

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/17/2019 09:02 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** The Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois (U336S190035)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	40	30
<b>Adequacy of Resources</b>		
1. Resources	20	20
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	20
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	18
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	88
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
1. STEM/Computer Science	5	5
<b>Sub Total</b>	5	5
<b>Invitational Priority</b>		
<b>Invitational Priority</b>		
1. Promise Zones	0	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	0	0
<b>Total</b>	105	93

# Technical Review Form

**Panel #1 - Teacher Quality Partnership - 2: 84.336S**

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

**Applicant:** The Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois (U336S190035)

## 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 presents a sound rationale which clearly addresses how the project aligns with the identified needs of the target group. For example, the rationale for the project is to prepare teachers in the target city's most underserved communities a viable pathway to gain state teacher licensure and a graduate level coursework while maintaining employment and strong relationships with young children and their families at their current workplace. The project is also designed to address acute teacher shortages, lack of teacher diversity in lead teacher roles, teacher turnover and retention, and lack of multiple educator pathways to support growth and change in the profession (pp. e18, e19).

(ii) The applicant presents five broad goals to be achieved by the project. One of the goals, for example, is to enhance the partner university's Alternative Early Childhood Education Licensure (residency) program and mentoring model to include intense UIC coaching support and increased content in socio-emotional learning, STEM, and inclusion of diverse learners (p. e23). Objectives that correlate with the project's goals are evidenced. In addition, the applicant presents a concise logic model consisting of inputs, resources, activities, products, and short and long-term outcomes to guide the implementation of the project. Intended project outcomes include but are not limited to increase in overall instructional quality and content specific practices, and increased sustainable, scalable models of teacher preparation programs (p. e29).

(iii) The applicant provides sound evidence that the proposed project is designed to build capacity during the administration of the grant period. As indicated in the proposal, for example, free online professional development courses, as well as a vast array of instructional and educational resources, are available to early childhood professionals (p. e32). The residency part of the university's program will be substantially enhanced by the project's partnership. The enhancements include intensive mentoring from site-based teachers and coaches, and content-focused professional learning communities (p. e38). Capacity building will also involve STEM professional learning communities that will build on the success of the Early Math Matters professional development program.

(iv) The project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities established for the competition. As indicated in the narrative, for example, the partner university's master's degree program blends early childhood and early childhood

special education to prepare teachers to support all young learners. The applicant also proposes to enhance the licensure teacher residency program via additional instruction in critical content areas to include STEM and expanding mentoring through the applicant's partner university coaches that support quality classroom instruction, and sustainable data-informed professional learning. Further, the project will build on existing partnerships with the partner university to use observational measures that focus on global quality and social-emotional teaching to inform resident development and practice around promoting children's social-emotional and STEM learning, and the inclusion of diverse learners (p. e18, e19). The applicant also provided supporting citations indicating that STEM and social-emotional learning are not a part of traditional early childhood teacher preparation programs, which tend to underemphasize science and math, further supporting the exceptional approach of this project (p. e27).

**Weaknesses:**

(ii) Most of the objectives, which are necessary to evaluate the project's progress towards meeting its goals are not stated in measurable terms. For example, one of the objectives proposed is to "train residents in high-quality practices skills especially around social-emotional learning, working with diverse learners, and STEM" (p. e55). Therefore, it is unclear what is being measured and what the applicants anticipate to be the intended outcome.

(iii) The applicant lacks specificity regarding how capacity building would take place beyond the grant period. Specifically, the applicant proposes to enhance its mentoring but does not explain how this would take place or what the enhancement would be.

**Reader's Score: 30**

**Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources**

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

(i) The proposal provides evidence that the applicant organization has the teaching resources necessary to successfully implement the project. For example, the lead applicant organization has over 40 tenured and tenure-track members of the scientific faculty. The lead applicant organization has a long history in the graduate education of scientists, and educators that are actively engaged in research on teaching, teacher education, and science education (pp. e22, e23). In addition, the lead applicant organization provides exhibition-related resources, classrooms, and laboratories that scaffold teacher and student use (p. e54). Other resources that are adequate to support the project include tuition scholarships to teacher residents participating in the project that is provided by the target city that includes covering expenses such as parking, books, state testing, and technology needs (p. e12).

