

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/20/2020 02:25 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Cal Poly Corporation (S336S200007)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	30	30
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
<b>Adequacy of Resources</b>		
1. Resources	30	30
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	20
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	100
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
1. Opportunity Zones	3	3
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
1. New Grantees	3	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	6	3
<b>Total</b>	106	103

# Technical Review Form

**Panel #1 - FY20 Teacher Quality Partnership - 1: 84.336S**

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

**Applicant:** Cal Poly Corporation (S336S200007)

## 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.**

**(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 represents an exceptional approach for meeting statutory purposes and requirements.**

**(vi) 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.**

#### **Strengths:**

(i) The applicant has provided an adequate rationale for the proposed project (pages e22-e34). The applicant has provided data to show that 80% of California school districts are hiring special education (SPED) teachers with few qualified applicants and in 2016-2017, two-thirds of new SPED teachers were on sub-standard credentials. The project seeks to address these issues by increasing the number of diverse teacher residents with high qualifications in the area of SPED (pages e23-e24). The applicant has addressed how the project integrates components such as innovative models of the residency-based teacher preparation, evidence-based practices and culturally responsive teaching (pages e25-e26). The project will also provide a living wage salary and use multiple methods to assess participant instructional efficacies. The applicant in figure 2 has provided a clear curricular framework for the project and has stipulated that it will integrate best practices that have shown promising results in improving teaching practice for emergent bilingual learners and students with disabilities (pages e29-e30). The applicant seeks to address the existing curriculum issues by including translanguaging pedagogies that draw on student's full linguistic capabilities. The applicant has also made a convincing case for a clinical practice that includes clinical rounds and in-person and video-based tools, and a two-year induction program that will help the LEAs who cannot support the induction financially (pages e32-e33). The applicant has provided a comprehensive logic model (page e103) that adequately describes the project and incorporates a functional project design that underlines the theory to justify the project.

(ii) The applicant has provided two overarching goals of developing an effective residency program and creating sustainability partnerships with local districts and high-need schools in QOZs to promote continuous improvement and increase capacity of both the teaching residents and the mentor teachers (pages e35-e37). Each of the goals drill down into specific objectives that are measurable. For example, goal # 2 has three objectives with outcome measures. Objective 2.1 seeks to provide all teacher residents and mentors with high quality professional development, and the project outcomes include 75% of the teacher residents demonstrating improved self-efficacy to teach students with disabilities and emergent bilinguals as measured by participant surveys, and establishment of a summer annual event to support participants in the high-need areas of SPED and culturally responsive teaching (pages e42-e47). The applicant has provided these goals as outcomes in the logic model on page e103. The strength of the project goals and objectives is a discussion of the background to the goals that make the goals achievable. For example, goal # 1 is made possible by developing five working teams that are responsible for a subset of subset of the objectives and their collaborative work to achieve each of the objective (pages e35-e36).

(iii) The applicant has provided an adequate explanation of the project's exceptional approach to meet the statutory purposes and requirements (pages e47-e49). The applicant has stipulated that the project will work upon the existing infrastructure and long-standing partnership with the school districts through their current TQP program. The applicant has developed effective tools of observation and assessment protocols, and the applicant school of education has earned the highest pass-rate for the teacher credentialing site visit. The applicant has support from expert faculty. On pages e24-e34, the applicant has addressed programmatic requirements of the residency model, stipends to the participants, curriculum and professional development activities, clinical practice and mentorship and a two-year induction program. Each of the programmatic requirements are addressed with an attempt to quality and rigor. For example, the induction program is implemented by an induction team that consists of the applicant and the partner stakeholders to determine the mode of delivery and plans to create a New Teacher Learning Community (pages e32-e33).

(iv) The applicant has provided adequate information of how the project will implement and assess the goals of improving students' academic achievement and access to rigorous academic standards (pages e49-e50). The applicant seeks to use current educational priorities that exceed rigorous state common core standards for SPED and bilingual students in both academic and socio-emotional competencies. The applicant has developed a TQP program to support local high-need districts and schools in providing equitable educational opportunities. The project components are well-aligned with the state Special Education Local Plan Areas (SELPA) that seek to provide high quality educational programs and services for special need students and training for parents and educators.

