

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/17/2020 03:45 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Texas A&M University (S336S200027)

Reader #1: *****

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

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Texas A&M University (S336S200027)

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. This proposal for the Teacher Quality Partnership (TQP) grant opportunity strives to advance teacher quality and retention through an eligible partnership as defined by the Higher Education Act (HEA) section 200(6) with commitments from several educational entities at Texas A&M University [the College of Education and Human Development (CEHD), College of Science, College of Liberal Arts], as well as partner school districts (Austin Independent School District - AISD, Bryan Independent School District - BISD, Caldwell Independent School District - CISD, and Hearne Independent School District - HISD, with high-need schools. The applicant provides historical evidence, supported by section 111(b) (1) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965, and amended by Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), that requires Texas school district partners to critically be examining the academic achievement of their learners, particularly those children in high need schools, relative to the quality of teaching and retention. The partner school districts, Austin Independent School District (AISD), Bryan Independent School District (BISD), Caldwell Independent School District (CISD), and Hearne Independent School District (HISD), have conducted needs assessments to diagnose academic challenges for learners and inform a comprehensive plan for their schools. As the applicant organization established proof of concept with the success of the Aggie Teacher Residency Model (aggieTERM) program that began in 2019, this proposal addresses teacher quality and retention of beginning teachers to support learners in high-need schools. (pg. e16-e27)

(ii) The application demonstrates that the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable. The applicant describes the needs of the partner ISDs that are aligned to the objectives, expected outcomes, and expected impact. The applicant provides the following SMART Goal: By the end of the five-year aggieTERM grant cycle, which includes a year-long authentic and rigorous residency program, 80% of the 250 high-quality pre- and post-baccalaureate candidates with a masters of education degree program will be hired in high-need schools in the Austin, Bryan, Caldwell and Hearne ISDs for 3-year minimum commitment. This goal is measured by performance measurement data that are embedded in a Comprehensive Community Induction Framework (CCIF). The objectives (input objectives, output objectives, evaluation objectives, and evaluation of impact) are aligned to the performance measures, tasks, responsibility, milestones, and timeline. (pg. e27-e28; e59-e62)

(iii) The application clearly demonstrates that the proposed project represents an exceptional approach for meeting statutory purposes and requirements. The application demonstrates that the Aggie Teacher Education Residency Model

(aggieTERM), in the College of Education at Texas A&M University, is a selective residency program for prospective teachers to teach in an underserved/high-need school district that started in 2019 for pre-baccalaureate students. The applicant organization has supported one successful cohort to date and 11 residents have successfully completed the pilot program and have signed a 3-year contract with the Bryan Independent School District. The aggieTERM program is a short-term response with long-term personnel implications for independent school districts (ISDs) with staffing challenges in the state of Texas. The TQP funds will be used to enhance and sustain the capacity of the aggieTERM program, which leverages a 5-point Comprehensive Community Induction Framework (CCIF), including: a coherent vision of teaching between school and university partners, comprehensive strategies that enhance clinical experiences, shared governance, developmental induction training for clinical teachers and mentors, and anchored in the community. (pg. e16-e27)

(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 indicates that the five core components of the aggieTERM Program are consistent with ESEA Section 111(d)(1)(B) because aggieTERM is a link between partner ISDs and the lead university applicant that have diagnosed their needs in order to develop a comprehensive support and improvement plan to improve student outcomes, that is based on a school-level needs assessment. The aggieTERM program leadership will facilitate monthly roundtable gatherings to discuss district needs, trends in aggieTERM data, and the implications for their partnership work together to discuss teacher candidate data and any other issues. The applicant demonstrates that the school district partners will make adjustments to the aggieTERM program, including co-developing an assessment and performance management system to assess candidate professionalism and the use of evidence-based approaches for mentors, a site supervisor, and university supervisors. The aggieTERM leadership team for each partner school will also prioritize designing common learning experiences across school sites, which includes building a shared language and ensure standardization. (pg. e28-e35; e74-e78)

