

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/14/2019 04:30 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Cooperative Educational Services (U336S190011)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	40	37
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Resources	20	18
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	18
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	18
Sub Total	100	91
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. STEM/Computer Science	5	0
Sub Total	5	0
Invitational Priority		
Invitational Priority		
1. Promise Zones	0	0
Sub Total	0	0
Total	105	91

Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - Teacher Quality Partnership - 5: 84.336S

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Cooperative Educational Services (U336S190011)

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 demonstrates a rationale for the project based on a needs assessment that is presented. For example, the target student population is high need based on the 88% qualifying for free or reduced lunch, (p. e24) or the growing need for teachers based on the growing vacancy numbers, 123 in 2018 (p. e25).
- The overarching goals of the project are built upon the needs assessment: 1) improved collaboration between project members, 2) pre-service teacher residencies which blend theory and practice simultaneously with a laser-like focus on the domains and elements of the New Mexico teacher evaluation system, 3) intensive, individualized professional development, 4) selection, recruitment and support of mentor teachers who will serve as on-site teacher educators, and 5) a two-year induction support structure with an emphasis on improved student achievement. (p. e27). These goals make clear how the project will address the needs of the target population, such as difficulties with teacher retention and vacancies and improving student performance.
- Aligned with the goals, the project proposal includes objectives and performance measures, which are specific and measurable (p. e33-e36). For example, one objective is, in collaboration with LEA and CES, to provide two years of research-based mentor and induction support for novice teachers. (p. e36). Objectives like these, as well as others in the project, show that the project aims to build capacity.
- The project partially presents an exceptional approach to the grant program by building the capacity of teachers and mentor teachers for high needs schools in New Mexico, and building a community for these educators to support their ongoing development (p. e38-40). Under the weakness section, there is a note for why this constitutes only partial evidence.

Weaknesses:

- The project does not make clear how this project will be an exceptional approach with respect to the purpose of the TQP grant, which prioritizes the development of STEM-C or computer science teachers. A focus on STEM-C teachers does not appear to be a focus of the project and is not mentioned in the proposal. A focus on STEM-C or computer science teacher education and professional development would indicate a more exceptional approach aligned with the purpose of the TQP grant.

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 table on page e40 describes the responsibilities within the project for each partner involved. In particular, the CES organization, as the lead partner, has extensive experience and capacity to ensure that course work, professional development and coaching can be carried out (p. e41). This includes not only having the facilities to support teacher professional development, but also the associated supplies necessary to achieve the project goals.
- Moreover, the project proposal describes the key personnel with respect to their roles and expertise (p. e41-e43). These suggest that the project will have adequate resources to carry out the project.
- The project builds upon existing, state-approved programs for teacher education and mentoring, and key personnel also include IHE and LEA personnel, instructors, and mentors. By building on previous work and experience, this suggests that the necessary resources, such as the facilities, equipment and supplies, are in place to carry out this project.

Weaknesses:

- The letters of support listed in the appendix all contain the same text, which makes it difficult to infer what the specific project related commitments, rather than a general commitment to the idea of the project, are for each partner.

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 includes a management plan that is aligned with each of the goals of the project. (p. e46-e49). This alignment makes transparent how the objectives, milestones and activities support the achievement of the goals.
- This management plan includes objectives for each of the goals, key activities to support those objectives, and benchmarks to indicate when a particular activity is completed. (p. e46-e49). The objectives are specific, which clearly articulate what will be accomplished through the project activities, and also how involved each member of the project team

will be based on their responsibility listed for completing milestones.

- In addition, the management plan includes a timeline to show the sequence of these activities and the person responsible for each of the activities. (p. e46-e49). This detail suggests that the plan is feasible and reflective of the goals of the project.

Weaknesses:

- For some of the benchmarks listed in the proposal's management plan, there is a lack of specificity. For example, on page e49, the activity that reads "CES field coaches identifies baseline data from first quarter formative assessment scores in ELA and math for residency & non-residency first year teachers," has the benchmark of "report on file." However, it is not clear what this report entails or where it is on file.

