

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/17/2020 03:39 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Three Rivers Education Foundation, Inc. (S336S200025)

Reader #1: *****

| | Points Possible | Points Scored |
|------------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Questions | | |
| Selection Criteria | | |
| Quality of Project Design | | |
| 1. Project Design | 30 | 30 |
| Quality of the Project Evaluation | | |
| 1. Project Evaluation | 20 | 17 |
| Adequacy of Resources | | |
| 1. Resources | 30 | 30 |
| Quality of the Management Plan | | |
| 1. Management Plan | 20 | 20 |
| Sub Total | 100 | 97 |
| Priority Questions | | |
| Competitive Preference Priority | | |
| Competitive Preference Priority 1 | | |
| 1. Opportunity Zones | 3 | 3 |
| Competitive Preference Priority 2 | | |
| 1. New Grantees | 3 | 0 |
| Sub Total | 6 | 3 |
| Total | 106 | 100 |

Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - FY20 Teacher Quality Partnership - 4: 84.336S

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Three Rivers Education Foundation, Inc. (S336S200025)

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 application clearly describes how the proposed project demonstrates a rationale. The application demonstrates that the rationale for the proposed project includes the following: research that supports the design and the framework; research-based components of the program; and justification for the need for an effective teacher preparation program. The overall design of the proposed project is informed by research into various broad topics in education, including research into connected learning theories (Ito, 2013), high-impact practices (Kuh, 2008), community immersion processes (Waddell, 2013), competency-based credentialing (Digital Promise, 2015–16; Hickey, et al., 2014), high-velocity clinical preparation strategies (NCATE, 2010; Darling-Hammond, 2014), and high-leverage pedagogies (Loewenberg Ball, & Forzani, 2012). With this research as the framework for the design of the teacher residency program, all elements of the project design have been strategically chosen to enhance teacher preparation at the PK-12 level and the university levels. The logic model describes a rationale and includes the following elements: objectives, strategies, actions, and outputs. (pg. e21-e22; e111)

(ii) The application demonstrates that the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable. The proposed project has three goals, aligned with objectives and appropriate measurable performance measures to ensure the coordination of all components and accountability for meeting implementation targets and outcomes. For example, Goal 1: Establish, increase collaboration, and sustain a partnership of professional educators from IHEs and LEAs to develop and implement teacher residency programs that impact high-need school districts in Colorado and New Mexico, is aligned with Objectives and measurable performance measures. (pg. e35-e38)

(iii) The application clearly demonstrates that the proposed project, 3RivSWTQP, represents an exceptional approach for meeting statutory purposes and requirements. The proposed project contains seven exceptional and unique components. First, in the target service area, no other IHE is offering intensive, year-long teaching residencies, and they do not offer the level of support being offered through this proposal. Second, the proposed project established and expands clear criteria for mentor teachers. Third the concept of total immersion through a 12-month teaching residency with a mentor teacher is a novel approach for Colorado and New Mexico schools. Fourth, residents will engage in practicum in which they will work with small groups of students, and have the opportunity to learn and apply instructional strategies, learn to interpret student data to inform instruction, and refine their understanding of reading. Fifth, creating a partnership of

participating district and the IHE to address teacher education is unique in Colorado and New Mexico. Sixth, there will be greater emphasis on technology for isolated, rural school settings, and for delivery of professional development. Seventh, the use of Cognitive Coaching will strengthen and sustain productive interactions among colleagues, promote a reflection of practice, and contribute to a more successful induction process. (pg. e39-e41)

(iv) The application describes how the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students. The applicant demonstrates that systemic change can occur throughout the evolution of this project, including teacher training, hiring, and induction. Resident teachers will be recruited to serve in classrooms working in settings with real students and with mentor teachers who have proven records of achievement with all students. This process will bring a new emphasis on sustained higher education involvement with a university faculty member being involved in new teacher development over a period of three years. The university will have the opportunity to use the evaluations from this program to make adjustments in their own educational processes. The applicant indicates that as the Institution of Higher Education (IHE) liaison makes routine visits to the classroom of participants, they will be able to coordinate their own research-based instruction with the conditions they observe in a real classroom setting. (pg. e41-e42)

Weaknesses:

(i) No weaknesses were noted.

