

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/14/2019 02:03 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Tulare County Office of Education (U336S190056)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	40	36
<b>Adequacy of Resources</b>		
1. Resources	20	18
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	17
<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 #7 - Teacher Quality Partnership - 8: 84.336S**

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

**Applicant:** Tulare County Office of Education (U336S190056)

## 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 has made a sound rationale for the project by identifying pertinent research and models that support a rigorous teacher preparation program (pages e21-e33). For example, the application demonstrates how the project is grounded in the four major aspects such as careful recruitment and selection, tightly integrated curriculum, adequate financial assistance, and mentoring support. The applicant provides a detailed logic model that covers partners, resources, activities, outputs and short and long-term outcomes. The project model is derived from proven successful models such as California State University, especially the Next Generation Science Standards in critical areas of math and science. This makes the project design both reasonable and strong.

(ii) The application has successfully established four over-arching goals that cover training of teachers to institutionalizing the residency program (pages e33-334). The project goals and objectives correspond to the phases of the teacher preparation based on a cohort model. The project goals are clearly aligned to measurable outcomes. For instance, in the first goal of recruitment, the recruitment and certification of a fixed number of mentors and cohort of teacher trainees clarifies the outcomes of the goal. The goal also covers the competitive preference priority of training in computer science. The application provides a detailed narrative of how each of the objectives will be implemented with the extraordinary support of partners and resources (e35-e53).

(iii) The applicant has made a brief description of building capacity and yielding results for the project (pages e47-e48). The application stipulates the project will use Prepared to Teach as a strategic support plan to grow residency and create sustainability. The capacity building and sustainability is based on scale-up and creating a K-12 arch with the state standards in computer science.

(iv) The application has successfully described how the exceptional nature of the project lies in the collaborative effort and integrated approach (page e48-e49). The hallmark of the project is the digital system by which the applicant collects and disseminates a wealth of information. The exceptional nature of the project design is supported by tracking systems and creating a diverse qualified pool for the residency program.

**Weaknesses:**

(i) The project logic model did not cover a feedback and evaluation loop (page e23). The project design will potentially not be able to provide a comprehensive rationale for project activities.

(ii) No weaknesses noted.

(iii) The project design has not fully explored the potential to build capacity and yield results beyond Federal funding. For example, the application has not described in detail how the project will be scaled into the subject preparation courses and clinical experiences (pages e22-e23). The integration of the K-12 arch into the state California Computer Science Education Standards is stated but not supported by documentation (page e48).

(iv) No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 36**

**Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources**

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

(i) The application has provided sufficient details about the resources that will be provided by the applicant (pages e50-e52). The application has covered the project lead resource funds (\$6,721,766) and in-kind support for facilities. The California State University at Bakersfield and the school district will provide in-kind support. The project support is comprehensive.

(ii) The application has provided a clear indication of pertinent support to the project (pages e52-e54). For example, the partnering university will be the credentialing agency and provide curriculum for the project, and the school district will provide content experts and in-kind facilities support. Other key partners such as the Prepared to Teach and EnCorps STEM Teachers program will also bring expertise in recruitment, planning, programming and sustainability. The application has thus covered comprehensive support to the project from partners.

**Weaknesses:**

(i) The application does not specify the availability of computers or laptops for the project participants (e50-e52). The campus resources may not be sufficient for participants who are involved in asynchronous instruction. Moreover, the budget allocated for the computers is limited to the project staff on page e136. Hence, it is unclear if the lead applicant has appropriated sufficient computer and learning technology hardware for project participants to ensure project success.

(ii) No weaknesses.

**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:**

(i) The application has provided a functional management plan (pages e54-e59). The application has described a strong Project Team with qualified staff. For example, the team consists of an experienced principal investigator, an effective recruitment coordinator, and a current department chair as a Residency Professional Development Provider. The project implementation is overseen by an advisory team, and the Project Team includes a district liaison. On pages e58-e59, the application has provided a detailed project plan with project staff responsible to implement the project through the five years starting from hiring staff to institutionalizing residency model. The plan is thus feasible and provides a blueprint for project implementation.

