

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/17/2019 09:44 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Temple University - Of The Commonwealth System of (U336S190019)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	40	30
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Resources	20	20
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	20
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	15
Sub Total	100	85
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	85

Technical Review Form

Panel #6 - Teacher Quality Partnership - 7: 84.336S

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Temple University - Of The Commonwealth System of (U336S190019)

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 effectively demonstrated that the proposed project was designed using several cited research sources to evidence the components and rationale. For example, the applicant cited research regarding the need for certified STEM teachers across grades 4-12 with high need minority populations. The research indicated that minority elementary students have been shown to have greater student achievement when taught by teachers of the same race. Other rationale for the project included research that teachers who complete residency programs are as effective as other novice teachers, but by the time they are in their fourth or fifth year of teaching, they outperform similarly veteran teachers due to the integration of course work with clinical time, so teachers can make connections between practice and theory. (pgs. e-20-e42)

(ii) The applicant reasonably indicated that the goals of the project are: (1) the preparation and support of 32 new math and science teachers over five years and (2) support and professional development of 20 or more in-service teachers who will serve as mentors and share practices across the schools. (pgs. e32-e33)

(iii) The applicant reasonably demonstrated that the proposed project design has the potential to build capacity with likely results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance. For example, the applicant is proposing to develop new, stackable, online and/or hybrid professional development modules for mentor teachers and coaches. The professional development modules will be related to coaching and mentoring, including observing instruction, focusing feedback, supporting teacher growth, and communicative practices. In addition, the applicant will develop content modules focused on mathematics and science and the expansive collection of modules will benefit programs after the grant-funded project is over; supporting and challenging teachers and teacher-leaders at all points on their professional continuum, and across Temple's STEM-education programs. (pgs. e23-e43)

(iv) The applicant reasonably demonstrated that the proposed project represents a unique approach for meeting statutory purposes and requirements. The applicant indicated that the proposed program will recruit cohorts of undergraduate content majors in STEM through a fifth year. The fifth year program will provide connecting graduate residency program that will prepare them for STEM teaching and will culminate with a Master of Education (M.Ed.) and Teacher Certification in Middle Grades (4th-8th) or Secondary (7-12) STEM areas within 12-months, with an additional

two years of post-induction support. The unique String Theory Schools pedagogical approach of integrated academic and artistic excellence and use performance and inquiry as catalysts in teaching and learning offers opportunities to strengthen the capacity to prepare STEM teachers ready to engage in research-based, student-centered instructional practice. (pgs. e20-e43) The residency year is a 12-month intensive program during which students take 31-graduate hours of coursework while working in String Theory schools from Monday to Thursday and on Fridays, residents take Temple teaching methods courses and engage in supervised practice.

Weaknesses:

(i) No weaknesses noted.

(ii) While the applicant provided two broad goals, the applicant did not provide associated objectives and performance measures aligned with the goals. Without this information it will be difficult to measure success and to evaluate the program implementation.

(iii) No weaknesses noted.

(iv) No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 30

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 provided comprehensive evidence that the proposed program will have adequate support from the university to implement the program at a high level. The support was thoroughly presented. For example, a sample of the support included, during the residency year, residents will be supported with a living stipend of \$47,000, out of which they will need to pay a reduced tuition for Temple University. The project will support the residents post-graduation for 2 years. Temple matching funds will cover the cost for printing, copying and the dissemination of training, professional development and project related materials. Funds will also be provided to support Advertising and Recruiting efforts. The College of Education will support each Resident by providing remission on the cost of attendance of approximately \$5,400 per participant. The University will provide office space, equipment for staff and access to computer labs for participants. (pgs. e50-e52) The Fiscal Administrator will serve as program support, and provide operational support, maintain a database of participants, stipend allocations for participants, mentor teachers, coaches, and assist with travel arrangements. The grant analyst will be supported with 10% matching funds.