(ii) No weaknesses were noted.

(iii) No weaknesses were noted.

(iv) No weaknesses were 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 application demonstrates that the proposed project includes valid and reliable outcome measures for the program that meet the outcome measurement standards defined by the WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook, Version 2.0. The data on teacher participants will include progress in a master's program course of study and completion, residency completion, licensure attainment, teacher of record documents, induction participation, and participants' students' assessment results with comparison to non-participant data. The applicant demonstrates that the student assessment data used by the Colorado and New Mexico Public Education Departments are valid and reliable measurements (e.g., PARCC, short-cycle assessments). The applicant also provides details indicating that the measures and tools, and associated analysis methodologies, are directly tied to the outcomes and the GPRA measures to ensure validity. (pg. e42-

e43)

(ii) The application demonstrates that the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project. The applicant indicates that the purpose of the proposed project is to improve student achievement by improving the preparation of new teachers and holding IHEs accountable for improving teacher preparation programs. The proposed project will achieve these outcomes through a partnership with ENMU, 20 LEAs, and the Foundation to implement an extended teacher residency and improved induction support program; and inform improvements in IHE teacher education preparation programs at the higher education and state level. The applicant addresses the requirement of evaluation measures requirements in 204(a) of the Higher Education Act by aligning each objective to a specific evaluation measure. The applicant clearly aligns each research question to data sources, collection time period, analysis method, person responsible, and GPRA connection. (pg. e44-e53)

Weaknesses:

(i) The application does not clearly describe the methodology on how the evaluators will use Propensity Score Matching (PSM) to match residency teachers with non-residency teachers in the same grades and subject for comparison purposes in a quasi-experimental design. (pg. e53)

(ii) No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 17

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 application clearly demonstrates an adequacy of support, including facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources, from the applicant organization. The applicant organization is a 501©3 non-profit regional organization and will serve as the lead applicant and the fiscal agent. The organization is fully staffed with a business office and a Chief Financial Officer. The applicant organization will devote resources, including staff time, evaluation support, office space, supplies, subscriptions, and a field office to ensure project success. The applicant organization provides a number of

resources as a match to ensure the project has adequate support. The applicant clearly links the applicant organization resources to a description of the commitment, and to the amount of each annual commitment. (pg. e53-e55)

(ii) The application provides a comprehensive budget that is adequate to support the proposed project. The five-year funding request of \$7.4 million along with the cost-share of \$7.4 million equals to a total cost of \$14.8 million for the proposed service and research, which is \$81 per student in the participating districts. The detailed goals, objectives, and outcomes anticipate 75 new special education, secondary mathematics or science education teachers will be school-based team members as partners in school-wide transformation. The costs for the proposed project are reasonable, given that this project will help to: improve teacher preparation programs; improve district induction programs; increase teacher effectiveness; improve student achievement in math and science education; improve instruction for students with limited English proficiency (EL) and special needs; and improve teacher retention rates (3-year). (pg. e55; e72-e86)

(iii) The application demonstrates that costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project. The proposed project will improve the special education, math, and science content knowledge and pedagogy of 75 teachers. The proposed project builds in strong support for the implementation of high-quality professional development in a cost-effective and sustainable manner. The distance technologies will be used to reduce face-to-face hours required for interactions, which reduces travel time. The proposed project will have the capability to capture videos of teachers and use virtual meetings to engage in reflective conversations. The financial commitment of the LEAs, and Eastern New Mexico University to a shared investment model ensures that the work funded through the proposed project will continue after federal funds ends. (pg. e55-e56)

(iv) The application 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 partners; and evidence of broad support from stakeholders critical to the project's long-term success. The applicant organization is fully staffed with a business office, and operational staff, facilities, and resources to implement the proposed project. The applicant indicates that the Foundation was established in 2008 and successfully managed two grant program, such as Innovative Approaches to Literacy and a Carol White Physical Education program with total funding in excess of \$18 million, and currently manages two High School Equivalency grant programs with a total funding in excess of \$10 million dollars. (pg. e56-e57)

Weaknesses:

(i) No weaknesses were noted.

