

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/06/2022 03:22 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Coppin State University (S336S220012)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	30
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Adequacy of Resources	30	30
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	20
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Educator Diversity	4	4
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. Diverse Workforce	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
1. Meeting Student Needs	2	2
Competitive Preference Priority 4		
1. Promoting Equity	2	2
Invitational Priority		
Invitational Priority		
1. Grow Your Own	0	0
Total	111	111

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Panel - 1: 84.336S

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Coppin State University (S336S220012)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. A. Quality of the Project Design (30 points)

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

- (i) The extent to which the proposed project demonstrates a rationale.
- (ii) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.
- (iii) The extent to which the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students.
- (iv) The extent to which the design of the proposed project reflects up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.
- (v) The extent to which performance feedback and continuous improvement are integral to the design of the proposed project.
- (vi) The extent to which the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance.

Strengths:

- (i) Project activities are rooted in research and demonstrate a rationale for reducing educational gaps by providing pathways to increase diversity. For example, 50% of students in the area are Black or Latino, but only 20% of teachers are from those backgrounds (pg. e31). This demonstrates significant need as data has shown considerable positive impacts from having teachers of color. The logic model (pg. e24) aligns with the rationale by emphasizing the need for multiple pathways to professions for diverse teachers. In addition, the narrative includes a well-designed system design (pg. e26) that demonstrates how all components interact to lead to teacher diversity and student success.
- (ii) Project goals, objectives, and outcomes are clearly specified and measurable. Specifically, three goals are outlined along with six objectives. Each goal is centered around connectedness, specifically connecting ecosystems for capacity and linkage building; connected learning for career readiness; and connected pathways for career advancement. Specific benchmarks and measures are indicated for each objective.
- (iii) The proposed project builds upon national and local efforts to make education more inclusive while building teacher capacity. For example, the project aligns with the state's Blueprint for Maryland's Future Act (pg. e32), specifically policy area 2 related to High Quality and Diverse Teachers and Leaders. The program is well designed as it builds regional capacity to prepare and retain diverse teachers and supports rigorous learning via MicroCredential and MicroResidencies (pg. e40).
- (iv) The project design is appropriately supported by research that demonstrates interventions are effective. (pg. e45-46) The project design is informed by five recommendations from various studies. For example, all project objectives within Goal 1 are based on research related to the connection of educational and employment ecosystems. Several research studies are cited. It is evident that extensive research has been conducted and project activities are based on internal research through current TQP grants at the institution (MicroCredentials and MicroResidencies) (pg. e46).
- (v) Performance feedback and continuous improvement are key components of the project. The applicant comprehensively addresses this by providing information on reporting and dissemination procedures (pg. e 47). Four

committees will aid in assessing project operations and the accomplishment of objectives (P2P Advisory Board, Inclusive Services Committee, MicroCredential Committee, and MicroResidency Committee). The applicant will involve the entire project community by providing annual leadership academic opportunities to provide feedback about project outcomes, lessons learned, and identify best practices (pg. e48).

(vi) The project's ability to build capacity and yield results beyond the conclusion of federal funding is well documented and supported by evidence-based strategies. For example, the applicant identifies several strategies such as Connected Ecosystems, Connected Learning for Career Readiness, and Connected Pathways for Career Advancement. Institutionalization efforts are noted related to the MicroCredentials and MicroResidencies.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 30

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. B. Quality of the Project Evaluation (20 points)

The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (i) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes.**
- (ii) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.**

Strengths:

- (i) The evaluation plan is comprehensive and inclusive of multiple methods to evaluate progress. It is based on the Improvement Sciences model from the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching among other strategies (pg. e35). To ensure valid and reliable performance data is collected, qualitative and quantitative data will be utilized to assess efficacy over time.
- (ii) Evaluation methods are thorough, allowing for internal and external feedback about progress. For example, a formative Descriptive Study will be conducted by an external evaluator (REA) that includes bi-annual perceptual studies (pg.e50). Other methods of evaluation include descriptive studies related to content and construct analysis of model development, implementation models, and GPRA measures. In all aspects, the evaluation plan assesses every facet of the project. The plan's collection processes and timelines (pgs. e55-56) are well articulated and feasible to answer research and evaluation questions (pg53).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

1. C. Adequacy of Resources (30 points)

The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources for the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (i) The adequacy of support, including facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources, from the applicant organization or the lead applicant organization.
- (ii) The extent to which the budget is adequate to support the proposed project.
- (iii) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.
- (iv) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates that it has the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the grant, including a multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan; the demonstrated commitment of any partners; evidence of broad support from stakeholders (e.g., SEAs, teachers' unions) critical to the project's long-term success; or more than one of these types of evidence.
- (v) The relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project.

Strengths:

- (i) The applicant institution, Coppin State University, provides considerable support for the project in the form of physical resources and other in-kind contributions. For example, the applicant will provide access to campus facilities, including instructional, laboratory, technology and meeting facilities (pg. e57). Other in-kind resources consist of instructional support, time committed to the project and other resources such as Learning Management Systems. (pg. e206-208).
- (ii) The budget is adequate to support project activities and includes the proper expenses to implement a project of this scope. These include salary and benefit costs for personnel, travel, supplies, contractual expenses, and training stipends (pg. e191). Costs are also reflective of investments in operational capacity related to Goals 2 and 3 (pg. e58)
- (iii) Proposed costs are reasonable given the project's use of co-design, co-implementation, and co-evaluation strategies. For example, costs are shared related to instructional materials, facilities, and technology support (pg. e59)
- (iv) Detail is provided related to sustainability with the applicant indicating success in securing grant funds and collaborative efforts to seek sustained funding (pg. e60). Letters of support from partners demonstrate significant investment as indicated by 100% matching funds.
- (v) The applicant demonstrates strong partner commitments that will aid in the institutionalization of project elements such as teacher-leader career ladders (pg.e60). The partnering institutions and LEAs are committed to sharing expertise and resources to support academic and community development.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 30