### **Weaknesses:**

(i) The management plan does not align project activities with project objectives (pages e58-e59). It cannot be, thus, verified if the project objectives will be implemented within time and budget. Moreover, the management plan has not distinguished between activities and milestones. In the absence of clear milestones, the project management plan does not have clear targets to ensure timely and productive implementation.

**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:**

(i) The application provides for a working evaluation plan that consists of a mixed-methods plan as well as a quasi-experimental design (pages e60-e62). A mixed-methods evaluation is suitable to teacher education program evaluation as it helps in providing rich qualitative data. The application has provided an objectives-based evaluation plan that specifies both evaluation methods and sources. An external evaluation agency will be able to provide objective evaluation (page e62). The application has briefly discussed both formative and summative evaluation tools.

(ii) The project evaluation provides a clear indication of collecting pertinent evaluation data (pages e63-e69). Each project goal has been aligned with evaluation questions, and pertinent academic and process data will be collected. The project evaluation questions are aligned with the GPRA performance measures (page e65). Moreover, in the final year of the project, the evaluation plan will implement a quasi-experimental design. The evaluation plan also has an in-built longitudinal data system (page e68).

**Weaknesses:**

(i) Project evaluation plan does not provide sufficient details of formative and summative evaluation (page e62). For instance, beyond proving the importance of continuous improvement and the establishing a formal reporting cycle, the evaluation plan does not specify how the feedback data will be used for project improvement. The project evaluation plan also does not provide sufficient details describing of the quantitative part of the project evaluation. This will potentially affect the quality of evaluation.

(ii) The application has not completely described the nature and process of the quasi-experimental design that will be implemented (page e68). For instance, the application has not provided details of comparative groups and analyses that will be used for such a design. This will potentially affect the quality of the quasi-experimental evaluation.

**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 application has provided a sound description of the implementation of the competitive preference priority (pages e27-e30). The applicant will launch with a STEM+C Lab School that will help participants to develop STEM+C potentials. The project participants will also participate in the district computer science pathway. The hallmark of the STEM+C approach is not only exposure but a team of faculty who will help residents translate their education to be attuned to the needs of the community. Moreover, the residents have an option of obtaining a micro-credential in computer science. The application has integrated the STEM+C into the project design and implementation successfully.

**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:** 06/14/2019 02:03 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/14/2019 04:13 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Tulare County Office of Education (U336S190056)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	40	38
<b>Adequacy of Resources</b>		
1. Resources	20	17
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	19
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	18
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	92
<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	97

# Technical Review Form

**Panel #7 - Teacher Quality Partnership - 8: 84.336S**

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

**Applicant:** Tulare County Office of Education (U336S190056)

## 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 Teacher Residency for Rural Education (TRRE) model's rationale and design includes:- A well prepared "Theory of Action" which provides a consistent and encompassing design based on current, documented research and best practices with rural school settings. (Pages e21 & 24-26)- A promising master's residency program beginning with recruitment of residents, followed by rigorous teacher preparation curriculum and activities, and finally to the retention of a cadre of highly qualified teachers and mentors in high need rural classrooms with STEM education. (Page e17, 20-21)- A compact, easy to comprehend logic model which identifies the partners, underlying conditions, resources, activities, outputs, and outcomes (short-term, mid-term, and long-term) on a single page. (Page e23, Appendix G) - A computer science pathway with STEM skill experiences to be applied by the residents, from their own lab student learning to utilize while co-teaching with their mentor, to their own classroom teaching, and then becoming a teacher leader for other cohorts of residents. (Pages e27-28.) - A continuation of the lessons learned and providing application experiences to more teachers and residents while modeling their Capstone. The residents become newly acquired resources for the incoming residents and in their district high-need schools.- An overarching goal which aligns with the TQP grant—to improve student achievement. The well-defined program has four performance-oriented goals with time specific objectives and outcomes. (Pages e31-34, 39-49) The charts mirror the Absolute Priority goals for effective teaching residency programs. (Appendix E) Goal 1 will also yield an added plus, as the mentor teachers will become National Board Certified teachers, thus improving the student achievement of more rural students. (Page e44-45)- A partner, Bank Street College, commits to support planning for sustaining funded residencies for the TRRE project. (Page e39)- Regular and intense collaboration opportunities with the key IHE and community partners supporting the development of highly qualified teachers in rural classrooms. Their students will then attend the IHE or community learning programs, therefore forming a symbiotic relationship.