(ii) No weaknesses were noted.

(iii) No weaknesses were noted.

(iv) No weaknesses were 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 application describes an adequate 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. The applicant provides a clear work plan that aligns each measurable objective, activities, benchmark, timeline, and responsibility. The logic model also includes the following elements: objectives, strategies, actions, and outputs. The applicant provides a detailed organizational chart. The applicant describes the roles and responsibilities of the following key personnel: Teachers, School Principals Supervision and Placement, Three Rivers Executive Director, Three Rivers Financial Officer, Director of Grant Programs, and Central Office Technical Support. The applicant includes resumes for the following key personnel in the Appendix: Project Director, Program Coordinator/Coach, Program Coaches, and Director of Grant Programs (in-kind Matching. (pg. e57-e65; e112-e126)

(ii) The application demonstrates the relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project. The applicant indicates that local capacity will be developed and improved from both the LEA and the higher education perspective. The LEAS understand the importance of a strong mentoring and induction process as a result of hiring better-prepared residents, and they are committed to the ongoing use of the enhanced induction process that will result from the proposed project. The improvements, and the recruitment techniques, will be cost-effective as the retention of teachers is increased, as instruction is improved, and as student achievement is improved. The iHE will be encouraged to shift the delivery of instruction to pre-service teachers from a traditional student teaching model to a residency model with collaborative support from everyone who is involved in the process. The applicant indicates that continuity between coursework theory and classroom application will be developed in a clinical setting. The desired outcome will be improved pre-service educator instruction that is sustained and institutionalized. This proposed project would set a precedent for new partnerships between LEAs and IHEs to extend the benefits established through the proposed project. The existing relationships between the IHE and the State Commission on Higher Education (CHE) will help to establish policy guidance that may affect requirements for teacher preparation programs and induction support that affects all IHEs in the state. (pg. e65-e66)

Weaknesses:

(i) No weaknesses were noted.

(ii) No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. Spurring Investment in Qualified Opportunity Zones (Up to 3 points).

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that the area in which the applicant proposes to provide services overlaps with a Qualified Opportunity Zone, as designated by the Secretary of the Treasury under section 1400Z-1 of the Internal Revenue Code.

An applicant must--

(a) Provide the census tract number of the Qualified Opportunity Zone(s) in which it proposes to provide services; (ED Panel monitor will verify the QOZ using this link.) and

(b) Describe how the applicant will provide services in the Qualified Opportunity Zone(s).

Note: To receive competitive preference points under this priority, applicants must provide the Department with the census tract number of the Qualified Opportunity Zone(s) they plan to serve and describe the services they will provide. For the purposes of this TQP competition, applicants should consider the area where the partner LEA(s) serves to be the area that must overlap with a QOZ; an LEA may be considered to overlap with a QOZ even if only one high-need school included in the project in the proposed TQP grant application is located in a QOZ. A list of QOZs is available at www.cdfifund.gov/Pages/Opportunity-Zones.aspx; applicants may also determine whether a particular area overlaps with a QOZ using the National Center of Education Statistics' map located at <https://nces.ed.gov/programs/mapped/LocaleLookup/>.

Strengths:

(a) The application provides the census tract number of the Qualified Opportunity Zones in which it proposes to provide services in Appendix H. The application provides a list of the targeted public-school districts and their corresponding census tract number, noting their specified Qualified Opportunity Zone designation. (pg. e21; e105)

(b) The application clearly describes the services it will provide in the Qualified Opportunity Zones. The application demonstrates that all 20 public school districts that have been identified for inclusion in this grant are in Qualified Opportunity Zones (QOZ) or the area in which the applicant proposes to provide services overlaps with a QOZ. The applicant provides clear demographics on the needs for the proposed program in the target schools, by providing the data on poverty, free/reduced lunch, ethnicity, percentage of English language proficiency, and the percentage of mathematics proficiency. The proposed program will provide services such as coaching and mentoring during the residency year. The Cognitive Coaching framework will serve as the model for the mentoring/coaching support that the participants will receive. Cognitive Coaching is a research-based model intended to produce self-directed persons with the cognitive capacity for excellence both independently and as members of a community. The applicant demonstrates that the proposed project partnership and the evaluator will conduct a formative review of the induction plan on an annual basis to ensure that all aspects of the teacher induction plan support the development of highly effective teachers and result in increased student achievement in the school districts in the QOZ Zones. (pg. e21; e26; e32-e33)

Weaknesses:

(a) No weaknesses were noted.

