

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/20/2020 02:25 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: University of West Alabama (S336S200037)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	26
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Resources	30	30
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	20
Sub Total	100	96
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Opportunity Zones	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. New Grantees	3	0
Sub Total	6	3
Total	106	99

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - FY20 Teacher Quality Partnership - 1: 84.336S

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: University of West Alabama (S336S200037)

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 has provided an adequate rationale for the project on pages e18-e21. The applicant seeks to recruit, train and graduate sixty diverse, highly effective teachers to reduce the achievement gaps of K-12 students in literacy, math, STEM and Computer Science. The applicant approach is cohort based, with a living stipend. The applicant has stipulated that they are recognized for their equity-based approach to ensure success for minority students. On pages e26-e29, the applicant has provided data of the target schools that show a high need to address low income and low achieving high schools. In Table 3, page e28, the applicant has listed the target schools, the proficiency levels of the students, the teacher inexperience rate/retention. The applicant has indicated a comprehensive needs assessment that demonstrated that the partners should work on providing highly qualified teachers through an effective teacher preparation program (page e27).

(ii) The applicant has provided four project goals with subsequent project objectives that cover important aspects of the project. For example, goal # 3 seeks to provide teacher residents ongoing induction support during their novice teacher years to positively impact the academic outcomes of high need public school students. The subsequent objectives include 100% of teachers participating in professional development activities, conducting quarterly needs assessment, and collaborating with instructional coaches assigned to new teachers of record. The project objectives are also aligned to performance measures. For example, objective 3.1 seeks to have 80% of participants remain in the high-need LEAs in the target counties as verified by personnel records. The strength of the goals is that they include residency model and other components along with aligned GPRA performance measures (table 2, pages e20-e21). The logic model on page e78 adequately summarizes the project inputs, activities, outputs and outcomes in the context of project planned activities and the effects of the planned activities.

(iii) The applicant has provided a brief indication of the exceptional approach of the project (pages e18-e20, and e26-e27). The project logic model on page e42 shows that the project will cover major strategies such as research strategies, STEM, Computer Science, Rural Ed tables, dissemination of findings via publications and presentations. The project will use a cohort model and help prepare teachers located in one of the poorest counties in the nation. The project will focus on improving literacy, improving math instructional strategies, and classroom management system. The project also includes a full academic year of co-teaching in eligible partners schools to boost further collaboration (page e29).

(iv) The applicant has made an attempt to explain how the project will provide a comprehensive effort to improve the teaching/learning and support of rigorous academic standards for students (pages e29-e31). The applicant discusses the use of the cohort model in a sustainable professional development support structure for new and experienced teachers to enable them to function comfortably in a high need setting. The project seeks to embed effective teaching practices in the teachers' daily practice. Other strategies include "Get Ready!" initiative, and training modules for teacher trainees for Next Generation Science Standards.

Weaknesses:

(i) & (ii) No weaknesses noted.

(iii) The applicant has not provided a strong description of the exceptional approach of the project (pages e18-e20, and e26-e27). While the applicant discusses important aspects such as the residency program, living stipends, induction program and math literacy, the applicant does not demonstrate the uniqueness of the project to address these project components. For example, it is unclear how the project design will provide the participants a high-quality and high-rigor residency teacher preparation program, or how the math and computer science literacy components for the teacher trainees will enhance their abilities as novice teachers.

(iv) The applicant has not strongly indicated how the project will make a comprehensive effort to improve the support of rigorous academic standards for students (pages e29-e31). The project design is focused on rigorous training for participants, but the applicant has not discussed what strategies will enable the training to impact the academic standards of the students. For example, the applicant has not discussed how strategies such as "Get Ready!" or participant acquaintance with the Next Generation Science Standards will be used by the project participants to help improve the standards of academic instruction of the students by the participants.

