

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/14/2019 01:35 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Winthrop University (U336S190012)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	40	33
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Resources	20	20
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	18
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Sub Total	100	91
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. STEM/Computer Science	5	3
Sub Total	5	3
Invitational Priority		
Invitational Priority		
1. Promise Zones	0	0
Sub Total	0	0
Total	105	94

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Teacher Quality Partnership - 3: 84.336S

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Winthrop University (U336S190012)

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 identifies a detailed rationale. The applicant thoroughly describes plans to create a project designed to respond to the critical teacher shortage (e81). The applicant also provides a clear description of the supply/demand gap of teachers impacting their most impoverished districts and hard to staff content areas (e81). The need for this project is clearly further addressed in the application (e80-e81).

ii. The applicant adequately identifies specific project and program goals, objectives and measurable outcomes. For example, the applicant indicates three overall goals: (1) to promote higher levels of P-12 student learning; (2) to increase the number and effectiveness of teachers in the partner schools; (3) to provide better post-baccalaureate access to quality, clinically based teacher preparation through an innovative and impactful MAT residency program, including computer science training and professional development (e30). Specifically, the applicant indicates clear measurable objectives for teacher recruitment and for student achievement outcomes. The applicant further provided a detailed logic model highlighting the proposed objectives, inputs and connected them to measurable outcomes (e110-e112).

iii. The applicant has indicated sufficient evidence of plans designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance. For example, the applicant has noted a partnership with The Rex Institute, through the WU COE, which supports the WU-School Partnership Network (PN) – made up of the fifty schools and WU - that has sustained the collaborative work among WU and its ten partnership districts for over ten years (e33). The applicant specifically indicates a focused recruitment on three populations: 1) current undergraduate students not pursuing an education degree, especially those in STEM majors; 2) individuals who graduated from WU or another university with a non-education degree within the last five years; and 3) mid-career professionals wishing to pursue a teaching career (e37).

iv. The applicant provides sufficient information that represents an approach for meeting statutory purposes and requirements. For example, the applicant purports that the proposed project, in partnership with three rural LEAs with schools identified as SC “critical geographic schools,” will offer a MAT year-long residency designed to prepare teachers in SC’s “critical subject areas” of math, science, English, social studies (secondary and middle levels), Spanish and French languages, special education, physical education, as well as needed fields of early childhood (grades PK-3) and

elementary education (grades 2-6) —all providing an expedient option to add special education certification (e36). They have also identified clear strategies for promoting the program in their communities, including a search for non-instructional personnel who hold a bachelor's degree (e37); including the use of the campus Center for Career and Civic Engagement, which facilitates service learning, volunteer opportunities, community service, and career guidance activities, who will help share information about the MAT residency program to graduates who have shown interest in working in schools and rural communities (e38).

Weaknesses:

i. No weaknesses noted

ii. No weaknesses noted

iii. No weaknesses noted

iv. The proposed program does not represent an exceptional approach, workshops are not anything new and/or innovative in preparing teacher educators (e37).

Reader's Score: **33**

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

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

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

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

Strengths:

i. The applicant has provided solid documentation of the adequacy of support for facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources from the applicant (e48-e53). For example, the applicant clearly articulates that they are in partnership with the College of Education (COE) and the College of Arts and Sciences, who have committed to providing leadership (CAS) as well as facilities, technology and other resources needed to support the NetServe project (e48). This is a strong commitment to the project and will serve well to sustain the program post-funding (e48-e53). WU will provide matching funds from various budgets to facilitate the implementation and daily operation of NetSERVE (e49).

ii. The applicant has thoroughly identified strong partnerships that demonstrate a commitment in the proposed project towards the implementation and success. For example, the applicant indicates that Riley College of Education (COE) commits \$1,174,533 over the five-year grant period in addition to human capital resources that have been dedicated to the project (e49-e51). Additionally, the applicant notes that the SCDE Office of Personalized Learning is committed to providing access to national training on competency-based, transformative education to three cohorts (e53). The applicant has also sufficiently identified partners to assist with ensuring the residency program meets the needs of the educators (e35). For example, detailed letters of support specifying relationships, in-kind donations and commitments of partnerships are included (e158-e187). The applicant has also created a plan for reallocation of funding suggested by Prepared to Teach (e35). Furthermore, the applicant will assume the cost of travel to NetSERVE schools to support implementation of developmental competencies aligned with the Profile of the SC Graduate (e53). Detailed documented letters of support, outlining the specifics of each partners support are also included (e158-e187).