(b) No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 2

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2: (ED Panel Monitor provide the score and comments this CPP.)

Applications from New Potential Grantees (0 or 3 points).

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that it has never received a grant, including through membership in a group application submitted in accordance with 34 CFR 75.127-75.129, under the program from which it seeks funds.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/17/2020 03:39 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/17/2020 03:46 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Three Rivers Education Foundation, Inc. (S336S200025)

Reader #2: *****

| | Points Possible | Points Scored |
|------------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Questions | | |
| Selection Criteria | | |
| Quality of Project Design | | |
| 1. Project Design | 30 | 30 |
| Quality of the Project Evaluation | | |
| 1. Project Evaluation | 20 | 17 |
| Adequacy of Resources | | |
| 1. Resources | 30 | 30 |
| Quality of the Management Plan | | |
| 1. Management Plan | 20 | 20 |
| Sub Total | 100 | 97 |
| Priority Questions | | |
| Competitive Preference Priority | | |
| Competitive Preference Priority 1 | | |
| 1. Opportunity Zones | 3 | 3 |
| Competitive Preference Priority 2 | | |
| 1. New Grantees | 3 | 0 |
| Sub Total | 6 | 3 |
| Total | 106 | 100 |

Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - FY20 Teacher Quality Partnership - 4: 84.336S

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Three Rivers Education Foundation, Inc. (S336S200025)

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 documents a clear rationale for the project documenting the need for an effective teacher preparation program that is informed by research and effective practice. The applicant cites research from Ito 2013, and Kuh, 2008 on connected learning theories and high-impact practices that will be implemented as a part of the proposed project design. The Logic Model provides a helicopter view of the proposed activities (i.e., develop a recruitment plan, recruit 75 participants, and build capacity to sustain high-quality teachers).

The proposed model focuses on the need for highly-qualified math and special education teachers, which supports the rationale for the proposed project (pg. e21-23 , 111).

(ii) The applicant has identified three specific goals (i.e., sustain a Partnership of professional educators from IHEs and LEAs to develop and implement teacher residency programs that impact high-need school districts in Colorado and New Mexico); objectives (i.e., recruit and select 75 participants through a rigorous selection process for the teaching residency component and acceptance into the master's degree program component), and outcomes (i.e., By January 2021, and annually thereafter, 15 participants for a total of 75 participants will be enrolled in the program as a result of meeting the required criteria as identified in the recruitment plan) that can be measured to determine project effectiveness (pg. e35-38).

(iii) The applicant documents the need for the proposed intervention services to include instructional strategies that support a high-quality coaching and teaching model. The applicant has identified an exceptional approach to meeting the statutory requirements and documents the seven exceptional and unique components that will be implemented (i.e., intensive year-long residencies, ongoing support from coaches, forums for examining student data with relevant intervention strategies, mentor teachers, and a 12-month total immersion teaching residency program). Pg. e39-41

(iv) The proposed project design is part of a comprehensive effort to improve student outcomes through the recruitment and retention of resident teachers that will work in the classroom at the same time they are pursuing their credentials. The applicant documents that this strategy will provide the university with information needed to adjust training and development and coordinate future research-based instruction based on what they observe in the classroom settings (pg. e41).

Weaknesses:

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

Reader's Score: 30

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(i) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes.

(ii) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.