Reader's Score: 26

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 has a strong project evaluation plan to collect valid and reliable performance data (e32-e43). The evaluation will be conducted collaboratively by a qualified and experienced external evaluator working with the associate dean for the college of education and director of assessment and evaluation. The evaluation plan is integrated into the project and covers both formative and summative evaluation. The applicant has discussed clear strategies to gather valid and reliable data such as use of quasi-experimental approach, propensity score analysis, and appropriate statistical methods (pages e35-e36). The applicant has indicated use of What Works Clearinghouse standards and ensuring effective qualitative analysis based on conceptual construction and contextual factors. The strength of the evaluation is the use of stakeholder input. Table # 4 on pages e37-e40 lists project evaluation methods of data collection such as surveys, observations, questionnaires, enrollment data, and licensure data.

(ii) The applicant evaluation plan is feasible and appropriate (pages e37-e41 and e44-e46). The appropriateness of the plan includes use of an objective third party evaluator, clear data collection methods and roles of various project staff and milestones (table 4). The feasibility of the plan is addressed adequately in table 4 which lists all the project goals and

outcomes to be assessed. For example, the objective of recruiting and enrolling individuals who possess a baccalaureate degree will be assessed by tracking data on teaching licenses and a Master of Science in education. Table # 5 on pages e44-e46 shows effectively the feasibility of the evaluation data collection plan and the alignment of the evaluation questions to GPRA measures. For example, teacher employment after three years of employment is aligned to teacher retention.

Weaknesses:

(i) & (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 has adequately provided information that demonstrates the institutional support to the project (pages e48-e49). The applicant has stipulated that the college of education will provide necessary resources and personnel necessary to support the project objectives and activities. For example, the applicant institution will support the project with computer labs, library, the math lab, the writing center, center for rural education, and center for teaching, learning and leading. The applicant support covers equipment and facilities such as library facilities, mentoring support, and instructional coaching online courses via Advancement Courses and Virtual and face to face professional development. ON page e156 of the budget, the applicant has listed the required match of \$1,408,026 per year for the grant that ensure adequate institutional support to the project through the four years.

(ii) The applicant has successfully discussed the adequacy of the budget (page e50). The budget on pages e155-e172 shows adequate allocations for personnel, fringe benefits, travel, supplies, and contractual. The budget adequately covers important TQP aspects such as training stipends, and the required matching funds for all five years. The federal budget of \$6,911,092 is adequate to provide an effective TQP program for the identified cohorts to be served by the applicant.

(iii) The applicant has made a strong case for the reasonableness of the project costs (pages e50-e52). The project budget allocates 68% of the funds to be spent primarily on the living stipends for the teacher residents. The applicant also secured the current staff by expanding their responsibilities to the project instead of hiring new staff. Also, 22% of the budget is utilized to support teacher residents, mentor teachers, and school leaders with best practices and embedded and personalized professional development. The applicant has indicated the use of the TQP monies as seed money to initiate a cultural shift for LEAs towards a collaborative model (page e51).

(iv) The applicant has discussed a working plan for project sustainability (pages e50-e53). The applicant has discussed several strategies that enable continuation of the program beyond federal funding. For example, the applicant will expand the responsibilities of the project staff so that they can continue providing services to the project after the grant funds (page e50). The applicant has discussed the use of the TQP grant as seed money to initiate a cultural shift and institutionalization of the project as a part of higher level collaboration among the isolated schools (page e51). The applicant anticipates that some variations of the project structures will continue with the applicant and the partners. The applicant also seeks to continue applying to foundations and local and national agencies to replicate the project model. The applicant has also proposed a plan such as reinvesting the tuition monies of the teacher residents for program continuity (pages e52-e53).

Weaknesses:

(i), (ii) (iii) & (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 has provided a detailed management plan with a timeline in table 6 on pages e54-e57. The applicant has arranged for a good management and advisory council structure to facilitate the day-to-day operation. The roles of the teams are clearly delineated into operations, fiscal and administrative responsibilities, and monitoring progress. The project plan clearly identifies the project staff such as the PI, recruitment/pd coordinator, recruitment/field management placement coordinator, and evaluation coordinator. Their roles are listed on pages e57-e60 that demonstrate a strong management system. Table 6 lists all the project activities, timeline, staff responsible and evidence based on project goals and objectives. For example, for goal # 4, the project will conduct surveys after summer, fall and spring terms, and the PI, coordinators and the evaluation team will conduct them. The project will include deliverables such as survey data and reports.