Weaknesses:

- i. No weaknesses noted

- ii. No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

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

Strengths:

i. The applicant provides a detailed program management and oversight plan designed to achieve the objectives of the project on time and within budget (e54-e63). The applicant clearly demonstrates that they have able personnel in place to carry out the goals and objectives of the proposal to a successful end. Careful delineation of roles and primary responsibilities makes the project more doable for the funding institution. For example, two co-PI's, and a Project Director, will organize and lead the groups' meetings and program implantation (e55). Other key personnel members' qualifications and functions within the proposed project are clearly outlined (e55-e57). Detailed job descriptions exist, providing responsibilities for each position (e114-e157).

A detailed program timeline is provided that links the objective milestones with the personnel and their major tasks/responsibilities; and provides the designation of year in which the activity will take place (e59-e63).

Weaknesses:

More clarity is needed on the role the MAT coordinator will play in the program planning and implementation. This person is only noted in the budget narrative in the appendix and not in the narrative alongside the other identified key personnel. If this person is to be a key player in the implementation of the overall program (as indicated in the budget narrative), it would be beneficial to note this individuals' role as part of the management plan (e54-e63).

Reader's Score: 18

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

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

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

Strengths:

i. The applicant provides robust evidence of an evaluation plan that will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes. For example, the applicant has contracted an outside evaluation company that appears to be well qualified and have thorough knowledge and experience in evaluation, research design, measurement, benchmarking, test and survey construction, data analysis and reporting (e63; e66). The applicant provides significant evidence that the evaluator will use a mixed-methods, utilization-focused evaluation approach that combines multiple quantitative and qualitative data sources from multiple reporters for triangulation, thereby significantly enhancing the validity and reliability of the evaluation (e63). In addition, it is clearly noted in the application that the standardized instruments being used for assessing student achievement, have had acceptable levels of reliability and validity established by national publishers. Therefore, they meet the WWC design standard requirement for measurements. Furthermore, it is noted that a priori power analysis indicates that they proposed in the study has enough statistical power to accurately test for program effects on science, math, and ELA at the .05 level of significance (e64).

ii. A thorough evaluation process and measures plan for evaluating this project is provided from recruitment to induction (e63-e69). Goals and objectives are clearly presented and supported by both quantitative and qualitative collections of data. Types of data, data sources, personnel responsible, and data analysis information are detailed (e63-e69). For example, hierarchical linear modeling (HLM) will be utilized to examine the impact of the NetSERVE program on student achievement. Additionally, the analysis model will examine student achievement scores nested within teachers nested within schools. Also, the level one factors (students) will include free-and reduced-lunch status, gender, ethnicity, and baseline achievement test scores; while, level two factors (teachers) will include years of experience, hire date, gender, and ethnicity. Further, the level three factors (schools) will include school percent free and reduced-lunch status, and school percent minority. To rule out internal threats to conclusion validity, matched cases will be established for teachers who have not participated in the NetSERVE program (e68).

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:

The applicant distinctly notes that recruitment will be directed to all critical subject areas. Elementary and middle/secondary level STEM teachers will be recruited to participate in Computer Science (CS) training to integrate CS into their curricula and, for middle/secondary level, to teach a course in support of SC's implementation of new CS Standards (e36). For example, the applicant specifies that the proposed project residents will focus on STEM competencies, including critical thinking, problem-solving, communication, information, media and technology in a summer workshop. In addition to becoming familiar with the CS Standards, it will be embedded within the coursework (e26). Classroom teachers will receive summer workshops focusing on CS and STEM (e26).

Weaknesses:

The STEM inclusion, specifically in CS, is only through a summer professional development and not throughout the project. Therefore, it is not clear what is to be learned in the workshop or how it will be used in the classroom after the workshop (e37).

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:

No strengths noted

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not apply to this competitive priority preference.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/14/2019 01:35 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/14/2019 03:39 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Winthrop University (U336S190012)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	40	35
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Resources	20	18
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	18
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Sub Total	100	91
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. STEM/Computer Science	5	2
Sub Total	5	2
Invitational Priority		
Invitational Priority		
1. Promise Zones	0	0
Sub Total	0	0
Total	105	93

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Teacher Quality Partnership - 3: 84.336S

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Winthrop University (U336S190012)

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 articulates project to advancing quality teacher effectiveness built on sustained engagement (e21). The rationale for project design is apt and well connected.
- (iii) The applicant thoroughly demonstrates practical opportunities for participant professional development (e27-28) that provide participates with critical teaching skills, strong mentorship, and professional development throughout the program that will build capacity and increase investment. This project provides inductees several 'touch points' to critically reflect on and adjust their teaching practice throughout the induction phase.
- (iii): The program design clearly outlines modes for sustainability (e29) beyond Federal financial assistance.