(ii) The relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project are clearly evidenced. Demonstrated commitment includes but is not limited to the following. The city's Office of Early Learning has granted the partner university residency program more \$600,000 through its Early

Learning Workforce Scholarship Program to support the first 40 residents enrolled in the program (pe50). School leaders and administrators within the target schools will serve as evaluators of participant's performance throughout their residency (p. e205). In addition, the governor's office will help facilitate necessary data agreement to study the program's impact and support the dissemination of key findings from the program's evaluation to stakeholders and policymakers (p. e206).

**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 applicant presents a detailed management that is adequate to achieve the objectives of the project as projected. The management plan boasts an implementation process that aligns the goals, objectives, and a timeline of key activities and persons responsible for ensuring each activity takes place (pp. e54-e56). The management plan is organized through a leadership team and project committees. The project's leadership team consists of a team of co-principal investigators will oversee all aspects of the program objectives (p. e52). The management plan also includes an operations committee will oversee recruitment, selection, and admissions (p. e53). The implementation plan includes a timeline for when each activity will take place. For example, during the summer of the project's implementation year, coaches will be trained in collecting and using video for reflective supervision, collecting and using self-report data for reflective supervision (p. e54). In addition, the budget includes costs for personnel, travel, and supplies and materials. All costs are reasonable in relation to the anticipated outcomes of the project (p. e233-e238).

**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 applicant presents a detailed evaluation plan that is formative and summative in nature. The evaluation plan is designed to provide valid and reliable performance data on the project's intended outcomes. Formative and summative evaluations, for example, will focus on the effectiveness of the residency program in developing and licensing teachers to provide high-quality early childhood education in high needs communities. (p. e59). Quantitative data will be collected to determine the project's accomplishments and impacts. Data will be collected every semester allowing for a rich understanding of resident growth. The formative evaluation findings will be disseminated to the research team over the course of the project to support adaptive learning and program improvements (p. e60). The summative evaluation findings will be disseminated to the broader group of the project's stakeholders seeking to identify models for continuous development of the early childhood workforce. Overall, the project anticipates that the evaluation findings will strengthen the current project as it unfolds and also inform future efforts focused on early childhood teacher preparation and policy (p. e61).

(ii) The applicant's method of evaluation is thorough and is designed to measure the success of the project in achieving its goals, objectives, and outcomes. The proposal outlines a detailed process aligning the project's goals, objectives, activities and evaluation questions that focuses on the project's intended outcomes. For example, one of the goals is to enhance the target groups alternative licensure program and coaching mode. The objective aligned with the goal is to train the coaches. The accompanying activity involves the development of a coaching protocol for reflective supervision practices. The accompanying evaluation questions seek to find how many and which trainings the coaches attend (p. e61).

**Weaknesses:**

(ii) It cannot be fully ascertained if the method of evaluation is feasible and appropriate relative to objectives, as the proposal does not demonstrate objectives that are measurable, which are necessary to evaluate the project's progress towards meeting its intended goal.

**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 well demonstrates that the project is designed to improve student achievement by proposing to prepare educators to deliver rigorous instruction in STEM via the implementation of an effective early childhood teacher residency program 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 field (p. e22). The applicant proposes to provide an online STEM professional development for Early Childhood teachers consisting of a curriculum that contains a series of eight courses addressing the major conceptual areas of math and computer science learning: math literacy, number sense, patterns, geometry, measurement, data collection and math processes (p. e32). In addition, project participants will participate in The STEM professional learning communities that are anticipated to will build on the success of the Early Math Matters professional development where they will gain the knowledge, confidence, and skills

necessary to integrate math, science and computer science in their classrooms (p. e42).

