

**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: Western Michigan University (S336S200011)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	30	28
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
<b>Adequacy of Resources</b>		
1. Resources	30	25
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	17
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	90
<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	3
<b>Sub Total</b>	6	6
<b>Total</b>	106	96

# Technical Review Form

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

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

Applicant: Western Michigan University (S336S200011)

## 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 project on pages e17-e25. The applicant has discussed the needs assessment of the target school districts. For example, the Benton Harbor Area Schools is diverse with a high level of low-income students, and the three-year teacher retention is less than 50%. The teacher turnover is at 29.2% compared to the state average of 19.3%. The target school district was to be shut down for lack of critical resources, and the applicant has identified elements such as new teacher training in classroom management, curriculum training, whole child model, and adaptive classroom strategies to help the students. Similarly, the Kalamazoo Public schools have a low ranking for average years of teaching and the teachers in the target area have professional needs such as student engagement, trauma-informed teaching practices, restorative practices, instructional technology and multi-tiered system of support (pages e20-e23).

(ii) The applicant has adequately discussed the main project goals and the outcomes associated with the project (pages e16-e17). The project has set four goals of recruiting more teachers of color, increasing the number of certified teachers in high need areas by at least 90 over five years, increasing the three-year retention of certified teachers in high need areas, and ensuring that all program graduates have the professional development they need to be rated as effective teachers within 3 years. On pages e108-e109, the applicant has provided the project objectives with clear targets. For example, for objective # 3, the applicant seeks to achieve a 90% retention of teachers as an outcome measure. The applicant has provided a logic model on pages e50-e51 that tracks project needs, strategies, short/intermediate and long-term outcomes.

(iii) The applicant has provided an adequate description of the project approach to the statutory purposes and requirements (page e23-e38). The applicant discussed the hallmarks of the project elements such as an effective teacher residency model that addresses the needs of the target school districts and is aligned with the NCTR research on establishing effective residencies. The underlying aspect of educator training is the teaching of social justice (page e24). The applicant has discussed an effective pre-service preparation through the use of CAEP standards. The project design takes care to use a program based on best strategies for teacher and an added diagnostic tool. The applicant has described the NCTR standards and how they will be used in the project design. Other hallmarks of the project that address statutory requirements include rigorous graduate-level coursework (page e27), a well-detailed calendar for the residency program (pages e29-e32) for both elementary and special education programs. The applicant has adequately

ensured statutory requirements such as admission processes, resident salaries, cohort models, clinical experience, an effective mentoring model and an induction model. The project logic model on pages e50-e51 tracks project needs, strategies, short/intermediate and long-term outcomes.

(iv) The applicant has briefly addressed the issue of effective teaching and learning on pages e27-e32. The applicant will use the NCTR model to provide the participants a rigorous graduate level teacher preparation program. The project residency model blends a rigorous full-year classroom apprenticeship with a carefully aligned sequence of academic coursework within the institution of higher education. The participants are also exposed to an intensive program in the summer to hone on their teaching and learning skills (pages e31-e32).

**Weaknesses:**

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

(iv) The applicant has not addressed the issue of how the project will lead to improvement in providing students access to rigorous curriculum (pages e17-e38). The applicant does not comprehensively state how the applicant will prepare participants to provide students taught with high level of academic experiences especially students with special needs.

**Reader's Score: 28**

**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 provided a working evaluation plan on pages e41-e60. The project evaluation is goals-based and is guided by key evaluation questions. For example, one of the evaluation questions is whether the residency model is effective for preparing teachers for the target school district needs. The applicant has clearly stated sources of data for project evaluation that includes data points for participant demographics, state licensure completion, program persistence, and research-based instructional practice surveys (page e43). The applicant has discussed methods of ensuring valid and reliable data. For example, the project surveys will be validated through expert review and a pilot study and the data will be triangulated through classroom observations, interview and survey data (page e49). The applicant will also use the quasi-experimental design with control groups to address the What Works Clearinghouse standards. The applicant will also use data to inform programmatic decisions.

(ii) No applicant has discussed both the feasibility and appropriateness of the project evaluation approach. The appropriateness of the evaluation is based on using project goals, objectives and target outcomes aligned with evaluation questions as guiding principles (pages e41-e43). On pages e44-e48, the applicant also discussed an evaluation plan that demonstrates how the evaluation questions will use measurements of accomplishment, data collection/analysis procedures, and a timeline. The strength of the evaluation is the use of multiple sources of data (pages e49) to triangulate the data with both qualitative and quantitative data and the use of data for programmatic improvement. The applicant will use regular management meetings, annual debriefing interviews, and the use of "lessons learned." The applicant will use a dynamic logic model for project evaluation. The project evaluation will be conducted by a doctoral student in education who will focus on program evaluation and the teacher development (page e52).

