

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/18/2019 12:16 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** University Corporation at Monterey Bay (U336S190006)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	40	32
<b>Adequacy of Resources</b>		
1. Resources	20	15
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	15
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	15
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	77
<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	82

# Technical Review Form

**Panel #8 - Teacher Quality Partnership - 9: 84.336S**

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

**Applicant:** University Corporation at Monterey Bay (U336S190006)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

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

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

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

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

### Strengths:

- The applicant details a rationale (e24-e28) that establishes that the area covered by the proposed project has shortages of prepared teachers in areas that are of particularly high need (i.e., high illiteracy, large percentages of high need students).
- Practices that POPPY proposes (i.e., recruiting trained teachers, providing additional training to current and future teachers) will address these needs. The applicant appropriately uses interventions that are research-based (e43)
- The outcomes in the logic model (e112) and, goals, objectives and outcomes in the workplan (e222-e289) are clearly specified (e.g., with percentage increase goals or other clearly specified targets) and measurable (e.g., counts of students, number of program coursework revised).
- A feature of the project is that the Continuous Improvement Data Team will be examining the data to determine whether goals are met (e44).
- The applicant demonstrates that the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield long-term results.
- The teacher training and professional development components will yield results for as long as the teachers are teaching in these areas (e45)
- The applicant will build internal capacity through using and improving existing resources and faculty (e45).
- The applicant established that they will have three teams (i.e., Executive Council, Leadership Team, Continuous Improvement Data Team, and Continuous Improvement District Team) that will include sustainability as part of their goal (e46).
- The applicant demonstrates the project represents an exceptional approach through its use of deliberate interdisciplinary partnering (e38-e39); and breaking down silos around different types of teacher education, credentialing, and development (e39); and iterative evidence-based improvement (e41-e42).

**Weaknesses:**

- The applicant did not specify in sufficient detail the methods or processes of recruitment of non-traditional populations so that adequacy could be determined.
- The applicant did not discuss in sufficient detail the living wage provided to participants so that adequacy could be determined. Discussing the terms of the living wage explicitly would allow for judgement of its sufficiency.

**Reader's Score: 32**

**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:**

- Committed partner resources are adequate for the project, some of which are delineated and matched with project goals in Table 1 (e75).
- The partners demonstrate their commitment to the proposed project in their letters of intent (e169-e219).
- The partner districts are relevant in that they all have high need students that could benefit from the project's services (e71), while the community colleges and CSUMB are relevant partners because they provide training, and college pathways to teaching (e72), as well as focused resources like CSUMB's MakerSpace, Monterey Bay Aquarium/Ocean Ed, or the Monterey Institute for English Learners.

**Weaknesses:**

- The applicant talked about departments or organizations that are going to be involved but did not give specifics about facilities or supplies that will be provided with enough specificity to determine adequacy. From the description provided we cannot determine what facilities will be provided by partner organizations, for example or what equipment or supplies will be provided.

**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 leadership team has appropriate specialties (e.g., SPED Program Coordinator, Secondary and Elementary Program Coordinators) for this project (e76), and several years of experience.
- The applicant has clearly planned what teams (and individuals that make up that team) are responsible for which goals (e77-e78) and they do plan on focusing on iterative improvement within the teams.
- The workplan clearly lays out objectives and activities that are related to larger project goals, as well as the timeline and responsible party for completing those goals and the milestones/outcomes for that goal (e222-e289).

**Weaknesses:**

- The applicant did not provide sufficient detail about how the PIs will manage the multiple teams across the length of the project to determine whether this portion of the management plan is adequate to achieve the objectives of the project.

**Reader's Score:** 15

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation****1. The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

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

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

**Strengths:**

- In Table 2 (e81-e), the applicant clearly pairs project goals and activities with the data sources that will be used to evaluate them. Much of this data comes from reliable sources (e.g., school records, or state standardized tests).
- The applicant intends to use a mixed methods approach, with a quasi-experimental design being the quantitative portion (e80).  
A QED is an appropriate design because it allows the applicant to measure the effect of the intervention by comparing the group receiving the intervention to a similar group that did not.  
The applicant intends to use propensity score matching or other methods to ensure baseline equivalence, which is appropriate to the design.
- Formative assessment is very much aligned with the program goals of continuous improvement (e82-e83).
- The applicant intends to measure both teacher and student outcomes, which addresses whether the intervention has an effect on the core need (i.e., poor achieving students because of a dearth of qualified teachers in some subjects) (e92).

