

**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: Montana State University (U336S190040)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	40	40
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Resources	20	18
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	16
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	18
Sub Total	100	92
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. STEM/Computer Science	5	0
Sub Total	5	0
Invitational Priority		
Invitational Priority		
1. Promise Zones	0	0
Sub Total	0	0
Total	105	92

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Montana State University (U336S190040)

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 between multiple institutions in Montana including the Montana Office of Public Instruction, the Board of Regents, non-profit organizations, education and school board associations, with lead institution Montana State University (e16, e20, e25-e26). The collaboration is evident in both the design, proposed advisory board (e53-e54), as well as the continuous feedback model 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 (e26-e27). 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 outlines four primary goals, each with aligned objectives, strategies, milestones and performance measures (e55-e58). The goals presented are specific and measurable and align the outcomes of the proposed residency program to meet the articulated community needs for the Montana school partners. For example, the proposal articulates that the second goal associated with recruiting and retaining teacher candidates measures performance through coursework, support of cohort structure, and mentoring/induction support as measured through both MAT program records and state employment data. This exemplifies the connection between the residency program and addressing the primary needs of the rural school districts, which is a noted strength of the proposal.
- The proposal clearly defines the coursework for teacher candidates (e27-e28, e30-e31), which demonstrates a clear alignment of objectives to practical learning opportunities and high-leverage teaching practices (e29-e30). The inclusion of these practical strategies within the program, was a noted strength as it prepares teachers with skills to be successful in their future classrooms.
- The project demonstrates an intensive needs assessment that has been completed by the partners in preparation for the development of this proposal (e20-e23). The project design informed by data collection from national, state, and local levels create a clear needs case associated with improving teacher recruitment and retention for Montana rural schools. The robust data set creates a sound foundation for a successful program design that meets the needs of all partners.
- The proposal clearly details the significance of the project through the investigation of the effectiveness of teacher residency and support in rural schools (e20-e23). The inclusion of online learning communities is a strength to the

approach, as it allows a mechanism to create a cohort experience across multiple schools and communities that are separated by vast distances. The research into rural teacher retention is a national need, and the project could inform other states with rural schools.

- The partners are diverse and have worked together to redesign the teacher education program, demonstrating a commitment to the shifts in instruction that are proposed. For example, the Department of Public Instruction has approved the MAT program for state licensure ahead of the proposal submission (e25, e31). This demonstrates collaboration and opportunities for sustainability beyond the grant award period.

Weaknesses:

- No weaknesses noted.

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:

- The proposal presents the inclusion of resources from Montana State University through a robust narrative (e47-e52). The resources include expertise of personnel, access to high quality resource and career centers, facilities, and technology. Additionally, the resources addressed align clearly with the activities in the logic model (e24). The resources presented are comprehensive and address the needs of the project.

- The one partner has included a letter of support (e72) from the Montana Department of Public Instruction. The letter outlines their commitment to the project with specific partner responsibilities, such as approving this program for teacher licensure, demonstrating their understanding of their commitment to the implementation and success of the project.

- Additionally, the project includes letters of support from several non-profit organizations, multiple legislators, as well as two K-12 school districts (e128 – e151). The diverse partners that are coming together to support this proposal are a noted strength, demonstrating a comprehensive investment from the Montana community.

- The proposal presents a comprehensive needs assessment to demonstrate the data used to inform and create the proposed project (e20-e23). The data looks at statewide trends for education and future education workforce needs and is a strength of the proposal as it creates a clear context for this work to occur and have impact in the state of Montana.

Weaknesses:

- It is not clear what data set was used to create the comprehensive needs assessment (e20-e23). The needs assessment does not clearly present a survey of current practitioners or administrators. The proposal would be strengthened by an inclusion of survey results of the local education agencies to help inform the development of the plan.

