

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/07/2022 11:10 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: University of Cincinnati (S336S220039)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	30	30
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
<b>Adequacy of Resources</b>		
1. Adequacy of Resources	30	30
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	18
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
1. Educator Diversity	4	3
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
1. Diverse Workforce	3	3
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 3</b>		
1. Meeting Student Needs	2	2
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 4</b>		
1. Promoting Equity	2	2
<b>Invitational Priority</b>		
<b>Invitational Priority</b>		
1. Grow Your Own	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>108</b>

# Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - Panel - 5: 84.336S

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

Applicant: University of Cincinnati (S336S220039)

## 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:

The logic model and design structure demonstrate a rationale for students with HIN have less exposure to effective instruction, which results in fewer occasions for students with HIN to develop proficiency across academic areas. Individuals with HIN are often the least likely to be employed (Bush & Tasse, 2017) and have limited opportunities to live on their own and develop meaningful relationships (Lee & Morningstar, 2019). (e23-e27) The program outcome will be accomplished through the ultimate purpose of SSHINE will be to enhance the equitable learning experiences of K-12 students with HIN and thereby increase the students' academic achievement. Aligned with this purpose, the summative goal is to effectively train and retain 36 prospective special educators of students with HIN. To achieve the purpose and summative goal, the formative goal ensures each prospective teacher is proficient with the following three professional competencies throughout their master's degree program by promoting high expectations for all learners, using HLPs and EBPs in a differentiated manner that is appropriate for each learner, and collaborating with diverse stakeholders using an interdisciplinary team-based approach. (e27-e42) The applicant is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and to support rigorous academic standards. SSHINE will address challenges by supporting prospective teachers to develop (a) an understanding of the social ecological approach to disability, (b) knowledge of essential skills that support students in inclusive settings, and (c) specific practices necessary for supporting students in a variety of inclusive settings. The current educational priorities in Ohio will be to increase students' academic achievement, career readiness, and persistence to graduation from high school (ODE, 2019). (e42) Formative assessment of these processes supports continuous improvement, which is critical to ensuring that project activities produce intended outcomes. The applicant performance feedback and continuous improvement occurs bi-monthly throughout Year 1, the Leadership Team with support from the evaluators will engage in research and development activities. Through these collaborative efforts, they will (a) identify and create any additional preliminary training needs for prospective teachers and mentor teachers, and (b) align and refine syllabi, assignments, field experiences, and program expectations. The Program Development and Mentoring Teams will use these data to inform their program planning efforts. (e62) The applicant and partners each have invested large amounts of their staff members' time as an in-kind contribution to this project to see the work completed. They are committed to continuing these partner activities after the grant ends. (e59)

**Weaknesses:**

None 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:**

WordFarmers Associates (WFA) will use the Context-Input-Process and Product (CIPP) model developed in the 1960s by Daniel Stufflebeam and colleagues, and updated since that time (Stufflebeam & Zhang, 2017). The model addresses formative evaluation aims to help the project improve its activities and processes and summative evaluation aims to ensure that the project meets its short-, mid-, and long-term goals. Note that the evaluation activities focusing on process and products in this model provide evidence for four of the five levels of data that the Kirkpatrick (1998) and Guskey (2000) identify as important sources of evidence. The four are: participant satisfaction, participant learning, organizational support and change, and participant use of new knowledge and skills. WFA uses online written surveys and feedback forms (via SurveyMonkey collectors). (e43-e44) (e62) The methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project. In collaboration with SSHINE leadership, WFA will design data collection instruments keyed to specific evaluation purposes and levels of data. Table 4 lists the evaluation instruments that WFA will develop over the course of the project, cross-referencing them to evaluation purposes and levels of data. (e48)

**Weaknesses:**

None 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:**

The faculty, staff, and administration support an educational setting of excellence, opportunity, and service that support, including facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources for the project. The College of Education, Criminal Justice, and Human Service (CECH) established the IMPACT Accelerator to support faculty who receive external funding. Through the accelerator, faculty have access to personnel to support data management and technology. The CECH Systems Development & Improvement (SDI) Center at UC at the core of many Center activities is a commitment to advocacy on behalf of all children, as well as partnerships with school districts, professional associations, institutions of higher education, regional providers, and the state that improve conditions and outcomes for students with disabilities and other marginalized groups of learners. (e52-e54) The budget is adequate to support the proposed project. Over 50% of the requested grant funding will be distributed directly to the 36 prospective teachers for their cost-of-living stipend. All prospective teachers will receive \$26,000 in two payments of \$13,000. (e57-e58) The cost is reasonable for the amount of funds will provide a meaningful and manageable cohort size for UC and the partners that will support through the program and into induction years. (e59) Inter-agency collaborative teaming will begin from the start of SSHINE. This ensures that the redesign efforts reflect the perspectives and priorities of each stakeholder and that our efforts are sustainable after the life of the grant. UC and the partners each have invested large amounts of their staff members' time as an in-kind contribution to this project to see the work completed. They are committed to continuing these partner activities after the grant ends. (e59)