**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 described some support for the project from the lead institution and the partnering schools (pages e39-e40). The application has provided support from the school districts in the provision of mentors, salaries/stipends, and data support. The university support includes release time for the project director, and salaries for the faculty instructors. On page e180, the applicant indicated matching funds in the form of supplies for the project. On page e109, while providing the budget, the applicant has indicated required match of \$1,141,225.38 for the whole five-year grant. This demonstrates that the project has adequate institutional support.

(ii) The applicant has provided a budget narrative on pages e108-e127. The budget allocates sufficient funds for important aspects such as salaries, fringes and contractual. The applicant has also budgeted for summer orientation travel cost. Stipends are awarded as subawards to the AUSL and the professional evaluation will be paid from the grant monies.

(iii) The applicant budget has provided an adequate budget narrative on pages e123-e127. The budget shows the breakdown of project personnel salaries including matches. The applicant has provided justification for the salaries and fringes and conference travel costs for staff. The applicant has also discussed the contractual for NCTR and the subaward to the public schools.

(iv) The applicant has briefly indicated an attempt to sustain the project at the end of grant funding. On page e40, the applicant will seek NCTR consultation for project sustainability. One of the technical assistantships provided to the project by the agency will be developing a financial sustainability plan.

**Weaknesses:**

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

(iv) The applicant has not demonstrated in the narrative a strong plan beyond the intention for project sustainability. The applicant does not provide a multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan. While the applicant indicates working with the NCTR, the letter of support from the agency on pages e67-e68 does not stipulate technical help

to develop a sustainability plan.

**Reader's Score: 25**

### **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 a brief management plan for the program on pages e52-e56. The management plan provided on pages e54-e56 provides a timeline and milestones for the first cohort. For example, the project staff is hired in October 2020, and by July 2021, cohort 1 classes start. The applicant timeline includes completing annual project report. The applicant also discusses the roles and responsibilities of the project management team (pages e52-e54). For example, the chair of the department of teaching, learning, decagonal studies at the institution will be a part of the management team as the project director. The project will also have support from the school districts in the management team, and the project coordinator will be in charge of the program delivery. Other project staff roles such as the curriculum design team, site coordinators and the NCTR are also discussed.

(ii) The applicant has provided adequate information to demonstrate the commitment of each partner in the proposed project. In appendix E, pages e64-e71, the applicant has provided letters of support that show that the important project partners have indicated strong support. For example, the letters of support from both the Benton Harbor Area Schools and the Kalamazoo Public Schools. The Benton Harbor Area Schools letter provides substantial commitment in terms of in-kind, mentoring support and a seamless connection to the induction program. Similarly, the NCTR will provide technical assistance to developing, supporting and acceleration the teacher residency project.

#### **Weaknesses:**

(i) The applicant management plan does not include a strong strategy to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget (pages e52-e56). The applicant management plan does not include information about the project timelines, and milestones beyond the first cohort.

(ii) No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 17**

### **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 indicated that the project will serve the school districts in Qualified Opportunity Zones (QOZs). On pages e18-e20, the applicant has cited that the schools are located in the census tracts provided.

(b) The applicant has discussed the high need of a quality teacher preparation program for the target QOZs and what is actually needed to address the needs. The applicant has stipulated how the changes in the public-school student placement in AP classes are creating a high need for more math and science teachers. The project will address this need by providing qualified teachers for students in the QOZs.

**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:**

This applicant has never received a TQP award and thus qualifies for the CPP points.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 3**

---

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/14/2020 07:52 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Western Michigan University (S336S200011)

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	26
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	17
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	93
<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	3
<b>Sub Total</b>	6	6
<b>Total</b>	106	99

# Technical Review Form

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

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

Applicant: Western Michigan University (S336S200011)

## 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 population involved with these schools is mainly Black and Hispanic. The families in the area are low income. Because of state budget cuts and low teacher retention, there are many vacancies which are being filled with teachers who are not content qualified or are teaching with emergency licenses. e17-22 That statement was justified with data. There is a shortage of SPED and STEM teachers in this location and there was data to justify this. e18-21 To address this issue, they have reached out to WMU to help develop a residency model which will help local residents earn a bachelor's degree and ultimately teacher certification. This program will help to increase the number of racially diverse, effective teachers in elementary, middle, and secondary schools in this location. Both districts have partnered with WMU to host interns in their undergraduate teacher education program and will hire graduates from that program upon completion. e17 Having more highly qualified teachers in these diverse districts will help to raise student achievement. e18

(i) The teachers in these districts need very specific professional development to help them be successful in the classroom. NCTR will play a very large part in designing and implementing the residency program. e23. The program professional development will be designed specifically for the special needs of these schools.