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 proposal plans to implement an advisory board (e53-e54) as a component of their project management plan. The advisory board has a diverse membership, including the Montana Board of Public Education and the Montana Board of Regents to represent for policy expertise. Additionally, the advisory board includes practitioners, including a principal, two teachers, and a current program resident. The inclusion of all these relevant perspectives creates a robust advisory board to provide insight and recommendations for improvement and iteration of the program.
- The proposal clearly presents key project personnel and their qualifications (e52-e53, e94-e117) and demonstrates the capacity and expertise of the leadership for the project. The leadership team represents for all partners and brings a diversity of expertise related to teacher education, local school district, and rural education. The prior experience leading prior grant management experience were noted strengths.
- The proposal notes that relationships and communication about teacher preparation is currently in action and that will continue beyond the grant period (e26). The establishment of these communication channels and strategies from planning are viable approaches to ensuring project outcomes are accomplished.

Weaknesses:

- The proposal presents an advisory board (e53) but notes the advisory board will meet once a year. This timeline doesn't allow for robust continuous feedback and iteration related to the project feedback. The proposal would be strengthened with additional meetings, either in person or online, especially in the first two years of the program.
- The proposal's project management team lacks representation from the K-12 practitioners (e52-e53). Although they have a voice in the advisory board, they do not have a demonstrated leadership in the day-to-day project management, which is completely administered by the personnel with Montana State University. The leadership team would benefit from inclusion of a K-12 practitioner in the project leadership team.

Reader's Score: 16

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 includes both qualitative and quantitative data and seeks to evaluate both the teacher residency design on retention of rural teachers as well as the process for training those educators. This comprehensive approach was noted as a strength to the proposal (e55-e58).
- The proposal engages an external evaluator, the Gordon Group to complete the evaluation on each of the four goals of the proposal. The use of multiple tools and measures demonstrates a comprehensive data set and evaluation of the proposal. The qualifications of the evaluator as well as the plan for multiple measures were strengths of the proposal (e54).
- The proposal presents a comprehensive table that outlines the evaluation objectives, measures and timeline associated with each of the four key research questions. The table clearly demonstrates how multiple data sets will be used for analysis (e55-e58).
- The proposal includes a data management plan, noting an attention to keeping personally identifiable information safe, which was a strength of the proposal (e55).

Weaknesses:

- The proposal does not clearly describe the methodology for the analysis of each of the key data sets. Although the proposal states it will use SPSS for quantitative analysis and Dedoose for qualitative analysis, it is not clear how those methods will apply to the data sets that are being collected as part of this proposal (e55). This methodology is key to the study and warrants additional details to establish if the process is rigorous to inform possible outcomes.
- The proposal speaks to using validated tools (e54) but does not explicitly address what those tools will be and how they align with the intended outcomes. The proposal would be stronger with the inclusion of specific tools identified in relation to the data collection to detail the alignment and validity of the evaluation process.

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:

- Not addressed in the proposal.

Weaknesses:

- Not addressed in the proposal.

Reader's Score: 0

Invitational Priority - Invitational Priority

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

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

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

Strengths:

- Not addressed in the proposal.

Weaknesses:

- Not addressed in the proposal.

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: Montana State University (U336S190040)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	40	40
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Resources	20	15
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	17
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	16
Sub Total	100	88
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. STEM/Computer Science	5	0
Sub Total	5	0
Invitational Priority		
Invitational Priority		
1. Promise Zones	0	
Sub Total	0	
Total	105	88

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Montana State University (U336S190040)

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:

- This proposal educates 78 teacher residents to help address the teacher shortage in northern rural Montana, partnering with many state organizations such as the Rural Education Task Force and the Montana Office of Public Instruction, who have the similar mission to improve education. (e24)
- MOUs are in place for the partnerships showing their willingness to work together. Large group of partnerships are well planned and higher-level partnerships. (e35)
- Every course, including residency, is detailed in the grant. The courses are described as to which is taken each semester from the beginning of the program through the final semester. (e33-38)
- Addresses recruitment and retention through induction and mentoring and professional development to school leaders and trustees on the topics of recruitment and retention. (e19)
- Addresses needs of math and science (and English and social studies) for K-8 curriculum. Utilizing the university faculty who are content experts in these fields of study throughout the residency program. (e41-42)
- MAT program addresses math, science, English and social studies in secondary curriculum. (e27-28)
- Residency is online in a cohort format, with secondary cohort already started in May 2019 and elementary cohort beginning in March 2020. The online program makes things easier for the rural program and may be an incentive for potential candidates. (e26)

Weaknesses:

- No weaknesses found.

