

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/17/2019 09:44 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Georgia State University Research Foundation, Inc. (U336S190026)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	40	30
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Resources	20	20
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	20
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Sub Total	100	90
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. STEM/Computer Science	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Invitational Priority		
Invitational Priority		
1. Promise Zones	0	0
Sub Total	0	0
Total	105	95

Technical Review Form

Panel #6 - Teacher Quality Partnership - 7: 84.336S

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Georgia State University Research Foundation, Inc. (U336S190026)

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 effectively demonstrated that the proposed project is aligned with a clearly defined and sound rationale. For example, the applicant indicated that the proposed project adopted the Transtheoretical Model of Theory of Change recognizing that learning takes place over a series of developmental steps at all P-12 and university levels. The project will focus on three key aspects of the model: deepening knowledge, changing values, and developing skills. The three key components are important because it will allow more time in the school setting for candidates to master content knowledge. The applicant indicated that the program was developed around the research of the best practices of the residency model for training teachers. For example, the applicant cited several research-based sources used to develop the Teacher Residency framework which will integrate co-teaching and a cohort structure based on the foundation of school-based professional learning communities. The applicant's proposed program will provide residency candidates theoretical knowledge and contextualized experiential learning to support the development of effective teachers. (pgs. e39-40)

(ii) The applicant provided eight comprehensive goals with associated objectives and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project. All of the objectives associated with each goal are aligned with GPRA indicators and measurable performance outcomes. For example, the primary goal for the project is to increase the number of highly qualified teachers who are committed to high-need schools, in urban and rural settings. Project activities associated with the goal are to guide participants through a traditional residency model and a paraprofessional-to-teacher residency. The applicant indicated that performance measures aligned with the annual program objectives include the following: (a) 85% of teacher residents will complete licensure requirements within 2 years of acceptance; (b) 80% of teacher residents who complete university and licensure requirements will obtain a position inclusive of STEM content area in a high-need school district; (c) 80% of teachers residents will remain in full-time teaching positions in a partner high-need school system for 3 years. (pgs. e52-25)

(iii) The applicant successfully demonstrated that the proposed project design has the potential for sustainability and to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance. For example, the applicant indicated that the framework for the program will include ongoing and sustained collaboration within Professional

Learning Communities (PLCs) focused on developing teaching ability embedded within the schools with supporting activities, and individualized mentoring and coaching. The coursework, professional development modules and PLCs are components of the project that can be sustained after the life of the project grant period. (pgs. e43-44)

(iv) The applicant reasonably provided evidence that the proposed project represents an exceptional approach for meeting purposes and requirements for the TQP grant initiative. For example, the applicant indicated that the program model and approaches to support the development of highly effective teachers are innovative in four ways: (1) a strong project team, (2) a unique residency model, (3) a focus on STEM and (4) an emphasis on computer science. The applicant's model is innovative because the time spent with candidates and the residency teams will allow the candidate to focus on STEM and Computer Science, thus mastering the content of the subject. The residency model was developed to improve the practice of the teacher residents through focused collaborations with others in their school, external experts, and university professors and coaches. Cohort based PLCs have become well established as a sustainable practice for developing and improving teachers' instructional skills. In addition, the applicant will engage residents, mentor teachers, in-service teachers and partners within the districts in a Summer Research Readiness and Residency Summit (SR3S) experience. The purpose of this initiative is to create an annual professional development opportunity for dissemination of Anchor Action Research projects and workshops and work sessions related to best practices and effective instruction. The applicant cited research-based evidence from What Works Clearinghouse that indicated engaging teachers with mentors and opportunities to share with professionals can yield positive effects towards the retention of new teachers. (pgs. e45-47)

Weaknesses:

(i) No weaknesses noted.

(ii) No weaknesses noted.

(iii) The application was unclear as to how the Paraprofessional program component is eligible for the grant program funding. The applicant included funds of \$5500 to support the program and this cost is not allowable. Further explanation was needed to explain how the program has incorporated a high school program in the funding. The funding of this program is not an allowable expense.

(iv) The application was unclear about some aspects of the program. While the concept of grow your own is a great idea, the program components are not allowable in this grant.

