

2020 College Readiness and Success Models for 60x30TX (2020 CRSM)

	<u>Questions</u>	<u>Answers</u>
1	Can you please verify the date that the intent to apply is due?	An addendum to the original RFA was sent with an extended Intent to Apply date (March 18, 2020, COB) and additional corrected dates.
2	<p>To Whom It May Concern-I am a little confused regarding the multiple measures criteria. If we are scaling to 100% for Spring 2021 and are placing all students in a co-requisite based on math pathways, how do the following indicators play a role? We already at our institution utilize SI and online resources in our NCB course that is paired with the college level course. Any guidance would be appreciated. Thank you.</p> <p>For students not meeting the college readiness benchmark, Applicants will propose a Multiple Measures model using the following indicators, as outlined in the Applicant’s proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •3.2.2.1 High school GPA of at least 2.5 or 3.0 through at least end of junior year, self reported or verified through high school transcript •3.2.2.2 Four (4) years math, as reported on ApplyTX* or verified through high school transcript •3.2.2.3 Four (4) years English Language Arts (ELA), as reported on ApplyTX* or verified through high school transcript 3.2.3 <p>Use of supplemental instruction, technology-supported learning, and other non-course options, proposed by the Applicant, as the DE support component of corequisite models designed to help ensure successful completion of the college-level course.</p>	<p>The Multiple Measures (MM) model would apply only for students who meet the approved criteria you propose. Students who meet your approved proposed MM criteria would be considered college ready and would be able to enroll in any entry-level academic course without restriction. Students who don't meet your approved proposed MM criteria would still be considered underprepared and would then be placed in a corequisite model. An example of proposed MM criteria (for students who don't meet the college readiness benchmark on the TSIA2) could be a minimum 2.8 GPA, plus 4 years math and 4 years English. Students who meet these MM criteria would then be considered college ready. However, there will still be a number of students who don't meet these MM criteria; those students would then be placed in a corequisite model. More details will be provided in the mandatory Bidder's Webinar scheduled for March 24, 3-4 p.m. (Login information for the webinar will be emailed to your institution's point of contact no later than March 23, COB.)</p>
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Can institutions who still have unexpended completion funds from the CRSM-2018 grant apply for this grant? Are there any specific guidelines about being required to expend all CRSM-2018 completion funds before expending CRSM-2020 funds? Is it permissible to have both funds as long as we propose to use them for distinct purposes that don’t supplant each other? •What is the maximum dollar amount an applicant can request? •In section 2.2 on page 6, it suggests this is a one-year grant period but says applicants can receive “year three continuation funding.” Is it actually a two-year grant period? •In section 6.2.1 on pp. 11-12, are “Stipends for faculty coordination, planning, and implementation” included or not included in “Program staff salaries and fringe benefits” which are limited to 25% of the total budget? •In section 3.2.2 on page 7, do items 3.2.2.1 – 3.2.2.3 refer to “alternate indicators of college-readiness” that applicants can use to determine placement in developmental coursework? •There are a few conflicts between the dates on the cover page of the RFA and the text within the RFA sections. Are the dates on the cover page and in section 4 on pp. 6-7 the correct dates to abide by? 	<p>Yes. Each grant is considered separately. There are no minimum or maximum dollar amounts. Applicants are encouraged to propose a budget based on their proposed activities. THECB staff will negotiate final budgets with all awarded applicants. The grant period can extend for one additional year, beyond the grant period, pending approval. Stipends for faculty coordination, planning, and implementation are NOT included in Program staff salaries and fringe benefits, which are limited to 25% of the total budget. Alternate indicators for college readiness do not inform placement in developmental coursework since these students would be considered college ready. See Addendum for corrected dates.</p>
4	Is this funding opportunity for Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs) that currently meet the HB percentage or IHEs that do not yet meet the required percentages?	All Texas public institutions of higher education are eligible to apply, regardless of their status in meeting HB 2223 percentage requirements.