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 provides the details on the methods of evaluation that will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes. The program evaluation will be guided by the New Teacher Center's Teacher Induction Program Standards (2018). The applicant demonstrates that aggieTERM will use multiple measures to gather evidence to inform decision-making and to engage key stakeholders to take active roles to promote the sustainability of the partnership. A quantitative methodology will be used that will allow for the utilization of numeric data to describe the phenomena under evaluation. The applicant clearly demonstrates the reasons that this framework was chosen, such as it allows for the collection of data from a large sample size; the data sources selected will generate numeric/statistical estimates of the populations; statistical results may be viewed by policymakers as providing greater objectivity and credibility; statistical scores provide comparisons across the data sources and to other research studies; and the descriptive data will provide the foundation for future qualitative studies. (pg. e36-e39)

(ii) The application clearly demonstrates that the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project. The applicant provides project objectives/questions related to inputs, outputs, and evaluation of outcomes and impact. The applicant aligns objectives (input objectives, output objectives, evaluation objectives, and evaluation of impact objectives), performance measures, tasks, responsibilities, and milestones. The proposed project will use a mixed method data collection with a matched (e.g., economic disadvantage, special education population, bilingual education population, STEM, etc.) comparative quantitative model and an emergent qualitative design perspective. The evaluation of TQP will take steps to approximate a quasi experimental design in which purposefully selected TQP residency schools will be compared with matched comparison schools on several school characteristics of interest (i.e., the percentage of students economically disadvantaged, receiving services for bilingual education or English as a second language, and those receiving special education services). The applicant illustrates a clear model for comparison, including sampling, assignment, implementation, short-term outcomes, and long-term outcomes. (pg. e36-e39; e63-e66)

Weaknesses:

(i) No weaknesses were noted.

(ii) No weaknesses were 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 application clearly demonstrates an adequacy of support, including facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources, from the applicant organization. The lead applicant is committed to support, such as adequate personnel; in-house program evaluation center; funding (support student cohorts, \$1,200 per year as scholarships for pre-baccalaureate students, infrastructure, aggieTERM governance meetings, mentor training, (pg. e40)

(ii) The application provides a budget that is adequate to support the proposed project. This application proposes to advance teacher quality and retention through an eligible partnership as defined by the Higher Education Act (HEA) section 200(6) with commitments from several educational entities at Texas A&M University [the College of Education and Human Development (CEHD), College of Science, College of Liberal Arts], as well as partner school districts (Austin Independent School District (ISD), Bryan ISD, Caldwell ISD, and Hearne ISD), which are high-need schools and scattered in 33 QOZs. The total anticipated 5-year budget for the aggieTERM program to perform this work is \$13,315,674.00; \$6,657,837.00 is the requested grant amount and \$6,657,837.00, or 50% of the budget, is the amount of the cost share/match provided by the partner ISDs and the university:

The total: \$13,315,674.00 (100%)

Grant Amount Requested: \$6,657,837.00 (50%)

Cost Share/Match: \$6,657,837.00 (50%)

(pg. e40)

(iii) The application demonstrates that costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project. The applicant organization and its principal investigator (PI) and co-principal investigators (co-PIs) are jointly responsible for the stewardship of sponsored research funds in compliance with federal cost principles established by the university. The applicant adheres to all cost principles as required to appropriately justify the expenses of conducting research at the applicant university. (pg. e43-e44)

(iv) The application indicates that the aggieTERM program leadership will facilitate bi-monthly roundtable gatherings to discuss district needs, trends in aggieTERM data, and the implications for their partnership work together to discuss teacher candidate data and any other issues. The application indicates that the aggieTERM leadership team for each partner school will prioritize designing common learning experiences across school sites, which includes building a shared language to ensure standardization. The applicant provides a projected budget to sustain the aggieTERM Program. The applicant aligns each budget item, cost, and potential funding source. The applicant provides a plan to leverage resources required to institutionalize the proposed program, including initiating relationships with target ISDs; identifying additional funding opportunities; refining vision, mission, case for support; refining the logic model to clarify sustainability goals and objective; analyzing program costs; and refining and executing the plan for a sustainable budget. (pg. e44-e46)

Weaknesses:

(i) No weaknesses were noted.