(ii) The applicant clearly evidenced the commitment of partners. Letters of support are provided in the Appendix. For

example, one of the partners is the String Theory School which is a public charter school network. The partnership will include support to implement an induction program that will offer ongoing training and professional development opportunities to potential mentor-teachers, current mentor-teachers, student-teaching coaches, and graduates. A Summer Institute and ongoing cohort training will support residents post-graduation in their new positions with String Theory Schools, the induction program will last for the first two years of a teacher's employment. The applicant indicated that the String Theory Schools was selected as the partner based on their educational philosophy, structures and the needs of the student populations they serve. (pgs. e50-e53)

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 applicant provided a detailed management plan that comprehensively outlines and aligned the programs activities to achieve the goal of the proposed potentially project on time and within budget. The applicant clearly aligned the program with the goals of the project and included clearly defined responsibilities, timelines and milestones for accomplishing project tasks. For example, the applicant indicated in the management plan that Year 1 will be a planning year in which the project will (1) hire a Project Coordinator,(2) refine graduate courses in teacher preparation and (3) develop PD modules. A timeline with assigned persons responsible for these tasks is provided in the management plan. (Appendix) By Year 2, the applicant indicated that the project will reach capacity (8 residents). (pgs. e52-e54)

Weaknesses:

- (i) No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

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 reasonably demonstrated that the proposed project will conduct an evaluation and provided some methods of evaluation will provide data on relevant outcomes. The proposed evaluation plan includes both formative and summative analyses using mixed (qualitative and quantitative) methods. The assessment will be co-designed with the Center for Assessment, Evaluation, and Education Policy Analysis at Temple University, which is an independent, stand-alone research and evaluation body within the College of Education. Other appropriate methods were discussed regarding the development of surveys and interviews to gauge the success of program components such as, pre-service preparation, induction supports for new teachers, and PD for mentor teachers. (pgs. e 59-65 and e 170)

(ii) The applicant indicated that the evaluation will utilize the Danielson's Framework for Teaching and Temple's Standards for Skillful Teaching model to measure informal feedback from mentors or coaches, intermediate performance assessment completed by residents to gauge the extent to which residents know and can teach their content, teaching observation reports completed by the coach and mentor feedback. (pgs. e59-e65)

Weaknesses:

(i) The applicant indicated that the evaluation will measure the specific program goals and objectives described in the Program Design, as well as to gauge the outcomes. However, the applicant did not provide specified goals and objectives in the program design. The applicant also did not provide GPRA Performance Measures in the narrative. It is difficult to ascertain how the evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes with some measurable outcomes.

(ii) While the applicant described some valid methods of evaluation, without pre-determined and aligned goals, objectives and outcomes it is difficult to determine how the proposed assessments will yield feasible and appropriate data on program outcomes.

Reader's Score: 15

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:

No strengths.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not demonstrate that the proposed project will incorporate computer science in the preparation of educators.

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 applicant did not address the Invitational Priority.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not address the Invitational Priority.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/17/2019 09:44 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/17/2019 09:34 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Temple University - Of The Commonwealth System of (U336S190019)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	40	35
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Resources	20	15
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	20
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Sub Total	100	90
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	90

Technical Review Form

Panel #6 - Teacher Quality Partnership - 7: 84.336S

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Temple University - Of The Commonwealth System of (U336S190019)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

(i) The extent to which the proposed project demonstrates a rationale (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).

(ii) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.

(iii) The extent to which the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance.

(iv) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach for meeting statutory purposes and requirements.

Strengths:

The applicant's proposed project is framed within the context of a previously successful iteration of the project and represents a sound rationale for the new project services. Specifically, the applicant thoroughly describes a process to build on the existing teacher residency program's goals of preparing, supporting and retaining high-quality math and science teachers by strengthening induction support through a new, 2-year seminar component (pg. e49). The proposal has the potential to meet the target area's need for highly – qualified middle and high – school STEM teachers.

An exceptional approach and strong component of the design is the recruitment of STEM majors for a “fifth year contiguous graduate residency program” (pg. e20). Research shows that teachers with strong content knowledge, particularly in STEM often achieve greater outcomes with students.

Using lessons learned from previous iterations of the residency project, the applicant has planned to minimize recruitment effects of competing programs by offering substantial living wage stipends for participants during the residency year, the amount of which is equal to that offered by similar programs (e48).