2020 College Readiness and Success Models for 60x30TX (2020 CRSM)

	<u>Questions</u>	<u>Answers</u>
5	<p>1. The wording from the RFA says: “The project director/co-director are responsible for implementing and overseeing the proposed project and shall be full-time educators...” Question: If awarded, do the project director and co-director need to be dedicated full time to the CRSM project?</p> <p>2. The wording from the RFA says: “Program staff salaries and fringe benefits are not to exceed 25% of total budget.” Question: Is that 25% of the grant award budget? Or is that 25% of the whole project budget (of which the grant is a part of)?</p> <p>3. The RFA refers to both a program director and a project director. Question: are those terms being used interchangeably for the same position? Or are those two different positions?</p> <p>4. The RFA requests applicants propose to do the following: “Use of supplemental instruction, technology-supported learning, and other non-course options, proposed by the Applicant, as the DE support component of corequisite models designed to help ensure successful completion of the college-level course.” Question: is the intention that the applicant will propose “Non-Course Competency-Based Developmental Education Interventions” (a term that is defined later in the RFA)? In other words, is the THECB’s intent that section 3.2.3 describes NCBOs? Please clarify.</p> <p>5. The RFA states: “The matching requirement may be waived for institutions serving low-income/disadvantaged students. A federal waiver from the Department of Education serves as documentation.” Question: If an institution has been designated by the Department of Education as an “eligible institution under Titles III and V of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended by the Higher Education Opportunity Act of 2008 (HEA)” (and has a letter from the Department of Education documenting that designation) would the matching requirement be waived?</p> <p>6. Question: If the answer to the above question is ‘no,’ please elaborate on (and /or give examples of) what documentation is acceptable to qualify for the waiving of the matching requirement.</p> <p>7. The RFA states: “Applicant may allocate up to five percent each year or 10% of the total grant award toward the salary for Program Director.” Question: What year does this refer to? Calendar year? State Fiscal Year? The IHE’s Fiscal Year? Other?</p> <p>8. Question: Do the letters of commitment count as attachments or do they count as part of the 7 page (max) narrative?</p>	<p>1. No, they do not need to be dedicated full-time; the applicant can determine the amount of time dedicated to the CRSM project. 2. The 25% criteria applies to the total amount of the applicant's proposed budget. 3. These are two positions. We want to ensure the least interruption in case the project director or co-director leaves the project for unforeseen reasons. 4. While NCBOs provide the most flexibility, an institution may propose another innovative and successful option that they would like to scale. 5. Yes. 6. (see #5) 7. The year begins with the date of the signed, executed contract and extends 12 months from that date. 8. Letters of commitment count as attachments, not part of the narrative.</p>