### Weaknesses:

The inclusion of a rationale and specific outcomes for the funded first year site visits to observe residency programs for input would strengthen this proposal. It is not clear what questions will be asked and answered by the field experiences. (Page e122) Generally, the design lacks an ongoing plan to secure funding after implementation in order to readily continue the program after the grant period ends. Some examples of scaling the project would enhance this proposal.

Also, more detail would strengthen this proposal if there was a dissemination plan to inform the public of the project's ongoing development and success as a stellar STEM residency program. This plan could result in more recruits and funding.

**Reader's Score: 38**

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

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

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

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

#### **Strengths:**

The TRRE proposal successfully:- Aligns all the key partners with their roles, responsibilities and resources necessary for the program to fully be supported with funding, facilities, equipment, supplies and a common vision to improve student achievement through ongoing teacher development. (Pages e31-54)- Organizes a team that has been improving education through other grants for over 15 years. The team of partners and advisors work together well because they complement each other in intellectual contributions that are not measured on a budget or on formative and summative assessments. Their collaboration could continue to positively change teacher preparation programs. (Pages e50, 52)- Targets the lead applicant organization, Tulare County Office of Education (TCOE), with its team as a conduit for innovation for ongoing teacher/student development by bringing their experiences together to promote advances in research and content. For example, TCOE and team have a history of bringing new practices to scale by implementing the first California Teacher Recruitment Centers. A consortium of state agencies and educational institutions will come together to collaborate on preparing to increase math, science, and English achievement in schools with underrepresented populations. (Page e51-52). - Has proven TCOE and team teacher education programs work due to their collaborative organizational planning, committed resources, and timely execution of other highly successful grant programs. (Pages e53-54) The lessons learned from previous ED grants have led this team to continue to modify teacher education programs and address yet another underrepresented student achievement issue.

#### **Weaknesses:**

An explanation, with research documentation, for selecting and funding AVATAR kiosks, budgeted at \$60,000 in Year 1 only, would enhance this proposal. (Page e141). Also, this proposal would benefit from a stated intent of how the robots will be used and when, for what reason(s), and how it will enhance recruitment, retention, teacher preparation and/or student achievement. The cost of a high-end computer for the community high-needs, underrepresented residents may be an obstacle for recruiting the most skilled applicants. The computer will need to run STEM software, include program tools specific to the program, be utilized several years, and have professional development information pertinent to the resident. It would be important for participants to be given their own computer to keep. The computer will then be able to be used after the grant program ends to continue the program professional developmental skills, tools. and techniques which may increase retention rates.

**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 TRRE proposal management plan addresses:- The management structure and operations in relationship to achieving all the goals, objectives and outcomes. The narrative is well written defining the roles, responsibilities and tasks for all partners and stakeholders. Every member of the project management team and advisory council has current grant experiences. (pages e55-57; 79-93)- The TQP grant application guidelines with varied activities, specific timelines, and assigned responsibilities for executing the five-year grant residency project. (Pages e58-59 Management Table)- Budget oversight with monitoring by members of the project team and advisory council. Both groups will also provide opportunities for all stakeholders and partners to provide input for continuous improvement of the residency model. (page e54) Two team members have not been identified yet, but roles, tasks and responsibilities have been clearly defined. (Page e57)- The need for a district liaison (DL) and teaching credential and program advisement specialist (CSUB) to support and navigate the school policies and government regulations that may impede the residents and mentors from successfully completing the program on time.

**Weaknesses:**

The application would be stronger if the objectives and activities were in alignment with each other. Due to this mismatch, the objectives will not be able to be fully evaluated within the period of the grant unless the activities being assessed reflect the stated objectives. (page e57-59)The addition of specific milestones for directly evaluating the implementation would enhance this residency management plan. There is a lack of clarity between the project activities and the program milestones.

