

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/17/2019 09:44 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Howard University (U336S190043)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	40	37
<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	13
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	90
<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	95

# Technical Review Form

**Panel #6 - Teacher Quality Partnership - 7: 84.336S**

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

**Applicant:** Howard University (U336S190043)

## 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 reasonably demonstrated that the proposed project was based on the Talent Development research of professors at the university as well as cited other evidence based research that blends the rationale and establishes a framework. Additionally, the applicant indicated that a needs assessment was conducted to help establish the goals for the project.(pgs. e32-33)

(ii) The applicant provided clearly specified goals aligned with objectives and expected outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project. The goals and objectives are additionally detailed in the logic model and associated activities and tasks to ensure the successful implementation of the program. For example, the applicant is proposing as a goal to improve the preparation of prospective teachers and enhancing professional development activities for new teachers through a teacher residency program. The accompanying activities are to: (1) refine the existing professional development modules and develop four new modules to the existing master's coursework and (2) provide peer coaching and mentoring and collaboration opportunities. The applicant will measure the outcomes through (a) grades, (b) assessment scores from modules, (c) pre-service teaching evaluation scores, and (d) observation data from peer coaching sessions. Overall, the goals are realistic and achievable based on a review of the aligning activities. (pgs. e35-39)

(iii) The applicant reasonably evidenced that the Teacher Residency program has the potential to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance. The applicant has amassed partners and community support for the project. The applicant has been a leader in the training of teachers for many years. The partnerships with The National Center for Teaching Residencies is a promising partnership and will provide capacity building on teacher residencies at the university. The established partnerships with the DC Public Schools offer the university opportunities continue the project through recruitment and providing schools as host training sites. (pgs. e30-33)

(iv) The applicant provided reasonable evidence that the proposed teacher residency program represents an acceptable approach for the preparation of teachers. The proposed project is grounded in the research and experience from The

National Center for Teaching Residencies. The Center indicated that the program is one of the most comprehensive models of teacher preparation in the nation and blends a rigorous full-year classroom apprenticeship for pre-service teachers with a carefully aligned sequence of academic coursework. The university's program will be able to offer coursework that is tailored to district context, with residents learning the district's core instructional initiatives and curriculum during the training year. (pgs. e35-36 and Appendix)

**Weaknesses:**

(i) No weaknesses noted.

(ii) The applicant did not provide clear measures for each goal and objective. Without targeted outcome projects, it is difficult to determine if the applicant will be able to ascertain program effectiveness.

(iii) No weaknesses noted.

(iv) No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 37**

**Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources**

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

(i) The applicant reasonably indicated that the proposed project will have adequate support from the university to effectively implement the project. For example, the applicant indicated that the university will share site licenses to statistical software such as MATLAB, SPSS, and Mathematica for use with the project. The School of Education administration will support the project by providing pre- and post-award oversight, as well as securing additional on-campus office space or convenings of 50 or more attendees. Additionally, the School of Education is equipped with three multipurpose spaces to host symposiums and other events. The Department of Computer Science also has ample meeting space to host workshops. (pgs. 34-35 and e-50-51) The applicant also indicated in a Letter of Support from the School of Education Dean that each resident will receive a 15% tuition discount. For the 39-credit program, fall and spring tuition totals \$29,090 and 9 credits in the summer at \$1,700 per credit = \$15,300. Thus, the total tuition costs are \$44,390. The 15% discount equals \$6,658.50 per resident. Based on your estimate of 10 residents per year for three years, the university will contribute \$66,585 per year in tuition discounts. (pgs. e50-51 and Appendix)

(ii) The applicant effectively demonstrated relevant support and commitment from partners in the proposed project to ensure the implementation and success of the project. For example, the DC Public Schools will provide human resources

in the form of staff to assist with recruitment of potential candidates, central office staff and five host schools for Teacher Residents. The National Center for Teacher Residencies (NCTR) agreed to provide a five-year in-kind contribution of \$95,000 for the project Teacher Residency Program to be used as NCTR technical assistance fees. (Appendix) The (NCTR) Residency Development Program (RDP) is a two-year long program that will provide comprehensive guidance and support to Howard University to develop a high-quality teacher residency programs to certify teachers. Other relevant support will be offered by the CNA Analysis and Solutions organization, who is committed to providing evaluation services to ensure that the project meets the program goals. CNA will conduct document analysis of meeting minutes, observe selected program meetings, conduct focus groups with pre-service and in-service teacher residents, and provide technical review of all midterm and end of year research reports. (pgs. e-50-52 and Appendix)