2020 College Readiness and Success Models for 60x30TX (2020 CRSM)

	<u>Questions</u>	<u>Answers</u>
6	<p>9. The RFA states: "Matching funds can include funds for ... administrative costs..." Question: Which budget line on the application's budget form can applicants indicate administrative costs for the project?</p> <p>10. The RFA states: "by spring 2021: ... One hundred (100) percent of eligible students enroll in corequisite models in both subject areas of mathematics and English Language Arts Reading (ELAR)" Question: Is the intent that 100% of eligible students are enrolled in those classes in spring 2021? Or that 100% are enrolled by spring 2021 for the following semester (summer 2021).</p> <p>11. The RFA states: "High school GPA of at least 2.5 or 3.0 through at least end of junior year, self-reported or verified through high school transcript." Question: Does the applicant need to propose which GPA it would be (2.5 or 3.0)? (Please clarify the need for a range of GPAs as the baseline).</p> <p>12. The RFA states: "Applicant may allocate up to five percent each year or 10% of the total grant award toward the salary for Program Director." Question: Is there any such restriction on the amount of grant award for the salary of the co-Project Director?</p> <p>13. The RFA states: "Applicants will propose a Multiple Measures model using the following indicators, as outlined in the Applicant's proposal..." and what follows is a series of elements that include a choice between 'X' or 'Y.' Question: Does the THECB intend that applicants will propose both elements in each section? (ex: as reported on ApplyTX AND/or verified...) or do applicants have a choice which of the two they will propose as part of the model (ex: ApplyTX or verified...)?</p> <p>14. The RFA states: "Matching funds can include funds for ...support staff." Question: Can matching funds be allocated from the Director or Co-Director's time?</p>	<p>9. Line item 10.6.5. 10. It is expected that 100% of eligible students be enrolled in spring 2021 for both subject areas. 11. Yes, the institution may propose the GPA it would like to use for its Multiple Measures (MM) model. The proposed GPA should be based on local, state, or national research. 12. The co-director's salary should meet the same limitations as the Program Director. 13. Some institutions do not have capacity to receive official high school transcripts, in which case they may use the ApplyTX self-reported high school GPA. It is not expected that applicants propose to use both verified (i.e., official transcripts) and self-reported (i.e., via ApplyTX). 14. Yes.</p>
7	I just received a copy of the RFA for CRSM-2020 from our VP and would like to submit an Intent to Apply notice. I am currently administering CRSM-2018 and would like the chance to continue my work. Is it possible that an exception can be made to allow a late entry? Thank you very much! :)	The Intent to Apply deadline was extended from March 13 to March 18, 2020. THECB cannot accept additional Intents beyond March 18, 2020.
8	<p>My question is regarding the institutional profile, based on the 2019 Developmental Education Program Survey (DEPS).</p> <p>First, am I correct I do not need to submit any of this information with the Intent to Apply? Second, is this survey/report submitted by a THECB portal? As the Pre-Award Specialist, I do not have access to this information. What do I need to do to be able to verify and upload any changes to our institutions profile?</p>	You do not need to submit your institution's DEPS with the Intent to Apply. We will email a copy of each institution's DEPS to the applicant's point of contact on or before March 30. The DEPS will not be submitted via a special portal. If there are changes to the DEPS, we expect the changes to be made on the DEPS form and submitted as part of the application. If there are no changes to the DEPS, simply send the original DEPS with the application.
9	I'm looking through the RFA for this one (#781-20-22918), and I noticed that according to the cover page, the Webinar is 3 p.m., March 24, 2020. Page 8 says that the webinar is scheduled for that time on Wednesday, March 24, 2020. March 24 is a Tuesday. Is the webinar on Tuesday, March 24 or Wednesday, March 25? I'm thinking that it's scheduled for Tuesday, March 24, but wanted to confirm for scheduling the appropriate people.	The webinar is Tuesday, March 24, 3-4 p.m. We will email login information to each applicant's point of contact on or before Monday, March 23, COB.
10	By what date does the applicant have to fully implement the following ? (as per Section 3.2.1) One hundred (100) percent of eligible students enrolled in corequisite models in both subject areas of mathematics and English Language Arts Reading (ELAR).	We expect the awarded institution to enroll 100% of eligible students in a corequisite model for both subject areas (math and ELAR) for the spring 2021 semester and later.

2020 College Readiness and Success Models for 60x30TX (2020 CRSM)

<u>Questions</u>	<u>Answers</u>
<p>11 If there is a possibility for the extension of the deadline considering planning at institutions at higher ed due to the impending concerns with the Corona Virus.</p>	<p>At this time, we do not anticipate changing the due date. Extending the due date means decreasing planning time for awarded applicants, and we want to ensure awarded applicants are provided maximum planning time to help ensure deliverables are met. <i>Please note this determination may change as more information becomes available. We will notify applicants immediately if any changes are made.</i></p>
<p>12 Can we submit 2 separate attachments for the 1. budget and 2. The Work Plan in addition to the Narrative Document? Or does the entire package have to be all together in one package such as in Word or Adobe?</p>	<p>You may submit 2 separate attachments for the budget and Work Plan in addition to the narrative.</p>
<p>13 Hoping this deadline was extended due to COVID-19 activities this week?</p>	<p>Please see question 11.</p>
<p>14 CRSM-2020 requires a 10% match, which may be waived for institutions serving low-income/disadvantaged students. Our Institution carries this designation through July 1, 2020. So while we could submit as an eligible institution with our application, and we would be at the beginning of the grant period, which starts in April, we would not be throughout the whole grant period. My question is: can the 10% match be waived considering our institutions status?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>
<p>15 Many colleges are closed for extended spring breaks as a precautionary measure to contain COVID 19. This is interrupting work and study schedules throughout the state. Would THECB consider extending the deadline for College Readiness and Success Models by 10-14 days?</p>	<p>Please see question 11.</p>
<p>16 Please advise if the deadline to submit the Intent to Apply has been extended beyond 18 March 2020. Thank you.</p>	<p>With regard to the Intent to Apply, there will not be another extension beyond the March 18 deadline.</p>
<p>17 I wanted to find out when we may be receiving the Institutional Profile information mentioned in the RFA</p>	<p>Applicants that submitted an Intent to Apply will receive their Developmental Education Program Survey (DEPS) institutional on or before March 30, 2020.</p>