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. D. Quality of the Management Plan (20 points)

The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers

the following factors:

- (i) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.
- (ii) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

Strengths:

(i) The project management plan will rely heavily on prior experience in implementing other US Department of Education grants including TQP and CEEBT (pg. e63) to guide them in managing this project. Roles and responsibilities are clearly defined for procedures related to evaluation and general oversight. Project personnel are highly qualified as demonstrated by their expertise related to MicroCredentials, MicroResidencies, and education (pg. e63). A timeline is presented that outlines milestones for completion via the logic model (pgs. e61-62). In addition, a timeline is presented within the appendix (pg. e181-184) that indicates personnel responsibilities and the timeframes for accomplishment.

(ii) Feedback will be assured via quarterly Advisory Board meetings, bi-weekly Inclusive Services Committee meetings, and monthly committee meetings (MicroCredentials and MicroResidencies) (pgs. e64-65). Meetings will include opportunities to discuss progress and determine if modifications are needed.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. Increasing Educator Diversity (Up to 4 points).

Under this priority, applicants must develop projects that are designed to improve the recruitment, outreach, preparation, support, development, and retention of a diverse educator workforce through adopting, implementing, or expanding one or both of the following:

- a) **High-quality, comprehensive teacher preparation programs in Historically Black Colleges and Universities (eligible institutions under Part B of Title III and Subpart 4 of Part A Title VII of the HEA), Hispanic Serving Institutions (eligible institutions under section 316 of the HEA), or other Minority Serving Institutions (eligible institutions under Title III and Title V of the HEA) that include one year of high-quality clinical experiences)prior to becoming the teacher of record) in high-need schools (as defined in this notice) and that incorporate best practices for attracting, supporting, graduating, and placing underrepresented teacher candidates.**
- b) **Reforms to teacher preparation programs to improve the diversity of teacher candidates, including changes to ensure underrepresented teacher candidates are fully represented in program admission, completion, placement, and retention as educators.**

Strengths:

The applicant meets the competitive priority by presenting a high-quality program to increase access for aspiring teachers of color.

(a) Given their designation as an HBCU, the applicant has a large target population and key expertise in the preparation of teachers of color. This will be accomplished by providing multiple Pathways to Professions (pg. e20) that include clinical experiences.

(b) MicroCredentials and MicroResidencies will provide candidates with opportunities to learn core teaching competencies and engage in hands-on opportunities to improve teaching effectiveness. Other methods related to recruitment and retention include Inclusive Services and Networked Improvement Communities (pgs. e20--21).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 4

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 2

1. Supporting a Diverse Educator Workforce and Professional Growth to Strengthen Student Learning (Up to 3 points).

Projects that are designed to increase the proportion of well-prepared, diverse, and effective educator serving students, with a focus on underserved students, through increasing the number of teachers with certification or dual certification in a shortage area, or advanced certifications from nationally recognized professional organizations.

Strengths:

The applicant has a strong plan to assure that the project will result in a significant increase of prepared teachers who are prepared to teach underserved students. A strength of the plan is that it is in alignment with state/regional goals (pg. e21). Partnerships are located in areas that critically need teachers of color. It is anticipated that 100% of participants will be placed in high-need areas and 80% will receive the necessary certification in a critical shortage area within one year of program completion. (pg. e22)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 3

1. Meeting Student Social Emotional, and Academic Needs (Up to 2 points).

Projects that are designed to improve students' social, emotional, academic, and career development, with a focus on underserved students, through creating a positive, inclusive, and identity-safe climate at institutions of higher education, through one or more of the following activities:

- a) **Fostering a sense of belonging and inclusion for underserved students.**
- b) **Implementing evidence-based practices for advancing student success for underserved students.**

Strengths:

(a)The proposed project strongly addresses the improvement of students' social, emotional, academic, and career development by providing specialized services such as advising and mentoring (pg. e22). These advisors and mentors will provide stop-gap resources to aid in recruitment and preparation. Mentors will provide academic and non-academic

support as well as career advancement.

(b) To address supporting the social, emotional, and academic needs of P-12 students, the applicant will provide MicroCredentials and MicroResidencies to advance underserved students. Interventions will include strategies in supporting social-emotional needs; cultivating diversity and growth mindset; and engaging in culturally responsive practices.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 2

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 4

1. Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities (Up to 2 points).

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that the applicant proposes a project designed to promote educational equity and adequacy in resources and opportunity for underserved students.

a) In one or more of the following educational settings:

- (1) Early learning programs**
- (2) Elementary school.**
- (3) Middle school**
- (4) High school**
- (5) Career and technical education programs.**
- (6) Out-of-school-time settings.**
- (7) Alternative schools and programs.**

b) That examines the sources of inequity and inadequacy and implement responses, and that may include pedagogical practices in educator preparational programs and professional development programs that are inclusive with regard to race, ethnicity, culture, language, and disability status so that educators are better prepared to create inclusive, supportive, equitable, unbiased, and identity-safe learning environments for their students.

Strengths:

(a) The project will promote educational equity and adequacy in the P-12 environment in high-need communities. The project's goals and objectives support enhancing teacher effectiveness and student engagement (pg. e28).

