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

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/14/2019 05:25 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Ohio University (U336S190027)
Reader #1: **********

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	40	37
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Resources	20	16
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	20
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	5
Sub Total	5	5
Invitational Priority		
Invitational Priority		
1. Promise Zones	0	0
Sub Total	0	0
Total	105	98

Technical Review Form

Reader #1:　　**************

Applicant:　Ohio University (U336S190027)

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 demonstrates a thoroughly supported rationale for the proposed project. That rationale includes research supporting the need for well-prepared teachers, the lack of high-quality teaching in STEM+ fields for students with disabilities, and the critical shortage of special education teachers in the area of moderate-to-intensive educational needs. (Pages e26-27) The proposed project will address this rationale and promote relevant outcomes. (Logic Model)(Pages e32-33)

   (ii)The logic model outlines clearly the goals and short-term and long-term outcomes. These are well aligned, specific, and measureable. For example the first goal is to train new special education teachers. The Outcomes include a formation of partnerships, and the creation of systems and supports for sustaining the collaborative efforts. (Logic Model) (Pages e32-33)

   (iii)The proposed project is designed to build capacity for the two partners who are involved. The LEA will have more and highly trained special education teachers and the IHE will have an enhanced Special Education program that will be available to subsequent new teachers. This effort coupled with the possible use of Teacher Quality Partnership resources this program will viable after the end of the Federal funding assistance. (Page e49-e50)

   (iv)This proposal represents an exceptional approach for meeting the statutory purposes and requirements by relying on an established, strong partnership that will extend to training in the areas of STEM and computer systems and the needs of special education in the moderate-to-intensive educational needs. (Page e51)

   Weaknesses:

   (i)　　　No weaknesses noted.

   (ii)The objectives for addressing the goals are not specifically measurable. For example, it is unclear how the applicant will be measuring the development of a Mentoring Team. It is unclear how that development will be measured for

success. (Logic Model)

(iii)No weaknesses noted.
(iv)No weaknesses noted.

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:

   (i)   In addition to the academic support the Ohio University will provide accounting services, meeting rooms, assessment rooms and video-conferencing equipment. The University will also purchase SWVL robot and iPad sets for use by the mentors and teachers. (Page e56) This support is adequate for the university-based activities.

   (ii)   The applicant includes letters of support from Ohio University, Educational Service Center, and South-Western City School District. ESSCO will be contributing $3,702,829 to provide mentor teachers for the project. Ohio University will provide key personnel for the support of the program. This support is crucial for the success of the proposed project. (Letters of Support)   (Pages e120-e123)

   Weaknesses:

   (i) No weaknesses noted.
   (ii)   It is unclear what support the LEA will be providing during the project. The letter of support from the South-Western City Schools does not include provisions for resource. Without that information it is difficult to determine the "buy-in" from that entity. (Pages e120-123)

Reader's Score: 16

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 key to the strength of the management plan for this project is the well-defined Teams that are identified. Those teams include: Executive, Curriculum, Clinical, Mentoring, Induction, and Professional Development. Each Team addresses specific Program Activities. These teams have clearly defined timelines and Program Activities. These efforts will ensure that the project tasks are accomplished on time and within budget. A management chart included provides evidence of Timelines, Program Activities, and Program Deliverables. The timelines in that chart are specific. Included is the year and months of completion. The responsible parties are clearly identified. These efforts will assure that the project tasks are accomplished in a timely manner. (Pages e61-65) (Management Chart-

(i)   The key personnel that are identified in the project are highly qualified and will provide adequate support for the success of the proposed project. For example, the Clinical Team will be led by a person who has extensive experience in clinical supervision in the area of special education. (Page e43) The Project Director has a strong background in grant administration as well as special education teaching strategies. (Page e58) (Resumes) (Pages e94-e119)

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:

   (i)The proposed project includes formative and summative elements. These will provide for the support of continuous improvement within each project year. In Table 5 the applicant identifies the assessment, when it is administered and by whom it is administered, and this is evidence of strength because the alignment will assure that the assessment will be completed with consistency. For example, The Pre-Professional Internship Review will be using a performance-based instrument that will be administered prior to the year-long teacher residency and will be completed by the prospective teacher and their faculty advisor. This outline also demonstrates the variety and type of assessments. For example, rubrics will be used as well as Standardized Testing.   The evaluation team will help to ensure that the evaluation is unbiased and outcomes are objective. This will provide valid and reliable performance data. (Page e42 and Page e67)

