

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/14/2019 04:15 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Southwest Center for Educational Excellence (U336S190022)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	40	38
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Resources	20	18
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	19
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Sub Total	100	95
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	95

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Southwest Center for Educational Excellence (U336S190022)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

- The proposal demonstrates a rationale for the project by demonstrating the needs of the students by the percent identified as low SES (p. e23 and low performance on achievement tests (p. 7).
- Moreover, a needs assessment conducted with superintendents identified the need to employ and retain high quality teachers (p. e25-e28).
- The proposal states the project goals and aligns those goals with objectives and outcomes in the table listed on pages e33-e36. These outcomes are measurable and specific, with data sources included in the table to substantiate each outcome (p. e33-e36).
- The proposal aims, to some extent, to build capacity and yield results beyond the term of the grant by creating a new path for those in the teaching profession. Specifically, the project aims to create a path for paraprofessionals into the teaching profession. (p. e33-e36).
- The project represents an exceptional approach to the grant purpose through its components of certification, pre-service seminars and induction, that is personalized and collaborative and networked (p. e38-e41).

Weaknesses:

- In sustaining this work beyond the term of the grant, it is not clear how the project can support all aspects of the work in the future, such as maintaining the elements of the induction program.

Reader's Score: 38

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

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

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

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

Strengths:

- The proposal states that this project is building upon previous collaborative projects, which suggests that they have the necessary facilities and material resources to carry out the work as intended. (p. e51).
- In addition, the proposal identified some of the key personnel who have the experience necessary to support this work. (p. e50 and CVs). For example, one of the partners to provide professional development, Todd Whitaker, has written a book on distinctive instructional practice and has extensive experience facilitating professional development.
- The partner LEAs have committed to allowing teaching residents to take advantage of their trainings, seminars and other PD opportunities afforded to teachers (p. e52).
- Moreover, the proposal notes that the partner LEAs have committed to sharing human and fiscal resources to achieve the project goals, such as providing mentor teachers for the project (p. e52).

Weaknesses:

- The extent of the partners' commitment is unclear from the letters of support based on the general language used in those letters.

Reader's Score: 18

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 management plan includes the activities that are necessary to carry out the project, milestones that help indicate when the activities are accomplished, what personnel member is responsible for carrying out the activities and achieving the milestone as well as a begin and end date for many of the activities. (p. e57-e59).
- In addition, the proposal more specifically describes the roles of the personnel within the project that makes evident why they are responsible for particular tasks (p. e53-e55).
- The work plan is aligned with the key elements of the overall project, which further suggests that the plan is adequate to accomplish what it intends to accomplish (p. e57-e59).

Weaknesses:

- In some cases, the management plan includes the term "ongoing" for the timeline, which does not make evident when benchmarks are intended to be accomplished.

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:

- The proposal has identified an independent evaluation team for the project, with specific roles identified for the quantitative and qualitative analysis. (p. e50).
- The evaluation design is based on two teaching residency program evaluations, TFA and TNTP, which are informed by the What Works Clearinghouse standards (p. e51 – e53). This suggests a level of rigor for the evaluation since they are based on measures that support validated and reliable claims.
- Moreover, the evaluation is broken up into phases of baseline, development and impact as a way of ensuring that the evaluation data can be useful, through the development phase and summative through the impact phase (p. e50-e54).
- The evaluation plan also includes the analytic approach, which makes clear how the impact will be assessed. (p. e54-e57).

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:

Did not address

Weaknesses:

Did not address

Reader's Score: 0

Invitational Priority - Invitational Priority

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

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

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

Strengths:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/14/2019 04:15 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/12/2019 07:38 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Southwest Center for Educational Excellence (U336S190022)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	40	36
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Resources	20	17
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	19
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Sub Total	100	92
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	92

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Southwest Center for Educational Excellence (U336S190022)

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 provides evidence of the effectiveness of teacher residency programs to support the proposed approach for addressing critical shortages of highly qualified teachers and the recruitment and retention of highly qualified teachers in high-needs rural districts (p. e21).
- The applicant includes a thorough explanation of the need for recruiting and retaining highly qualified teachers (p. e23). Data reflect changes in demographics over time, including more English Language Learners and more rural minority students than in previous years (p. e23). Student achievement data also reflect a need for increased student performance, which is especially challenging with the teacher shortage (p. e23).
- A logic model illustrates the sequence of related events connecting the need for the proposed project to the goals and outcomes (p. e30-31).
- Goals are established for the proposed project, and the goals are accompanied by objectives and measurable outcomes to provide clarity and direction as the proposed project progresses (p. e33).
- The applicant describes access to high quality speakers and professional development through the proposed project which is not often possible for teachers in remote, rural districts (p. e16).
- Clinical residency, high-quality mentorship, and flexible scheduling of coursework all contribute to the level of exceptionality in the approach proposed (p. e48-e49). These collective strategies provide multiple levels of support for participants. The ongoing, sustained learning opportunities through the residency, mentorship, and coursework support the acquisition of new knowledge and skills more so than a single training experience.

Weaknesses:

- A comprehensive description of how the applicant plans to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance is not readily apparent.