(ii) No weaknesses were noted.

(iii) No weaknesses were noted.

(iv) The application does not clearly demonstrate that it has the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the grant period, The applicant does not provide a clear plan regarding the demonstrated commitment, including the potential funding source of partners, after the grant period ends.

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 application will utilize a 3-stage roadmap (initiation, implementation, and continuous improvement) management plan that establishes the program components and shared governance strategy. The initiation stage, the shared vision for preparing future teachers, includes initiation of aggieTERM (the site personnel and management systems confirmed), support structures finalized, and recruiting (50 candidates identified via 3-round selection process by school-university team). During the implementation state, the aggieTERM program participants will work as a team to identify and select high quality teacher candidates. The partners will implement the Comprehensive Community Induction Framework (CCIF) in which community mentors, mentors, site leaders, and university supervisors provide a culture of family so clinical teachers will feel connected to an Independent School District (ISD) that is committed to their long-term service to learners and the community. The continuous improvement stage is a process for teacher preparation program to be adaptive in responding to the partner ISDs' staffing needs. The applicant organization recognizes the partner ISDs as future employers of the university's teacher candidates.(pg. e47-e57)

-The application describes the coordination or the synchronization among the partner ISDs and the university, which is crucial to the successful implementation of the AggieTERM program. The applicant describes the roles and responsibilities of the site supervisor/coaches, university supervisors, and community mentors. (pg. e54-e55)

-The application describes a goal (SMART) and aligns objectives (input objectives, output objectives, evaluation objectives, and evaluation of impact objectives), performance measures, tasks, responsibilities, and milestones. (pg. e63-e66)

(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 partner school districts (Austin Independent School District (ISD), Bryan ISD, Caldwell ISD, and Hearne ISD), which are high-need school districts, will commit to engaging in a recruiting and selection of residents; supporting the management and sharing of data; providing a stipend/salary for post-baccalaureate residents; providing a quality mentor for each mentee/resident; giving the mentor adequate release time to support the resident; jointly creating sustained and coherent professional development opportunities for the residents for the 'Residency Year' and for the length of the 2-year induction program; creating a professional community of care; offering qualified and successful residents a 1-year residency (with intention for renewal for 3 years pending adequate progress); arranging an "intent to serve" and "contract signing" event for April/May and invite the local community, press, and university partners; supporting marketing and communications needs (press releases, social media, etc.) ; support students in state loan forgiveness program; ensure mentors and site supervisors complete onboarding training and receive release time; providing a qualified site coordinator; ensuring ISD personnel attend aggieTERM governance meetings; and provide facilities (meeting spaces, classrooms, and web platforms) to deliver professional development. (pg. e42-e43; e59-e61)

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/maped/LocaleLookup/>.

Strengths:

- (a) The application provides the census tract number of the Qualified Opportunity Zones in which it proposes to provide services. (pg. e76-e77)
- (b) The application clearly demonstrates how the proposed program will provide services in the Qualified Opportunity Zones. The services include the following: new teacher trainings, general professional development offerings – beginning teachers, general professional development – mentors, The new teacher trainings will include services, such as 2-year professional learning progression, Kick Start Summer sessions, Teacher Induction Program (TIP) Academy and Personalized Learning Conference, and an assigned mentor. The general professional development offerings, for beginning teachers, will include professional learning exchange days. The general professional development, for mentors, will include professional learning, mentoring 101, Deeper Dive, and classroom observations. The applicant proposes to leverage an innovative Comprehensive Community Induction Framework (CCIF) that emphasizes community and culture. The applicant indicates that 50 teacher recruits per year will receive a one-year residency, collect a 12-month living stipend, participate in a 2-year post residency induction, commit to serving in the partner ISD for a minimum of three years, and enroll in a master's degree program for a high-need subject area (e.g. special, bilingual, STEM, urban, or social studies/language arts program). The applicant demonstrates that the aggieTERM program offers two pathways for a master's degree: pre-baccalaureate or 'fifth year' track and a post-baccalaureate onramp for recent graduates with four-year degrees while completing a teaching certificate. (pg. e11; e76-e77; e82)

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:

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

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/17/2020 03:45 PM

Status: Submitted

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

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Texas A&M University (S336S200027)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	30
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Resources	30	27
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	3
Sub Total	6	6
Total	106	103

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Texas A&M University (S336S200027)

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 to include a Logic Model that highlights the challenges and academic gaps at 33 high need schools in the Qualified Opportunity Zones (QOZs) The applicant cites high teacher attrition rates, high rates of students (38.1%) who are at-risk of dropping out, and the need for mentors to support classroom practice, and the lack of teacher support as it relates to bilingual and special education (pg. e17-18, 82).

