

**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: American Museum of Natural History (U336S190042)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	40	35
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Resources	20	20
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	15
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Sub Total	100	90
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	95

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: American Museum of Natural History (U336S190042)

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

The applicant presents a sound and convincing rationale which clearly addresses how its project aligns with the identified needs of the target group. As indicated in the narrative, for example, recent data suggest that only one-third of teachers teaching science. Thirty-one percent of Earth science teachers in the target area are not certified to teach in their subject area (p. e24). The applicant also has a proven track record of focusing on the teaching and learning of a set of research-based science teaching practices with an explicit focus on computational thinking and use of computer science models in the context of Earth and Space science. In addition, the applicant supports the development of an initial repertoire of culturally responsive science teaching practices (pp. e27, e28).

(ii) The proposal evidences one broad goal to be achieved by the project that is specific and measurable. The goal of the project is to develop and implement a highly effective residency program working with a robust set of partners to meet the critical shortage area of certified Earth science teachers prepared to increase student achievement in high-need schools throughout the United States (p. e58). The program has three objectives: 1) develop graduates' abilities to enact the high-leverage teaching practice of surfacing and working with students' thinking and experiences in science, including CT, 2) expand graduates' abilities to address the needs of culturally and linguistically diverse students in science, and 3) strengthen graduates' abilities to foster students' engagement in and understanding of science through the use of informal science resources (p. e43). In addition, the applicant presents a comprehensive logic model consisting of inputs, resources, activities, outputs, and short, mid-range and long-term outcomes aligned to the project's, goals and objectives to provide support for the project's rationale. Intended project outcomes include but are not limited to school-based mentors to improve their own instruction, new teachers were rated as effective in performance reviews, and increased Earth science teacher retention (p. e84).

(iii) The applicant provides sound evidence the proposed project is designed to build capacity during and beyond the administration of the grant period. As indicated in the proposal, for example, graduates complete three years of teaching in high-need schools, during which they receive ongoing support, including two years of induction support followed by two years of professional support (p. e29). Consultants will work with program faculty to develop new components that include

engaging experienced graduates as induction mentors and will train these mentors alongside their inductees (pp. e32. e33). In addition, the roles and responsibilities for mentors will be expanded beyond mentoring residents during school residency placements by enlisting their continued guidance and support for graduates after they begin teaching (p. e44).

(iv) The project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities established for the competition. As indicated in the narrative, for example, the applicant has a longstanding commitment to teacher development in New York City and beyond, with robust K–12 professional development offerings on-site and online. The applicant’s educators are actively engaged in research on teaching, teacher education, and science education, including active inquiry (p. e22). Project activities include a combination of co-teaching between scientists and educators (p. e27). The applicant’s program is also led by a team of education and science faculty that includes two five-month teaching residencies (p. e29). Through the New Teacher Induction Program, faculty members visit graduates in their classrooms during their first two years of teaching. This affords a unique opportunity to observe graduates in action and confirm they are applying the skills learned during the MAT-R program. These activities provide further evidence that the project’s approach to addressing the needs of the target group is exceptional in nature (e62).

Weaknesses:

(ii) The project’s objectives are not stated in measurable terms. One of the objectives for example, is that the project will develop graduates’ abilities to enact the high-leverage teaching practice of surfacing and working with students’ thinking and experiences in science, including conceptual thinking. This objective, as with the applicant’s other proposed objectives does not allow for the quantifiable and time-bound measurement of the project’s intended outcomes and progress toward the achievement of its goals.

(iii) The applicant fails to demonstrate what the professional supports for mentors would be beyond the grant-funding period.

Reader's Score: 35

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 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).

(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

secondary partner schools will provide well-qualified science, English Language Learner and Special Education teachers, each with STEM teaching experience, to serve as mentors. The lead applicant will provide stipends for mentoring, teaching resources, and opportunities to co-teach in the program. Direct services are provided to teachers and students in the form of field trips and online resources. In addition, the Horizon Research organization will provide personnel with experience in the area of program evaluation expertise (p. e53).