Strengths:

(i) The applicant proposes an evaluation design that meets the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) Design Standards with Reservations, and documents sufficient evidence of a plan to ensure valid and reliable outcome measures. For example, the applicant will measure progression as it relates to master's degree program completion, completion of all residency components, and attainment of licensure. The overall evaluation plan takes into consideration the need to align the measures to the outcomes to ensure a reliable evaluation, as the applicant documents that the evaluators will conduct comparisons using statistical adjustments to ensure baseline differences among the study populations (pg. 43-44).

(ii) The applicant provides a detailed description of the methods of evaluation which are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the project. The proposed design includes a quasi-experimental design with matched comparison schools. The overall plan will focus on the individual experiences of resident teachers and their support teams, to identify areas of strength in a comprehensive induction program (pg. e37-38,43).

Weaknesses:

- (i) The applicant is proposing a quasi-experimental design and the use of propensity score matching in their evaluation design. However, the details on how they will match resident and non-resident teachers from the same grade levels and subject area for comparison is not clearly described (pg. e53).
- (ii) No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 17

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 sufficiently documents their commitment as evidenced by the in-kind support of staffing that is equal to over \$150,000. In addition, the applicant documents the resources to include office space, supplies, and partnerships with other entities that have documented their commitment through letters of support (pg. e54-55, 192-200).

(ii) The applicant provides for a budget that is reasonable and cost-effective as the majority of funds are allocated for staff that will provide direct services to the project. The applicant is proposing to provide services that will result in 75 teachers with improved skills in math, science, and pedagogy. The overall cost of the project has been estimated by the applicant as \$14.8 million dollars, which according to the applicant, equates to \$81 per student, which clearly demonstrates a strong return on investment (e55, 72-86, 223-224).

(iii) The applicant provides for a reasonable budget as it relates to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the project. The majority of funds for the project will directly support the training and development of resident teachers to include professional development activities in math and science for teachers in high-need rural schools. Moreover, the matching funds demonstrate a commitment by the applicant to ensure the sustainability of the project (pg. e54-56).

(iv) The applicant documents sufficient evidence of a plan to continue the project objectives once federal funding ends. For example, the project requires a multi-year financial and operating model, which the applicant documents sufficient resources to continue many of the activities outlined in the Project Design. The commitment by partner agencies provide opportunities for leveraging of resources even after federal funding for the project has ended (pg. e55-57).

Weaknesses:

(i) No weaknesses noted.

(ii) No weaknesses noted.

(iii) No weaknesses noted.

(iv) No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 30

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

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

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

Strengths:

(i) The applicant documents a comprehensive management plan that aligns with each project objective. The activities are aligned with benchmarks, timelines, and responsible parties. For example, one of the activities is to develop recruitment channels through social media with benchmarks of a fully functional website by November 30, 2020. The responsible person or organization for each activity is documented (pg. e58-64).

(ii) The applicant documents sufficient evidence of a commitment by partner agencies to the project as evidenced by letters of support. Moreover, the matching support that will be provided demonstrates a commitment to the overall goals and objectives. The applicant also documents an existing relationship with the Institution of Higher Education and the State Commission on Higher Education (CHE) and how they will assist in establishing policy guidance that have potential to affect teacher preparation programs that may lead to policy development at the State level (pg. e65-66).

Weaknesses:

(i) No weaknesses noted.

(ii) No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. Spurring Investment in Qualified Opportunity Zones (Up to 3 points).

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that the area in which the applicant proposes to provide services overlaps with a Qualified Opportunity Zone, as designated by the Secretary of the Treasury under section 1400Z-1 of the Internal Revenue Code.

An applicant must--

(a) Provide the census tract number of the Qualified Opportunity Zone(s) in which it proposes to provide services; (ED Panel monitor will verify the QOZ using this link.) and

(b) Describe how the applicant will provide services in the Qualified Opportunity Zone(s).

Note: To receive competitive preference points under this priority, applicants must provide the Department with the census tract number of the Qualified Opportunity Zone(s) they plan to serve and describe the services they will provide. For the purposes of this TQP competition, applicants should consider the area where the partner LEA(s) serves to be the area that must overlap with a QOZ; an LEA may be considered to overlap with a QOZ even if only one high-need school included in the project in the proposed TQP grant application is located in a QOZ. A list of QOZs is available at www.cdfifund.gov/Pages/Opportunity-Zones.aspx; applicants may also determine whether a particular area overlaps with a QOZ using the National Center of Education Statistics' map located at <https://nces.ed.gov/programs/maped/LocaleLookup/>.

