

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/20/2020 04:32 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: University of St. Thomas (S336S200016)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	25
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	18
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Resources	30	28
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	19
Sub Total	100	90
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	96

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: University of St. Thomas (S336S200016)

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 noting a proposed project that will prepare effective educators from underrepresented communities, specifically targeting recruitment on their state's large Somali and Hmong communities due to high needs in their targeted area. They also indicate that increasing effective teachers who represent their communities will lead to improvements in teaching, student achievement, and overall learning potential (e689). Evidence of strong needs at the state, partner communities and in charter schools is clearly evident in the narrative (e710-e711). For example, the applicant indicates that charters report struggling not only to recruit teachers of color in these areas, but in some cases, report having few or no licensed applicants for special education positions meaning positions remain unfilled or are filled by teachers working under special provisions. Additionally, the applicant notes, 14% of charter school students qualify for special education services; with 27 of the state's 168 charters serving a population with over 1/3 of all students qualifying for services (e711). The rationale is clearly connected to the goal and objectives noted in the narrative and is broadly described in the logic model. The applicant further provides a logic model with inputs, resources, interventions, outputs, and impact (e40).

ii. The applicant provides a clearly defined goals, objectives and measurable outcomes. For example, the applicant indicates that their goal centers on creating and sustaining high-quality teacher residency programs that contribute to student achievement and quality of new teachers by improving the preparation of prospective teachers and enhancing professional development for new teachers (e715). More specifically, the applicant indicates that they will increase teacher retention and grow their own teacher leaders through advanced professional development and multi-tiered differentiated induction supports for four-years past graduation. Their plan is to retain 80% of their graduates and to prepare at least 50% (e716).

iii. The applicant provides some evidence of an exceptional approach for meeting statutory purposes and requirements. For example, the applicant proposes to expand their comprehensive residency program to include an induction plan that entails a 5-year commitment between their school partner, resident-graduate, and university (e716).

iv. The applicant limitedly identifies a plan for improving teaching and learning and support of rigorous academic standards for students through the proposed PREPARE framework, that is designed to train residents to teach effectively and create impactful change by teaching them to think critically and act wisely to disrupt, contradict, and halt challenges

negatively impacting the field and students (e40; e718).

Weaknesses:

- i. The logic model provided in the narrative is broad and does not provide clear details on how the proposed activities connect to the goals, objectives, and outcomes (e40). Additionally, the applicant failed to include short-term, mid-term, and long-term outcomes in the logic model for the proposed project. These outcomes would demonstrate clear opportunities to monitor the progress of the proposed activities and make modifications as needed based on those results. Additionally, the logic model provided in the narrative.
- ii. No weaknesses noted
- iii. No weaknesses noted
- iv. It is unclear in the narrative how the applicant proposes to support students' rigorous academic standards with the noted activities. While teachers are being trained in social consciousness, the direct connection to students' performance is missing in the narrative (e718).

Reader's Score: 25

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. Appropriate methods of evaluation that will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress towards achieving intended outcomes are noted in the narrative. The applicant states that they will utilize qualitative and quantitative methods (both formative and summative) to collect valid and reliable performance data. Methodologies used will be dependent on the outcomes being measured. To ensure fidelity of implementation, both an internal and external evaluator will assess progress towards the relevant outcomes. Project directors, as well as internal and external evaluators, will meet on an ongoing basis to ensure all grant objectives are being met (e734).
- ii. A limited evaluation table is provided summarizing the components of this project's evaluation, data collection methods and personnel responsibilities that will be followed to ensure outcomes are met (e736). Clearly established targets and methods for collection of data are also noted in the evaluation plan and are clearly connected to the proposed goals and objectives noted in the application (e736-e 739).

Weaknesses:

- i. No weaknesses noted
- ii. The applicant failed to provide a specific target for short and mid term evaluations. This data will help in monitoring the success of the project on an on-going basis rather than just at the end of the project.

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

1. The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources for the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(i) The adequacy of support, including facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources, from the applicant organization or the lead applicant organization.

(ii) The extent to which the budget is adequate to support the proposed project.

