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

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: National University (S336S220047)
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

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

Applicant: National University (S336S220047)

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 to establish a research-based system of collaboration for the project's rationale, ASPIRE has designed a high-quality collaboration system based on the work of Weinstein & Shiferaw (2017, What Works Clearinghouse [WWC] moderate evidence with reservations), Wang et al (2018), Bryk et al (2010), and Olson, Lee, & Showalter (2022). (e28) The program outcome will be accomplished through the objectives that meet the SMART standards of being specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time related. Establishing and Maintaining the Governance Council, Management Team, and Work Teams. Outcome 1: Each project year, the Governance Council and Work Teams will have met regularly to establish and maintain a system of collaboration with a high rate of attendance. Performance Measure 1: By September 30th of each project year, the Governance Council and Work Teams will have met at least quarterly and Management Team weekly to focus on establishing and maintaining the system of collaboration and 80% of Governance Council, Management, and Work Team members will have participated in project meetings. (e30-e36) The applicant is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and to support rigorous academic standards. ASPIRE's comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and supports rigorous academic standards for students is modeled after an adapted medical residency clinical practice approach (Becher & Lefstein, 2021), and is designed to increase, diversify, and enhance the teacher preparation pipeline. The tendency of teacher residency programs leads to much higher-than-average teacher retention rates (Carver-Thomas & Hammond, 2017), fitting for CVESD and its students. (e35-e36) The applicant performance feedback and continuous improvement will include the formative evaluation design handled by the Management Team that ensures continuous improvement and feedback for the project. A key component of the project is to engage teachers in reflective practice, mentoring, and documenting student learning on a continuous basis. Ongoing assessment of project participants is a central aspect of the project, and its design. Information will be used in a variety of ways to manage progress towards the project's stated goals and objectives to produce intended outcomes. (e59) The project's Management Team will be responsible for managing the project's evaluation design in conjunction with the External Evaluation Group. The Management Team will work with the External Evaluator and the Project Director to refine the project evaluation design, implement it, and report quarterly to the Governance Council on formative and summative evaluation results. (e63-e64) The ASPIRE project will build capacity and yield results beyond the period of federal financial assistance because of the infrastructure and processes that will be established throughout ASPIRE among NU, CVESD, and its partners. ASPIRE

will develop a comprehensive capacity building recruitment process designed to address CVESD's district shortage areas, building a pipeline of teachers from Chula Vista to NU and back to the district that will be sustained beyond federal funding. As a result, improved student achievement for all children will be realized through the development of new cultural systems and collaborative structures which will be sustained after Federal financial assistance has ended. (e59-e61)

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:

The psychometrics of ASPIRE's project evaluation will be both valid and reliable on several levels in producing performance data for its relevant outcomes. First, it is expected that the psychometrics of all standardized instruments and new instruments developed by the project for relevant outcomes listed below will demonstrate face, content, construct, and predictive validity (as appropriate). Internal consistency reliability coefficients for scores obtained from instruments administered during the project will be calculated and reported, with .70 as a minimum threshold. The External Evaluator will be responsible for developing and piloting all new instruments. Valid and reliable teacher resident and new teacher assessment measures will include California Basic Educational Skills Test, California Subject Examinations for Teachers, Reading Instruction Competence Assessment, CalTPA, ASPIRE's interrupted time series pre-post assessment instruments of teacher resident, mentor, mentee, and new teacher performance, and observation protocols of teacher residents and new teacher instruction. (e61-62) The purpose of this project's evaluation plan is to provide a holistic analysis of whether the project's objectives have been met through a summative assessment and how the project can be improved as it is being implemented through a formative assessment. Benchmarks and timelines will be set annually to gauge whether the project's activities are meeting the partnership's objectives.

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:

As the lead applicant, National University (NU) has a solid institutional infrastructure and will provide adequate support including facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources to support the Project ASPIRE. NU has extensive support services to ensure that the proposed Project objectives will be met, and timely reporting of data will be executed. Further the commitment of the proposed Project's community support and partnerships is well documented in the Letters of Support and Affiliation Agreements. The NU Office of Institutional Research provides research consulting, support, facilitation, and technical assistance to college faculty, staff, administrators, and students. This Office facilitates research support and reporting for accountability reporting efforts related to accreditation, federal requirements, grants, and statewide initiatives. (e74-e77) Based on 100 teacher residents (high-need shortage areas in special education, dual-language immersion, and elementary education) over a five-year period and $26,000 per resident, and $5,000 per mentor teacher, ASPIRE is requesting a total of $6,936,140 to implement the current proposal, which is adequate to support the 20 residents per year. Resident teachers will also be provided with support in identifying and applying for grants, loans, and scholarships. The costs for the ASPIRE project are reasonable in relation to the 3,000 LEA students, 100 teacher residents, 300 classroom and induction mentors and NU faculty members to be served over the five grant years. The project cost is approximately $2,040 per student, teacher resident, mentor, and faculty served each project year of the grant. ASPIRE and its partners also will provide additional support for the project in the form of additional private and public sector grants, and in-kind resources from these organizations amounting about $1,387,267 per year, which amounts to a 100% in-kind match. (e77-e78) The institutionalization of this project will be successfully undertaken because funds received from the US Department of Education to launch the ASPIRE Project will be conceived of as seed monies. The organizational leadership across partners are offering 100% match to showcase ability and intent to sustain this project after the grant period. Staff hired with federal funds will no longer be needed once federal support ends, as new organizational structures will have been established to continue the project. After the project ends, NU faculty and staff, along with CVESD teachers and staff will continue their participation as part of their regular professional assignments. (e79) Setting the stage for external funding and coordination strategies with other funding sources: NU has an established record of receiving funds from federal pass-through grants, States, and private foundations that support public education. From FY19 through FY22, NU's COE received $1.2 million from the State of Nevada's Department of Education, San Diego Foundation; Wells Fargo Foundation; Mathematics Education Trust; US Department of Education pass through Fresno Unified School District; and the Wallace Foundation. (e80)

