

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/14/2020 01:49 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: IDEA Public Schools (S374A200045)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	25	20
Sub Total	25	20
Selection Criterion		
Quality of the Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	30
Sub Total	30	30
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	20
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Adequacy of Resources	25	25
Sub Total	45	45
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority #1		
Spurring Investment in Qualified Opportunity Zones		
1. CPP 1	10	10
Sub Total	10	10
Competitive Preference Priority #2		
Diverse and Effective Workforce		
1. CPP 2	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Total	115	110

Technical Review Form

Panel #6 - TSL - 6: 84.374A

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: IDEA Public Schools (S374A200045)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

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

Reader's Score: 20

Sub

1. (i) The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project, including the nature and magnitude of those gaps or weaknesses.

General:

Overall: The applicant presents insufficient details to demonstrate severity of magnitude of the proposed gaps and weaknesses.

Strength:

The applicant proposes an adequate project design to addresses the specific gaps in services, infrastructure, and opportunities of the underserved population. The applicant presents identified gaps with resources required to impact high-need schools. For example, the applicant identifies a gap of limited access for a single entry location for student achievement data, teacher and school leader performance data, and aggregated professional development information. The application proposal describes the prioritization of identified gaps with demonstration of promising potential for long-term outcomes and organizational transformation (p. e16-e43).

Weakness:

The application proposal would be strengthened with details of student subgroup breakdown per target school based on historical and comparative data for the ACT achievement, AP Test Passed, and STAAR passing to make a clear determination of severity of need for the target population. The applicant could benefit from more details on generalized needs of students served based on English learners, students with disabilities, retention, graduation, and remediation data to establish a thorough needs assessment for personalized support for teachers and school leaders to be effective for the proposed project (p. e16-e43).

Reader's Score:

2. (ii) The extent to which the proposed project will integrate with or build on similar or related efforts to improve Relevant Outcomes (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)) using existing funding streams from other programs or policies supported by community, State, and Federal resources.

General:

Overall: The applicant presents clear information on the integration efforts to improve relevant outcomes.

Sub

Strength:

The application proposal builds upon structures in place from pilot projects with professional development, performance/recognition, core work, benefits, and salaries. The applicant develops exemplary teacher and school leader practices aligned to school leadership levers outcomes. The applicant presents a clear financial projection model chart supported by community, State and Federal resources. For example, the applicant indicates that funding from TIF would increase their efforts to make improvements and align their Human Capital Management System (HCMS) to support all educators in the state (p. e16-e43, e57, e410, e158).

Weakness:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score:

3. (iii) 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.

General:

Overall: The application proposal demonstrates a good to great comprehensive design.

Strength:

The application proposal demonstrates a good to great comprehensive design based on the teacher retention pilot and teacher career residency. The applicant proposes to develop digital content library of exemplary teacher practices aligned to prioritized guideposts for excellent teaching and learning. The applicant presents community schools for leadership coach cohort of teacher manager, principals in residence, and assistant principals of instruction to strengthen leadership capacity and accelerate teacher development. The applicant outlines an overall strategy for improving student learning outcomes to ensure that every child and school has the ability to thrive (p. e14-e43).

Weakness:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score:

4. (iv) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.

General:

Overall: The applicant presents clear expansion of equitable access and resources for the proposed project.

Strength:

The applicant addresses a need for the expansion of equitable access of the Compass teacher evaluator and support system statewide. The applicant describes how the proposed program leads to academic achievement through a teacher residency and professional development of teachers and administrators. The proposed project expands to rural districts, thus allowing them the same benefits and supports (p. e16-e43).

Weakness:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score:

Selection Criterion - Quality of the 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:

Reader's Score: 30

Sub

1. (i) **The extent to which the proposed project Demonstrates a Rationale (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).**

General:

Overall: The applicant presents a clear rationale.

Strength:

The applicant provides a convincing discussion that shows the proposed project is based on a strong theoretical perspective. The applicant provides a strong rationale with activities outputs, and short- and long-term outcomes for good to great conceptual framework tied to logic model. The applicant states the rationale that aligns to how teacher and school leader incentive program reaches the four stated goals. The applicant adequately demonstrates a sound logic model of outputs, outcomes, and activities that are clearly aligned with the goals and objectives of the proposed project. For example, the applicant outlines effective ways to increase student achievement with focused teacher preparation and recruitment, quality improvement of instruction and educator effectiveness pipeline. The applicant additionally establishes a cohesive system that meet each of the components of a successful system (p. e43-e44, e64-65).

