

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/20/2020 04:34 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Alder Graduate School of Education (S336S200017)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	30	28
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
<b>Adequacy of Resources</b>		
1. Resources	30	30
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	20
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	98
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
1. Opportunity Zones	3	3
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
1. New Grantees	3	3
<b>Sub Total</b>	6	6
<b>Total</b>	106	104

# Technical Review Form

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

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

Applicant: Alder Graduate School of Education (S336S200017)

## 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 this project which includes an overview of the goals and outcomes for the project; need and justification for the residency and induction program; research that supports the design, and research-based components of the program (e20). The identified partners will plan and launch three new residency and induction programs in high need local education agencies (LEAs), which include and will prepare twelve cohorts of resident teachers (1 cohort/partner/year for Year 2-5 of the grant period). As a partnership, they will provide an exceptional approach which includes building deeply collaborative and contextualized partnerships between IHEs and high need LEAs to cultivate diverse and local talent, share costs to ensure sustainability, and respond to local priorities (e20-e21). Four documented issues drive the need for this project: 1) the highest need students and schools often have the least experienced and least qualified teachers; 2) the demand for teachers in high need schools in critical content areas like math, science, and special education is increasing due to low supply and high attrition in the current teaching force; 3) the majority of students of color are taught by white teachers despite research showing same-race teachers improve student outcomes, and 4) the current recession has created uncertainty this project can help address. All four issues require more effective and more representative teachers available to the highest need students and schools (e22). The logic model provided includes inputs, components, and outcomes (e24; e96-e97) that are clearly aligned to the proposed needs and goals. The program design of clearly builds upon core strategies developed by Teach for America (TFA) that have been shown to be effective at selecting and preparing teachers to positively impact student achievement in high need schools. Supportive research-based data on the effectiveness of TFA is found in the narrative (e24). The applicant has further provided a comprehensive research-based project design (e25-e36) where they have appropriately described the needs data (e40-e44)

ii. The applicant describes evidence of clear goals, objectives, and measurable outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project. For example, in Goal 2 the applicant proposes to train, support and retain effective new teachers in schools with high concentrations of high need students. Matching objectives include: Placing graduates in high need schools over 5 years; 85% of graduates will secure teaching positions in partner LEAs; 80% of graduates will be rated effective or higher on teacher evaluations; 60% of graduates placed in partner LEAs will be retained for three consecutive years; and Conduct an evaluation that produces evidence of new teacher effectiveness, measured by student achievement. Additionally, the applicant proposes to select and train high-quality induction coaches to support new teachers; provide

ongoing development of early career teachers through instructionally focused induction support aimed at improving retention and student learning (e37-e38).

iii. The proposed project represents an exceptional approach because of the unique design of the program, which is a demonstrated, scalable, sustainable and a replicable teacher residency model that enables deep, collaborative partnerships between IHEs and high need LEAs to cultivate a pipeline diverse and local talent, share costs to ensure sustainability, and can be contextualized to meet the specific needs of each partner LEA. Specific features of the proposed project partnership with LEAs include: 1) tuition revenue sharing from the start to avoid a financial cliff at the end of the grant, 2) shared personnel to lead residency to ensure alignment and coherence from recruitment to induction, 3) investments in the highest needs' areas (including QOZs and consortia of high need schools within partner LEAs) to amplify local talent and diversify the teaching force and 4) funding a new grantee partnership promoting innovation with federal dollars that produces sustainable programming and lasting impacts (e38).

iv. The proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students. For example, the proposed residency program is clearly one important way that each partner LEA is planning to prepare more effective teachers that will be hired and retained in their high need schools. Residents and graduates are supported to understand content standards and plan their assessments and instruction around them to ensure better outcomes for students (e43). In order to address these state and local teaching and learning needs, this partnership will support teacher candidates through coursework and their clinical experience to earn a multiple subject credential, a single subject credential in English, Social Studies, Science or Math, or a Special Education Mild/Moderate credential. Additionally, residents will take content-based methods coursework every term, which will introduce rigorous academic standards (e.g. CCS-ELA, CCS-Math, NGSS, and ELD) and spiral to deepen understanding and application of standards and evidence-based practices in planning, instruction, and assessment (e44).