   (ii)The applicant includes, in Table 9, the evaluation performance measures, targeted goals and data sources. This table outlines the thoroughness of the evaluation plan. These are appropriate to measure the goals and outcomes of the proposed project. For example: The percentage of special education program graduates who have attained initial State licensure by passing all necessary licensure assessments within one year of program completion is a performance measure that is appropriate and is a goal of this project. (Page e68)

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 proposed project is designed to integrate evidence-based and high-leverage practices in special education STEM and computer information into a Special Education Master's Degree Program. The design is supported by a comprehensive plan to provide for that integration for new teachers. This integration will increase the number of educators adequately prepared to deliver rigorous instruction in the STEM fields. (Page e22-e23)

   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:

NA

Weaknesses:

NA

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/14/2019 05:25 PM

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/14/2019 03:15 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Ohio University (U336S190027)
Reader #2:   **********

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	40	37
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	20
Sub Total	100	97
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. STEM/Computer Science	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Invitational Priority		
Invitational Priority		
1. Promise Zones	0	
Sub Total	0	
Total	105	102

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - Teacher Quality Partnership - 4: 84.336S

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

Applicant: Ohio University (U336S190027)

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:

    1.   The project presents a clear and well thought out rationale for its work. The proposal starts with the premise that students learn best when they are taught by well-prepared teachers who demonstrate they have the teaching skills and content knowledge for their teaching positions. Next comes the acknowledgement that there are current shortages in the number of qualified special education teachers and a lack of training resources to support and sustain special education teachers in their positions. As a result, many students with disabilities have less exposure to high-quality teaching in the content areas, creating fewer opportunities for students with disabilities to learn the content and skills in STEM and computer science to be successful in their college and career pursuits. The remedy in the form of this project is to train more and better prepared special education teachers to meet these needs. (p. 6)

    2.   The goals, objectives, and outcomes are clearly specified, and the project provides evidence of how it will measure its performance and adjust its work based on feedback. For example, the purpose of the project is to improve the academic achievement of K-12 students with moderate-to-intensive disabilities. The application fully explains and details the work to improve achievement for this especially needy group of students. The program's aim is to increase the quality and quantity of new moderate-to-intensive special education teachers by meeting two goals. One is to enrich the quality of coursework and clinical experiences for the university's special education Master's degree program. The second is to provide the means by which new and current special education teachers can become better teachers and better serve their students though improved communication, collaboration, mentorship, and professional development. (p. 11)

    In short, the project's details paint a complete picture of how it will prepare special education teachers with strong pedagogical and content-related skills to develop valuable learning programs for their students with disabilities in STEM content, literacy, social-emotional skills, and functional life skills. (p. 10)

    3.   The proposal is likely to produce additional capacity and provide tangible results well beyond the time of the grant. The application notes that its model of simultaneous renewal, wherein collaboration is viewed as a teaming process that is mutually beneficial for all stakeholders, may foster building strong capacity in teachers and their students beyond

the bounds of the grant period. The application cites research that found that simultaneous renewal collaborations enhance outcomes for students and that it is a necessary model of collaboration for effective partnerships to be maintained over time. Another example of the lasting impact of the project that is presented, is the new model proposed for the Master's degree program. By redesigning the curriculum and clinical experiences in partnership with high-need districts, the innovative strategies, including strengthening course content on evidence-based practices, high-leverage practices, and data-based decision making, will foster an important difference in the future of special education in the service area. (pp. 28-29) Finally, the large number of participants anticipated to complete the program presents a significant difference maker in and of itself. (p. 29)

4.   The project successfully demonstrates that it has several components that allow it to meet the definition of an exceptional approach to the problem posed. One is that the project focuses on a particularly underserved group of students who are often overlooked but who could benefit from a targeted, well designed set of teaching strategies and approaches and have a meaningful learning experience in STEM and gain valuable skills that will forever change their lives. (p. 24) Another is that the program intends for teachers to earn micro-credentials in STEM and computer science, in addition providing them with the latest tools and technologies to better teach their students. Use of these micro-credentials help mark this program as exceptional, as it adds distinction and accomplishment to the work of the participants. (p. 48)

Weaknesses:

1.   No weaknesses found.

2.   The proposal notes that one of its leadership teams, the Curriculum Team will consist primarily of faculty members of the university. The application notes that it will include representatives from all other agencies, but it doesn't call out the district's key employees. The inclusion of district mentor teachers, the practitioners in the classroom, in such a key team, would have strengthened this attribute of the proposal. (p. e35)

It is confusing that new teachers specifically would be chosen to lead professional development efforts. (p. e47) Further explanation would have been helpful for the reviewer.