**Weaknesses:**

None 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:**

The applicant's chart outlines the project goals, aligned objectives, those responsible for carrying out the objectives, and a timeline for implementation. The applicant has designed the management plan so that the structures and processes necessary to manage and achieve SSHINE's objectives on time and within budget are both achievable and sustainable after the grant period. The leadership function will include the Leadership Team comprised of the PI, team leads from the other five teams, and the project's fiscal leads. The Leadership team will oversee the overall progress toward Goals 1 and 2 and their respective three objectives. The advisory council will meet quarterly to review project progress and deliverables and advise on next steps for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant did not provide milestones.

**Reader's Score:** 18

**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:**

In 2021, UC created a Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) Teacher Pathway. The BIPOC Pathway includes partnering with districts to create grow-your-own programs to support recruitment and retention of BIPOC educators. (e20-e21)

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not identify as a High-quality, comprehensive teacher preparation program in Historically Black Colleges and Universities.

Reader's Score: 3

### 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:

Ohio currently has a dwindling supply of BIPOC teacher candidates in the pipeline, which without intentional action will further the underrepresentation of BIPOC teachers in Ohio. Less than 70% of Ohio's student population is White, but over 92% of the teacher workforce is White (Education Trust, 2022). SSHINE will support the recruitment and retention of BIPOC scholars in a shortage area (i.e., special education). (e21)

#### Weaknesses:

None 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:

The applicant's redesign efforts are focused on embedding social-emotional HLPs and EBPs into their program (Priority 3). This involves the environment (e.g., creating positive, inclusive, and identify-safe climates) and instruction (e.g., implementing EBPs, bias-free assessments). It also focuses on prospective teachers examining their own beliefs about teaching and learning and taking a critical examination of the systems that have resulted in a loss of equitable instruction followed by intentional action to accelerate instruction for learners that have been underserved. (e22)

**Weaknesses:**

None 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:**

By using a grow-your-own model (Invitational Priority) with partner districts to support the short-term needs of insufficient personnel as well as the long-term needs by ensuring an ongoing pipeline of educators – including BIPOC educators – into the profession. (e21)

**Weaknesses:**

None 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:**

By using a grow-your-own model (Invitational Priority) with partner districts to support the short-term needs of insufficient personnel as well as the long-term needs by ensuring an ongoing pipeline of educators – including BIPOC educators – into the profession. (e21)

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

**Reader's Score:**     **0**

---

**Status:**           Submitted  
**Last Updated:**   06/07/2022 11:10 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/06/2022 06:42 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: University of Cincinnati (S336S220039)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	30	30
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
<b>Adequacy of Resources</b>		
1. Adequacy of Resources	30	30
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	20
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
1. Educator Diversity	4	3
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
1. Diverse Workforce	3	3
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 3</b>		
1. Meeting Student Needs	2	2
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 4</b>		
1. Promoting Equity	2	2
<b>Invitational Priority</b>		
<b>Invitational Priority</b>		
1. Grow Your Own	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>110</b>

# Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - Panel - 5: 84.336S

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

Applicant: University of Cincinnati (S336S220039)

## 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:

Table 1 (e34-36) Standards and Competencies.

#### Weaknesses:

None.

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:

Tables 2-5: Articulating the Evaluation elements in detail.

**Weaknesses:**

None.

**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:**

- (ii) Well-explained resource allocations (e57-58).

**Weaknesses:**

- (v) Criterion not included as a Heading; not addressed here.

Information is provided in the Management Plan section, e62-63.

**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:**

e63: Figure 3 Timeline.

**Weaknesses:**

None.

**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 strong program design, implementation, and evaluation are described throughout the Narrative and Appendices.

**Weaknesses:**

Does not meet the Criterion a)

**Reader's Score: 3**

**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:**

Very well-designed and presented project.

**Weaknesses:**

A relatively low number of cohort participants is planned for: 40 total, four years of 10 residents each year.

**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:**

Program design includes educator training so that they can meet the SEA needs of their K-12 students.

**Weaknesses:**

None.

**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:**

The program addresses K-12 students. The project design, implementation, and evaluation, including the Sustainability plans promote equity in K-12 student access to resources and opportunities.

**Weaknesses:**

None.

**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 project is designed as a Grow Your Own program.

**Weaknesses:**

None.

