

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/20/2020 04:27 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Montclair State University (S336S200013)

Reader #1: *****

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

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - FY20 Teacher Quality Partnership - 2: 84.336S

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Montclair State University (S336S200013)

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 provides a strong rationale for the proposed project. The applicant clearly notes that the schools that are the focus of this proposal have an average of 81.7% of students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch. In academic achievement, college/career readiness and student growth, the schools are among the lowest in the state (e28). In the target schools, the percent of faculty that were working under a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) at the end of the current school year ranges from a low of 7.10% to a high of 11.43% (e28). Additionally, the inquiry focus of the proposed project will build the capacity of the school educators to use research to enhance student, school, and district performance. More specifically, it will help educators at different stages in their teaching careers develop an inquiry orientation to their work and acquire the knowledge and skills necessary to 1) use student achievement data to improve their practice; 2) understand, interpret and use research to improve teaching and learning; 3) assess needs and formulate questions for district, school, and classroom research and evaluation; and 4) design, conduct and use action research within professional learning communities to improve learning and teaching in their classrooms (e43). Additionally, a clear linkage of this rationale is provided in the form of a logic model with appropriate inputs, goals, objectives, activities, short, mid and long-term outcomes (e83-e91).

ii. Strong relevant goals, objectives and measurable outcomes are provided in the application. For example, the goals are to: recruit and prepare high-quality, dually-certified prospective teachers for partner LEAs through a residency program for individuals who reflect the diverse communities of the school district communities, who have strong academic backgrounds, who have interests in mathematics and science, and who will educate students in special education across PK-12, and in all subject areas; improve the quality and retention of mentor teachers in partner LEAs through professional development aligned to residency curricular goals; improve the quality and retention of novice teachers in partner LEAs by supporting program graduates with an induction program, ongoing professional development, and a network of local and national, high quality educators; and disseminate and scale the exemplary teacher residency model by incorporating key elements into the university's teacher education program, strengthening the partnership with the city school board induction program, extending the model into a new partnership with targeted school districts, and informing the urban teacher education field (e14; e44-e48).

iii. The applicant provides solid evidence of an exceptional approach for meeting statutory purposes and requirements. For example, the applicant proposes to work with two high-needs school districts, specifically to operate a teacher

residency program. Consistent with the desires of the two LEAs, the program will work to recruit applicants from URGs to the program, and will provide teacher residents with the education, training, and skills necessary to work in the two districts, teaching in high-needs schools in high-need subject area (e23). Also, graduates of the teaching residency program will be placed in cohorts that facilitate professional collaboration (e23). Further, the program design is influenced by strong research-based models relating to the successful qualities of urban teachers, as well as literature on the professional development continuum for teachers, from pre-service through induction and into professional development and research on teacher retention in high-poverty urban schools (e49).

iv. The applicant clearly identifies a plan for improving teaching and learning and support of rigorous academic standards for students through the proposed program. The proposed project is embedded in a well-established, long-standing and multi-faceted partnership with state school board that has cemented professional relationships among leaders and staff across institutions, ensuring the coordination of teacher preparation and professional development programs with educational reforms initiated at all levels. The history of collaboration will ensure the alignment of standards, assessments, curriculum, and procedures across the district and the university. These relationships and history have led to clear communications and the development of strategic to collaboratively recruit, prepare, and retain high quality teachers (e50). The applicant proposes to use a research-based framework in building their model and plan.

Weaknesses:

- i. No weaknesses noted
- ii. No weaknesses noted
- iii. No weaknesses noted
- 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 describes extensive that they will retain the Center for Research and Evaluation on Education and Human Services (CREEHS) to conduct the program evaluation of the proposed project. CREEHS has consulted on the design of the proposed evaluation plan to ensure its inclusion of (i) valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes and (ii) thorough, feasible and appropriate methods, aligned to the goals, objectives and outcomes of the project (e51). The evaluation will employ a mixed methods design, utilizing multiple qualitative and quantitative methods to collect data from a wide range of stakeholders and sources. The evaluation will provide periodic performance feedback to inform ongoing monitoring of progress toward project benchmarks as well as a summative analysis of that progress (e53). The logic model and conceptual framework noted in the narrative informs the instrument development and refinement, procedures and reporting described in this application (e53).