3.   A more detailed explanation of the role to be played in the project by distance or online learning would have been helpful. It would have been helpful to know to what extent that would be, and what experience those teaching the online and/or distance learning courses had. This mode of teaching and learning is outside the norm somewhat, and there is no real explanation or exploration of how it might change the dynamic of the program. (p. e 50)

4.   No weaknesses found.

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:

1.   The strong support from the lead applicant organization is clear, evident and abundant. For example, The Office of Research and Sponsored Programs provides post-award support for faculty to manage external grants, including this, it is assumed. Supports for faculty include accounting, submission of reports, and requests for budget revisions. In addition, the education department has its own post-award staff person who performs a number of grant-management tasks. (pp. 33-34) Another example of strong support is found in the facilities and equipment details. The site proposed for the project has multiple offices and work stations, meeting rooms, assessment rooms and video conferencing equipment. (p. 34)

2.   The commitment and relevance of the project partners is also clear and evident in this proposal. As demonstrated in the letters of support from the regional educational program and the school district with its 21 high-need schools, it is apparent that the program has full commitment and partnership from all entities. This commitment is demonstrated by the representation from each partnering agency on each of the six leadership teams that are envisioned to guide and complete the work of the grant. (pp. 37-38)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

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:

   The project details a management plan that has structures and processes in place to manage and achieve the objectives on time and with fidelity to the plan. The application provides a clear and precise table outlining the timeline of activities of the individuals or groups that have specific responsibility for each important step, and detailed information on what the deliverables are along the way. For example, each of the six teams for leadership (Curriculum Team, Clinical Team, etc.) in the project are named and tasks assigned to them with milestones throughout the years outlined in the management plan. (pp. 41-43) Another important note about the management plan to emphasize is its distributed leadership among the university, the school district, the teachers within the partnering schools, and stakeholders from the community. This inclusive kind of management plan means that there is likely to be ownership and important feedback obtained from all parties. (p. 40)

   Weaknesses:

   No weaknesses found.

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:

   1.   The methods of evaluation for the project will go to great extent to provide valuable and reliable feedback on program performance. First, the description includes specific quantitative measures, such as demographics, responses to selected surveys, progression rates, and academic achievement. Qualitative methodologies are observations, individual interviews, surveys, and document review. The evaluation design allows for interaction between qualitative and quantitative data throughout the program period so that multiple parts can be examined within the project and throughout the grant period. For example, the evaluation will include a formative and summative assessment of the program, including an assessment of how well the partners collaborated and engaged individual schools and their teachers. It is also of note that the evaluation is being conducted by an external evaluation team that does not have a stake in the program's development or implementation. (pp. 46-47)

   2.   The methods of evaluation can readily be seen to be of strong quality and capable of providing appropriate measurements of the grant's goals and outcomes. This can be seen in categories in the evaluation performance measures, goals, and data sources. One example of an important goal is the one-year persistence. This measure will be the percentage of program participants who were enrolled in the postsecondary program and continued after the first year. The goal is 90% of participants. Another example of a thorough and feasible evaluation method is the judicious use of qualitative descriptions to add context, to add credibility to the reported information, and to help explain any variability in outcomes that may arise. Further, the comprehensive and complete nature of the evaluation is shown when the plan calls for measuring how well the program fits with other professional development and school and school district reform efforts and whether it leads to creating a sustainable effort. Finally, it is appropriate that the summative portion of the evaluation will focus on outcomes at the teacher, school, and student level. (pp. 46-47)

   Weaknesses:

   No weaknesses found.

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 primary goal of this project is to improve student achievement in computer science through increasing the numbers of qualified teachers in STEM and computer science. It will develop and implement a teacher residency program for this purpose in partnership with a high-need district it serves. (p. e22) It is worth noting that many students with disabilities have less exposure to high-quality teaching in the content areas, creating fewer opportunities for students with disabilities to learn the content and skills in STEM and computer science This project is to train more and better prepared special education teachers to meet these needs

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

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:

   Weaknesses:

   Reader's Score:

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/14/2019 03:15 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Ohio University (U336S190027)
Reader #3: **********

		Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions			
Selection Criteria			
Quality of Project Design			
1. Project Design		40	40
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	20
	Sub Total	100	100
Priority Questions			
Competitive Preference Priority			
Competitive Preference Priority 1			
1. STEM/Computer Science		5	5
	Sub Total	5	5
Invitational Priority			
Invitational Priority			
1. Promise Zones		0	0
	Sub Total	0	0
	Total	105	105

Panel #3 - Teacher Quality Partnership - 4: 84.336S

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

Applicant: Ohio University (U336S190027)

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 proposed STEM+FOR ALL project addresses the point that students with disabilities have less exposure to high quality teaching and content areas, which results in fewer opportunities for students with disabilities to develop proficiencies in science, technology, engineering, mathematics. The lack of high-quality teaching in these fields for students with disabilities is a disservice to the students because the STEM fields are the one in which students tend to excel due to needing extreme level of focus in order to successfully solved some problems, as stated by applicant. This project proposes to correct this by building a project that promotes equitable education experiences and STEM+content to ensure that students with disabilities are career ready for computer information science professions.

   The project proposes to address the fact that prospective special education teachers need strong pedagogical and content specific preparation. The preparation will be paired with intensive clinical experiences where prospective special education teachers can apply their knowledge in the classroom with students with disabilities so that prospective teachers develop the skills necessary to positively impact the K12 students with disabilities and effectively prepare individuals with disability for computer information science careers. Additionally, the project also addresses the critical shortage in special education. Due to the limited personnel and resources to meet student individual needs, special education teachers have reported that they believe their students are not achieving mastery and content areas compare with their peers without disabilities. The applicant reports that Ohio is faced with a shortage in special education teachers and are in the greatest need of teachers of students with moderate-to-intensive educational needs. (pages e23-25)

   (ii)   The goals and objectives are detailed, clearly articulated, measurable and are in alignment with improving the academic achievement K-12 students. As an example, the logic model outlines the project's two Goals, one of which is to - effectively train 104 new special education teachers to successfully obtain licensure in special education for learners with moderate-to-intensive needs and teach K12 students with moderate-to-intensive educational needs. The project objectives are clearly defined and are followed with detailed input activities and short and long-term outcomes. (pages e32-33)

   (iii)   The proposed project represents an exceptional approach to providing services for students with disabilities in

that it is specifically addressing the critical and often overlooked needs of students with moderate-to-intensive disabilities. It has an innovative approach to providing the necessary skills needed to better teach students science, technology, engineering, and math skills that they need. The program components which include the redesign of the online curriculum as well as the services that will be provided by the various Teams that have been created to carry out the project's goals and activities. The project will embed evidence-based practices and high-leverage practices throughout their curriculum and assessment. The project will: add a curriculum related to computer information science; provide yearlong teacher resident residency programs model after the Ohio's teaching fellow program; and create a stronger alignment between curriculum and clinical experiences.

(iv)   Other teams that are created and illustrate the division of worked required to effectively implement the program include: The Leadership Team with specific roles; Clinical team which is responsible for enhancing the special education clinical experiences; Mentoring team who will create a system's activities and materials that foster ongoing communication and collaboration; Mentorship and induction team who will work with developing and supporting new teachers by building their capacities, and professional development teams who will work with providing resources common activities and support for all stakeholders through ongoing professional development.   (pages e44-52.)

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted for (i) – (iv).

Reader's Score: 40

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 resources are adequate based on the details provided by the applicant. The Ohio University Office of Research and Sponsored Program will provide post awards support for faculty to manage external grant. The faculty support includes account setup, partnership agreements and communication with the funders as well as submitting reports budget request. The University provides assistance and support from staff members. Additionally, there is an Office in The Center for Intervention Research in Schools and the Center has multiple offices and workstations, meeting rooms assessment and video conferencing equipment. Faculty have access to the library of professional development manuals and procedures. In addition, 75% of the grant funds will go to prospective teachers for the cost of living stipends. The Principle Investigator/ Project evaluator will be paid out of the grant funds. Funds Grant funding will pay mentor teachers a small stipend for their time and expertise in supporting the prospective and new teachers outside of their contractual hours doing the academic year and in the summer. Finally, strategies to sustain the program after the grant period ends are evolving. (pages e53-57)

(ii)   Ohio, ESCCO, and Southwestern City School District show their commitment in the letters of support and partnerships. Their commitment includes: representation from each agency on 6 different teams; commitment from the partners and key faculty member which includes financial support; faculty participation, time commitments to the continuation of activities when the grant ends; The applicant included documentation that 100% match for the project; the match come from both Ohio an ESCCO which demonstrates a strong partnership and commitment of resources to ensure success of the STEM+ FOR ALL project. Ohio faculty are commitment to providing adequate time commitments to ensure the completion of the partnership activities as well the school district teachers have released time to cover the work related to the project.   (pages 57-60)

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted for (i) and (ii).