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 project proposal has identified an evaluator for the project, who has extensive experience in evaluation (p. e50-e51; appendix). This suggests that the evaluator has the expertise and experience to carry out the evaluation as intended. Moreover, the identification of the evaluator indicates that a role has been identified to implement the evaluation.
- The proposal notes that a progress evaluation report will be provided to a steering committee on a monthly basis to ensure that data and analysis can be used for improvement and/or necessary changes can be made (p. e51).
- The evaluation will collect quantitative and qualitative data to address the project objectives (p. e52).
- These characteristics suggest that the evaluation is feasible, the methods are appropriate to the goals of the project and provide opportunities to communicate the evaluation findings in an ongoing basis.

Weaknesses:

- The proposal does not make clear the timeline of the evaluation to show the sequence of evaluation activities or when the evaluation activities will be completed. A clear timeline that indicates the sequence of evaluation activities or articulates when the evaluation activities will be completed would suggest that the evaluation plan is feasible.

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:

The proposal does not address this priority.

Weaknesses:

The proposal does not address this priority.

Reader's Score: 0

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 does not address this priority.

Weaknesses:

The proposal does not address this priority.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/14/2019 04:30 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/14/2019 02:02 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Cooperative Educational Services (U336S190011)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	40	35
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	19
Sub Total	100	89
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. STEM/Computer Science	5	0
Sub Total	5	0
Invitational Priority		
Invitational Priority		
1. Promise Zones	0	0
Sub Total	0	0
Total	105	89

Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - Teacher Quality Partnership - 5: 84.336S

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Cooperative Educational Services (U336S190011)

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 proposed project will impact over 23,000 students in high need LEAs, which is a significant number of students who could potentially benefit from the project (p. e23).
- The applicant includes evidence of teacher shortages in critical areas across the county and state to demonstrate a rationale for the proposed project (p. e24). Further, student achievement data presented also reflect a need for increased performance in reading and math, which requires instruction from high-quality teachers (p. e25).
- Goals and objectives which were derived from identified needs are included in the proposed project (p. e31). Objectives are listed for each goal, and performance measures are connected to each objective (p. e32-e36).
- A blended format of face-to-face, online collaboration, summer institutes, and monthly meetings increase the likelihood of realizing results from each activity and sustaining them over time (p. e37).
- The proposed project includes a pathway to gain credit hours toward a Master's program (p. e38). This component can potentially be an incentive for participants to continue their education, thus extending the initial results to a greater setting.
- The focus on the statewide teacher evaluation program and the unique needs of earning dual certification in general education and special education represent a potentially successful approach (p. e38). The incorporation of mentoring that is specific to a LEAP teacher can also enhance learning opportunities within the proposed project (p. e39).

Weaknesses:

- The applicant does not clearly explain how the professional development, mentoring, and certification opportunities represent an exceptional approach to meeting the purposes and requirements. These collective activities are common in many teacher preparation programs, so it is not clear how they represent a different or exceptional approach. An explanation of how the activities collectively provide a new or innovative approach could further enhance

this section.

Reader's Score: 35

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:

- Evidence of adequate professional development, coursework, and coaching support is apparent in reviewing the experience and contributions of the lead applicant (p. e40).
- Relevant experience and qualifications of key personnel are provided to show the capacity of the applicant to carry out proposed project tasks (p. e41-e44). This previous experience and background will be useful in implementing tasks within the proposed project that are similar.
- Some evidence of partner commitment to the proposed project is referenced in the existing state-approved programs for teacher education and mentoring, suggesting a past connection among these particular entities to provide support (p. e44).

Weaknesses:

- The applicant does not provide a comprehensive description of the facilities, equipment, and supplies that will be needed and provided. As a result, it is difficult to ascertain the degree to which they will be adequate to fully implement all of the activities proposed in the project
- The applicant does not thoroughly outline the extent to which all partners are committed to the proposed project in terms of contributions and specific experiences (p. e45).

