

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/14/2019 11:48 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Bowie State University (U336S190029)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	40	38
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	18
Sub Total	100	96
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	101

Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - Teacher Quality Partnership - 6: 84.336S

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Bowie State University (U336S190029)

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 clearly demonstrates the collaboration of the Bowie State University and three high-needs school districts in the greater Washington DC area to develop the STAR teacher quality partnership (e16). The collaboration is evident in both the design to meet district needs, the proposed leadership structure of the advisory boards (e54-e55), as well as the continuous feedback model (e54, e58) that exists for input from all organizations. For example, the partners have co-designed the teacher residency model to leverage faculty expertise in partnership with district teacher mentors to create a coherent experience for teacher residents (e36-e37). This is a strength of the proposal as it leverages the expertise from both researchers and practitioners to inform the development and implementation.
- The proposal clearly presents the academic need for the local district partners (e24-e25). The presentation of multiple data points demonstrates an opportunity for the program to have significant impact on student learning outcomes and support improved teacher staffing related to the detailed shortages. This was a noted strength of the proposal.
- The project demonstrates an intensive needs assessment that has been completed by the partners in preparation for the development of this proposal (e24, e75-e126). The project design was informed by data collection from multiple stakeholder groups including teachers, professors, and candidates to develop the logic model (e134). The robust data set creates a sound foundation for a successful program design that meets the needs of all partners.
- The STAR program creates a comprehensive set of strategies for teacher education that blend the teacher residency model (e19) and blend it with innovative strategies such as the use of micro-credentials related to STEM and computer science (e20). The inclusion of the innovative practices demonstrates a commitment to extending the research base (e30) and improving our overall understanding of best practices for teacher training.
- The proposal clearly outlines a primary goal with four aligned objectives and performance measures (e26-e27). The goals presented are specific and measurable and align the outcomes of the proposed residency program to meet the articulated community needs for the Washington DC school partners. For example, the proposal articulates that the first objective is to improve academic achievement in high needs schools, and seeks to measure multiple indicators including ELA, Math, and Science proficiency, high school graduation, and post-secondary enrollment for students. This exemplifies the connection between the residency program and student outcomes, which is a noted strength of the proposal.
- The proposal presents a literature review of the relevant research that supports the design of the project and meets the What Works Clearinghouse Standards without reservation (e23). The inclusion of these students demonstrates

the potential for impact of the diverse strategies included within the proposal.

- The proposal presents a comprehensive narrative for how the STAR program award has the potential to inform innovation both locally and nationally beyond the federal award period (e33-e47). Additionally, the inclusion of a clear dissemination plan (e49, e54-e55, e64) increases possible replication of the model in other partnerships.

Weaknesses:

- The proposal includes a clear intent to engage candidates from traditionally underrepresented groups for high needs teaching areas (e28-e29). However, the proposal does not provide a clear set of strategies for recruitment to attract high caliber candidates. Additionally, it is not clear what the target is for enrollment of those individuals. The proposal would be stronger with the inclusion of targets related to the number of teachers they expect to recruit in relation to this goal.

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 clearly articulates that Bowie State University will provide a match for all resources awarded through the federal grant to the partner school districts (e48), including the use of in-kind contributions. The commitment of the university is detailed through grant management services, expertise, learning resources, technology, and facilities (e48-e49). The detail of the resources demonstrates a clear commitment by the lead organization and is a strength of the proposal.

- The proposal presents the inclusion of resources from the partner institution through a budget justification table (e262-e274). Additionally, resources are addressed in the logic model (e68) as a component of inputs. The resources presented are comprehensive and clearly align with the needs of the project. The resources are being used thoughtfully, recognizing an attention to sustainability, which is a noted strength of the proposal.

- The partners have included letters of support (e230-e233) from each of the partner institutions. Each letter outlines their commitment to the project with specific partner responsibilities, demonstrating their understanding of their commitment to the implementation and success of the project.

