

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/20/2020 04:30 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (S336S200015)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	29
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	18
Sub Total	100	97
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Opportunity Zones	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. New Grantees	3	3
Sub Total	6	6
Total	106	103

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (S336S200015)

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 clearly identifies specific gaps and weaknesses in infrastructure and the nature and magnitude of those gaps or weaknesses. For example, the applicant notes that schools in opportunity zones have over a 92% non-white student population; only 29%-30% of the teachers in those schools have an advanced degree; the schools have received a C or below on the state report card; and the one-year turnover rates ranges from 9%-34% (e16; e99). The applicant further indicates that the city public schools had an 18.9% attrition rate compared to the rate for the state of 11.5% (e23) and in the state, 38% of students, but only 17% of teachers are Black and Latinx (e23). The applicant also provides a detailed research-based rationale in the form of a logic model with clear inputs, strategies, outputs, short-term outcomes, and long-term outcomes (e103).

ii. The applicant provides a clearly defined goal with four appropriately connected objectives. For example, DREAM will leverage and enhance its DPS partnership with existing partnerships with the College of Arts and Sciences and its institutes. The SOE has adequate facilities and resources to ensure project sustainability upon completion of the 5-year grant period (e52).

iii. The proposed project builds on the foundation of Project PACE, a previously funded grant that created a new model of engagement for teacher induction, one that engaged pre-service teachers in the induction space with beginning teachers in an effort to bridge the divide and blur the lines between preparation and practice (e86). Additionally, a robust SWOT analysis is provided identifying the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats related to the current program and the proposed project (e89-e96).

iv. The applicant provides a comprehensive plan for improving teaching and learning and support of rigorous academic standards for students through the DREAM (Diverse and Resilient Educators Advised through Mentorship) project. The project is to recruit and retain underrepresented pre-service teachers with a focus on increasing the number of Latinx educators in high-need specialization areas and hard-to-staff schools (e14) and to increase the number of resilient and efficacious underrepresented teachers to teach elementary and special education long-term in schools located in the city's Quality Opportunity Zones (QOZ) (e15). The proposed program is a multi-year, three-pronged approach to teacher education and teacher leader development that simultaneously focuses on increasing teacher diversity in the city's Public Schools and is guided by Transformative Socioemotional Learning (SEL) practices for both students and teachers (e13).

As DREAM teachers become teacher leaders in their schools, they are engaged in professional development that builds upon prior transformative SEL pre-service and induction training. As a whole, the model migrates DREAM residents from pre-service teacher to beginning teacher to become teacher leaders (e14).

Weaknesses:

- i. The applicant failed to provide mid-terms goals in the logic model. Without mid-term goals it is difficult to determine how the applicant will monitor on-going progress (e103).
- ii. No weaknesses noted
- iii. No weaknesses noted
- iv. No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 29

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 provides clear evidence of appropriate methods of evaluation to be conducted that will yield valid and reliable outcomes. For example, the applicant indicates that they will utilize an external evaluator that will lead evaluation studies related to teacher candidate and beginning teacher workforce outcomes. The evaluator will conduct descriptive and empirical analyses on teacher candidate performance and recruitment, as well as subsequent outcomes for beginning teachers, such as hiring, placement, and retention (e56). Administrative data sources will include: teacher candidate administrative data (e.g., recruitment, program completion, GPA, student teaching placements, licensure exam, and edTPA scores); Department of Public Instruction data (e.g., student test scores and demographics, classroom rosters, teacher demographics, teacher education, teacher licensure, teacher salary, teacher value-added estimates, teacher evaluation ratings, and school characteristics data); and, Recent Graduate Survey. Additionally, the applicant will conduct focus groups and interviews with samples of teacher candidates, program faculty, mentor teachers, program graduates, and district personnel to examine stakeholders' perceptions of program implementation and impact, as well as program context (e58).