**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:**

(i) The applicant provided a detailed and clearly defined management plan that outlines how the proposed project will accomplish tasks and activities to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and included clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks. The management plan is appropriately aligned with the project goals that indicated the applicant's consistency towards meeting project outcomes. The applicant clearly established persons responsible for completing tasks and aligned some measures of milestones to be completed. For example, to increase state-test scores, the applicant indicated one and three-year teacher retention rates and annual DCPS data from October will provide a milestone indication of retention. The alignment of the management plan with project goals provides an effective plan for ensuring all project goals are implemented in a timely manner. (pgs. e51-53)

**Weaknesses:**

- (i) 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 reasonably provided some evidence that an evaluation plan is being developed and some methods of evaluation will be used to provide valid and reliable performance data on project outcomes. The applicant will utilize the services of an external evaluator to conduct independent focus groups of programs completers and provide technical feedback on internally-generated program and research reports. The applicant provided a matrix that aligned the project goals and objectives with some measurable performance outcomes. (pgs. e-69-70)

(ii) The applicant reasonably provided some evidence that the proposed evaluation plan will include methods of practical evaluation and will lead to some results of the outcomes of the proposed project. The partner NCTR will provide formative and summative feedback to assess the efficacy of the residency program, such as persistence and retention. (pgs. e-69-70)

**Weaknesses:**

(i) While the applicant provided some evaluation methods to ascertain how the project will be evaluated, the information was vague and general in scope. The applicant also did not address the required GPRA measures, which would have given the evaluation plan more information to thoroughly determine that the plan will effectively measure program success. Although the applicant indicated an external evaluator will be utilized, their role in the planning and guidance of the evaluation was not evident in the proposal.

(ii) While the applicant provided some evidence that in the planning stages of writing the evaluation narrative some thought was given to how the project will measure the implementation and success of meeting the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project. However, the information was vague in scope and inconclusive. The information as presented does not provide a clear picture of the evaluation plan and thus does not lend itself to providing relevant conclusion.

**Reader's Score: 13**

**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 effectively demonstrated that the proposed project will continue to work with a prior commitment with the DCPS to implement three pathways outlined in the K-12 Computer Science Framework for computer science. The Computational Thinking Across the Curriculum module will introduce teachers to the online community of practice for

elementary and middle school groups who share resources for integrating computer science across the curriculum. For example, the applicant is developing modules, which will amount to a one year course for DCPS teachers to complete over the summer. The goal for offering the professional development for teachers in the region are: (1) increase computational thinking offerings in PK-12 schools in the District of Columbia, (2) build computational thinking skills of teachers and school leaders in the District of Columbia, (3) increase understanding of the relationships between computer science/computational thinking offerings and student outcomes, (4) increase understanding of the relationships between literacy and computer science/computational thinking outcomes and (5) provide support that leads to computer science and computational thinking integration into the preK-8 curriculum in the District of Columbia. Teachers will also receive professional development regarding the Computational Thinking Leadership Toolkit to assist them with developing a CS/CT vision and improving technology infrastructure. The applicant indicated that project will leverage resources for the Computer Science for All Community of Practice, which is managed by the American Institute's for Research and funded by the National Science Foundation. (pgs. e-49)

**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 the Invitational Priority.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant did not address the Invitational Priority.

**Reader's Score:** 0

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 06/17/2019 09:44 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/17/2019 09:34 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Howard University (U336S190043)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	40	33
<b>Adequacy of Resources</b>		
1. Resources	20	20
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	18
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	15
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	86
<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	91

# Technical Review Form

Panel #6 - Teacher Quality Partnership - 7: 84.336S

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

Applicant: Howard University (U336S190043)

## 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:

A strong component of the applicant's project design is that fact that it is based on a "model for capacity building (pg. e48)" which has the potential to yield results that may extend beyond the period of federal financial assistance.

The required, non-credit professional development modules which will be offered online are also important components (e35). Specifically, the computational thinking component of the applicant's design (e21) has the potential to equip residents with the skills needed to be able to effectively teach critical thinking skills to students.

Moreover, the Teacher and Student Health and Wellness and Engaging Students with Disabilities Modules are also a strength and represent an important component for new teachers so that they will be able to effectively assist students with disabilities.

The applicant's work with partner, the National Center for Teacher Residencies is also a very strong component that will enable the applicant to develop a high-quality teacher residency program (pg. e168 – e174).

