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

Technical Review

Applicant: Region 18 Education Service Center (U374A170083)
Reader #1: **********

	Points Possible	**Points Scored**
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Evidence of Support		
1. Evidence of Support	30	29
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	25	25
Selection Criterion		
Quality of the Project Design		
1. Project Design	20	17
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	18
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Adequacy of Resources	5	3
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority #1		
Improve Equitable Access to Effective Educators		
1. CPP 1	10	10
Competitive Preference Priority #2		
Diverse and Effective Workforce		
1. CPP 2	5	4
Total	115	106

Technical Review Form

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

Applicant: Region 18 Education Service Center (U374A170083)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Evidence of Support

1. **In determining evidence of support of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Reader's Score: 29

Sub Question

1. **(1) The extent to which the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students.**

   General:

   Overall Comments:
   The applicant seeks to build on partnerships and efforts from three previous TIF grants between the IHEs and existing HCMSs in 62 high-need schools in four school districts. These partnerships support a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students. (Abstract)

   Strengths (if applicable):
   The proposal by the Service Center will 1) bridge partnerships between LEAs and IHEs; 2) allow for development of screening and selection tools; 3) provide research-based instruction and leadership strategies with follow-up mentoring and coaching sessions; 4) evaluate the efficacy of evaluation systems; and 5) modify performance-based compensation systems. Issues to be resolved include high beginning teacher numbers, especially in high need districts and high numbers of special populations including ELL, economically disadvantaged and minority populations; high administrative turn-over; and low student success performance ratings for schools.(Abstract) Partnerships exist between the IHEs, Service Center and the four high-need LEA districts that appear to have been forged during three previous TIF grants.

   Weaknesses (if applicable):
   None noted.

   Reader's Score:

2. **(2) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of the project services.**

   General:

   Overall Comments:
   Existing partnerships between IHEs and LEAs will be expanded to include a student teacher rating system, coaching and mentoring models, learning modules, recruitment efforts and credentialing supports (e. 25). Collaborative Learning Communities (CLCs) will engage in ongoing discussions regarding the professional development system (SEED). The SEED structure provides career ladder opportunities and financial incentives. Teacher leaders are encouraged to model lessons, mentor teachers, and monitor and interact with students. Additional efforts to train and provide support to administrators and principal supervisors are inherent in the project

(e. 46).
Biweekly CLC meetings will be held for principal supervisors to discuss successful strategies, experiences, and develop supportive techniques for topics, such as budgeting, scheduling, staffing, and developing leadership teams (e. 47).
Teacher and principal residency programs will be initiated to mentor teachers and principals, and provide professional development in data analysis and other areas of expertise required of effective leaders (e. 47).

Strengths (if applicable):
Teachers who serve as mentors are expected to have ratings of highly effective, and receive monetary compensation for their role. Incentives are in place for being effective mentors once they have been designated as an attending teacher (e. 48). Ongoing training in the TSL Institute and principal training meetings will provide training and support for key leaders, and begin the efforts of sustainability (e. 49).
Teachers and administrators in the LEAS, as well as the service center, and IHE teacher preparation programs have submitted letters of commitment and MOUs for the project. (Attachments)

Weaknesses (if applicable):
The applicant mentions the ratings of PSJA ISD under the accountability system, however, little information is provided on what each level represents, how that information may impact the direction of the TSL project, and the buy-in of possible participants (e. 29).

Reader's Score:

3. **(3) The extent to which the proposed project will integrate with or build on similar or related efforts to improve relevant outcomes (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)), using community, State, and Federal resources.**
   General:

   Overall Comments:
   All LEAs have a current and well-defined HCMS in place. The take-aways from each of these unique systems will serve as the catalyst for a more coherent system across the state.

   Strengths (if applicable):
   A data repository system, the State Longitudinal Data System (SLDS), has been in place for ten years with the benefits of comprehensive access to information across the state and a system to collect and manage statewide data. The system has the capability of tracking a candidate's progress from IHE to LEA throughout their educational career. Statewide evaluation models (T-TESS and T-PESS) have been implemented across 1,000 LEAs, and linked to the data collection system (e. 27).   There appears to be a history of willingness on the part of the LEAs to embrace change and innovation.

   Weaknesses (if applicable):
   None noted.

   Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. **In determining the need for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Reader's Score: 25

   Sub Question

1. **(1) The extent to which the proposed project will provide services or otherwise address the needs of students at risk of educational failure.**

   General:

   Overall Comments:
   The applicant has provided evidence that partners are LEAs with high need areas relative to economics, diversity, mobility, and teacher experience. Percentages for many areas of need in most LEAs are higher than 70% (e. 30).

   Strengths (if applicable):
   High percentages of at-risk populations are identified for each of the LEA partners. The campuses have collectively demonstrated low student achievement in reading, writing and mathematics as measured by passing rates on the STAAR tests (e. 30-31).
   The applicant identified human capital challenges in the high-need partner schools. There appears to be a direct correlation between the existence of the least experienced teachers and administrators working in the highest need LEAs (e. 31-32). A high rate of turnover also exists.

   Weaknesses (if applicable):
   None noted.

   Reader's Score:

2. **(2) The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project, including the nature and magnitude of those gaps or weaknesses.**

   General:

   Overall Comments:
   Six campuses of TSL partners have unacceptable performance ratings in student achievement, student progress, closing performance gaps, and postsecondary readiness (e. 33). Two campuses in one district have been rated as Improvement Required for five consecutive years. Indicative of this poor rating is the data that 68% of teachers and 75% of principals were rated as ineffective/developing (e. 33).

   Strengths (if applicable):
   The applicant proposes to support the low ratings through training, mentoring, and coaching that measures increased efficiency through student achievement (e. 33).
   The state rating accountability system has provided ratings of D or F for 40.3% of TSL partner district on Student Achievement and 33% of TSL partner districts receiving a D or F on Student Progress and Closing the Gaps (e. 34).
   The applicant proposes to address gaps with teacher and campus leader supports such as training, coaching and incentives to be involved in teacher leader positions (e. 35).