- The engagement of community members from each of the partner organizations in the needs assessment to create the comprehensive solution is a noted strength of the proposal (e47-e48). Each of the partners have an investment and input into the project design, which demonstrates a commitment to the implementation and potential success of the project.

Weaknesses:

- No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

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

Strengths:

- The proposal clearly presents a management plan that addresses roles on taskforces (e51-e53) related to each of the proposed components. Each implementation action describes the responsible party and a timeline for each of the five cohorts. The level of detail is noted as a strength of the proposal.
- The proposal details timely completion (e50) and budget oversight (e53) processes for STAR. The inclusion of these details demonstrates a commitment to the achievement of the project goals within the timeframe and resources of the project and is a strength of the proposal.
- The development of an Advisory Board incorporates a continuous feedback model from practitioners to inform the iteration and improvement of the project. This level of detail creates a strong foundation and path for the execution of the project toward the intended goals and is noted as a strength.
- The proposal clearly presents key project personnel and their qualifications (e55-e56, e135-e229) and demonstrate the capacity and expertise of the leadership for the project. The leadership team represents for all partners and bring a diversity of expertise related to teacher education, local school district, and STEM learning. The prior experience working with STEM in K-12 and prior grant management experience were noted strengths.
- The proposal notes the intent to plan a second phase that includes offering the micro-credentials to the state as professional learning for teachers, demonstrating how the project will continue beyond the grant period (e57-e58). The establishment of these next steps are a clear demonstration of the commitment of the partners to serve the larger education field beyond the federal award period.

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 proposal presents an evaluation plan that meets the What Works Clearinghouse Design Standards with Reservation (e59-e61). The design includes both qualitative and quantitative data and seeks to evaluate both the teacher residency design as well as impact on student learning. This comprehensive approach was noted as a strength to the proposal.
- The proposal engages an external evaluator, EduSHIFT, Inc. to complete the robust external evaluation of the program (e58). The use of multiple tools and measures demonstrates a comprehensive data set and evaluation of the proposal. The qualifications and prior experience of the evaluator as well as the plan for multiple measures to verify outcomes were noted strengths of the proposal.
- The proposal presents a comprehensive table that outlines the measures and timeline associated with each of the five key research questions. The table clearly demonstrates how multiple data sets will be used for analysis (e66-e69).
- The proposal includes a detailed articulation of the matching methodology (e59-e60), demonstrating a thorough match process that considers administrative files of educators, school size, proportion of economically disadvantaged students, and pre-intervention student achievement. The varied data sets to determine the match was a noted strength of the proposal.
- The proposal clearly details the methodology for the determination of the effect size (e60) and aligns with the What Works Clearinghouse threshold for “substantively important”. This is a noted strength, as it demonstrates how the research outcomes have the potential to be included in the What Works Clearinghouse to inform the larger national education research field.

Weaknesses:

- The proposal has a single overarching research question that is framed specific to measuring if STAR graduates academically perform better than other novice teachers (e59). The project would benefit from the inclusion of additional research questions to address the multiple strategies and outcomes that are articulated throughout the proposal. The use of a single research question lacks the depth and breadth of research that are possible for the STAR program.

Reader's Score: 18

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 proposal includes explicit goals, strategies and measures associated with recruitment and training teachers for computer science through micro-credentials (e20-e21, e41). The focus on expanding credentialed teachers for computer science in a technology-based instructional setting is a noted strength of the proposal.
- The proposal seeks to expand the computer science credential to teachers beyond the STAR teacher fellows (e21), demonstrating an increased potential for impact for students and teachers in the high-needs districts. The extension of this resource was a strength, as it builds capacity to address access to computer science, which was a noted need of the partner districts (e25).

Weaknesses:

- No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Invitational Priority - Invitational Priority

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

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

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

Strengths:

- The proposal provides clear evidence that the TQP project schools are located within an opportunity zone as described by the priority (e21). The proposal clearly details the census tract numbers and provides additional detail in the proposal appendices (e243-e246).