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 outlines a detailed plan that includes a timeline and milestones for its Master of Art in Teaching Residency Program will be implemented. The plan is inclusive of a 14-month Program Design indicating what activities take place during the first ten weeks in Summer one, over a ten month-period during the Academic year, what occurs over an eight week period during the second Summer, and what takes place over the two-year post-graduation Induction time-period (p. e33). Project personnel and their general responsibilities are clearly presented. For example, a collaborative project leadership team will manage project design and implementation, induction and continued professional development, evaluation, and compliance. The project will be administered by co-directors and guided by an external advisory board (pp. e64, e65). The proposal also presents a visual representation of the intended use of grant funds relative to how the activities of the program are to be carried out, when, and by whom (p. e54). In addition, the budget includes costs for personnel, travel, student support costs, stipends, and facilities. All costs are reasonable in relation to the anticipated outcomes of the project (p. e192-e197).

Weaknesses:

Details regarding the levels of responsibility, and who will be responsible for carrying out project activities are not sufficiently described. Clearly identified milestones for completing project tasks, not demonstrated.

Reader's Score: 15

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 presents a detailed evaluation plan that is formative and summative in nature. Seven research questions will be used to guide the project's evaluation process. The formative and summative components, each will be guided by a set of questions. The formative process will provide feedback to project leadership to inform mid-course adjustments. The summative process will gauge the extent to which project goals are achieved (p. e65). The evaluation includes a multi-method, multi-source approach to addressing the questions (p. e66). Student test score data from the MAT-R graduates will be compared to data of students of non-MAT-R graduates. The data comparison will inform the program about its effectiveness in preparing new Earth science teachers to positively impact student learning outcomes (p. e69).

(ii) The applicant's evaluation plan is thorough and is designed to measure the success of the project in achieving its goals, objectives, and outcomes. The project evaluation will focus on five overarching questions to ensure the goals and objectives are achieved. For example, one of the formative evaluation questions seeks to determine to what extent is the project able to attract diverse, well-qualified applicants, select, and enroll them as residents? One of the summative evaluation questions seeks to determine whether the project achieved its preparation, certification, and high-needs school hiring target rate (pp. e183, e187). The evaluation process includes clearly specified data sources from which evaluation questions can be drawn. The evaluation process also includes a thorough a qualitative and comparative analysis process to determine if the project's goals are being met. For example, a qualitative analysis of interview transcripts will be conducted to identify strengths and weaknesses in the partnership. A comparison of teacher effectiveness data and subject area knowledge to selection criteria will also be conducted (pp. e183, e184).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

- 1. Projects designed to improve student achievement or other educational outcomes in computer science by increasing the number of educators adequately prepared to deliver rigorous instruction in STEM fields, including computer science, through recruitment, evidence-based professional development strategies for current STEM educators, or evidence-based retraining strategies for current educators seeking to transition from other subjects to STEM fields.**

Strengths:

The proposal well demonstrates that the project is designed to improve student achievement by proposing to prepare educators to deliver rigorous instruction in computer science via the expansion of its Master of Arts in Teaching - Residency (MAT-R) program with specialization in Secondary Earth Science, a longstanding shortage area in the target state (p. e21). The applicant anticipates graduating an additional 72 new Earth science teachers for high-need schools in the target area (p. e23). Activities will include but are not limited to refining program supports to ensure integration of culturally responsive science teaching practices in the courses, teacher identity workshops, and residency placements and integrating computational thinking into the Master's program curriculum (p. e21).

