

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/14/2019 02:07 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Board of Control for the Southern Regional Education Board (U336S190015)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	40	33
<b>Adequacy of Resources</b>		
1. Resources	20	20
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	19
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	92
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
1. STEM/Computer Science	5	5
<b>Sub Total</b>	5	5
<b>Invitational Priority</b>		
<b>Invitational Priority</b>		
1. Promise Zones	0	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	0	0
<b>Total</b>	105	97

# Technical Review Form

**Panel #2 - Teacher Quality Partnership - 3: 84.336S**

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

**Applicant:** Board of Control for the Southern Regional Education Board (U336S190015)

## 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:

i. The applicant provides a detailed rationale for the proposed program. The applicant outlines thoroughly the teacher recruitment and retention needs in critical STEM fields facing their region. For example, the applicant provides a detailed chart noting the poverty rate, school free-and-reduced lunch percentages, teacher retention median, percentage of teachers on emergency waivers, and the proficiency of students in Math and Science (e22). This data indicates significant deficits in all six middle schools. Further the applicant indicates that according to data compiled by the Education Commission of the States (ECS, 2019, using 2017 data) only 22 percent of 8th grade students in Georgia were taught math by teachers with an undergraduate degree in math, and only 31 percent of 8th grade students were taught science by teachers with an undergraduate degree in science (e24).

ii. The applicant identifies three goals and twelve clearly measurable objectives that are designed to meet the needs to the targeted populations. Additionally, the applicant outlines strong measures that will be used to evaluate each of the specified goals and objectives. (e26-e27; e66-e67). For example, some key objectives and outcomes include: (1) 90% of residents complete their MAT, become fully certified as STEM teachers, and are hired to teach STEM subjects in high-need schools; (2) At least 25% of residents will receive an additional certification in computer science; (3) teachers completing their residency will remain in high-need schools for at least three years following their residency; (4) students assigned to GREAT teachers will exceed district and state proficiency rates on end of grade assessments in mathematics and science, and also exceed state and district student growth outcomes for those subjects; (5) GREAT teachers will have measurable gains in their sense of efficacy as measured by TSES; (6) students of GREAT teachers will demonstrate gains of 10 percent or more in STEM attitudes and career interest as measured by S-STEM (e17).

iii. The applicant identifies specific ideas indicating the proposed project's ability to build capacity (e27-e29). The applicant indicates that through continued partnerships with key stakeholders and a residency program, they will be able to fill the gaps in qualified teacher educators. For example, the applicant indicates that partner districts have committed to significantly expanding how they use mentors to support developing teachers by placing each resident with a trained and highly-effective mentor for the year-long residency. They have also agreed to release the mentors for required meetings and training. This is a noteworthy commitment on the part of the districts as an IES report on mentoring new teachers found that 69 percent of the districts they surveyed did not provide release time for mentors to work with new teachers

(e28). The applicant also specifically states that they will partner with school districts to recruit diverse populations and then applicants will move through an extensive selection process (e33).

iv. The applicant strongly represents an exceptional approach for meeting statutory purposes and requirements. The applicant has significantly ensured that the STEM Component is included from induction through the end of the proposed program (e26-e25). Unique to the proposed project is an inclusion of an exceptional amount of field-based hours (1500) (e34).

**Weaknesses:**

- i. No weaknesses noted
- ii. No weaknesses noted
- iii. Specifics on how the applicant plans to yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance is lacking in the application (e27-e44).
- iv. No weaknesses noted

**Reader's Score: 33**

**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:**

i. The applicant has demonstrated a clear commitment from SREB as a partner that will provide support, including facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources (e46-e49). Additionally, the applicant clearly demonstrates a strong commitment from GCSU and Oconee RESA (e49-e50). The applicant has provided a letter from SREB to indicate their intent to provide the match funding of \$598,716.00 (e154).

ii. The applicant notes a clear commitment of each of the noted partners within the grant including SREB, GCSU and Oconee RESA (e50-e53). For example, letters of support detailing the commitment of their participation in the program are provided (e153-e155).

**Weaknesses:**

- i. No weaknesses noted
- ii. No weakness noted

**Reader's Score: 20**

## 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:

i. The applicant provided a comprehensive management plan outlining the goals objectives, key milestones, activities, and the personnel responsible for completing the task (e54–e59). The applicant also provides a clear budget and budget narrative is provided with reasonable cost and expenses (e157–e169). The applicant also provides a detailed logic model connecting the goals and outcomes (e82).

### Weaknesses:

i. The cohort timeline provided by the applicant lacks detail and clarity on how the induction of the various cohorts is connected to the noted goals and objectives of the management plan (e127- e128).

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:

i. A thorough evaluation processes plan for evaluating this project is provided from recruitment to induction (e60-e68). Goals and Objectives are clearly presented and supported by both formative and summative collections of data. Data sources, personnel responsible, and data analysis information are detailed in a chart that connects them to each of the goals and objectives (e66-e68).

ii. The method of evaluation proposed by the applicant is thorough, feasible and appropriate to the goals, objectives and outcomes described in the narrative. The applicant further proposes to complete a quasi-experimental design (e61). The applicant also has clearly articulated the use of both formative and summative data using both qualitative and qualitative measures that are both valid and reliable (e66-e67).