(b) Specific strategies will allow aspiring teachers who may not have equitable opportunities prepare to teach in diverse schools; provide professional development in a networked improvement community that supports diversity and inclusion; provide high-need LEAS with resources to recruit and retain highly effective and diverse teachers; and provide students of those schools with access to high-quality instruction.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 2

Invitational Priority - Invitational Priority

1. Partnership Grants for the Establishment of Grow Your Own Programs

Projects that establish Grow Your Own programs that are designed to address shortages of teachers in high-need areas, schools, and/or geographic areas, or shortages of school leaders in high-need schools, and increase the diversity of qualified individuals entering the teacher, principal, or other school leader workforce.

Strengths:

Not applicable.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not address the Invitational Priority.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/06/2022 03:22 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/07/2022 11:30 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Coppin State University (S336S220012)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	30
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Adequacy of Resources	30	30
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	20
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Educator Diversity	4	4
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. Diverse Workforce	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
1. Meeting Student Needs	2	2
Competitive Preference Priority 4		
1. Promoting Equity	2	2
Invitational Priority		
Invitational Priority		
1. Grow Your Own	0	0
Total	111	111

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Panel - 1: 84.336S

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Coppin State University (S336S220012)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. A. Quality of the Project Design (30 points)

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

- (i) The extent to which the proposed project demonstrates a rationale.
- (ii) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.
- (iii) The extent to which the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students.
- (iv) The extent to which the design of the proposed project reflects up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.
- (v) The extent to which performance feedback and continuous improvement are integral to the design of the proposed project.
- (vi) The extent to which the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance.

Strengths:

(i) The narrative is extensive to support a rationale for the projects. For example, the applicant cites multiple sources of data that provides a explanation for targeting its program to both rural schools and a high need urban school district. For example, one school district is one of the largest urban school systems in the state, serving 77,856 students from grades K-12, with 80.6% attendance rates, and 69.20% graduation rates in 2021 (page e33). For all three target school districts, the applicant identifies at least 2 free and reduced-meal schools with percentages of 80% or higher (pages e82/Appendix B). A logic model is provided with a visual depiction of input, outputs and outcomes. For example, the applicant will provide micro-credentialing to address professional development needs in the target districts. The applicant will use its institutional committee (input) to evaluate and offer courses to teachers (activities/outputs) to affect long-term outcomes such as increased level of teaching effectiveness in four competency areas (pages e84-e86).

(ii) The narrative sufficiently details the goals, objectives and activities that support three goals of the project. These are: Connected Ecosystems that will build systemic capacities and linkages through strategic partnership among IHEs and LEAs serving high-need communities; Connected Learning for Career Readiness which will increase the rigor of teacher preparation and accelerate the diversity of teacher supply in critical shortage areas; and the Connected Pathways for Career Advancement which aims to elevate the teaching professions with career ladders to improve teaching effectiveness and increase retention (page e32). Short-term, mid-term, and long-term goals are effectively described for each objective that supports the goal. For example, the short-term goals of using micro-credentialing for career readiness is to implement programs in the four core areas: (a) Diversity and Growth Mindset, (b) Universal Design for Learning, (c) Differentiated Instruction, and (d) Culturally Responsive Practices (page e36). Eventually such courses will be institutionalized within the institutions of higher education.

(iii) The applicant provides a nearly detailed narrative to encompass activities to build teaching and learning and student success (pages e28-e44) by describing in detail the activities that support the objectives within the project design. The applicant combines both classroom training experiences (micro-credentialing) and residencies to present an effective model for increasing skills of teachers while they also work with students. For example, the applicant conducts a College Readiness Academies and Career Success Seminars for individuals in teacher educator programs. For field-based

experiences, the applicant provides micro-residencies are designed to (a) enable field-based observations of teaching and learning in diverse school settings, and (b) demand evidence-based demonstration of culturally responsive practices that support diverse learning needs (page e42).

(iv) The narrative is well-defined for reflecting up-to-date research and effective practice to support the project design (pages e42, e45-e46). For example, the applicant cites its use of micro-credentialing in previous and current programs as recognized by the US Department of Education (page e42). Specifically, research is cited throughout the narrative that supports the project design (Appendix J). As an example, the "Inclusive Services" activity under Goal 1 is informed by the framework of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (World Economic Forum, 2020), new approaches to student services (New, 2020), and promising practices on diversifying educator workforce (New England Secondary School Consortium, 2020).

(v) The narrative is sufficient to describe how the applicant will provide feedback and continuous improvement (pages e46-e48). For example, bi-annual reports will document processes, products, strategies, outcomes, as well as unanticipated barriers to progress and possible solutions and this information will be shared with project partners. The applicant will also gather feedback from existing residencies as well as from a professional development three-day conference for participants. The applicant will conduct periodic observations of mentors and participants.

(vi) The applicant anticipates that high impact activities such as micro-credentialing will become institutionalized and thus provide a mechanism for sustainability (pages e48-e50). In so doing, credentialing may be extended across disciplines such as special education. The Pathways program also presents a sensible mechanism for building the capacity of high-need LEAs through activities that provide sustained leadership beyond the grant period. This is a sufficient plan for sustaining capacity of the partners.

Weaknesses:

(i) No weaknesses noted.

(ii) No weaknesses noted.

(iii) No weaknesses noted.

(iv) No weaknesses noted.

(v) No weaknesses noted.

(vi) No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 30

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. B. Quality of the Project Evaluation (20 points)

The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(i) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes.

(ii) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.

Strengths:

(i) The methods of evaluation are extensive to provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes with the external evaluation conducting a Descriptive Study evaluation will focus on content and construct analysis of model development, review stages of implementation with identified strengths and weakness, and analyze periodic outcomes of competency mastery as demonstrated by micro-credentials and micro-residencies (page e51). The applicant will also capture qualitative data through surveys and individual reflections. The evaluation also includes GPRA measures reporting to the US Department of Education. For example, at least 80% of teacher candidates will pass licensure exams and receive a State issued teaching license within one year of graduation (page e52).

