**APPENDIX D: Cover Page**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Applicant: |  |  |
| Address: |  |  |
| City/State/Zip: |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Applicant Contact (Director): |  |  |
| Phone Number: |  |  |
| Fax Number: |  |  |
| E-Mail Address: |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Applicant Contact Director): | (Co- |  |
| Phone Number: |  |  |
| Fax Number: |  |  |
| E-Mail Address: |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Authorized Signature: | |  |
| Printed Name and Title: | |  |
| Date: | |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Applicant Certification | I certify that this application is the sole application for the 2018 College Readiness and Success Models for *60x30TX* (CRSM-2018) for this institution. |
| Authorized Signature: |  |
| Printed Name and Title: |  |
| Date: |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **2018 College Readiness and Success Models for *60x30TX* (CRSM-2018)** | | | | |
| **Name of Institution** | | | | |
|  | | | | |
| **I. RFA Budget Line Item** | **II. Item Description** | **III. Purpose and Explanation** | **IV. Percent of Time on Project** | **V. Proposed Budget** *(Initial Funding)* |
| **10.6.1** | **Project Director, Co-Director** |  |  |  |
| **10.6.2** | **Other Professional/Support Staff** |  |  |  |
| **10.6.3** | **Fringe Benefits** |  | |  |
| **10.6.4** | **Travel** |  | |  |
| **10.6.5** | **Other Direct Costs** |  | |  |
| **Total ALL Program Costs (Equals 10.6.1 through 10.6.5 above)**  **INITIAL FUNDING ONLY** | | | | $0.00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **2.4** | **Cost Sharing for Applicant** |  | | $0.00 |
| **Total Projected Funding Based on Completions**  **10.7** *(GRAND TOTAL FROM APPENDIX F) Completion Funding Calculation Worksheet* | | | | $0.00 |
| **PROPOSED TOTAL GRANT AWARD (Equals ALL Program Costs Less Cost Sharing)** | | | | $0.00 |

**APPENDIX E: PROPOSED Budget Form (Initial and projected)**

**Appendix F: COMPLETION FUNDING TERMS**

Funding, other than the initial payment outlined in Section 2.1.2, will be based on corequisite course enrollments and successful corequisite college-level completions\* according to this document and as outlined in the Awarded Applicant’s executed contract.

All completion payments are contingent upon the institution meeting the minimum percentage (25% - AY1 fall 2018 - summer 2019; 50% - AY2 fall 2019 - summer 2020) of students enrolled in developmental education to be enrolled in an approved corequisite model, per TAC, Chapter 4, Subchapter C, §4.62(a)(8). Each semester of the academic year is calculated by independently.

**NOTE: The Completion Funding Terms for AY 1 and AY 2 are DIFFERENT.**

*\* Successful completion of the corequisite college-level course is considered completing the course with a grade of A, B, or C.*

***AY1***

**AY1 (fall 2018, spring 2019, summer 2019) – Successful Completion\* Funding**

Calculation of AY1 Funding is based on 1) meeting the minimum threshold of 25% and 2) the actual percentage of corequisite enrollments and successful completions\* of corequisite college-level course, according to the following schedule (see Figure 1):

**Figure 1: AY1 Completion Funding**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Percentage of corequisite enrollments** | **Amount per Successful Completion\* of corequisite college-level course** |
| 0 – 24% | 0 |
| 25 – 29% | $200 |
| 30 – 39% | $250 |
| 40% + | $300 |

**EXAMPLE: AY1 Completion Funding**

In AY1- Fall 2018: Institution A has **met the minimum threshold of 25%** and reports 28% of its students enrolled in developmental education to be enrolled in an approved corequisite model. One hundred and twenty-five (125) of those students successfully complete the college-level course. According to Figure 1, 28% equates to $200 per successful completion, so the institution is awarded $20,000 (125 x $200=$25,000) in completion funding for fall 2018.