   Weaknesses (if applicable):
   None noted.

   Reader's Score:

Selection Criterion - Quality of the Project Design

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

Reader's Score: 17

1. **(1) The extent to which the proposed project demonstrates a rationale.**

   General:

   Overall Comments:
   Through the learnings from three previous TIF grants, the applicant proposes to assist LEAs in evaluating the effectiveness of evaluation and support systems, modifying the HCMS and evaluating validity and reliability, and improving the pipeline of quality educators (e. 35). Teacher leader opportunities and supports will also be enhanced (e. 36).

   Strengths (if applicable):
   The applicant provides four over-arching goals that build upon the existing human capital management systems (HCMS): models for strengthening the educator pipeline, models for supporting development of effective teachers and principals, strategies for identifying, recruiting, retaining, and distribution of effective educators, and models of innovation for educator compensation (e. 36). The applicant plans to build upon the SLO student management system initiated as part of the TIF 4 project (e. 45).

   Weaknesses (if applicable):
   The application lacks detail relative to the research that supports specific needs of each LEA that will be addressed by the project (e. 35-36). For instance, little rationale is provided that best showcases research-based models for strengthening the educator pipeline.

   Reader's Score:

2. **(2) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.**

   General:

   Overall Comments:
   The TSL applicant is seeking to systematize the human capital continuum including the addition of screening and evaluation measures (e. 37). Included will be the following components: educator preparation, hiring and selection processes, effective educator rewards, educator evaluation systems based, in part, on student achievement, job-embedded professional development and supports; and a data management system (e. 37-38).

   Strengths (if applicable):
   The applicant has discussed the use of best practices to address the needs of the LEAs with highly diverse populations of students, especially second language learners, and their families (e. 37). All LEAs are currently addressing the effectiveness of the evaluation and support systems by convening stakeholder work groups to reflect upon weights and use of evaluation measures (e. 43). Additional stakeholder discussions regarding student growth measures are taking place (e. 44). The SEED addresses the specific challenges faced by schools with high ELL populations (e. 47). Teacher and administrator residency programs, which are research-based, will be a part of the project and serve to involve new teachers and administrators in direct training efforts and follow-up (e. 48-49).

   Weaknesses (if applicable):
   Little detail is provided by the applicant that address how specific goals will be addressed that will meet the needs of the target populations. Diverse populations are briefly mentioned; however, other needs and populations are not discussed. For instance, a specific plan to address the needs of economically disadvantaged students, or the need to diversify the teaching/administration population has not been addressed (e. 36-37).

   Reader's Score:

3. **(3) The extent to which the grant activities will be evaluated, monitored, and reported to the public.**

General:

Overall Comments:
An external evaluator, American Institutes for Research (AIR) will develop a system to evaluate the project toward meeting TSL project goals (e. 53).

Strengths (if applicable):
Areas to be evaluated by AIR include the correlations of activities to each entity's visions and goals, the effects of the implementations on student achievement, formative and summative objectives of professional development and mentoring; and the development of evaluation and dissemination tools.

Weaknesses (if applicable):
None noted.

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

   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.

   General:

   Overall Comments:
   After an initial year of planning, a full rollout of the project will take place in year 2 beginning with a TSL institute (e. 54).

   Strengths (if applicable):
   Engagement of school boards in the first year will help to facilitate adoption of policies that support the remainder of the project (e. 54). Districtwide implementation will begin in Year 3 with completion of a toolkit for schools by the end of the project. The Educator Service Center will be the fiscal agent and has the credentialed staff to support the IHEs and LEAs throughout the project (e. 55). Monthly meetings are scheduled to determine areas of needed support (e. 56). The implementation plan provides the detail to assure that the project will achieve its goals on time and within budget. There is a clearly defined set of responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing specific project tasks (e. 53-55 & 588).

   Weaknesses (if applicable):
   It appears that planning for the Teacher and Principal Residency Programs have not been considered as part of the pre-proposal planning. Applicant would benefit from initial planning with the IHEs and the LEAs and assurances of commitment by those entities prior to submitting the proposal (Appendix F6, e. 588 & 54). Meeting the desired outcomes by the conclusion of the project in year 5 would be more realistic if year 1 was an actual implementation year. It was mentioned that high need schools will receive more intensive support from team members, but few details are provided on what that support may entail (e. 56).

Reader's Score: 18

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

1. **The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources for the proposed project based on the following factors:**

Reader's Score: 3

1. **(1) The potential for continued support of the project after Federal funding ends, including, as appropriate, the demonstrated commitment of appropriate entities to such support.**

   General:

   Overall Comments:
   The applicant has provided information on the adequacy of resources to bring the project to fruition including discussions on participants, financial support, and partner credentials (e. 58-59).

   Strengths (if applicable):
   The Project Director credentials and experiences managing large federal grants are consistent with her abilities to manage the TSL (e. 55 & 87-89). An Assistant Director, a Director of Partnerships and a Director of Training/School Support are included in the field staff (e. 90). Each LEA has a support staff of administrators and teacher leaders in place. An Advisory Board will provide direction and input for the project (e. 56). Top administrators for the IHEs, LEAs, research and state education agencies as well as teachers and principals of partner LEAs will be seated on the Advisory Board (e. 56) (Organizational Chart Appendix D). A centralized educator management system is in place and will be enhanced by the project funding. Authorized personnel will be able to obtain analytical reports for recruitment and hiring decisions, personnel performance monitoring, and student achievement direction (e. 57). The system is composed of six modules: student growth, educator evaluation, educator effectiveness, performance-based compensating, hiring/talent acquisition, and training and professional development. Existing educator work groups have been analyzing existing HCMSs and creating an action plan for implementing modifications (e. 58).
   Support from education agency, IHEs, LEAs, congressmen, school boards, and teachers and principals. (Appendix E) MOUs have been signed showing commitments.
   Both financial and in-kind matches are in place (e. 59). Several sustainability efforts are in place. The Research Institute will assist LEAs to analyze data available; all LEAs will submit Sustainability Plans each year including semi-annual planning meetings; (e. 60 and letters of commitment) and letters of support from Legislators who will debate human capital reform are provided (e. 60 & 139-144). A letter of support is in place from the Secretary of the state education agency (e. 145) and the state school board HR Services Director (e. 146). Letters of support are in place for each of the IHEs (e. 147-152) and the community and school entities, as well as teachers committed to the project of Galveston (e, 153-166), Lytle (e. 167-194), and Pharr-San Juan-Alamo (e. 195-427). A MOU exists between the TSL project partners and AIR (e. 434-442).