(ii) The methods of evaluation are extensively thorough and feasible for the goals, objectives and activities (pages e52-e56). The plan includes guiding research questions, and evaluation sources/outcomes that area aligned with goals, objectives and activities. Specifically, the Descriptive Study will provide formative evaluation to establish and operate Inclusive Services in areas of recruitment, preparation, placement, and induction. This will support Goal 1.

Weaknesses:

(i)No weaknesses noted.

(ii)No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources**1. C. Adequacy of Resources (30 points)**

The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources for the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (i) The adequacy of support, including facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources, from the applicant organization or the lead applicant organization.**
- (ii) The extent to which the budget is adequate to support the proposed project.**
- (iii) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.**
- (iv) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates that it has the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the grant, including a multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan; the demonstrated commitment of any partners; evidence of broad support from stakeholders (e.g., SEAs, teachers' unions) critical to the project's long-term success; or more than one of these types of evidence.**
- (v) The relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project.**

Strengths:

(i) The plan is sufficient to provide facilities, equipment and supplies to support the project (page e57). The applicant will provide state-of-the-art facilities inclusive of instructional, research, recreational, and residential buildings. Both of the IHE campuses contain multiple educational centers and learning libraries and laboratories, supports a vibrant campus life, and

is equipped with advanced technologies for 21st century education which will be used to support the project.

(ii) The budget appears sufficient to cover the cost of project activities (page e58). For example, the budget covers the cost of delivering the project activities for items such as personnel and travel. Specifically, salaries and fringe are covered for key personnel. Additionally, funds are allocated to support rural-urban partnership with dispersed locations across the state, as well as dissemination of lessons learned and promising practices for potential scaled implementation.

(iii) Costs are reasonable to the project design and project objectives (page e59). In direct alignment with the 2% cap on administrative costs (which supersedes the 8% indirect cost rate), the applicant and the partnering IHE and LEA agencies have agreed to use 2% indirect cost for the project. The institution and partners are contributing 100% of match funds to successfully implement the project.

(iv) The plan is sufficient for extending beyond the grant funded period (pages e48-e50 and e59-e60). As the activities are conducted, it is expected that program activities will be institutionalized. The activities, at the same time of delivery, will build the capacity of each of the institutions. For example, career credentialing will assist teachers become future leaders within the partner school districts.

(v) The demonstrated commitments of reach of the partners are sufficient and relevant for the project (pages e60-e61). Letters of commitments are provided for each partner (Appendix E). For example, partners have the commitment to provide monetary and in-kind resources as well as personnel assistance.

Weaknesses:

(i) No weaknesses noted.

(ii) No weaknesses noted.

(iii) No weaknesses noted.

(iv) No weaknesses noted.

(v) No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 30

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. D. Quality of the Management Plan (20 points)

The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(i) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

(ii) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

Strengths:

(i) The management plan includes a well coordinated list of personnel and their qualifications (pages e63-e64). For example, the Interim Dean of College of Arts & Sciences, and Education and a professor representing the School of Arts and Sciences will chair the advisory board. Committees will govern the administration and completion of activities for each goal. For example, Inclusive Services Committee will focus on integrated academic, student, and career services designed to increase access and enhance success for diverse teachers; and will include key members from each of the IHEs. A timeline with milestones are included on pages e181-e184.

(ii) Mechanisms for feedback and continuous improvement are sufficiently described (pages e64-e65). For example, the advisory board will meet on a quarterly basis and will review progress, recommend changes as needed, share findings and implications for sustainable improvement, and ensure achievement of projects on time and within budget.

Weaknesses:

(i) No weaknesses noted.

(ii) No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Priority Questions**Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1****1. Increasing Educator Diversity (Up to 4 points).**

Under this priority, applicants must develop projects that are designed to improve the recruitment, outreach, preparation, support, development, and retention of a diverse educator workforce through adopting, implementing, or expanding one or both of the following:

a) High-quality, comprehensive teacher preparation programs in Historically Black Colleges and Universities (eligible institutions under Part B of Title III and Subpart 4 of Part A Title VII of the HEA), Hispanic Serving Institutions (eligible institutions under section 316 of the HEA), or other Minority Serving Institutions (eligible institutions under Title III and Title V of the HEA) that include one year of high-quality clinical experiences (prior to becoming the teacher of record) in high-need schools (as defined in this notice) and that incorporate best practices for attracting, supporting, graduating, and placing underrepresented teacher candidates.

b) Reforms to teacher preparation programs to improve the diversity of teacher candidates, including changes to ensure underrepresented teacher candidates are fully represented in program admission, completion, placement, and retention as educators.

Strengths:

(a) The applicant convincingly addresses this competitive preference priority as it is a Historically Black University. As the lead applicant, the partnership will implement a project that has wide ranging affects on both rural and urban high need schools (page e12). Specifically, schools have high free and reduce lunch percentages, high teacher turnover, and low teacher retention.

(b) The applicant substantially address this competitive preference priority as the activities within the program reforms teacher preparation program so improve the diversity of teach candidates (page e12). Specifically, the applicant's program will impact a total of 250 aspiring and new teachers and 6250 P-12 students in four school districts in Designated Qualified Opportunity Zones in urban and rural Maryland.

Weaknesses:

(a) No weaknesses noted.

(b) No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 4

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 2

1. Supporting a Diverse Educator Workforce and Professional Growth to Strengthen Student Learning (Up to 3 points).

Projects that are designed to increase the proportion of well-prepared, diverse, and effective educator serving students, with a focus on underserved students, through increasing the number of teachers with certification or dual certification in a shortage area, or advanced certifications from nationally recognized professional organizations.