***AY2***

**AY 2 (fall 2019, spring 2020, summer 2020) – Performance Improvements**

Calculation of AY2 funding is based on 1) meeting the minimum threshold of 50% and 2) the difference in corequisite college-level COMPLETIONS between AY2 and AY1, by semester. Funding for AY2 is $300 for each additional successful completion.

**Figure 2: AY2 Funding (Difference is calculated based on corresponding semester of AY1)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Successful Completions of corequisite College-level Course in AY2- Fall 2019** | **Successful Completions of corequisite College-level Course in AY1 - Fall 2018** | **DIFFERENCE BETWEEN AY2 AND AY1 corequisite college-level COMPLETIONS** | **Amount Awarded**  **Fall 2019** |
| 200 | 125 | (200 – 125 = **75**) | $22,500 (**75** x $300) |

**EXAMPLE: AY2 Funding**

The increase in numbers of successful corequisite college-level completions from AY1-Fall 2018 to AY2-Fall 2019 will determine total completion award for AY 2-Fall 2019. Thus, if AY1-Fall 2019 completions totals 200 students and AY2-Fall 2018 completions totaled 125 students, funding will be for the additional 75 students who completed in AY2. In other words, the difference between AY2-Fall 2019 completions (200) and AY1-Fall 2018 (125) completions is an increase of **75** (200-125=75), so the institution is awarded $22,500, (**75** x $300=$22,500) in completion funding for fall 2019 (see Figure 2).

**APPENDIX G: Completion Funding Calculation Worksheet**

***AY1***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **TABLE F1: AY 1 (2018-2019) Completion Funding Example** | | | | | | |
| **A** | **B** | **C** | **D** | **E** | **F** | **G** |
| **Semester** | **Anticipated DE Enrollment for subject area (deduct HB 2223 exemptions)** | **Anticipated Total Number of Corequisite Enrollments** | **Anticipated HB 2223 percentage of Corequisite Enrollments**  **(C/B=D)** | **Completion Pay Rate per student (See Figure 1, Appendix E)** | **Anticipated Total Number of Successful Corequisite Completions**  **(x%) = anticipated completion rate** | **Anticipated Total**  **Completion Funding**  **AY1 (E x F = G)** |
| **Fall 2018** | 300 | 75 | 25% | $200 | 53 (71%) | $10,600 |
| **Spring 2019** | 150 | 53 | 35% | $250 | 32 (60%) | $8,000 |
| **Summer 2019** | 50 | 25 | 50% | $300 | 19 (76%) | $5,700 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **H. Total Projected AY 1 Completion Funding** | | | | | | $24,300 |
| **Note: To receive any Completion Funding, the institution must meet the corequisite enrollment thresholds required by HB2223 in the semesters requested (2018-2019, 25%). Additionally, the total amount of Completion Funding will NOT exceed the total award amount (see Appendix D).** | | | | | | |

***AY2***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **TABLE F2: AY 2 (2019-2020) Completion Funding Example (Performance Improvements)** | | | | | | | |
| **A** | **B** | **C** | **D** | **E** | **F** | **G** | **H** |
| **Semester** | **Total DE Enrollments by subject area (deduct HB 2223 exemptions)** | **Anticipated Total Number of Corequisite Enrollments** | **Anticipated HB 2223 percentage of Corequisite Enrollments**  **(C/B)=D)** | **Anticipated Total Number of Successful Corequisite Completions**  **(x%) = anticipated completion rate** | **Anticipated Successful Completions from AY 1 corresponding semester (see Table F1, Column F)** | **Difference between current AY 2 semester and AY 1 corresponding semester** | **Anticipated Total**  **Completion Funding**  **AY2**  **(G X $300)** |
| **Fall 2019** | 450 | 225 | 50% | 147 (65%) | 53 | 94 | $28,200 |
| **Spring 2020** | 200 | 120 | 60% | 72 (60%) | 32 | 40 | $12,000 |
| **Summer 2020** | 50 | 25 | 50% | 19 (76%) | 19 | 0 | $0.00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Total Projected AY 2 Completion Funding** | | | | | | | **$40,200** |
| **Total Projected AY 1 Completion Funding (Table 1, H.)** | | | | | | | **$24,300** |
| **(AY 1 + AY 2) Completion Funding Grand Total**  **\*This total should be entered on line 10.7 in Appendix D, PROPOSED Budget Form** | | | | | | | **$64,500** |
| **Note: To receive any Completion Funding, the institution must meet the corequisite enrollment thresholds required by HB2223 in the semesters requested (2018-2019, 50%). Additionally, the total amount of Completion Funding will NOT exceed the total award amount (see Appendix D).** | | | | | | | |

