

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/14/2019 04:09 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Frostburg State University (U336S190008)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	40	35
<b>Adequacy of Resources</b>		
1. Resources	20	20
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	16
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	91
<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	96

# Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - Teacher Quality Partnership - 5: 84.336S

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

Applicant: Frostburg State University (U336S190008)

## 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 project proposal aligns with Maryland state policy by addressing a teacher shortage. For example, the proposal cites that over 60% of new teachers hired are recruited by LEAs from outside of the State (p. e27).
- In addition to this rationale, the proposal also reasons that the project will also address the achievement gap in the state by building the capacity of the teacher workforce. (p. e27).
- The proposal notes that a shortage of teachers in STEM-C areas, the unbalanced distribution of qualified teachers, and the low-performing status of the partnering LEAs demonstrates the urgent need for high-impact interventions to recruit and retain qualified teachers. (p. e28).
- The proposal includes a logic model for the project, which makes clear the project goals, and objectives to drive the work of the project and shows how the project goals and objectives are aligned with each other (p. e30).
- The logic model specifically refers to the aim of building capacity through the teacher pathways. (p. e30).
- Moreover, through the pathways and the teacher residencies, the co-construction and co-delivery of shared curriculum, instruction, and assessment are designed to build institutional capacities through the project (p. e50).
- The proposal also demonstrates for meeting the purposes of the grant through the incorporation of accelerated learning experiences for pre-service teachers, the use of micro-credentials embedded in assessments and the collective network improvement community that supports the participants (p. e51-e53). These ambitious supports for the teachers along with the general focus on the computer science education, suggests that the project's approach meets the purpose of the grant in an exceptional way.

The logic model specifically refers to the aim of building capacity through the teacher pathways. (p. 9). Moreover, through the pathways and the teacher residencies, the co-construction and co-delivery of shared curriculum, instruction, and assessment are designed to build institutional capacities through the project (p. 28).

The proposal also demonstrates for meeting the purposes of the grant through the incorporation of accelerated learning experiences for pre-service teachers, the use of micro-credentials embedded in assessments and the collective network improvement community that supports the participants (p. 30-32).

**Weaknesses:**

- The proposal does not make clear how the project will build capacity and support results beyond the term of the grant.
- In addition, the proposal does not make evident how the mentor and coach roles are different. These distinctions would suggest how the specific roles are supporting the teacher-learners in a complementary manner.

**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 proposal demonstrates that the project will have adequate resources to carry out this work, such as the resources of the university and the support of the LEAs and researchers at the university. (p. e55-e56).
- To ensure that there is demonstrated commitment from the partners, the proposal includes letters of support as evidence of their commitment (appendix). These include the use of supplies and facilities, such as how it was spelled out by the Garrett County Public Schools' letter (p. e121).
- Moreover, the proposal is building upon existing collaborative efforts and notes 100% of matching funding (appendix).

**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 proposal includes a management plan on p. e62, which includes the goals and objectives of the project. The objectives are aligned with the overall goals of the project, which suggests addressing the objectives will further the goals

of the project.

- In addition, the objectives have accompanying benchmarks that serve as milestones for the project. Furthermore, the benchmarks are allocated to a responsible member of the project personnel to suggest a level of accountability in the project.
- Plus, the management plan includes a timeline that suggests when project milestones will be completed and in what sequence the work will be accomplished. Furthermore, the timeline is reasonable

**Weaknesses:**

- The milestones that are listed in the management plan were overly general in some cases. For example, the second objective for goal two states that conducting a training is one of the benchmarks. (p. e62). This makes it difficult to know what specifically would constitute completion of an activity.
- There is a discrepancy related to the amount of time that will be dedicated to the project by the assessment and research associates. In the narrative on page e64, it states 100% for both. However, in the budget, one of the associates will be 80%. Either amount of time might be appropriate, but clarity might be important for managing the project.