Strengths:

The applicant substantially addresses this competitive preference priority (page e21) by increasing the proportion of well-prepared, diverse and effective educators serving students. Specifically, the applicant will focus on Critical Shortage Subject Areas and will target Elementary Education, Early Childhood Education, Special Education, and Dual Certification (Elementary and Early Childhood) (Senate Bill 965 and House Bill 1372; MCIEE, 2019; MSDE, 2016, and US Department of Education Teacher Shortage Areas 2018-2023); as well as Critical Shortage of Diverse Teachers will target the preparation and retention of black male teachers and teachers of color to serve in high-need schools (Senate Bill 965 and House Bill 1372; MCIEE, 2019; MSDE, 2016). By doing so, the applicant will align with state objectives as well as meet the needs of target LEAs.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 3

1. Meeting Student Social Emotional, and Academic Needs (Up to 2 points).

Projects that are designed to improve students' social, emotional, academic, and career development, with a focus on underserved students, through creating a positive, inclusive, and identity-safe climate at institutions of higher education, through one or more of the following activities:

- a) **Fostering a sense of belonging and inclusion for underserved students.**
- b) **Implementing evidence-based practices for advancing student success for underserved students.**

Strengths:

(a) The applicant substantially addresses this competitive preference priority (pages e22-e26) by implementing social, emotional, and academic needs activities in the activities for teachers and students in each of the supporting goals. For example, in Goal 1, deliberate efforts with dedicated advisors will be devoted to providing academic, social-emotional, and career support services with stop-gap resources across the spectrum from recruitment and preparation to placement and induction.

(b) The applicant clearly provides SEL activities within the micro-residencies. Specifically, new teachers will have the opportunity to provide such techniques in their field experiences (page e23). For example, new teachers will be able to implement culturally responsive teaching practices and social emotional learning.

Weaknesses:

(a) No weaknesses noted.

(b) No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 2

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 4**1. Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities (Up to 2 points).**

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that the applicant proposes a project designed to promote educational equity and adequacy in resources and opportunity for underserved students.

a) In one or more of the following educational settings:

- (1) Early learning programs**
- (2) Elementary school.**
- (3) Middle school**
- (4) High school**
- (5) Career and technical education programs.**
- (6) Out-of-school-time settings.**
- (7) Alternative schools and programs.**

b) That examines the sources of inequity and inadequacy and implement responses, and that may include pedagogical practices in educator preparational programs and professional development programs that are inclusive with regard to race, ethnicity, culture, language, and disability status so that educators are better prepared to create inclusive, supportive, equitable, unbiased, and identity-safe learning environments for their students.

Strengths:

(a) The applicant targets three elementary schools withing two rural LEAs and one urban LEA. All have over 80% free and reduce meal (FARM) participation as well as low score attainment on state assessments (pages e33-e34). The applicant clearly addresses this competitive preference priority.

(b) The Pathway to Preparation in its entirety provides well research practices that appear to be impactful for making changes (pages e28-e30). The applicant summarizes key aspects of the program with respect to this competitive preference priority which state that its program will provide (1) aspiring teachers who otherwise would not have equitable opportunities to engage in a high-quality program that prepares them to teach in diverse schools; (2) new and mentoring

teachers who otherwise would have limited access to high-quality professional development in a networked improvement community that supports diversity and inclusion; (3) high-need LEAs in urban and rural settings who otherwise would not have the sole capacity and resources to recruit and retain highly effective and diverse teachers; and (4) P-12 students in high-need schools who otherwise would have limited access to high-quality instruction taught by highly effective and diverse teachers.

Weaknesses:

(a) No weaknesses noted.

(b) No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 2

Invitational Priority - Invitational Priority

1. Partnership Grants for the Establishment of Grow Your Own Programs

Projects that establish Grow Your Own programs that are designed to address shortages of teachers in high-need areas, schools, and/or geographic areas, or shortages of school leaders in high-need schools, and increase the diversity of qualified individuals entering the teacher, principal, or other school leader workforce.

Strengths:

The applicant clearly promotes a "Grow Your Own" culture to meet the requirements of the Invitational Priority while targeting both urban and rural areas. The applicant provides a description of how the program will address shortages of teachers in high-need areas, schools, and geographic areas. Furthermore, the applicant describes, in detail, how it will address the shortage of school leaders in high-need schools and increase the diversity of qualified individuals entering the teacher, principal of other school leader workforce. Thus, the applicant addresses this Invitational Priority.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/07/2022 11:30 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/06/2022 03:27 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Coppin State University (S336S220012)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	30
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Adequacy of Resources	30	30
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	20
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Educator Diversity	4	4
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. Diverse Workforce	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
1. Meeting Student Needs	2	2
Competitive Preference Priority 4		
1. Promoting Equity	2	2
Invitational Priority		
Invitational Priority		
1. Grow Your Own	0	0
Total	111	111

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Panel - 1: 84.336S

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Coppin State University (S336S220012)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. A. Quality of the Project Design (30 points)

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

- (i) The extent to which the proposed project demonstrates a rationale.
- (ii) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.
- (iii) The extent to which the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students.
- (iv) The extent to which the design of the proposed project reflects up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.
- (v) The extent to which performance feedback and continuous improvement are integral to the design of the proposed project.
- (vi) The extent to which the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance.

