

**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:** South Bend Community School Corporation (U336S190016)

**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	19
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	17
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	89
<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	94

# Technical Review Form

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

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

**Applicant:** South Bend Community School Corporation (U336S190016)

## 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 strong rationale for the proposed project. For example, the applicant clearly demonstrates that over 160 teachers hold emergency provisional teaching assignments annually (e16). The applicant also effectively denotes that the school district is being threatened with state takeover for poor academic performance (e24). Evidence provided reveals that graduation rates are extremely low; seven of the eight schools are F schools and there are eleven schools on the 2018 ESSA Targeted Support and Improvement List (e24). Further, needs assessments fully show that the identifies schools have not demonstrated achievement in any of the represented subgroups. In fact, failure rates, are significant among all subgroups (e24).

ii. The proposed teacher residency model is designed to provide intensive instruction in foundational skills through targeted, specialized modules which are clearly grounded in evidence-based/peer-reviewed, research. These modules are clearly designed to meet and exceed the goals, objectives and measurable outcomes (e-25) of the program. The applicant proposes one goal and four objectives that are each clearly measurable (e25).

iii. Unique to this proposal the applicant purports to incorporate hybrid components that will provide in-depth pre-service learning on topics and approaches that receive minimal emphasis in many existing preparation programs (e27), thus helping to build capacity. For example, the applicant strongly plans to adopt an inquiry-based model for educator preparation that links academic learning to the root-cause analysis of problems of practice (e28). The applicant also effectively plans to expand the impact of courses of study beyond their direct influence on participating teachers through the creation and continual expansion of Networks for School Improvement (e28). Another distinctive method of building capacity will be the production of White Papers, suggested to empower Candidates to contribute to the body of knowledge in the field, reflect on identified problems of practice, conduct root-cause analysis of those problems and share effective strategies learned during residency; with the intent to promote continuous improvement (e45).

iv. An exceptional approach for meeting statutory purposes is succinctly provided in the narrative. For example, the applicant proposes to restructure the traditional model from lecture-based, theoretical study into an expanded, education development approach that adopts a demonstrated, competency-based, experiential learning model that engages pre-service teachers in face-to-face, online and hybrid academic study, extensive teacher apprenticeship and supportive

coaching (e21). Distinct plans to redesign the 36-month program into an 18-month Master's Degree program that links academic study with a teacher residency in high-needs public schools is noted in the application (e26-e27).

**Weaknesses:**

i. No weaknesses noted

ii. No weaknesses noted

iii. The applicant lacks sufficient information on how they intend to extend the program beyond the grant period (e24-e27). Additionally, the applicant failed to provide a plan for building capacity for the proposed project programming (e27-e28).

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 provides sufficient evidence that SBCSC will contribute significant resources to expand the capacity and impact of PLUS (e47). For example, the applicant indicates that SBCSC will host numerous grant activities to share the burden of indirect operating expenses (e47). In addition, they clearly note that they will provide facilities, grant management, expertise, induction support, learning resources, and technology resources (e47-e49). The applicant provides a letter specifying the details of the match (e264-265).

ii. The applicant provides detailed evidence that they noted partners are committed to the success of the proposed project and have invested a strong level of commitment as identified in the letter of support and in the descriptions within the narrative (e49; e264-e265). For example, the applicant states that they leadership from PLUS building principals, coaches and mentor teachers will provide valuable supports needed by aspiring and novice teachers as they serve their Teacher Residencies; in addition to supplementary reading and math programs for struggling readers (e49).

**Weaknesses:**

i. The letter for matched funds has no signature, leaving the reader to question if the partner truly agreed to the items noted in the letter (e271).

ii. No weaknesses noted

**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:**

The applicant clearly provides a fully developed management plan highlighting the goals and objectives to be achieved by the proposed project (e50-e57). A comprehensive Logic Model is also included that provides a clear connection between the objectives, outcomes and activities (e139). The adequate timeline provided lists the personnel and some of the details related to the task assigned for carrying out the proposed project (e140 – e252) The budget provided is reasonable and demonstrates that the project can be carried out within the listed guidelines(e94–e107). The comprehensive timeline provided (e51-e52) includes the activities, responsible parties for data collection and a clear link to objectives (e51-e52). Detailed resumes of key personnel clearly demonstrate capability of completing tasks (e267-e270).

#### **Weaknesses:**

Many key personnel need to be hired for the proposed project; however, the timeline does not indicate a time frame for hiring those persons. For example, the applicant indicates a need to hire a project director, however, the timeline provided (e51-e52) does not indicate the time frame for doing so.