### Weaknesses:

i. No weaknesses noted

ii. No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 20

## 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:**

i. The applicant provides adequate evidence of a proposed project that is 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 (e20-e21). For example, the applicant proposes that The GREAT project will (1) select candidates with bachelor's degrees and/or work experience in STEM fields; (2) will have math and science focused coursework at GSCU; (3) will provide a STEM and project-based learning (PBL) focus in instructional coaching; (4) will have residency placements in math or science classes under a skilled teacher-mentor; and (5) will provide specific enrichment learning opportunities for computer science and coding, with a goal that one-quarter of the residents will earn the Georgia Professional Standards Commission's (GaPSC's) new certificate endorsement in teaching computer science. (e20-e21).

#### **Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses 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 provides data displaying all LEAs and school districts serve students in five opportunity zones (e6) and program responds to invitation priority to serve students in high-needs areas.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:**     **0**

---

**Status:**           Submitted

**Last Updated:**   06/14/2019 02:07 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/14/2019 03:39 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Board of Control for the Southern Regional Education Board (U336S190015)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	40	35
<b>Adequacy of Resources</b>		
1. Resources	20	20
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	19
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	94
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
1. STEM/Computer Science	5	5
<b>Sub Total</b>	5	5
<b>Invitational Priority</b>		
<b>Invitational Priority</b>		
1. Promise Zones	0	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	0	0
<b>Total</b>	105	99

# Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Teacher Quality Partnership - 3: 84.336S

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

Applicant: Board of Control for the Southern Regional Education Board (U336S190015)

## 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:

- (ii): The applicant provides an exceptional narrative to describe program design and implementation strategies (e22-43) that are designed to meet the needs of six partner school districts (each clearly high-needs via student achievement data, poverty rates, teacher retention (e22) and methods for addressing these needs holistically.
- (i): The rationale for program is aligned with each GPRA priority (e35-36) and application demonstrates significant alignment between program goals and outcomes. Furthermore, STEM priority has been integrated in innovative and deeply embedded coursework, content, and continued professional development (e30-33) as a way to prepare teachers to fully integrated STEM standards and is appropriate for graduate study. Induction activities are pre/professional (e41-43) and situate learner in teaching context that is authentic, practical, and relevant to building skill.
- (iv): The program design exceeds national norms for stipend (e43), and clearly articulates an implementation plan that will foster strong partnerships and promote longevity. Participants are treated on par with practicing teachers and the project design will attract more applicants, as financial barriers are limited in the program.

### Weaknesses:

- (iv): The application makes little mention of how the project will be sustained beyond the grant period, particularly given the high stipend and financial contributions of local school district partners. There is no mention of how this component of the project will occur beyond federal assistance.

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:**

- (i): The application clearly demonstrates non-profit's capacity with regards to infrastructure, personnel, and experience with developing/sustaining partnerships in order to facilitate the scope and sequence of this program (e46-50). The organization emphasizes its capacity to manage large grants, infuse current personnel onto new project and build coalitions.
- (ii): The applicant clearly and specifically outlines resources of each collaborative partner (e51-53) to demonstrate relevance and commitment in expanding current program. The support letters speak directly to stated goals and objectives, as they relate to the partner.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 20**

**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:**

- (i): The application provides a multi-tiered plan that precisely identifies roles, responsibilities, specific frequency of action steps (target dates/month & year) and milestones that are aligned to GREAT program goals and objectives (e54-59). The depth of the management plan chart provides critical insight into how the applicant has operationalized each task, assigned appropriate personnel, and delegated milestone management that is indicative a strong leadership team.

**Weaknesses:**

- (i): The applicant created a very good cohort model chart (e127-128), but did not align these activities to stated goals, objectives, or stated outcomes. For example, it is not clear where the cohort activities fit in to the timeline.

**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:**

- (i): The applicant has provided research-backed instrumentation tools that are valid, reliable, and aligned with project in a manner that will elicit key findings (e65).
- (ii): The applicant addresses all GPRA performance measures at least once in program evaluation measures (e68) and has outlined a dual-process evaluation method to investigate formative and summative components of the program (e60). These evaluation measures reflect current research and use assessment data (students, teachers, district; e62) to anchor evaluation strategy.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 20**

**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:**

- (prepared for rigorous instruction): The applicant has STEM and Computer Science strategies which are deeply embedded throughout the program design. They include exposure and implementation to strategies for mentor teachers, participants, and partners (e46) that maintain and/or establish STEM rigor in K-12 classroom instruction.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses 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:**

- Applicant provides data displaying all LEAs and school districts serve students in five opportunity zones (e6) and program responds to invitation priority to serve students in high-needs areas.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:**     **0**