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

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

Strengths:

i. The applicant has clearly articulated a commitment of facilities, equipment, supplies, personnel and other resources such as computers, access to technology, diversity and inclusion services and more (e741). For example, the applicant indicates that key project personnel have a campus office and classrooms with access to telephones, computers, and up-to-date technology including interactive whiteboards, document cameras, internet, and projectors (e741). Additionally, participants will have access to the Center on Race, Leadership and Social Justice, the Center for the Common Good, Wellness Support, Disability Support and the office of Sponsored Programs (e741).

ii. The budget provided is sufficient to support the proposed project. The applicant provided clear evidence of matched funds by the partner LEA's and the partner institution (e675). Stipends will be covered and a new position, as they are hiring a consortium residency coordinator to support the residency programs, launch the new residency, and provide induction supports. The budget will also cover some induction supports and a percentage of the project directors' costs in the summers when residency cohorts overlap (e742). A detailed management plan with timeline, milestone tasks, defined responsibilities and evaluation components is also provided in the narrative (e745-e753).

iii. The costs noted in the narrative are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project. The applicant provides strong evidence that they will have impact beyond the five years of this grant as they build strong collaborations to sustain nonconventional pathways to licensure in their state to meet areas of high needs and work to remove barriers to enrolling in teacher preparation programs through their annual summits. The summits will bring new stakeholders to the table to contribute to increased capacity and sustainability and will allow smaller entities to come together to collaborate and make an impact in areas in which they are unable to do so on their own (e742).

iv. Sufficient evidence is noted in the narrative demonstrating that they have the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the grant. The applicant notes, they will commit to resident graduates for a minimum of five years. They have designed a multi-tiered system of support (MTSS) framework to differentiate support for graduates. For 5-years, they will

follow the resident to teacher to teacher leader journey. A detailed table is provided outlining their multi-tiered induction supports (e729-e731). In this project, they will hire a charter consortium residency coordinator who will serve a dual role as an induction specialist. Additionally, the school district has Professional Assistance and Review (PAR) mentors to assist new and experienced teachers in developing and improving skills required to be a proficient teacher (e731). The applicant has provided strong evidence of state, community and university support (e 744). A plethora of letters of support from community partners and stakeholders are provided indicating their commitment to the project's success.

Weaknesses:

- i. No weaknesses noted
- ii. No weaknesses noted
- iii. No weaknesses noted
- iv. While the budget narrative does describe the matched funds, the letters of support provided in the narrative lack the specifics of the types of support to be offered or the amount of financial support (e97; e135-e136).

Reader's Score: 28

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

(i) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

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

Strengths:

i. The applicant has provided strong evidence of a management plan designed to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks. A detailed management plan with timeline, milestone tasks, defined responsibilities and evaluation components is provided in the narrative (e725-e733). Key personnel identified have the requisite skills to carry out their identified responsibilities as identified in their attached vitas.

ii. The proposed project gives the university and partner schools the opportunity to collaboratively create a pathway, improve preparation, and realize the positive outcomes of residency in charter schools (e35). The applicant has provided strong evidence of state, community and university support (e 744). A plethora of letters of support from community partners and stakeholders are provided indicating their commitment to the project's success. The applicant also proposes to deepen their partnerships with charters schools by collaborating to design and implement a residency model (e711). The proposed project allows the university and partner schools to collaboratively create a pathway for new teachers in charter schools and influence positive educational outcomes for students of color and students identified with special education needs (e711). Further the applicant indicates that district and university key personnel have made a commitment to collaboration by participating in weekly meetings between the district residency coordinator and the university coordinator. During these meetings they plan, problem-solve, and review data to determine next steps for residents, mentors, and graduates. Monthly, other district staff, such as the mentors join to specifically plan MT PD and induction support (e754). Detailed commitments are noted in a table provided and in the letters of support (e754).

Weaknesses:

- i. No weaknesses noted
- ii. The applicant failed to provide a signed letter of support from three of the partnering LEA's (e97-e101).