**Reader's Score: 16**

**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 proposal states that MN Associates will serve as the external evaluator (p. e66). This suggests that an experienced, independent evaluator can carry out the plan as intended.
- The evaluation will collect quantitative and qualitative data that is generated from programmatic sources, such as teacher retention data as well as through the evaluator's involvement, such as focus groups (p. e65-e66).
- In addition, valid and reliable performance data will be collected to address evaluation questions (p. e65).
- The evaluation is aligned with the logic model and intends to provide both summative and formative functions within the project (p. e65-e68).
- The evaluation plan and timeline related to the evaluation (p. e69) as well as the prior experience of the evaluation team suggests that the methods are feasible and aligned with the overall goals of the project. (p. e69).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 20**

**Priority Questions**

## Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

### **Strengths:**

- The proposal states that the project will include targeted strategies in addressing this particular competitive preference priority. First, the project aims to increase STEM-C educators through the delivery of a re-engineered MAT in Science and Mathematics and the delivery of a new MAT program in Computer Science.
- Also, the project addresses the need to integrate mathematic problem solving and computational thinking across all MAT programs to promote scientific inquiry in partnering elementary and secondary schools. (p. 3).

### **Weaknesses:**

- The proposal is lacking specific details with respect to instructional practices to support the preparation of STEM-C educators in the design of the project. This suggests that the teachers may be prepared with STEM-C disciplinary knowledge, but not necessarily the pedagogical knowledge to support STEM-C learning.

**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:**

Applicant does not address this priority.

### **Weaknesses:**

Applicant does not address this priority.

**Reader's Score: 0**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 06/14/2019 04:09 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/12/2019 07:38 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Frostburg State University (U336S190008)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	40	34
<b>Adequacy of Resources</b>		
1. Resources	20	20
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	16
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	90
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
1. STEM/Computer Science	5	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	93



# Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - Teacher Quality Partnership - 5: 84.336S

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

Applicant: Frostburg State University (U336S190008)

## 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 proposed project addresses the state's requirement for coordination across five main policy areas, including high-quality and diverse teachers and leaders (p. e27).
- Data indicating a teacher shortage in the STEM areas across Maryland supports the need for the proposed project (p. e27).
- Student achievement data reflect a need among the partner LEAs for increasing performance in the STEM areas, which also suggests a need for highly-qualified teachers in these areas (p. e28).
- The applicant has outlined short-term and long-term outcomes to correspond with each project goal and objective (p. e29).
- The applicant includes a logic model to illustrate the potential impact of the proposed project at the individual, institutional, and community levels (p. e32).
- The applicant includes the development of the Accelerated MegaCommunity to expand learning experiences and address the need for capacity-building (p. e44).
- The proposed project includes multiple approaches to improve teacher preparation, effectiveness, and teacher retention (p. e52). Specific opportunities to expand teacher content knowledge and effective instructional practices in computational thinking, mathematical problem solving, culturally responsive teaching, and high leverage practices across disciplines are included to strengthen the potential for overall success (p. e52). These collective strategies represent an exceptional approach for meeting the requirements. Multiple methods for enhancing access to content and practices are provided to participants, which also increases the likelihood of retaining the information and utilizing it in instructional practices.

**Weaknesses:**

- The applicant mentions plans to build capacity through professional development and career advancement ladders without any specifics on what funding will be needed to sustain efforts after the initial period of Federal financial assistance (p. e32-e33). Some mention is made of cost-effective strategies to continue long-term, but there are few specific details connecting ongoing needs with potential funding needs and sources long-term (p. e49-50).

**Reader's Score: 34**

**Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources**

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

- The applicant provides sufficient evidence of adequate facilities through the higher education institution and partners to effectively implement the proposed project (p. e56).
- Commitment letters from partners demonstrate evidence of financial support and leadership necessary to ensure that project tasks are carried out effectively (p. e56-e57). The letters include ways in which each partner will support the tasks in the proposed project and show a firm commitment to ensuring that the project is successful.
- Proposed project goals are consistent with the core principles of the partners included, which illustrates evidence of a commitment to address the stated priorities (p. e57).
- The applicant cites relevant examples of expertise among the partners to enhance project implementation (p. e58). For example, the co-development of the Educator Career Ladders is one effort that demonstrates the possibility for long-term partner commitment (p. e58).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were 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 use of the MA Executive Committee to facilitate collaboration, oversee processes, and review inputs and outputs depicts an adequate approach to project oversight and management (p. e60). Bi-weekly meetings of this committee provide a forum for monitoring progress and assessing the effectiveness of major project tasks (p. e60).
- Qualifications are included for key project managers and personnel to provide evidence of leadership and expertise needed to oversee the implementation of proposed project tasks (p. e61-e64).
- An implementation plan provides overall guidance in carrying out the objectives of the proposed project on time (p. e62).