**Weaknesses:**

(i), (ii), (iii) & (iv) No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 30**

**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 has a strong project evaluation plan to collect valid and reliable performance data (e60-e68). The applicant will hire an independent, experienced, and reputed research firm to conduct the evaluation. In table # 6, on pages e61-e63, the applicant has provided four clear evaluation questions that are aligned with the project goals and valid data sources and outcomes that can be measured through the data. For example, the evaluation question 4 of the project impact on mentor self-efficacy and teacher retention is aligned with the second project goal and has data sources of pre- and post-self-efficacy surveys, demographic data, HR data and grant expense budget reports. The applicant has clear responsibilities for the evaluation firm to collect formative and summative data grounded in the project logic model and receiving project documents to ensure data collection. The project evaluation also has a sound formal reporting cycle to ensure programmatic changes and improvement (pages e63-e64).

(ii) The applicant evaluation plan is feasible and appropriate (pages e64-68). The feasibility and appropriateness of the plan includes use of an independent evaluator and the exploration of the project objectives through clear evaluation questions. For example, to address the second evaluation question of project impact on residents' self-efficacy on teaching students with disabilities and emergent bilinguals, the evaluation firm will use methods such as pre and post self-

efficacy surveys, track the learning growth of students taught by the project participants, and also track the certification and licensure completion of the participants from sources such as QED and EdTPA respectively (pages e65-e66). The appropriateness of the evaluation plan also includes strategies to increase sample size of the cohorts, measurement of aggregate scores based on combination of end-of-year state assessments and common benchmarks assessments (page e66-e67).

**Weaknesses:**

(i) & (ii) No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 20**

**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 extent to which the budget is adequate to support the proposed project.**

**(iii) The extent to which costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.**

**(iv) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates that it has the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the grant, including a multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan; the demonstrated commitment of any partners; evidence of broad support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) critical to the project's long-term success; or more than one of these types of evidence.**

**Strengths:**

(i) The applicant has provided sufficient information to demonstrate applicant support to the project (pages e50-e53). The applicant institution is well-equipped with classrooms fitted with cutting-edge technology and a new educational technology lab. The applicant will also provide participants access to Swivel camera and software licenses for capturing video of classroom instruction. The applicant school of education offers full credential programs. The applicant has internal support through the office of research and sponsored programs to help them manage the project, and the lead faculty will provide support through his/her collaboration successes. The strength of the project is that the applicant will build upon the resources that have been established from previous partnerships and the established in-kind partner district contribution. Moreover, the applicant will also seek support from their school of education alumni to involve in the project as mentor teachers and supervisors (pages e51-e52).

(ii) The applicant has provided a budget on pages e276-e289. The budget description adequately lists costs associated with personnel including PIs, core leadership team, adjunct faculty, and curriculum and instruction master program lecturers. It also covers expenses for travel, supplies such as the purchase of technology platforms for remote supervision/video observation, contractual, training stipends, and indirect. The applicant has provided, as needed the required matching funds and in-kind for the project. The applicant budget of a total of \$2,161,113 is adequate to support the project.

(iii) The applicant budget is reasonable to the project. On pages e53-e54, the applicant has discussed how the project costs were planned according to the contribution from district partners and campus in-kind support. The strength of the budget is the allocation of a majority of the federal budget request for living wage stipends to the teacher residents during

clinical practice. Also, a significant cost-share comes from the local control accountability plan funds to deliver quality professional development for mentor teachers and residents. While discussing the rates the applicant has provided sufficient information of how the costs were determined. For example, the salaries were determined by the state polytechnic state university and the applicant corporation (page e286) and the travel costs are discussed by providing current mileage and per diem rates (page e287).

