

**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: Marian University (U336S190002)

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	20
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	0
Sub Total	5	0
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: Marian University (U336S190002)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

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

(ii) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.

(iii) The extent to which the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance.

(iv) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach for meeting statutory purposes and requirements.

Strengths:

The applicant presents a sound and convincing rationale which clearly addresses how its project aligns with the identified needs of the target group. The proposed project seeks to ensure that a diverse cadre of new teacher candidates are effectively trained and supported in early years so that high-need schools will have more effective early career teachers. As indicated in the narrative, for example, challenges of the target population include but are not limited to the struggles high-need districts experience in filling hard-to-staff positions with effective teachers, especially math, science, Special Education and English Learners as well as recruiting teachers that reflect the population of the students being served. In addition, the proposal's rationale is supported by a theory of action that includes short and mid-term outcomes that are anticipated to result in increased teacher retention and student achievement (pp. e27-e30).

(ii) The applicant clearly states four broad goals to be achieved by the project to address the identified needs of the target audience. One of the goals, for example, is that the applicant proposes to build coherence between systems and structures for support for new teachers at the university, school, and district levels. The proposal also includes objectives that correlate with the project's goals. One of the objectives the applicant proposes, for example, is to train clinical faculty on the Teaching Standards Rubric indicators and the use of the rubric for high-quality evaluation and feedback. One of the proposed outcomes, for example, is an increase in the number of highly qualified individuals, including minorities and those prepared to deliver instruction in STEM fields, into the teaching force, and the number of highly qualified mentor teachers available to support resident teachers (p. e30).

(iii) The applicant provides sound evidence that the proposed project is designed to build capacity during the administration of the grant period. As indicated in the proposal, coursework during the residency will be delivered outside of school hours and is aligned to the job-embedded tasks of the residency experience. The proposed master's degree course work will be supported by resident mentor teachers as well as school and district leaders, to ensure the residents are fully prepared to serve as full-time teachers in the high-need partner districts. In addition, mentor teachers will also participate in high-quality training to strengthen their capacity to support induction teachers (pp. e37, e39). To ensure the proposed project will build capacity beyond the grant period, the applicant university has recruited 10 high-need district and charter school partners in the target area for its 4+1 residency program. Three of the high-need districts have

committed to the expanded residency plus induction program proposed under this grant, and the university will continue to recruit additional high-need district and charter schools among existing and new partners to expand and sustain this new program as it grows over time. Partner districts have signed a residency memorandum of understanding with KEC, which includes a data sharing component, allowing the residency program board of visitors to further refine instruction for teacher candidates. In addition, clinical faculty assigned to provide coaching and support to residents and their mentors within the partner districts will continue to be available to graduates (pp. e45-e47).

(iv) The project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities established for the competition. As indicated in the narrative, the proposal will provide students clinical experiences in high-need partner schools starting in their first year as freshmen. The clinical and simulation experiences will continue over a four-year period, which will help future teachers understand the culture within high-need schools. All partners in this grant have committed to using the same research-based teaching standards to support professional learning, coaching, mentoring and evaluation. Investments in building an induction model for new teachers will be sustained and integrated into the schools' professional learning system (pp. e48, e49). The applicant's theory of action is a logic model that includes clearly identified inputs, outputs, and activities to support the project's proposed short and mid and long-term outcomes (p. e87).

Weaknesses:

(ii) The objectives with their associated outcomes that are necessary to evaluate the project's progress towards meeting its goals are not stated in measurable terms. For example, one of the project's objectives is that it will align coursework with NIET Teaching Standards Rubric in use in districts (p. e30).

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) Support, including facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources, from the applicant organizations or the lead applicant organization, is clearly evidenced. The narrative demonstrates, for example, that the applicant will provide clinical faculty to work full-time in partner districts. Facilities, equipment, and supplies to support the program where appropriate, can also provide remote access virtual simulation training to residents, mentors and inductees as needed. The applicant will also provide the curriculum for the onsite course delivery. In addition, districts will provide facilities for program activities during the school day, including coaching, training and smaller professional learning communities (pp. 27-28).

(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 residency program committing to embedding the same teaching research-based NIET Teaching standards in the districts into both clinical practice and coursework. Districts have existing partnerships with KEC and have been involved in the development of a residency and induction model. They are committed to providing residents with a highly effective

mentor, as well as supporting new teachers and mentors with the time and resources to continue to improve their practice (p. e49, e50).