(ii) The applicant has adequately provided evidence of partners' commitment to the project (pages e61-e62). The applicant plan for partners' commitment includes assigning five teacher residents to each LEA, while the LEA will co-select the mentor and co-teach the teacher resident. The LEAs will also provide release time to the mentors, professional development sessions, and hiring project graduates in their high-need schools. On pages e126-e136, the applicant has provided a list of MOUs and letters of support that demonstrate adequate partner support to the project. For example, on page e127, the applicant provides a letter of support from the Tuscaloosa School System offering teaching positions for the project participants. The applicant thus has a strong foundation in project collaboration.

Weaknesses:

(i) & (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 has addressed the competitive preference priority by providing a list of the QOZ tract numbers that will be served by the project in table 1 on page e17. The applicant has clearly identified the school districts, the school names, the QOZs and the opportunity zone tract number.

(b) The project will use strategies such as mandating the schoolteachers to spend minimum of 60 hours of professional development opportunities and a team approach.

Weaknesses:

(a) & (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:

No strengths noted.

Weaknesses:

None.

Reader's Score: **0**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/20/2020 02:25 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/20/2020 12:04 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: University of West Alabama (S336S200037)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	27
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Resources	30	30
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	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 #1 - FY20 Teacher Quality Partnership - 1: 84.336S

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: University of West Alabama (S336S200037)

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) There is some data to show a need for this project, which is located in one of the poorest counties in the nation. Data shows the lack of competent teachers in math and STEM. e16 The students attending these schools have poor academic performance and unqualified teachers in these areas. The residency program will reduce the achievement and opportunity gaps of K-12 students in literacy, mathematics, STEM and computer science because highly qualified resident teachers will help to raise student achievement for their students. Because these teachers will feel supported through an induction program and other professional development opportunities, research shows they are more likely to stay in the field of education and that will help with retention issues. e18

(i) A strong logic model is located in the Appendix c – e42 – It has rich detail which shows how the inputs, activities, and outputs, will lead the program outcomes desired.

(ii) The goals, objectives, and outcomes are clearly specified and measurable. e21-27 There is a chart on e20 and e21 which details activities and GRPA Performance Measures.

(iii) The narrative does explain the content and skills programming and the professional development activities the residents will be a part of. Some examples include improving literacy (dyslexia), and essential components of reading instruction, improving mathematics instructional strategies and improving STEM. This content will help to improve the quality of those teachers who are teaching in high-needs schools. Research shows that qualified teachers will ensure students achieve at high levels in those high-need schools. e19-22

(iv) The Instructional Coaches and mentors will provide important trainings in areas such as classroom management, instructional strategies and teaching students with special needs. These are areas that need to be understood for the classroom environment to run efficiently and effectively. e22, 59-60

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses:

- (iii) The narrative does not make a strong case concerning the uniqueness of this project. More information which compares this program to other programs explaining why this program is exceptional should have been included.
- (iv) More information on who is providing the content/instruction for the Mentor Academies and Mentor Forums for the Instructional Coaches should have been provided so we can see the quality of those individuals. e22, 59-60

Reader's Score: 27

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 College of Education will retain the services of Dr. Mani Hull to serve as the external evaluator. An external evaluator is important to help eliminate bias. Dr. Hull is highly experienced with mixed-method evaluations. She has provided educational leadership to non-profits, for-profits, public, and private higher education institutions, and partnered with federal and state government agencies for 35 years. This experience and expertise will ensure that the evaluation portion of the project will progress smoothly. e33
- (i) The evaluation plan has been integrated into the programmatic activities as an integral part of this project. The evaluation team selected to use Stufflebeam's Program Evaluation CIPP Model (Context, Input, Process Product; 2000), which is research-based and appropriate, as its overall approach to evaluation.
- (i) The methods of evaluation will provide valid/reliable performance data on relevant outcomes. The characteristics of Project REACH will all be examined in formative and summative aspects. e11, 33 The evaluation will include data from Praxis, edTPA assessment system, and various observations. e26
- (ii) The methods of evaluation are feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project. e34 Table on e37-40 includes how evaluation methods are aligned with objectives, milestones, outcomes.
- (ii) There is an overall evaluation plan found on pages e44-47 which show the data sources, collection times, analysis method, the person responsible and the connection to the GPRA. This plan shows considerable time and thought went into the design of the project and the team leader knows what will happen along the way which will help the grant to move forward in a smooth, logical manner.