Reader's Score: 36

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:

- Past collaborative partnerships provide a foundation for success in working with districts to achieve instructional improvement (p. e51).
- The applicant has identified key personnel and relevant experience to show the capacity to carry out the major activities within the proposed project (p. e50).
- Partners will allow teacher residents to participate in additional training sessions, seminars, and other professional development opportunities provided to teachers in the district (p. e52). This can increase access to valuable resources throughout the proposed project.

Weaknesses:

- The applicant references access to facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources with few details explaining each one and how it will be provided to meet the needs specified in the proposed project activities (p. e51). As a result, it is not clear how adequate these resources are for ensuring that the project is fully implemented.
- The letters of support are vague and do not necessarily tie to the proposed activities, so it is difficult to determine the extent to which there is a commitment from each partner to ensuring the success of the proposed project.

Reader's Score: 17

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

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

Strengths:

- Leaders of the project have worked together in past initiatives and are all past successful building principals from rural, high needs districts (p. 36). This increases the ability of the staff to understand issues and challenges as they pertain to the target population.
- Regular meetings of the project team can help facilitate progress monitoring and task completion (p. 36).
- A thorough description of relevant experience and qualifications is provided for each key leader of the project team (p. 37) and educational team (p. 38).
- The use of the advisory council to provide feedback and expertise throughout the proposed project represents another mechanism to support the timely completion of project tasks (p. 39).
- A detailed work plan is included to outline each project activity, along with corresponding timelines, milestones, and persons responsible for ensuring that each is completed (p. 40-43).

Weaknesses:

- In the management plan, the applicant makes reference to ongoing support and benchmarks that are ongoing, but it is not clear what specific support will be provided and at what time intervals (p. e47-e51). The benchmarks are not clearly explained, so there is some ambiguity in how these will be analyzed and adjusted to ensure completion of each task.

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:

- The proposed project includes a variety of data sources on which to assess effectiveness. For example, student pre-and post-tests will be used to measure student outcomes (p. e62). Additionally, surveys, interviews, focus groups, and student achievement data and teacher hiring, retention, and performance data will be analyzed to gather valid and reliable performance data (p. e65).
- The evaluation process is divided into phases, the development phase and the effectiveness phase in which baseline data can be compared to the impact based on specific benchmarks (p. e64). The clarity in data sources, process for analyzing the data, and connections between the outcomes and project goals provide evidence of evaluation methods that are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.
- The applicant includes a qualitative and quantitative analysis to effectively analyze the impact of the proposed project activities (p. e64-e65).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were 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:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Invitational Priority - Invitational Priority

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

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

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

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/12/2019 07:38 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/11/2019 01:43 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Southwest Center for Educational Excellence (U336S190022)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	40	37
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Resources	20	17
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	19
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Sub Total	100	93
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	93

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Southwest Center for Educational Excellence (U336S190022)

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:

- MoACT is a project that will help seventy paraprofessionals to achieve certification after completing a five-year educational training program which includes a residency component. (e20-22) These paraprofessionals will work with SWC, WGU, and serve in 42 high-need districts in SW Missouri. The districts are noted for having many students in poverty, diverse populations, and low achievement scores. (e22-24) Additionally, the area suffers from a high rate of teacher shortages as well as many educators teaching without appropriate credentials. (e25-26) The applicant has substantiated a rationale and the need for such a program and the likelihood that the project will succeed. (e108-119) Efforts by the SWC to prepare a needs assessment involving all partners in fact-finding and discussions were commendable. The data obtained and analyzed detail the need for the project and directly link each area of need with a reform that is provided through the project. (e20-30; e107-119)
- A detailed Logic Model has been provided that showcases the resources, activities, outputs, outcomes, and impacts of the MoACT project. (e30-31; e137) A detailed chart of goals and objectives is provided that clearly aligns with the needs previously discussed. (e33-35) Within each goal are key research and evaluation questions, objectives, measures, outcomes, and data collected. For instance, under goal one the key questions are listed with four objectives that support solutions to those questions. Timelines for activities are provided that clearly outline the milestones for this project.
- The applicant has provided several exceptional approaches in preparing educators. Examples provided are the residency program, strengthening learning communities, and recruiting existing professionals (paraprofessionals) that have demonstrated a desire to work in schools to bring about student achievement. (e36-37)
- There is a consistent and ongoing support system planned for the new teachers in residency and induction, as well as their mentors. The plan is consistent with strong, sustained professional development practices. Training for the mentor teachers is well-planned and appropriate using the 3Cs coaching model to support the TRs. (e45-46)
- Each key component of the project is included in the MoACT Model Timeline-Responsibilities-Alignment of Goals and Objectives Table 9. A clear timeline has been delineated along with persons responsible and the specific goal alignment of each key area. The outline is very easy to understand because of its detail. Suggested seminars include topics such as inquiry-based learning, data-driven instruction, and literacy. (e47)

Weaknesses:

- The applicant has provided limited documentation as to how the project will build capacity and extend the successes of the project. (e36) The application might benefit from commitments by the partners to continue adding cohort groups in the years post-funding.
- The importance of teachers learning to use technology and having the STEM background to effectively model the importance of STEM information and skills is provided. However, the applicant does not explain how the candidate will achieve this information and these skills, other than a few seminars. This would be an activity for the Arts and Science faculty as their role has not been well-defined. (e42-43)
- The use of BPIS is admirable considering the population of students that these new teachers will be affecting. The applicant mentions that the teacher residents will develop these practices, but little else is known about where, when, and how the teachers will gain this knowledge. This is a comprehensive model that takes a great deal of time to understand and practice so that it can be used effectively. (e44)

Reader's Score: 37

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

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

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

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

Strengths:

- Though new to the TQP process, the Center has had multiple projects, many in collaboration with the partnering SW Missouri districts, funded over the past 18 years. They appear to be adequately able to administer this project. (e51) Letters of support are in place from the partnering districts, Western Governors, Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE), and area legislators. (e51-52; e173-230)
- The commitment of each partner is evident through past collaborations with the Center and letters of commitments. Several letters showcased current commitments in-kind and through resources and personnel, which was helpful in determine the full commitment of each district.
- Building on previous funding showcases levels of support for the project. Partners have collaborated throughout the planning of the project to determine how to leverage existing human and fiscal resources. (e51)

Weaknesses:

- Many of the letters of support from legislators appear to be “boilerplate”. It would have been more beneficial to the applicant to have the legislators briefly outline their concerns for the education of children in Missouri and how this funding will help remedy the concerns. Only a few did that.
- Several letters of support provided little substantial evidence of commitment, whether monetary, facilities, resources, or personnel. The applicant would have benefited from letters outlining their roles and the commitments of the districts to fulfill those roles. An example would be a commitment to support new and mentoring teacher professional development time.

Reader's Score: 17

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

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

Strengths:

- The applicant has clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks. The Center staff, which largely comprises the project team, has a history of collaboration. They are experienced educators, many with administrative backgrounds and are adept at working toward raising student achievement in rural, impoverished districts. The staff will meet bi-weekly to coordinate, review, and execute the project activities toward meeting the goals. Much of the professional development for stakeholders is conducted by the Center staff. (e53-54)
- The Educational Team is comprised of faculty and placement coordinators from WGU. Table 5 outlines the key research and evaluation questions, objectives, measures, outcomes, and data collected for each goal of the project. (e33-36) The teaching team is from WGU and will vary with the content of the course taught. (e55)
- The Project and Education teams are largely funded at 1 FTE each. Their salaries are appropriate for their job descriptions. (e257-281) The expertise of project and education team members, the evaluation team, the professional development team, and the advisory committee chair is noted in Appendix H and appears to be adequate. (e55; e139-172)
- A detailed chart of goals and objectives is provided that clearly aligns with the needs previously discussed. (e33-35) A detailed work plan has also been provided that outlines key tasks, milestones, and timelines by cohort. The work load and timeline appear appropriate to success of the project. (e57-59)
- Using various meeting mediums, an Advisory Council will monitor ongoing workings of the project as well as meeting annually to review data and feedback, policies, and operations; to refine practices as warranted; and to disseminate findings and implications determined from the analysis of data. The use of guiding questions to examine the program is appropriate to the analysis tasks. (e56) A plan is in place to amend proceedings as needed for Cohort 2 based on what was learned from Cohort 1. (e57-59)

Weaknesses:

- A timeline is presented, however the term “ongoing” does not pinpoint particular times for activities to be conducted or assessments to be given. The application would benefit from a more concise illustration of time commitments. (e57-59)

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:

- A thorough overview of the evaluation plan for this project has been provided. (e60-67) Evaluation will consist of both qualitative measures, such as focus groups, and quantitative measures, such as the GPRA measures, to assess the

project. (e56)

- An external evaluation team will conduct a concurrent mixed methods formative and impact evaluation. (e-56; e60-67) A strength of the evaluation team is their familiarity with the staff and the Center as well as their knowledge of the region and area schools based on past collaborations. (e60)
- Methods of evaluation have been derived from multiple studies. Using the research of successful national programs such as Teach for America and Teaching Fellows, the applicant and evaluation team have designed a thorough evaluation system for this project. Utilization of the researched measures will increase the validity and reliability of the evaluation. (e60-67) Evaluation is aligned to project goals and objectives as is evident in Table 5. (e33-36)
- A longitudinal effectiveness study will compare MoACT teachers' effectiveness with non-participating new teachers. The control group design is a positive aspect of the evaluation system as it allows for triangulation of data and a rich design. (e62) An additional strength of the evaluation plan is the use of baseline data for a comparison study. (e62)
- The evaluation team has been budgeted \$380,000. The amount appears to be reasonable and appropriate given the large scope of the evaluation plan in place. (e268; e60-67)

Weaknesses:

- There are no apparent weaknesses in this application.

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 did not address CPP

Weaknesses:

- The applicant did not address CPP

Reader's Score: 0

Invitational Priority - Invitational Priority

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

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

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

received or will receive financial assistance and describe the extent to which the applicant will use the financial assistance for its proposed project.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/11/2019 01:43 PM