**Weaknesses:**

- Some milestones within the management plan are stated in general terms, and as a result, it is not clear specifically what activities would need to be completed for each objective to ensure that they are properly and effectively implemented. For example, goals 2 and 3 contain two objectives each. In the milestones listed, examples are implement program and conduct training in years 3-5 (p. e62). It is not immediately clear what the incremental steps are implementing these two project tasks in particular.
- There is a lack of consistency in the amount of personnel noted as research associates. On page e64, both are listed at 100 percent time on the project, but on pages e143 and e144 one is listed as 80 percent rather than 100 percent. As a result, there is some confusion about this time allocation.

**Reader's Score: 16**

**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:**

- Formative and summative data will be collected from internal and external sources to assess degree to which outcomes are realized (p. e65).
- Use of surveys, interviews, focus groups, and pre-post evaluations provide a mechanism to examine the effectiveness of key project activities as they related to the goals, objectives, and outcomes (p. e65).
- The applicant includes specific techniques for analyzing quantitative and qualitative data, including multi-linear regression and thematic pattern matching (p. e66). These methods will increase access to valid and reliable performance data that can be analyzed over the course of the proposed project.
- Research questions are clearly connected to the project goals to establish clarity in what needs exist and how they are being addressed (p. e67).
- The comprehensive evaluation plan provides a clear picture of how each goal will be examined (p. e69).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were noted.

**Reader's Score:** 20

**Priority Questions**

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

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

**Strengths:**

- The applicant intends to increase the educators available in STEM-C through program development in science, math, and computer science (p. 3).
- Curriculum and clinical experiences incorporated into the proposed project build on computer science principles and existing statewide and national efforts to build computer science programs (p. 4).

**Weaknesses:**

- There is little description of how the actual instruction will convey content and instructional practices in computer science. More explanation is needed to determine how the strategies will improve student achievement or other educational outcomes in computer science, specifically.

**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:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**Reader's Score:** 0

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 06/12/2019 07:38 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/11/2019 03:57 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Frostburg State University (U336S190008)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	40	34
<b>Adequacy of Resources</b>		
1. Resources	20	20
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	16
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	90
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
1. STEM/Computer Science	5	3
<b>Sub Total</b>	5	3
<b>Invitational Priority</b>		
<b>Invitational Priority</b>		
1. Promise Zones	0	
<b>Sub Total</b>	0	
<b>Total</b>	105	93

# Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - Teacher Quality Partnership - 5: 84.336S

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

Applicant: Frostburg State University (U336S190008)

## 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 has provided substantial support for the project that will impact 43 new teachers, 138 induction mentors and coaches, and 4500 P-12 students in high-need rural communities in several high-need areas. The project is aligned with Maryland's Commission on Innovation and Excellence in Education blueprint on specific educational needs to support the State's schools. (e27) Teacher shortages in general, attrition, and critical STEM-C teacher shortages were designated as key impacts on quality education for the future. Achievement gaps are evident as is the high FRL statistics for the state. (e28)
- Key partners include Frostburg State University, high-need rural public school districts and individual schools and the FSU Professional Development Schools Network. (e17)
- A Needs Assessment has been provided that supports the above-mentioned areas as well as the concerns of poorly prepared educators and lack of streamlined career pathways for teachers. (Appendix C e78-82) Of particular concern, and addressed in the proposal, is the high incidence of recruitment outside the State, high turnover rates with half of second year teachers not returning, and the number of out-of-area teachers. Less than 32% of computer science, mathematics and science teachers are prepared in the State. Teacher shortages are a commonality to all partner LEAs as are teacher opportunity and achievement gaps. (e78-82) Additionally, the applicant has demonstrated that not less than 33% of the children served by the LEAs are children from low-income families. (e81)
- The goals, objectives and outcomes are aligned with current research in practice and clinical models and national and state standards of excellence in educator preparation. Objectives in meeting the needs of special populations of students have been addressed. The applicant provides a clear outline of all aspects of the MA program. (e32-48)
- Three high-tech, high-touch innovative models, accelerated teaching residencies, and accelerated teacher-leader pathways have been outlined in the Logic Model. (e89-90) The Logic Model provides inputs, resources, and activities, as well as outputs with short- and long-term outcomes. Of particular interest is the attention to the needs in the critical shortage areas and the movement toward National Board Certification by the end of the program. The applicant has also included Maryland Accelerates' Logic Model (e31) and Table 2 (e34) to support alignment of the two programs.
- The program does build capacity and yield sustainable results through its alignment with Maryland Accelerates and existing partnerships between IHE and high-need LEAs. Rigorous selection of qualified mentors and an ongoing professional development plan help ensure that capacity and sustainable results are supported. (e35) A 100% match