**Reader's Score:** 17

### **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's choice in choosing an outside company to complete the evaluation of the proposed project clearly indicates the beginnings of a solid method of evaluation. For example, the applicant states, EduShift, Inc., a 19-year-old research and evaluation organization, will be hired to conduct an outcome evaluation that links all partners through collaborative data collection, data analysis, reporting and feedback, promoting continuous quality improvement throughout the duration of PLUS (e47). The applicant provides strong data to support the use of the FORECAST model (FORmative Evaluation, Consultation, and System Techniques), a valid and reliable tool, as an objective evaluation structure (e58).

ii. The applicant provides a comprehensive plan of evaluation which includes ongoing evaluation of the PLUS goal, objectives and outcomes, which will be conducted by an experienced, external evaluation team with oversight from a highly-qualified Project Director and Principal Investigator who both have extensive backgrounds in program and project

evaluation (e25-e26; e31-e33). The applicant also provides a comprehensive description of how the evaluation will be conducted including the use of a randomized control assessment of outcomes through comparison of treatment and control group educators (e58). The applicant further clearly describes the process for meeting WWC standards of evaluation by using a propensity-score matching approach (e58).

**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:**

The applicant provides strong evidence of meeting this competitive priority preference by proposing a comprehensive program designed to provide face-to-face instruction, virtual coaching, online and hybrid programming, that will focus on instruction, culture and equity in learning topics critical to effectively integrating STEM and Computer Science education strategies into daily K-12 classroom instruction (e20).

**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 detailed data displaying all LEAs and school districts serve students in three opportunity zones (e20-21) and has developed a program that responds to the 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 05:52 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** South Bend Community School Corporation (U336S190016)

**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	19
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	17
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	91
<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	96



# Technical Review Form

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

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

Applicant: South Bend Community School Corporation (U336S190016)

## 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): Project application demonstrates rationale (e16) via project components which include viable residency model with induction support. Substantiates need through aligned research (e19) and research framework outlined. This framework is aligned with demographic data (e24) to show increased need, as all partner LEAs are in failing school districts.
- (ii): Project goals, objectives, and outcomes [1 major goal; 4 objectives; e16] are clearly displayed in a detailed logic model (e23) that provides thorough account of "short/mid/long range" timeframes. This provides exceptional accountability for proposed goals and objectives.
- (iii): Applicant provides clear and concise measures to build capacity via improving the level of proficiency and mastery of teachers and to include preservice residents (e26) through networked approaches. Approach to building capacity includes high yield strategies that involve community.
- (iv): Applicant thoroughly explains detailed approach to meeting learning and induction goals (e32-46) that are exception for increasing capacity in urban landscapes without perpetuating stereotypes.

### Weaknesses:

- (iii): Unfortunately, applicant does not provide detailed insight about how the project will be sustained beyond the grant funding period (e45-46). Applicant only shows programmatic viability (e23/e26) after funding period.

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 commitment of partners through specific and institution focused letters of support (e48-50) and each outlines the specific roles and responsibilities for each partner through specific memoranda of understanding (e254-257). The applicant has displayed clear synergy of how partners will use shared facilities, course work (via induction activities), and resources to facilitate program goals.
- (ii): Applicant thoroughly describes how PLUS Advisory Board and partner districts have matched 100% of funds and are committed to project.

**Weaknesses:**

- (i): The application appears to contain a letter (e264-265) that does not have a signature from a proposed partner.

**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:**

- (i): The applicant provides a detailed management plan with timelines (e51-52) with milestones appropriate to project goals and objectives. The management plan highlights duties via intersectional team with clear accountability measures in place and most key personnel showcase high expertise in the areas designated to them (e54-56).

**Weaknesses:**

- (i): The application does not appear to provide any milestones or timeline for hiring of Project Director, which is a major role for the project.

**Reader's Score: 17**

**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 provides an exceptionally detailed evaluation plan for EduShift (e57), as an external evaluator. External evaluator provides clear insight on how FORECAST model (e58) will be used as the methodological tool to evaluate teacher induction activities.
- (ii): The proposed framework, along with complementary qualitative methods, uses statistical baselines appropriate to goals and objectives listed in the proposal. These data sources include assessments of formative and summative measures (e64). As outlined, these measures are thorough, feasible and appropriate. Each evaluative method is aligned well to the proposed goals, objectives, and outcomes (e61-63).

**Weaknesses:**

No weakness 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:**

- (increasing number of educators adequately prepared for rigorous instruction): The applicant has embedded STEM/CS content and instructional strategies into induction coursework (taught by discipline experts) and require residents to infuse STEM activities, reflections, and ongoing learning into "daily K-12 instruction" (e20). In doing so, the experiential knowledge and practical insight residents will acquire have a great chance of being transferable into their lesson plans and interactions with students.