**Reader's Score: 19**

**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 TRRE evaluation plan includes:- A comprehensive project narrative and outline of the four project goals and aligns them with mixed evaluation methods and sources. (Pages e61-69) Each well-stated goal has varied evaluation methods and specific sources identified with project personnel.- An external evaluator to collect formative data on project implementation and identify possible outcomes in relationship to critical situations and components of the project. The logic model will be used for guidance when reviewing documents and updating features of the program based on stakeholders' responses to open and closed-ended questions. (Pages e62)- Formative evaluation for continuous improvement of the teacher preparation program. The project staff will reflect on the information on current performance and assess opportunities for change and/or improvement. (Page e63)- Qualitative and quantitative data from several sources to increase validity of the results. The evaluator will provide thorough annual performance reports on the effectiveness of each goal component in the teacher residency program. For example, tracking the diversity of the

candidates and their educational backgrounds may assist the project team in improving recruitment and selection of participants under Goal 1. (Page e63)- The availability of the evaluator to respond to the data needs of a stakeholder that may perceive a problem or a solution that improves the teacher preparation or student improvement. The project's archival program data includes measures which assess the quality of components using many varied evaluative tools, such as review documents and portfolios. (Pages e64-65)

**Weaknesses:**

The formative and summative evaluation tools would be stronger if more description was provided for how the feedback data will be identified with improvement. (Page e62). More description is also needed regarding the program's quantitative data and tools because they are the backbone for the integrity of the evaluation plan. The evaluation narrative is also light on providing details about the comparative group studies used for residency vs. non-residency evaluation. (Pages e68-69)

**Reader's Score: 18**

**Priority Questions**

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

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

**Strengths:**

The TRRE proposal includes:- Recruitment strategies for participants with varied backgrounds, recent graduates and mid-career professionals and military retirees. (Page e40)- The need for more graduate education students to participate in professional development in computer science, as well as an increase of highly qualified STEM+C education residents to promote STEM learning and teaching. Both groups will have curriculum and instruction in a year-long classroom clinical experience with expert mentors while completing their master's coursework. (Page e17)- STEM+C curriculum, pedagogy and assessment to improve teacher performance in STEM education. The greater percentage of residents will be from underrepresented groups and the graduates placed in high-need schools. (Page e17)- A summer Lab experience in STEM+C before the clinical practice. During the clinical year, residents will participate in the district's computer science pathway as part of a capstone experience that prepares them to be a teacher leader for the next cohort of residents. (Page e28)- Opportunities for the residents to provide STEM+C Lab learning into their own classrooms. These residents will be observed in the classroom by the science specialists for ongoing improvement of computer science skills, pedagogy and multidisciplinary curricula. These experiences address the need for highly qualified STEM educators and computer science teachers. Research documentation supports the need and practice for pre-service teachers to integrate and engage STEM in their classrooms. (Pages e27-28)

**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:**

Not addressed.

**Weaknesses:**

Not addressed.

**Reader's Score: 0**

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 06/14/2019 04:13 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/14/2019 02:24 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Tulare County Office of Education (U336S190056)

**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	15
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	18
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	17
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	85
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
1. STEM/Computer Science	5	5
<b>Sub Total</b>	5	5
<b>Invitational Priority</b>		
<b>Invitational Priority</b>		
1. Promise Zones	0	
<b>Sub Total</b>	0	
<b>Total</b>	105	90

# Technical Review Form

Panel #7 - Teacher Quality Partnership - 8: 84.336S

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

Applicant: Tulare County Office of Education (U336S190056)

## 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 strengths for this application include the following:

(i) Provides a rationale for the impact of the proposed project that strongly addresses the needs within a rural community (pages e21-e49)

- Clearly researched and conveyed the basis and intent to support efforts to increase the number of effective residency programs (pages e39-40)

- Excellent use of the logic model found on page e23, as a visual representation of the overall project design, from the causes to the resources to the outcomes and how together they will secure the project outcomes

- Supports the rationale and design through connecting proposed design with current research that address teaching strategies, community building, and the unique needs of rural-based education (pages e24-30)

(ii)

- Goals and objectives are presented in measurable terms (pages e33-34)

- Project activities support the outcomes and are further defined by activities to be conducted leading to specific outcomes (pages e35-39)

