

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/10/2016 11:00 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Region One Education Service Center (U374A160002)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	20	20
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	45	45
<b>Selection Criterion</b>		
<b>Professional Development Systems</b>		
1. Development Systems	15	15
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	15	15
<b>Adequacy of Resources</b>		
1. Adequacy of Resources	5	5
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Supporting High-Need Students</b>		
1. CPP 1	2	0
<b>Improving Teacher Effectiveness</b>		
1. CPP 2	5	5
<b>Total</b>	107	105

# Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - Teacher Incentive Fund - 6: 84.374A

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

Applicant: Region One Education Service Center (U374A160002)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Significance

1. We will consider 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.

#### General:

##### Strengths:

The applicant presents a strong plan that is supported by 82% of its districts leaders, as well as teachers. The plan provides performance based incentives, which will assist in recruiting and retaining qualified teachers. In addition, the applicant outlines a plan to improve practice through various observational measures and student performance, as well as through personal reflection, which is believed to improve student achievement (p. e22).

##### Weakness:

None Found

Reader's Score: 20

### Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, we will consider the following factors

--

Reader's Score: 45

#### Sub Question

1. (1) 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:

The applicant documents a plan that will begin with a planning year and grow overtime as the implementation is increased (p. e24-25). The proposal focused on establishing both a HCMS and PBCS, that will attract and maintain highly effective teachers through recruitment support, professional development, career advancement, and rewarding high level performance. The plan provides a detailed timeline of monitoring and support (p. e25- e35).

##### Weakness:

None Found

Reader's Score:

**Sub Question**

- 2. (2) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services.**

**General:**

Strengths:

The applicant provides an exhaustive list of collaborators, which includes local colleges, universities, community organizations, as well as private entities and school districts (p. e36). The proposed plan also outlines a plan to collaborate with stakeholders in order to effectively support and build the capacity of teachers and administrators to maximize resources and sustainable educational reform (p. e37).

Weakness:

None Found

**Reader's Score:**

- 3. (3) The extent to which the proposed project is supported by a strong theory.**

**General:**

Strengths:

The applicant presents a strong connection to the Motivation theory and specifies that financial incentives coupled with ongoing professional development and support will be used to attract and maintain teachers (p. e38). The applicant provides research based evidence to prove that such teacher incentives can positively affect student achievement (p. e39).

Weakness:

None Found

**Reader's Score:**

- 4. (4) The extent to which the proposed project will integrate with or build on similar or related efforts to improve the relevant outcomes (as defined in 34 C.F.R. 77.1(c)), using existing funding streams from other programs or policies supported by community, State and Federal resources.**

**General:**

Strengths:

The applicant details how the proposed plan will be combined with several on-going plans already in place to provide LEA's with training, support and guidance that will improve operations of the school system and positively affect student outcomes (p. e40).

Weakness:

None Found

**Reader's Score:**

**Selection Criterion - Professional Development Systems**

- 1. In determining the quality of the professional development systems to support the needs of teachers and principals identified through the evaluation process, we will consider the extent to which--**

**Reader's Score: 15**

**Sub Question**

- 1. (1) Each participating LEA has a high-quality plan for professional development to help all educators located in high-need schools, listed in response to Requirement 2(a), to improve their effectiveness.**

**General:**

**Strengths:**

The applicant presents a strong plan to collaborate with other entities to provide professional development opportunities for staff and leadership throughout the school year (p. e40- e41). The proposed professional development will address various topics that are centered around helping to improve teacher effectiveness. The plan focuses on collecting and assessing student data and using data in order to improve practice and student outcome (p. e41).