Reader's Score: 19

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 clearly indicates their project meets the requirement of competitive preference priority 1 as the schools they are partnering with are in qualified opportunity zones (QOZ). Census numbers are provided in the narrative. The applicant also indicates that over 50% of their public schools 2020-21 residency host school sites and 70% of their charter's schools reside in neighborhood communities identified as designated Qualified Opportunity Zones (QOZ).
- b. The applicant proposes to provide clinical learning in classrooms in high-need schools served by high-need local educational agencies (LEA). Additionally, induction support provides the applicant with an opportunity to partner with more schools throughout the district (e714).

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 04:32 PM

Status: Submitted

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

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: University of St. Thomas (S336S200016)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	25
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	18
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Resources	30	28
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	19
Sub Total	100	90
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	96

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: University of St. Thomas (S336S200016)

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 resources, intervention, outputs, and impacts (p40). The rationales are fully developed including: (1) needs in special ed for BIPOC (p689), (2) support needs of charter schools (p691), (3) teacher retention in shortage areas (p692). A good track record, 28-year (p688) justifies their capacities.

(ii) The goal, objectives and measurable outcomes are well developed. It states how the project is to improve the quality of prospective and new teachers by improving the preparation of prospective teachers and enhancing professional development activities for new teachers; hold teacher preparation programs at institutions of higher education (IHEs) accountable for preparing teachers who meet applicable State certification and licensure requirements; and recruit highly qualified individuals, including minorities and individuals from other occupations, into the teaching force (p695-696).

(iii) The residency approach (15m grad, 3yr induction) is fully developed and meet the TQP purposes and requirements (p683). The PREPARE framework is a solid plan (p697-712). The exceptional approaches include additional leadership development in Y4, the Y1 cohort will sever as mentor teacher for Y5 cohort (Figure 1, p693), micro-credentials (p707).

(iv) The effort to improve teaching and learning is fully developed as highlighted on Tables 10, 11 and 12 and described on p713.

Weaknesses:

(i) The logic model (p40) provides broad category description. It would be better if it also shows how one/some resources, intervention, outputs, and impacts have been connected specifically.

(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 students is adequately developed. It lacks a strong argument about how coursework and clinical practice experiences can support rigorous academic standards for K-12 students (special ed, underrepresented communities) they served.

Reader's Score: 25

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 evaluation dataset stated on Table 14 (p e716-719) provide some valid and reliable performance data on the four objective outcomes such as NCTR's Standards Indicators, EdTPAs, NExT surveys.

(ii) The applicant has provided a well-developed evaluation plan for assessing the project in terms of qualitative and quantitative methods (p714-719). The evaluation team includes internal and external evaluators builds a capacity of evaluation. The applicant will use both formative and summative evaluation and link the formative and summative evaluation. The evaluation is guided by clear evaluation questions (Table 14, column 1, p716-719).

Weaknesses:

(i) The information of validity and reliability of performance data and instruments (e.g. NCTR's, NExT) are not cited or explained between p 714-719

(ii) N/A

Reader's Score: 18

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 adequacy of support, including facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources, from the applicant organization are fully developed as stated on Table 16 (p721). The match was met as it requests \$2.89M, and provides \$2.89M in-kind (a total of 5.78M) for 155 residents.
- (ii) The MSP project leverages its resources as it will cover their resident's stipends (n= 75) and the most of the project budget will support the charter residents (n=80). Therefore, the requested federal budget can adequately serve the 80 resident candidates in the charter school system.
- (iii) It is a cost-effective project which will serve 155 resident candidates with a \$2.89M federal funding (\$18.6K per resident).
- (iv) The project has state, community, university, and partnership support to sustain the project beyond the grant, including Minnesota DOE, University administrators, Deans of Colleges of Education and Arts and Sciences, St Paul and Minneapolis Public Schools and partnered charter schools

Weaknesses:

- (i) N/A
- (ii) N/A
- (iii) N/A
- (iv) Multi-year financial commitment from partner LEA and schools is not specified in their letters of commitment or related documents.