   Weaknesses (if applicable):
   Few details on the responsibilities of project personnel are available. Little is provided in the way of credentials and experiences for personnel beyond the Project Director and three direct assistants (e. 56; e. 592). Stakeholder work groups will be put into place, however little information is provided that outlines the diversity of group members. In addition, the overall goals or outcomes for the work groups have not been delineated. It appears that Drs. Bolt and Brooke-Garza are the only staff members with direct ELL experiences and education. The responsibilities of these individuals were not well presented in light of their credentials (e. 101-115). Resumes for numerous staff members were provided, but the applicant did not provide sufficient detail on the roles of these individuals to ascertain their credibility.

   Reader's Score:

2. **(2) The potential for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing program of the agency of organization at the end of the Federal funding.**

   General:

   Overall Comments:
   Sustainability measures have been provided (e. 59-60).

   Strengths (if applicable):

Commitments from the TSL partners to sustain project efforts are in place in the form of letters of commitment and a commitment to prepare annual sustainability plans (e. 59). TxCEE will continue to assist LEAs in examining data points, collection of quantitative and qualitative data, and formulation of impact studies of strategies and practices (e. 60). The in-kind match is clearly provided and support by the LEA's assurances (e. 611).

Weaknesses (if applicable):
Commitments and assurances are generally presented. The applicant would have made a stronger case by providing specific details of commitments to all outcomes/aspects of the project. (letters of commitment/Appendix) All salaries appear high. Except for four individuals there is no association of the role with a particular individual to correlate credentials with role and compensation (e. 597-603). The cost for the external evaluator appears high as the applicant has not clearly outlined the responsibilities of the external evaluator American Institute for Research (e. 606-607). The sustainability of the project after year 5 is questionable given the costs of the Service Center personnel throughout the grant. There is no evidence of where the continued support and training will come from. This, coupled with the uncertainty of ramping up to meet outcomes in only four years, puts sustainability in doubt.

Reader's Score:

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority #1 - Improve Equitable Access to Effective Educators

1. **Projects that are designed to address the most significant gaps or insufficiencies in student access to effective teachers, School Leaders, or both teachers and School Leaders, in High-Need Schools, including gaps or inequities in how effective teachers, School Leaders, or both, are distributed across the LEA or LEAs the project will serve. At a minimum, applicants must:**

   (1) Identify the most significant gaps or insufficiencies in student access to effective teachers, School Leaders, or both, in High-Need Schools, including gaps or inequities in how effective teachers, School Leaders, or both, are distributed across the LEA(s) the project will serve;

   (2) Identify relevant factors used in determining such gaps, such as data on availability of school resources, staffing patterns, school climate, and educator support; and

   (3) Describe how the strategies proposed for closing the identified gaps are aligned to and are consistent with the strategies identified in the State's Plan to Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Educators, approved by the Department in 2015.

   General:

   (1)
   Overall Comments:
   2015 statewide studies have been conducted to determine factors that influence equitable access to high-quality educators. It was determined that equity gaps existed in schools with the higher percentages of less experienced teachers who were serving those schools with high populations of minority and economically disadvantaged students (e. 50). The plan supports more robust screening and selection tools and connections to high-quality educator preparation programs. A plan to redistribute effective educators exists.

   Strengths (if applicable):
   Money will be placed into a recruitment and retention pool to attract and keep effective teachers and principals (e. 51). A state plan exists to promote equitable access to excellent educators and will be supported and aligned with the TSL project (e. 50). Local equity plans will be developed that include robust screening, selection tools, and connections to high quality IHE teacher preparation programs. Recruitment and retention incentives will be put into place (e. 51).

   Weaknesses (if applicable):
   None noted.

   (2)
   Overall Comments:

The TSL project utilizes research conducted by the state to examine characteristics of effective schools and students that influence equitable access to high-quality educators.

Strengths (if applicable):
Evidence from the Texas Equity Plan indicates that the highest quartile of minority students and economically disadvantaged students have higher percentages of less experienced teachers than schools in the lowest quartile of those students (e. 50).
Relatively small differences between high-poverty, high-minority schools and low-poverty, low minority schools exist (e. 50). High-poverty, high minority schools with higher percentages of less experienced teachers are at somewhat of a disadvantage to low-poverty, low minority schools (e. 50).

Weaknesses (if applicable):
None noted.

(3)
Overall Comments:
The Texas Equity Plan supports implementation of promising strategies, to which TSL has aligned (e. 50).

Strengths (if applicable):
In addition to developing state supported screening and selection tools and connections to high-quality educator preparation programs, the TSL plans to redistribute effective educators across the districts by attracting effective and highly effective educators from the highest achieving schools to the lowest achieving schools through recruitment incentives (e. 51).

Weaknesses (if applicable):
None noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference Priority #2 - Diverse and Effective Workforce

1. **Projects that are designed to attract, support, and retain a diverse and effective workforce, including effective teachers, School Leaders, or both, from historically underrepresented populations. At minimum, applicants must provide:**

   A description detailing their commitment to creating and maintaining a diverse workforce.

   General:

   (1)
   Overall Comments:
   Teacher and principal populations are disproportionate to the student populations as more than 75% are white and female (e. 51).