**Weakness:**

None Found

**Reader's Score:**

- 2. (2) The plan describes how the participating LEA will use the disaggregated information generated by the proposed educator Evaluation and Support System to identify the professional development needs of individual Educators and schools.**

**General:**

**Strengths:**

The plan clearly describes the data that will be gathered upon receipt of the grant and how the data will be collected and analyzed to make improvements and adjustments to the plan (p. e46). The applicant details the multifaceted data streams that will be used to respond to the needs of the individual schools, students, and staff, which would also include securing an independent evaluator to conduct evaluations and make recommendations (p. e47)

**Weakness:**

None Found

**Reader's Score:**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan**

- 1. 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 applicant provides an extensive management plan that includes those who are responsible for over-seeing the project. The proposal also includes a timeline of proposed activities and those responsible for the implementation and monitoring (p. e49- e53). In addition, the applicant details a comprehensive list of goals and outcomes (p. e54- e56).

**Weakness:**

None Found

**Reader's Score: 15**

## Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

1. In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, we will consider the extent to which--

Reader's Score: 5

### Sub Question

1. (1) The applicant demonstrates that Performance-based Compensation Systems are developed with the input of teachers and schools in the schools and local educational agencies to be served by the grant.

#### General:

##### Strengths:

The applicant provides a convincing account of providing multiple opportunities for teachers, staff and administration to review the proposed plan and provide meaningful suggestions, feedback about the activities, goals and outcomes described in the plan. The information gathered was used to differentiate plans of support and formally obtain "buy-in" from individual schools in order to provide local schools with varying levels of support and influence. The plan was supported by 82% of the educators in the impacted schools. (p. e56).

##### Weakness:

None Found

#### Reader's Score:

2. (2) The applicant demonstrates a plan to sustain financially the activities conducted and systems developed under the grant once the grant period has expired.

#### General:

##### Strengths:

The applicant presents a sound plan to continue to sustain the proposed plan after the expiration of the TIF. By leveraging support from the schools, the plan will be able to sustain the proposed HCMS/PBCS systems and compensation once the grant has expired (p. E57- e58).

##### Weakness:

None Found

#### Reader's Score:

## Priority Questions

### Competitive Preference Priority - Supporting High-Need Students

1. (1) Projects that are designed to improve academic outcomes for students served by Rural Local Educational Agencies.

#### General:

##### Strengths:

The proposal clearly describes their targeted population as economically depressed. urban/rural school districts, in which 88.21% of the student population receives free and/or reduced lunch (p. e20).

##### Weakness:

However, the fact that the targeted population is both urban and rural and not exclusively rural, this excludes them from meeting the requirements of this CPP.

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Competitive Preference Priority - Improving Teacher Effectiveness**

- 1. We will consider projects that are designed to address promoting equitable access to effective teachers for students from low-income families and minority students across and within schools and districts.**

**To meet this priority, teacher effectiveness must be measured using an Evaluation and Support System. We are particularly interested in applications that address the following invitational priority:**

**Invitational Priority-Promoting Equitable Access Through State Plans To Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Educators: Applications that include a description of how the applicant's project promotes equitable access to effective Educators for students from low-income families and for minority students across and within districts, consistent with approved State Plans to Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Educator.**

**General:**

**Strengths:**

The applicant details how equitable access to effective educators for students from low-income families and for minority students across the LEA through a collaboration among teachers and administration among all partner campuses. The collaboration will entail a peer review process in which administrators and lead master teachers from participating campuses will work together to review, discuss, share, and replicate effective pedagogical strategies. The plan will focus on the replication of effective instructional practices, professional collaboration and growth that will support high student achievement (p. e37).

**Weakness:**

None Found

**Reader's Score: 5**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 08/10/2016 11:00 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/10/2016 05:34 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Region One Education Service Center (U374A160002)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	20	20
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	45	45
<b>Selection Criterion</b>		
<b>Professional Development Systems</b>		
1. Development Systems	15	15
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	15	15
<b>Adequacy of Resources</b>		
1. Adequacy of Resources	5	5
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Supporting High-Need Students</b>		
1. CPP 1	2	0
<b>Improving Teacher Effectiveness</b>		
1. CPP 2	5	5
<b>Total</b>	107	105

# Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - Teacher Incentive Fund - 6: 84.374A

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

Applicant: Region One Education Service Center (U374A160002)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Significance

1. We will consider 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.

#### General:

##### Strengths:

The applicant provides ample evidence of a high needs target population, high educator turnover, shortage of new teachers, and teacher attrition. The proposed HCMS will focus on increasing skill, which will result in instructional improvement and student achievement. They further delineate a step by step approach to an analysis of where the districts are and where they want to be in five years through a PBCS that is based on schoolwide student achievement gains (pp. e19-25).