2020 College Readiness and Success Models for 60x30TX (2020 CRSM)

	<u>Answers</u>
<p align="center"><u>Questions</u></p> <p>18 How should applicants address the problem of GPA scales when using 3.2.2.1 as a measure for college readiness...? Are we restricted to the 2.5-3.0 range stated in 3.2.2.1? For schools that don't use a 4.0 scale, can we deviate from that range and use an adjusted GPA equivalent to a 3.0/4.0? (For instance, a 3.0/4.0 is much different than a 3.0/8.0. It would need to be set at 6.0/8.0) What about students who transferred from one high school to another between junior and senior year and possibly lack the transcript from their first high school—can we use their senior-year GPA only? Also, since self-reported GPA is only collected on the ApplyTexas for four-year institutions, and some home school and private high schools don't even list GPAs on transcripts, as a college we have some students with no high school GPA on record. Would we still have to propose a GPA-related measure per 3.2.2.1?</p> <p>In reference to RFA section 3.2.2, are both of these acceptable ways to propose a Multiple Measures model? Using math as an example: (a) Student must have a GPA of 3.0 AND 4 years of math to be deemed college ready. (b) Student must have a GPA of 3.0 OR 4 years of math to be deemed college ready. In other words, are we free to use either/or, or are applicants supposed to use a combination of the criteria as a measure?</p> <p>In reference to section 3.2.1 and 3.2.3, if our current corequisite model includes a credit course + a DE course, can we continue with the model in this way? Or is 3.2.3 saying we must eliminate DE courses and use only non-course options as our DE support component? Or does 3.2.3 work with 3.2.1 by saying we just need to use non-course DE options in at least one subject area / DE level / etc.?</p> <p>In regards to the data collection and reporting discussed in the webinar on 3/24, will grantees be required to report on both the corequisite-enrolled students AND the Multiple Measures students who don't have to take DE? Does THECB expect applicants to include outcomes and measures for both groups of students in our Evaluation Plan?</p>	<p><u>1.</u> The GPA ranges outline in the RFA are recommendations based on current research. However, as noted in the Bidder's Webinar, we want to provide ample flexibility for Applicants to propose any GPA and/or range(s) it would like to test, especially one(s) that have basis in research. With regard to the various scales, we agree that adjusting the GPA to a 4.0 scale is a viable option. We don't, however, recommend using GPA from only the senior year (or just one year) and instead would agree in those circumstances that the GPA be self-reported. We recommend reviewing the literature on self-reported vs. verified (via transcripts) GPA. If an applicant would rather not allow self-reported GPAs, use of other indicators is allowable. Keep in mind that your proposal should be based in current research/studies and be something that can inform possible changes in statewide TSI policy. <u>2.</u> Yes, both are acceptable ways to propose a MM model; either/or or a combination of the criteria are acceptable. <u>3.</u> Yes, Applicants can continue to use a corequisite model that includes a DE course as its support component. We recommend, however, that Applicants consider moving to an NCBO as the support component because of the flexibility for faculty to make adjustments during the semester, based on students' performance as indicated by assessments and other assignments in the college-level course. <u>4.</u> Awarded applicants will be expected to report on the performance of its students in both corequisite models and those in the MM study. These outcomes will play a very important role in informing possible considerations for future changes to TSI. THECB will provide support to ensure the reporting component is as streamlined as possible.</p>
<p>19 Thank you At the webinar yesterday afternoon, it was agreed upon that the deadline to apply would be extended from April 13 to May 4. Will the deadline to submit questions about the grant be extended from April 1 to a later date as well?</p>	<p>Yes, the inquiry deadline will be extended to April 13, 2020.</p>
<p>20 I was not able to view the mandatory bidders webinar, unfortunately with all the changes in workspace and equipment I was not able to establish a connection using my computer. Does this mean we can no longer try to apply?</p>	<p>No, you are still eligible to apply provided you request the link to the webinar by emailing CRI@theccb.state.tx.us and review the webinar.</p>
<p>21 Due to circumstances beyond our control, we were not able to attend this webinar yesterday. Is there a recording or notes we can review in hindsight?</p>	<p>Please see the question above (#20)</p>
<p>22 I am needing to confirm if the April 24 webinar was held? Will there be a repeat webinar?</p>	<p>No, the webinar is posted on the THECB's YouTube page at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FGc-1TkGDBU.</p>