ii. A thorough feasible, and appropriate evaluation plan that is connected to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project is noted in the narrative. The proposed evaluation consists of formative and summative elements. The

project goals have each been designed with specific evaluation questions in mind. They have clearly identified objectives, outcomes and specific performance measures that are appropriately aligned (e53-e59). The applicant indicates that the external evaluator will design all instruments, protocols, and templates to collect data that respond to the evaluation questions, performance measures and indicators noted in the narrative. These will include both quantitative and qualitative data, which will be triangulated to increase the reliability and validity of findings. Data will inform findings about program implementation and processes, program outcomes and impacts, lessons learned (e.g., successes and challenges), and recommendations for program improvement that emerge from the information collected and synthesized (e59). Additionally, the applicant indicates that qualitative data collected from all interviews, focus groups, observations and surveys will be summarized and content analyzed for common themes and trends. Also, quantitative data from surveys and extant data will be analyzed using appropriate analytic methods, including descriptive (e.g., frequencies, cross tabulations) and/or correlational analyses as well as any inferential techniques (e.g., analysis of variance, analysis of covariance, multilevel modeling) appropriate to the data collected and/or objectives (e61; e237-e247).

Weaknesses:

- i. No weaknesses noted
- 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. Solid evidence of support, including facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources, from the applicant organization and the lead applicant organization is provided in the narrative. For example, the applicant indicates that significant in-kind resources including facilities, faculty and staff costs with fringe, graduate assistants, and technology resources are contributed by the university. Both the city school board and school systems will also assure that staff will be released to help teach sessions with the residents. The Co-PIs will be responsible for sharing the strengths of the residency program with other faculty, LEAs, and the state to gain support for the residency model across the state (e62).

ii. The applicant requests \$3,692,915 over the five-year period and provides an equal amount of match contributed by the applicant and their LEA partners. They have also identified the costs necessary to support each program element (including goals and objectives) and have carefully budgeted every line item. The applicant specifically indicates that

salaries and fringe requested (and provided as match) are in line with institutional policies and community norms (e63).

iii. Clear evidence of reasonable costs are in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project. For example, stipends for teacher residents are one of the single largest costs in their requested budget. The applicant indicates that stipend costs are based on LEA pay scales and are shared with the districts as part of their commitment to the program. Also, costs for materials and supplies (on the match side) are budgeted to include digital backpacks for each participant that will benefit the teacher and district long-term. Additionally, they indicate consultant costs allow them to provide high-quality training and professional development essential to the program. Indirect costs have been limited to 2% of modified total direct costs (e63). Further, the applicant notes induction services are provided at no-cost to this project as it is an existing service currently provided by the university that will be transferred to become the responsibility of their district partners beginning in Year 2 and 3 (e21).

iv. The applicant provide solid evidence 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. For example, the applicant notes that the university will continue to provide the professional development for the mentors and teachers in areas requested by each district throughout the project. Topics for the planned professional development include diversity, equity, and inclusion, as well as social emotional learning, cognitive coaching, universal design for learning, data-driven assessment, and action research (e21). The applicant also clearly states that their program will support 60 teacher residents in four cohorts across the five-year program (e23). The applicant also indicates that they are contributing more than two-thirds of the required match in both cash and in-kind costs. This extraordinary contribution speaks to the deep commitment from the applicant. They also purport to actively fundraise for the program going forward, seeking additional grants as well as corporate and foundation support (e64). Commitments from stakeholders are also cleared provided in the application (e152-e157).

Weaknesses:

- i. no weaknesses noted
- ii. no weaknesses noted
- iii. no weaknesses noted
- 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. An adept management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget is provided in the application. Specifically, faculty and administrators with expertise in project related areas including instructional subject areas, grants management, and financial management are prepared to support grant activities as provided in the narrative (e64) Vita's noting key qualifications are appropriate and provided in the application (e93-e150). The applicant also provides a clear timeline noting milestones for accomplishing project tasks (e22).

Specifically, the applicant demonstrates that in Year 1 they will engage in active planning for the project implementation with the state board of education and the partnering school districts. The applicant has also provided Memoranda of Understandings from these partners, which are included (e151-e157).

ii. Appropriate commitments of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project is evidenced in the application. For example, the applicant indicates that the university and their two LEA partners, have each made significant financial commitments including: 1) The College of Education and Human Services will contribute significant matching in-kind services and funds to the project including: a) course release time for the PIs; b) Space to operate the program; c) Digital backpacks that include hardware such as laptops, iPads and peripherals for each teacher resident admitted to the program; d) Faculty time to teach courses; e) Marketing and publicity; and g) Travel for findings dissemination; 2) the College of Science and Mathematics will contribute personnel to the project specifically to teach mathematics and science courses for the teacher residents; and 3) partner LEA's will: 1) Execute a MOU with university for the proposed program; 2) Participate in a project advisory team; 3) Support recruitment and selection of teacher residency candidates; 4) Identify potential mentors and support the project with stipends for mentors; 5) Support a portion of the stipends for teacher residency candidates; and 6) Assume the responsibility for induction services with the university in Year 2 and Year 3 (e66).