   Strengths (if applicable):
   Partner IHEs have developed action plans to address Critical Race Theory and implicit bias. One IHE was recognized by the White House Initiative on Educational Excellence for Hispanics for their efforts to address preparation of diverse populations, engaging students and community members in P-20 initiatives, and increasing minority populations in STEM fields (e. 52). Commitment from the education Research Center to examine preparation, recruitment, and retention data of partners to make informed human capital decisions around diversity (e. 52).

   Weaknesses (if applicable):
   None noted.

(2)
Overall Comments:
There is a plan for attracting, supporting, and retaining diverse educators to the partnership schools.

Strengths (if applicable):
Partnerships, TxCEE and the Education Research Center efforts are in place to provide the training and support to partner institutions to ensure that coaching, mentoring, and evaluation practices value equity (e. 52). Partner IHEs have received recognition for efforts to prepare educators to support diverse student populations, engage students and community members in P-20 initiatives, and increase the number of minority students in STEM fields (e. 52).

Weaknesses (if applicable):
The application lacks details regarding the specific procedures to provide educators that meet the needs of these districts (e. 52).

Reader's Score: **4**

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/13/2017 11:19 AM

Technical Review

Applicant: Region 18 Education Service Center (U374A170083)
Reader #2:   **********

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Evidence of Support		
1. Evidence of Support	30	28
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	25	24
Selection Criterion		
Quality of the Project Design		
1. Project Design	20	19
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	20
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Adequacy of Resources	5	4
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority #1		
Improve Equitable Access to Effective Educators		
1. CPP 1	10	8
Competitive Preference Priority #2		
Diverse and Effective Workforce		
1. CPP 2	5	4
Total	115	107

Technical Review Form

Panel #14 - TSL - 14: 84.374A

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

Applicant: Region 18 Education Service Center (U374A170083)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Evidence of Support

1. **In determining evidence of support of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Reader's Score: 28

Sub Question

1. **(1) The extent to which the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students.**

    General:

    The proposal builds on previous work to improve HCMSs systems and improve the human capital systems through a framework of eight project elements (e. 24). The efforts are comprehensive and incorporate six strategies at the LEA level. Previous successes are not presented.

    Strengths (if applicable):
    The project builds on five years of previous efforts to improve human capital through HCMSs (e. 22). The partnership includes public schools and higher education (e. 23). The strategy and framework table demonstrates the alignment of the project to improve teaching and learning (e. 24). The LEAs are existing partners and will move forward in this project to further improve implementation of quality HCMSs (e. 22).

    Weaknesses (if applicable):
    The applicant does not provide evidence demonstrating the level of improvement they have achieved in the previous five years of this work. To enhance previous work through the identified goals and objectives, previous success data would strengthen the proposal.

    Reader's Score:

2. **(2) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of the project services.**

    General:

    Each partner has a specific role in the project. The proposal demonstrates the collaboration of each partner through expected strategies and scope of responsibility (e. 25-26). An external evaluator will conduct a comprehensive evaluation of project elements (e. 27).

    Strengths (if applicable):
    The partnerships include four school districts and four universities. The university partners produce educator candidates that feed into the partner LEAs (e. 25). Five strategies to improve human capital are presented that demonstrate how the LEAs and IHEs. They allow for customization to be responsive to local needs (e. 25). An

additional partner is Austin's Education Research Center bringing the ability to track teacher preparation candidates from IHEs into the educator workforce and is the repository for student data (e. 26) which will be used to track improvement in the low performing schools (e. 27).

Weaknesses (if applicable):
None noted.

Reader's Score:

3. **(3) The extent to which the proposed project will integrate with or build on similar or related efforts to improve relevant outcomes (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)), using community, State, and Federal resources.**
   General:

   The project partners have already spent five-year reallocating resources to sustain a comprehensive HCMS system along with educator evaluation systems that include student growth measures for every classroom (e. 28). The LEAs have decided to place 1% of their annual cost of living increases into a pool for performance-based salary increases. The applicant has utilized existing funding streams and has the support of some private foundation money to "improve human capital in public schools" (e. 29).

   Strengths (if applicable):
   The partners, with stakeholder input, have implemented rigorous evaluation systems that are based on research, incorporates student achievement, professional development that is job embedded, and provides a performance-based compensation system (e. 28). The partner LEAs have set aside 1% of the annual cost of living pay to place in a pool to support performance-based wage increases (e. 28). The project is building on previous performance increases and targeting enhancements in the areas that need improvement under the Texas Accountability System (e. 29).

   Weaknesses (if applicable):
   None noted.

   Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. **In determining the need for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Reader's Score: 24

1. **(1) The extent to which the proposed project will provide services or otherwise address the needs of students at risk of educational failure.**
   General:

   Student and teacher data was provided to demonstrate the needs of students of students at risk of failure and to identify the need of identified services to address the gaps (e. 31). High poverty, high minority rural and urban schools have higher rates of turnover, services provided by IHEs will address this need by adequately preparing pre-service teachers for working in and with students in high poverty settings (e. 32)

   Strengths (if applicable):
   Specific data was provided on the 74.1% at-risk student populations in the participating LEAs, such as, 84.7% economically disadvantaged, 37.7% ELL, 20.9% student mobility coupled with 35.2% of teachers with five or less

years of teaching experience (e. 30). The levels of student achievement were provided from the campuses demonstrating the student achievement gaps at those campuses (e. 31).

Weaknesses (if applicable):
High rates of teacher and administrator turnover is stated, but not supported with specific data.

Reader's Score:

2. **(2) The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project, including the nature and magnitude of those gaps or weaknesses.**

   General:

   The gaps and weaknesses that the project was designed around were presented and discussed. Each problem to be addressed is supported by data to indicate the magnitude of the problem and then linked to strategies that will be used in the project to address the problem.