**APPENDIX H: Performance Measures and Outcomes**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Program Evaluation Plan** | | | | | |
| **Goal** | **Activities/Strategies** | **Expected Outcome(s)** | **Measures of success** | **Stakeholders involved** | **Methods for**  **collecting data** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Please use this form to indicate the:

1. Goals you are trying to reach.
2. Anticipated activities/strategies you plan to implement to reach the goal.
3. Anticipated outcome(s) for year one and year two.
4. Measures you will use to evaluate the success of each strategy.
5. Stakeholders impacted by this goal.
6. Methods used to gather data. Methods should be both qualitative and quantitative.

**APPENDIX I: Scoring Rubric**

**Scoring Rubrics**

This guide to the scoring rubrics provides Applicants with a tool to use in planning proposed work and ensuring alignment with the THECB’s priorities. This section covers two rubrics: (1) THECB’s rubric for screening applications; and (2) the Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) rubric for assessing finalists’ applications.

**Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board Rubric for Screening Applications**

This rubric will be used to determine whether applications are eligible for further consideration. Applications that do not have all the required documentation will be removed from the Applicant pool.

|  |
| --- |
| **Required Documentation** |
| Cover Sheet |
| Table of Contents |
| Transmittal Letter |
| Narrative |
| Proposed Budget (see Appendix D) |
| Completion Funding Calculation Worksheet (See Appendix F) |
| Developmental Education Program Survey (DEPS) Institutional Profile (with or without revisions) |
| Program Evaluation Plan (See Appendix G) |