Weaknesses:

None 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) There is a chart on page e48-49 which shows support area and function areas. This helps to justify the facility for this project.

(i) Each partner is committed to the design as outlined in this proposal and is dedicated to providing resources (e.g., funding, personnel time, space, equipment, and other supports as needed) to ensure full participation and overall sustainability after grant funding. Appendix E

(ii) The match was met. e50

(iii) The narrative provided justification for the budget on page e50. The documentation shows that 68% is for teacher living wage, 22% is for mentors/coaches, and 10% for evaluation, supplies and travel. That is adequate for the amount of teachers they will turn out.

(iv) The narrative does supply a plan to operate the project beyond the length of the grant, including a multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan including reinvesting the tuition monies of the teacher residents and money from the LEAs on pages e52-53. It also states that Project REACH will enhance continued collaboration that will help to build that system of high need teacher recruitment, preparation, and mentoring/induction, helping to fortify a concrete model to help prepare these teachers for Alabama's high-needs districts. e29

Weaknesses:

None 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 narrative describes the creation of an Advisory Board composed of representatives from each partner entity to examine program performance every six months. e25 This is important so that if there are problems along the way they can be worked out quickly and the grant can continue to be executed.

(i)There are various communication measures mentioned in the narrative. A newsletter will help to share best practices and performance measures quarterly. e26 Findings will be formally disseminated via Annual Performance Reports, via an Interim Project Report, and via a final evaluation report at the conclusion of funding. Data will be informally disseminated as available on an on-going basis to PIs and project partners. This is important so that project leadership can make changes as needed to support achievement of project goals and objectives e43 All stakeholders need to be aware of what is happening so the program can adapt and change to support achievement of project objectives. e26, e43

(i)There is a demonstrated relevant commitment by each partner in the proposed project to work towards a successful completion of this project. The management team and advisory council will ensure all relevant stakeholders provide input and guidance so that the project will be completed on time and within budget. e53-54 Because there is clear division and clear specification of what each partner will do there is greater chance the project tasks will be accomplished by the specified timelines. See Table 6 on pages 54-57 that shows clearly defined responsibilities, timelines and milestones which will help to ensure all parts are implemented in a systematic and timely manner while meeting deadlines and upholding the quality of the partnership.

(i)A recruitment plan is listed on page e22-23. It also states the qualifications for these candidates and it listed examples. e22

(i) The project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students. Mentors and Instructional Coaches who support the resident teachers will be carefully selected through an application, observation, and interview process. e22, e59 Research shows that when teachers are supported by high quality mentors/coaches, they are more likely to be and feel successful and they will remain in the educational field. These individuals will make sure that the residents are improving their classroom instruction and are using multiple strategies to assess students' academics and strengths. That will help students to learn and grow at deeper levels and achieve at higher levels. e59

Weaknesses:

None 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) Census tract Number is provided. The narrative describes how the project will provide services for that area e17
- (b) Project REACH will provide services to the QOZs by establishing and designing teacher residency programs to be implemented in the LEAs within the QOZ. Embedded and on-going professional development will be provided to the teacher residents, the mentor teacher, and the school leader. The mentor teacher and the school leader will have at a minimum of 60 hours of professional development opportunities each year of the project. The project design allows for maximum learning within a school environment. A team approach ensures success from the top down and the bottom up. e17

Weaknesses:

None 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:

None Noted

Weaknesses:

None Noted

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/20/2020 12:04 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/24/2020 12:14 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: University of West Alabama (S336S200037)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	30
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Resources	30	30
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	20
Sub Total	100	100
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	103

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - FY20 Teacher Quality Partnership - 1: 84.336S

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: University of West Alabama (S336S200037)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

(i) The extent to which the proposed project demonstrates a rationale.