   Strengths (if applicable):
   Gaps and weaknesses in the human capital management systems for recruiting, supporting, and retaining effective teachers have been identified on both the LEA side and the IHE side (e. 33-35). Data was provided to substantiate the scope of the need to be addressed; such as, in four of the schools labeled "Improvement Required" for five years, 68% of the teachers and 75% of the principals were rated as ineffective/developing (e. 33). One strategy to address this need is to provide support through training, mentoring, and coaching at all partner LEAs (e. 33). Each problem identified is linked to strategies to address the problem. Data reporting the magnitude of the gaps is provided.

   Weaknesses (if applicable):
   No weaknesses were noted.

   Reader's Score:

Selection Criterion - Quality of the Project Design

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

Reader's Score: 19

1. **(1) The extent to which the proposed project demonstrates a rationale.**

   General:

   The project design uses a Logic Model to demonstrate the conceptual framework and project components. The project has been designed through previous experience and outcomes gained from previous grants and experiences (e. 35). There is also the rationale to make the systems work for each LEA and IHE; therefore, some modifications will facilitate local needs (e. 35-36).

   Strengths (if applicable):
   The primary goal is to improve student achievement by building upon human capital management systems (e. 36). The four approaches are:1) strengthening the educator pipeline; 2) supporting the development of effective teachers and principals, 3) identify strategies for identifying, recruiting, retaining; and distribution of effective

educators; and 4) innovation for teacher compensation (e. 36).

Weaknesses (if applicable):
One of the strategies listed is distribution of effective educators. The narrative does not indicate how educators are currently distributed or if there are significant gaps in the current distribution.

Reader's Score:

2. **(2) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.**

   General:

   The proposed project addresses all needs that are encompassed in the strategies and the frameworks that are identified in Table 2. Additionally, the practices/activities will build local capacity for each LEA and IHE.

   Strengths (if applicable):
   The proposal breaks down each of the Human Capital Components presented in Table 2 to detail the existing practices and present the enhancements that are proposed in the project (e. 38-39). Rational is provided in each of the areas for; educator preparation, hiring and selection process, rewarding effective teachers and principals, student growth measures, professional development systems for teacher and principals through the evaluation process, and a training and support plan (e. 39-49). A unique feature is to develop teacher and principal residency programs, with similarities to medical residency programs that offer on-the-job, guided support for new and developing teachers/principals (e. 47).

   Weaknesses (if applicable):
   None noted.

   Reader's Score:

3. **(3) The extent to which the grant activities will be evaluated, monitored, and reported to the public.**

   General:

   The evaluation plan includes the use of an external evaluator. Appendix F-8 provides the evaluation plan that utilizes formative and summative data, that is both qualitative and qualitative in substance.

   Strengths (if applicable):
   Appendix F-7 and F-8 provide project research and project evaluation for short-term and long-term outcomes that are formative and summative, allowing for adjustments while maintaining the fidelity of the project design. Appendix F-5 provides a comprehensive communication plan for project and contains specific communication goals.

   Weaknesses (if applicable):
   None noted.

   Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

   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.

General:

EElements of management are provided in the narrative and in the Appendix documents. The abbreviated timeline does cover all five years of the grant. Appendix 6 provides a detailed timeline that provides guidance for the project to be on time and within budget (Budget narrative). Key personnel have previous experience with similar projects.

Strengths (if applicable):
The description of staffing in the budget narrative appears to be adequate for the project. The timeline is comprehensive and detailed. Responsibilities are assigned through the budget narrative, narrative, and timeline. An advisory board will be established to provide input and direction that includes key project staff and representatives from the project partners (e. 56-57).

Weaknesses (if applicable):
No weaknesses are noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

1. The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources for the proposed project based on the following factors:

Reader's Score: 4

Sub Question

1. (1) The potential for continued support of the project after Federal funding ends, including, as appropriate, the demonstrated commitment of appropriate entities to such support.

   General:

   The partners have started working for stability of existing practices and will continue to institutionalize the project strategies and systems, but both local and state policies must be updated to accommodate the changes required to sustain and fund the strategies/practices presented in this project for the long-term (e. 59).

   Strengths (if applicable):
   Each LEA is responsible for developing a plan for sustainability annually (e. 59-60). Each partner has agreed to attaining sustainability for their portion of the project (e. 59-60). State, federal, and local foundation funds will also be part of the equation for sustained funding (e. 60). ESC 18 and the partner LEAs are leading Texas in HCMS reform efforts, so that may allow some political capital for state level policy changes for sustainability (e. 60).

   Weaknesses (if applicable):
   It is not clear what updating the policies entail, and if this will be realistic to accomplish. To complete the timeline activities on time and within the scope of the funding period, compensation policies will need to be changed to allow the performance-based compensation model presented. If the policies are not changed then a portion of the project will not have the potential for continued support after Federal funding.

   Reader's Score:

2. (2) The potential for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing program of the agency of organization at the end of the Federal funding.

General:

The elements of the project will be incorporated into the processes of the participating LEAs and IHEs, along with ESC 18. There are current funding streams that will help sustain many parts of the project.

Strengths (if applicable):
Several of the LEAs have already made plans to integrate the performance-based compensation system utilizing current per student allocations from state and local funding (e. 60). Many of the partners will reallocate existing funds to support the project initiatives.

Weaknesses (if applicable):
No weaknesses are noted.

Reader's Score:

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority #1 - Improve Equitable Access to Effective Educators

1. **Projects that are designed to address the most significant gaps or insufficiencies in student access to effective teachers, School Leaders, or both teachers and School Leaders, in High-Need Schools, including gaps or inequities in how effective teachers, School Leaders, or both, are distributed across the LEA or LEAs the project will serve. At a minimum, applicants must:**

   (1) Identify the most significant gaps or insufficiencies in student access to effective teachers, School Leaders, or both, in High-Need Schools, including gaps or inequities in how effective teachers, School Leaders, or both, are distributed across the LEA(s) the project will serve;

   (2) Identify relevant factors used in determining such gaps, such as data on availability of school resources, staffing patterns, school climate, and educator support; and

   (3) Describe how the strategies proposed for closing the identified gaps are aligned to and are consistent with the strategies identified in the State's Plan to Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Educators, approved by the Department in 2015.