**Weaknesses:**

- i. The applicant failed to provide short and midterm outcomes in the logic model making it difficult to determine how the applicant plans to monitor on-going progress (e95-e97).
- ii. No weaknesses noted
- iii. No weaknesses noted
- iv. No weaknesses noted

**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. Solid evidence is providing demonstrating that the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes. For example, the applicant clearly notes that the research team will (1) measure fidelity of

implementation during the teacher candidate residency and induction support years, and (2) assess the partnerships' impact on student achievement and teacher retention outcomes following graduates' first year of teaching. Also, to measure outcomes, the study will employ an appropriate matched comparison group quasi experimental design (QED) to estimate the effect of the proposed model, as implemented in the three participating districts. The impact analyses will combine three cohorts of residents to obtain an adequate sample size to detect effects (e48). The external evaluator will conduct an implementation study to make sense of findings from the impact studies as well as to provide performance feedback to the applicant and LEA leaders. Further, the implementation study will assess the fidelity of program implementation across LEAs, including recruitment, residency, placement, and induction supports (RQ1); explore school and district leaders', residents', and mentors' experiences with the residency program (RQ2); identify strengths and challenges in efforts to recruit, support, and retain participants from historically underrepresented groups (RQ3); and examine how the various project components contribute to a sustainable pipeline of teachers (e49). Additionally, the evaluator will use a quasi-experimental propensity score matching design to assess the impact of the project on teacher retention and student achievement. The evaluator will estimate the impact of the project on teacher retention (RQ5) using a two-level logistic regression, with teachers nested within schools, accounting for teacher and school characteristics, including induction support, and the measures used for baseline equivalence (e50).

ii. Appropriately developed methods of evaluation that are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes are detailed in the application. The applicant will collect data from extant program records and surveys, and interviews with a wide range of stakeholders. Also, the implementation study will provide a thorough analysis of the project and induction supports, an assessment of the extent to which each partnership is successful recruiting and retaining teachers from historically underrepresented groups, and an examination of the model's sustainability (e53). The external evaluator will provide formative feedback throughout the evaluation, as well as a final, summative report at the end of the evaluation.

**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 sufficient evidence of support, including facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources, from the applicant organization and the lead applicant organization. The applicant articulates that they will devote a variety of resources such as staff time, grant management infrastructure, and office space (e54). They have also noted through the provided MOUs that their K-12 partners will commit to providing access to space in schools or LEA offices for weekly in-person seminars and quarterly in-person course intensives (e55). Additionally, the applicant notes that all staff and faculty members receive a laptop for their professional use, software subscriptions, and IT support. Additionally, the staff and faculty have access to technology support including their own video conferencing accounts to flexibly support collaboration. Through the use of Canvas and Populi the residents will have access to faculty and other online resources at no additional costs. Additionally, the applicant indicates that staff and faculty have access to comprehensive technology support from a dedicated third-party provider including procuring technology; network maintenance; information technology support; phone services; email and software support; data collection, sharing and analysis; and modeling services (e55). The applicant also notes that they will contribute faculty and staff to ensure successful implementation and execution of grant goals (e56). Further, each of the 221 residents will have a mentor and an induction support for two years after becoming a teacher of record who will be staffed by partner LEAs. Additionally, partner LEA staff will provide professional learning to both residents and teachers as part of the support they provide (e56).