(iv) The applicant has discussed a strong project sustainability plan (pages e54-e55). Project sustainability plans include multi-year scale up of program services, sharing of costs for program personnel, mentor teacher salaries and professional development through the applicant and the partner districts, the use of leadership team to ensure support of the sustainable and successful residency in years 2-5. Other strategies include working with the applicant development and advancement office to secure external funding and continued support from the district local control and accountability plans. The applicant will have a standing sustainability agenda item on the advisory committee and partners district meetings. The most impactful sustainability aspect is building capacity of the mentor teachers to provide quality coaching beyond the funding period (page e55). The applicant has provided the description of the required match for the project on page e278 to ensure project implementation and sustainability through the five years.

**Weaknesses:**

(i), (ii), (iii) & (iv) No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 30**

**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 the following factors:**

**(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.**

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

**Strengths:**

(i) The applicant has provided an adequate management plan (pages e56-e58). Table 5 on pages e57-e58 provides a list of time bound program activities, responsible parties and program deliverables/milestones. For example, in year 1, from August to December 2020, the applicant seeks to hold leadership team meetings to identify processes and key timelines for other groups, and specific teams engage in work related to program designs and recruitment efforts. The project deliverables include systems and processes to facilitate the project activities, develop partnerships such as that with the evaluation agency, and create essential evidence-based practices and CRT's. On pages e207-e210, the applicant also provides a work plan based on project objectives and inputs from various teams aligned with intermediate and long-term outcomes. The project organizational chart on page e211 clearly identifies the project staff and partners. The roles of the project leadership are clearly outlined on page e56. For example, Ms. Sarah Hegg will serve as program manager, while the PI will serve also as a chair of the recruitment and induction teams.

(ii) The applicant has adequately demonstrated project partner commitment (pages e59-e60). The applicant has already secured cost-share from some of the partners and secured support and collaboration from the California State University center for advancement of reading and writing, school superintendents and Santa Barbara county office of education. The applicant has provided letters of support and partner MOUs (Appendix E, pages e153-e188). The applicant has letters of support from the superintendents of Santa Barbara County and San Luis Obispo county. Moreover, the applicant has

support from California State University, and internal support from institutional leaders such as the dean for diversity and curriculum. The support letters and MOUs clearly demonstrate that the partners are committed to project success. For example, the support letter from Santa Barbara County superintendent shows support to the project plans to implement evidence-based practices and culturally responsive teaching.

**Weaknesses:**

(i) & (ii) No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 20**

**Priority Questions**

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

**1. Spurring Investment in Qualified Opportunity Zones (Up to 3 points).**

**Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that the area in which the applicant proposes to provide services overlaps with a Qualified Opportunity Zone, as designated by the Secretary of the Treasury under section 1400Z-1 of the Internal Revenue Code.**

**An applicant must--**

**(a) Provide the census tract number of the Qualified Opportunity Zone(s) in which it proposes to provide services; (ED Panel monitor will verify the QOZ using this link.) and**

**(b) Describe how the applicant will provide services in the Qualified Opportunity Zone(s).**

**Note: To receive competitive preference points under this priority, applicants must provide the Department with the census tract number of the Qualified Opportunity Zone(s) they plan to serve and describe the services they will provide. For the purposes of this TQP competition, applicants should consider the area where the partner LEA(s) serves to be the area that must overlap with a QOZ; an LEA may be considered to overlap with a QOZ even if only one high-need school included in the project in the proposed TQP grant application is located in a QOZ. A list of QOZs is available at [www.cdfifund.gov/Pages/Opportunity-Zones.aspx](http://www.cdfifund.gov/Pages/Opportunity-Zones.aspx); applicants may also determine whether a particular area overlaps with a QOZ using the National Center of Education Statistics' map located at <https://nces.ed.gov/programs/maped/LocaleLookup/>.**

**Strengths:**

(a) The applicant has adequately addressed the competitive preference priority 1 by providing pertinent information of the QOZ's to be served (pages e21-e22). The applicant has provided in table 2 on page e22, the list of the four QOZs that the project will serve and the school districts that will be located in the QOZ census tract numbers. The applicant has provided information of the school districts in these QOZs that indicate a need for the project based on demographics. The target school districts have a high percentage of families living at or below poverty levels, and there is a high need for STED qualified teachers.