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's visual representation of a detailed management chart indicates the project's objectives are aligned with annual activities. The applicant presents a yearly timeline of tasks activities and identifies persons responsible for completing each task. Key project personnel and their responsibilities are clearly presented. For example, the Director of Clinical Experiences will coordinate all clinical and residency placements in collaboration with school and district partners, as well as assist in the placement and tracking of the graduates into their positions with each district partner for the induction program (p. e60). The proposal includes a detailed budget sufficient to serve 170 teacher candidates in four cohorts over four years (p. e15). The budget includes costs for personnel and training stipends. All costs are reasonable in relation to the anticipated outcomes of the project (p. e176).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

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

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

Strengths:

(i) The applicant outlines a comprehensive evaluation plan that is formative and summative in nature. Seven research questions will be used to guide the project's evaluation process. The evaluation methods are comprehensive because data to evaluate the program's effectiveness on the project's target participants (p. e61). Questions guiding the evaluation process will provide valid and reliable performance data on the project's outcomes include but are not limited to how the project is being implemented and to what extent is implementation sustainable, and what effects does participation in the

project have on teacher retention (pp. e62, e63). Qualitative data will be used to assess fidelity of implementation will come from sources such as interviews and surveys. Quantitative measures will be collected from sources such as teacher qualifications, licensure, retention, teacher performance, and student achievement data to assess the program's impact (p. e64).

(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 for the following reason. The evaluation strategies and methods are aligned with the four program goals and include qualitative and quantitative data from multiple sources to ensure thoroughness and to strengthen content, construct and contemporary validity and reliability. Performance data and evaluation methods are summarized by each of the project's goals (p. e66).

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:

No strengths noted.

Weaknesses:

The proposal did not address improving student achievement in computer science relative to increasing the number of educators adequately prepared to deliver rigorous instruction in computer science.

Reader's Score: 0

Invitational Priority - Invitational Priority

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

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

Demonstrate in its application that it has received or will receive financial assistance from a qualified opportunity fund under section 1400Z-2 of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended by

the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, for a purpose directly related to its proposed project. In addressing this priority, an applicant must identify the qualified opportunity fund from which it has received or will receive financial assistance and describe the extent to which the applicant will use the financial assistance for its proposed project.

Strengths:

The applicant did not address this priority.

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/17/2019 04:24 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Marian University (U336S190002)

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	20
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Sub Total	100	100
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. STEM/Computer Science	5	0
Sub Total	5	0
Invitational Priority		
Invitational Priority		
1. Promise Zones	0	0
Sub Total	0	0
Total	105	100

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Marian University (U336S190002)

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 clearly demonstrates a rationale by seeking to provide solutions to four challenges affecting first- and second-year teachers and those in educator preparation programs (pg. 5). These solutions include building a local education agency induction program, a full year residency model, and creating a pipeline to fill openings in STEM, Special Education, and English as a New Language (e 25).

II. The applicant presents four goals that are specific, measurable and aligned to specific objectives and outcomes of the project. The applicant proposes to measure the effectiveness of the goals and objectives using measures such as list of training sessions, quarterly meeting notes, the applicants' demographic information and a survey of resident teachers regarding perceptions of and satisfaction with support received by mentor teachers.

III. The applicant provides a reasonable measure for building capacity by responding to the needs of the students and teachers in the grant program through data sharing and building an induction program in each high-need high school to help support teachers after the life of the grant.

IV. The proposed project presents an exceptional approach for meeting the statutory purposes by providing students a clinical simulation experience prior to entering a full-time residency program. This is an exceptional approach because it helps build student's confidence and candidates to influence student achievement prior to residency. Additionally, support is given to students through weekly professional learning groups with their mentors and other teachers at their school during the clinical simulation and during their four years of the residency program.

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 applicant adequately describes the support and other resources it will have from the applicant organization such as faculty, staff, facilities and curriculum. The applicant organization will also provide faculty members to serve on the Board of Visitors that will meet quarterly to assess the project's effectiveness quarterly (pg.49).

II. The applicant sufficiently identifies the relevance and commitment of each partner dedicated to the implementation and success of the project by noting that each of the partnering districts has worked with National Institute for Excellence in Teaching and have existing partnerships with Klipsch Educators College (e12, e51)

Weaknesses:

I. None noted

II. None noted

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

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

Strengths:

I. The applicant provides a reasonable management plan for achieving the proposed project on time and within budget. All goals, objectives and milestones align to a responsible individual at either the applicant institution or a

collaborating partner and a reasonable timeframe for completing activities (e53-59). Each milestone is aligned to a specific goal of the project and contains research questions to guide project implementation and evaluation of project activities (e66-71). For example, to determine if the project has recruited high-quality participants, the applicant will compare characteristics of successful and unsuccessful applicants to demographic information such as performance on standardized tests (e62).

Weaknesses:

None noted

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

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

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

Strengths:

i. The applicant thoroughly describes it will use qualitative data to triangulate responses from resident teachers, induction teachers, mentor teachers, program staff and NIET staff. The applicant will collect data from sources such as meeting agendas, sign in sheets and surveys to ensure the program is meeting project objectives (e64). The applicant will also collect and track qualifications, licensures, and retention to assess the impact the program has on participants (e65).

ii. The applicant presents a clear and coherent Logic Model that aligns inputs to outputs and outcomes from the program. The planned evaluative measures of focus groups and data from successful and unsuccessful applicants are appropriate to ensure the success of the project. To ensure reliability, for example, the applicant will record focus group sessions and the video will be transcribed and coded by at least two researchers (e64).

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:

None noted

Weaknesses:

None noted

Reader's Score: 0

Invitational Priority - Invitational Priority

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

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

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

Strengths:

This criterion was not addressed.