ii. The applicant proposes a rigorous and dynamic evaluation plan to address project implementation and outcomes related to preparing Latino/a teachers to teach and stay teaching in high-needs schools. The evaluation plan leverages the collective research and program evaluation expertise available in the SOE and complements it with the expertise of the external evaluator (e55). The evaluator will collect and analyze other pertinent data, including Completer Exit surveys and program artifacts. In addition to conducting formative and summative evaluations, the evaluator will provide consultation to program faculty and co-researchers (e59). A timeline for collection of data is provided in the narrative (e60). The applicant also provides strong evidence of ways in which the data will be analyzed including regression models. They will also use Cohen's d to determine an appropriate effect size (e61)

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. Clear evidence of support, including facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources, from the applicant organization is noted in the narrative. For example, the applicant indicates that they will provide printers, one-way mirror observation room, accessible and purposeful space for seminar meetings away from campus (e52). Additionally, the applicant notes that the proposed project will receive strong fiscal management support from the SOE Business Office for grant management. Also, the university Cashier's Office, Office of Scholarships and Student Aid and Graduate School are poised to partner with the project for the financial agreement residents make with the SOE to receive the living wage stipend (e53).

ii. The applicant provided an adequate budget provided in the narrative of \$4,853,668 which is appropriate to support the proposed project. Additionally, in-kind support from partner IHE's and cash donations from LEA's are clearly articulated in the application (e5; e245-e247).

iii. The applicant provides a satisfactory budget in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project. For example, the applicant indicates that in-kind support will cover most of the salaries of key personnel, travel cost of \$5300, and supply cost of \$28,528 is reasonable.

iv. The applicant provides adequate evidence that demonstrates that they have the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the grant. In-kind support is noted in the appendices (e216) and matched-funds from partner LEA's is also noted in the application (e247).

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. A limited management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks is noted in the narrative. For example, the applicant states, the applicant also indicates that the proposed project will receive strong fiscal management support from the university Business Office for grant management. The universities Cashier's Office, Office of Scholarships and Student Aid and Graduate School are poised to partner with the project for the financial agreement project residents make with the university-SOE to receive the living wage stipend. Similar to the promissory note the university-SOE engages with its university Teaching Fellows, each project resident will sign an agreement that states they will serve as a full-time teacher for a total of not less than three academic years immediately after successfully completing the proposed program (e53). Appropriately qualified personnel are noted in the application including, a program director who will serve as project's Lead Principal Investigator and Chair of Task Force 2 (residency design). Her experience teaching and researching in Latinx communities combined with her expertise in teacher education, qualitative research, and project management to position her for this role which requires a simultaneously strategic (bird's-eye) and tactical (granular-level) understanding of the MAT program in relation to the school district's partner and MAT student goals (e53).

ii. The applicant clearly identified information on a commitment from partners in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project. For example, commitments are noted in the budget and in the letters of support provided by partner LEA's and IHE's (e247; e218-e223)

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses:

- i. The management plan provided lacks specific details additionally, the applicant failed to provide strong evidence of a timeline that clearly provides connections to the goals, objectives and outcomes in one table/chart. Instead bits and pieces are spread throughout the narrative making it difficult to clearly see the alignment between all of the pieces.
- ii. No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 18

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 clearly provides tracking numbers for three schools: Oak Grove EL 37063001001; Y.E. Smith EL 37063001001; and R.N. Harris EL 37063001400.
 - ii. Residents and faculty will meet for coursework at the school site, alternating between the three school sites across the year. Situating the coursework within the school sites provides greater opportunity for collaborative classroom observation and attention to specific school and district-based foci, essentially applying coursework directly into real classrooms (e39).
- b. The applicant sufficiently describes how the applicant will provide services in the Qualified Opportunity Zones. For example, the applicant will use a cohort model to facilitate professional collaboration in the teacher residency model. Specifically, they propose to establishment of an effective teacher residency program that recruits, prepares, supports, and retains teachers for high-need school districts and high needs subject areas, to fulfill a crucial need to hire highly qualified teachers who are obligated to serve for three years in these districts (e14).

