's degree completed within 18 months (pg. e33).
- The program further demonstrates a strong rationale by being developed in collaboration with key school partners and reviewed by faculty, program completers, and K-12 partners (pg. e33). The project provides a clear pathway for two types of teacher certification pathways: traditional teacher who needs a yearlong internship and teacher candidates who have been hired and will complete their residency period in their classroom (pg. e34).
- The goals, objectives, and outcomes are clearly stated, i.e., there are five goals that are informed by a task force. Each goal has a clear objective, strategy, milestone, and measurable outcomes. For example, goal 1 for recruiting 36 teacher candidates half of whom are students of color includes clear objectives of the core subject areas of need, the strategy of a task force which includes leaders, milestones of meeting goals, and measurable outcomes.
- The project is likely to build capacity and yield results after the period of federal funding has ended because the project design includes a very cost efficient and high-quality program, \$4,000, online, and can be completed within 18 months (pg. e51). There is future cost sharing between partners such as the University committing 12 \$1,000 awards and Cabarrus County Schools human resources committing to providing teacher substitute opportunities twice a week (pg. e50).

Weaknesses:

- Goal 2 is vague in developing a strategy for placement of teachers (pg. e22). Having MOUs with the School Superintendent in the high needs schools would aid in having a commitment that a certain amount of students will be placed in the high need schools.
- Goal 3 is unclear as to the details of the online course format. It is limited in providing details about the courses in the online format and how computer science classes are provided (pg. e23).

Reader's Score: 38

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

1. The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources for the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

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

(ii) The relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project.

Strengths:

- The applicant provides that a "large private gift" will support each mentor teacher for coaching and \$800 stipend (pg. e41). The applicant provides evidence of space for classes, meetings, and residency programs.
- A valuable resource is the funds that each school receives to hire substitute teachers to further compensate the mentoring teachers and enable the time to develop leadership skills (pg. e41).
- The applicant provides evidence of building capacity in regards to the professional development of mentors after the period of Federal funding has ended, i.e., funds will be provided at the school level to allow time for mentors to observe and coach their mentees (pg. e49).

Weaknesses:

- The investment of time committed to the project by the administration is minimal, i.e., devoting more time by project leadership to carry out the project will ensure the probability of program success (pg. e50-51).

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

(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.

Strengths:

- The applicant presents a very detailed and high-quality management plan that is highly likely to achieve the objectives within budget, and the responsibilities, timelines, and milestones are clearly defined (pg. e52).
- The management chart (pg. e53) clearly defines the key personnel management plan of the five goals. The PI is a professor and Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education and Teacher Preparation in the Cato College of Education (pg. e56). The Co-PI includes leadership in key roles such as Assistant Superintendent of Human Resources for the School District, a Co-PI Professor and Chair of the Middle, Secondary, and K-12 Education program at UNC Charlotte, a Co-PI who is the Dean of the Cato College of Education, a Co-PI who is Professor and Assistant Dean for Teaching and Innovation, a Co-PI who is Assistant Professor in the Department of Mathematics and Statistics at UNC Charlotte, and a Co-PI who is Professor of Reading and Elementary Education (pg. e57-58). The key personnel hold leadership positions in key strategic partner institutions which are important decision makers. The management team are highly qualified and have releavent experience to carry out the project.

Weaknesses:

- It is unclear how much time the PI and co-PI will dedicate to the project each week such as the percentage of FTE (pg. e56).

Reader's Score: 18

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

(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 provides that an external evaluator with 30 years of experience evaluating K-20 initiatives will conduct all external evaluations (pg. e63).
- The applicant provides relevant summative questions that will be evaluated and how data will be collected each year (pg. e64-65). Table 6 (pg. e66-69) illustrates clear formative evaluation questions, data sources, time period of data collection, and analysis methods.

Weaknesses:

- It is unclear how certain district data will be shared with the researchers; there is not a plan or an agreement for a MOU detailing the sharing of data (pg. e63-69).
- The methods for establishing the match group is not clear. Not establishing clear match group methods may cause validity issues and reliability when looking for patterns across multiple studies (pg. e63-69).

Reader's Score: 17

Priority Questions**Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1**

- 1. Projects designed to improve student achievement or other educational outcomes in computer science by increasing the number of educators adequately prepared to deliver rigorous instruction in STEM fields, including computer science, through recruitment, evidence-based professional development strategies for current STEM educators, or evidence-based retraining strategies for current educators seeking to transition from other subjects to STEM fields.**

Strengths:

The applicant provides a comprehensive program that seeks to increase the number of educators in STEM fields through setting an annual goal to recruit a minimum of 4 STEM teacher candidates in each cohort of 12 (pg. e37). The project is rigorous and is based on evidence based strategies.

Weaknesses:

No Weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Invitational Priority - Invitational Priority

- 1. An applicant may address one or both of the following priority areas:**

Propose to serve children or students who reside, or attend TQP project schools, in a qualified opportunity zone as designated by the Secretary of the Treasury under section 1400Z-1 of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended by the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act (Pub. L. 115-97). In addressing this priority, an applicant must provide the census tract number of the qualified opportunity zone for which it proposes to serve children or students and describe the extent to which the applicant will serve individuals in the Qualified Opportunity Zone(s). OR

Demonstrate in its application that it has received or will receive financial assistance from a qualified opportunity fund under section 1400Z-2 of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended by the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, for a purpose directly related to its proposed project. In addressing this priority, an applicant must identify the qualified opportunity fund from which it has received or will receive financial assistance and describe the extent to which the applicant will use the financial assistance for its proposed project.

Strengths:

The applicant proposes a solid program to serve students who reside in TQP, opportunity zone in a highly quality teacher residency and MAT program to increase teachers from underrepresented groups in high poverty schools. (pg. e17 and e. 20).

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/14/2019 08:52 AM