**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 three opportunity zones (e20-21) 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 05:52 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/14/2019 10:47 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** South Bend Community School Corporation (U336S190016)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	40	38
<b>Adequacy of Resources</b>		
1. Resources	20	19
<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	96
<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	101

# Technical Review Form

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

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

Applicant: South Bend Community School Corporation (U336S190016)

### 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. South Bend provides statistical data to rationalize the development of a teacher training residency model to address teacher retention, creating a more diverse culturally responsive pool of teachers that will provide the platform for increasing student achievement (e31). A table listing the number of failing school on page e24 help support performance issues the proposal is trying to address. A detailed logic model is provided that illustrates both objectives and proposed outcomes (e139).

ii. The project authors provide a set of well-defined goals and objectives for the project (e25). These include measureable outcomes such as raising the academic achievement of high-needs students and increasing the pool of well qualified teachers to serve these improvised schools. Each of these measures can be easily measured through descriptive outcomes (e27-29).

iii. The proposal provides evidence of plans designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance. The project supports a partnership housed at Indiana University South Bend's School of Education will collaborate with its College of Arts and Sciences to offer PLUS Candidates a STEM/Computer Science Specialized Module that prepares educators to effectively integrate STEM and Computer Science concepts and teaching / learning strands throughout grade levels e20). Implementation of PLUS during the five-year grant period and beyond will: (a) build capacity to address evolving K – 12 education priorities; and (b) yield lasting results that strengthen the instructional competencies of novice teachers and improve the academic outcomes of highest-needs students.

iv. The proposal does represent an exceptional approach for meeting statutory purposes and requirements. The uniqueness of the program is graduates of the program will receive induction support from SBCSC and IUSB in the form of: Mentor Teacher support, Instructional Team support and Virtual Coaching support. This ongoing instruction and individualized support will be available for a minimum of two years as new teachers implement what they have learned, with the help of expert and seasoned colleagues (e35).

**Weaknesses:**

- i. No weaknesses noted
- ii. No weaknesses noted
- iii. The commitment of Indiana University South Bend's School of Education with the College of Arts and Sciences does strengthen the capability for continued funding of the project beyond grant. However, this section of the proposal addressing continued funding would be improved if the authors identified other federal resources or state and local grants they plan to reach out to for support beyond the funding period of the grant (e40)
- iv. No weaknesses noted

**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:**

- i. The proposal provides documented sufficient support for facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources from the applicant (e48-e53). The collaboration between the School of Education and College of Arts and Sciences will spearhead the leadership for the project along with providing the facilities, technology and other resources needed to support this project (e48). Indiana University South Bend will provide matching funds from various budgets to facilitate the implementation and daily operation (e159 and e160).
- ii. The proposal provides letters of support, outlining the specifics of each partners support (e170-e180). A budget narrative is provided to explain cost associated with the grant (e266). The budget seems appropriate for the project being proposed.

**Weaknesses:**

- i. No weaknesses noted
- ii. There is a key concern about one of support letters provided emphasizing matching funds for the project (e264). In this case, the letter supports the matching funds concept; however the letter is not signed by the Superintendent of South Bend Community School Corporation.

**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:**

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 (e53). A detailed timeline is provided linking milestones with the personnel and their major tasks. CVs are provided in the proposal that indicate that the management team is well qualified to conduct the project (e141-e145).

### **Weaknesses:**

i. In their milestone addressed in the management plan the term Project Director (e51) is used. However, on page e64 the term Project Management was used. I can only assume that these two individuals are one and the same.

**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 proposal presents a well-planned evaluation model. Both formative and summative outcome measures will be collected for the project. 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 well developed evaluation plan (e66-e67). To determine the impact of the project both descriptive and correlational methods will be used to address causations 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 plans to 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:**

Several of the schools that will be served in this TQP grant are located inside South Bend Opportunity Zones, 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). The census tract numbers of the South Bend Community School Corporation, LEA & fiscal agent PROJECT NARRATIVE qualified opportunity zones for which PLUS proposes to serve students are: 18141000900 (29.6% poverty rate; 10.2% unemployment), 18141001000 (40.8% poverty rate; 7.3% unemployment) and 18141002900 (35.6% poverty rate; 17.4% unemployment). The PLUS project will give priority placement to individuals who choose to teach in schools that are located in South Bend's Qualified Opportunity Zones.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted

**Reader's Score:** 0

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 06/14/2019 10:47 AM