Weaknesses: None noted.

Reader's Score: 20

### Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, we will consider the following factors

--

Reader's Score: 45

#### Sub Question

1. (1) 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:

The applicant states they plan to establish a HCMS and PBCS to create a K-12 source of educators to increase student achievement. This process includes recruitment, development, and retention efforts, promotion of career advancement, and rewarding high performance through value added assessment systems. Their plan is comprehensive in that it does not rush efforts to promote growth but rather fosters a paced approach to analyzing needs and addressing deficiencies over five years (pp. e24-36).

Weaknesses: None noted.

Reader's Score:

2. (2) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services.

**Sub Question**

**General:**

**Strengths:**

The applicant notes their 50 year history of working with stakeholders to provide services and programs designed to help students, schools, and district achieve success. This is evidenced by many letters of support in Appendix E. They maintain a connection with districts through a regional advisory council which meets on a monthly basis to share best practices and network. The overarching goal of the LEAs and the applicant is to provide effective support to enhance student success (pp. e37-38).

**Weaknesses:** None noted.

**Reader's Score:**

**3. (3) The extent to which the proposed project is supported by a strong theory.**

**General:**

**Strengths:**

The applicant's theoretical concept is grounded on Motivational theory which argues that intrinsic financial rewards from work provide additional motivation. Further, educators are more likely to succeed when they have input on incentives. They provide a Logic Model in Appendix C which highlights anticipated outcomes (pp. e38-39).

**Weaknesses:** None noted.

**Reader's Score:**

**4. (4) The extent to which the proposed project will integrate with or build on similar or related efforts to improve the relevant outcomes (as defined in 34 C.F.R. 77.1(c)), using existing funding streams from other programs or policies supported by community, State and Federal resources.**

**General:**

**Strengths:**

The applicant states they will build on ongoing efforts of the current structure for administrative and leadership support in the region. The project's efforts will be combined with the "GEAR UP" program resulting from an ED seven year grant begun in 2011. Other federal funds and a partnership with the TEA's TIF Summer Institute and the Texas Association of school Boards will bolster activities and provide a keen focus (pp. e38-39).

**Weaknesses:** None noted.

**Reader's Score:**

**Selection Criterion - Professional Development Systems**

**1. In determining the quality of the professional development systems to support the needs of teachers and principals identified through the evaluation process, we will consider the extent to which--**

**Reader's Score: 15**

**Sub Question**

**1. (1) Each participating LEA has a high-quality plan for professional development to help all educators located in high-need schools, listed in response to Requirement 2(a), to improve their effectiveness.**

**Sub Question**

**General:**

**Strengths:**

The applicant, along with higher education institutions, community based organizations, and private firms will provide year round PD to participants on appropriate topics that drive student achievement. Emphasis will be on collecting and assessing data and formal reviews of teacher performance (pp. e40-48).

**Weaknesses:** None noted.

**Reader's Score:**

- 2. (2) The plan describes how the participating LEA will use the disaggregated information generated by the proposed educator Evaluation and Support System to identify the professional development needs of individual Educators and schools.**

**General:**

**Strengths:**

Information from the HCMS and PBCS and educator Evaluation/Support System will be used to guide PD through job embedded coaching, educator development, implementation of PLCs, educational leaders, and external evaluation (pp. e48-56).

**Weaknesses:** None noted.

**Reader's Score:**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan**

- 1. 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 applicant states this plan will be implemented through existing organizational and operational structures. MOUs found in Appendix E provide evidence of previous incorporation of systems. They further plan to include the Regional Advisory Committee for planning, implementation, and feedback. The applicant clearly defines roles, responsibilities, timelines, and milestones that are realistic and attainable (pp. e48-56).