(i) A Logic model was found on e50-551. Logic models show that the management team has thought through all the different scenarios that are possible. The logic model does show that the services and practices provided could lead to the positive result the grant is striving for.

(ii) Goals, Objective, Outcomes are listed on pages e12, 16-17, 41-42 They are specific and measurable.

(iii) These courses will provide knowledge on culturally relevant teaching and trauma-informed practices which will target the students who live in that area. In addition, the Curriculum Design Team will have faculty who will ensure this content is integrated in the methods courses and seminars. Coursework is tailored to district context. There is a schedule of classes on pages e29-32. The content methods courses in math, literacy, science and social studies focus on teaching the grade level standards for the state. This should help to raise the academic levels on state testing for students in that area. Finally, in the research methods and assessment classes, students will learn about and implement data-based decision making to plan instruction during their residency e28 Using data to drive instruction is critical for student success.

(iii) WMU will work with NCTR to design a program based in research, best practices, and the NCTR Standards of Effective Residences. (vi) The standards serve as guideposts for the development of high performing programs that prepare and retain effective teachers. e26

(iv) The project will work with IHE WMU to accomplish the goals for the local schools. It will work with the NCTR who will

provide development, training, and evaluation. Teacher residents experience extensive opportunities to learn how to teach by working alongside a teacher educator in the district in which they will eventually work. The Center uses best practices and standards. (e26) The residents will teach and learn alongside a trained mentor who will align clinical practice to coursework. This process is excellent role modeling for these new teachers to learn the process of teaching. These mentors will receive release time to plan, prepare, and coach.

(iv) Narrative states that WMU will collaborate with its partners BHAS and KPS to conduct a rigorous recruitment and selection process for mentors. e35. A skeleton sketch of the criteria was included on page e36. It is enough information to help us to know that these mentors are truly leaders. The role of the mentor is described in detail. e37 The narrative mentions that mentors will be given a toolkit of explicit coaching strategies that will help the resident reflect on the instructional practices that impact student learning. The example of feedback was provided. e37 Some mentor training information and ongoing mentor support information was listed on page e38 to show that these mentors will be highly qualified.

(iv) A plan for resident selection was included on page e33. Examples of criteria listed include: leadership roles, the ability to persevere, academic achievement, and their commitment to the community.

(iv) This grant will offer professional development to residents and in the formal induction program in the areas of: student motivation and engagement, trauma-informed teaching practices, and restorative practices. e23. This content will help new teachers to understand and handle behavioral and emotional issues that they might encounter in their future classrooms. e20, 23.

**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) Quantitative and qualitative data will be collected through surveys, observations, interviews, and numerical data. e43

(i) There is an evaluation chart found on page e44 that shows how the project evaluation is organized around key questions. The chart does describe core measures, data collection procedures, and timelines to address project goals. The narrative states that both qualitative and quantitative data will be collected which will help to provide validity for this project. e44.

(ii) The Preliminary Evaluation Plan Chart provides an overview of evaluation. A detailed evaluation plan will be created within three months of project funding that provides detailed measures, specific evaluation activities, and a timeline consistent with the project timeline. e44-48 The data evaluation data and updated logic model information will be used by the management team for assessing progress towards goals. e50-51

**Weaknesses:**

NONE 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) BHAS and KPS have committed to paying a teacher assistant salary of \$30,000 to each resident. That shows the commitment of these schools to entice these teachers to stay in their districts. The grant funds will be used to pay a stipend of \$20,000 to each resident to supplement the salary to the level of a new teacher (\$50,000) as an incentive to earn certification and promising to teaching in the district for a minimum of 3 years. e36

(i) the match has been met (e107)

(ii) The budget does seem adequate for the scope of the project. e107 The budget listed costs for personnel, supplies such as consumables, travel, and other expenses.