(b) The project will serve the QOZs by hosting teacher residents within the QOZs during their first year of clinical practice, providing professional development and working with school and district leaders in placing new teacher residents in the QOZs (page e22).

**Weaknesses:**

(a) & (b) No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:** 3

**Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 2**

- 1. Competitive Preference Priority 2: (ED Panel Monitor provide the score and comments this CPP.)**

**Applications from New Potential Grantees (0 or 3 points).**

**Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that it has never received a grant, including through membership in a group application submitted in accordance with 34 CFR 75.127-75.129, under the program from which it seeks funds.**

**Strengths:**

No strengths noted.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant has stipulated on page e47 that they have a current TQP grant entitled "El Camino Education Alliance." They are therefore not eligible for this competitive preference priority.

**Reader's Score:** 0

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 08/20/2020 02:25 PM



Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/14/2020 01:37 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Cal Poly Corporation (S336S200007)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	30	30
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
<b>Adequacy of Resources</b>		
1. Resources	30	30
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	20
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	100
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
1. Opportunity Zones	3	3
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
1. New Grantees	3	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	6	3
<b>Total</b>	106	103

# Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - FY20 Teacher Quality Partnership - 1: 84.336S

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

Applicant: Cal Poly Corporation (S336S200007)

## 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.

(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 represents an exceptional approach for meeting statutory purposes and requirements.

(vi) 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.

#### Strengths:

(i) The data provided in the narrative supports the need articulated for this project. This geographic area is one of low socio-economic status. Promising teacher candidates from this area do not have the financial backing to access high quality graduate level courses. Because of this, the area has difficulty finding strong candidates for special education and bilingual education who possess strong academic skills and are well prepared academically. e34 This project represents an exceptional approach for meeting this purpose. The narrative clearly describes the barrier they are facing which is Cal Poly has one of the least racially and ethnically diverse undergraduate student population in the CSU system. e8

(i) The narrative does supply a logic model on page e103. It shows how the project will continually improve to refine the residency.

(ii)The goals, objectives, and outcomes concerning this project are clearly specified and are measurable. e19-20, e35, e207

(ii)Since this project is run by a very skilled leadership team, there is great likelihood that their efforts will improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students. e25

(iii)The proposed residency program draws on current research and other innovative residency models. It integrates specialized courses to meet the needs of these teacher candidates and the students they will teach. The team is using verified teaching approaches with consistent progress monitoring so corrections and adaptations can occur quickly. e30.

(iii)Using research and best practices, this model should help to improve the quality of teachers for this high-need area. These teachers will then help student with disabilities or those that are bilingual.

(iii)Their marketing approach to reduce racial and ethnic barriers concerning teacher candidates is innovative. Narrative describes the recruitment marketing materials that utilize images and language representative of a diverse set of ethnicities, races, and cultures. They will strategize recruitment efforts to publicize in locations and venues outside of those traditionally targeted.

(iii)The program narrative described rigorous criteria for the prospective candidates. e32-33. Examples include GPA 2.67, letters of recommendation from IHE, passing subject matter competencies, admission to the Cal Poly credential and Master's degree programs. e27

(iii) There is a mentorship program with this project. A strong mentor program can provide the needed feedback that teacher residents need to be successful as they attempt the application of new skills and knowledge. e32

(iv)The project proposes the development of informational sessions on bias training, social emotional learning, and social justice curriculum for entering prospective resident teachers and university supervisors. e8 This content will help these

prospective teachers better understand the students that will comprise their future classrooms. Teacher shortage is another issue as SPED and bilingual teachers are leaving these schools and the profession at high rates. e23. Special education students and bilingual students need teachers who are high quality with exceptional skill. This grant will provide teacher residents with additional supports so that they will be highly qualified and skilled to help these students to meet proficiency benchmarks in reading, math and science. Table 1 on page e18 documents the student population of those schools. The project proposes innovative ways to market this residency program to recruit minorities to enter the teaching workforce. This will help to lessen the issue of teacher retention. e19.