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 provided solid evidence that the proposed program will have the necessary and available support to successfully implement the project. The applicant indicated that the university will ensure office space with computers and other equipment is available for staff. Students will have the support of student support services, computer labs, the library and other campus school services. (pg. 15)

(ii) The applicant reasonably provided evidence that the project will engage partners in project relevant activities to ensure implementation and success of the project. The applicant indicated that the proposed project partnership will consist of three public universities in Georgia (Georgia State University, Middle Georgia State University, Fort Valley State University) and eight LEAs (Douglas County Schools, Baldwin County Schools, Bibb County Schools, Bleckley County Schools, Dodge County Schools, Houston County Schools, Laurens County Schools, Pulaski County Schools). Among the diverse group of stakeholders, the project will engage a rural HBCU, high-need rural and urban school districts, and several opportunity zone schools.

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 provided a detailed management plan that outlined how the proposed project will achieve meeting the objectives on time, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks. The applicant provided clear lines of responsibilities for accomplishing all activities and tasks associated with meeting goals and objectives. The unique management plan is aligned with the priorities proposed by the applicant. For example, for each activity and task in the management plan, the applicant identifies the specific activity, the associated priorities, the individuals responsible, the key participants, and the expected outcomes or rationale. The management plan provided key milestones that will be met for each task or activity over the life of the project. The applicant will begin planning activities in July 2019. Based on a review of the management plan timeline, the project has the potential to guide program implementation to completion on time and within budget. (pgs.e 50-58)

Weaknesses:

(i) No weaknesses noted.

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 provided a detailed evaluation plan that included appropriately aligned methods of evaluation that will provide valid and reliable performance data associated with the proposed outcomes. The applicant provided eight comprehensive goals with associated objectives and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project. All of the objectives associated with each goal are aligned with GPRA indicators and measurable performance outcomes. For example, the primary goal for the project is to increase the number of highly qualified teachers who are committed to high-need schools, in urban and rural settings. The applicant indicated that performance measures aligned with the annual program objectives include the following: (a) 85% of teacher residents will complete licensure requirements within 2 years of acceptance; (b) 80% of teacher residents who complete university and licensure requirements will obtain a position inclusive of STEM content area in a high-need school district; (c) 80% of teachers residents will remain in full-time teaching positions in a partner high-need school system for 3 years. (pgs. e52-25)

The evaluation provided a detailed alignment of the GPRA performance objectives, data sources and the measurement for each of the targeted indicators. For example, in GPRA Indicator Performance Measure 1: Certification/Licensure, the applicant will measure the percentage of program graduates who have attained initial State certification/licensure by passing all necessary licensure/certification assessments within one year of program completion. GPRA Indicator Performance Measure 2: STEM Graduation, the applicant will measure the percentage of math/science program graduates that attain initial certification/licensure by passing all necessary licensure/certification assessments within one year of program completion. Evaluation methods will include measurement of the increase in % of completers passing the Georgia Teacher Exam based on baseline data from the previous year.

(ii) The application sufficiently demonstrated that the scope of the methods of evaluation are aligned to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project. The applicant indicated that an evaluation of the program has been integrated into the ongoing program activities. The applicant will utilize Stufflebeam's CIPP Model of Program Evaluation and linked the evaluation with the Logic Model activities and the outcomes proposed for the project. The evaluation will employ a mixed-methods evaluation approach. For example, the evaluation will use methods that will match comparison schools (quasi-experimental designs) and match classrooms to treatment (TIP) and comparison classrooms (quasi-experimental designs). The purpose of using these methods is to determine the changes in school achievement performance based on matched school demographics where residents have been placed and school performance where there were no residents. The evaluation will provide valuable data and site-based research focused on increasing academic achievement at the classroom level, as well as the effectiveness of Teacher Residency performance. (pgs. e65-79)

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 effectively demonstrated that the proposed project will include a component of the program for the attainment of the Computer Science Endorsement (CSEnd) for in-service teachers, which will qualify the teachers to add computer science to their existing certifications. (pgs. 36-37) The program is a year-long, four-course program culminating with a certification from the Georgia Professional Standards Commission for grades P-12. The courses are designed to allow the teachers to apply their knowledge in various contexts, depending on the grade band and type of classes that they will be teaching. For example, all teachers will learn the components of computational thinking, but then they will complete an individual project based on a computing tool that they plan to use in their classroom. (e59-60)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Invitational Priority - Invitational Priority