Reader's Score: 28

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. Gatti and PD- Brusnahan, Dean Campbell who have extensive residency working experiences (p724-725). The management plan with the PREPARE framework is fully developed (Table 18, p725-733). The timelines, milestones and responsibilities were clearly outlined on Table 18. Additional information about key personnel and their roles are available on page 42-48.
- (ii) The commitments from University, partners, project directors, consortium residency coordinator, district residency coordinator, planning teams, induction coach and mentors etc. are fully developed (Table 19, p734-736)

Weaknesses:

- (i) N/A
- (ii) Letters of commitments are broad description and not specific.

Reader's Score: 19

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.31 & p35)

(ii) The quality of the services in the QOZs is fully developed- to prepare special education and elementary education including those from underserved communities (p689) which align with the need's assessments on p28-p38 and the project narrative session on p688-689.

Weaknesses:

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 04:35 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: University of St. Thomas (S336S200016)

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	18
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Resources	30	28
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	19
Sub Total	100	95
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	101

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: University of St. Thomas (S336S200016)

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 to implement a project where they will expand and enhance their currently successful teacher residency model where educators work, learn, and earn while participating in the professional development program. The project includes recruiting from and working with traditionally underserved communities, including but not limited to Hmong & Somali. In the expanded project the applicant will initiate a new charter school consortium partnership to prepare 80 new educators and expand their current public school partnership to provide 75 residents with multi-tiered induction supports for retention and advanced professional development as they prepare for school leadership roles. The project, based upon cited research studies, includes integrated coursework and practice-based learning experiences that prepares the educators to engage in effective teaching practices that are culturally relevant in high-need areas. (page Abstract, e689) To demonstrate the need and rationale for the proposed project, the applicant cites national, state and LEA needs in terms of teacher shortages and high numbers of high need students in the schools to be served. (page e690) The rationale for expanding their current teacher residency model to include charter schools is documented with relevant data and state Department of Education research that indicates that charter schools have more struggles attracting competent teachers due to available funds and other struggles, leaving charter schools with inexperienced, unqualified, out-of-field teachers. (page e691) The applicant includes an illustration of their Logic Model that sufficiently depicts the theoretical framework for their project. The Logic Model includes the required elements. (page e40)

ii) The applicant presents an overarching project goal and a set of specific and measurable project objectives that include specific measures and anticipated outcomes. The goal and associated objectives are clear and lay out a pathway for the overall project implementation and evaluation processes. (pages e677-e680, e695-e696)

iii) The applicant makes a solid argument that their early success with their current residency teacher preparation program makes their proposed approach to expand to charter schools in their region a reasonable one. They propose to assess the individual charter school needs and create a model that is responsive. They are suggesting that a comprehensive, multiyear induction program with reduce staff turnover, thereby, effectively addressing teacher retention rates across all participating schools. The residency programs are district-serving with embedded practice-based learning experiences that include differentiated multi-tiered levels of support for novice residents. The proposed model includes embedding effective practices utilizing an intensive clinical experience were the participants will apply their newly gained knowledge from coursework and practice skills efficiently with guidance of a mentor. (page e696 – e697, e703))

iv) The applicant provides a comprehensive description of the project framework, clearly demonstrating that the work that will take place is a part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and student learning in both the public schools and charter schools. They list the educational standards and cite sources of national and state standards. (pages e697-e711) Additionally, the applicant purports that their proposed project aligns with their university's mission and vision for education. They describe their School of Education' four goals for promoting excellence; preparing tomorrow's leaders; connecting with communities; and inspiring change. (page e712)

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 includes having both an internal and external evaluator to ensure that the project is implemented as intended and to assess progress towards the outcomes. Their plan includes effective strategies for ensuring the collection of both quantitative and qualitative data that will indicate progress to achieving project goals. They include a detailed list of the project objectives that include specific objective measures and data sources that will be collected and analyzed. The project directors will meet with the evaluators on an ongoing basis to ensure that the grant objectives are being met. The internal evaluator and directors will conduct the internal evaluation to review progress measures and to ensure that all the professional development offerings and courses contain the requisite numbers of standards (national, state, & technology) and practices that align to state licensing requirements. This team will regularly assess the progress toward completion of the project goal and objectives during monthly meetings throughout the project. The external reviewer will be responsible for ensuring that the project carries out the evaluation. He is responsible for producing the summative evaluation report in the final year of the project to determine the extent to which goals of the project were achieved. (page e714-e716)

ii) The applicant provides an evaluation plan that sufficiently identifies the evaluation methods that will be implemented and includes the identification of the evaluation component, data collection methods and the personnel responsible for each of the objective measures. The proposed evaluation methods include a review of documents, cross-referencing course materials with education standards, participant interviews and surveys, interviews with project personnel, partners, and district personnel. (pages e716-e717)

Weaknesses:

- i) No weaknesses noted.
- ii) The applicant's evaluation plan does not include short or mid-term evaluation strategies that would assist them with assessing progress over time.