Weakness:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score:

2. (ii) **The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress towards achieving intended outcomes.**

General:

Overall: The applicant presents strong methods of evaluation.

Strength:

The applicant presents strong methods of evaluation for performance feedback and periodic progress. The applicant provides research questions to determine quantitative and qualitative data quality of teacher preparation experiences. The applicant engages an external evaluator to carry the research methods addressing appropriate review practices. The applicant leverages state-level strategies to improve teacher preparation and support teachers. The applicant provides evidence to document the academic growth, annual student performance on statewide assessments and annual student attendance and retention rates, high school graduation rates, college attendance rates, and college persistence rates for educationally disadvantaged students as compared to students served by other public schools in the State (p. e45-e47).

Weakness:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score:

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 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.

General:

Overall: The applicant provides a comprehensive management plan for the proposed project.

Strength:

The applicant provides a comprehensive management plan for the proposed project. The applicant provided a timeline that illustrated the project tasks, responsibilities and corresponding milestones, in addition to a strong management plan which illustrates the project has appropriate oversight. The applicant describes how the applicant plans to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget. The applicant presents a management plan aligned with project objectives, activities and milestones for achieving each task and activity. Additionally, the applicant provides a detailed timeline for accomplishing tasks and activities and clear lines of responsibility implementing program components. The applicant proposes a sound timeline highlighting milestones to accomplish during each phase of the project (p. e50-e58).

Weakness:

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:**

Reader's Score: 25

Sub

- 1. (i) The likelihood that the proposed project will result in system change or improvement.**

General:

Overall: The applicant presents clear evidence for potential likelihood to make systemic change.

Strength:

The applicant demonstrates strong likelihood of proposed project resulting in system change. Thus, the applicant indicates an expansion likely to build local capacity and to improve services that address the needs of the target population. The applicant presents a second order change for a long-term sustainable model with incremental and slow progressions of change and performance management. For example, the applicant project works with the Harvard Strategic Data Project and the Center for Education Policy Research at Harvard University. The applicant describes how the feedback enables preparation providers to make changes regarding recruitment, selection, residency programs, and partnerships for school systems to meet workforce needs of their high-need schools (p. e49-e58).

Weakness:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score:

Sub

- 2. (ii) The extent to which the proposed project is likely to build local capacity to provide, improve, or expand serves that address the needs of the target population.**

General:

Overall: The applicant presents a sufficient plan to build capacity to improve conditions in addressing needs of the target population.

Strength:

The applicant presents a sufficient plan to build capacity with a teacher preparation quality rating system. The applicant presents community schools for leadership coach cohort of teacher manager, principals in residence, and assistant principals of instruction to strengthen leadership capacity and accelerate teacher development. The applicant provides good to great program components, COMPASS, digital libraries and curriculum, coaching model, and level 5 teacher retention strategies to build capacity across teacher and school leaders. For example, the applicant introduces the cost-effective talent pipeline to support induction for new teachers by leveraging existing Mentor Teachers, Content Leaders, and Intervention Content Leaders — strategies that expand and build on through this proposed project (e49-e58).

Weakness:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score:

- 3. (iii) 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., SEAs, teachers unions) critical to the project's long-term success; or more than one of these types of evidence.**

General:

Overall: The applicant demonstrates clear evidence for internal and external resources for the proposed project

Strength:

The applicant demonstrates clear evidence to show the proposed project builds on other efforts supported by community, State and Federal resources that are intended to improve desired outcomes. The applicant thoroughly demonstrates partnership work using community, State, and Federal resources. The applicant soundly demonstrates a clear chart of funding sources (p. e57). The applicant describes a strategic approach to ensure long-term success. The applicant presents a sustainability plan for long-term success with funding to support the proposed program. The applicant indicates multiple sources of evidence of funding through grant and foundation financial commitments. For example, the applicant uses allocated funds to support professional development, coaching and the development of a teaching and learning guidebook (p. e49-e58).

Weakness:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score:

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority #1 - Spurring Investment in Qualified Opportunity Zones

- 1. 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).

General:

Overall: The applicant provided clear information on areas with opportunity zone census tract numbers and related services.