Strengths:

- a) The applicant addresses the Competitive Preference Priority identifying the Census Tract Numbers for the targeted schools in Qualified Opportunity Zones (QOZs) pg. e21, 24-25
- b) The applicant documents sufficient evidence of a plan to provide services. For example, that the majority of schools they are serving are in the Qualified Opportunity Zones (QOZs) and outlines the strategies that are specific to training and the development serving in these areas. The applicant documents the poverty levels and needs in the QOZs and has identified 20 of the school districts that will be served through the project along with the strategies to include continuous coaching and mentoring during the residency year (pg. e21-26, 32-33).

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:

Non-applicable.

Weaknesses:

Non-applicable.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/17/2020 03:46 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/17/2020 03:50 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Three Rivers Education Foundation, Inc. (S336S200025)

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 | 17 |
| Adequacy of Resources | | |
| 1. Resources | 30 | 30 |
| Quality of the Management Plan | | |
| 1. Management Plan | 20 | 20 |
| Sub Total | 100 | 97 |
| Priority Questions | | |
| Competitive Preference Priority | | |
| Competitive Preference Priority 1 | | |
| 1. Opportunity Zones | 3 | 3 |
| Competitive Preference Priority 2 | | |
| 1. New Grantees | 3 | 0 |
| Sub Total | 6 | 3 |
| Total | 106 | 100 |

Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - FY20 Teacher Quality Partnership - 4: 84.336S

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Three Rivers Education Foundation, Inc. (S336S200025)

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:

- Subfactor i – The proposal demonstrates a clear need for additional highly qualified mathematics and special education teachers in the New Mexico and Colorado region. For example, the New Mexico 4-year universities have seen a 27.7% decrease in students completing education degrees over the past six years. (e18) This data demonstrates the need for an innovative model that includes teacher incentives to recruit new educators. The proposal details the creation of a teacher residency to not only recruit teachers, but train them to be highly effective through professional development and mentoring. (e18) The proposal clearly outlines the relevant research and effective practices that have informed the design of the Three River Southwest Teacher Quality Partnership project (3RivSWTQP). (e22-e23) Additionally, the proposal includes a logic model that aligns the research to the action plan (e172) to create a comprehensive and coherent proposal.
- Subfactor ii – The proposal outlines three goals to increase collaboration between the university program and the district practitioners, provide a residency program to produce 75 teachers for high-needs LEAs in special education and secondary mathematics, and retain and support participating teachers during the two-year induction program. (e35-e38) Each of these goals are supported by aligned objectives that identify multiple performance measures. Each performance measure includes a clear time-bound outcome and a data set for measuring the successful achievement. The inclusion of multiple performance measures in a noted strength, as it demonstrates clear outcomes in areas of program development and teacher preparation to show how the project will reach the ultimate goal.
- Subfactor iii – The proposal outlines seven exceptional components that when combined create a unique approach to the priority. For example, the proposal describes how no other institute of higher education is offering a teacher residency program in the region, nor that there are opportunities for support during induction to help retain teachers. (e39) Additionally, the proposal outlines the inclusion of small group instructional settings to support the development of skills and instructional strategies for interventions for the teacher residents. (e40) The overview of all seven components of innovation with supporting rationale is a noted strength of this proposal and demonstrates an opportunity to advance knowledge in the field for training and retaining high-quality teachers in remote and rural areas.
- Subfactor iv – The proposal details that improvement in student achievement is a key objective to the overall project. (e18) The proposed intensive commitment of time in class compared to time in graduate coursework is appropriate, as it places an emphasis on the time in the classroom to prepare the teacher residents for the classroom (e40). This paired with the coaching and small group professional development was noted as a strength of the proposal

for the comprehensive approach to preparing teacher residents to provide high-quality instruction to the students in Colorado and New Mexico.