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:

   The management plan is well organized and detailed. The applicant presents an outlined table describing and delineating various management tasks and activities.

   The applicant states that the management model is a "distributed leadership model" between and among Ohio, ESCCO, teachers within the partner schools, and stakeholders from the community to ensure that all relevant parties have a voice to communicate the assets of the plan as well as any barriers experienced or anticipated that could jeopardize the targeted outcome achievement. The structure of the plan is for effectively achieving goals with the grant as well as sustaining after the grant. The table includes the timelines for activities, the responsibilities for the various teams and partners and parties as well as the deliverables for this project. (pages e58-60)

   Project management responsibilities are distributed among the following Teams: Executive Team; Curriculum Team; Clinical Team; Mentoring Team; Induction Team; and the Professional Development Team. Details for the implementation of the various components of this project are included. Based on the evidence that has been presented by the applicant, the management plans will sufficiently achieve the objectives and project goals on time and within budget. (pages e60-63)

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted for (i).

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)   As reported by the applicant, the evaluation design for this project include components for the project improvement and a summative component to assess the short- and long-term outcomes and achievement. The evaluators will assess the long-term sustainability of the program. The evaluation approach also has mixed-method study with combined qualitative and quantitative data. The evaluation includes a set of evaluation questions by intended participants, and the evaluation questions are aligned with the project's two goals and objectives. The evaluation will include formative and summative assessment of the program; assess the partnerships; examine how well the program integrates activities with other professional development and school reform activities; and, how the program utilizes grant resources along with other supports to create sustainable efforts. The summative portion of the evaluation will focus on outcomes at the teacher school and student level. Quantitative measures, as stated by the applicant, include institutional data such as demographics responses to selected surveys, progression rates and academic achievement. The qualitative methodologies incorporate observations, individual interviews surveys and documents reviews. In terms of data management, the evaluator will use a variety of methods to collect summative data annually.

   (ii)   The applicant also included clearly articulated performance measures, targets and identified the data sources. Quantitatively, teacher progress, graduation, certification, placement, and retention will provide a baseline framework for assessing progress. Qualitative data with interviews and focus group protocols will be developed and will assist in developing profiles of the prospective teachers, new teachers, mentor teachers, and teacher educators as prospective teachers entering and completing the program. The evidence provided by the applicant ensures that the evaluation plan will yield valid and reliable performance data on relevant project goals, objectives and outcomes. E65-70

   Weaknesses:

   No weakness noted for (i) – (ii)

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:

   Ohio University proposes to improve learning outcomes for K12 students with moderate to intensive educational needs. The project aims to leverage the preparation of prospective teachers at Ohio University to build the capacity for Ohio ESCCO (Local Education Agency) in partnership to train and mentor prospective, new, and current teachers. Specifically, the STEM+FOR ALL proposed project will extend Ohio's "online" moderate-to-intensive special education master's degree program to include 3 redesign efforts:

   1. Integrating evidence-based and high leverage practices and special education and science, technology, engineering, and mathematics plus computer information science content into the special education master's degree program.
   2. Lengthening Ohio's Special Education Master's degree clinical experiences to include a yearlong teacher residency. The project will redesign the clinical experiences of Ohio's graduate special education preparation program to encompass a yearlong teaching apprenticeship and the mentorship of a special education teacher from the ESCCO who is licensed, experienced, and successful in the teaching of K12 students with moderate-to-intensive educational needs.
   3. Ongoing mentoring and induction support on topics contextually relevant to the local education agency's (ESCCO) teaching of students with severe conditional emotional disturbances.

   Through the innovative approach of developing high-quality special education teachers who are well prepared to deliver effective computer information science instruction to students with disabilities, the applicant will improve the STEM+ FOR ALL achievement as students with disabilities in the prospective and new teachers' classrooms. In addition to student achievement, Ohio's innovative approach to delivering high quality teacher preparation will promote design thinking and computational thinking skills in K12 students both of which can promote problem solving skills and critical thinking mindset.

   Weaknesses:

   No weakness 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:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/14/2019 08:42 PM