(ii) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.

(iii) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach for meeting statutory purposes and requirements.

(vi) The extent to which the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students.

Strengths:

(i) The applicant clearly describes its rationale for serving the target population. Numerous high-intensity needs and challenges facing the target population are identified. As indicated in the narrative, for example, performance assessments indicate that pedagogical practice shows a lack of competent teachers teaching in literacy, mathematics, STEM, computer science, and other content areas (p. e16). In addition, the target region includes the poorest counties in the state and the nation. The applicant also presents data indicating the high percentages of students who are not proficient in reading and mathematics that range from 45 to 98 percent. To further substantiate the rationale for the project, data provided indicate that the target districts and school experience high rates of teacher turnover, and the percentage of teachers teaching outside of highly qualified teaching content areas (p. e26-e28). Additionally, the proposal includes a comprehensive logic model that presents a visual plan for guiding the project's implementation. The logic model shows the relationships among the project's inputs, activities, output, and anticipated outcomes anticipated to be achieved (p.e42).

(ii) Four comprehensive goals that address the identified needs of the target audience to be served are evidenced. The goals are measurable and time-bound. As indicated in the narrative, one of the goals the applicant proposes is to engage selected Teacher Residents in a 14-month full-time teacher residency preparatory curriculum and professional development program that enhances their content knowledge, develops their expertise in inquiry-based learning, and cultivates their culturally relevant pedagogical skills with students and families in high need communities. The project also evidences measurable outcomes that correlate with the project's goals and describe specific changes the project anticipates accomplishing. One of the objectives, for example, is to Implement a 14-month full-time teacher residency program that leads to a teaching license and a Master's degree (pp. e22-e27).

(iii) The proposal included sound evidence that the project's approach is exceptional. The approach is exceptional because the design will provide continuous support through an induction program that carries teacher residents through their critical first two years of teaching. The content focus will be specific to literacy, mathematics, STEM, and computer science. The project will also include a retention component designed to support career teachers with 3-10 years of teaching experience. Additionally, candidates will spend a full academic year co-teaching in eligible partner schools (pp. e11, e29). These exceptionalities have promise to lead to the applicant's desired outcomes specific to increasing teacher retention, strengthening the induction experience, and preparing high-quality teachers prepared to teach in high-poverty and low-achieving schools.

- (iv) A clear and credible approach anticipated to improve teaching and learning, and support rigorous academic standards for students is demonstrated. Such credible approaches include but are not limited to:
- improving the partner schools' capacity to provide high-quality clinical experiences for preservice teachers;
 - assisting in improving teaching practices by providing professional development activities focused on pedagogical support for both new and experienced teachers and by providing mentoring;
 - providing coaching and support to facilitate the sharing of resources and dialogue around teaching and strategies for supporting students and families; and
 - providing training specific to literacy and mathematics instructional practices, and STEM-related topics (pp. e30, e31).

Weaknesses:

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 proposal presents a robust evaluation methodology designed to produce valid and reliable performance data on the project's relevant outcomes. For example, a mixed-methods evaluation design will be used to evaluate the project (p. e32). In addition, the project will utilize qualitative and quantitative methods and the data collected will come from a variety of sources. Qualitative data will be used to explain the motivations, identify needs, and participants' experience. Quantitative data will focus on the number of residents who are selected for the program, the enrollment, and the percentage of completers who enter the teaching field and are placed in a high need school (p. e34).