2020 College Readiness and Success Models for 60x30TX (2020 CRSM)

	<u>Questions</u>		<u>Answers</u>
23	I attended the webinar and was curious if the PPT was going to be emailed out to participants or posted on the website, along with the update to the due date.		The PPT is only available by accessing the webinar recording. Please see question #22 for the link to the recording.
24	Has the webinar been posted online anywhere yet?		Please see question #22.
25	<p>1.How long is the grant period? One or two years?</p> <p>RFA Section 2.2 Grant Period states the grant period will conclude on August 31, 2021 which suggests the grant period is one year. However, the following sentence states “If funding permits, Awarded Applicants may receive year three continuation funding.” This suggests the grant period is two years and the grant period will conclude on August 31, 2022. Year three of continuation of funding would conclude August 31, 2023.</p> <p>2.Can you please define Total Projected Funding (Appendix E)? Is it the sum of Total All Program Costs and Cost Sharing for Applicant?</p>		<p>1. The grant period will be begin upon execution and will conclude August 31, 2021. The next line should read, " If funding permits, Awarded Applicants may receive year three [not year two] continuation funding.</p> <p>2. The Total Projected Funding line item in Appendix E template does not apply to this solicitation. It should be left blank.</p>
26	<p>In the CRSM-2020 RFA, it seems to be missing critical information under Section 10. On pages 17-18, the RFA delineates information for Sections 10.1, 10.2, and 10.3. However, page 11 of the RFA refers to Section 10.5 and page 3 of the FAQs document refers to line item 10.6.5.</p> <p>Am I overlooking something?</p>		The table of contents is an accurate reflection of the contents of this RFP, including the subsections of section 10, which includes 10.1, 10.2, and 10.3. The reference to line item 10.6.5 is to the budget in Appendix E, not to a section in the RFP.
27	<p>In the RFA, Appendix G (p. 44) lists the following as required documentation: •Program Evaluation Plan (see Appendix G) However, the Program Evaluation Plan is Appendix F on page 43.</p> <p>Also listed as required documentation in Appendix G (p. 44) is: •Completion Funding Calculation Worksheet (see Appendix F) However, the Program Evaluation Plan is Appendix F on page 43, and the Completion Funding Calculation Worksheet is nowhere to be found.</p> <p>This is very confusing, so please clarify these discrepancies, as these appendices are required documents.</p>		The table of contents is an accurate reflection of the contents of this RFP. The program evaluation plan is Appendix F. The completion funding calculation worksheet (referenced in the narrative as Appendix G), generally applicable to CRSM grants, is <i>not</i> applicable to this specific grant solicitation and is not required.
28	<p>What is the transmittal letter?</p> <p>I also wanted to follow up on the previous question I had earlier. So the levels 1-6 is for any student who does not score above the 350 on the TSI exam, correct? Is 1 a high score and 6 the low score or do I have those backwards? Is there anything else that is considered in order to give a student their level ranking?</p>		<p>1. The transmittal letter, generally required for grant applications, is no longer required under new RFP template requirements, including for this solicitation. The certification page has replaced the transmittal</p> <p>.2. A student who does not meet the college readiness benchmark (e.g., 350 in math) will be directed to one of two diagnostics: the DE diagnostic, which automatically means levels 5-6; and the ABE diagnostic, which will provide a level 1-6 test result. The range starts at level 1, roughly equivalent to grades 1-3 knowledge and skill levels, to Level 6, roughly equivalent to grade 11-2 knowledge and skill levels. Skill levels 1-6 are based strictly on students' performance on the diagnostic tests.</p>