Weaknesses:

- i. no weaknesses noted
- 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; 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:

- i. The applicant had noted the two LEA's Census Tract numbers 34013008100 and 34013018900 (e26).
- ii. The applicant also provides clear evidence of clearly appropriate services that will be provided to the district and schools in these zones. Also, teacher residency candidates will be placed into programming that will serve the schools and students who live in these zones (e26). Further, teachers will be provided professional development in diversity, equity, and inclusion, as well as social emotional learning, cognitive coaching, universal design for learning, data-driven assessment, and action research. These will be used to help educators incorporate these strategies into existing STEM curriculum.

Weaknesses:

- i. No weaknesses noted
- ii. 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:

This applicant has received a TQP award, therefore they do not qualify for the CPP points.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/20/2020 04:27 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/21/2020 12:36 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Montclair State University (S336S200013)

Reader #2: *****

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

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - FY20 Teacher Quality Partnership - 2: 84.336S

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Montclair State University (S336S200013)

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 logic model is included and well developed with inputs, goals, objectives, activities, outputs and outcomes (p e83-91). The project provides a good rationale about needs for special education and bilingual education teachers, teachers of colors (p e29) and a significant number of teachers to replace each other (n=105, in OPS in 2018-19, p e31-32). Each fellow will pursue elementary or secondary education with disability or TESOL endorsements (p e35)

(ii) The goal, objectives and measurable outcomes are well developed and detail in the logic model. It states (1) recruit high-quality, dually certified teachers, (2) retention in mentor teachers, (3) retention in novice teachers and (4) dissemination and scalability (p e44-48)

(iii) The residency approach (18m grad, 2yr induction) is fully developed and meet the TQP purposes and requirements. The approach is evidence-based by research support and has similar elements to the MyTeachingPartner program which meets WWC standards with reservations (p e49).

(iv) The effort to improve teaching and learning is fully developed as described in the project narrative (p e44-51). Specifically, Goal #1 is to recruit and prepare for prospective teachers for two high-need LEAs (NBOE and OPS) and align with Goal #2: improving the quality and retention of mentor teachers, Goal #3 improving the quality and retention of novice teachers and Goal #4 disseminating and scaling up this residency model.

Weaknesses:

(i) N/A

(ii) N/A

(iii) N/A

(iv) N/A

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) An independent and experienced evaluator, CREEHS is involved in the evaluation process. The information of validity and reliability of instruments is discussed on p e53.

(ii) The performance data on the relevant outcomes is aligned to four project goals, objectives and outcomes (p e51-52). The applicant has provided a well-developed evaluation plan for assessing the project in terms of formative and summative elements (p e53) to respond GPRA and HEA requirements.

Weaknesses:

(i) N/A

(ii) N/A

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) Strong partnership between MSU, NBOE and OPS, Colleges of Education and Sciences. The match was met as it requests \$3.69M, and provides \$3.69M for in-kind (a total of \$7.38M combined) for 60 residents (p e05).

(ii) The living stipend \$44,000 is adequate to recruit and support the residency fellows in NJ.

(iii) The cost of the project is reasonable. The cost of living in NJ is expensive as the project requests \$1.7M and in-kind match \$0.94 M for resident stipends (e253-254). The remaining requested amount \$1.99M (\$3.69M-\$1.7M) to train 60 residency candidates as \$33K per resident.

(iv) The partnership has a sustainable working model. The partners commit to support nearly 25% of the stipend costs (p e63). MSU is also deeply invested in the TQP with providing significant in both cash and in-kind match. MSU will actively fundraise and seek for additional funding to support.

Weaknesses:

- (i) N/A
- (ii) N/A
- (iii) N/A
- (iv) N/A

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 capacity of the management team is fully developed, including the PI and two co-PIs with two previous TQP projects. The management plan was not specified on Section IV but the related information can be found on Section I and the logic model.