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 applicant includes a logic model to guide the overall project implementation. The logic model is accompanied by a work plan, which delineates objectives, activities, benchmarks, a timeline, and a list of persons responsible for each activity stated (p. e46-e49).
- Outcomes provide a measurable aspect of each major project goal (p. e46-e49). This suggests clarity and organization within each major project goal so that there is a possibility to gauge progress and whether or not the goals were achieved.

Weaknesses:

- It is not clear how some of the benchmarks will be achieved. For example, the benchmark listed for activity 1.1.4 is reports indicative of sound implementation (p. e46). There is no corresponding explanation of what such reports would entail or what information would suggest that the program is being implemented effectively.

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 monthly progress evaluation report provided to the BTQP Steering Committee provides a mechanism for comparing progress of the activities with the guidelines provided in the work plan (p. e50).
- Student-based assessments on coursework with clearly defined rubrics provide a quantitative basis for examining progress (p. e50).
- Teacher focus groups and surveys establish a form for gathering data that can be compared with desired outcomes (p. e50).
- The use of self-reflections and assessments can provide specific information from the participants about project effectiveness (p. e50).

Weaknesses:

- The timeline of evaluation is not specific to show the sequence of events in the evaluation activities. It is not clear specifically when each source of data will be collected and when it will be analyzed to provide feedback. The lack of a timeline of evaluation activities leads to questions about whether or not the evaluation activities will be thorough and feasible and aligned to each of the goals, objectives, and outcomes.

Reader's Score: 19

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:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

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:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/14/2019 02:02 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/14/2019 01:52 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Cooperative Educational Services (U336S190011)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	40	37
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Resources	20	19
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	19
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	19
Sub Total	100	94
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. STEM/Computer Science	5	0
Sub Total	5	0
Invitational Priority		
Invitational Priority		
1. Promise Zones	0	
Sub Total	0	
Total	105	94

Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - Teacher Quality Partnership - 5: 84.336S

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Cooperative Educational Services (U336S190011)

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 BTQP applicants clearly have shown the need for heightened recruitment, training and retention of highly-qualified educators in this four-district area of New Mexico. There are high populations of Native American and Hispanic students, many who are using Free and Reduced Lunch benefits and special education services. The teacher shortage for these schools, especially in areas such as special education, is staggering. A Needs Assessment was provided. (e61; e200-201)
- The project builds upon the current LEAP model that is overseen by the Center with membership from numerous LEAs including partners for this project. The planning and successes of this model are evident and a solid foundation for the new project has been initiated. (e57-e194)
- A work plan is attached that aligns each goal with responsibilities, timelines, and milestones. (e45-48) Each goal for the project is linked to objectives, performance measures and projected outcomes. (e32) For example, Goal 2 specifies recruitment and selection of residents for the program. Performance measures such as interviews are established for each year of the project. (e32-36) A control group of non-residency classroom students has been identified to strengthen the evaluation of performance. (e36)
- One of the strengths of the proposal is the residency program where residents are required to immediately practice what they have learned. An additional strength is the dual certification in regular and special education which will support meeting the needs of the students in these districts. (e37) Both of these actions will help to build capacity by increasing teacher efficacy and efficiency for meeting student achievement needs.
- A Logic Model is provided that aligns the goals, objectives, activities, results and outcomes of the project. (e205) High expectations are provided such as a successful completion rate of 95% of candidates passing state licensure requirements by the end of the program.
- The residency, using a fifth year model that leads to Level I highly-qualified status, is promising. Continued communities of learners for all participants with identified, ongoing professional development will strengthen the project by opening discussions, supporting ownership of the program, and by filling gaps that might be found in instructional practice. (e38-40)
- Existing teaching and effectiveness assessments are currently in place and required by the State licensing agency. These requirements help to assure that quality teachers are graduating and serves as a possible control group for comparison purposes. (e45)

Weaknesses:

- While the applicant alludes to continued and sustained success following the conclusion of grant funding, it is unclear exactly what that will look like and how it will be funded. (e37-38) For example, the applicant briefly discussed a requirement of teaching in the districts for three years beyond completion of the program. Elaboration on the applicant's commitment to continuing the project, or parts of the project, post funding would be helpful. (e34) In addition, explaining how additional cohorts might be continued following the completion of grant funding would be beneficial.
- There is no mention of the specific roles of qualified faculty in either the College of Education or in STEM-C fields.
- Exact specifications regarding the inclusion of STEM-C instruction is not provided. The application would be strengthened by providing specific examples of the training and professional development activities, especially in the STEM-C areas. For instance, the applicant might provide the areas of STEM-C training to be included, recognize by whom and when the training will be provided, and elaborate on how the training will be practiced in the field.