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:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/17/2019 04:19 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: American Museum of Natural History (U336S190042)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	40	40
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Resources	20	20
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	15
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Sub Total	100	95
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. STEM/Computer Science	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Invitational Priority		
Invitational Priority		
1. Promise Zones	0	
Sub Total	0	
Total	105	100

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: American Museum of Natural History (U336S190042)

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 application clearly demonstrate a rationale through the establishment of an effective teacher residency program. The application proposes to follow to address the need of reducing a shortage of teachers in Secondary Earth Science through a residency program using the elements from the Teachers for New Era design.

ii. The application presents the objectives and outcomes aligned to a goal in the form of Logic Model. The application states project objectives will be evaluated and findings of best practices will be disseminated.

iii. The proposed project will add support to current cohort of teacher residents. The application will provide two years of induction support at American Museum of National History followed by two years of professional support provided by the Museum's Gottesman Center for Science Teaching and Learning.

iv. The application presents an exceptional approach to the meeting the priorities that includes providing training and professional development focusing on students with special needs and English Language Learners. Additionally, through the New Teacher Induction Program, faculty members will visit graduates in their classrooms during their first two years of teaching (e25-27). By providing mentoring, in conjunction with two-five month residencies, will provide faculty members to observe graduates in action and assess the effectiveness of graduates transferring theory into practice. These activities provide assurance the project is meeting the needs of the target group and provide evidence that the project's approach is exceptional.

Weaknesses:

I. None noted

II. None noted

III. None noted

IV. None 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:

i. The support, facilities, equipment and supplies, for example, supplied by the applicant organization or lead applicant organization are clearly described. Support such as mentored practicum opportunities, scholarships and research on teaching and teacher education and/or expertise in graduate education in science and expertise in teacher education and development will be provided by the applicant organization or lead applicant to implement project activities..

ii. The relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project is evident. For example, the application states it will collaborate with four area high schools superintendents to identify new high-need schools. Additionally, if funded, the applicant will collaborate with the principals and superintendents in the local school districts to place teacher residency graduates. The placement of teacher resident graduates in high-need schools will contribute to the implementation and success of the project.

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:

The application outlines who will be responsible for activities related to the project. The application outlines milestones associated with performance measures that are needed for achieving project success (e55-56).

Weaknesses:

The application lacks a clear timeline for accomplishing milestones. The application lacks a thorough or comprehensive that highlight milestones with a realistic timeline for completing critical components of the project. Further, the application lacks a description of the responsibility of the Collaborative Project Leadership Team, which is needed to assess which projects they will be implementing or facilitating and if they are able to complete those tasks within a set timeframe (e63).

Reader's Score: 15

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 clearly describes the methods of evaluation that will used to be assess the project. The project will conduct qualitative and quantitative analysis that will provide valid and reliable data of project objectives. The variety of evaluative methods used, ie. Open ended questions, priori coding scheme will help to ensure the most effective activities are implemented to achieve project goals. (e184-186)
- ii. The methods of evaluation are feasible and appropriate to the goals and outcome of the proposed project (e184-e186). The methods of evaluations are appropriate for answering the five overarching questions to ensure goals and objectives are achieved (e183 – 188). The data collection process utilizes multi-methods and multi-sources, such as observations, instruments and course evaluations. This will ensure that the project collects appropriate data and will accurately measure the project goals and objectives.

Weaknesses:

- i. None noted
- ii. None noted

Reader's Score: 20

Priority Questions**Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1**

1. Projects designed to improve student achievement or other educational outcomes in computer science by increasing the number of educators adequately prepared to deliver rigorous instruction in STEM fields, including computer science, through recruitment, evidence-based professional development strategies for current STEM educators, or evidence-based retraining strategies for current educators seeking to transition from other subjects to STEM fields.

Strengths:

The applicant clearly outline a plan to improve student achievement in computer science by increasing the number of educators adequately prepared to deliver instruction in STEM fields. The applicant proposes to use computer modeling and simulation activities for students in high-needs schools. As an example, educators will utilize computer science models in the context of Earth and Space science to deliver rigorous instruction (e27).