Strength:

The applicant presents a clear appendix D indicating the specific locations and maps of the qualified opportunity zone schools with census tract numbers. For example, the applicant identifies the school sites in relation to the opportunity zone census tracts in all seven existing campus regions such as Austin, El Paso, Tarrant County/Fort Worth, Houston, Permian Basin, Rio Grande Valley, and San Antonio (p. e19-e21, e144-e156).

The applicant provides school-based services within the Qualified Opportunity Zones schools for students, parents, and families. The applicant presents regular school-day educational services, supplemental education, social-emotional learning activities, physical education, the federal free and reduced-price meals program, college preparation and counseling, career exploration and preparation, financial aid applications, college application completion and preparation, and standardized college admissions testing, among other core curriculum and enrichment activities. (p. e19-e21).

Weakness:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference Priority #2 - Diverse and Effective Workforce

1. Applications from New Potential Grantees (0, 2, or 5 points).

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate

- a) The applicant 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 (0 or 5 points); or
- b) The applicant has not had an active discretionary grant under the program from which it seeks funds, including through membership in a group application submitted in accordance with 34 CFR 75.127-75.129, in the five years before the deadline date for submission of applications under the program. (0 or 2 points)

General:

Overall: The applicant provides clear information on never receiving a TIF or TSL grant.

Strength:

The applicant has never had a TIF or TSL grant.

Weakness:

No weaknesses identified

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/14/2020 01:49 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/10/2020 11:43 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: IDEA Public Schools (S374A200045)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	25	20
Sub Total	25	20
Selection Criterion		
Quality of the Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	30
Sub Total	30	30
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	20
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Adequacy of Resources	25	25
Sub Total	45	45
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority #1		
Spurring Investment in Qualified Opportunity Zones		
1. CPP 1	10	10
Sub Total	10	10
Competitive Preference Priority #2		
Diverse and Effective Workforce		
1. CPP 2	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Total	115	110

Technical Review Form

Panel #6 - TSL - 6: 84.374A

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: IDEA Public Schools (S374A200045)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

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

Reader's Score: 20

Sub

1. (i) The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project, including the nature and magnitude of those gaps or weaknesses.

General:

Strengths: The application provides gap/weakness for the school district and how it is impacting students' performance (e18-33). The application does provide the need for systematic change. The application does provide how the grant will address each need (e18-e33).

Weakness: None

Reader's Score:

2. (ii) The extent to which the proposed project will integrate with or build on similar or related efforts to improve Relevant Outcomes (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)) using existing funding streams from other programs or policies supported by community, State, and Federal resources.

General:

Strengths: None

Weakness: The application provide s the need for master teachers to be closer to new teachers. The application states that proximity is an issue. With technology, class recording, zoom, or face-time can solve this issue (e24). The application states there is no centralized system to collect personnel data, a system update would help solve the issue (e25 - 34).

Reader's Score:

3. (iii) 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.

General:

Strengths: None

Weakness: The application provide s the need for master teachers to be closer to new teachers. The application

Sub

states that proximity is an issue. With technology, class recording, zoom, or face-time can solve this issue (e24). The application states there is no centralized system to collect personnel data, a system update would help solve the issue (e25 - 34).

Reader's Score:

- 4. (iv) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.

General:

Strengths: None

Weakness: The application provide s the need for master teachers to be closer to new teachers. The application states that proximity is an issue. With technology, class recording, zoom, or face-time can solve this issue (e24). The application states there is no centralized system to collect personnel data, a system update would help solve the issue (e25 - 34).

Reader's Score:

Selection Criterion - Quality of the 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:

Reader's Score: 30

Sub

- 1. (i) The extent to which the proposed project Demonstrates a Rationale (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).

General:

Strengths: The application provides a logic model (e44). The logic model states the long term and short term goals. The application provides the resources needed and partnerships to complete the project (e44). The outcomes are aligned to the project objectives. The application provides personnel information and resumes for staffing of the project (44). The application provides the frequency of measurement of the goals (e46). The frequency is short and it allows to close monitoring and course corrections. The application provides multiple ways to collect data that engages the community (e48).

Weakness: None

Reader's Score:

- 2. (ii) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress towards achieving intended outcomes.

General:

Strengths: The application provides a logic model (e44). The logic model states the long term and short term goals. The application provides the resources needed and partnerships to complete the project (e44). The outcomes are aligned to the project objectives. The application provides personnel information and resumes for staffing of the project (44). The application provides the frequency of measurement of the goals (e46). The frequency is short and it allows to close monitoring and course corrections. The application provides multiple ways to collect data that

Sub

engages the community (e48).