Weaknesses:

- No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/14/2019 11:48 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/14/2019 11:57 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Bowie State University (U336S190029)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	40	38
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	17
Sub Total	100	95
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	100

Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - Teacher Quality Partnership - 6: 84.336S

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Bowie State University (U336S190029)

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:

- Strong collaborations are present with university departments, and school districts that includes design, mentorship, and evaluation within the proposal. (e24, e57)
- Collaborating partners create a Replication Support Team designed to expand the potential of this proposal and increase the impact of the federal funding for this proposal. (e48-49)
- Goals, objectives and outcomes have been outlined to fulfill the needs of the district partners. These needs such as teacher turnover, teacher shortages, teacher/student demographics gaps are all listed and the model recommended in the proposal addresses these needs and provides an action plan and outcome to relieve some of the needs of the district. (e24-27)

Weaknesses:

- The perception is that those employed under this proposal would not need to recruit, so no recruitment plan is in place. In order to obtain participants, one should know how they will get them. If no recruitment plan is necessary, then they should at least explain how they will obtain participants. If recruiting is going to take place, they should explain how in the grant proposal. (e28)

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:

- An advisory board is in place to make sure resources are present. (e54)
- PI will be hired full time (e54) which provides someone to lead the initiatives and make sure everything runs as planned and trouble shoots where needed.
- Primary partner (the university) and other partners have pledged a match of 100% to the federal funds. These matches are included in areas such as grant management, program expertise, facilities and technology. This shows the ability for this program to potentially continue past the five-year commitment of the grant. (e48)
- Resources needed focus on the student and student learning and what directly impacts the program which supports the role and purpose of the grant. (e47-50)

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:

- A replication support team is identified (e46-47, e34) to make sure the program can continue on and is sustainable past the five-year mark.
- Management plan provides a strong method to achieve the objectives through specified responsibilities, timelines, and milestones. (e32-40)
- Responsibilities for grant management are clearly defined. These include hiring appropriate staff to launch the project, designating the PI to document implementation, and enlist the help of the university's grants accounting office to ensure a 100% match of federal funds. (e53-54)
- Quarterly meetings are planned for the Advisory Board that includes grant personnel, university personnel and school district personnel. This ensures that everyone knows the current state of events for this proposal, ensuring that it is of the quality expected. (e54)

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:

- Proposal makes use of a third-party company, Edushift for their external evaluation. Company has been in existence for a number of years with a strong track record. (e56)
- Uses document analysis, and formative and summative evaluations in their evaluation process. This ensures a triangulation of data that is not skewed because of only one measurement being utilized to show goals are being met. (e62-65)
- Uses multiple methodologies to evaluate, including quantitative and qualitative forms of data collection and analysis. (e65)
- The external evaluator will identify a control group that matches the characteristics of those participating in the proposed project by using administrative records. This will help answer the research question proposed for this proposal. (e60)

Weaknesses:

- While multiple objectives are included, only one research question is evident: "Do students of STAR graduates academically outperform the students of traditionally-trained novice teachers?" The grant may have other items to address, such as scores on the licensure exams, or attrition rates in the program, or even how long they stay in the field of education. It would also be interesting to know how many more mails might enter into the program. If everything is going to be a comparison from one program to the other, perhaps there should be an explanation of the program to which they are comparing. (e59).