(iv) The project will also help to improve the quality of the current and future teaching force through its rigorous curriculum and professional development. e19. This will help to address the teacher shortage as teachers who feel supported and are provided with skills to meet the needs of the students, they are teaching are more likely to stay in those schools. e19, e195-198

(iv) Narrative states that experienced mentors will be involved in the process. They will be trained through the Summer Institute on the process, procedures, and expectations of being a mentor. e45

(iv) The narrative does discuss how the mentor teachers will be selected and what their qualifications will include. e209.

**Weaknesses:**

None noted

**Reader's Score: 30**

**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 project has an independent, external evaluator involved. WestEd will serve as a partner and external evaluator for the TIER Program. e60. This is important because having an external evaluator should help reduce bias, which improves validity and reliability.

(ii) The methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of this project. The narrative mentions multiple types of data being collected through the various evaluations. A table (Table 6) presents an aligned plan that includes the goals, evaluation questions, and how the evaluation will collect appropriate performance data to report on relevant outcomes. e60 Both qualitative and quantitative data will be collected. This helps to strengthen the validity of the results as well. e64

**Weaknesses:**

None noted

**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 extent to which the budget is adequate to support the proposed project.

(iii) The extent to which costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.

(iv) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates that it has the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the grant, including a multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan; the demonstrated commitment of any partners; evidence of broad support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) critical to the project's long-term success; or more than one of these types of evidence.

**Strengths:**

(i) Cal Poly School of Education earned the highest pass rate across the board during California's Commission on Teacher Credentialing site visit (2019). e48 This university is known for its cutting edge, hands-on, interactive learning. This facility will be a good fit for the teacher candidates as hands-on learning is a best practice for struggling learners. The Cal Poly office has a long history of supporting faculty dealing with grant-management. The lead faculty has a long history of collaboration as well. This expertise will help Cal Poly be successful in implementing this grant.

(i) The equipment at Cal Poly is cutting edge technology so prospective students will gain experience with technology integration such as Swivel cameras and GoReact software. This is important in today's society where technology is a large component of teacher instruction/learning and student activities/learning.

(iii) The budget is reasonable in relation to the project plan. Because of this project, many teachers will graduate and will help their students to raise their achievement levels. The budget will also be reviewed quarterly by the leadership team and district partners to make sure the project stays on time and within budget. e53

(iv) The narrative does include a multi-year financial and operation model and accompanying plan on page e54-55 which should help to build capacity and sustainability. It shows scale up for the projects, cost sharing, professional development, and coaching beyond the life of the grant.

(iv) There is strong commitment by each partner to do their part. This is important because when there are no questions on who needs to complete the activities, the grant will continue to move forward.

(i) The match for this project was met.

**Weaknesses:**

None noted

**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 the following factors:**

**(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.**

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

**Strengths:**

(i) There is a table on page e57 which shows clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and program deliverables to accomplish the project tasks.

(i) The narrative provides evidence of a highly qualified team across all sections. The Principal and Co-Principal Investigators have worked on other federal and state-funded grants such as TQP. e48 Because the team has previous experience and is highly qualified, there is adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives on time and within budget.

(ii) There is relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project. A Leadership Team will consist of individuals from both Cal Poly and partner districts who have the authority to make educational decisions on behalf of their agency. e25. The teams have experience working cooperatively in the past. They have a timeframe to meet twice monthly which will help them to sustain collaboration, facilitate the grant process and to engage in continuous improvement from the formative feedback being shared. This shows the relevance and demonstrated commitment of these partners in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project. Since this project is being led by highly competent and experienced team, there is great likelihood that their efforts will improve the quality of teachers in that area who will support rigorous academic standards for their students. e25 There is an organizational chart in the Appendix H5 on page e211 which details the TIER Organization and Committees.