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:

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 04:30 PM

Status: Submitted

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

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (S336S200015)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	28
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	18
Sub Total	100	96
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Opportunity Zones	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. New Grantees	3	3
Sub Total	6	6
Total	106	102

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (S336S200015)

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 fully developed with inputs, strategies, outputs, and outcomes (p e103). A rationale about needs and eligibility for IHE and LEA is well documented on Appendix B, including QOZ track number, status of beginning teachers, student academic performances.

(ii) The DREAM project has one overarching goal- increase the number of underrepresented teachers (>50% Latinx) to teach elementary and special education in DPS (p e15) and four objectives (Table 2, p e17) that address the needs of DPS. The goal, objectives and measurable outcomes are fully developed.

(iii) The residency approach (one year MAT curriculum, 3yr induction) is fully developed and meet the TQP purposes and requirements. The residency plan is a solid plan, specifically with an approach of transformative social and emotional learning (SEL) for teachers (p e28)

(iv) The effort to improve teaching and learning is fully developed.

Weaknesses:

(i) N/A

(ii) The four objectives do not include how to improve student achievement as required in NIA (p4)

(iii) N/A

(iv) The support for rigorous academic standards for elementary and special education students is well developed. Although student performance data is briefly mentioned on Data Sources (p e57), but it is not included in the logic model and research questions stated on Table 9 (p e59).

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 project has an evaluation team, Education Policy Initiative at Carolina (EPIC) conducting descriptive and empirical analyses on fellow performance and recruitment as well as hiring, placement and retention (p e65). The validity and reliability of assessments are briefly addressed (p e56). Additional assessment information is available on Appendix H (p e238).

(ii) The applicant has provided a fully-developed evaluation plan for assessing the project in terms of qualification of the evaluation team, data collection timeline aligned with measurements and questions, and reporting and communication (Tables 3-6 p e18-22, Table 9 p e59-62).

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) The 100 % match was met as it requests \$2.43M federal funding and provides 2.43 M in-kind match. The support including facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources, from University, SOE, LatinxEd, ISA is fully developed (p e51-52).

(ii) The project use school-based tuition awards of \$11,700/year per student to lower the project cost.

(iii) The cost of the project is reasonable. It requests \$2.43M federal funding to support its 40 fellows on average

\$61K/ fellow.

(iv) The project has state, community, university, and partnership support to sustain the project beyond the grant, including Durham Public Schools, School of Education, College of Arts and Sciences, NCDPI, ISA, LatinxEd (p e213).

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 PI- Dr. Papoi, two PIs and key personnel as stated on p e53-55 with their responsibilities on Task Forces 1-4.
- (ii) The commitments from LEA, related stakeholders at UNC-Chapel Hill are fully developed in the narrative and letter of commitments.

Weaknesses:

- (i) The applicant's management timeline plan is not clear as the applicant does not provide a specific project timeline on Section D (p e51-55). It is difficult to fully understand the flow of the project about how and when activities would be initiated or completed.
- (ii) While the applicant lists a Memorandum of Agreement as being Appendix E, the said agreement is not included in their proposal package. The attached letters of support from the various partners, including the target school district are general in nature and do not specify what they are committing to the project in terms of personnel, time, or financial support. (pages e213-e222)

Reader's Score: 18

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.e16)
- (ii) The quality of the services in the QOZs is fully developed- to prepare special education and elementary education including those from underserved communities which align with the needs assessments (Appendix B) and the project narrative session.

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:

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

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/20/2020 04:30 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (S336S200015)

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	18
Sub Total	100	98
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Opportunity Zones	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. New Grantees	3	3
Sub Total	6	6
Total	106	104

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (S336S200015)