**Weaknesses:**

- The evaluation design is not completely finalized (e81) so the study's final validity, reliability, and appropriateness cannot be fully determined.
- The exact measures used are not specified in some cases (e.g., surveys of prospective teachers on motivations for participating in the program and teaching).

**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 applicant has project design elements that will increase the numbers of educators prepared to deliver adequate STEM instruction.
- The applicant plans to do this through adding STEM experiences to current training, developing a computer science credential program (e30, 332-e33), providing current teachers with STEM professional development experiences (evidence-based professional development strategies for current STEM educators) (e30-e31).

**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:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**Reader's Score:**     **0**

---

**Status:**            Submitted

**Last Updated:**    06/18/2019 12:16 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/17/2019 05:42 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** University Corporation at Monterey Bay (U336S190006)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	40	30
<b>Adequacy of Resources</b>		
1. Resources	20	13
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	17
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	17
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	77
<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	82



# Technical Review Form

**Panel #8 - Teacher Quality Partnership - 9: 84.336S**

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

**Applicant:** University Corporation at Monterey Bay (U336S190006)

## 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 area has high LEA(s) and schools which are in desperate need of attracting and retaining quality teachers to reach their population of underrepresented poor minority students.

The project narrative provides adequate evidence that all five eligible partners are working together to solve this problem so that quality teachers can help improve students' achievement for these students.

Helping to train new teachers and retain quality teachers for these schools and this specific student population will help to improve student achievement, because research shows that when students know their teachers understand them and their culture academic scores improve.

The narrative provided some specificity concerning the previous initiatives which this new project can now build on. This will help this project to have a greater chance of being successful.

Because the narrative does provide a logic model which is informed by research and a work plan to help identify the key project components there is a likelihood that relevant outcomes will be successful.

The narrative provides detailed information on why this model is considered an exceptional approach. It is based on the research and practice of the Teacher Preparation Transformation Centers which develop, pilot, and scaffold teacher preparation practices which will help these candidates to become quality teachers, thus improving student achievement.

The work plan has goals, objectives, and outcomes that are specific and measurable. Each has associated activities, timelines, responsible parties and milestones which will help to ensure that all components will be completed on time and within budget.

The process is data driven and will use the data to make continuous improvements, thus driving continuous improvement and build capacity beyond the funding period. P24

There is evidence in Appendix J and the narrative that this project could continue beyond the period of federal funding. The work plan shows matching fund from partner districts and letters of support detailing services and contributions. Page 23

The marketing ventures to help attract, retain, and support prospective teachers from under-represented populations is somewhat vague. P29

There is adequate evidence the program has stringent criteria in place for these candidates as they interview and test to enter this program. P. 29

There is adequate evidence that the residency program is grounded in practice-based teaching preparation, has rigorous curriculum, and continuous support for these teachers based on the logic model. P30-32.

There is adequate evidence that the project has given thought to the requirements for these mentors. Research does show that mentors have a significant impact on the success rate for these teachers. P.37

Narrative does supply adequate information on the 2-year induction program.

#### **Weaknesses:**

The narrative does state that this recruitment effort will be through a variety of venues and locations that are not normally utilized to attract candidates of color. However, the narrative did not provide examples of venues or locations to strengthen this application. E13.

The narrative did not supply enough information on how this residency program will be marketed to possible teaching candidates from diverse background.

The reader could not locate information in the narrative concerning the one-year Living Wage Stipend, or the repayment program. She did find one line in Appendix J on page 8.

**Reader's Score: 30**

#### **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 narrative and the letters provided show there is great support for this project across all five goals.

All letters from partners state they are invested in this project and are committed to the goals.

Because all of the lead agencies and their associated resources are in full support, there is sufficient evidence to ensure the project's success.

**Weaknesses:**

There is not a clear list of activities, along with a timeline for the responsible parties. This is critical so all of the applicant organizations understand their part of the overall project.

There is not a clear chart which indicates the goals, resources, and which person or entity is responsible for that component. This includes pledges of matching support and equipment.

**Reader's Score: 13**

**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 narrative provides evidence of clearly defined roles for all parties and clearly delineated responsibilities. This will help so that the milestones and the goals will be accomplished on time and within budget.

The qualifications of the PI and other key personnel shows they are very qualified to administer a grant of this magnitude. Several key people have 20 to 30 years of executive grant funding experience.