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not include sufficient information related to their proposed plan to build capacity and continue to produce positive results beyond the period of federal financial assistance. It is not clear if the applicant will be able to sustain the sizable living wage stipends that are to be offered in the project. Further while goals are listed, there is a lack of specificity provided within in the narrative regarding anticipated outcomes and performance measures.

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:

The applicant institution proposes to provide in-kind administrative support to include fiscal and administrative support, provided by the Fiscal/Admin/Grant Analyst and support for the development of a website to promote the TTR+ST by the institution's Director of IT (pg. e166). The represents clear support from the applicant organization to ensure that some necessary project components are in place.

Further, because the partner LEA, String Theory Schools is a paperless school, and, as a result, all residents will need a laptop and iPad for their residency year the applicant has allocated grant funds for these purchases. The partner LEA will also include all residents in professional development opportunities conducted at the school – which is representative in-kind support that will be important for teacher residents.

Weaknesses:

While the applicant includes information in the project narrative related to support to be provided by project partners, there is no documentation provided (i.e., letters of commitment, etc.) to document or substantiate this support.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

(i) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

Strengths:

The applicant very clearly describes key personnel duties and responsibilities and also includes details about each individual's qualifications. The well – qualified management team have experience in managing a project of this magnitude. Moreover, key personnel have the expertise to ensure that project activities are carried out on-time and within budget.

The project timeline (pg. e160 – e162) provides an overview of when milestones for project activities are to be completed. The applicant includes a planning year which will be essential to program implementation and refinement. Taken together, these components allow for a clear connection to be made as to how and when project activities will be carried out.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

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 methods of evaluation will allow for both quantitative and qualitative data collection which will yield important information related to the extent to which the project is operating as described within the project design. In addition, the evaluation will use appropriate measures (pg. e61-e62) that will ensure that valid and reliable information related to project outcomes is obtained.

Moreover, the evaluation is thorough in that not only will there be data collected while participants are residents but there will also be follow-up performed by way of a survey on graduates' employment status (school, position, assigned courses) and a survey of principal perceptions of former resident preparedness and suggestions for program improvement (e 63).

Taken together, all evaluation methods, including data collection and data analysis are thorough (formative and summative components) and feasible because of the expertise of the evaluation entity (Center for Assessment, Evaluation, and Education Policy Analysis, pg. e60) and appropriate based on the relation to goals and the project design to evaluate the extent to which objectives and outcomes are achieved.

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:

The applicant does not address this priority.

Weaknesses:

The applicant 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 applicant does not address this priority.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not address this priority.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/17/2019 09:34 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/14/2019 05:55 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Temple University - Of The Commonwealth System of (U336S190019)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	40	35
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Resources	20	15
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	20
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	15
Sub Total	100	85
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	85

Technical Review Form

Panel #6 - Teacher Quality Partnership - 7: 84.336S

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Temple University - Of The Commonwealth System of (U336S190019)

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:

- Organization has demonstrated success with their current residency program supporting 49 students to pursue their Masters + PA teaching certification in middle and secondary STEM field (e-16) with 19 identifying as coming from an underrepresented background (e-24) indicating a project designed to yield results beyond period of Federal financial assistance.
- Organization has partnered with a school which has demonstrated success in a neighborhood previously considered to be one of the most violent and poor-achieving schools in the city (e-26) representing an exceptional approach for meeting statutory purposes and requirements.
- Proposed residency program is 12 months with residents working in the cooperating school Monday-Thursday and taking methods courses on Friday (e-16). This offers the opportunity for purposeful building on instruction, an exceptional approach for meeting statutory purposes and requirements.
- Program emphasized constructive feedback from mentors, university coaches, and TTR program staff. Residents meet weekly to reflect upon residency experiences and make connections to coursework (e-25). This approach is innovative in that it allows real world practice of coursework which allows for connections to be made. It also allows for the residents to practice reflection, a necessary requisite to teaching that impacts student learning.
- There is an involved process to pairing up the resident-mentor pairs (e-25) which places emphasis on working well together. The mentor needs to be a go-to person who can offer steady support and critical encouragement indicating the project is designed to yield results beyond the period of Federal financial assistance.
- Mentors receive professional development during a summer institute as well as WebEx which focus on critical areas in order for the resident-mentor relationship to be successful.
(e-25)
- Exceptional approach to meeting requirements through a model which involves co-planning and co-teaching. It offers frequent coaching, check-ins with project faculty and staff, as well as support of a mentor teacher. The applicant has created a model after making changes based on problems noted from the current model in which strong recruits have been lost based on lower stipends. Thus, the applicant is offering a \$47,000 living stipend to pay for a reduced tuition, and support of resident's post-graduation for 2 years (e-28).
- Utilization of social media platforms and services to promote communal support and resource sharing (e-47) is an innovative way to use technology as a tool for resident learning.