2020 College Readiness and Success Models for 60x30TX (2020 CRSM)

	<u>Questions</u>	<u>Answers</u>
29	<p>1. Section 8.3 of the RFA says we need a project goal statement and then objectives and outcomes. The project evaluation template in Appendix F has a column where we can list multiple goals, but no column for objectives. So do we propose just one goal or multiple? Do we have to use the format in Appendix F when presenting our goals, objectives, and outcomes, or can we modify it so long as we meet all the requirements of Section 8 (and 7)?</p> <p>2. When responding to section 8.5, Budget, do we have to use the template that is in Appendix E?</p> <p>3. I believe it was stated in the webinar that the maximum amount applicants can request is \$100,000. Can you verify in writing whether that is correct?</p> <p>4. Just to make sure, the areas of MATH and ELAR can propose different sets of Multiple Measures criteria right? (E.g., one might use GPA + HS courses, while the other might use GPA only)</p> <p>5. Section 6.2.1 says instructional materials are allowable. Can applicants purchase class sets of materials for students that would belong to the institution but be used by the co-requisite students?</p>	<p>1. We ask applicants to use Appendix F as a guideline to address the requirements of Sections 7 and 8. 2. The Budget template (Appendix E) is required when responding to Section 8.5. 3. We anticipate awarding up to \$100,000 for each selected applicant for this solicitation. However, this expectation may change, depending on the number of applications received. We recommend that applicants propose a budget that would address all the components of the applicant's activities, but be aware that final budgets may be subject to negotiation for the awarded applications. 4. Yes. 5. Yes.</p>
30	<p>In preparing the information for the CRSM grant, a question came up regarding the 100% participation in the Co-Requisite Program. When we listened to the bidder's webinar, it seemed as though this meant that 100% of the students that qualify for our co-requisite program are enrolled. Would you please clarify if this is a correct understanding or if it should be 100% of students that are not TSI complete, must be enrolled in a co-requisite program?</p>	<p>The 100% requirement is based on the language of HB 2223, which requires a certain percentage of students enrolled in developmental education to be enrolled in a corequisite model. For this solicitation, 100% of your students enrolled in developmental education must be enrolled in a corequisite model. Note that this percentage most likely will not be applicable to all of your students who are not TSI complete, as some of those students, for various reasons, may not be enrolled in DE for a semester or may not be enrolled in DE for all of the subject areas where the student is not TSI complete.</p>
31	<p>According to the bidder's webinar, the application date was unofficially changed to May 4th. I looked on the website, but do not see any new information. I am writing to make sure the new application date is official?</p>	<p>Yes, the official new due date is May 4, 2020, 3 p.m. (CT). Addendum 2 reflecting this new due date has been posted to THECB's Institutional Grant Opportunities page. All applications received by the May 4th due date will be accepted.</p>
32	<p>We have not received the DEPS survey that was to be sent out March 30th. Has that been sent out?</p>	<p>Yes, the DEPS survey was emailed on March 30th to the point of contact listed in your Intent to Apply. If you still have not received your DEPS, please email CRI@theccb.state.tx.us and request that your DEPS be emailed. Please include your institution name.</p>
33	<p>1. The appendices in the RFA do not match application screening rubric. In particular, there is no "completion funding calculation worksheet". How can this be provided?</p> <p>2. Is the "transmittal letter" the same as the "certification page"?</p>	<p>1. The table of contents is an accurate reflection of the contents of this RFP. Please see #27 above. 2. Yes.</p>