**Weaknesses:**

None noted

**Reader's Score: 20**

**Priority Questions**

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

**1. Spurring Investment in Qualified Opportunity Zones (Up to 3 points).**

**Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that the area in which the applicant proposes to provide services overlaps with a Qualified Opportunity Zone, as designated by the Secretary of the Treasury under section 1400Z-1 of the Internal Revenue Code.**

**An applicant must--**

**(a) Provide the census tract number of the Qualified Opportunity Zone(s) in which it proposes to provide services; (ED Panel monitor will verify the QOZ using this link.) and**

**(b) Describe how the applicant will provide services in the Qualified Opportunity Zone(s).**

**Note: To receive competitive preference points under this priority, applicants must provide the Department with the census tract number of the Qualified Opportunity**

**Zone(s) they plan to serve and describe the services they will provide. For the purposes of this TQP competition, applicants should consider the area where the partner LEA(s) serves to be the area that must overlap with a QOZ; an LEA may be considered to overlap with a QOZ even if only one high-need school included in the project in the proposed TQP grant application is located in a QOZ. A list of QOZs is available at [www.cdfifund.gov/Pages/Opportunity-Zones.aspx](http://www.cdfifund.gov/Pages/Opportunity-Zones.aspx); applicants may also determine whether a particular area overlaps with a QOZ using the National Center of Education Statistics' map located at <https://nces.ed.gov/programs/maped/LocaleLookup/>.**

**Strengths:**

- (a) The narrative does provide thorough documentation concerning the Qualified Opportunity Zones. Census tract numbers are provided. The districts in this TIER partnership have a high population of families living at poverty levels above 20%, compounded with high teacher need in the areas of SPED and bilingual education (see Appendix e21)
- (b) The narrative provides information concerning the services to schools and districts that overlap with these QOZs as follows: 1. host teacher residents within these four QOZs during their first year of clinical practice placement; 2. provide professional development opportunities with mentor teachers; and 3. work with school and district leaders in placing new teacher residents within these QOZs. e22

**Weaknesses:**

None noted

**Reader's Score: 3**

**Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 2**

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 2: (ED Panel Monitor provide the score and comments this CPP.)**

**Applications from New Potential Grantees (0 or 3 points).**

**Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that it has never received a grant, including through membership in a group application submitted in accordance with 34 CFR 75.127-75.129, under the program from which it seeks funds.**

**Strengths:**

None noted

**Weaknesses:**

Currently has a TQP award.

**Reader's Score: 0**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 08/14/2020 01:37 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/20/2020 01:43 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Cal Poly Corporation (S336S200007)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	30	30
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
<b>Adequacy of Resources</b>		
1. Resources	30	26
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	20
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	96
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
1. Opportunity Zones	3	3
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
1. New Grantees	3	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	6	3
<b>Total</b>	106	99

# Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - FY20 Teacher Quality Partnership - 1: 84.336S

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

Applicant: Cal Poly Corporation (S336S200007)

## 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.**

**(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 represents an exceptional approach for meeting statutory purposes and requirements.**

**(vi) 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.**

#### Strengths:

(i) The applicant presents a sound rationale regarding its intent to serve the target population. Relevant data to support its rationale for addressing the needs of the target population is evidenced. Several needs and challenges facing the target population such as high populations of families living at poverty levels above 20%, with high teacher need in the areas of SPED and bilingual education, and 3 to 10 percent of the teachers holding emergency or provisional certification were identified (pp. e21-e23). To further support its rationale, the proposal includes a detailed logic model that presents a visual plan for guiding the project's implementation. The logic model shows the relationships among the project's objectives, inputs, activities, and anticipated short and long-term outcomes. The applicant proposes to use the logic model to drive change that will increase the percentage of residents completing a multiple or single subject credential to include bilingual authorization and special education credentials (p. e103).

(ii) Two comprehensive and measurable goals to be achieved by the project clearly address the identified needs of the target audience to be served. The goals are measurable and timebound. One of the proposed goals, for example, is to develop a residency program that effectively recruits and trains 44 new teachers in the critical shortage areas of special and bilingual education (p. e35). The project also evidences measurable outcomes that correlate with the project's goals that also describe specific changes the project anticipates accomplishing. One outcome, for example, is that the project will form five teams that will oversee the design and implementation of all activities specific to leadership, curriculum and professional development, clinical mentorship, recruitment, and induction (p. e36).