(ii) The commitments from University, partners, project leadership team, College of Education and College of Science and Math are fully developed (p e50 and p e151-157) For example, the letter of commitment from College of Science and Mathematics states its faculty instructors will support preservice teaching, residents, novice teachers, and mentor teachers in Newark and Orange schools, and will participate in other preparation, induction, and networking activities with the goal of supporting the teachers' continuing development of content knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge in mathematics and science.

Weaknesses:

- (i) N/A
- (ii) N/A

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; 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:

- (i) The census tract numbers were provided and described in detailed (p.e26)
- (ii) The quality of the services in the QOZs is fully developed as stated in the project narrative. The project serves two LEAs, Newark Board of Education Census Tract 4013008100 and Orange Public Schools Census Tract 34013018900 through its four project goals (prospective teachers, mentor teachers, new teachers, scalability)

Weaknesses:

- (i) N/A
- (ii) N/A

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:

A previous awardee is not qualified for these 3 points.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/21/2020 12:36 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/20/2020 04:33 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Montclair State University (S336S200013)

Reader #3: *****

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

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - FY20 Teacher Quality Partnership - 2: 84.336S

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Montclair State University (S336S200013)

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 proposes an effective project based on research which indicates that a teacher residency program that includes the introduction and teaching of pedagogy, has opportunities for classroom experience of new concepts and practices, and includes the mentoring of teachers will produce stronger teachers. They cite several studies that demonstrate the success of programs that teach and foster community, collaboration, and continuous improvement. The program is designed so that participant residents earn a master's degree over an 18-month period and benefit from induction support and ongoing professional development to solidify the new knowledge and understanding of practices. (page e32) Further, they cite research that recommends highly selective hiring practices that include having candidates demonstrate a strong content knowledge as determined by a degree in a relevant field with a minimum 3.0 GPA; letters of recommendation; strong verbal and written communication skills as determined by a submitted essay and interview; successful passing of state licensing exams; reflectiveness and commitment to critical thinking and resiliency qualities. (page e33) They include a copy of a Logic Model that illustrates the theoretical framework for their program's rationale. (Appendix C)

ii) The applicant presents a set of four goals and several associated objectives. The objectives are specific and measurable and identify the anticipated outcomes. For instance, Goal # 1 focuses on the recruitment and preparation of high-quality, dually certified prospective teachers through a residency program who will work and serve two partner LEAs. The objectives include the recruitment and selection of 60 teacher residents, broken into four cohorts over the course of the project, who will learn and incorporate inclusive teaching practices, demonstrate their capacity to meet or exceed program performance standards and earn a master's degree in their certification areas. Teachers with an interest and experience with improving student achievement in math and science will be intentionally recruited and supported because this is a recognized deficiency within the target schools. (Page e44 – e48)

iii) The proposed program meets the criteria for an exceptional approach. The applicant is proposing to expand a currently successful teacher residency program that is grounded in research and is aligned with high-quality teacher preparation programs that are being conducted nationwide. (pages e48- e50) They explain how their residency program is influenced by the Boston Teacher Residency and the Urban Teacher Residency in Chicago, which implemented research-based models relating to the successful qualities of urban teachers. Further, they describe the kinds of literature that documents the influence of a professional development continuum from pre-service to induction leading to teacher

retention in high-poverty urban schools. (page e49) The proposed program also has elements that are like the eMINTS Comprehensive Program cited in the What Works Clearinghouse as an intervention that meets standards without reservations. (page e49)

iv) The proposed project is clearly part of a comprehensive effort to meet the needs of the LEAs in the target area and is an extension of a long-standing multi-faceted partnership between the applicant university and one of the LEA Board of Education. Their history of collaboration has assured the alignment of standards, assessments, curriculum and procedures across the district and university. Those same alignments and efforts will be implemented with the new partner LEA. The collaborative work with the new partner LEA has resulted in a shared sense of purpose and focus. The applicant reports that the new LEA has made a significant financial commitment to the program as well. (page e50) Further, the two LEAs have strategic plans that have shared needs for recruiting highly qualified teachers which has led to the development of the proposed program expansion. (e51)

Weaknesses:

- i) No weaknesses noted.
- ii) No weaknesses noted.
- iii) No weaknesses noted.
- 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 proposes to contract with an external evaluator who has consulted on the evaluation plan design and has ensured that it includes valid and reliable performance data on the project outcomes and that it will implement thorough, feasible and appropriate collection and analysis methods. (pages e 51-e52) The external evaluator has an extensive history of conducting evaluations and applied research methods for federally funded teacher preparation and development projects. The project will employ a mix methods design, utilizing multiple quantitative and qualitative methods to collect data from a wide range of stakeholders and sources. The evaluation team will provide periodic performance feedback to the project team and will develop a summative analysis of the project progress. (page e52) The applicant assures that the evaluator will review the project's Logic Model to ensure that relationships between participants, resources, activities, outcomes and resulting impacts are clearly described.