ii. The budget provided in the application is adequate to support the proposed project. The primary costs include personnel, evaluation resources and stipends for residents. For example, in the first two years of the grant there are upfront investment costs to planning, evaluation design, recruiting residents, and adapting the program for each of the partner LEAs. These costs for the applicant decrease over time as the mode of operating shifts and as each partner LEA scales to a full cohort of 20-23 residents. To support the specific goals of this project, the applicant will have faculty and staff supporting planning and launch of residencies at each partner LEA, as well as a project director and project manager to coordinate the grant (e56-e57). Also, to ensure the project has adequate financial support, they have a strong plan to provide matching funds. For example, the applicant has identified private funding sources to match their portions for Year 1 and Year 2. Each partner is contributing personnel, materials, travel expenses, and in-kind support that match the funds requested for the five years of the grant (e57; e158). Among the partners, the majority of costs for this project are personnel-related, including mentor stipends, in-kind time for induction coaches, in-kind time for principals and district administrators who support recruitment, selection, coordination, and oversight, and resident stipends. Therefore, partner LEAs have budgeted to support these roles and demonstrate 100% project match for their portion (e57).

iii. Strong evidence that the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project is provided in the narrative and budget narrative. This project will serve three high need LEAs that include over 97 schools in and around QOZs that serve approximately 75,000 students annually, most of whom qualify as high need. Due to high retention rates, graduates trained in this model will reach and teach many more students over time than comparable peers. The applicant will provide professional development to at least 80 mentors and induction coaches in partner LEAs (e58). The design of this partnership, the promising practices developed, the formative feedback gathered and the lessons learned from this project will inform many future partnerships, increasing the impact of this work across the state (e58). The applicant has the organizational capacity to ensure objectives are achieved on time and within budget. Given the project's design and significance, the return on this investment is significant (e60).

iv. Comprehensive evidence is provided to demonstrate that the applicant has the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the grant. For example, the applicant notes that their partnerships are committed to operating this model beyond the length of the grant. With proposed funding, partner LEAs will be able to plan, launch and scale their residencies, creating efficiencies important for sustainability (e60). The applicant's model is unique in that inherent in its design is the promise of sustainability. As a graduate school of education, they receive tuition revenue, which is maintained at an intentionally competitive price-point as compared to the most affordable master's programs in the state, and for which students have access to financial aid and scholarships. The applicant shares tuition revenue with K-12 partners to offset costs of the critical Director position which becomes a part of LEA budgets. With partner districts, charter management organizations, and county offices of education covering and/or contributing significantly to the resident and

mentor stipends, as well as the Director position overseeing the residents and mentors across schools, this residency has found a place on district budget lines--a longstanding obstacle to long term viability of the typical independent residency model (e60-e61). A table with the details of each partner's dedicated project leads and resource commitments, as well as planning efforts underway to support this project. Leadership at each partner is already in regular contact coordinating efforts needed to launch this project on time (e62). The partnership between partner LEAs and the GSE is recognized through a formal agreement (MOU) that articulates responsibilities and is designed to address the specific needs of the partner LEA for effective new teachers, including adaptation of academic program and role of the residency Director as a faculty member and in supporting residents and mentors (e62; e132-e156).

**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 proposed project brings together a robust management team to ensure successful implementation of the proposed goals and objectives. The partners in this project have created a feasible timeline and budget to seed three new residency and induction sites and support the project's success and dissemination (e60; e183-e185). key responsibilities of each partner to achieve objectives are outlined (e64-e65) and are directly aligned with the goals and objectives of the proposed project. A thoroughly developed timeline that connects the goals, objectives, milestones, and key responsible parties provides a strong visual of the management plan (e65-e67).

ii. To demonstrate relevance and commitment of each partner, the applicant details an appropriate plan. For example, the applicant provides solid evidence of project leads and resources each partner is contributing;) planning efforts and formal agreements in process; and commitment to 100% financial match of the project. Each of these is thoroughly described and outlined. For example, the director of elementary teacher education of the partnering university will commit their time and content expertise that will engage in review of the academic program and overall model (e68). Letters of support are provided in the form of MOU's clearly describing the commitments (e132-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](http://www.cdfifund.gov/Pages/Opportunity-Zones.aspx); applicants may also determine whether a particular area overlaps with a QOZ using the National Center of Education Statistics' map located at <https://nces.ed.gov/programs/maped/LocaleLookup/>.**

**Strengths:**

a. Partner LEA's with schools located in the QOZ's are specified in the narrative. For example, the applicant notes seven schools in one district, 31 in another and 9 partnership LA Schools. The opportunity zones for those nine schools are:

- 6037206032
- 6037242200
- 6037224020
- 6037224600
- 6037226001
- 6037228600
- 6037242100
- 6037540400

b. The applicant clearly proposes to support teacher candidates through coursework and their clinical experience to earn a multiple subject credential, a single subject credential in English, Social Studies, Science or Math, or a Special Education Mild/Moderate credential. Additionally, residents will take content-based methods coursework every term, which will introduce rigorous academic standards (e.g. CCS-ELA, CCS-Math, NGSS, and ELD) and spiral to deepen understanding and application of standards and evidence-based practices in planning, instruction, and assessment (e40-e41) These skills will be used during residences with schools identified in the opportunity zones.

**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 04:34 PM

Status: Submitted

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

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Alder Graduate School of Education (S336S200017)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	30	29
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
<b>Adequacy of Resources</b>		
1. Resources	30	30
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	20
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	99
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
1. Opportunity Zones	3	3
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
1. New Grantees	3	3
<b>Sub Total</b>	6	6
<b>Total</b>	106	105

# Technical Review Form

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

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

Applicant: Alder Graduate School of Education (S336S200017)

## 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, components and outcomes (p e95). The project rationale is with three clear goals, evidence-based arguments (p e23-25-) and eight research-based project design components (p e25- e36) that are tied with TQP requirements and project measurement indicators. Outstanding!

(ii) The goal, objectives and measurable outcomes are fully developed and are clearly specified and measurable. It meets all of the TQP requirements and purposes as stated in NIA.

(iii) The residency approach is fully developed with four significant features: tuition sharing, shared personnel, high-need areas and a new grantee (p e38-42).

(iv) The components of improving teacher and learning (p e43-44) and support rigorous academic standards (p e44-45) are fully developed. Additionally, the project offer support for trauma-informed practices.

#### Weaknesses:

(i) The logic model can be enhanced by adding short, middle, and long-term outcomes instead of a broad description.

(ii) N/A

(iii) N/A

(iv) N/A

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 project has an external evaluation team, SRI international, employing a matched comparison group quasi-experimental design (p e48). The applicant will use both qualitative and quantitative assessments to evaluate the project goals with six research questions (4 for implementation and 2 for impact)

(ii) The applicant has provided a fully developed evaluation plan for assessing three project goals and six research questions. The methods are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and measurable outcomes.

**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 \$6.96M federal funding and provides 6.96 M in-kind match. The adequacy of support, including facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources, from the applicant organization are fully developed as stated on p e54-56.

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

(iii) It is a cost-effective project as it requests \$6.96M federal funding for 221 fellows for three high-need LEAs with 97 schools in and around QOZs. Each fellow costs \$31.4K.

(iv) Demonstrated commitments regarding the resources to operate the project are documented. They include multi-year financial and operating model (p e60) and evidence of broad support from stakeholders (p e62)

**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 project management plan is fully developed with objectives aligned with key roles and responsibilities (Table D1.i, p e64) and goals aligned with milestones, responsibilities and timeline.
- (ii) The commitments from Alder, SRI international, three LEAs, Graduate School of Education and Humanities and Sciences are fully developments (p e67 and Appendix E)

**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](http://www.cdfifund.gov/Pages/Opportunity-Zones.aspx); applicants may also determine whether a particular area overlaps with a QOZ using the National Center of Education Statistics' map located at <https://nces.ed.gov/programs/maped/LocaleLookup/>.

**Strengths:**

- (i) The census tract numbers were provided and described in detailed (p.e41)
- (ii) The quality of the services in the QOZs is fully developed- to prepare 221 new teachers for three high need LEAs.