### Weaknesses:

The project goals that are listed in the applicant's abstract (pg. e15) differ from the project goals that are listed within the Goals table (pg. e34). This makes it somewhat difficult to determine what the applicant is indeed proposing and if activities will lead to the achievement of objectives.

Further, the applicant does not include sufficient detail to make a determination as to whether their program represents and exceptional approach to addressing the priorities of the TQP competition. The applicant is proposing a teacher residency program but does not include evidence of original, novel or extraordinary components.

**Reader's Score:** 33

### **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 includes sufficient evidence of ample resources to support the project. For instance, the applicant will leverage resources from various entities and partners such as AIR to support the Computer Science for All Community of Practice (pg. e45).

In addition to in-kind contributions from the partner LEA (including use of schools and facilities, pg. e166), the applicant will also leverage partner DCPS' Learning together to Advance our Practice (LEAP) professional development. This weekly professional development opportunity is a critical asset to project participants. (e45).

Further, Howard University's 15% tuition discount and in-kind personnel contributions shows that there is substantial commitment to the project to ensure that activities are carried out successfully, as envisioned.

Moreover, NCTR is offering in-kind "customized consultation" which is another example of the adequacy of resources and the firm commitment of project partners (e46).

#### **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 addresses this criterion by presenting a plan to ensure proper and adequate management of project resources and to ensure the goals and objectives of the project are carried out on-time and within budget. The project timeline includes milestones and expected deliverables that would signify goal attainment. From the biographies and resumes provided, it is evident that the PIs and other key personnel have the experience, knowledge and expertise to

oversee a project of this magnitude.

In addition, the applicant includes details related to their plan for collecting and using feedback via monthly stakeholder meetings to discuss the short-term goals and overall progress toward the goals (pg. e37). Information learned can be used for improvement which will all aid in ensuring that the project is carried out in an efficient manner.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not provide a complete description of the duties and responsibilities of key personnel. Without this information it is difficult to determine if the persons identified have the necessary and requisite expertise to manage the project tasks.

**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 proposes multiple methods of data collection to use in evaluating the project. For instance, there will be the use of both instructive formative and summative feedback. Multiple partners will be involved in this process such that NCTR will assess the efficacy of residents and CNA will conduct independent focus groups of programs completers, use member checks to ensure accurate representation and will also provide technical feedback on internally-generated program and research reports. These modes of inquiry will ensure that data related to performance is valid and reliable (e54 – e55).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant's evaluation plan lacks details with regard to evaluation questions and data analysis. Without this information, it is difficult to determine if the plan is feasible or appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.

**Reader's Score: 15**

**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 computational thinking component of the applicant's design (e21) has the potential to equip residents with the skills needed to be able to effectively teach critical computer science and higher order thinking skills to students.

**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 does not address this priority.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not address this priority.

**Reader's Score:** 0

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 06/17/2019 09:34 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/17/2019 09:34 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Howard University (U336S190043)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	40	35
<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	20
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	95
<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	
<b>Sub Total</b>	0	
<b>Total</b>	105	100

# Technical Review Form

Panel #6 - Teacher Quality Partnership - 7: 84.336S

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

Applicant: Howard University (U336S190043)

## 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:

- Specific attention and preparation being given towards the mentors is of huge importance as a quality mentor can greatly enhance the resident's success. Requirement of attendance in select orientations, professional development, and seminars, rather than making it their choice will facilitate the mentor/resident relationship. Unique to this proposal is the addition of a stipend for the mentor as well as recognition at the end of the year (e-20). The attention being given to the importance of the mentor teacher is an exceptional approach for meeting the requirements.
- Howard University is the only DCPS provider with 100% of its new teachers rated Effective (e-26) which indicates a quality educator preparation program. The ability to produce quality teachers will facilitate the project's ability to build capacity and extend the results beyond the Federal financial assistance.
- To inform the development of the residency and induction programs the organization has done an excellent job of conducting a multi-component needs assessment. Along with collaboration with various stakeholders in collecting the needs assessment information, the support workshop for alumni and their invited colleagues which collected informal information through focus groups will provide information regarding strategies and supports needed (e-31, demonstrating an exceptional approach for meeting statutory purposes and requirements.
- The proposed project has chosen to develop an induction model based on affinity group approach. Forming groups around a similar interest or common goals during the critical period of a new teacher's career will offer much needed support and strategies to address specific needs as they arise (e-21). This focus on professional development to improve the quality of new teachers demonstrates the ability to build capacity and extend results beyond the Federal funding.
- Project goals have been listed, which are measurable, with specific activities that will facilitate their being met. Outcomes are listed and the responsible partner along with a timeline has been submitted (e-52).
- The applicant demonstrates a rationale with DCPS, the cooperating LEA, indicating teacher turnover being higher than comparable cities in the nation. 55% of teachers leave within a five-year period and the five school partners are 100% economically disadvantaged. This is addressed with refinement of masters courses, customized consultation (e-80) and providing faculty development support to assist with candidates who will work in high need schools and areas as well as decreasing the high teacher turnover rate.