ii) The applicant's description of their evaluation design includes a comprehensive overview of the project goals linked with specific evaluation questions. They have identified objectives, outcomes and performance measures for each goal and list the related evaluative question(s) that will be answered through the evaluative process. (e53- e59) Additionally, the applicant clearly describes the strategies and methods that will be employed to gather the quantitative and qualitative data. (page e59) The proposed evaluation methods are thorough, feasible and are appropriate to the proposed goals and objectives. (pages e53-e61, e237-e247)

Weaknesses:

- i) No weaknesses noted.
- 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 provides an adequate summary of the kinds of support and resource that will be contributed to the project by the applicant and the two partner LEAs. They assure that the program will benefit from the integration of funds from several sources, including some that are directly from the partner LEAs. The LEAs are contributing funds toward residents' and mentors' stipends and are providing significant access to in-kind resources such as facilities, faculty and staff salaries and fringe benefits, graduate assistants and technology resources contributed by the applicant. The two LEAs have assured that the staff will be released to help teach sessions with the residents.
- ii) The applicant's budget was developed collaboratively with their project partners, assessing the costs related to pay scales for the stipends for the resident teachers, estimates for local and grant related travel to Washington, D.C., consultant costs, materials and supplies, and the cost of providing the training and professional development. The proposed budget includes items that are detailed and appear reasonable, adequate, and in alignment with the scope of the project. (pages e253 - e276)
- iii) The proposed budget costs are reasonable and are in alignment with the proposed activities for the project. The applicant's budget worksheet and narrative explain the cost basis for the expenditures and links the cost items to the project goals and objectives. Additionally, the applicant describes how they came to the proposed costs based on meeting the goals, objectives, and activities. (pages e253 – e276, e62-e63) The applicant includes appropriate levels of the required financial match. (page e256)
- iv) The applicant's explanation for how the project budget includes a plan for sustainability beyond the period of the grant award is reasonable. They assert that they have deliberately planned for sustainability and as such, have included a sixth

year's budget plan that provides for faculty salaries that have been attributed to the grant will be institutionalized following the end of the grant. The applicant describes a plan of having an Advisory Council consisting of the principle investigators and senior leadership from each of the LEAs, will work on developing a strategy for establishing a method for sustaining the resident stipends beyond the grant award. (page e63) Additionally, they include a description of the in-kind contributions that will be made by the LEAs which includes supporting a portion of the stipends for teacher residency candidates and assuming the responsibility for the induction services in year two for one LEA and in year three for the other LEA. (page e66)

Weaknesses:

- i) No weaknesses noted.
- ii) No weaknesses noted.
- iii) No weaknesses noted.
- 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 provides an adequate description of the key personnel and identifying their experience and expertise and describing the overarching role and responsibilities to the project. They include detailed copies of the resumes/vitae which further documents the expertise of each of the personnel. (pages e64-e65, e93- e150) The applicant includes a sample timeline that plots key project activities by quarter in each of the three program years. They also provide an evaluation plan that includes a specified timeline for data collection that helps to illustrate the overall program implementation plan. (pages e21-e22, e237-e247)

ii) The applicant describes the planned contributions and commitments of the applicant university and the two partner LEAs, (page e66) They assure that the university will contribute course release time for the principle investigators, space to operate the program and digital backpacks that include laptops, iPads and peripherals for the teacher residents, faculty time to teach courses, marketing and publicity and travel for dissemination of the project findings. They assure that the LEAs will execute a Memorandum of Understanding for the project and will participate in the Advisory Council. (page e66) They include copies of signed letters of agreement from each of the project partners that verify the planned contributions and commitments of each. (e151-e156)

Weaknesses:

- i) No weaknesses noted.
- 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; 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 provides the two census tracts for the areas covered by the project that demonstrate that they are high need QOZs. (page e26)

b. The applicant explains that the teacher residency candidates will be placed within schools that are located within the identified census tracts. These teachers will provide enhanced course curriculum and best practices within the target schools because of successfully completing their residency and training through the proposed project. (page e 26)

Weaknesses:

a. No weaknesses noted.

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:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/20/2020 04:33 PM