Strengths:

(i) The application provides a comprehensive description on how the proposed project demonstrates a rationale. The applicant provides a thorough logic model demonstrating how the goals, objectives, and activities will lead to outputs and short-term outcomes, resulting in long-term outcomes (pgs. e24-e25). The applicant demonstrates how the proposed program Pathways to Professions (P2P) aims to build capacities for preparing and sustain a diverse educational force for inclusive excellence. The career-wide pathways to professions are designed to increase access, improve effectiveness, and accelerate career advancement for aspiring and new teachers; while at the same time bridging opportunity and achievement gaps for P-12 student success in high-need urban and rural schools. The applicant describes how the identified challenges have provided data to address and inform the proposed project: opportunity and achievement gaps and teacher diversity and career pathways gaps. These challenges and gaps will be addressed in the proposed project, Pathways to Professions (P2P) as a Blueprint for teacher diversity and student success. (pgs. e20-e45).

(ii) The application clearly describes goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project that are clearly specified and measurable. The applicant demonstrates that the program structures and activities are designed based on the logic model to build capacities and linkages at individual, institutional, and community levels. The applicant describes SMART goals (specific, measurable, attainable, relevant, and time-based) in defining the project operations. The proposed project includes three goals aligned to six key strategic actions. The three goals include: connected ecosystems for capacity and linkage building; connected learning for career readiness; and connected pathways for career advancement. The applicant thoroughly articulates key services across the program milestones from recruitment and preparation to placement and induction. The applicant aligns benchmark assessments, timelines, and expected year over year outcomes for each of the six key strategies (pgs. e35-e38; e55-e56).

(iii) The applicant demonstrates how the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students. The proposed project initiative is designed to build region-wide capacities in preparing and sustaining diverse teachers while improving teacher competencies necessary to support students in high-need LEAs. The goals reflect a vision with interventions that are grounded in a logic model for successful implementation. Using approaches to leverage expertise and resources, the three goals will be realized through six key

strategies for sustainable improvement. The applicant demonstrates how these key strategies will improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students (pgs. e38-e45).

(iv) The applicant clearly describes the design of the proposed project that reflects up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice. The proposed project and its strategic actions are informed by current theories and promising practices, and are designed to create sustainable pathways for teacher diversity and student success. The proposed project connects educational and employment ecosystems (Prince et al., 2015; CLASP, 2015; KnowledgeWorks, 2012; Hecht & Crowley, 2020) for comprehensive services from pre-professional preparation to career advancement. The Inclusive Services for Career-Wide Success is anchored in human-centered service design (IDEO, 2015) by integrating human, digital, and physical interactions for a differentiated and personalized experience. The Inclusive Services are informed by the framework of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (World Economic Forum, 2020, new approaches to student services (New,2020), and promising practices on diversifying educator workforce (New England Secondary School Consortium, 2020; Pennsylvania Educator Diversity Consortium; and Center for Black Educator Development) (pgs. e45-e46).

(v) The applicant provides clear performance feedback and continuous improvement that are integral to the design of the proposed project. The applicant describes data informed processes for continuous improvement. The logic model and method of SMART goals were used in defining project operations. Each of the six key strategies has a built-in reviewing cycle based on data collected from semester-based direct assessments and bi-annual/annual perceptual studies and impact evaluations. The applicant describes internal reporting and dissemination and external dissemination. The applicant provides the details on the highly structured plan supported by four committees (P2P Advisory Board, Inclusive Services Committee, Micro-Credential Committee, and MicroResidency Committee) to ensure fidelity, review progress, and to make necessary changes for continuous improvement (pgs. e46-e47).

(vi) The applicant demonstrates how the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance. The P3P strategies and activities are based on the theories and practices of capacity and linkage building at the individual, institutional, and community levels. The applicant demonstrates that using co-constructive approaches to leverage cross-agency expertise and resources, the P2P model encourages renewal and reciprocal transformation and expected results yielding beyond the grant period. The applicant describes how each of the three goals maximizes collective expertise and resources through the development of common goals, joint processes, shared strategies, and leveraged resources to increase teacher diversity and enhance teacher retention. The key indicators for impact during and beyond the grant period include: high-quality design anchored in a logic model with clearly defined goals and objectives; high-touch Inclusive Services across career-wide milestones; high-impact MicroCredentials and MicroResidencies with rural-urban rotations for competency mastery; rigorous evaluation methods with descriptive studies and impact evaluations on efficacy and potential for scaled implementation; robust implementation and management plan; and thoughtful dissemination for structured internal and external distributions to share promising practices and to encourage replications. The deliberate effort efforts of moving the key interventions toward institutionalization are thoroughly designed for sustainability beyond the grant period (pgs. e48-e50).

Weaknesses:

(i) No weaknesses were noted.

(ii) No weaknesses were noted.

(iii) No weaknesses were noted.

(iv) No weaknesses were noted.

(v) No weaknesses were noted.

(vi) No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 30

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. B. Quality of the Project Evaluation (20 points)

The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (i) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes.
- (ii) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.

Strengths:

(i) The applicant demonstrates that the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes. The applicant describes how the rigorous evaluation strategies and methods have been aligned to the project goals and will include qualitative and quantitative data from multiple assessments and multiple sources. The applicant describes the methods of evaluation that will provide performance data aligned with each of the three goals. The applicant clearly aligns goals/actions to the benchmarks, and the team lead and timelines (pgs. e50-e52; e61-e62).

(ii) The applicant clearly describes how the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project. The evaluation strategies and methods, and the data collection processes and timelines, are designed to ensure thoroughness, feasibility, and fidelity. The applicant provides valid and reliable data for each of the objectives. The applicant provides a comprehensive assessment and evaluation plan by linking each research question to the goals, objectives, and activities; and to the evaluation/sources/outcomes (e52-e56).