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:

- Proposal provides a clear list of the facilities available on the university campus, including faculty in the College of Education, library resources, technology, Career Service Centers, and Counseling. (e-47-51)
- Proposal budget uses a sliding scale for personnel salaries, based on need of each year. This leads one to believe that time is well thought out so as not to provide salary when it is unnecessary. (163-177)

Weaknesses:

- Proposal does not describe the resources of partner school districts and how they would be implemented, for example, the use of materials and the facilities as the teacher candidates are observing or conducting clinical experiences or residency in the respective buildings. (e47-51)
- Proposal does not explain how the resources meet the needs of the proposal or of the students in the residency program described. Center resources and technology resources will be needed at various times during the residency, but no explanation of how this happens is evident. (e47-51)
- PI is at less than 50% of time for the proposal, which is concerning if there is not complete buy-in for the project. (e168-169)

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

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

Strengths:

- Proposal outlines the roles of each person's responsibilities, such as the PI and co-PI, staff, partners, evaluator, districts, advisory board, and cooperating teachers. (e52)
- Proposal states who each of the members of the advisory board will be, including the Boards of Education, the superintendent, principal and teachers (e53)
- Timeline for recruitment, when cohorts begin, and when career fairs take place are included. (e61)

Weaknesses:

- Timeline does not include planning time, or when and how often the advisory team meets. (e61)
- Lead personnel come from the university. Project administration does not have membership from the partners

except for in an advisory role. It would be best for partners to have more ownership to the project in order to be more vested. (e47-53)

Reader's Score: 17

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:

- Letter of support from the Montana University Commission Office of Commissioner of Higher Education states they will be conducting the project evaluation. (e133)
- External evaluator is experienced with over fifteen years of experience in program evaluation. She plans to evaluate the Teacher Residency, induction and mentoring program, and professional development for school and district leaders to support the evaluation process. (e54)
- Data sources are multiple: "surveys, interviews and/or focus groups, validated instruments, teacher recruitment and retention data, teacher resident tracking during the MAT program and post-graduation, and examination of artifacts" which provides triangulation in data. Using multiple data sources provides a stronger evaluation and stronger analysis. (e54)

Weaknesses:

- Validated instruments are mentioned, but the proposal does not articulate what they are. More substance or explanation of how the evaluation will take place would be helpful. (e54-58)
Proposal states that the study will follow a mixed methods design (e54), and a participatory approach to data collection (e54), but the methodology and analysis are not described in the detail expected. (e55)

Reader's Score: 16

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:

not addressed in this proposal

Weaknesses:

not addressed in this proposal

Reader's Score: 0

Invitational Priority - Invitational Priority

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

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

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

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Status: Submitted

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/14/2019 08:57 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Montana State University (U336S190040)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	40	40
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Resources	20	17
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	18
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	17
Sub Total	100	92
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. STEM/Computer Science	5	0
Sub Total	5	0
Invitational Priority		
Invitational Priority		
1. Promise Zones	0	0
Sub Total	0	0
Total	105	92

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Montana State University (U336S190040)

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 details a strong rationale and project design, e.g., Montana State University partners with the Office of Public Instruction for a consortium of eligible LEAs for each grant year (pg. e16). For example, being a one-year degree program will enable students to complete coursework and remain in their home communities given the distance to each location. Furthermore, the applicant presents another strong rationale through the difficulties in rural teacher recruitment and retention and the project's goal to train high quality teachers in high poverty schools and provide professional development.