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 well-developed plan to establish a multi-year, three-pronged approach to teacher education and teacher leader development that also focuses on increasing teacher diversity in the target school district. The applicant includes a clearly developed Logic Model that depicts the theoretical foundation for their program design and includes the proposed goals and objectives. The applicant provides a compelling argument, backed with citations of research, for including a diversity focus to their teacher recruitment campaign, seeking to increase the number of racially and ethnically diverse cohorts, with a focus on Latinx teachers. (page e15) They report that the target school district has 33% of the student population who identify as Latinx and 42% identify as being Black, but there is an overwhelming lack of diversity within the district's current teaching staff. Statewide 38% of the students are Black and Latinx but only 17% of the teachers are Black and Latinx. (page e22–e23) The applicant also proposes to integrate Social Emotional Learning (SEL) practices for both students and teachers in response to their statewide initiative to integrate SEL into the school climate. (page e29)

ii) The applicant clearly explains that they have an overarching project goal with four primary objectives. They seek to increase the number of resilient and efficacious underrepresented teachers to teach elementary and special education long-term in the schools located in their target school district and QOZ. To do so, they intend to recruit racially and ethnically diverse pre-service teachers with a focus on Latinx individuals; provide QOZ embedded coursework and fieldwork; improve beginning teacher induction services; and increase the retention rates of diverse cohorts of teachers beyond the induction period. The applicant provides well-developed SMART goals and objectives that lay a clear pathway for project process and achievement. (pages e15-e17) Further, the applicant provides a clear description of the strategies, milestones, and measurable outcomes for each of the goals, making it easy to understand what will take place and how the project will be implemented. (pages e18-e22)

iii) The applicant effectively demonstrates that their proposed project represents an exceptional approach to teacher development and to meeting the needs of their high-needs school district. They are proposing to recruit teachers for an intensive teacher residency program that will culminate in a standards-aligned Master of Arts in Teaching degree. The exceptional components of the project are that they are looking to intentionally recruit ethnically and racially diverse group of teachers, with a specific focus on Latinx individuals and they are proposing to educate the teachers on Social Emotional Learning practices and curriculum so that it can be integrated into the schools. The applicant explains that the

schools in the target district are in high need communities with 92.7% - 97.6% student population who identify as non-white; 73.94% - 98.78% of the students qualify for the free and reduced lunch program and the one year teacher turnover rate ranges from 7% in one school to 35% in another. (page e16) Additionally, in terms of providing induction support for the residents upon graduation and job placement within the target schools, the project includes a layered support approach that assigns the teachers to Affinity Caucuses where they can gather, meet and share learning with other new teachers. The Affinity Caucuses aim to facilitate the development of teaching skills and dispositions that improve psychic wellness, increase the capacity to cope with social identity-related challenges and support the integration of the social emotional learning. (page e28)

iv) The proposed project is a part of a statewide comprehensive strategy to increase the number of qualified diverse teachers in high need subject areas and to integrate the Collaborative for Academic, Social and Emotional Learning's (CASEL) Social Emotional Learning framework into the state's schools. The implementation of the Social Emotional Learning curriculum also supports the state's Healthy Schools Initiative. (page e29, e50)

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's evaluation plan is adequate and demonstrates their ability to collect and report on valid and reliable project data related to the project outcomes. They intend to contract with an independent evaluator, an organization that is a policy research and evaluation initiative within the applicant university's Public Policy Division. (page e55-e56) The researchers are reportedly well versed in educator quality and impacts, effective and equitable schools, and post-secondary outcomes. Their multidisciplinary staff are experienced external evaluators and they will lead the evaluation studies related to the teacher candidate performance and recruitment. They will analyze the subsequent outcomes such as hiring, placement and retention. The analyses will be used formatively to monitor program implementation and will inform program faculty and staff of potential trends that might need to be addressed. In Year Five, the evaluator will conduct a summative evaluation using a pooled treatment sample of program candidates and graduates across the five years. The pooled sample will serve to maximize the sample size and as such, increase the ability to detect a statistically significant effect, should one exist. (page e58)

ii) The applicant's evaluation plan sufficiently demonstrates an ability to collect both quantitative and qualitative data to assess the extent to which their project design is successful in achieving their goals and objectives. The applicant describes the four goals and provides a comprehensive description of the documentation and processes for analyzing the

program's implementation using implementation science and an active implementation framework. They list each research question and identify the data sources, the availability of evidence or time for collection, and the analysis methods that will be used for each source. (pages e56, e59-e62)