**Reader's Score: 0**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 06/06/2022 06:42 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/06/2022 07:04 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: University of Cincinnati (S336S220039)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	30	30
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
<b>Adequacy of Resources</b>		
1. Adequacy of Resources	30	30
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	20
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
1. Educator Diversity	4	3
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
1. Diverse Workforce	3	3
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 3</b>		
1. Meeting Student Needs	2	2
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 4</b>		
1. Promoting Equity	2	2
<b>Invitational Priority</b>		
<b>Invitational Priority</b>		
1. Grow Your Own	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>110</b>



# Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - Panel - 5: 84.336S

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

Applicant: University of Cincinnati (S336S220039)

## 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 applicant provides that there is a shortage of special education teachers in Ohio (pg. e24) and more importantly in Cincinnati Public Schools, having 28 open special educators in the district in which they typically hire 35 to 40 new special educators each year (pg. e25).

The proposal addresses the achievement gap between students with and without HIN (pg. e25). And through pedagogical changes, mentoring, and effective and experienced educators, the project seeks to address the achievement gap.

ii) The proposal includes two goals that are clearly defined and include objectives that correlate to the activities of the project (pg. e27). For example goal 1 focuses on recruiting and retaining 36 prospective teachers and the objectives clearly define the steps the applicant will take in order to achieve the specific results, e.g., create a track in special education program that includes training in evidence-based literacy and social-emotional instruction for students with HIN, create a year-long residency for UC Master's degree in Special Education, and create mentoring systems to support prospective teachers during their master's and induction programs. The objectives are very detailed.

iii) The applicant provides evidence that the program is a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students. The applicant provides that Ohio has prioritized teacher quality by focusing on inclusive preparation programs, field-intensive clinical experiences, and partnerships with one more LEAs (pg. e42-43).

iv) The program reflects up-to-date knowledge such as a learning cycle that calls on educators to embed core practices into instructional routines that creates opportunities for rehearsal of the relational and improvisational work of teaching (pg. e40).

v) The applicant demonstrates a commitment to continuous improvement that is integrated in the program design.

vi) The project is designed to build capacity and yield results beyond the period of Federal financial assistance.

**Weaknesses:**

No weakness 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 provides that an external evaluator will conduct the evaluation and use a context-input-process-and product model. This model uses formative and summative evaluation (pg. e43). The evaluation questions are detailed and aligned with sources of evidence.
- ii) The applicant provides GPRA measures, program specific measures, and project specific measures. These measures have specific targets for each performance measure, e.g., the percentage of graduates who have attained initial State licensure by passing all necessary assessment within on year is identified as 100% as the annual target. The applicant provides a detailed evaluation timeline to complete each evaluation throughout the project (pg. e51-52)

**Weaknesses:**

No weakness 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 provides evidence of adequate support for the project. They state that through their accelerator, faculty have access to personnel to support data management and technology (pg. e52). The SDI Center provides assistance with partnerships with school districts, professional associations, institutions of higher education, regional providers, and the state.

ii) The applicant's budget is adequate to support the proposed project (pg. e57). For example over 50% of the budget will be provided to the 36 prospective teachers for their cost-of-living stipend and the additional budget reflects personnel that contribute to the activities of the project.

iii) The costs are reasonable given the relation to the goals, objectives, and outcomes (pg. e58). For example, the applicant matched 100% of the in-kind contributions.

iv) The applicant cites the strong partnerships and in-kind contributions throughout the project as evidence as sustainability after the period of Federal funding has ended (pg. e59). This makes a strong case since a long term commitment and partnership will aid in the ongoing collaboration and partnership for sustainability.

v) The applicant demonstrates a strong commitment of each partner that will highly-likely contribute to the success of the project.

**Weaknesses:**

No weakness 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 provides a clear management structure that is highly likely to achieve objectives on time and within budget (pg. e60-63). The applicant describes specific responsibilities from the project leadership, project advisory council, the partners, the evaluation team, and partner districts.

ii) The project includes detailed information regarding the commitment of each partner in their letters of support and through their financial in-kind commitment to the project.

**Weaknesses:**

No weakness 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:**

UC created a BIPOC Teacher Pathway, partnering with districts to create grow-your-own programs to support recruitment and retention of BIPOC educators (pg. e21).

**Weaknesses:**

It is not clear that the applicant is partnering with a minority serving institution.

**Reader's Score: 3**

**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 cited strong local connections with their key personnel to recruit scholars from diverse backgrounds (pg. e21).

**Weaknesses:**

No weakness 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:**

The project includes a redesign effort focusing on embedding social-emotional HLPs and EBPs into the program.

**Weaknesses:**

No weakness 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:**

The applicant provides a strong case of equitable access through the redesign efforts that include revising literacy coursework that have a stronger alignment with the science of reading (pg. e22).

**Weaknesses:**

No weakness 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 meets the invitational priority.

**Weaknesses:**

No weakness noted.

**Reader's Score: 0**

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 06/06/2022 07:04 PM