**Rubric for Assessing Applications**

This rubric will be used by the SMEs to assess the quality of applications. Below Applicants can find descriptions for a low, medium and high rating for each of the criteria that are critical for a successful plan. In addition to the use of quantitative scores, reviewers will consider each proposal holistically and provide overall assessments of the proposals.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **High Score**  **(5-6 points)** | **Medium Score**  **(3-4 points)** | **Low Score**  **(1-2 points)** |
| **Qualities of the Application (42 points)** | | | |
| **Focused and aligned:** Clearly focuses on delivery of one or more corequisite models, as described in the RFA | Application clearly describes how work aligns with one or more of the corequisite models | Proposed work mostly aligns with the selected corequisite model(s) | Proposed work does not align with the selected corequisite model(s) |
| **Persuasive:**  Clearly explains causal link between proposed work and increases in success and completion | Application makes a persuasive case that the proposed work will have a significant impact on the institution’s ability to reach its achievement goals | Application makes a somewhat persuasive case that the proposed work will enhance the institution’s ability to reach its achievement goals | Application does not make a persuasive case that the proposed work will enable the institution to reach its achievement goals |
| **Strategic:**  Well‑developed, comprehensive and thoughtfully sequenced | Proposed work is well‑developed, comprehensive and carefully sequenced to reflect a strategy that will increase student success and college completion | Proposed work is developed to a satisfactory level, and is mostly complete | Proposed work is mostly programmatic and focuses on implementation without emphasis on strategy |
| **Evidence-based:**  Based on evidence of what has worked at the institution, in the state and in the field more generally, to date | Application clearly describes how proposed work reflects actions that are proven to effectively increase student success and college completion | Application is informed by, but not based upon, evidence of which actions are most effective | Application does not explain use of knowledge in the field |
| **Scalable:**  Can be enhanced, expanded, and replicated at other institutions | Proposed work lays a strong foundation for further work in these focus areas and can be effectively scaled within the institution and possibly statewide | Application describes how proposed work could enhance further work, but does not explain how proposed work will spur future work | Application does not detail ways in which proposed work can be expanded, replicated and/or scaled |
| **Ambitious and feasible:**  Application reflects plans to implement significant action to achieve success and completion goals, and benchmarks can be realistically achieved | Proposed work reflects ambitious goals, but is achievable with the proposed funding and timeline | Proposed work is somewhat ambitious and achievable OR proposed work is overly ambitious and only partially achievable | Proposed work is not ambitious or cannot be realistically completed with the proposed funding and timeline |
| **Budget** | Budget for the project is reasonable and cost effective; the purpose and explanation for the line items provides a strong connection to the proposed work | Budget for the project is reasonable and/or cost effective; the purpose and explanation for the line items provides a weak or marginal connection to the proposed work | Budget for the project is not reasonable and/or cost effective; application did not include a budget; the purpose and explanation for the line items does not support a connection to the proposed work |
| **Institutional Commitment (18 points)** | | | |
| **Proposed work incorporates evidence of Applicant’s ability to improve student success and college completion** | Proposed plan incorporates evidence of Applicant’s ability to improve student success and college completion | Proposed plan demonstrates evidence of Applicant’s prioritization of student success and college completion, but does not show success in improving outcomes | Proposed plan does not demonstrate evidence of Applicant’s prioritization or improvement of student success and college completion |
| **Demonstrated effort and commitment in the selected corequisite models(s)** | Proposed work builds on demonstrated effort and commitment in the corequisite models(s) | Applicant has engaged in ongoing work in the corequisite models(s), but proposed work is not aligned with existing work | Applicant has not worked in the corequisite models(s) |
| **Proposed work incorporates a clear Professional Developmental plan for corequisite model faculty (DE and College level)** | Proposed work incorporates a clearly defined Professional Development plan that will impact the implementation and/or scaling of corequisite models | Proposed work incorporates a Professional Development plan, but does not OR minimally describe(s) how it will impact the implementation and/or scaling of corequisite models | Proposed plan does not incorporate Professional Development for corequisite faculty |
| **Monitoring and Sustaining Impact (24 points)** | | | |
| **Assessing impact** | Application includes process for assessing which changes in student success are attributable to work implemented through the CRSM and modifying work to improve impact when necessary | Application includes incomplete plan to assess impact and modify work OR plan is not feasible | Application does not include a plan to assess impact and modify work |
| **Improved outcomes** | Application clearly demonstrates how proposed work will improve student outcomes and enhance student achievement | Application addresses how proposed work will improve student outcomes, but does not demonstrate a clear causal link | Application does not describe how proposed work will improve student outcomes |
| **Sustainability strategy** | Application includes a strategy that explains how the proposed work will continue to improve student success and college completion rates beyond the grant period | Proposed plan includes an incomplete strategy, or a strategy without high likelihood of success | Proposed plan does not include a sustainability strategy |
| **Project Evaluation Plan** | Goals address all areas and are ambitious and attainable, activities / strategies, expected outcomes, measures of success, and methods for collecting data are appropriately aligned and support achieving the goal | Goals address all areas, but are not ambitious and attainable OR activities/strategies expected outcomes measures of success, and/or methods for collecting data are not appropriately aligned or support achieving the goal | Goals do not address one or more areas; expected outcomes are not defined for both years OR activities/strategies, measures of success, or methods for collecting data are missing |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Overall**  **Assessment** | **High Score**  **(12-16 points)** | **Medium Score (6-11 points)** | **Low Score**  **(1-5 points)** |
| **Overall Assessment of the Application (16 points)** | | | |
| **Overall assessment of application (max. 16 points)** | Application is high quality, complete and makes a persuasive case that funding will have a significant impact on furthering the institution’s work to achieve success and completion goals | Application is of satisfactory quality, complete and will enable the institution to meet most of its success and completion goals | Application is low quality, incomplete and/or has little or no likelihood of enabling the institution to meet its success and completion goals |
| **TOTAL PROPOSAL SCORE** *(100 max. points)* | | | |