**Weaknesses:**

- The 70% passing rate on the Praxis which was less than the statewide average of 76%, was noted for 2017-2018, though not official the university does state that 92% met all the score requirements for 2018-2019 (e-24). A concern for this specific data would be the ability of the applicant to meet the project goal of 90% pass rate as previous data demonstrates a much lower passing rate.

**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:**

- The applicant organization has numerous resources with which to assist with the project. These include departments already created that will assist with checks and balances regarding the grant, space to host symposia and research events (e-50).
- Demonstrated commitment (Appendix I) by major stakeholders through documentation as well as in-kind contributions. It is evident from this documentation that the stakeholders all are in support and willing to collaborate. Success of the project is increased by this mutually beneficial partnership.

**Weaknesses:**

- No weaknesses have been noted by the reviewer for adequacy of resources.

**Reader's Score: 20**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan**

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

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

**Strengths:**

- The management plan indicates a variety of data sources from which goals and activities will be assessed including both qualitative and quantitative sources (e-52). This will allow for the individuals involved in the project to build on the strength of each type of data collection and minimize any weakness to a single approach.
- The management plan mentions monthly meetings of all stakeholders to discuss four essential questions regarding short-term goals and overall progress with responses recorded and summarized in the annual report (e-53).

This collaboration among the stakeholders again demonstrates a commitment to the success of the proposed project.

- The management plan offers a concise timeline of activities which will be produced to meet the goals of the proposal. Responsible partners are listed (e-51) along with biographies of the staff who will be responsible for the various activities, which lends credibility to individuals selected to work on this grant. (e-56).
- The proposed management plan identifies the specific month or semesters for when each of the outcomes should be completed (e-52). This documentation of the scope of the project being clearly defined, setting realistic timelines, and making sure all stakeholders understand the timelines will ensure that the project will be achieved on time and within budget

**Weaknesses:**

- No weaknesses have been noted by this reviewer for the management plan.

**Reader's Score: 20**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation**

**1. The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

**(i) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes.**

**(ii) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.**

**Strengths:**

- The team has carefully considered the measures which will inform the development of the residency program involving a variety of stakeholders in the gathering and analyzing of the data. This data collection will be critical to the future success of the program and will maximize the stakeholder's engagement in the program offering more opportunities to discuss the goals of the program. (e-54). The involvement of multiple stakeholders will allow for more meaningful and reliable performance data.
- The team is addressing the validity of the results (e-55) with the understanding that some of the measured listed as outcomes are binary, and will assess linear probability and Logit models to assess trade-offs between function form and interpretability. Thus, this shows a demonstrated effort by the applicant to utilize methods of evaluation that are feasible and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes.
- The evaluation plan (e-51) will utilize both qualitative and quantitative methods to provide reliable performance data on relevant outcomes.

**Weaknesses:**

- The reviewer did not note any weaknesses regarding the project evaluation.

**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:**

- Proposed project has a goal of improving integration of computational thinking across the curriculum which will be implemented through non-credit course modules which support traditional coursework. Teachers will have the ability to pursue computational thinking through three different pathways of varying levels. (e-23). This may be more attractive to those teachers who do not have positive attitudes towards technology in education or struggle with how to integrate the technology, while giving those innovative teachers more resources from which to draw from. Giving teachers choice in how they might choose to pursue improving integration of computational thinking across the curriculum will most likely lead to more interest in the area thus increasing the number of educators who will be adequately prepared to deliver rigorous instruction in STEM fields. With the number of educators increasing in the STEM fields student achievement and other educational outcomes in computer science should increase as well.

**Weaknesses:**

- No weaknesses have been noted by this reviewer regarding Competitive Preference 1.

**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:**

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 06/17/2019 09:34 PM