Weaknesses:

- (i) No weaknesses were noted.
- (ii) No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

1. C. Adequacy of Resources (30 points)

The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources for the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (i) The adequacy of support, including facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources, from the applicant organization or the lead applicant organization.
- (ii) The extent to which the budget is adequate to support the proposed project.
- (iii) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.
- (iv) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates that it has the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the grant, including a multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan; the demonstrated commitment of any partners; evidence of broad support from stakeholders (e.g., SEAs, teachers' unions) critical to the project's long-term

success; or more than one of these types of evidence.

(v) The relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project.

Strengths:

(i) The applicant clearly describes the adequacy of support, including facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources, from the applicant organization. The applicant describes the physical resources and the human and social capitals to be committed to the proposed project. The lead agency will commit state-of-the-art facilities inclusive of instructional, research, recreational, and residential buildings. The applicant will commit instructional, laboratory, technology, and meeting facilities to support the delivery of P2P activities. The learning system, Watermark will be utilized to support the assessment of P2P MicroCredentials and MicroResidencies. The applicant will leverage the expertise and support from its Connected Ecosystems (Goal 1) with in-kind contributions from researchers, teacher educators, university faculty and administrators, district leaders, school administrators, and experienced mentors. The applicant has documentation of the in-kind contributions of the core partners in the commitment letters (pg. e57; Appendix E).

(ii) The applicant describes a budget that is adequate to support the proposed project. The application describes a comprehensive and detailed line item budget and budget justification for the following line items: personnel, fringe benefits, travel, supplies, contractual, indirect costs, and training stipends (pgs. e58; e191-e203).

(iii) The applicant provides costs that are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project. The costs are adequate in relation to the requirements of the three goals and the six key strategies. The applicant describes numerous cost-effective strategies for key interventions, such as MicroCredentials and MicroResidencies. These include the development of shared instructional materials and assessments, effective use of local and regional facilities, common placement protocols and operations, and the innovative use of technology for scalable delivery. (pg. e59).

(iv) 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. The applicant describes how the goals and strategies are directly aligned with institutional and state priorities of increasing teacher diversity and improving student learning; and are developed to directly support LEA-specific hiring needs and local priorities. These intentional alignments are designed to ensure relevancy with organizational support for sustainable operations (pgs. e59-e60).

(v) The applicant describes the relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project. The proposed project demonstrates the resources to be committed by the partners. The partners have had a long-standing reputation of success in sharing expertise and resources to support academic and community development through Professional Development Schools partnerships and through multiple grant activities. The partners' commitment for successful implementation is articulated in the support letters with a 100% match (pgs. e60-e61; Appendix E).

Weaknesses:

(i) No weaknesses were noted.

(ii) No weaknesses were noted.

(iii) No weaknesses were noted.

(iv) No weaknesses were noted.

(v) No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 30

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. D. Quality of the Management Plan (20 points)

The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (i) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.**
- (ii) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.**

Strengths:

(i) The applicant describes a detailed 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. The applicant provides a thorough implementation plan with goals, aligned to objectives, benchmark assessments, and team lead and timelines. The applicant provides the qualifications of the key personnel and their roles and responsibilities. The applicant includes detailed tasks and timelines in Appendix I. All key interventions will be conducted via Watermark System, and aggregated data will be stored in the secured SharePoint site (pgs. e61-e64; e181-e184).

(ii) The applicant describes an adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project. The applicant describes highly-structured engagements for continuous improvement. The P2P Advisory Board will meet on a quarterly basis and will review progress, recommend changes s needed, share findings and implications for sustainable improvement, and ensure achievement of projects on time and within budget. The Inclusive Services Committee will meet on a bi-weekly basis; the MicroCredentials committee will work closely with IHE partners during monthly progress meetings; and the MicroResidencies Committee will also work closely with IHE and LEA partners during monthly progress meetings (pgs. e64-e65).

Weaknesses:

(i) No weaknesses were noted.

(ii) No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. Increasing Educator Diversity (Up to 4 points).

Under this priority, applicants must develop projects that are designed to improve the recruitment, outreach, preparation, support, development, and retention of a diverse educator workforce through adopting, implementing, or expanding one or both of the following:

a) High-quality, comprehensive teacher preparation programs in Historically Black Colleges and Universities (eligible institutions under Part B of Title III and Subpart 4 of Part A Title VII of the HEA), Hispanic Serving Institutions (eligible institutions under section 316 of the HEA), or other Minority Serving Institutions (eligible institutions under Title III and Title V of the HEA) that include one year of high-quality clinical experiences)prior to becoming the teacher of record) in high-need schools (as defined in this notice) and that incorporate best practices for attracting, supporting, graduating, and placing underrepresented teacher candidates.

b) Reforms to teacher preparation programs to improve the diversity of teacher candidates, including changes to ensure underrepresented teacher candidates are fully represented in program admission, completion, placement, and retention as educators.

Strengths:

Overview:

The applicant clearly describes how the applicant institution and its partners will implement specifically designed strategies to recruit, retain, and promote teachers from diverse backgrounds with multiple Pathways to Professions.

(a) The applicant clearly addresses Competitive Preference Priority 1: Increasing Educator Diversity. The proposed project increases access to undergraduate teacher preparation programs for community members who have strong aspirations of entering the teaching profession (Pathway from the Fields); increases access to undergraduate teacher preparation with career advancement options moving from paraprofessionals to certified teachers (Pathway from LEAs); provides seamless transition from two- to four-year colleges with a streamlined pathway that reduces credit waste while increasing career readiness (Pathway from IHEs); and provides early access through teacher pipeline programs that cultivate interests and accelerate time-to-degree completion through dual enrollment (Pathway from High Schools) (pg. e20).