(iii) The costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and the significance of the project. e107

**Weaknesses:**

(iv) There was little evidence that this project has the ability to operate beyond the length of the grant. e40 There was a statement in the paragraph on e40 that NCTR would help with sustainability, but there was no memorandum of understanding provided or other information to justify that statement.

**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 management plan does describe expertise and includes many years of experience working on multi-million dollar grants. e52

(ii) The narrative does supply evidence concerning the commitment of each partner and that the partners are qualified. There is information on page e52-54 where the responsibilities are defined.

(ii) The narrative does provide adequate information concerning the relevance and commitment of each partner in this project. Evidence included letters of support on page e38. The details of support was listed on page e64-70

(ii) There is adequate information that the partners will each do their part in this project. A bulleted list is provided on e39-40. The narrative does talk about release time for the project director and the monetary commitment provided by partners.

**Weaknesses:**

(i) There is a chart on page e54 that shows a timeline and milestones for this project however, it only covers the first cohort. To get a clear picture of the project, the chart should have shown the entire timeframe.

Reader's Score: 17

**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) Census tract Number is provided – census tract 4 3e

(b) The narrative does describe in adequate detail how they will provide services for that area "to promote equity and excellence in education" by recruiting, preparing and retaining 100 high need teachers. Project Goals were listed: 1. Recruit more teachers of color by creating cohorts that are at least 20% racially diverse. 2. Increase the number of certified teachers in high need areas by at least 90 teachers over the 5 years of the project. PR/Award # S336S200011 Page e16 WMU Urban Teacher Residency Program 4 3. Increase 3 year-retention of certified teachers in high need areas. 4. Ensure that all program graduates have the professional development they need to be rated as effective teachers within 3 years. E3

**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:**

Has not received a grant before

**Weaknesses:**

NONE NOTED

**Reader's Score:** 3

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 08/14/2020 07:52 PM

Status: Submitted

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

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Western Michigan University (S336S200011)

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	25
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	15
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	90
<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	3
<b>Sub Total</b>	6	6
<b>Total</b>	106	96

# Technical Review Form

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

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

Applicant: Western Michigan University (S336S200011)

## 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. The applicant identified several high-intensity needs and challenges facing the target population to include but not limited to continued teacher shortages; teacher retention rate of 50 percent or less; high teacher turnover rate of 29.2 percent compared to the state average of 19.3 percent; and 100 percent of the students in the target area are low-income (p. e18). To further support its rationale for implementing the project, 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 needs, strategies, and short, intermediate, and long-term outcomes the project anticipates (pp. e50, e51).

(ii) Four comprehensive goals to be achieved by the project which clearly address the identified needs of the target audience to be served are evidenced. The goals are measurable and timebound. One of the goals, for example, is that the project will recruit more teachers of color by creating cohorts that are at least 20 percent racially diverse. The proposal also includes objectives and outcomes that correlate with the project's goals. One objective and its corresponding outcome, for example, is to develop a recruitment and selection process designed to attract least 10 new racially diverse teachers candidates in each of the project's participating districts (p. e41).

(iii) The proposal included sound evidence that the project's approach is exceptional. Exceptional aspects of the proposal include the fact that the project is responding to current challenges of the target area specific to student motivation and engagement, trauma-informed teaching practice, restorative practices, instructional technology, and multi-tiered systems of support. The design of the project is also anticipated to prepare teachers who are committed to social justice and social change. Participants will also engage in coursework that is tailored to district context, with residents learning the district's core instructional initiatives and curriculum (p. e24, e28). In addition, participants will take courses that provide knowledge on culturally relevant teaching and trauma-informed practices, and learn about and implement data-based decision making to plan instruction during their residency (p. e28).

(iv) The project outlines a detailed approach that is anticipated to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students in the target area. The efforts include the designing of an effective preservice teacher preparation program designed to meet the teaching and learning needs of the target population (p. e25). Teacher participants will engage in rigorous course work that leads to a master of arts in teaching specific to special education,

English language arts, or mathematics at the elementary, middle, and high school levels. Further, teacher participants will be assigned to mentors. The mentors as well as school and school leaders will be provided the opportunity to engage in professional development opportunities (pp. e34-e38).

**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) A detailed evaluation method designed to produce valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes is demonstrated. As indicated in the narrative, for example, the evaluation process will include formative and summative components. The formative and summative evaluation components are anticipated to assess the effectiveness of strategies to recruit racially diverse residents; determine the impact of programming on mentors, residents, and new teachers; provide evaluative information to improve programming, and identify strengths and limitations of the project. Further, the evaluation will be guided by key questions that focus on the project's goals and intended outcomes (pp e42, e43).