---

**Status:**           Submitted

**Last Updated:**   06/14/2019 03:39 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/14/2019 04:32 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Board of Control for the Southern Regional Education Board (U336S190015)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	40	35
<b>Adequacy of Resources</b>		
1. Resources	20	20
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	18
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	93
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
1. STEM/Computer Science	5	5
<b>Sub Total</b>	5	5
<b>Invitational Priority</b>		
<b>Invitational Priority</b>		
1. Promise Zones	0	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	0	0
<b>Total</b>	105	98

# Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Teacher Quality Partnership - 3: 84.336S

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

Applicant: Board of Control for the Southern Regional Education Board (U336S190015)

## 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:

i. The proposal clearly defines a detailed rationale for the grant. The authors provide statistical data that identify the critical teacher shortage of highly qualified teachers available to teach in mostly impoverished districts located in Georgia (e22-e23). The teacher shortage is especially critical in areas of math and science where many classrooms are being staffed with uncertified teachers (e23). To further magnify the critical teacher shortage, teacher turnover rates in the districts is below the state average (e23).

ii. The project provides a set of well-defined goals and objectives with clearly measurable outcomes. The focus of the project is to develop and implement a teacher residency model "The Georgia Residency for Educating Amazing Teachers" (GREAT) with the following goals: (1) increase the supply of well-prepared novice teachers with a background in STEM fields entering the workplace to address the teaching shortage (2) improve middle grade students academic performance in science, mathematics and reading and (3) increase students' awareness and interest in STEM careers and computer Science (e27). Outcome measures in this proposal directly address the project rationale of eliminating the critical teacher shortage and improve student achievement. A detailed logic model is provided in the proposal (e82).

iii. The proposal provides evidence of plans designed to build capacity that the results of the project will yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance. The project will support the partnership of the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) with Georgia College and State University (GCSU) and six high-needs districts located in Oconee Regional Education Service Agency (RESA) service area (e17).

iv. The proposal does represent an exceptional approach for meeting statutory purposes and requirements. The GREAT program is a MAT residence program, in partnership with six high-needs districts in Georgia. The residents will complete a 54-credit online master's degree program in middle school math or science. Participants will learn alongside an experience mentor teacher during a one-year residency program in a math or science classroom (e17).

**Weaknesses:**

- i. No weaknesses noted
- ii. No weaknesses noted
- iii. No evidence is given on how the authors plans to yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance is lacking in the application (e27-e44).
- iv. No weaknesses noted

**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:**

i. The driving force for adequacy of resources in this project will be the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB), which is a non-profit organization. SREB has sufficient financial and human resources to deliver the services put forth in the proposal (e46). In the last fiscal year SREB's program revenue exceeded \$27 million, and net assets exceeded \$26 million. SREB has over 30 years partnering with states, districts and schools to identify barriers to achieving academic success. In the current program "GREAT," SREB will expand its role to include collaborating with GCSU to strengthen the STEM components of the MAT program. The proposal does provide evidence of matching funds (e147). Detailed letters of support are provided specifying commitments of partnerships to the program (e158-e187).

ii. The proposal provides letters of support, outlining the specifics of each partners support (e158-e187). SREB will serve as the fiscal and reporting agent for the project throughout the grant and is committed to providing access to national training on competency-based, transformative education to three cohorts from each GREAT.

**Weaknesses:**

- i. No weaknesses noted
- ii. No weaknesses noted

**Reader's Score: 20**

**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:**

i. The authors of the proposal provide a detailed management plan that highlights the roles and responsibilities of each of the participants in the project (e54-e59). A detailed timeline is provided linking milestones with the personnel and their major tasks. Furthermore, activities that will take place during the school year are provided in detail in the timeline (e54-e59). A strong logic model is provided (e1)

**Weaknesses:**

i. The cohort timeline provided by the authors lacks detail and clarity on how the induction of the various cohorts is connected to the noted goals and objectives of the management plan (e127- e128).

**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:**

i. The proposal presents a well-planned evaluation model. Data collected will provide both formative and summative outcome measures. Similarly, both quantitative and qualitative data sources will be used. The authors paid a lot of attention to validity and reliability of outcome measures.

ii. The goals and objectives are clearly defined and measurable which is an essential element in the evaluation process. A table is provided that highlights a well-developed evaluation plan (e66-e67). To determine the impact of the project both descriptive and correlational methods will be used to address causal outcomes that can be associated with the project.

**Weaknesses:**

- i. No weaknesses noted
- ii. No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 20

## 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:**

In addressing CPP1, the project plan do the following: (1) selecting candidates with bachelor's degrees and work experience in STEM fields (2) a math and science focus in GCSU coursework (3) A STEM and project-based learning focus in instructional coaching (4) residency placement in math or science classes under a mentor teacher and (5) enrichment learning opportunities for computer science e20-21). Finally, the project will prepare candidates to effectively integrate STEM and Computer Science concepts and teaching / learning strands throughout grade levels.

#### **Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses 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:**

According to the needs assessment of the four partnering school districts, the numbers of children who reside or attend TQP project schools in a qualified opportunity zone are in the range of 13-37 % of overall district student populations. A table is provided in appendix A illustrating the percentages.

#### **Weaknesses:**

None noted

**Reader's Score:** 0

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 06/14/2019 04:32 PM