Reader's Score: 18

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 a comprehensive description of the various university resources and facilities that will be accessible by the proposed project, demonstrating a strong capacity to support the overall project and the individual participants effectively and adequately. For example, they have 40 accredited programs in the School of Education and College of Art and Sciences that prepare teachers and educational leaders. Additionally, grant personnel, course instructors, clinical supervisors, mentor teachers, and residents have access to a multitude of resources and support, such as, the necessary technology and IT support; university library services; diversity and inclusion services; wellness support academic support services and disability services. The applicant has a successful history of federal grant implementation and management and documented history of student achievements. (pages e719-e721) The applicant's budget includes the required match of funds from the applicant institution and the partner LEA. (page budget worksheet attachment, section c)
- ii) The proposed budget is adequate to support the proposed strategies and initiatives for teacher residency, expansion to include charter schools and the expansion of professional development supports for induction. The applicant's budget narrative explains each cost item in detail, and all are appropriate to the scope of the project. (budget worksheet attachment)
- iii) The proposed budget costs are reasonable and in alignment with the proposed objectives and associated activities. The budget includes funds for project personnel and professional development expenses. (budget worksheet attachment)
- iv) The applicant effectively documents the commitment of project partners through copies of signed letters of support. They include letters of support from the state's Department of Education and several community agencies that have an interest and resources to share with educators; faculty and staff within the university who will be active participants in the project; the regional public school district; and members of the charter school consortium. (pages e97-e136)

Weaknesses:

- i) No weaknesses noted.
- ii) No weaknesses noted.
- iii) No weaknesses noted.

iv) The applicant does not provide a description of or documentation for a multi-year financial or operating plan for the project that extends beyond the grant award period. The letters of support do not include a description of any financial contributions by partners and the sample Memorandum of Agreement does not include specific financial information nor is it signed by anyone. (pages e97-e136)

Reader's Score: 28

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

(i) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

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

Strengths:

i) The applicant presents a detailed management plan that clearly identifies the role, responsibilities, and expertise of the project key personnel in both project narrative and accompanying copies of resumes. (pages e42 - e48) The project key personnel appropriately include project directors, residency coordinators, internal and external evaluators, planning teams, residents, and administration representatives from both the university and the LEA). There will be weekly meetings between the district residency coordinator and the university coordinator, where they will plan, problem-solve, and review project data to determine next steps for residents, mentors, and graduates. There will be monthly meetings that include district staff, such as the project mentors, who will plan the district level professional development and induction support. (e732 - e734) They include a detailed description of the coursework that will take place and include detailed copies of syllabi and program descriptions. (e188 - e674)

ii) The applicant includes copies of current, generalized letters of support from their project partners demonstrating their commitment and participation in the project. Further, there is a Director of Charter School Authorizing who will serve as the liaison to the charter school network to recruit and support their participation in the project. (page e724, e91 - e129)

Weaknesses:

i) The applicant's management plan is incomplete as it does not include a timeline for implementing and accomplishing the specific project tasks. (pages not found.)

ii) While there is a sample copy of a Memorandum of Agreement, the applicant does not include a signed agreement, nor do they describe the number of signed partner agreements that may be on file. (page e130)

Reader's Score: 19

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 clear listing of all of the QOZs impacted and potentially involved with the proposed project. (pages e31, e35, e37-38)

b) Throughout the application narrative, the applicant describes the needs of the schools in the QOZs and describes how they will recruit, train, support and sustain the teachers in an effort to improve their teaching competencies and to improve student outcomes.

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 04:35 PM