Weaknesses:

- Subfactor i – No weaknesses are noted.
- Subfactor ii – No weaknesses are noted.
- Subfactor iii – No weaknesses are noted.
- Subfactor iv – No weaknesses are 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:

- Subfactor i – The proposal presents an evaluation plan that meets the What Works Clearinghouse Design Standards with Reservation by conducting a quasi-experimental design with matched comparison classrooms (e42-e43). The design includes both qualitative and quantitative data and seeks to evaluate both the teacher residency design as well as impact on student learning. This comprehensive approach was noted as a strength to the proposal. The proposal leverages an evaluator to also complete progress monitoring as well as performance feedback (e43). These additional evaluations will benefit the execution of the teacher residency program, as well as providing feedback to improve teacher resident instruction. These were viewed as a strength of the proposal.
- Subfactor ii – The proposal presents a comprehensive table that outlines the measures and timeline associated with each of the ten objectives of the proposal. The table clearly demonstrates how multiple data sets will be used to for analysis (e44-e46). Additionally, each measure includes a performance measure that aligns with the previously stated objectives and goals for the Three River Southwest Teacher Quality Partnership project (3RivSWTQP). (e35-e38). The proposal also includes a diverse set of data sources including participant course enrollment and final grades, teacher licensure test scores, classroom observations of the teacher residents, and data from interviews with coaches and mentors. (e48-e50) The diversity of the data sets provided increased opportunities for insights related to the outcomes of the project and effectiveness of the chosen strategies to prepare teacher residents for successful careers in the classroom.

Weaknesses:

- Subfactor i – The proposal does not clearly describe the methodology for establishing the matching groups that will be used for evaluation in the quasi-experimental matched study beyond a single reference to using propensity scoring.

(e53) This methodology is key to the study and warrants additional details beyond the intent to match teachers in the same grade and subject to establish if the process is rigorous to inform possible outcomes. Additionally, the proposal lacked information about the sample sizes that would be used in the evaluation process, as well as the effect size that was being used as a benchmark for success.

- Subfactor ii – No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 17

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:

- Subfactor i – The proposal clearly demonstrates the collaboration of the Three Rivers Foundation, the Eastern New Mexico University Department of Education, and the school districts from New Mexico and Colorado (e19 – e20). For example, the proposal outlines that Eastern New Mexico University will be the lead in the development of robust clinical experiences, while the partnering school districts will provide placement for residents with qualified mentor teachers, and space for professional learning. (e20) The collaboration is evident in both the design, proposed leadership structure (e65), as well as the continuous feedback model that exists for input from all organizations. As Eastern New Mexico University is an existing state approved teacher preparation program, the teacher residents will be in a pathway that leads to state education licensure, which was a strength of the proposal. The proposal includes letter of support from each of the partnership entities (e190-e204) that outline their specific commitment to the partnership, demonstrating that each partner is clear in regard to their role within the proposed project.
- Subfactor ii – The budget presented is adequate and describes clear resources, such as salaries for lead project personnel as described in the project management plan and meets the match requirement. (e211-e213) Additionally, the project includes funding for the district leaders such as the master mentor teachers and school principals that will be responsible for placement. (e223) The inclusion of funding to support the district staff is a noted strength of the proposal as it values their time to ensure their commitment to the success of the project. Additionally, the budget includes resources for both meals and travel, which are necessary due to the large region that is being served. (e224) The inclusion of these expenses demonstrates a thoughtful allocation of resources to meet all project needs and is a noted strength.
- Subfactor iii – The proposal will train 75 teachers over the length of the project period, at an average cost of \$81 per student in grant funding. (e55, e223-e224) With the commitment to a living wage (e24) for all teacher candidates during their residency experience the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project. Additionally, the opportunity to provide highly qualified teachers in special education and

secondary mathematics for rural high-needs schools may provide a long-term benefit to these schools, communities, and ultimately student learning.