(iii) The proposal well demonstrates that the project's approach is exceptional. For example, the project is employing a non-conventional approach to address challenges relative to widespread teacher shortages in special education and bilingual education, and the lack of high-quality instruction for emergent bilinguals and students with disabilities (p. e22). Exceptional efforts include the project's approach to enhancing the current special education and bilingual authorization program at the partner university by infusing evidence-based practices and culturally relevant teaching models for instruction. Further, the project's approach is exceptional because project participants will engage in clinical rotations to develop specialized competencies and they will be provided mentor teachers (pp. e207-e210). Additionally, the approach



is exceptional because it has promise to impact leadership, curriculum and professional development, clinical mentorship, recruitment, and induction systems changes that influence effective teaching practices specific to special education and bilingual education.

(iv) The project presents a comprehensive process for improving teaching and learning that support rigorous academic standards for students for the target group. The efforts include activities and practices specific to supporting the target high-need districts and schools in providing equitable educational opportunities for students who are most historically underserved, specifically, students with disabilities and students identified as emergent bilinguals. The activities and supports will focus on improving the implementation of evidence-based and culturally relevant practices specific to teaching special education and bilingual students (pp. e49, e208).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 30**

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

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

(i) The proposal demonstrates a detailed method of evaluation designed to produce valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes. For example, the evaluation will involve implementing both a study of program implementation and outcomes. Quantitative data specific to Government Performance & Results Act, Higher Education Act, and the proposed project goals, objectives, and outcomes, will be collected and analyzed. A quasi-experimental design will be utilized to assess whether the project results in improved student outcomes. Qualitative data will be collected and analyzed and used to assess progress and allow for longitudinal comparisons. (p. e60). Reliable performance data will also be collected from relevant artifacts such as surveys, student demographic data, interviews, and standardized assessments to also gauge the project's outcomes (pp. e60, e61).

(ii) The proposal evidence methods of evaluation to gauge the intended outcomes and impact of the project. For instance, the evaluation process includes a visual process outlining the evaluation's approach that aligns the project's goals, evaluation questions, and data sources, and anticipated measurable outcomes. In addition, the formative evaluation will include the use of built-in methods supporting continuous improvement to ensure that implementation efforts are informed by data that help project staff make midcourse corrections as needed (pp. e61-e63). The evaluation process will also provide annual summaries of the quantitative teacher and student outcome measures, specific to student achievement and teacher retention (pp. e67, e68). Further, progress on measures will be reported to program stakeholders through annual performance and annual evaluation reports (p. e64).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 20**

**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 extent to which the budget is adequate to support the proposed project.**

**(iii) The extent to which costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.**

**(iv) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates that it has the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the grant, including a multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan; the demonstrated commitment of any partners; evidence of broad support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) critical to the project's long-term success; or more than one of these types of evidence.**

**Strengths:**

(i) The support, facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources are adequate to successfully support the implementation of the project. For example, the partner university is fully-equipped with classrooms outfitted with cutting-edge technology and a new School of Education technology lab that allows prospective teacher residents to gain experience with technology integration. In addition, the partner districts are committed to providing on-going professional development (p. e50). Further, the partner university's Office of Research and Sponsored programs provides post-award support for faculty to manage external grants that include accounting and communications with the funder. The partner university also has a post-award staff member who conducts tasks such as maintaining the grant's budget (pp. e51, e52).

(ii) The budget identifies all funds that are adequate to support the development and implementation of the proposal. This includes costs shared by the partner school districts are also included in the budget. For example, total costs provided in the budget narrative necessary to implement the project include costs for personnel, travel, supplies, equipment, and training stipends (pp. ee286-e289). Other costs associated with the project such as cost for district personnel, interventionists, and training rooms will be leveraged from project partners to provide further support of the budget (pp. e138, e139). Further, the project's leadership team and district partners will conduct quarterly reviews of the budget to identify progress in spending and revisions needed (p. e53).

(iii) All costs in the budget narrative are reasonable in relation to the project's objectives and potential significance based on the number of persons it proposes to serve. For instance, the primary use of the grant funds will be devoted to the development of a residency program that effectively recruits and trains 44 residents and mentor teachers in the critical shortage areas of Special Education and Bilingual Education. Other reasonable costs to support activities to ensure the objectives are met include but are not limited to personnel necessary for providing services; overseeing and managing the project; and professional development events and teacher resident stipends (pp. e13, e54).