- The proposed activity includes support to new teachers by paying the fee for each new teacher to join a relevant national professional teacher organization (e-50). This will provide a way for new teachers to network with people who share professional interests, information on workshops and conferences, as well as a variety of ways to gain new information on the profession such as through journals, newsletters, and websites, yielding results past Federal financial assistance.
- The applicant lists goals and objectives that are clear and measurable (e-170 through e-172).
- The proposal represents a rationale to recruit a diverse workforce and those individuals representative of the community using social media to recruit paraprofessionals, substitute teachers, and career-changers (e-38).

Weaknesses:

- The organization recognizes that the mentors are in need of training as the current program reported residents receiving different levels of support based on the capacity of the mentor teacher to provide support that is desired (e-30). While the applicant identified this as an issue and the proposed program is requiring professional development during the summer months and WebEx during the year to focus on skills needed for the resident-mentor relationship to be successful, there is not a system put in place through the year to ensure this approach is working. A weakness of the proposal is that there is not a system in place to recognize that there is a breakdown in the mentor-resident relationship prior to the end of the year so that the resident is given needed support

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:

A Partnership is in place with two historically black colleges and universities for recruiting a well as being an ally of The Fellowship-Black Males Educators for Social Justice. An agreement exists with Slippery Rock University and Troops to Teachers to recruit veterans into the teaching field (e-37) demonstrating adequacy of other resources from the lead applicant organization. The applicant already has resources in place to support their current successful residency model (e-20) which the proposed model is being based off of.

Weaknesses:

- Letters of commitment from partners listed in the applications including String Theory Schools have not been provided in the application. This makes it difficult to ascertain the demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

(i) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

Strengths:

- Provides information about each personnel assigned to key responsibilities (e-53). The timeline is set up for each year with initial needs assessment, planning, and end of year activities proposed. (e60- e65). The management plan will include a report after the fifth year based off of data collected which will address each goal of the program (e-65). Having specific tasks noted as well as the individuals responsible for that task will help to keep the proposed project on time and within the budget.
- Information has been included which give qualifications of the staff who will be responsible for implementing the various activities as part of the proposed project indicating the ability of the program to meet the program's objectives (e-53 through e-59). This detailed information presents the specific roles each individual will have in the management plan as well as why that individual has specifically been chosen.

Weaknesses:

- The reviewer did not note any weaknesses to the quality of the management plan.

Reader's Score: 20

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:

- Includes formative and summative analyses using mixed methods to measure specific program goals and objectives. The use of mixed methods will give more understanding to the data that has been collected.
- Listed performance measures have quantitative data collection to provide meaningful data on program outcomes (e-171). For example, the program has set a goal of recruiting 3 residents from the underrepresented communities out of 8 total recruited. The performance measures break this down giving the target ratio for each measure (e-171). This represents a feasible and appropriate goal, objective, and outcome for the proposed project.
- Coding of qualitative data regarding effective aspects and areas of improvement in the TTR program (e-60). Through this process reliable information giving insight into the TTR program will be provided.

Weaknesses:

- Unable to find the baseline for how the program objectives and performance measures were determined. This is a weakness in that it can be difficult to know if the goals and objectives that have been set are going to be attainable. It would be helpful to know where the program is starting from in terms of numbers to understand if the current ratios put in

place are truly attainable.

Reader's Score: 15

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:

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/14/2019 05:55 PM