(ii) The applicant identifies goals that include closing the academic gaps at high-need schools in (QOZs), decreasing teacher attrition rates, placement of teachers in high-need areas (i.e. Special Education, STEM, and Bilingual Education). For example, one of the objectives will look at how high-need districts compare and contrast as it relates to equity access and hiring. The tasks associated with this objective includes developing a data access and collection systems, which will provide opportunities for the applicant to ascertain if they are meeting the targeted milestones pg. e27,59-62

(iii) The applicant has identified an exceptional approach to the meeting the statutory requirements through the implementation of a selective residency program for pre-baccalaureate students to teach in high-need school districts while pursuing their teacher credentials and master's degree in education. The applicant documents previous experience in implementing teacher residency programs and highlights the success of a previous cohort that resulted in 11 residents completing the program and signing a 3-year contract to work in a high-need district (pg. e22).

(iv) The proposed project design is part of a comprehensive effort to improve student outcomes through the recruitment and retention of career changers and district employees who are interested in teacher certification, and specifically those individuals interested in serving as middle and high school teachers, where there is a great need for support. The applicant provides a detailed description of the high-need schools highlighting teacher demographics, attrition rates, and the Opportunity Zone designation type (i.e., low-income community) and the need for designing a learning system that will help streamline the learning process (pg. e24 -27, 28-35,74-75, 85).

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 will provide performance data on the proposed outcomes that are aligned with the Inputs outlined in the Logic Model. For example, the proposed evaluation will compare and contract inputs with high-need districts (i.e., equitable access to high-quality beginning teachers, student achievement gaps, and the climate, culture, and support for teacher success). pg. e36
- (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 the use of mixed methods and 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).

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 sufficiently documents their commitment as evidenced by the financial and in-kind support of 50% of the proposed project budget. The applicant identifies a budget for the project that is over \$13 million, which indicates a commitment of over \$6 million dollars to the project.

(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. For example, limited funds are allocated for supplies, and the major costs are for the resident's salary (\$1.5 million for 25 residents), and professional development curriculum and professional learning activities (pg. e44).

(iii) The applicant provides for a reasonable budget as it relates to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the project. For example, a large percentage of the costs are associated with salaries for residents and the Professional Learning Community of Residents (pg. e44).

(iv) The applicant states that they aspire to develop a long-term collaboration with each of the partner ISDs to continue the induction program and identifies some of the areas of support from the partner school districts (i.e., provide a stipend/salary for post baccalaureate residents, offer qualified residents a 1-year residency with potential for renewal for 3 years). pg. e 42-44,59-60,62.

Weaknesses:

(i) No weaknesses noted.

(ii) No weaknesses noted.

(iii) No weaknesses noted.

(iv) The applicant does not provide sufficient evidence of support from stakeholders beyond the length of the grant. The information provided in letters of support focus on supporting the proposed grant application, without details as to an ongoing commitment to the project activities and support staff (pg. e44, 201-209).

Reader's Score: 27

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 the objectives, milestones, and tasks to include prioritization of beginning teacher development in cultural competence. The performance measures, tasks, responsible parties, milestones, and timelines are clearly delineated. The objectives are aligned with goals that are measured by data embedded in the program Framework (pg. e59-62).

(ii) The applicant documents letters of support from potential partners indicating they support the overall project design and the work they are proposing to accomplish. For example, part of the match share includes salaries for post-bac residents, which are funds from the partner agencies that can continue to be leveraged once federal funding ends (pg. 201-209).