**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:**

**Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score:** 0

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 06/17/2019 09:02 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/17/2019 04:21 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** The Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois (U336S190035)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	40	30
<b>Adequacy of Resources</b>		
1. Resources	20	20
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	20
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	19
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	89
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
1. STEM/Computer Science	5	5
<b>Sub Total</b>	5	5
<b>Invitational Priority</b>		
<b>Invitational Priority</b>		
1. Promise Zones	0	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	0	0
<b>Total</b>	105	94

# Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Teacher Quality Partnership - 2: 84.336S

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

Applicant: The Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois (U336S190035)

## 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 project aims to expand the number of early childhood education teachers, expand the Alternative Early Education Licensure and seeks to provide residents state licensure and graduate level coursework while employed (e22).

ii. The application presents goals and objectives (e54). Each goal has an accompanying objective with specific activities that are necessary to achieve project success.

iii. The application plans to build capacity through multi-tiered mentoring support and content-focused professional learning communities (e29).

iv. The proposed project represents an exceptional approach in its aim to increase the number of STEM educators in early childhood classrooms. The proposed project seeks to place residents in early childhood classrooms in addition to community-based organizations classrooms that educate early childhood students (e22, e40).

### Weaknesses:

i. None noted

ii. The proposal presents objectives that are not stated in measurable terms. As an objective, the application notes training residents in high-quality practice skills, however, there are no outcomes, it uncertain if the goals are specific and measurable.

iii. It is unclear how the application will extend beyond the Federal financial assistance period. It is unknown how the application will continue project implementation without funding from this grant.

iv. None noted

Reader's Score: 30

### Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

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

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

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

#### Strengths:

i. The application demonstrates the lead applicant has the resources to support the project. The application will provide fellowships, work-study and training of individuals in research techniques (e208).

ii. The application adequately describes the demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project. Partnering institutions have committed in-kind funds in the form of evaluators for candidate's performance (e205) and educational reimbursements (e206).

#### Weaknesses:

i. None noted

ii. None noted

Reader's Score: 20

### Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

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

#### Strengths:

i. The application presents a logical management plan that outlines the lead applicant as having oversight of all program objectives and activities. Further, the management plan aligns goals with the personnel responsible for completing activities within a specified timeline (e54).

#### Weaknesses:

none 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 application will collect summative and formative feedback through ongoing evaluative measures. The application will collect data that will be used to assess the effectiveness of program activities (e59).

ii. The methods of evaluation are appropriate to the goals and objectives of the project. By using formative and summative evaluation and collecting data from partners, in addition to participants, will ensure the activities are appropriate to achieving the goals of the project (e60)

#### **Weaknesses:**

i. None noted

ii. The applicant presents goals and objectives that are not aligned to project outcomes. Because of such, it is uncertain if the objectives are feasible and appropriate achieving project outcomes.

**Reader's Score:** 19

### **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 presents a detailed plan to increase the number of educators prepared to deliver a rigorous instruction in STEM through the implementation of an Early Childhood Teacher Residency Program (e22, 32). The proposed plan will include access to free resources such as short videos related to computer science concepts. Additionally, the project will provide teacher residents will the skills and knowledge to integrate math, science and computer science into their classroom which will prepare teachers for delivering rigorous instruction in STEM fields, including computer science (e42).

#### **Weaknesses:**

None 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 applicant did not address this criterion.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant did not address this criterion.

**Reader's Score:** 0

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 06/17/2019 04:21 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/16/2019 11:57 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** The Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois (U336S190035)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	40	29
<b>Adequacy of Resources</b>		
1. Resources	20	18
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	20
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	18
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	85
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
1. STEM/Computer Science	5	5
<b>Sub Total</b>	5	5
<b>Invitational Priority</b>		
<b>Invitational Priority</b>		
1. Promise Zones	0	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	0	0
<b>Total</b>	105	90

# Technical Review Form

## Panel #1 - Teacher Quality Partnership - 2: 84.336S

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

**Applicant:** The Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois (U336S190035)

### 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 rationale and outlines the challenges (i.e., teacher shortage, lack of diversity in lead teacher and administrative roles, high degree of teacher turnover, lack of viable educator pathways, lack of specialized training in the STEM field) facing the Early Childhood Education (ECE) workforce (pg. e22-24).

The applicant states that by 2021 the state will need a minimum of 1,500 ECE educators and presents a Logic Model (pg. e118-119) that aligns with the proposed residency program, which has strong potential to meet the 2021 goal (pg. e24-25).

(ii) The applicant presents a number of goals (i.e., enhance Alternative Licensure program and coaching model, expand a sustainable model of the Alternative Licensure program, demonstrate partnership effects on the program residents) that appear reasonable and that have accompanying objectives (pg. e33-35).