   General:

   1. Overall Comments:
   The project will help the participating LEAs to implement the equity strategies identified in the Texas state plan (e. 50). The applicant clearly described and presented the gaps and insufficiencies regarding a shortage of effective teachers and effective principals in the high-need schools participating in the project.

   Strengths (if applicable):
   In a Texas state study, the characteristics of the school and students were investigated as well as factors that influence the equitable access to effective teachers in schools (e. 50). Using this data and the state plan for creating equitable access to quality teachers, the project was designed to address these inequities in the partner LEAs. Specific data was presented on the schools in the LEAs to substantiate the high-need status of the schools (Appendix B).

   Weaknesses (if applicable):
   Student achievement data was not provided on the high-need school documentation.

   2. Overall Comments:
   To address the teacher equity distribution issue, the strategy will be to attract effective and highly effective teachers from the highest achieving schools to the lowest achieving schools (e. 51). Recruitment incentives will be part of the strategy to encourage those teachers to move.

   Strengths (if applicable):
   An outcome of the project is to develop the creation and implementation of local equity plans that will include improved screening, selection tools, connections to high quality teacher preparation programs and the redistribution of effective

educators across the school district (e. 51).

Weaknesses (if applicable):
School climate was not addressed.

3. Overall Comments:
The project is aligned to the Texas State Plans to Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Educators. ESC 18 and the partner LEAs are early adopters and advancing the policy.

Strengths (if applicable):
The project is aligned to the Texas State Plans to Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Educators. ESC 18 and the partner LEAs have worked on previous projects to implement the base strategies presented in this project, which them enhances the strategies to increase outcomes.

Weaknesses (if applicable):
No weaknesses are noted.

Reader's Score: 8

Competitive Preference Priority #2 - Diverse and Effective Workforce

1. **Projects that are designed to attract, support, and retain a diverse and effective workforce, including effective teachers, School Leaders, or both, from historically underrepresented populations. At minimum, applicants must provide:**

   A description detailing their commitment to creating and maintaining a diverse workforce.

   General:

   1. Overall Comments:
   Partner IHEs will increase their efforts for ensuring diversity in their pre-service teacher programs. ESC 18 and the LEAs will provide educator supports and opportunities to increase retention of a diverse workforce.

   Strengths (if applicable):
   The IHEs have developed action plans to address Critical Race Theory and implicit bias, strategies to close gaps in student success rates in teacher education programs across all demographics, and to monitor and evaluate progress to ensure accountability and equity (e. 52).

   Weaknesses (if applicable):
   Strategies for recruiting and retaining pre-service teacher program students that represent the ethnic and gender gaps were not discussed.

   2. Overall Comments:
   The project provides many layers of support and opportunity for educators, from residency opportunities, to taking leadership roles in support of increasing educator quality. Incentives are provided through performance-based compensation systems and bonuses for reassignment to a low-performing school.

   Strengths (if applicable):
   The applicant thoroughly describes the key project strategies and frameworks that will serve to attract, support, and retain educators, both new educators and effective/highly effective educators. The residency programs for teachers and principals will support and guide then as they gain proficiency in their profession. Compensation models serve to retain, reward, and recognize effective teaching and leadership.

   Weaknesses (if applicable):
   None noted.

Reader's Score: 4

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/13/2017 11:29 AM

Technical Review

Applicant: Region 18 Education Service Center (U374A170083)
Reader #3: **********

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Evidence of Support		
1. Evidence of Support	30	29
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	25	25
Selection Criterion		
Quality of the Project Design		
1. Project Design	20	18
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	20
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Adequacy of Resources	5	4
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority #1		
Improve Equitable Access to Effective Educators		
1. CPP 1	10	10
Competitive Preference Priority #2		
Diverse and Effective Workforce		
1. CPP 2	5	4
Total	115	110

Technical Review Form

Panel #14 - TSL - 14: 84.374A

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

Applicant: Region 18 Education Service Center (U374A170083)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Evidence of Support

1. **In determining evidence of support of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Reader's Score: 29

Sub Question

1. **(1) The extent to which the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students.**

   General:

   Overall Comments:

   The applicant asserts that by improving systems for educator preparation, selection, support, evaluation, and evaluation, they will improve the challenges identified in their high-needs schools. The applicant states through this grants, the proposed target school districts will be able expand their human capital management systems work by bridging LEA interests with those of Institutions of Higher Education in Texas (e. 23).

   Strengths (if applicable):
   The applicant proposes the Texas Educator Effectiveness Model framework to use as a framework for local education agencies in Texas, or nationally to advance Human Capital Management Systems. The applicant list commitments from partner LEAs to expand HCMS and serve as a blueprint for sustainable, long term LEA-IHE partnerships that improve human capital, and the development of support for 350,000 Texas educators and accelerate achievement among 5.3 million students across the state of Texas (e. 23).

   Weaknesses (if applicable):

   The applicant fails to describe performance achievement measures during the first five years of implementation of this model. This will be beneficial considering this project is based on building and improving previous measures.

   Reader's Score:

2. **(2) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of the project services.**

   General:

   Overall Comments:

   The applicant demonstrates that its program will collaborate with Texas Education Agency. The applicant plans to expand its relationships with the University of Texas at Austin, the Texas A & M University System, Texas Association of School Board's HR Services Division and American Institutes for Research (e. 24).

Strengths (if applicable):

In addition to collaborating with local LEAs, the applicant clearly describes the collaborative efforts with partners such as a former school board member, University of Texas at Austin, Texas A&M University System, Texas Association of School Boards' Services Division, and the American Institutes for Research (e. 24). The applicant proposes to expand its relationship with LEA-IHE partnerships to increase the candidate pool of effective teachers, teacher leaders, and principals.

Weaknesses (if applicable): None noted.