**Weaknesses:** None noted.

**Reader's Score: 15**

**Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources**

- 1. In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, we will consider the extent to which--**

**Reader's Score: 5**

**Sub Question**

- 1. (1) The applicant demonstrates that Performance-based Compensation Systems are developed with the input of teachers and schools in the schools and local educational agencies to be served by the grant.**

## Sub Question

### General:

#### Strengths:

The applicant provided many letters of support (see Appendix E) that demonstrate “buy-in” from all critical personnel. Working sessions were held to elicit feedback and the timeline and budget was discussed to ensure an understanding of programmatic and financial commitments. A digital survey (see Appendix F6) produced an 82% favorable response rate, which is exceptional (pp. e56-57).

Weaknesses: None noted.

### Reader's Score:

- (2) The applicant demonstrates a plan to sustain financially the activities conducted and systems developed under the grant once the grant period has expired.**

### General:

#### Strengths:

The applicant asserts that grant monies will be supplemented by the resources of Division of Leaders, school and community support, and GEAR UP, along with other federal funds. Sustainability is demonstrated by money already allocated by districts in cash and in kind funds. Budgets will be reviewed annually to determine if additional resources can be generated. A commitment has been made to gradually leverage resources and assume performance incentives, bonuses, and stipends in local operating budgets over the term of the grant and beyond (pp. e57-58).

Weaknesses: None noted.

### Reader's Score:

## Priority Questions

### Competitive Preference Priority - Supporting High-Need Students

- (1) Projects that are designed to improve academic outcomes for students served by Rural Local Educational Agencies.**

### General:

#### Strengths:

The applicant states its partnership is with 16 high need, economically depressed urban/rural school districts. Of these, 10 are designated as rural. Given the applicant's comprehensive plan to address academic improvement for all students, there is a high probability that the rural districts will benefit as well.

#### Weaknesses:

Since the applicant does not serve all rural LEAs, they do not qualify for this CPP.

**Reader's Score: 0**

### Competitive Preference Priority - Improving Teacher Effectiveness

- We will consider projects that are designed to address promoting equitable access to effective teachers for students from low-income families and minority students across and within schools and districts.**

**To meet this priority, teacher effectiveness must be measured using an Evaluation and Support System. We are particularly interested in applications that address the following invitational priority:**

**Invitational Priority-Promoting Equitable Access Through State Plans To Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Educators: Applications that include a description of how the applicant's project promotes equitable access to effective Educators for students from low-income families and for minority students**

**across and within districts, consistent with approved State Plans to Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Educator.**

**General:**

Strengths:

The applicant's stated objective is to establish an effective Human Capital Management System and Performance Based Compensation System to ensure highly effective educators are properly prepared and retained. This success is engendered by equitable access to effective teachers in all the partner districts (pp. e36-38).

Weaknesses: None noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 08/10/2016 05:34 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/10/2016 10:55 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Region One Education Service Center (U374A160002)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	20	20
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	45	45
<b>Selection Criterion</b>		
<b>Professional Development Systems</b>		
1. Development Systems	15	15
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	15	15
<b>Adequacy of Resources</b>		
1. Adequacy of Resources	5	5
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Supporting High-Need Students</b>		
1. CPP 1	2	0
<b>Improving Teacher Effectiveness</b>		
1. CPP 2	5	5
<b>Total</b>	107	105

# Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - Teacher Incentive Fund - 6: 84.374A

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

Applicant: Region One Education Service Center (U374A160002)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Significance

1. We will consider 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.

#### General:

Strength: This applicant serves as the fiscal agent within a partnership of 16 high-need economically lower-income urban/rural school districts with 88.21 percent of free and reduced lunch rate. Of these schools: 6 charter schools, 10 rural and 21 are categorized as Priority (p. e16). The applicant's Project RISE will establish and effective human capital and educator evaluation in which to foster development of educators who are eager to advance (p. e16). The goal is to create a K-12 grade of highly-effective teachers, leaders and educators which will increase student learning and academic achievement (p. e16).