(ii) Methods of evaluation designed to measure the intended outcomes and impact of the project are demonstrated. Qualitative and quantitative data collection will be drawn from artifacts such as participant demographics, state licensure completion, program persistence, teacher retention and survey data, and classroom observations. The data will be analyzed and used to inform project programming improvements and to assess progress towards the project meeting its goals and associated objectives (pp. e43, e49).

**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, supplies, and other resources are adequate to successfully support the implementation of the project. As noted in the narrative, for example participating school districts will provide \$30,000 a year teacher assistant salaries for the residents, partial salaries for site-based coordinators as well as provide data support. The partner university will commit to paying the salaries of the faculty instructors of the courses in the MA programs. In addition, grant funds will be used to cover the summer salary for the project director and the Curriculum Design Team. Grant funds will be used to defray other costs such as mentor training, the induction process, and technical assistance to ensure the sustainability of the project's efforts (pp. e39, e40). In addition, the National Center for Teacher Residencies committed to cost-sharing of \$35,000 in the first year of the grant (p. e67). The cost for supplies such as professional development books, office supplies, and technology are reflected in the budget narrative. Additionally, as indicated in the budget narrative, the project and the partner university will be equally responsible for all costs related to project's implementation (p. e124).

(ii) Sound evidence that the budget is adequate to support the proposed project is provided. Total costs provided in the budget narrative necessary to implement the project include costs for personnel, travel, supplies, and technical assistance (pp. e107-e113). In addition, the budget includes costs shared by the partner school districts.

(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. Specifically, the grant's funds will be used to ensure the increase in the number of certified teachers in high need areas and increase teacher retention, and increase the number of teachers of color (p. e108). 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 for project mentors and school leaders (p. e38).

(iv) A general plan for the sustainability of the project beyond grant funding is demonstrated. As indicated in the narrative, for example, the applicant will utilize grant funds in years 3-5 to receive ongoing technical assistance from the National Center for Teacher Residencies to develop a financial sustainability plan to cover program expenses when the grant ends (p. e40).

**Weaknesses:**

(iv) The proposal lack details regarding the technical assistance that will be provided by the National Center for Teacher Residencies relative to sustaining the project beyond grant funding. Further, clearly demonstrated commitments of the project's stakeholders to include the lead applicant, the partner university, and the partner districts beyond grant funding are not demonstrated.

**Reader's Score: 25**

## 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 presents a concise process for how the project will be managed. Delineated responsibilities of key project personnel are demonstrated. For example, the project director will supervise the function of the project as well as plan and coordinate program activities, and be in charge of financial matters. The project evaluator will be responsible for planning, coordinating, and carrying out the evaluation and research, and dissemination of the project's results (p. e53). Further, the management plan includes a timeline of activities and milestones, for when specific activities will occur, and identified staff responsible for when some of the activities will be addressed (pp. e54-e56).

(ii) The relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project are evidenced via letters of support. For example, the dean of the project's host university is committed to recruiting content faculty to serve on the project's design team. In addition, the two participating school districts will commit to defraying portions of the costs for the resident's salaries and portions of costs for the induction program as well as 10 percent of the administrative project salaries and professional development (pp. e65-e69).

### Weaknesses:

(i) The management plan does not include a detailed process for aligning the activities with the project's goals and objectives. Although a timeline of activities is presented, the plan does not evidence all persons responsible for ensuring each activity is addressed in an effort to ensure the goals and objectives are met. Many of the activities are limited to being the responsibility of the project coordinator. Limited persons responsible for carrying out project activities have the potential to limit the overall intended implementation and the anticipated outcomes of the project (pp. e54-e56).

Reader's Score: 15

## 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 is located in QOZ(s). Census tract numbers are provided for the zones the project is proposing to serve (p. e12).

(b) Services the project proposes to provide include but are not limited to recruiting, preparing, and retaining 100 teachers through the implementation of a teacher residency program that is anticipated to address the severe teacher shortage in the target areas. Services will include but are limited to participants being assigned mentors, participating in relevant professional development, and taking course work that leads to a master of arts in teaching ( pp. e17, e22-e26).

**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:**

This applicant has not previously received a Teacher Quality Program application grant (p. e16).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 3**

---

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