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

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant successfully demonstrated that three of the eight counties in their partner districts throughout the state were identified as Opportunity Zones: Douglas County, Bibb County, and Baldwin County. The applicant included the Census Tract Numbers: Baldwin, 13009970200, 13009970400, 13009970500, 13009970600, 13009970600, 13009970701,

13009970702; Bibb, 13021010100, 13021010400, 13021010500, 13021011000, 13021011100, 13021011500, 13021012300, 13021012400, 13021012500, 13021011600, 13021011700, 13021011800, 13021011900, 13021013800, 13021013900; Douglas, 13097080201, 13097080202 13021011900, 13021013800, 13021013900; Douglas, 13097080201, 13097080202; Laurens, 13175950300, 13175950400, 13175950800, 13175950900.) Pgs. e28-30)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/17/2019 09:44 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/17/2019 09:34 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Georgia State University Research Foundation, Inc. (U336S190026)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	40	30
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Resources	20	20
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	20
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Sub Total	100	90
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. STEM/Computer Science	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Invitational Priority		
Invitational Priority		
1. Promise Zones	0	0
Sub Total	0	0
Total	105	95

Technical Review Form

Panel #6 - Teacher Quality Partnership - 7: 84.336S

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Georgia State University Research Foundation, Inc. (U336S190026)

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 presented a comprehensive and well documented description of the teacher shortage and rationale for the implementation of project in the proposed service area. To address the shortage, the applicant has created 9 clearly specified goals and corresponding objectives that are aligned to goals and are measurable.

The creation of a Resident Readiness Academy (pg. e33) and pipeline (teacher recruitment model) beginning with high school students is a great approach to addressing the teacher shortage. This pipeline will also build capacity of the applicant to ensure that there will continue to be potential participants as well as a cadre of well trained teachers for high need classrooms after the period of federal assistance.

The recruitment of Teacher Residency candidates from existing pools of non-certified school-based employees, paraprofessionals, bus drivers and library staff (individuals who currently work in and have a vested interest in the partner LEAs) to establish a Paraprofessional-to-Teacher (PTT) residency model is also an important and innovative approach to addressing the shortage (pg. e43).

Moreover, the applicant clearly describes its rationale, rooted in trans-theoretical change model, which aligns very well with key project components as depicted in the logic model (pg. e65, appendix G).

Weaknesses:

While it is a promising approach to recruit from the pool of non-certified school employees, particularly, paraprofessionals, the applicant does not clearly explain the process for this component. The applicant proposes to develop a pipeline that involves not only persons with baccalaureate degrees, but also high school students, undergraduates/pre-baccalaureates as well as paraprofessionals (paraprofessional-to-teacher residency component). Per the budget narrative (e247, e249, e252), it seems that the applicant has included several design components that are not allowable, such as the Academy for Future Teachers summer enrichment program and the Bullying Programming. As TQP funds should be only used for a teacher residency program that includes financial support via a living wage stipend for teacher residents who meet eligibility requirements (recent high school graduates or mid-career professionals), including any funding for activities that

are not for these individuals, is not allowable and represents a weakness of the design of the project.

The applicant also to pay paraprofessionals \$5,500 but it is not clearly specified that these individuals will be eligible participants in the residency or how paraprofessionals, who do not meet the requirements for admission to the residency component, will obtain eligibility status. That is, the progression plan for undergraduates and paraprofessionals to teacher residents is not clear. Further, the selection criteria for teacher residents (pgs.e43-e45) does not specifically indicate that recruited individuals must be either a recent graduate of a four-year IHE or a mid-career professional.

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 applicant includes sufficient evidence of ample resources to support the project. For instance, with regard to teacher preparation, the applicant plans to leverage existing available resources within the university setting. Specifically, because of the success on certification assessments such as edTPA by students who've competed initial certification via the applicant's certification programs the applicant will continue the effective and innovative pedagogy and content preparation currently offered, thus eliminating the need to create or purchase new programs.

In addition two partner LEAs have committed to the provision of in-kind contributions, such as the use of classrooms, buildings and grounds at no cost, which will be critical to project success (e206 -e208).

Further, tuition waiver and discounts provided to participants by the applicant indicates a strong commitment to the recruitment of participants and also ensures that activities will be implemented to achieve project goals.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant's detailed timeline (pg. e50 – e58) clearly describes what is to be accomplished, how it will be done and when deliverables and milestones are expected. Employing this type of detail ensures that the project tasks will be managed well and accomplished on-time and within budget.