Weaknesses:

- (ii): The application only cursorily showcases program components related to computer-science integration. As a stated project goal, these instructional activities listed and their implementation strategies are not well designed (e21) or connected to induction activities in a way that support the overall goals of this program (e20-21), and STEM focus seems ancillary.
- (ii): Program design for participants as being 60% online (e22) in an effort to "maximize practical learning" (e37), is not fully explained or thoroughly connected to program goals or objectives.

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): The application clearly demonstrates the commitment of partners through specific and institution-focused letters of support and each outlines the specific roles and responsibilities for each partner (e33-34). The letters incorporate data to show 100% match (e29) as is the requirement for TQP grant. They are also augmented by a networked approach that amplifies the strengths of each partner and the applicant aligns data shared regarding participant stipend to cost-benefit analyses related to historic reallocation and deficits in spending that occur as a result of teacher turnover (e35). This data-backed information offers clear understanding of how project implementation will impact traditionally negative resource use and waste.

Weaknesses:

• (ii): The application requires clarity about how several 'part-time' partners (e49) will commit to the overall vision of the project. The application requires more synergy as it relates to bringing together these particularly entities in a more cohesive manner.

Reader's Score: 18

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

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

Strengths:

• (i): The application provides thorough and detailed timelines/projections for recruitment (e38), as well as relevant partnership roles/duties (e41-42) for the leadership team to effectively facilitate the project, are well-aligned to project goals, objectives and outcomes. The applicant clearly articulates a trajectory for milestone achievement and progression (e59-63) with varied inputs for stakeholder responsibilities. These inputs showcase strong intentionality in ensuring management team advances the goals and objectives of the project from year one to year five.

Weaknesses:

• (i): In one portion of the application (e57), no MAT Coordinator is listed, but later in the Appendix (e207) there is one mentioned. As this is a key personnel member of the management team, it is difficult to judge the appropriateness of the role without clearer expectations.

Reader's Score: 18

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

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

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

Strengths:

- (i): The applicant provides an exceptionally detailed alignment between NetServe goals, GPRA, and realistic measures of program evaluation (e30-33). The measures and projected outcomes show growth over time and are multimodal and appropriate for the in-depth nature of the proposed project.
- (ii): The applicant clearly articulates the role and proposed duties of an external reviewer to guide evaluation processes (e63) and research questions that are aligned with program goals (e63), which emphasize that formative (process) and summative evaluation are appropriate and follows trends for evaluating graduate residency programs. The research design includes ongoing assessment of content, mentorship, and infuses student achievement data as baselines for progress and growth.

Weaknesses:

No weakness 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:

- (increasing number of educators): The applicant has infused one computer science course (via mini certification) into induction process and it is viable for increasing awareness of STEM strategies in the classroom.

Weaknesses:

- (adequately prepared for rigorous instruction): The application mentions STEM integration through professional development only, but no practical experiences (e26) or problem-based activities situate the learning experience. Additionally, application makes no mention of university personnel, leadership team member or key staff with STEM expertise. It appears the primary mode of STEM integration is via contracted and limited professional development. This type of content implementation will not be enough to prepare educators who are ready to lead rigorous instruction.

Reader's Score: 2

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 provides data displaying all LEAs and school districts serve students in five opportunity zones (e17) and program responds to invitation priority to serve students in high-needs areas.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: **0**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/14/2019 03:39 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/14/2019 04:31 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Winthrop University (U336S190012)

Reader #3: *****

	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	18
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Sub Total	100	93
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. STEM/Computer Science	5	4
Sub Total	5	4
Invitational Priority		
Invitational Priority		
1. Promise Zones	0	0
Sub Total	0	0
Total	105	97

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Teacher Quality Partnership - 3: 84.336S

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Winthrop University (U336S190012)

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 proposal clearly defines a detailed rationale for the grant. The authors provide statistical data that identify the critical teacher shortage of highly qualified teachers available to teach in mostly impoverished districts located in South Carolina (e81). The teacher shortage is especially critical in areas of math and science where many classrooms are being staffed with uncertified teachers (e81). To further magnify the critical teacher shortage, teacher turnover rates average about 14% (e81).