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. e61,76-77.

b) The applicant documents the services to be provided in the QOZs to include obtaining data of academic performance of K-12 learners at high-need schools, and articulating how high-need districts compare and contrast as it relates to equitable access, hiring practices, climate, and identifying the achievement gaps at high-need schools (pg. e46-47).

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: 08/17/2020 03:46 PM

Status: Submitted

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

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Texas A&M University (S336S200027)

Reader #3: *****

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

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Texas A&M University (S336S200027)

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 aggieTERM proposal demonstrates a clear need for additional highly qualified teachers in the four Texas independent school districts. For example, in Austin ISD the district has a teacher attrition rate of 14% while serving a population of students where 49.4% are considered at risk for dropping out of school. (e17) This data demonstrates the need for an innovative model that includes teacher incentives to recruit new diverse educators and provide them with high quality preparation and induction support to improve student outcomes. 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. (e11) The proposal clearly outlines the relevant research and effective practices that have informed the design of the aggieTERM teacher residency program. (e18-e22) Additionally, the proposal includes a logic model that aligns the research to the action plan with needs, inputs, outputs, and outcomes/impacts (e82) to create a comprehensive and coherent proposal.
- Subfactor ii – The proposal outlines five overarching needs for the four district partners including closing academic gaps in high-needs schools in qualified opportunity zones, decrease the elevated teacher retention and provide effective teachers for high-need subject areas: Bilingual Ed, SPED, and STEM, and content areas. (e27) Each of these goals are supported by aligned objectives that identify multiple performance measures. (e27-e28) Each performance measure includes a clear outcome and a data set for measuring the successful achievement. (e59-e62) The inclusion of a specific data set for outcomes is 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 of improving student learning outcomes in Texas.
- Subfactor iii – The proposal outlines how the proposal builds upon the existing success of the first cohort of aggieTERM that focuses on scaling innovation to create a unique approach that embeds five key strategies to address the priority. (e22) For example, the proposal describes a project SMART goal that focuses on expanding from 11 to 250 teacher residents to serve four Texas independent school districts in high needs areas. (e22) Additionally, the proposal outlines the inclusion of the Comprehensive Community Induction Framework (CCIF) to support the coherence of the vision between district and university leaders in preparing teacher residents with comprehensive experiences. (e22-e23) The overview of all five 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. (e27) The proposal identifies the existing student learning needs and teacher retention needs for each of the four independent school districts to be served. (e16-e18) For example, the proposal details how Hearne ISD has an average mathematics proficiency score of 48% and the teacher attrition rate is 35%. (e18) The demonstration of data in both student achievement as well as teacher retention is a noted strength. Additionally, the aggieTERM project demonstrates 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 (e31-e35). This paired with the two-year induction program 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 Texas.

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 for a mixed method data collection with a matched comparative quantitative model. (e37) The design will be guided by the New Teacher Center's Teacher Induction Program standards and seeks to evaluate both the teacher residency design as well as impact on student learning (e36). This comprehensive approach was noted as a strength to the proposal. Additionally, the proposal plans to approximate a quasi-experimental design protocol and includes methodology for the creation of matched comparison schools on variables including the percentage of students economically disadvantaged, receiving services for bilingual education, and receiving special education services. (e37) The inclusion of these variables in alignment with aggieTERM goals and outcomes will benefit the execution of the teacher residency program, as well as providing feedback to improve teacher resident instruction. These are strengths of the evaluation plan for the proposal.
- Subfactor ii – The proposal presents a comprehensive list of key research questions in alignment with the aggieTERM logic model. (e38-e39) The list clearly demonstrates how both qualitative and quantitative data sets will be used to for analysis (e44-e46). The proposal includes a diverse set of data sources including school climate data from local districts, teacher attrition data, student learning outcomes, and interviews with teacher residents. (e39) 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. Finally, the project plans to conduct monthly roundtable discussion with district and university leaders to inform the continuous feedback process to iterate and improve upon aggieTERM to align with needs. (e29)

Weaknesses:

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

- Subfactor i – The proposal clearly demonstrate the collaboration of multiples colleges at Texas A&M University and the four local education agencies in Texas (e29, e40). For example, the proposal outlines that all entities will pool their available resources to provide the cost share match. (e40) Additionally, the collaboration is evident in both the design and commitment of resources from each of the partners. For example, the proposal outlines that the Texas A&M College of Education and Human Development will provide the expert personnel, evaluation center, and mentor training. (e41-e42) The four ISD partners will provide a stipend/salary for the post-baccalaureate residents, provide a qualified site coordinator, and facilities for professional learning. (e42-e43) The proposal includes letter of support from each of the partnership entities (e201-e209) 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 required match. (e241, budget narrative) Additionally, the project provides a budget narrative that describes how costs will be evaluated using four questions and reviewed monthly by the principal investigator and co-investigators to determine if the purchase is prudent and allowable in the scope of the project. (e43-e44) The inclusion of these protocols demonstrates a thoughtful allocation of resources to meet all project needs and is a noted strength.

- Subfactor iii – The proposal will train 250 teachers over the length of the project period across four high-needs school districts in Texas with a specific attention to schools in qualified opportunity zones. (e11, e22) With the commitment to a living wage (e44) 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 English language learners for rural high-needs schools may provide a long-term benefit to these schools, communities, and ultimately student learning.

- Subfactor iv – The aggieTERM program leadership demonstrates existing expertise at the organization that contribute to future sustainability efforts. For example, the proposal outlines each of the major budget items, and potential

funding sources for future continuation of the project activities. (e44) Additionally, the proposal provides a table of action steps with a clear timeline for building capacity and sustainability. (e45-e46) This creates an opportunity to develop future financial revenue opportunities and find cost-savings to continue the project beyond the grant period. The commitment of project leadership from Texas A&M and the four Texas school districts is a noted strength.

Weaknesses:

- Subfactor i – No weaknesses are noted.
- Subfactor ii – No weaknesses are noted.
- Subfactor iii – No weaknesses are noted.
- Subfactor iv – Although the proposal has a stated intent for sustainability (e44-e46), it is not clear how the existing model would be sustained beyond the federal funding period. The proposal does not clearly present strategies for funding sources that would sustain the activities with all of the partner institutions. Specifically, it appears that the majority of future funding for the residents' salary is exclusively coming from the ISD budget. This is a concern, as the project does not identify a specific state and federal budget stream that could be allocated to this \$1.5 million dollar expense. The proposal would benefit from additional details regarding financial sustainability beyond the grant period.

Reader's Score: 28

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

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

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

Strengths:

- Subfactor i – The proposal presents a management plan that addresses objectives, performance measures, tasks, responsibilities, milestones, and timelines (e59-e62). The actions align with the objectives and are aligned with a reasonable timeframe. The organizational chart (e29) was noted as a strength of the proposal, specifically the inclusion of the local education agencies, university, and high-need school leaders. The balanced partnership between K-12 and higher education is key to the success of the program to support the teacher mentors and residents in their daily work in coherence.
- Subfactor ii – The proposal provides clear list that outlines the commitment and responsibilities of each partner in the aggieTERM project (e41-e43). The commitments represent the comprehensive expertise, resources, and key activities that are necessary for the successful execution of the residency project. Texas A&M College of Education and Human Development has a demonstrated record of national ranking for educational programming, as well as accomplishment with production of teachers in Texas for general education, bilingual education, and special education (e41). Additionally, the proposal provides key resumes for aggieTERM leadership (e83-e200), which demonstrates expertise in both the training of teachers and execution of federal grants to support the successful implementation of 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 aggieTERM program will provide services to 250 teachers in four independent school districts in Texas that contain QOZs to provide qualified teachers for students in schools that been identified for serving high-needs students. (e11, e74-e78)
- The proposal provides the census tracts for each of the district partners participating in the aggieTERM teacher residency program. (e74-e78). Additionally, the proposal provides demographic data to describe the student population and highlight needs for highly qualified teachers.
- 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 demonstrates services that will be provided to teacher residents specific to special education in alignment with the needs of the school in the QOZ. (e33-e34) 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:

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

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are noted.

Reader's Score: 3

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