In addition, the applicant has assembled a knowledgeable management team, the members of which have ample experience and expertise in managing a project of this magnitude.

The time commitments for key personnel are adequate and commensurate with responsibilities.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant's plan (Stufflebeams' CIPP) represents a good approach to evaluate performance data on project outcomes (e68-e71). There is a plan for collection of both quantitative and qualitative data which will allow for multiple perspectives to be obtained. The inclusion of the annual summer Advisory Council retreat is an excellent opportunity for partners to meet to review performance data, discuss challenges and propose modifications to project activities. In addition, through the use of quasi experimental designs involving matched comparison schools and matched classrooms to treatment and comparison classrooms, the evaluation will yield useful data related to outcomes such as school climate and student achievement. Moreover, with regard to analysis methods, propensity score analysis will aid in ensuring dependable matching of treatment and control groups involved in the quasi experimental designs which in turn would lead to more reliable results (e70).

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 applicant includes a focus on Computer Science training via a rigorous computer science endorsement program for teachers (including, residents, mentor teachers and teachers in the state of Georgia; pg. e38). Specifically, the applicant includes a goal to develop computer science web-based training modules and implement a computer science endorsement program that emphasizes computational and algorithmic thinking, cybersecurity, problem-solving, and course integration. The applicant includes a description of the plan of study for the endorsement (pg. e60) which is comprised of such courses as Computational Thinking and Human Computer Interaction and Computer Science Concepts for Teachers – courses that will provide residents with content knowledge related to the endorsement. The applicant also includes activities that are aligned with this goal, i.e., objectives to measure the efficacy of participants who complete the computer science trainings (pg. e38) and provision of computer science professional development from expert faculty members (pg. e43). Residents and teachers who complete the computer science endorsement will have the requisite skills and content knowledge to be effective in integrating computer science principles and computational thinking into classes thereby aiding in the improvement of student achievement or other educational outcomes in computer science.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Invitational Priority - Invitational Priority

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

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant includes census tract numbers of the qualified opportunity zones for which it proposes to serve children or students (e29-e30). Specifically, the applicant indicates that Opportunity Zone Schools will be given priority for receiving residents, professional development, and PLC support.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/17/2019 09:34 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/17/2019 09:34 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Georgia State University Research Foundation, Inc. (U336S190026)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	40	30
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Resources	20	20
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	20
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Sub Total	100	90
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. STEM/Computer Science	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Invitational Priority		
Invitational Priority		
1. Promise Zones	0	0
Sub Total	0	0
Total	105	95

Technical Review Form

Panel #6 - Teacher Quality Partnership - 7: 84.336S

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Georgia State University Research Foundation, Inc. (U336S190026)

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 has developed a list of goals and a detailed list of objectives for making progress towards the goals (e12-14). GPRA indicators have been used indicating a results-oriented performance system with specific indicators, timeline, as well as the responsible party (e72-e89).
- The proposed project addresses the issue of teacher shortage in the areas of mathematics, science, and special education through a multi-level teacher readiness and residency program which takes place in urban and rural school districts which have demonstrated high need (e24). Evidence of a strong theoretical basis is provided through Prochaska's Transtheoretical Model of Change (e113) which recognizes the various steps through which learning takes place.
- Districts continue to pay paraprofessional during the residency year and candidates will be recruited through a pool of classified staff already employed within the district (e-33) which will allow for the results to extend beyond the period of financial assistance. This type of "grow your own" system could prove to be beneficial as the classified staff benefits from not losing their paycheck during the residency and the district benefits with an individual who already has demonstrated commitment to the district.
- The Residency Readiness Academy offers an innovative approach to prepare individuals in rural school districts holding less than a bachelor's degree to enter and complete the teacher residency program which will include a master's degree once completed. A clear plan has been presented which will allow for select individual's guidance through coursework, coaching support, and financial aid counseling to sustain applicants with an expectation of students completing their degree in a STEM discipline. The RRA will provide sustainability as school districts invest in hiring residents, which not only promotes the commitment of an individual who is already invested in a community, but enhances the public relations value of the hiring organization based on the role a teacher plays in the community.
- Selective mentor process extends beyond the "basic" mentor requirements of a district to include demonstrating outstanding instructional skills and technology use, effective classroom management practices in inclusive settings, and data collection for decision-making. The addition of a needs assessment to understand areas that will help contribute to the mentor's growth demonstrates a commitment to the development of what has already been identified as an outstanding teacher.
- Looking at the Logic Model, specifically at long-term outcomes it is evident that the project has goals to yield results which will extend beyond the period of financial assistance which include dissemination of results to contribute to

development of state-wide induction model, improvement of climate ratings for participating schools, a pool of well-prepared mentor teachers to support future teacher candidates, and ongoing access to online professional development in computer science for Georgia teachers (e-107).