Weakness: N/A

Reader's Score: 20

### Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, we will consider the following factors

--

Reader's Score: 45

#### Sub Question

1. (1) 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:

Strength: The applicant's strategy of Project RISE is to establish a HCMS and PBCS to create a K-12 grade schools of highly-effective teachers, leaders and educators. This will be accomplished by: (1) supporting recruitment, development and retention (2) promoting career advancement (3) rewarding educators for high-level performances (p. e25). In years 2 -5, the Project RISE will implement the value-added performance-based incentive plan as well as: Recruiting and Hiring, Coaching and Mentoring, Teacher Retention and Performance Assessment (p. e30).

Weakness: N/A

Reader's Score:

**Sub Question**

- 2. (2) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services.**

**General:**

Strengths: The applicant's induction to Project RISE will implement a comprehensive strategy that will provide the first year with new indicating three years or less teachers and teachers that are challenging with the knowledge and skills necessary to become effective. The content and instruction will be aligned with TEK, a Resource System-Researched-based Curriculum Management Practices, STARR-EOC and the designated Evaluation-Appraisal System, Talent- ED and VAL-ED (Appendix F7) (p. e26).

Weakness: N/A

**Reader's Score:**

- 3. (3) The extent to which the proposed project is supported by a strong theory.**

**General:**

Strength: The applicant's theoretical concept for the Project RISE is derived through the perspective of a motivational theory. This theory provides further insight into how employees working within an organized setting may respond to incentives. The Motivational theory argues that the intrinsic financial rewards from work will provide additional motivation (p. e32). Performances that are placed in the context of a value-added environment may become an integral component of employee motivation and productivity. Educators will be more likely to succeed when the incentives are realistic, transparent and designed with employee input (p. e33).

Weakness: N/A

**Reader's Score:**

- 4. (4) The extent to which the proposed project will integrate with or build on similar or related efforts to improve the relevant outcomes (as defined in 34 C.F.R. 77.1(c)), using existing funding streams from other programs or policies supported by community, State and Federal resources.**

**General:**

Strength: The applicant's Project RISE will also be combined with the GEAR UP program of Region One, which was Funded in 2011 by the US Department of Education. GEAR UP provided a 7-year grant of \$7 million annually to involve 22 school districts, 65 schools, 7 institutions of higher education and 14 organizations (p. e40).

Weakness: N/A

**Reader's Score:**

**Selection Criterion - Professional Development Systems**

- 1. In determining the quality of the professional development systems to support the needs of teachers and principals identified through the evaluation process, we will consider the extent to which--**

**Reader's Score: 15**

**Sub Question**

- 1. (1) Each participating LEA has a high-quality plan for professional development to help all**

**Sub Question**

**educators located in high-need schools, listed in response to Requirement 2(a), to improve their effectiveness.**

**General:**

Strengths: The applicant is prepared to use Bloom's Taxonomy and Carol Tomlinson's research on Differentiated Instruction methods for evaluation and training purposes (p. e43). Additionally, the applicant will also use the Baldrige Framework-Measuring What Matters curriculum which is aligned to the Texas' TEKS Resource System curriculum to assist teachers and administrators in ways to improve classroom instruction (p. e43).

Weakness: N/A

**Reader's Score:**

- 2. (2) The plan describes how the participating LEA will use the disaggregated information generated by the proposed educator Evaluation and Support System to identify the professional development needs of individual Educators and schools.**

**General:**

Strengths: The applicant will utilize the information that was generated by both the HCMS/PBCS and the educator Evaluation/Support System which will provide a high-quality plan for professional developmental needs (Appendix F-11). This list includes: (1) Job-embedded coaching (2) Educator Development, core content and technology integration training to teachers (3) Implementation of effective Professional Learning Communities (4) Master Teachers and principals (5) also disaggregated data generated by the external evaluators and the educator Evaluation and Human Capital Management/Support Systems to inform their teachers and educators of classroom management (p. e41). Professional development efforts of Project RISE (Section 3) will be integrated with the professional development efforts of the GEAR UP program. Additionally, Title 1, Title II, and IDEA funding will be reallocated within the general funds to provide professional development support for educators in areas that are directly related to content areas, instructional strategies, assessment tools, protocols, teacher growth and teacher leadership (p. e41).