**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 04:36 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Alder Graduate School of Education (S336S200017)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	30	29
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
<b>Adequacy of Resources</b>		
1. Resources	30	30
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	20
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	99
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
1. Opportunity Zones	3	3
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
1. New Grantees	3	3
<b>Sub Total</b>	6	6
<b>Total</b>	106	105

# Technical Review Form

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

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

Applicant: Alder Graduate School of Education (S336S200017)

## 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's description of their project design is clear and well developed. They include a succinct explanation of the rationale and cite the research that forms the foundation for the project design. The applicant is proposing to expand an existing teacher residency program to include new LEAs within area QOZs and high needs neighborhoods. The project is based upon research related to teacher preparation and ongoing support. It is designed using core strategies developed by Teach for America. The What Works Clearinghouse concluded that teachers who participate in intensive coaching and mentoring model are likely to be better prepared to be effective educators which has positive effects on their students' achievement in math and science. The applicant states that similar to Teach for America, the proposed project works with schools with high needs students. The applicant intends to utilize three core Teach for America practices that are described as the critical components of a teacher preparation program: selective admissions, intensive, preservice youth and placement and in-service support during the first years of teaching. (page e24) They include a copy of their Logic Model that further informs of the project process. (page e24)

ii) The applicant presents a clear and well-developed set of three project goals, nine specific and measurable objectives that are linked with measurable outcomes. For example, Goal # 1 focuses on the launching and scaling up of a new and sustainable residency program with three partner LEAs. Objective 1:1 calls for recruiting a pipeline of highly qualified teacher residents who have similar demographics as the students that will be served by the graduates of the program. The anticipated outcome is that over five years, the applicant will prepare 221 new educators. The first cohort of 41 residents will begin the program in Year 2 and 60 each year in Year 2 – Year 5. (page e37) The goals and objectives statements are further described and explained with a comprehensive description of the associated strategies and service delivery plans. (page e37, e25-e37)

iii) The applicant presents a well-developed and compelling description of their proposed project, pointing out why it is an exceptional approach to providing teacher preparation and support. The applicant and their partner LEAs have developed a sustainable project that includes tuition revenue sharing from the start of the project to avoid a financial drop off when the grant award concludes; shared personnel to lead residency to ensure alignment and coherence from recruitment to induction; investments in the highest need areas, which include investments and recruitment of local talent that reflect the diversity of the community being served; and a grantee partnership that promotes innovation and seeking federal funds to produce sustainable programming and having lasting impacts. The applicant will share the tuition revenue that they

receive with LEA where the teacher candidate comes from. The LEAs will build the resident and mentor stipends into their annual district budgets to ensure sustainability. (page e38) The applicant describes, in great detail, the project components (seven specific and measurable components, further demonstrating their exceptional approach. The project includes selective admissions, mentoring, coaching, clinical practice, resident and mentor stipends, intensive research-based instruction, and comprehensive induction activities. (pages e27-e36)

iv) The applicant has intentionally designed their project to be an integrated approach to supporting and responding to the highest needs communities where the level of poverty ranges from 21% to 30% and the teacher turnover rate ranges from 8% - 20%. Their proposed residency model is a community-based workforce development effort as they will recruit participants from within each community and return said resident to schools within those communities for placement and induction services. (Page e41) Further, the project is responsive to the need to align teacher preparation and school-based curricula to meet the state's Common Core State Standards. Each LEA will be better positioned to hire the most effective teachers who understand and are able to build curriculum that meets the standards effectively. (pages e42-e43)

**Weaknesses:**

- i) The applicant's Logic Model is not complete as they do not include any short or medium outcomes, making difficult to ascertain how they will assess the project progress prior to the end of the grant award. (Page e24)
- 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 proposes to hire a well-experienced external evaluation organization to serve as the external evaluator. They will conduct a rigorous independent evaluation of the project, the residency model, and the partnerships. The goals of the evaluation are to assess the impacts on teacher retention and student achievement rates. The evaluator will provide the project with ongoing formative feedback by answering six specific research questions. They will measure fidelity of implementation during the teacher candidacy residency and induction support years; assess the partnerships' impact on student achievement and teacher retention outcomes following the resident graduates first year of teaching. They will use a matched comparison group quasi-experimental design to estimate the impact. The study will focus on the residency year and first year of teaching for participants in cohorts 1,2 and 3. (pages e46-e48) The evaluation plan includes collecting and analyzing data related to resident, mentor and coach feedback, program general interviews using standardized protocols; and specific teacher impact upon student learning outcomes. (page e49)
- ii) The proposed evaluation plan aligns well with the project goals and objectives, making it easy to see how the applicant