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/17/2019 04:24 PM

Status: Submitted

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

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Marian University (U336S190002)

Reader #3: *****

	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	20
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Sub Total	100	100
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. STEM/Computer Science	5	0
Sub Total	5	0
Invitational Priority		
Invitational Priority		
1. Promise Zones	0	0
Sub Total	0	0
Total	105	100

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Marian University (U336S190002)

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 documents a high-quality Project Design with a sound theory of action as evidenced by the Logic Model (pg. e87) that aligns recruitment and preparation to high level professional development activities. The strategy is to enhance the quality of new teachers in the “key shortage areas” at the elementary and secondary level through the recruitment and preparation of new teachers specifically in the subject areas of STEM, Special Education, and English Language Learning. The overarching goal is to increase the instructional leadership skills and knowledge of all teachers in the highly underserved communities (pg. e24- e25).

(ii) The applicant documents four specific goals (i.e., build a coherent system and structure to support new teachers, recruit and select high-quality residency candidates, build the capacity of resident and mentor teachers during residency component, and build the capacity of new and mentor teachers). Each of the goals are clearly aligned to measurable objectives (i.e., attendance records review of training/coaching session, attendance records, demographic data) and align with the professional development activities proposed for the project (pg. e30-32).

(iii) The proposed project design has great potential to build capacity as evidenced by the various strategies to include the proposed residency model program that will result in the creation of a pipeline for recruitment, development, and retention in filling the critical STEM, Special Education, and English as a Second Language (ESL) teaching positions. Strategies that include supporting first and second year teachers and their mentoring through training and individual coaching both onsite and through distance learning is another strong aspect of the overall project design (pg. e29).

The strategies include ongoing training, coaching, and professional development activities for new teaching staff which is a model that deviates from the traditional 4-year education preparation program (i.e., no face-time with students until the 3rd or 4th year). The proposed design will provide immediate interaction with students during the induction period, which will help with the transition and likely build capacity over the long-term based on the opportunities for collaboration between mentor and induction teachers and the ongoing professional development activities. Moreover, financial incentives for mentor teachers will be provided, which is always a strong strategy (pg. e 24-23, 39-41).

(iv) An exceptional aspect of the proposed project design is the integration of activities with the College of Arts and

Sciences, three high-need school districts, and a national nonprofit institute that focuses on excellence in teaching (pg. e23). Another strength is that all partners have committed to aligning their current system of professional development to the research-based teaching standards from the proposed project to support ongoing professional learning, coaching, mentoring, and evaluation (pg. e48-49).

Weaknesses:

- (i) No weaknesses noted.
- (ii) No weaknesses noted.
- (iii) No weaknesses noted.
- (iv) No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 40

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

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

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

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

Strengths:

(i) The applicant agency provides sufficient evidence of support for the project, for example with the over \$3 million dollars in match dollars (i.e., personnel, travel, facilities, training stipends, and contract consultants) that have been committed. The applicant provides detailed information on how the clinical faculty will support the project (i.e., coaching and development of residents, serving on the Board of Visitors, and quarterly meetings to review progress and effectiveness). Pg. e49-50

(ii) One of the partners (NIET) documents over 20 years' experience in the area of educator effectiveness and experience managing over 10 federal grants and provides sufficient evidence of their experience working with high needs schools in the area of improving teacher quality (pg. e50-51). Moreover, the districts have identified existing partnerships and have committed to providing each resident with a highly effective mentor (pg. e51).

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 a competent management plan that outlines the specific goals, objectives, milestones, responsible parties, and timeline for achievement. The proposed budget outlines funding for a number of the tasks outlined in the budget narrative. Moreover, the qualifications and duties of each of the key personnel assigned to the project are clearly delineated (Pg. e53-59).

The management plan establishes a strong overall leader by providing a .75 FTE master's level Project Director who is well-qualified as evidenced by her resume outlining her background and expertise (pg. e60, 95-98). Moreover, key personnel are identified that demonstrate a strong and applicable experience in education, STEM, and teacher preparation (pg. e88-124).

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

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

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

Strengths:

(i) The applicant provides for both a formative and summative approach that is clearly aligned with the Logic Model inputs, activities, and outcomes establishing a cross-walk between the data to be collected and the project's objectives (pg. e64-65, 87). The design will allow for the collection of both qualitative (e.g., surveys, interviews) and quantitative (i.e., licensure, retention, sign-in sheets) data that will be used to determine program effectiveness (pg. e64-66).

(ii) The applicant outlines a well-developed mixed-methods evaluation design that are thorough, feasible, and appropriate for measuring if the outcomes (i.e., preparation, residency, induction components, mentors, and teacher portfolios) are being met. The proposed evaluation design is based on the collection of various qualitative and quantitative data that align with the goals and objectives and that will address the strategies outlined in the Logic Model (pg. e65-71, 87).

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:

None noted.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not discuss computer science.

Reader's Score: 0

Invitational Priority - Invitational Priority

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

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

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

Strengths:

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