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 effectively demonstrates that the project will have adequate support in terms of facilities, equipment, supplies, personnel, and program support. They provide a brief description of the contributions that will be provided by the project partners. For example, the university's School of Education will provide meeting and teaching space in their Center for Educational Excellence facility, which is an off campus building with flexible meeting space, cutting-edge technology and one-way mirror observation rooms. The LatinxED, within the university's School of Education will provide adjunct faculty and will collaborate with the project to ensure that the work of Latinx members of the university and local and statewide communities are to the benefit of the project participants. The Institute for the Study of the Americas, a unit within the university's College of Arts and Sciences will provide personnel and curriculum related to diversity education. The Business Office for grant management will provide financial management services for the grant project. (pages e51-e53)

ii) The proposed budget is adequate to support the scope of the project. The applicant has included appropriate costs related to personnel, teaching stipends and program supplies. The budget includes the required match. (pages e5, e245-e247)

iii) The proposed expenditures in the budget are reasonable and align with the proposed project goals and objectives. The applicant provides a detailed budget narrative that explains each cost item and includes the cost-basis for each. They have included adequate living wage stipends for the residents. (pages e252-e259)

iv) The applicant's plan for program stability is reasonable and includes the leveraging of in-kind contributions during the project time period that will enhance their ability to implement the project initially and institutionalize many of its activities as time goes on. For example, in-kind support from the School of Education leverages current programmatic support and demonstrates how the university is uniting their institutional research expertise with the project work of integrating the Social Emotional Learning model within its teacher preparation program in general. This will facilitate the institutionalization of the curriculum and practice across all of the teacher preparation programs. (page e50) Additionally, the applicant reports that at the conclusion of the grant award, they anticipate being able to sustain the residence work through awarding school-based tuition awards of at least \$11,700 per student per year. At this minimum stipend amount, the university's Graduate School will pay for the resident's Master of Art in Teaching tuition. Further funding sources will be available by 2026 from School of Education donor funds specifically earmarked for teacher preparation candidates. (page e50)

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 a brief description of the co-principle investigators for the project, including an explanation of their credentials and areas of expertise as it relates to their role and responsibilities within the project. Each co-principle investigator has a specific assigned role such as chairing a task force group for residency design or a group for teacher candidate recruitment. The partner district will contribute the time and effort of key administrative personnel to serve as work group/Task Force members. For example, the Director of Learning and Federal Programs within the district will draw upon his extensive experience in professional development, training, mentoring and school transformation to guide the district mentoring team. (pages e53-e55)

ii) The applicant provides a reasonable description of the kinds of resources and support that will be provided by their institution in terms of facilities and personnel. They include a description of the key university personnel who will be committed to specific project tasks such as chairing workgroups to design the residency model or to chair the work group developing strategies and curriculum related to diversity and inclusion. (pages e53-e54)

Weaknesses:

- i) The applicant's management timeline plan is not clear as the applicant does not provide a specific project timeline that clearly lays out what will take place at would describe how and when activities would be initiated or completed, making it difficult to fully understand the flow of the project. (page not found)

- ii) While the applicant lists a Memorandum of Agreement as being Appendix E, the said agreement is not included in their proposal package. The attached letters of support from the various partners, including the target school district are general in nature and do not specify what they are committing to the project in terms of personnel, time, or financial support. (pages e213-e222)

Reader's Score: 18

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 a list of the qualifying QOZs within the target school district that will be served with the proposed project. (page e16)

- b. The applicant's description of the needs of the schools within the QOZs indicate a clear need to recruit, educate and support Black and Latinx teachers. They report a significant shortage of racially and ethnically diverse teachers and state that the overarching goal of their project is to increase the number of resilient and competent underrepresented teachers to teach elementary and special education long-term in schools located in district's Quality Opportunity Zones (QOZ). Additionally, the applicant provides a compelling explanation for their rationale for introducing and embedding Social Emotional Learning practices in the partner schools. They describe a high level of poverty, a lack of social emotional competencies, poor academic performance, behavior, and health problems. (pages e15, e24, e25)

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:

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 04:30 PM