- The project includes a large list of partners involved in the project that should help strengthen the capacity and yield results such as the Recruitment and Retention Task Force of the Office of the Commissioner of Higher Education, Big Sky Youth Empowerment Project, Montana Federation of Public Employees, Southwest Montana School Services, Western Montana Professional Learning Collaborative, Montana Rural Education Association, and etc. (pg. e16).

- The applicant presents a strong need for the project. The applicant conducted a needs assessment that provided the following conclusions: Montana has a density ranking 48th out of 50 states, remote, and has the highest percentage of rural schools of any other state in the U.S. and as a result teacher recruitment is a challenge (pg. e20). In addition, Montana has the lowest teacher pay. The findings from the needs assessment is taken into consideration and parts are implemented in the project.

- The project is likely to build capacity and yield results beyond the period of Federal funding due to the strong partnerships with key stakeholders in the project design, such as the Montana Advisory Council on Indian Education and the Montana Board of Regents (pg. e53).

- The project illustrates a logic model that is comprehensive and addresses the problem, input, outputs, and outcomes (pg. e24). The inputs and outcomes are aligned with the goals of the program such as a MAT program, a recruitment plan, and a teacher residency plan.

- The applicant provides samples of the MAT curriculum which demonstrates a rigorous curricular program (pg. e27-28).

Weaknesses:

- No weakness noted.

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:

- The applicant provides evidence of adequate resources such as through the College of Education, Health, and Human Development, the University Library, Career Services, and program services provided by other partners (pg. e47). These resources collectively represent the needs of the project. Most needs are provided by the University through providing high cost items such as technology, library services, and career services.

- It is a beneficial resource that the applicant cites student counseling as a resource to students as well as a self-help app that may be more assessable to students in rural areas (pg. e52). This is a beneficial resource because students may face many challenges that could affect their matriculation and student counseling can help student's personal and academic success. Furthermore, an online interactive self-help app may appeal to some students to have access.

Weaknesses:

- The applicant is not specific about the resources coming from the partner schools (pg. e47-51). Having the details of the partner schools would leverage resources for students and illustrate the contributions of shared resources to ensure adequate resources are provided to students, especially those completing residencies in rural schools.

Reader's Score: 17

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

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

Strengths:

- The applicant identifies key personnel that are qualified to carry out the project such as the PI and Co PI (pg. e52). The PI has a Ph.D. in curriculum and instruction and both the PI and Co-PI demonstrate extensive research in rural education which is the specialty of the project.
- It is a strong management plan though the organization of an advisory board there are some key stakeholders that have the capacity to carry out the project on time and within budget. Some of the strong partners that will help ensure the recruitment and increasing students of underrepresented populations are the Montana Advisory Council on Indian Education and the Montana Board of Regents (pg. e53). Furthermore, the advisory board will meet via WebEx bi-annually to receive updates and provide formative assessment.
- Appendix F includes a detailed timeline of program activities that are very clearly illustrated and tied to the project outcomes (pg. e61-62).

Weaknesses:

- The management plan does not provide details regarding administrative planning time or include timelines for partnerships to plan activities that they seek to carry out (pg. e52-53).

Reader's Score: 18

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 details a highly qualified external evaluator (pg. e54). The external evaluator has fifteen years of experience in program evaluation and experience as an evaluator on large Federal grants. The project includes formative and summative assessment data and a mixed method program evaluation design that include detailed and comprehensive data points, surveys, interviews, focus groups, validated instruments, teacher recruitment and retention data, and MAT program and post-graduation (pg. e54).

Weaknesses:

- The applicant does not provide methodologies for analyzing data (pg. e55) e.g., what methods are going to be used to identify common patterns and an analysis that will likely result in achieving the research objectives.

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:

- N/A

Weaknesses:

- The applicant does not address competitive preference priority 1. The project does not include details of how rigorous instruction in STEM fields in the core curriculum. (pg. e27-31).

Reader's Score: 0

Invitational Priority - Invitational Priority

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

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

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

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/14/2019 08:57 AM