- The multifaceted process for selecting highly qualified mentors has the promise of producing the anticipated outcomes and enhancing the experience for each residency (p.e43-45)

- Effective strategies for mentors, such as regular meetings with the project manager, frequent observations and feedback, in addition to potentially obtaining board certification, should result in a positive learning experience for the mentors as well as the residents teaching, that are not always feasible in a one-teacher classroom setting, can inform future classroom management (p.e48)

- Provides excellent professional development of mentors and residents

- Innovative use of virtual interviewing and recruiting has the potential to influence the recruiting process (p. e49)

(iv) Strong rationale supported by implementing promising practices, such as co-teaching, that

are not always feasible in a one-teacher classroom setting, can inform future classroom management (p.e48)

**Weaknesses:**

Weaknesses:

The weaknesses include the following:

- Lacks a specific strategy during implementation to proactively continue project activities such as funding, leveraging of resources, and building buy-in beyond the Federal funding period (p.e47-50)
- Anticipates success to translate into support for continuation without addressing methods to inform public, such as incorporating electronic strategies similar to those implemented for recruiting (p. e47-50)  
No clear rationale presented for first-year student teaching of residents based upon the fine-tuned rubric for selection process (p.e23)
- Unclear as to why dissemination of improved student outcomes appears to be limited to Tulare County (p. e48)

**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 strengths of this application are as follows:

- (i) TCOE, as the lead agency, will primarily conduct recruiting, screening, and hiring through utilization of an electronic format in the selection of residents (p.e50)
- Innovative use of electronic monitoring will ensure that partners and participants will have access to continuous support and individual performance from induction to employment (p. e50)
- Detailed discussion of resources to be provided by partners (p. e50-54)
- In-kind contributions are supported by letters of commitment (pages e94-102)
- The project will benefit from the experience and expertise that CSUB brings, based on having already implemented three high-need residency models (p. e53)
- Visalia Unified School district will provide funds as well as personnel to serve as coaches, mentors, co-teachers and assist in planning (p. e53)

**Weaknesses:**

The weaknesses for this application are included below:

- (ii) Additional explanation is required regarding the line item for the purchase of Avatar kiosks (p. e121) This is the only reference to this item.
- Need clarification regarding not including computer purchases/supplies for teachers located in a rural area required for distance learning as research using Chrome books may not be adequate for STEM needs (p. e50)

**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:**

The strengths for this application are below:

- (i) Clear alignment between the tasks described in the narrative and displayed in the management
  - Positions assigned are highly supported by individual resumes or position descriptions (pages e54-57)
  - Role of the project team and advisory council is clearly aligned to implementation and oversight (pages e54-57)

**Weaknesses:**

The weaknesses of this application are below: -

- Failed to align management plan to the activities identified in the evaluation plan, making it difficult to adequately monitor progress and keep the plans on time and within budget (pages e58-59)
- Does not include interviewing for positions of the management team in the timeline (pages e58-59)

**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 strengths of the evaluation plans include:

- (i) Employment of an external evaluator is an excellent decision (p.e60) This will validate project outcomes and reliability.
  - Use of data to evaluate components, such as retention and student performance, are appropriately used to improve teacher selection, modify program, and influence project continuation after Federal funding ends (p. e62)
- (ii) Strong evaluation plan will employ mixed methods in a quasi-experimental design, aligned to effective measurement of teacher and student results (p. e60)
  - Clear alignment between evaluation objectives and project objectives, enabling the identification of evaluation sources and evaluation methods to be employed (pages e60-62)

**Weaknesses:**

The weaknesses of the evaluation plan are:

- Evaluation plan lacks a process for using data for continuous improvement in an established reporting cycle (e61)
- The quasi-experimental design is not fully described. It should include additional details regarding the groups and types of analysis.

**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:**

The strengths of the CPP for this application are below:

- Strong alignment with project purpose, including participation in “professional development in STEM.”

- Complete inclusion and integration of computer science in instruction and inclusion by residents in their lessons.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses found

**Reader's Score:** 5

**Invitational Priority - Invitational Priority**

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

**Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score:**

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 06/14/2019 02:24 PM