Reader's Score: 37

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:

- Each partner is responsible for certain aspects of the project. For instance, the high-need LEAs will be responsible for mentoring and induction costs and processes. (e40) Letters of support are in place for each of the stakeholders (e221-237)
- The Service Center provides grant support for two aspects of the program: School Improvement Technical Expertise and the Technical Assistance Program that manages the special education programs for member districts. (e41) Because of this affiliation, the Center is uniquely in a position to act as lead agent, provide the necessary linkage between classroom and special services, and to provide facilities, equipment, and other resources to fulfill the goals of the project. (e40-41) The management of the Center is supported with representation from each of the member districts. (e41)

Weaknesses:

- Most letters of support from the partner LEAs appear to be "boilerplate" prototypes. Therefore, the demonstration level of commitment is weak. The application would benefit from more detail on these partnerships such as exact level of resource commitment and/or funding provided. This information would substantiate the promise of match. (e221-237)

Reader's Score: 19

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:

- A detailed work plan exists that clearly defines responsibilities, timelines, and milestones. (e-45-) For example, Goal 1 specifies a working collaboration among the CES, IHEs, and LEAs. Objective 1.1 supports that goal with monthly planning meeting of representatives from each of the partnering entities. Additional information provided are the outcomes, activities, benchmarks, timeline, and responsibilities for each objective. (e46) The applicant has provided a very thorough plan of action.
- A Logic Model is found on page e-205 that clearly aligns with specified goals, objectives, activities, results and outcomes of the project. The Model appears to align to what was used successfully in the LEAP model on which this proposal builds.
- A procedure is in place for the Project Director to monitor the budget and governing plan, including contractual agreements. (e41) The budget and justification documents provide a detailed listing of grant funds being requested as well as the in-kind contributions. (e239-242)
- Resumes and job descriptions for those positions not yet filled are included in Appendix H. (e206-220) The Program Director and Coordinator for the project are sufficiently funded with job descriptions that align with their areas of education, interest and expertise. (e42-43; e239-242) Detailed job descriptions for staff to be hired include the necessary elements of title, supervisor, goals, performance responsibilities, minimum qualifications, work schedule, and evaluation protocols. (e215-220)

Weaknesses:

- Much of the activity, including designation of initial cohort, mentors, and coaches, specified in Goal 1 is completed by October 1 of 2019. This is prior to official TQP funding for the project. The applicant might have clarified these activities and their timeline to help ensure that the project is properly funded throughout and that all work completed meets the intended goals of the project. (e-48)

Reader's Score: 19

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:

- Monthly progress reports will be prepared and disseminated by the Program Coordinator that align with the work plan. (e50) Therefore, a plan is in place for continuous monitoring of the project. Both qualitative (focus groups, etc.) and quantitative data (GPRA indicators, etc.) will be collected, analyzed, and disseminated. (e50-53) A qualified outside evaluator has been hired to assess the success of the project. (e51)
- Performance measures are clearly specified for each goal and objective and linked to GPRA measures. (e32-36)

Weaknesses:

- Though a work plan is provided that outlines the goals, objectives, and performance measures, the timeline for each of the assessments to be administered is only generally presented. The application would be strengthened by details of when each assessment is to be administered so that a logical and consistent stream of assessment is realized. (e46-51)

Reader's Score: 19

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:

- There is no inclusion of information on Competitive Preference Priority 1.

Weaknesses:

- There is no inclusion of information on Competitive Preference Priority 1.

Reader's Score: 0

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 01:52 PM