Reader's Score: 17

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:

- This proposal works towards increasing the number of educators prepared to deliver STEM and computer science instruction, provide professional development to current STEM educators, and recruit for the field. (e3-29)
- This proposal works towards improving student achievement in education fields including STEM fields, and compares the achievement of the new program to the achievement of the current program. (e3-29)

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:

- Participants will be placed in school districts located in Opportunity zones, meeting the needs of this priority. (e36, e245-246)

Weaknesses:

- No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted**Last Updated:** 06/14/2019 11:57 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/14/2019 08:54 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Bowie State University (U336S190029)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	40	38
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	18
Sub Total	100	96
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	101

Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - Teacher Quality Partnership - 6: 84.336S

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Bowie State University (U336S190029)

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, Bowie State University presents a high-quality teacher program called STAR with three high-needs schools in Washington, D.C. (pg. e22). Bowie State University presents a strong rationale, as a HBCU with an excellent history in the graduation of African Americans in teacher education and technological fields (pg. e22). STAR is based on peer-reviewed educator impact and student achievement studies (pg. e22). The partner schools detail very important rationales such as a large achievement gap, a 90% white graduation rate and 68% Black graduation rate.
- The applicant presents detailed goals, objectives, and measurable outcomes (pg. e26-27).
- The applicant details a task force of key stakeholders at the University and School Districts to build capacity and plans for yielding results after the period of Federal funding ends (pg. e27).
- The applicant presents a detailed framework for procedures, learning credentials, residency, and replication strategies (pg. e34).

Weaknesses:

- Although the project lists collaboration of partners, it is vague in describing the extent and length of such collaborations. For example, on-going collaboration with school districts, the nature of human resources with school districts, and other collaborations with stakeholders and committees within the school districts (pg. e36).

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 applicant provides evidence of adequate resources such as technology, facilities, and expert professors such resources include online learning, facilities, and digital dissemination (pg. e49).
- The applicant and partners are committed to the implementation of the project through providing details of a strong grant management, a planning task force, and expertise in working toward (pg. e48).
- The applicant states that the PI will lead a sustainability committee; this is an important way to leverage resources in ensuring that sustainability of project services is met (pg. e50).

Weaknesses:

- No weakness 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 applicant presents a strong management plan that includes clear implementation activities, responsible parties, and timeline/milestones. The grant management adequately addresses essential parts of a comprehensive plan such as equal access, timely completion, responsibilities/milestones, budget oversight, management procedures, qualified personnel, demonstrated commitment, and future expansion (pg. e50).
- To ensure the project is completed on time and within budget, the applicant details an implementation activity chart that sets milestones and implementation timeline for each year of the project (pg. e51).

Weaknesses:

- No weakness 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:

- The applicant states that they will contract with a 19-year-old research/evaluation organization to conduct process and outcome evaluation; this experience is highly likely to result in a highly quality evaluation (pg. e58).
- The applicant presents evaluation oversight; this will contribute to ensuring that methods and processes result in an objective evaluation (pg. e58-59).
- The applicant provides that the design meets What Works Clearinghouse Standards and a randomized control assessment of outcomes and matching, propensity-score matching for the STAR research questions (pg. e59). These WWC standards and are highly likely to result in a strong evaluation plan.

Weaknesses:

- The applicant only presents one research question (pg. e59), however, the applicant would have a more robust evaluation plan if it would include additional research questions that address the multiple objectives of the program.

Reader's Score: 18

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 proposes a strong program to improve student achievement and other educational outcomes in Computer Science and STEM (pg. e20). The program is very rigorous in the curriculum design, residency, and mentorship of teachers in STEM and Computer Science.
- The applicant demonstrates this priority by designing pathways for computer science credentials to teachers in the program, not only STAR teacher fellows. This is an important design that is highly likely to increase student achievement in high poverty schools (pg. e21).

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:

- The applicant presents a strong program that serves students from three county high poverty schools, Prince George's County, Dorchester County, and District of Columbia Public Schools; the applicant states that the partner schools are located inside Maryland and District of Columbia Opportunity Zones (pg. e21). The applicant provides evidence of census for the opportunity zones, such as 48.7% poverty rate and 27.4% unemployment and 90.8% poverty rate and 52.2% unemployment.

Weaknesses:

- No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/14/2019 08:54 AM