(iii) The proposed project design has potential to build capacity as the applicant states that there is a national shortage of Earth Science teachers, which has prevented many school districts and specifically the targeted area schools from offering the courses, and in turn limits students from taking courses needed to matriculate at the postsecondary level and/or graduate. The applicant states that they will continue to support new teachers through the use of mentors (pg. e25).

(iv) The proposed project presents an exceptional approach for meeting the statutory purposes and requirements to include increasing the number of STEM Early Childhood Educators (ECE) and students with special needs. The applicant states that a significant focus of the training will include the use of data and technology using a clinical field residency approach. Another strong aspect is that all courses are developed and taught by teams of doctoral-level educators and/or scientists (pg. e33).

#### Weaknesses:

(i) No weaknesses noted.

(ii) The applicant fails to adequately address this selection criterion. While there are goals, objectives, timelines, and

responsible parties, the details on outcomes expected are not described making it difficult to assess how the proposed project will be measured (pg.e33-35).

(iii) The applicant does not provide sufficient detail on how the project will sustain itself once federal funding ends. No details on how they will financially continue to use mentors and/or resources paid through grant funding. A detailed description of a plan for sustainability is needed to assess the quality (pg. e233, budget narrative).

(iv) No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 29**

### **Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources**

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

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

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

#### **Strengths:**

(i) The applicant agency provides evidence of support in the form of salary match and construction costs that total over \$4 million dollars (pg. e 6-7, 238).

(ii) The applicant provides letters of support from the partners, indicating that they will support the project by identifying residency placement and facilitating data agreements to study program impact. The applicant indicates that all partners have agreed to support the dissemination of key findings from the program evaluation to ECE stakeholders and policymakers (pg. e203-206)

#### **Weaknesses:**

(i) The applicant provides conflicting information in the budget narrative and budget forms. The applicant states that in-kind support will total over \$4,642,50 outlining the in-kind support as salaries and tuition. However, the totals in the budget narrative (pg. e238) and the budget form (pg. e7) are not aligned. It is not clear what the actual in-kind support is to the project.

(ii) No weaknesses noted.

**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 applicant presents a management plan that identifies goals (i.e., enhance the ECE Alternative Licensure program and coaching model) objectives (i.e., train coaches in the coaching framework, develop coaching protocol including reflective supervision practices) key activities (i.e., train coaches in collecting and using video for reflective supervision), and responsible parties. The timeline is well documented to include constant program interaction, which should provide opportunities for a continuous feedback loop (pg. e54-56).

**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 applicant provides for both a formative and summative approach that is clearly aligned with the Logic Model inputs, activities, products, short-term, and long-term outcomes. (pg. e231). The applicant identifies various sources of data to be collected (i.e., demographics, achievement levels, persistence, licensure, employment) that can be measured to determine if the proposed project design is meeting the stated outcomes (pg. e59-65).

(ii) Some of the proposed methods of evaluation (i.e., collect pre and post-semester content focused videos, review weekly training meeting notes, review meeting notes) are appropriate to determine if the project is meeting some of the stated objectives (pg. e62-64).

**Weaknesses:**

(i) No weaknesses noted.

(ii) While the applicant provides information on the goals and objectives, specific information as it relates to outcomes is not provided to assess effectiveness.

**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 provides sufficient evidence of a plan to address the Competitive Preference Priority. The applicant has identified the need to address the lack of teacher diversity in the early childhood workforce and is proposing a project that will increase the number of Early Childhood Educators (ECE) who are culturally, linguistically, and trained in the areas of child development and early learning, and who are adequately prepared in computer science to deliver rigorous instruction in the STEM fields 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 (pg. e 22 & 95).

The proposed project design is focused on increasing the number of early childhood educators prepared to deliver rigorous instruction by creating a residency program that provides the necessary training and development for the ECE workforce to pursue state teacher licensure. The Logic Model and the overall project design addresses this area in and outlines the professional development model and the pathways (pg. e98)

**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:**

The applicant did not address this priority.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant did not address this priority.

**Reader's Score:** 0

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 06/16/2019 11:57 PM