(ii) The proposal evidences methods of evaluation that are designed to gauge the project's intended outcomes that are appropriate to the goals and objectives anticipated to be achieved. The evaluation methodology is appropriate and feasible because the project will conduct formative and summative analyses to gauge the project's overall effectiveness. For example, data collection will be used to build a database capable of providing ongoing and annual reports on program participation and implementation. The evaluation approach is also inclusive of a visual representation that aligns the project's goals, objectives, evaluation milestones, the anticipated outcomes, and the evaluation methodologies that will be utilized. Additionally, formative evaluation activities will be used to ascertain and improve the project's successful attainment of the objectives. Formative data collection will focus on assessing the quality of residents' training and associated activities. Further, summative evaluation will be utilized to assess the degree to which the stated objectives are attained as it relates to increased teacher recruitment and retention (p. e40).

Weaknesses:

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 support, facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources are adequately demonstrated to successfully support the implementation of the project. As indicated in the narrative, for example, the partner university's commitments to the project include but are not limited to the participants' use of the computer labs, the electronic library services, PRAXIS, student financial services, and resources and classroom space to engage in theory practices. Additionally, the partner school districts will commit to providing classroom space. The Center for Rural Education will provide on-going professional development (pp. e48, e49). Further, via a letter of commitment and support, Flight Works, the aerospace exhibition and center, is committed to providing teachers and students STEM, computer science, and mathematics training (p. e129). Further, as indicated on page two of the match budget page, the project and the partner university will be equally responsible for all costs related to the project's implementation.

(ii) The proposal provides sound evidence that the budget is adequate to support the proposed project. For example, 68 percent of the funds will be used to defray costs for living stipends for teacher residents (p. e49). Additionally, costs provided in the budget narrative necessary to implement the project include costs for personnel, travel, supplies. Other costs associated with the project include, but are not limited to, stipends for mentors, and living-wage stipends for teacher residents (pp. e161, e163).

(iii) All costs in the budget narrative are reasonable in relation to the project's objectives and potential significance based on the number of persons it proposes to serve. For instance, the primary use of the grant funds will be devoted to preparing four cohorts of fifteen teacher residents for a total of 60 teacher residents over a 5 year-period through course work that leads to a Master's of Science in Education (p. e18). The project costs are sufficient to support the significance of the project-specific to increasing teacher knowledge and practice in literacy, mathematics, STEM, computer science, and teacher retention, all of which are anticipated to positively affect student learning (p. e42).

(iv) The proposal demonstrates a concise process for the continued support of the project beyond grant funding. As indicated in the narrative, for example, the partner university will commit to continue to partner with LEAs and provide 70 percent of the cost of the living stipend to the teacher residency program. As more students enroll in the program the 30

percent of the tuition provided by the LEAs will be utilized for the continued support of the pipeline of teachers qualified produced by the project to teach in the target area (p. e52).

Weaknesses:

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 presents a detailed plan for how the project will be managed. For example, the project's management team will be responsible for facilitating the day-to-day operations and providing continuous feedback regarding project guidance and operations. Clearly delineated roles and responsibilities of key personnel to the project is evidenced. For example, the principal investigator will also serve as the project director and be responsible for leading the management team as well as have fiscal and administrative responsibility for the grant. The management team will coordinate efforts with the advisory council to monitor progress, provide feedback, plan long-range implementation, and institutionalize activities of the residency program (p. e53, e54). Additionally, the management plan includes a visual representation of the project's goals, which are aligned with activities, a timeline of dates, and milestones for when the activities will be addressed, and project personnel who will be responsible for ensuring each activity takes place (pp. e54, e57).

(ii) The relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the project are evidenced via letters of support. For example, the partner districts along with the Wiley Corporation are committed to providing professional development sessions throughout the life of the grant. The partner districts will also co-select the mentors to co-teach with the teacher resident (p.e61).

Weaknesses:

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 proposal demonstrates that the target group to be served is located in QOZ(s). In addition, census tract numbers are provided for the zones the project is proposing to serve (p. e17).

b) Services the project proposes to provide include but are not limited to establishing and designing teacher residency and providing embedded and on-going professional development to the teacher residents, mentor teachers, and school leaders in the target area (p. e16).

Weaknesses:

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:

N/A

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: **0**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/24/2020 12:14 PM