commitment is provided by the partners. An executive committee comprised of representatives from all partnerships will be in place to develop action plans, monitor grant activities and research, and ensure shared resources. (e49--50) To further support sustainability, the applicant will establish nationally networked improvement communities. (e50) Further, the use of career ladders, completion of the MAT, and opportunities for national Board certification will serve to support sustainability. (e50-51)

- The applicant has provided evidence of innovation through the use of mega-communities to initiate and execute the various components of the proposal. Partnering districts that make up the mega-communities plan and monitor the project collaboratively and will be able to share facilities, resources, and personnel to achieve the desired goals of the project. The stakeholders' efforts, aligned with the overarching goals of Maryland Accelerates makes for a cohesive manner in which to recruit, train, and maintain a qualified teaching staff.

#### **Weaknesses:**

- The inclusion and roles of faculty in the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences is generally presented. Other than a place on the P20 Executive Advisory Council, the recruitment and roles of members of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences are not well delineated. (e63) Specific roles and expectations are not specified. The application would be strengthened with such delineation. (e54)
- There is no mention of the continuation of cohort groups post-funding. This fact could serve to make educational achievement gradually lower in the years following funding. The application would be strengthened by commitments to continue cohorts, even if it meant fewer numbers and/or smaller stipends. (e35-51)
- The length of residency is somewhat confusing. Most sections suggest an 18-month residency, however, the abstract and headings suggest a year-long residency. Eliminating this inconsistency would strengthen understanding of the project's residency goals. (e17; e23)
- Overall, the design of the proposal is generally written using much repetition and many catch phrases. The proposal would be strengthened by offering particular examples. For instance, the methodology for instructing diverse populations might be improved by briefly outlining a model such as SIOP or outlining the protocol used to strengthen students' computational skills.
- It is confusing as to the roles of the Teacher Leader/Mentor and the Teacher Leader/Coach. Specifying their expectations would help justify the amount budgeted and eliminate any confusion as to role.
- The design explanation for recruitment, in particular for minority candidates, is vague. Providing a more specific plan for recruitment of a diverse candidate pool would be beneficial in assuring that qualified and diverse cohorts of candidates will be trained and prepared to teach in schools with diverse populations of students.

**Reader's Score: 34**

#### **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 partners have committed to 100% funding match. (e56) The adequacy of physical resources and facilities to support educational achievement is supported by the University's accreditation status which includes proof of adequacy. (e56)



- Letters of commitment from leaders of Frostburg State University and the LEAs, with in-kind match that exceeds the 100% match requirement described, are provided. (e118-128) For instance, two letters of support are provided for the Frederick County Public Schools: one that verbalizes the support and a second that outlines the match support for the LEA. (e118-119)
- The in-kind match is appropriate. Much of the human capital commitment is in the form of in-kind match which is consistent with the requirements for the grant. (e56-57)
- Vitae of those in primary leadership roles are provided. (e92-117) All appear to be qualified with the necessary education, experience, and commitment to the project. For example, Dr. Huang will serve as Director of the project. He is an Associate Professor and Associate Dean of the School of Education at Coppin State University. He is also a well-known researcher and currently leads an initiative to provide designated pathways to teaching. (e92-93)

**Weaknesses:**

- No weaknesses noted in the application.