will measure, assess, and determine the level of success in achieving the anticipated outcomes. The applicant provides a detailed and comprehensive description of the goals, objectives, and specific strategies for reaching the milestones. (pages e29-e30, e37, e52-e53) The applicant specifies the review and deliverables dates, making it easy to understand how they will continuously evaluate process and progress to goals and objectives.

**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's description of the support for the project is clear and demonstrates a strong capacity for having adequate resources to carry out the project. In terms of facilities, the applicant reports that a need for static facilities is limited because the residents are engaged in their immersive clinical experiences within the K-12 schools in their districts; residents are attending the college courses both online and in-person at their K-12 partner sites where the LEAs provide classrooms and meeting space for the project. In terms of technology and equipment the applicant reports that each of the project staff and resident will receive a laptop for their professional use, software subscriptions and IT support from the project/applicant. The applicant assures that residents and faculty have access to high-quality information and learning resources via the university library system. And all of the project partners are dedicating significant personnel time to the project in terms of course faculty, mentors and professional coaches, financial stipends. (pages e55-e56)

ii) The applicant's proposed budget is sufficient to support the activities proposed for the project. The applicant includes adequate expenses for personnel, travel, contractual services, and supplies. They include a general category of expenses to cover testing supplies, space rental, professional development related costs and software/library resources. (page e162-e167)

iii) The proposed expenditures are reasonable and in alignment with the proposed objectives and project design. The budget narrative provides a clear explanation for each of the cost categories and links the expense to the activities and objectives. (page e183-e185)

iv) The applicant's description of their sustainability plan for the project adequately demonstrates that within the participating districts, the partners are developing plans to institutionalize project activities and functions and are building the capacity to financially sustain positions and professional development activities beyond the grant award period. (pages e60-e61) Further, each of the project partners have submitted detailed letters of support that outline their commitment to the project in terms of staff, expense matching and building sustainable district budget plans for institutionalizing the new practices, protocols and positions. (pages e62-e63, e57)

**Weaknesses:**

- i) No weaknesses noted.
- ii) No weakness 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's proposed management plan is well-developed. They provide detailed resumes for the project key personnel, demonstrating that each are well-qualified and have the expertise necessary for the role and responsibilities assigned within the project. The applicant includes a comprehensive description of the key responsibilities to support the project objectives. They list each objective and link specific tasks, strategies, and personnel for each objective. (pages e63-e65) Further, the applicant includes a detailed outline of the planned activities, linking them with milestones, personnel that are responsible for the carrying out of the activities and a timeline broken out by months and project years. (page e65-e67)

ii) The applicant provides a clear description of the kinds of support and resources that are being contributed to the project. The attached letters of support provide a generalized description of the partner contributions. The applicant reports that they have been working with the partner districts for 4-6 months to ensure alignment between project goals and partner LEA needs. (page e68)

**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](http://www.cdfifund.gov/Pages/Opportunity-Zones.aspx); applicants may also determine whether a particular area overlaps with a QOZ using the National Center of Education Statistics' map located at <https://nces.ed.gov/programs/maped/LocaleLookup/>.**

**Strengths:**

- a. The applicant presents a detailed list of the area census tracts that qualify as QOZs. (page e41)
- b. The applicant clearly assures that the project will provide services and resources to the district QOZ and lists the areas of need by recruiting residency candidates from within the opportunity zones. The project is intentionally designed to prepare teachers in the principles of culturally responsive and trauma informed teaching practices. They will be learning to provide culturally responsive and trauma-informed curriculum and teaching practices to address the trauma that the students in these high needs schools experience as a result of poverty, home insecurity, health inequities, community violence and other challenges. (e40-e41)

**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 04:36 PM