**Weaknesses:**

There is limited evidence that this management team will use communication through various meetings throughout the year to provide continuous improvement to the process. This communication plan is crucial, so that the grant will be successful and will be within budget.

The meetings should be informed through data, which would then engage strategic planning to keep the project moving forward. e50-52

**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:**

The narrative supplied a chart on page 50 which elaborates on the activities and the associated milestones and outcomes. Each activity showed how they would collect, present, and analyze the data.

There is both qualitative data to measure progress on the Teacher Quality Program and also quantitative data which will measure progress or define measures of the project.

This is important because by using the data they can improve the progress and effectiveness of the grant. They can also use that data to make revisions and reforms so that they can complete this project within time and budget.

There is a chart on page 58 that shows the Project Goals, Activities, the Evaluation Methods and the Sources. There is a wide variety of evaluations in the project which include both summative and formative assessments. The formative assessments will help the group to make decisions which will drive the project forward. The summative assessments, such as a community survey, will help the team to know how close they are to meeting major goals. This chart will help to keep the grant on track and the team works to make those continuous improvements.

The grant does have an independent external evaluator. This will help to eliminate bias in the evaluation of the project.

### **Weaknesses:**

Since the evaluation plan has not been created yet, it is unclear how this evaluation plan will mesh with the management plan to engage and inform the stakeholders.

There is no timeline to show when the formative assessment data will be collected.

**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 narrative on page e30 did a thorough job of describing how this project will improve student achievement in the area of STEM, especially in the area of computer science.

**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:**

x

**Weaknesses:**

x

**Reader's Score:** 0

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 06/17/2019 05:42 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/17/2019 05:37 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** University Corporation at Monterey Bay (U336S190006)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	40	30
<b>Adequacy of Resources</b>		
1. Resources	20	15
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	15
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	14
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	74
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
1. STEM/Computer Science	5	3
<b>Sub Total</b>	5	3
<b>Invitational Priority</b>		
<b>Invitational Priority</b>		
1. Promise Zones	0	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	0	0
<b>Total</b>	105	77

# Technical Review Form

**Panel #8 - Teacher Quality Partnership - 9: 84.336S**

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

**Applicant:** University Corporation at Monterey Bay (U336S190006)

## 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 presents a compelling rationale for the proposed project. It clearly articulates the need for the project as Monterey County has the second largest English learner population in California, numerous rural schools, and teacher shortages which have led to hiring of individuals with intern credentials and provisional certification. A needs assessment was conducted with the 8 partnering LEAs to help inform the goals and focus of the proposed project. Finally, the applicant notes how the proposed project builds on existing projects and initiatives, such as its work with the National Center for Teacher Residencies, Teaching Works and its work on continuous quality improvement (pp. 21-28; 34-41).

(ii) The applicant clearly identifies five goals which will guide and inform its proposed project. For each goal, there are associated objectives and outcomes identified which are clearly specified and measurable. The logic model and in Appendix G and work plan in Appendix J provide details to demonstrate the alignment of goals, objectives and outcomes which are specific and measurable. (pp. 48-69)

(iii) The applicant proposes to build capacity and sustainability beyond the funding cycle by working in partnership with the 8 identified LEAs. For example, it proposes to co-create and co-deliver professional development with the partner districts, involve partnering districts in mentor teacher interview. The applicant notes it has three faculty members who are TeachingWorks Fellows who can provide training and support to the eight partner districts. By adding a fully online bilingual add-on credential and supporting special education paraprofessionals through the ACEIT Career Pathway Program, it will be able to continue to support underrepresented populations to teaching, particularly in high needs licensure areas and in rural areas. (pp. 44-46, 51, 55)

(iv) The applicant has some exceptional resources from which it can draw and build for the proposed project, such as strong partnerships with 8 LEAs, its work with the National Center for Teacher Residencies, a recently developed STEM observational rubric, and use of the Teacher Educator Practice Framework and collaboration with TeachingWorks (pp. 33-41).