Weakness: None

Reader's Score:

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 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.**

General:

Strengths:

The application provides a list of personnel and the reporting structure (e50-51). The application provides how each staff member will meet the objectives of the grant. The staff members are qualified for the recommended roles. The application provides timelines and responsibilities, and milestones for the project (e54). The appendix provides the supporting financial documentations.

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:**

Reader's Score: 25

Sub

- 1. (i) The likelihood that the proposed project will result in system change or improvement.**

General:

Strengths: The application provides the likelihood of the sustainability of the project by stating the buy-in from leadership on the district level (e37). The application provides adequately states how the project will engage the community. The engagement plan supports the goals and objectives (e56). The application provides the financial data that shows the project will be self-sustaining after the grant (e58).

Weakness: none

Reader's Score:

- 2. (ii) The extent to which the proposed project is likely to build local capacity to provide, improve, or expand services that address the needs of the target population.**

Sub

General:

Strengths: The application provides the likelihood of the sustainability of the project by stating the buy-in from leadership on the district level (e37). The application provides adequately states how the project will engage the community. The engagement plan supports the goals and objectives (e56). The application provides the final data that shows the project will be self-sustaining after the grant (e58).

Weakness: None

Reader's Score:

- 3. (iii) **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., SEAs, teachers unions) critical to the project's long-term success; or more than one of these types of evidence.**

General:

Strengths: The application provides the likelihood of the sustainability of the project by stating the buy-in from leadership on the district level (e37). The application provides adequately states how the project will engage the community. The engagement plan supports the goals and objectives (e56). The application provides the final data that shows the project will be self-sustaining after the grant (e58).

Weakness: None

Reader's Score:

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority #1 - Spurring Investment in Qualified Opportunity Zones

- 1. **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).**

General:

The grant will work with high opportunity zone schools (e-16).

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference Priority #2 - Diverse and Effective Workforce

- 1. **Applications from New Potential Grantees (0, 2, or 5 points).**

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate

- a) **The applicant 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 (0 or 5 points); or

b) The applicant has not had an active discretionary grant under the program from which it seeks funds, including through membership in a group application submitted in accordance with 34 CFR 75.127-75.129, in the five years before the deadline date for submission of applications under the program. (0 or 2 points)

General:

Strengths:

The applicant has never had a TIF or TSL grant.

Weakness:

No weaknesses identified

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/10/2020 11:43 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/09/2020 12:57 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: IDEA Public Schools (S374A200045)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	25	20
Sub Total	25	20
Selection Criterion		
Quality of the Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	30
Sub Total	30	30
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	20
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Adequacy of Resources	25	25
Sub Total	45	45
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority #1		
Spurring Investment in Qualified Opportunity Zones		
1. CPP 1	10	10
Sub Total	10	10
Competitive Preference Priority #2		
Diverse and Effective Workforce		
1. CPP 2	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Total	115	110

Technical Review Form

Panel #6 - TSL - 6: 84.374A

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: IDEA Public Schools (S374A200045)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

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

Reader's Score: 20

Sub

1. (i) The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project, including the nature and magnitude of those gaps or weaknesses.

General:

- Specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been clearly identified using district-level data and a review of current services. The main goal is “for teachers and leaders to have clear access to a single location where student achievement data, teacher and leader performance data, and professional development are aggregated, therefore allowing new views, queries, and connections to be made” (p. e42).

Reader's Score:

2. (ii) The extent to which the proposed project will integrate with or build on similar or related efforts to improve Relevant Outcomes (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)) using existing funding streams from other programs or policies supported by community, State, and Federal resources.

General:

- The proposed project is clearly designed to build on current practices as the Good to Great project ramps up the district’s current PBCS (called Total Rewards) “by adding a multiplicity of differentiated, targeted, and personalized professional development and support components” to increase two major identified needs: teacher retention and student achievement.
- The proposed project will create build on current efforts by:
 1. Building “a single talent management platform that aggregates data from multiple existing sources (HCMS and PBCS) and allows for the creation of new sources of information input”
 2. Creating an online professional development system that includes “best practices and artifacts from our highest performing teachers and leaders”
 3. Increasing coaching capacity so “teachers can get better faster” and all IDEA schools can have a top-level teacher in the building to coach others
 4. Developing a program to measure high level “teacher retention and test different strategies to measure” the effectiveness of proposed interventions.