Reader's Score:

3. **(3) The extent to which the proposed project will integrate with or build on similar or related efforts to improve relevant outcomes (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)), using community, State, and Federal resources.**

   General:

   Overall Comments:

   The applicant presents a logical plan for sustaining the project beyond the life of the grant. The applicant asserts that it will have funds from local and state professional development and mentoring programs, federal Title programs, and private foundations.

   Strengths (if applicable):

   The applicant clearly describes the way in which the project will be supported using funding from other programs or policies, such as it will have $38,040,025 in non-federal matching funds as needed from partner LEAs to achieve project goals (e. 59). The applicant lists funding in the form of in-kind salary and fringe contributions. The applicant asserts each LEA will present Sustainability Plans each year (e. 60).

   Weaknesses (if applicable): None noted.

   Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. **In determining the need for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Reader's Score: 25

1. **(1) The extent to which the proposed project will provide services or otherwise address the needs of students at risk of educational failure.**

   General:

   Overall Comments:

   The applicant adequately describes the demographics and population of the students who will be serviced by this project. The applicant proposes to support educators in teaching ELL students through a bilingual or dual language program. The applicant addresses high rates of teacher turnover as an areas of weakness.

   Strengths (if applicable):

The applicant adequately describes the extent to which the needs of students are at risk of educational failure by noting 74.1% of students across TSL campus are classified at risk, in comparison to the state's at-risk population of 50.1% (e. 30). The applicant highlights other factors such as 1/3 of the teachers have five or fewer years of teaching experience, and students in high-needs schools have limited access to effective educators. The applicant also cites high turnover rates in the target schools.

Weaknesses (if applicable): None noted.

Reader's Score:

2. **(2) The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project, including the nature and magnitude of those gaps or weaknesses.**

   General:

   Overall Comments:

   The applicant cites factors such as 68% of teachers and 75% of principals we rated as ineffective. The applicant states six campuses participating in TSL projects were rated as Improvements Required (e. 33). The applicant also cites factors such as novice teachers and principals are not adequately prepared to work in high-poverty, low-performing schools where there are high populations of ELL students.

   Strengths (if applicable):

   The applicant presents a clear plan to address gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities by providing incentives for recruiting and retaining educators and incentives for recruiting and retaining highly effective principals. Through the project's TSL project, they propose creating a school climate of success for second language learners and their families (e. 34). The applicant will enhance district-wide systems to support teachers and campus leaders to aide in providing rigor, support, and stability for students (e. 35).

   Weaknesses (if applicable): None noted.

Reader's Score:

Selection Criterion - Quality of the Project Design

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

Reader's Score: 18

1. **(1) The extent to which the proposed project demonstrates a rationale.**

   General:

   Overall Comments:

   The applicant provides as a strategy the distribution of quality teachers, and cites relevant literature that suggests school leaders and teachers have an impact on student achievement (e. 31). The applicant contributes high teacher turnover to a lack of professional and administrative support as a reason for leaving the profession.

Strengths (if applicable):

The applicants TSL project, TEEM, is based on ESC 18 – TxCEE. The applicant's is based on studies by Varlas, 2009, Darling-Hammond 2014, Heneman & Milanowsk 2011. The research based strategies the applicant presents are designed to support educator growth. The strategies/activities that the applicant proposes are unique to each LEA campus.

Weaknesses (if applicable):

The applicant failed to provide statistical data to support the development of a teacher pipeline representative of the schools to be served. The applicant fails to describe how the teachers are currently distributed throughout the district and how they will be implemented under new proposal.

Reader's Score:

2. **(2) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.**

   General:

   Overall Comments:

   The applicant states the proposed project will build on best practices of a previously implemented project. The applicant proposes to incorporate best practices for creating a school climate of success for second language learners and their families as a strategy for addressing the needs of its ELL learners.

   Strengths (if applicable):

   The applicant proposes a plan which will address the needs of the target population and improve instruction and leadership which will enhances student growth and support rigorous academic standards for students. The applicant proposes to incorporate best practices for second language learners and their families (e. 37). The applicant will work with partner LEAs, and IHEs to ensure positive educational outcomes for culturally and linguistically diverse populations.

   Weaknesses (if applicable): None noted.

   Reader's Score:

3. **(3) The extent to which the grant activities will be evaluated, monitored, and reported to the public.**

   General:

   Overall Comments:

   The applicant states the American Institutes for Research (AIR) to develop a TSL evaluation plan. The applicant states quantitative and qualitative data will be used to align the human capital management system with each of the district's vision for instructional improvement and assessing implementation quality (e. 53).

   Strengths (if applicable):

   The applicant has a logical plan for evaluating, monitoring, and reporting grant activities which includes American Institutes for Research assisting in the development of the evaluation plan that has evaluation questions, standards, measures, and data collection instruments (e. 53). The evaluation plan involves an analysis of student achievement results between districts/campuses participating in TSL programs compared to non-TSL Texas districts. The

applicant proposes the development of a tool-kit to disseminate results and lessons learned to interested parties.

Weaknesses (if applicable):

None noted.

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

   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.

   General:

   Overall Comments:

   The applicant asserts Year 1 will be used for planning of the Teacher Residency Program, and the Texas Principal Residency Program. The applicant presents a broad timeline for the completion of project tasks.

   Strengths (if applicable):

   The applicant presents a detailed timeline to achieve project objectives that are within budget. The applicant's proposed timeline includes planning in Year 1 and adoption of HR related policies for Year 2. The applicant provides a timeline of project tasks and activities as well as activities associated with human capital management such as developing/refining rigorous screening and selection tools and mentoring and classroom support for novice teachers.

   Weaknesses (if applicable):

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

1. **The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources for the proposed project based on the following factors:**

Reader's Score: 4

1. **(1) The potential for continued support of the project after Federal funding ends, including, as appropriate, the demonstrated commitment of appropriate entities to such support.**

   General:

   Overall Comments:

   The applicant has effectively demonstrated efficient use of funds to support their initiatives. The applicant provides modifications such as one-time bonuses by using performance to determine salary increase. The applicant highlights PSJA ISD, as example, on decreasing annual across the board 3% pay increases to 2% pay increases and performance based salary using the reserved 1% allotment.