(iv) The proposal well demonstrates that committed, multi-year financial support from project partners inclusive of an operational model and accompanying plan will be provided beyond grant funding. As indicated in the project, for example, the project will capitalize on structures already in place at the district level and university to provide professional development to mentor teachers and coaching and support for teacher residents. In addition, the project will work with the

university's Development and Advancement Office to secure external funding sources as well as District Local Control and Accountability Plans (pp. e54, e55).

**Weaknesses:**

(iv) The proposal lacks details regarding how the project will capitalize on structures already in place to sustain the project beyond grant funding (p. e55). Additionally, the proposal does not indicate what efforts the partner districts would be committed to relative to sustaining the project beyond grant funding.

**Reader's Score: 26**

**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 the following factors:**

**(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.**

**(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 demonstrates a detailed process for how the project will be managed. For example, the project's principal investigator will serve as the chair of the project's leadership team and chair of the recruitment and induction teams (p. e56). The other co-principal investigators will be responsible for recruitment and induction, and curriculum and professional development initiatives, respectively (p. e56). Further, the management plan includes a detailed visual representation of the alignment of the proposed timeline, program activities, responsible parties for program deliverables, to include milestones, and dates for when each activity will take place (pp. e57, e58).

(ii) The relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner to the project is evidenced via letters of support and memoranda of agreements between the participating districts and the project's partner university. The supports and commitments of the project's partners are appropriate for maximizing its efforts to successfully address the identified needs. The supports and commitments are inclusive of cost-sharing and in-kinds in the form of administrative time, mentor teacher time, professional development, teacher salaries, classroom space, and the sharing of data (p. e59). In addition, California State University committed to providing technical assistance specific to strengthening literacy teaching (e154-e184).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 20**

**Priority Questions**

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

**1. Spurring Investment in Qualified Opportunity Zones (Up to 3 points).**

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that the area in which the applicant proposes to provide services overlaps with a Qualified Opportunity Zone, as designated by the Secretary of the Treasury under section 1400Z-1 of the Internal Revenue Code.

An applicant must--

(a) Provide the census tract number of the Qualified Opportunity Zone(s) in which it proposes to provide services; (ED Panel monitor will verify the QOZ using this link.) and

(b) Describe how the applicant will provide services in the Qualified Opportunity Zone(s).

**Note:** To receive competitive preference points under this priority, applicants must provide the Department with the census tract number of the Qualified Opportunity Zone(s) they plan to serve and describe the services they will provide. For the purposes of this TQP competition, applicants should consider the area where the partner LEA(s) serves to be the area that must overlap with a QOZ; an LEA may be considered to overlap with a QOZ even if only one high-need school included in the project in the proposed TQP grant application is located in a QOZ. A list of QOZs is available at [www.cdfifund.gov/Pages/Opportunity-Zones.aspx](http://www.cdfifund.gov/Pages/Opportunity-Zones.aspx); applicants may also determine whether a particular area overlaps with a QOZ using the National Center of Education Statistics' map located at <https://nces.ed.gov/programs/maped/LocaleLookup/>.

**Strengths:**

(a) The proposal demonstrates that the target group to be served are located in QOZ(s). In addition, census tract numbers are provided for the zones the project is proposing to serve (p. e21).

(b) Services the project proposes to provide include but are not limited to assigning mentors to project participants; modifying coursework to include enhancing the current special education and bilingual authorization program at the partner university by infusing evidence-based practices and culturally relevant teaching models for instruction (p. e621).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 3**

**Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 2**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 2: (ED Panel Monitor provide the score and comments this CPP.)**

**Applications from New Potential Grantees (0 or 3 points).**

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that it has never received a grant, including through membership in a group application submitted in accordance with 34 CFR 75.127-75.129, under the program from which it seeks funds.

**Strengths:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:** 0

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 08/20/2020 01:43 PM