Reader's Score:

Sub

3. (iii) **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.**

General:

- The proposed project is appropriate to identified needs because needs are closely aligned with proposed solutions.

Reader's Score:

4. (iv) **The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.**

General:

- The proposed project will build on current efforts, but most of the need is related to technology and improving the current system.
- The support from community, State, and Federal resources is mentioned but not strong.

Reader's Score:

Selection Criterion - Quality of the 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:**

Reader's Score: 30

Sub

1. (i) **The extent to which the proposed project Demonstrates a Rationale (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).**

General:

- The proposed project demonstrates a rationale that includes a 4-part framework (resources and inputs, activities, outputs, and outcomes) that connect clearly to the stated goals and evidence (p. e34).

Reader's Score:

2. (ii) **The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress towards achieving intended outcomes.**

General:

- The methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback during quarterly, annual, and ongoing assessments on a cycle of progress towards achieving intended outcomes. The applicant stated that "IDEA will use mixed qualitative and quantitative methods that produce an in-depth understanding of the use of a comprehensive talent management platform, innovative teacher retention strategies, a digital library of exemplary practices, and personalized content coaching in replicating IDEA's model of student academic success" (p. e47). More staff, along with outside evaluators, will be brought into to help collect and analyze data.

Weaknesses:

- No weaknesses noted.

Sub

Reader's Score:

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 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.**

General:

Strengths:

- The management plan is adequate to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget because it includes highly detailed plans for a five-step evaluation cycle (p. e47); site visits and evaluations; surveys of teachers, parents, and students; and further data collection and analysis.
- The management plan includes responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks. The timeline, which includes steps toward outcomes and necessary personnel, shows how different team members and processes will come together to contribute to project success.

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:**

Reader's Score: 25

Sub

1. **(i) The likelihood that the proposed project will result in system change or improvement.**

General:

- The proposed project is likely to result in system change because it includes a well-designed plan for using grant funds. The proposed project is based on four clearly identified gaps/weaknesses (p. e25-e33) and targets them through a more robust technology systems and professional development (p. e56). The point of the proposed project is founded in the goal of system change: to ensure better "student outcomes, which is the ultimate measure of success to system changes and improvements" (p. e55).

Reader's Score:

2. **(ii) The extent to which the proposed project is likely to build local capacity to provide, improve, or expand serves that address the needs of the target population.**

Sub

General:

- The proposed project includes a multi-year financial and operating model, which is clearly described in the narrative (p. e57). Through the proposed project, two technology components and two incentive programs will support teaching and learning: 1) Compass, an HCMS system; 2) a digital PD library, 3) a coaching accelerator; and 4) school-level incentives for teachers and principals (p. e57). Multiple letters of support strengthen the application by showing the commitment of stakeholders in and outside the LEA, including teachers.

Reader's Score:

3. (iii) **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., SEAs, teachers unions) critical to the project's long-term success; or more than one of these types of evidence.**

General:

Weaknesses:

- No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score:

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority #1 - Spurring Investment in Qualified Opportunity Zones

1. **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).**

General:

Strengths:

- The application includes the census tract number of the Qualified Opportunity Zone(s) in which it proposes to provide services.
- The application describes how services will be provided in seven Qualified Opportunity Zones “in all seven existing IDEA regions—Austin, El Paso, Tarrant County/Fort Worth, Houston, Permian Basin, Rio Grande Valley, and San Antonio,” Texas (p. e20). IDEA schools, as part of their model, are designed to impact the neediest students. Because of the way IDEA recruits students, “nearly every IDEA campus impacts at least one Qualified Opportunity Zone,” which will allow the work of the proposed project to reach students with the highest needs (p. e21).

Weaknesses:

- No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference Priority #2 - Diverse and Effective Workforce

1. Applications from New Potential Grantees (0, 2, or 5 points).

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate

a) The applicant 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 (0 or 5 points); or

b) The applicant has not had an active discretionary grant under the program from which it seeks funds, including through membership in a group application submitted in accordance with 34 CFR 75.127-75.129, in the five years before the deadline date for submission of applications under the program. (0 or 2 points)

General:

The applicant has never received a grant under the program from which it seeks funds.

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/09/2020 12:57 PM