(b) The applicant describes reforms to teacher preparation programs to improve the diversity of teacher candidates, including changes to ensure underrepresented teacher candidates are fully represented in program admission, completion, placement, and retention as educators. For example, the applicant proposes to ensure success through inclusive services and competency mastery through the following services: inclusive services (Inclusive Services and Networked Improvement Communities), aspiring teachers (MicroCredentials for Career Readiness), and new and mentoring teachers (MicroCredentials for Career Advancement) (pgs. e20-e21).

Weaknesses:

(a) No weaknesses were noted.

(b) No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 4

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 2

1. Supporting a Diverse Educator Workforce and Professional Growth to Strengthen Student Learning (Up to 3 points).

Projects that are designed to increase the proportion of well-prepared, diverse, and effective educator serving students, with a focus on underserved students, through increasing the number of teachers with certification or dual certification in a shortage area, or advanced certifications from nationally recognized professional organizations.

Strengths:

Overview:

The applicant demonstrates that the proposed program will provide TQP and State priorities in preparing and retaining teachers specializing in critical shortage areas.

The applicant clearly addresses Competitive Preference Priority 2: Supporting a Diverse Educator Workforce and Professional Grow to Strengthen Student Learning. For example, the applicant provides a plan to target teachers in critical shortage subject areas (Elementary Education; Early Childhood Education; Special Education; and Dual Certification (Elementary and Early Childhood), in the critical shortage of diverse teachers (black male teachers and teachers of color), in the critical shortage in Maryland Jurisdictions (geographic areas including the groups from Tables 4 & 5, Appendix B) (pgs. e20-e21; e34-e35).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 3

1. Meeting Student Social Emotional, and Academic Needs (Up to 2 points).

Projects that are designed to improve students' social, emotional, academic, and career development, with a focus on underserved students, through creating a positive, inclusive, and identity-safe climate at institutions of higher education, through one or more of the following activities:

- a) **Fostering a sense of belonging and inclusion for underserved students.**
- b) **Implementing evidence-based practices for advancing student success for underserved students.**

Strengths:

Overview:

The applicant describes Competitive Preference Priority 3: Meeting Student Social, Emotional, and Academic Needs.

(a) The applicant clearly addresses Competitive Preference Priority 3: Meeting Student Social, Emotional, and Academic Needs. The applicant indicates that participating and practicing teachers will engage in instructional practices that support social, emotional, and academic needs through the following two interventions: MicroCredentials and MicroReidencies. These interventions will provide extensive opportunities to develop and demonstrate critical competencies and will provide

intensive field-based practices in rural-urban rotations with direct impact on P-12 student learning. The applicant clearly aligns aspiring teachers/ new and mentoring teachers to MicroCredentials and MicroResidencies. The applicant describes fostering a sense of belonging and inclusion for underserved students (pg. e23).

(b) The applicant clearly describes implementing evidence-based practices for advancing student success for underserved students. For example, the MicroCredential model is designed with three key characteristics: Learning ecosystems are designed through the 3Hs: High-Tech, High-Touch, and High-Impact principles; Learning experiences are anchored by the 3cs: Curriculum, Co-Curricular, and Community; and Learning outcomes are measured through the 3Es: Engaging Self, Engaging Others, and Engaging in Diverse Communities (pg. e41).

Weaknesses:

(a) No weaknesses were noted.

(b) No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 2

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 4

1. Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities (Up to 2 points).

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that the applicant proposes a project designed to promote educational equity and adequacy in resources and opportunity for underserved students.

a) In one or more of the following educational settings:

- (1) Early learning programs**
- (2) Elementary school.**
- (3) Middle school**
- (4) High school**
- (5) Career and technical education programs.**
- (6) Out-of-school-time settings.**
- (7) Alternative schools and programs.**

b) That examines the sources of inequity and inadequacy and implement responses, and that may include pedagogical practices in educator preparational programs and professional development programs that are inclusive with regard to race, ethnicity, culture, language, and disability status so that educators are better prepared to create inclusive, supportive, equitable, unbiased, and identity-safe learning environments for their students.

Strengths:

Overview:

The applicant demonstrates that the proposed project is designed to promote educational equity and adequacy of resources and opportunities in support for underserved students.

(a) The applicant clearly addresses Competitive Preference Priority 4: Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities. The applicant demonstrates a project, Connected Learning for Career Readiness (Goal 1), designed to promote educational equity and adequacy in resources and opportunity for underserved students. The applicant proposes to leverage evidence-based practices, long-standing partnerships, and shared resources among partnering agencies to build systemic capacities, advance theories, improve practices, and influence policies toward

increasing teacher diversity, improving teaching effectiveness, and enhancing P-12 student engagement in high-need communities (pgs. e28-e29). The applicant targets three elementary schools with two rural LEAs and one urban LEA, that all have over 80% free and reduced meal (FARM) participation and low score attainment on state assessments (pgs. e33-e34).

(b) The applicant examines the sources of inequity and inadequacy and implement responses, and that may include pedagogical practices in educator preparational programs and professional development programs that are inclusive with regard to race, ethnicity, culture, language, and disability status. The applicant describes Connected Learning for Career Advancement (Goal 3) that demonstrates that connected learning educators are better prepared to create inclusive, supportive, equitable, unbiased, and identity-safe learning environments for their students (pgs. e29-e30).

Weaknesses:

(a) No weaknesses were noted.

(b) No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 2

Invitational Priority - Invitational Priority

1. Partnership Grants for the Establishment of Grow Your Own Programs

Projects that establish Grow Your Own programs that are designed to address shortages of teachers in high-need areas, schools, and/or geographic areas, or shortages of school leaders in high-need schools, and increase the diversity of qualified individuals entering the teacher, principal, or other school leader workforce.

Strengths:

Overview:

The applicant did not address the Invitational Priority: Grow Your Own.

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/06/2022 03:27 PM