Weakness: N/A

**Reader's Score:**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan**

- 1. 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 applicant's management plan will include the RISE Advisory Committee (RAC) to assist with the planning, implementing and feedback areas. In efforts to support the collaboration in the implementation of the program, the RAC will meet quarterly to review the programs objectives, activities, recruitment and the hiring plans, policies, HCMS/PBCS systems, incentive payment, evaluation results and the outcomes. The RAC will be comprised of educators who will represent the lead agency, target school districts and campuses including: Deputy Director, Project Director, Superintendent or Designee, Principals, Assistant Principals, teachers and other school personnel (p. e50).

Weakness: N/A

**Reader's Score: 15**

## Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

1. In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, we will consider the extent to which--

Reader's Score: 5

### Sub Question

1. (1) The applicant demonstrates that Performance-based Compensation Systems are developed with the input of teachers and schools in the schools and local educational agencies to be served by the grant.

#### General:

Strength: The applicant provides letters of support which adequately demonstrates the input of teachers and local educational agencies that will be served by this grant (Appendix E). The applicant's Region One will meet the needs and assets of personnel for planning and the implementation of Project RISE (p. e56). To ensure the inclusion of these perspectives during this development, Region One will host various working sessions with the administrators, teachers, and educators (p. e57).

Weakness: N/A

#### Reader's Score:

2. (2) The applicant demonstrates a plan to sustain financially the activities conducted and systems developed under the grant once the grant period has expired.

#### General:

Strength: The applicant provides a Division of Leadership, School and Community Support and GEAR UP. With resources the Region One Five-year federal budget and non-federal budget adequately supports the proposed scope of work objective, activities and outcomes (e.57).

Weakness: N/A

#### Reader's Score:

## Priority Questions

### Competitive Preference Priority - Supporting High-Need Students

1. (1) Projects that are designed to improve academic outcomes for students served by Rural Local Educational Agencies.

#### General:

Strength: This applicant provided a target school based upon the low-income status. The applicant serves 16 high-need economically lower-income urban/rural school districts with 88.21 percent of free and reduced lunch rate (p. e16). The retention rate of teachers within the areas is low. The average tenure for a teacher and principal is two to three years (p. e20). To alleviate the problem of retention, target schools have difficulty in recruiting effective educators to serve its distressed economical distressed school. Thus, this give reason for the need to support through the accommodation of the need for the RISE project. Also, the Texas Assessment of Academic Readiness (STAAR) and the End-of-Course (EOC) tests measured the students' abilities to meet the academic standards and college readiness through 12th grade (p. e21).

Weakness: The applicant serves a high-need economically lower-income urban/rural school district. However, to meet this criterion the applicant must regard only the service of a Rural Local Educational Agency.

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Competitive Preference Priority - Improving Teacher Effectiveness**

- 1. We will consider projects that are designed to address promoting equitable access to effective teachers for students from low-income families and minority students across and within schools and districts.**

**To meet this priority, teacher effectiveness must be measured using an Evaluation and Support System. We are particularly interested in applications that address the following invitational priority:**

**Invitational Priority-Promoting Equitable Access Through State Plans To Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Educators: Applications that include a description of how the applicant's project promotes equitable access to effective Educators for students from low-income families and for minority students across and within districts, consistent with approved State Plans to Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Educator.**

**General:**

Strength: This applicant's professional development activities will be driven by evaluation activities. An on-going formative evaluation will focus on addressing whether or not the objectives or strategies are being implemented. On-going findings will be compared to the objectives and outcomes (p. e36-38). The following data will be collected yearly: (1) Student Accomplishments (2) School Climate (3) Improvement of Instruction (4) Evaluation Appraisal system (5) External Evaluation. Additionally, a Formative and Summative Evaluation will focus each year on addressing whether the proposed objectives were met (p. e47).

Weakness: N/A

**Reader's Score: 5**

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 08/10/2016 10:55 AM