Strengths (if applicable):
The applicant's sustainability plan includes funds from federal Title programs, local and state funding, local and state professional development, and mentoring programs, in addition to private grants. The applicant asserts several of the target schools have plans to absorb costs through non-federal matching funds. The applicant asserts several LEAs proposes to integrated performance based compensation into their local salary scales.

Weaknesses (if applicable):

The applicant fails to present evidence of the number of LEAs who have currently implemented performance based compensation into the existing project. The applicant fails to provide evidence of the LEAs and/or number of LEAs who proposes to implement performance based compensation into their local salary scales.

Reader's Score:

2. **(2) The potential for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing program of the agency of organization at the end of the Federal funding.**
   General:

   Overall Comments:

   The applicant states that the TSL partners will have to update state and local policies to accommodate substantial changes in order to ensure long-term sustainability. The applicant states that each LEA has committed to sustaining efforts to align and enhance human capital practices at the conclusion of the grant period (e. 59).

   Strengths (if applicable):
   The applicant's TEEM project will enhance currently implemented projects. The proposed strategies and activities will serve as a framework for other LEAs. The applicant asserts the results from evaluations of this project will inform future state policy and reform (e. 60). The applicant will use existing resources to improve human capital such as online professional learning platforms, and the University of Texas' Education Research.

   Weaknesses (if applicable): None noted.

   Reader's Score:

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority #1 - Improve Equitable Access to Effective Educators

1. **Projects that are designed to address the most significant gaps or insufficiencies in student access to effective teachers, School Leaders, or both teachers and School Leaders, in High-Need Schools, including gaps or inequities in how effective teachers, School Leaders, or both, are distributed across the LEA or LEAs the project will serve. At a minimum, applicants must:**

   (1) Identify the most significant gaps or insufficiencies in student access to effective teachers, School Leaders, or both, in High-Need Schools, including gaps or inequities in how effective teachers, School Leaders, or both, are distributed across the LEA(s) the project will serve;

   (2) Identify relevant factors used in determining such gaps, such as data on availability of school resources, staffing patterns, school climate, and educator support; and

   (3) Describe how the strategies proposed for closing the identified gaps are aligned to and are consistent with the strategies identified in the State's Plan to Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Educators, approved by the Department in 2015.

   General:

   (1)

Overall Comments:

The applicant present strategies that will address equitable access to quality teachers. The applicant used data compiled from a Texas State study of the characteristics of the school and students (e. 50).

Strengths (if applicable):

The applicant presents significant gaps or insufficiencies such as lack of experienced teachers in low-performing schools, high teacher turn-over, and a high number 74.1% of students in the target schools classified as at-risk. The applicant proposes developing a management system to recruit and retain highly effective teachers and principals. The applicant proposes to prepare novice teachers to meet the needs of the target population through bilingual and dual language programs.

Weaknesses (if applicable): None noted

(2)

Overall Comments:

The applicant indicates as a gap in the schools the equity of teacher distribution. The applicant used research and LEA experiences experimenting previous TIF initiatives to determine solutions for addressing factors such as staffing patterns and school climate (e. 38-40).

Strengths (if applicable):

The applicant states most of the highly effective teachers are in the high performing schools and presents a plan to distribute highly effective teachers to low performing schools. The applicant proposes to develop educators and principals based on outcomes from the evaluation systems.

Weaknesses (if applicable): None noted.

(3)

Overall Comments:

The applicant states their project is aligned to the Texas State Plans to Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Educators. Through this initiative, the state examined characteristics of its schools and students to determine the factors that influence equitable access to high quality educators.

Strengths (if applicable):

The applicant highlights the biggest gap that exists is minority and economically disadvantaged students have the higher percentage of less experience teachers. The applicant proposes to address this gap with Texas Educator Effectiveness Model (TEEM), in alignment with the 2015 Texas Equity Plan. The applicant proposes Human Capital strategies that redistribute effective educators from highest performing schools to lower performing schools, by offering recruitment incentives.

Weaknesses (if applicable): None noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference Priority #2 - Diverse and Effective Workforce

1. **Projects that are designed to attract, support, and retain a diverse and effective workforce, including effective teachers, School Leaders, or both, from historically underrepresented populations. At minimum, applicants must provide:**

   A description detailing their commitment to creating and maintaining a diverse workforce.

   General:

   (1)

   Overall Comments:

   In an effort to create and maintain a diverse workforce, the applicant states it will partner with Institutions of Higher Education and ISD leaders to promote the alignment of standards for educator preparation, support and evaluation through pre-service programming. The applicant states through the partnership with IHE curriculum, and training will be developed to support coaching and mentoring. A lack of these services are listed as reasons why novice teachers leave the profession.

   Strengths (if applicable):

   The applicant presents evidence of its partnering institutions such as Texas A&M University System institutions and University of Texas at San Antonio are implementing strategies to prepare educators to support diverse student populations (e. 52). These strategies will be used to support LEAs in strengthening recruitment, and retention practices and make informed decisions regarding human capital.

   Weaknesses (if applicable): None noted.

   (2)

   Overall Comments:

   The applicant plans include partnering with Institutions of Higher Education to strengthen pre-service programs and certification programs, create and implement teacher and principal residency models, and develop research based professional development in high-need focus areas (e. 606). The applicant will also partner with TASB to develop a multi-tier screen tools for selection and hiring of applicants.

   Strengths (if applicable):

   The applicant proposes to develop robust screening and selection tools and connect other high quality educator programs. The applicant proposes to redistribute effective educators across the local district by attracting effective and highly effective educators from the highest achieving to the lowest achieving schools. The applicant proposes monetary incentives of $10,000 for each TSL campus.

   Weaknesses (if applicable):

   The applicant fails to provide evidence for retaining and recruiting preservice teachers who have backgrounds similar to the population of the students to be served by this project.

Reader's Score: 4

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/13/2017 11:27 AM