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:**Weaknesses:**

Reader's Score:

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/17/2019 04:19 PM

Status: Submitted

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

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: American Museum of Natural History (U336S190042)

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	11
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Sub Total	100	89
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	94

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: American Museum of Natural History (U336S190042)

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 addresses the absolute priority by establishing a partnership with four high-need school districts to establish an effective teacher residency program. The proposal documents a rationale for the project and identifies a need to reduce the shortage of teachers in Secondary Earth Science in the targeted area by expanding the current Master of Arts in Teaching Residency program to include a specialization in Secondary Earth Science (pg. e21).

The applicant states that only one-third of teachers in the state teaching science are prepared to teach their subject area, and only 31% of Earth Science Teachers are certified to teach in their subject area, which further demonstrates a need for the proposed project design (pg. e24). The applicant presents a Logic Model (pg.e84) that aligns with the proposed rationale.

(ii) The applicant outlines some ambitious goals and outcomes/impact they propose to achieve (i.e., faculty & mentors prepared to support residents in CT & CRT, increase in better Earth Science Instructors). The proposed goals include the recruitment of 24 residents each year (with an emphasis on recruiting under-represented teacher candidates) and graduating 72 Earth Science teachers by the academic year 2023-2024 (pg. e19, 21, 29).

(iii) The proposed project design has the 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 providing training that focuses on working with English Language Learners 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) No weaknesses noted.
- (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. e25 & budget narrative).
- (iv) No weaknesses noted.

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:

(i) The applicant agency provides sufficient evidence of support in the form of salary match for the project. The applicant documents over \$5 million dollars in match dollars with close to \$2 million dollars in salary contributions. The applicant will leverage human resources to include 40 tenured and tenure-track members of the scientific faculty being leveraged for the proposed project, further demonstrating their commitment to the proposed project (pg. e7 & 22).

(ii) The applicant provides letters of support from the partners indicating that they will support the project if funded by identifying schools that can serve as a clinical residency (pg. e104-108). Horizon resource will provide support (e53 -54)

Weaknesses:

- (i) No weaknesses noted.
- (ii) 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 provides the names of the individuals who will be part of a collaborative project leadership team that will manage the design, implementation, induction, professional development, evaluation, and compliance aspects of the project. Each of the individuals have partnered with the organization in the past, which will allow the project to have members of leadership who are familiar with the overall goals and objectives to be accomplished.

Weaknesses:

The applicant fails to adequately address this selection criterion as no detailed or reasonable timeline with milestones for accomplishing tasks is provided. While the applicant provides the name of the “collaborative project leadership team,” details on their levels of responsibility are not clearly described (pg. e63).

Reader's Score: 11

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, and outcomes documenting the data to be collected and its alignment to the project’s objectives (pg. e65-66).

(ii) The applicant will ensure a quality evaluation that consists of multi-methods and multi-source approaches to include observations, course evaluations, and interviews (pg. e66). The methods of evaluation, data sources, and analysis methods are clearly outlined and should provide sufficient data to determine strategies that will allow for course corrections (pg. e183-188).

Weaknesses:

(i) No weaknesses noted.

(ii) No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. Projects designed to improve student achievement or other educational outcomes in computer science by increasing the number of educators adequately prepared to deliver rigorous instruction in STEM fields, including computer science, through recruitment, evidence-based

professional development strategies for current STEM educators, or evidence-based retraining strategies for current educators seeking to transition from other subjects to STEM fields.

Strengths:

The applicant provides sufficient evidence of a plan to address the Competitive Preference Priority. The applicant states that the goal of the project is to develop and implement a “highly effective residency program” that will train a sufficient number of teachers to meet the critical shortage of certified Earth Science teachers in the targeted schools as well as high-need schools throughout the US.

The applicant indicates that the focus will be on teaching with an explicit focus on the use of computer science models. The overall program design focuses on meeting this priority as the professional development activities outlined concentrate on providing training and development to current STEM educators as well as other teachers who are interested in transitioning into the STEM field (pg. e58).

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