- Tailored menu of service (e-209) gives the school-based stakeholders the freedom to choose which initiative will best fit their needs. The choices are current “hot topics” in education and include bullying prevention, wellness and whole child, staff wellness, personal finance, computational and algorithmic thinking, and professional learning committees.

Weaknesses:

- The applicant mentions that 20 residents participating in the paraprofessional-to-teach model through the various universities listed will receive a \$5500 stipend for tuition use along with compensation from their district for their positions, and tuition remission (e4417). The allocation of federal funds used for stipends is for those who have already met the criteria to begin residency. It is unclear if the paraprofessionals already have an undergraduate degree which would be a requirement for the program.
- The Academy of Future Teachers is being implemented at \$52,000 during year one, and \$55,000 during years 2-5 (e247). This program targets diverse high school students considering teaching math or science. This represents an organization thinking “outside the box” through an exceptional approach, however this would not be allowable for the funds being provided through this grant.

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:

- Program will utilize existing resources from within the university setting (e-26) whose curriculum has been proven to be successful as evidenced by edTPA scores and 100% students passing the state certification exam thus indicating adequate resources from the applicant organization.
- Partnerships include 3 public universities, 7 LEAs demonstrating commitment to the success of the project. Middle Georgia State University includes five campuses serving rural areas of Georgia (e29) indicating necessary resources to meet project goals.
- Commitment letters and forms have been filled out and are in the Appendix providing evidence of demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project.

Weaknesses:

- No weaknesses have been noted in terms of the applicant's adequacy of resources for this project.

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 detailed management plan which lists by semester the specific activities, associated priorities, name of the responsible individual, as well as the key participants and expected outcomes (e-51). Goals and objectives are listed throughout the management plan demonstrating how each is being addressed. Properly managing awarded funds is of utmost importance in order to complete the proposed project on time and within budget. The detail and specific duties of each individual, as well as information regarding the reason for each individual having a role in the management plan indicates that the applicant has taken considerable time in developing their plan.

Weaknesses:

- No weaknesses were noted by this reviewer in the quality of the management plan.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

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

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

Strengths:

- A strength for this proposal is the detailed performance objectives and their data sources, indicators, targets, timeline, and responsible party (e-71). The team has covered every aspect of the proposal and accounted for all the expenditure of grant funds to include partner cost share and funds from other related sources. Qualitative and quantitative data will be collected which will provide a more comprehensive understanding of the problems leading to better understanding providing reliable and valid performance data on relevant outcomes.
- The application gives information regarding what data analysis will consist of (e70) and includes how propensity score analysis will be used as well as how the organization will test for mediator variables to account for relationships between a predictor variable and outcome variable (e71). This may provide a more illustrative account of how the dependent and independent variables are related offering information that will be more useful to the organization and demonstrates methods of evaluation that are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.

Weaknesses:

- The reviewer does not note any weaknesses in the project evaluation plan.

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:

- As part of the proposed project in-service teachers will have the opportunity to add computer science to their existing certifications through a year-long four-course program which accommodates teacher schedules. As part of this certification process the in-service teachers will demonstrate their knowledge of the subject area through four key assessments. This pathway will allow for current teachers to help meet the demand for certification in computer science as well as giving the teachers the opportunity to utilize the knowledge they have learned and put it into practice. Part of being adequately prepared to teach in STEM fields will require that teachers demonstrate their ability to take what they have learned and integrate it into their teaching.

Weaknesses:

- The reviewer did not note any weaknesses in Competitive Preference

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:

- Opportunity Zone Schools will be given priority for receiving residents, professional development, and PLC support (e-34). This application has put a number of objectives in place to align with goals which promote "spurring investment" in opportunity zones such as recruiting specifically for the rural and urban teacher residency program and creating a pipeline for teacher certification for paraprofessionals in the rural district (e-35).

Weaknesses:

- No weaknesses were noted for Spurring Investment in Opportunity Zones.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/17/2019 09:34 PM