2020 College Readiness and Success Models for 60x30TX (2020 CRSM)

	<u>Questions</u>	<u>Answers</u>
34	<p>1.We are unclear on the definition of “eligible student” as explained in section 3.2.1 of the RFA and the mandatory bidder’s webinar. Does “eligible student” refer exactly to the HB 2223 population as calculated in the reporting methodology? If not, we have the following questions:</p> <p>a.Are previously reported ABE 1-4 students going to be considered "eligible students" as well, like they are for the HB 2223 denominator?</p> <p>b.If a particular student (with low GPA and other factors) who has ABE > 4 is placed in a DE course with a BASE NCBO, can they be excluded from the calculation for the 100% participation requirement, or must they be enrolled in a corequisite model for this project?</p> <p>2.In preparing to propose our Multiple Measures Model, we would like to know: will be responsible to gather, track and report participants' student success data in all freshman-level TSI-liable courses or just in their entry-level math and English courses?</p> <p>3.The budget template lists costs for supplemental instructors and tutors under direct costs. Our institution budget folks categorize those expenses with other staff and salaries, so this is confusing. This is also different that on other THECB grant applications in the past.</p> <p>a.Do you really want those expenses in the direct cost category? and if so,</p> <p>b.Will you want the commensurate fringe costs associated with supplemental instructors and tutors parsed out and included in the direct cost category also instead of with the other salary fringe costs?</p> <p>c.Section 6.2.1 Allowable Cost Categories refers to Section 10.5 for instructions for specific budget categories, but there is no section 10.5 in the RFA.</p>	<p>1. Yes, the "eligible student" is based on the same HB 2223 population as calculated in the methodology document. 2. The reporting requirement is limited to the courses that are part of the corequisite model(s) included in your proposal. For example, if your corequisite models focuses only on math and English courses, then tracking and reporting is limited to those courses. 3. Your institution may address costs for supplemental instructors and tutors, including fringe costs, under direct costs or as part of other staff and salaries, whichever aligns best with your institution's budget processes. Allowable Cost Categories are addressed in Section 6.2.1.</p>
35	<p>1)Should the total project period reflected in the budget be 2 years, for a total of \$50-\$75K across both of those years?</p> <p>2)Do we have to have a Director and Co-Director, or are Co-Directors (1 for English and 1 for Math) acceptable?</p> <p>3)Cost share/match exemption: We are a Department of Education Title III, Part A Grant Recipient and a qualified for a low-income/disadvantaged Cost Share Waiver in 2015. As a Title III Grant awardee, we are exempt from federally required cost share requirements and not obligated to submit for a waiver during the grant contract period. Is this sufficient for a waiver of the cost share/match requirement, and what documentation would we need to provide with the application, re: this?</p> <p>4)Completion Funding Worksheet: This is referred to in the Scoring Rubric Appendix, but is not included in the RFA as an Appendix and there is no related line in the Budget template. Is this a required piece of the application? Could you please provide the worksheet, if it is a required part?</p> <p>5)Multiple Measures: How should we deal with the current suspension of assessment testing?</p> <p>6)Multiple Measures: Do the criteria for Math and English need to be the same?</p>	<p>1. The total project period reflect in the budget should be for 2 years. 2. Co-Directors are acceptable. 3. Section 6.1 (last paragraph) addresses the waiver documentation. 4. The Completion Funding Worksheet (Appendix F), generally a requirement for CRSM grants, is not applicable for this solicitation and is not required 5. TSIA testing is available immediately via Video Chat Web Services (e.g., WebEx, GoToMeeting, Zoom, etc) and available via Examity and Proctor U remote proctoring services on April 17 and May 1, respectively. Your TSIA test administrator can access the training video and other informational documents in the TSIA test platform at the RESOURCE TAB. However, your proposed Multiple Measures model may include a version that includes indicators other than the TSIA for students who have no access to TSIA testing under TSI Rule 4.55, "exceptional circumstance" clause. Please review the THECB's FAQs for additional considerations (see http://www.thecb.state.tx.us/misc/coronavirus-update-for-higher-education/frequently-asked-questions/). 6. No.</p>