- Subfactor iv – The Three Rivers Education Foundation demonstrates existing expertise at the organization that will contribute to future sustainability efforts. For example, the foundation employs a Chief Financial Officer that will oversee the budgeting for the project. (e 57) This creates an opportunity to develop future financial revenue opportunities and find cost-savings to continue the project beyond the grant period. Additionally, as the Eastern New Mexico University already has an existing teacher program, it is possible that the university may institutionalize the program in alignment with the other existing licensure pathway models. (e65) The commitment of the Three Rivers Education foundation leadership and governing board is also a noted strength. (e57)

Weaknesses:

- Subfactor i – No weaknesses are noted.
- Subfactor ii – No weaknesses are noted.
- Subfactor iii – No weaknesses are noted.
- Subfactor iv – No weaknesses are 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:

- Subfactor i – The proposal clearly presents a management plan that addresses activities, benchmarks, timeline, and responsibility related to each of the proposed goals and objectives (e58-e64). The actions align with the objectives and are aligned with a reasonable timeframe. The organizational chart (e65) was noted as a strength of the proposal, specifically the inclusion of a liaison to facilitate the partnership between the participants, university, and district leaders. This is a key role to the success of the program to support the teacher mentors and residents in their daily work across the large distances that will be served.
- Subfactor ii – The proposal notes that relationships and communication about teacher preparation will continue beyond the grant period (e65-e66) with Eastern New Mexico University seeking to adopt the residency program in place of the traditional student teaching model. The establishment of these intentions to shift to the program model was noted as a potential strength of the proposal. The Three Rivers Education Foundation has demonstrated record of relationships and execution of educational programming for rural high-needs districts across four states, as well as accomplishment with previous grant implementation and evaluation (e20). The foundation outlines personnel and capacities that are adequate to support the proposed project.

Weaknesses:

- Subfactor i – No weaknesses noted.
- Subfactor ii – No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Priority Questions**Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1****1. Spurring Investment in Qualified Opportunity Zones (Up to 3 points).**

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that the area in which the applicant proposes to provide services overlaps with a Qualified Opportunity Zone, as designated by the Secretary of the Treasury under section 1400Z-1 of the Internal Revenue Code.

An applicant must--

(a) Provide the census tract number of the Qualified Opportunity Zone(s) in which it proposes to provide services; (ED Panel monitor will verify the QOZ using this link.) and

(b) Describe how the applicant will provide services in the Qualified Opportunity Zone(s).

Note: To receive competitive preference points under this priority, applicants must provide the Department with the census tract number of the Qualified Opportunity Zone(s) they plan to serve and describe the services they will provide. For the purposes of this TQP competition, applicants should consider the area where the partner LEA(s) serves to be the area that must overlap with a QOZ; an LEA may be considered to overlap with a QOZ even if only one high-need school included in the project in the proposed TQP grant application is located in a QOZ. A list of QOZs is available at www.cdfifund.gov/Pages/Opportunity-Zones.aspx; applicants may also determine whether a particular area overlaps with a QOZ using the National Center of Education Statistics' map located at <https://nces.ed.gov/programs/maped/LocaleLookup/>.

Strengths:

- The proposed Three Rivers Southwest Teacher Quality Partnership program (3RivSWTQP) will provide services to 75 teachers in 20 public school districts in Colorado and New Mexico that contain QOZs to provide qualified teachers for students in schools that been identified for serving high-needs students. (e13, e 21, e24)
- The proposal provides the census tracts for each of the district partners participating in the teacher residency program for mathematics, science and special education teachers with Three Rivers Education Foundation and Eastern New Mexico University. (e206). Additionally, the proposal provides demographic data to describe the student population and highlight needs for highly qualified teachers. (e29-e35)
- The proposal provides clear strategies that are specific to training teachers to service the needs of students and families in the qualified opportunity zones. For example, the proposal not only demonstrates needs for improved academic achievement in mathematics and science (e32-e34), the proposal identifies other community challenges including lack of healthcare, exposure to violence, family stress, inadequate housing and poverty. The recognition of these challenges demonstrates an understanding of the needs of schools and students in the QOZs that will be used to inform the overall teacher residency program.

Weaknesses:

- No weaknesses are 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:

Not applicable.

Weaknesses:

Not applicable.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/17/2020 03:50 PM