**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:**

- A detailed management plan exists that involves partners in the development, execution, data collection and analysis, and review of the project. Three committees of multi-partners will support the goals of the project: The MA Executive Committee will facilitate collaboration, oversee processes, and review inputs and outcomes. A Teaching Residency Committee will support faculty experts and placements of the residency program. The Teacher-Leader Committee will support new teachers with professional development and initiative tasks. (e60) Each will have regular meetings to support implementation and evaluation according to the goals, objectives, and outcomes provided. Quarterly updates will be provided. (e60) The Maryland Accelerates Institute will be utilized to provide professional development and services for recruitment, training, and retention. (e61)
- The PI and Co-PI appear to have the necessary credentials and have been given appropriate time for administering their responsibilities. (e61; e91-117) The experiences and expectations for the Project Coordinator align with the 100% time commitment for the individual. (e-64) Coordinators are assigned for each element of the proposal. The roles are supported by the time allotment for each. (e63) An external evaluator is assigned with the necessary credentials to provide a thorough evaluative process. (e64; e114)

**Weaknesses:**

- Tables 1, 3 and 6 (e24; e35; e62) discuss establishing measures and expectations for the residency program; yet the plan is to implement in the summer of 2020. It is unclear if six months is a long enough time period for start-up plans, creation of the Mega-Community, and selection of the first cohort to be initiated. The timeline for start-up tasks is provided and specifies that cohort 1 will begin in year one. Yet beginning a cohort in year one is in question because much of the MAT and recruitment planning has not yet been accomplished. Providing only six months for that planning and obtaining all approvals is optimistic. (e62)
- The narrative and budget narrative state that two full-time assessment and research associates will be hired to

drive the evaluation of the project. However, one section states that the associates will be full time while the budget indicates that one of the associates is full time and one is 80% time. The salary for the full time associate is less than that of the 80% time individual. The brief job descriptions are different. There needs to be more description of the roles of each of these individuals and the qualifications of the individuals. If the individuals are not yet hired, a job description would be beneficial. (e64; e143-144)

- The management plan for the evaluation system is vaguely presented. Management systems for housing, analyzing, and disseminating data and results are not well-explained. It is uncertain where the data be housed and how it will be utilized for the purpose of evaluating the outcomes of the project. (e64-70)

**Reader's Score: 16**

### **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:**

- A comprehensive Assessment and Evaluation Plan has been presented that provides the goals, objectives and activities of the project, then showcases the evaluation, sources, and outcomes evaluated. (e69) The evaluation system appears to be supported by the use of research methods such as TAP-IT and the work of Bryk in school improvement and program implementation. (e64-e65)
- Formative and summative assessments will be utilized from internal and external sources. Alignment of these measures with current standards and practice supports their selection. (e65)
- An external evaluator, with abundant experience and expertise evaluating nationally funded projects, will be used to assess the impact of the project. Both quantitative and qualitative measures will be utilized and supported through a mixed-methods, quasi-experimental design. (e65-70) The total contractual commitment for the evaluator is approximately 8% of the direct cost, which appears reasonable. (e144)
- The applicant has supported the validity and reliability of the data by the development of key research and evaluation questions which foster each of the goals of the project. (e66-68) All partners will be included in the collection and review of the analysis of the data results with dissemination to respective committees, stakeholders, the US Department of Education, and the project leaders. (e67)
- GPRA evaluation requirements are in place with completion and retention percentages around 85% which is reasonable. (e70) Action research and EdTPA measures will assess student learning during the time of the project as compared to statewide peers, thus strengthening the evaluation model.

#### **Weaknesses:**

- No weaknesses noted in the application.

**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:**

- Three strategies will be utilized to increase the number of educators in STEM and computer science fields and to strengthen their training and development in those fields. A Masters of Arts in Teaching will be developed, problem solving and computational thinking will be highlighted, and culturally responsive instruction and practice will be employed. (e24-26)
- Recruitment will follow three graduate pathways: field, LEAs, and IHEs.

### **Weaknesses:**

- Specifics as to recruitment requirements are not provided.
- Since the MAT is not yet developed, it is difficult to know the specifics for instruction, other than following standards, in the STEM and the computer science fields or training for culturally responsive instruction. This lack of clarification poses questions about the applicant's ability to fully meet CP 1.

**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:**

### **Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score:**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 06/11/2019 03:57 PM