**Weaknesses:**

(ii) For some of the objectives and outcomes listed for the five project goals, it is unclear what benchmarks or milestones will be required to achieve them in a timely manner as specified. For example, the applicant states it will obtain CSET science waivers as an objective or outcome for Goal 1, but it is unclear how or when this will be accomplished. Similarly, it proposes to create a Computer Science Credential by Year 5 but the intermediate objectives and outcomes to achieve this are not clearly identified. (pp. 48-51)

(iii) The applicant states it will recruit underrepresented populations to teach STEM, Computer Science, bilingual education and special education, but it does not present a compelling plan to achieve this stated goal. It is not clear how the two-year induction model will Monterey County or the year-long and evidence based professional development focused on STEM and literacy will be sustained after funding ends. (pp. 55, 60-63)

(iv) The applicant presents five goals and many objectives and outcomes, but it does not build a compelling case that its proposed approach is exceptional. While a letter of support and partnership is provided from Monterey County Office of Education and the other partnering LEAs, as well as the Monterey Institute for English Learners and the Center for Reading Diagnosis and Instruction, it fails to demonstrate the proposed goals or recruiting underrepresented populations, implementing a year-long residency and two-year induction model, professional development, and continuous improvement are to be achieved through an exceptional approach. (pp. 169-191)

**Reader's Score: 30**

**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 proposes to utilize the facilities of the University, as well as the equipment and supplies of its MakerSpace to support STEM across the curriculum. (p. 73)

(ii) The applicant presents commitment letters from each of the 8 partner LEAs, as well as other community partners, such as the Monterey Bay Aquarium. Not only do they offer support, but each partner also indicates how it will offer fiscal or concrete resources, such as the Aquarium's pledge of matched support. (pp. 73-75)

**Weaknesses:**

(i) The applicant does not clearly identify the specific facilities, equipment, supplies and other resources it will make available to the project. While it identifies divisions or units within the University, it is not clear how each of these will provide supplies and resources to benefit, not only the enrolled education candidates, but also the partnering LEAs and community partners. For example, while the applicant states 11 of its faculty members will support the project, it is not clear what facilities, equipment, and supplies will be made available to the partnering LEAs or other contributing partner agencies. (pp. 73-75)



**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:**

(i) The applicant presents a satisfactory management plan, including a PI and co-PI as well as two proposed continuous improvement teams. The work plan provides detailed plans of how the various proposed tasks will be accomplished on time and within budget, as well as responsible parties. (pp. 76-77)

#### **Weaknesses:**

(i) The applicant does not present a convincing case that its proposed management plan and organizational structure can be effectively managed by the PI and co-PI given the frequency of proposed meetings of two continuous improvement teams, leadership teams, district partners, etc. It seems many of the meetings and communication methods are not yet well-defined. The management plan seems to be heavily focused on the University faculty and candidates with more information and description needed concerning how partners will be engaged and active participants in the management plan. (pp. 76-77)

**Reader's Score:** 15

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

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

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

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

#### **Strengths:**

(i) The applicant proposes use of an external evaluator who will create a combined mixed methods design, using both quantitative and qualitative methods to assess the achievement of the five proposed goals. (pp. 80-93)

(ii) The applicant states it plans to conduct quarterly meetings with the external evaluator to inform data collection and analysis. (p. 83)

#### **Weaknesses:**

(i) The applicant does not clearly present a well-developed evaluation plan, but simply states it will be created by the external evaluator. In the table presented on page 81, the evaluation methods seem to be reporting quantitative data

on existing candidates rather than measuring the effectiveness of any specific recruitment strategies employed in the proposed project. It is unclear how the proposed evaluation plan will be interwoven with the proposed management plan to engage and inform all partners and stakeholders. (pp. 80-93)

(ii) Other than surveys concerning the induction model and the PD sessions, most of the data the applicant proposes to collect and analyze would already be available or collected on its education candidates or would be data already available from the partnering LEA Human Resources departments. While it proposes to annually and regularly conduct formative assessment, no clear plan is presented to ensure this occurs in a consistent and intentional manner. (pp. 80-93)

**Reader's Score: 14**

### **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 proposes to create pathways for computer science majors to pursue a career in teaching and create a computer science credential by year five. It also proposes to obtain CSET science waivers. It proposes to build on its implementation of a STEM observational instrument and provide equipment to support STEM across the curriculum through its MakerSpace.. (pp. 34; 48-51; 73)

#### **Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not identify or describe its proposed professional development as based on evidence-based strategies for current STEM educators or evidence-based retraining strategies for current educators seeking to transition to STEM fields.

**Reader's Score: 3**

### **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 applicable

**Weaknesses:**

not applicable

**Reader's Score:** 0

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 06/17/2019 05:37 PM