ii. The project provides a set of well-defined goals and objectives with clearly measurable outcomes. The goals identified in this proposal are the following: (1) to promote higher levels of P-12 student learning; (2) to increase the number and effectiveness of teachers in the partner schools; (3) to provide better post-baccalaureate access to quality, clinically based teacher preparation through an innovative and impactful MAT residency program, including computer science training and professional development (e30). Outcome measures in proposal that directly address the project rationale of eliminating the critical teacher shortage are that in Years 2-5, at least 95% of NetSERVE teachers will meet state certification and licensure requirements and will be hired by the high-need LEA to teach high-need schools. This will be evaluated using the South Carolina (SC) licensure/certification documentation and district hiring records by school level and high-need status (e32). A detailed logic model is provided in the proposal (e110-e112).

iii. The proposal provides evidence of plans designed to build capacity that the results of the project will yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance. The project will support the WU-School Partnership Network (PN) – made up of the fifty schools and WU - that has sustained the collaborative work among WU and its ten partnership districts for over ten years (e33). Detailed letters of support are provided specifying commitments of partnerships to the program (e158-e187).

iv. The proposal does represent an exceptional approach for meeting statutory purposes and requirements. The highlight and uniqueness of the program are the emphasis on community engagement along with cultural responsiveness in their teacher training program (e38). The NETSERVE program is a MAT residence program, in partnership with three high need LEAs in South Carolina. The MAT course work will be delivered 60% online and 40% face-to-face to promote access and maximize time in the school. Both COE and CAS faculty are well trained and are required to have an Online

Teaching Certification. The recruitment efforts will focus on three well defined populations: 1) current undergraduate students not pursuing an education degree, especially those in STEM majors; 2) individuals who graduated from WU or another university with a non-education degree within the last five years; and 3) mid-career professionals who are wishing to pursue a teaching career (e37).

Weaknesses:

- i. No weaknesses noted
- ii. Limited exposure computer science content only through workshops. Therefore, due to this limited exposure to CS content it is very difficult to see how teachers will be able to integrate CS skills into the classroom curriculum.
- iii. No weaknesses noted
- iv. No weaknesses noted

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. The proposal provides documented sufficient support for facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources from the applicant (e48-e53). The collaboration between the College of Education and College of Arts and Sciences will spearhead the leadership for the project along with providing the facilities, technology and other resources needed to support the NetServe project (e48). WU will provide matching funds from various budgets to facilitate the implementation and daily operation of NetSERVE (e49).

ii. The proposal provides letters of support, outlining the specifics of each partners support (e158–e187). The College of Education (COE), for example, will commit \$1,174,533 over the five-year grant period in addition to human capital resources that have been dedicated to the project (e49-e51). The SCDE Office of Personalized Learning is committed to providing access to national training on competency-based, transformative education to three cohorts from each NetSERVE LEA.

Weaknesses:

- i. No weaknesses noted
- ii. No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

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

Strengths:

i. The authors of the proposal provide a detailed management plan that highlights the roles and responsibilities of each of the participants in the project (e54-e63). Resumes are also provided indicating key personnel's qualifications (e74-e86). A detailed timeline is provided linking milestones with the personnel and their major tasks. Furthermore, activities that will take place during the school year are provided in details in the timeline (e59-e63).

Weaknesses:

i. Several of the key personnel on the leadership team for the project have not been hired (e49). There are no milestones listed on how they plan to recruit and or hire individuals for these positions. MAT Coordinator for example, has not been identified, and the hiring of this individual is not listed as a milestone.

Reader's Score: 18

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

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

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

Strengths:

i. The proposal presents a well-planned evaluation model. Data collected will both formative and summative outcome measures. Similarly both quantitative and qualitative data sources will be used. The authors paid a lot of attention to validity and reliability of outcome measures. Furthermore, the authors also addressed the issue of statistical power to accurately test for program effects on science, math, and ELA at the .05 level of significance (e64).

ii. The goals and objectives are clearly defined and measurable which is an essential element in the evaluation process. The evaluation model proposed for this project is hierarchical linear modeling (HLM), which makes sense given the program design. In this case the evaluator propose to have student achievement scores nested within teachers' scores nested within schools' scores will be the platform. The advantage of using HLM is that individuals tend to share certain characteristics that ordinary least squares regression does not account for and HLM does.

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:

In addressing CPP1, the project plan do the following: (1) Increase the pool of highly qualified STEM teachers (2) Increase Educational Technology support for students (3) Provide teacher training in Computer Science content along with skills to integrate this knowledge in the classroom. In addition to becoming familiar with the CS Standards, these standards will be embedded into the curriculum being taught at the middle and high school level (e26).

Classroom teachers will receive summer workshops focusing on CS and STEM (e26).

Weaknesses:

Limited exposure to CS content. In this case, participates will only receive summer workshops focusing on CS and STEM (e26).

Reader's Score: 4

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:

Did not address

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/14/2019 04:31 PM