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 management plan is designed to ensure that the program objectives will be achieved in a timely manner and within budget. Table 1 outlines the interrelationship between activities, responsibilities, timelines, milestones, and persons responsible for accomplishing project tasks. Adequate budget support has been provided for each of the project's objectives. The overall management will be undertaken by the Management Team, composed of the Executive Project Director, Co-Project Directors, NU Colleges of Education and Letters & Sciences faculty members, teacher residents, induction coordinators, representatives from CVESD, and each community partner. (e83) Executive Project Director (EPD) with 25% in kind, Dean, Sanford COE, NU, will be responsible for the overall direction, ensuring that the Governance Council and the Management Team provide a coordinated approach to the project and develop a pathway toward sustainability. (e85) The formative elements of the evaluation design will provide ongoing feedback to project staff for timely and valid information on the management, implementation, and efficiency of the project. Systems for providing feedback and ongoing assessment will be established as well as measures of ongoing project progress. For example, the Project Director and the Governance Council will receive monthly feedback from the Management Team and the Independent Evaluator to ensure that timely and valid information is provided. (e89-e92)

Weaknesses:

None 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 proposes increasing Educator Diversity: As a nonprofit designated HSI and ANAPISI, NU has a demonstrated record of increasing educator diversity by recruiting, preparing, and supporting underrepresented teacher candidates. Efforts to increase educator diversity in the teaching profession will be prioritized throughout the project, including recruitment and admission, throughout their master's level coursework, in team and interdisciplinary clinical classroom teaching, hiring and placement in CVESD, and through their induction and mentoring as new teachers – 70% of ASPIRE participants will come from underrepresented backgrounds. (e18)-e20)

Weaknesses:

None 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 proposes supporting a Diverse Educator Workforce and Professional Growth To Strengthen Student Learning: To strengthen student learning, ASPIRE will provide a variety of activities to support a well-prepared, effective, and diverse educator workforce to enhance professional growth, including team taught and interdisciplinary clinical experiences and induction. First, ASPIRE's recruitment strategies will be specifically aligned to address the CVESD's teaching shortage areas (e.g., special education, dual-language immersion, and elementary education) (e20-e24)

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 proposes Meeting Student Social, Emotional, and Academic Needs: ASPIRE is designed to improve underserved students' academic and SEL through the creation of inclusive, identity-safe climates, and evidence-based practices in several ways. NU will continue to intentionally integrate SEL into all academic aspects of ASPIRE, such as viewing students as creators rather than consumers of knowledge and valuing their lived experience. (e24-e25)

   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:

   The applicant proposes Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities: A fundamental aspect of ASPIRE is to provide equitable, identity safe learning environments, where there is an emphasis on culturally sustaining pedagogy in direct relation to the school and community context of Chula Vista. These pedagogical practices and PD programs in elementary schools examine the sources of inequity and inadequacy by emphasizing how inclusive teaching practices that honor the assets of race, ethnicity, culture, language, and disability status. (e25-e26)

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:

   The applicant proposes Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities: A fundamental aspect of ASPIRE is to provide equitable, identity safe learning environments, where there is an emphasis on culturally sustaining pedagogy in direct relation to the school and community context of Chula Vista. These pedagogical practices and PD programs in elementary schools examine the sources of inequity and inadequacy by emphasizing how inclusive teaching practices that honor the assets of race, ethnicity, culture, language, and disability status. (e25-e26)

   Weaknesses:

   None noted.

   Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/07/2022 11:12 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: National University (S336S220047)
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

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

Applicant: National University (S336S220047)

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:

   A very comprehensive and cohesive design throughout the application. They reference the GYO model a few times, but did not select the Invitational Priority for such (e41).

   e18-27: Clearly addressed all CPPs in a clearly labeled section. A very comprehensive and cohesive design throughout.

   e27: The narrative cross-references different elements throughout, stating where info can be found, e.g., in Appendices.

   e29: Activities are based on research literature, with citations / references.

   e42: References GYO methods, but did not select the Invitational Priority.

   e111: Another strength is the quality of Appendix C, their Logic Model.

   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:

National University, an HSI in San Diego, is extremely thorough in addressing all criteria throughout the Narrative.

e64: External evaluators were involved in designing the project. They mention that the TQP NIA requires this involvement.

e66: References are included in particular to the GPRA and HEA performance measures.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were found in their very comprehensive and appropriate Evaluation Plan.

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:

Comprehensive supports from NU, and thoroughly explained extensive resources (e74-82).

They include Letters of Commitment and Affiliation Agreements for Partners (referenced on p. e74).

Their Pre-award and Post-award Research Administration supports are thoroughly explained on pages e78-79, including a web-based tool for staff effort reporting that meets Uniform Guidance rules.

The project provides the required 100% match in inkind resources (e78).

Sustainability is ensured from Partners' match contributions from the beginning, and planning that will enable incorporating activities into established staff roles (e79).

Weaknesses:

None.

No weaknesses were found.

Just a note: On e81, the calculation of total Inkind Match value is wrong: 20% per year, is still "only 20%" – not 100%.)

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:

NU and its partners have designed a thorough Management Plan to ensure that all processes in criteria (i) and (ii) are accomplished.

The responsibilities of Key Project Personnel are clearly defined, identifying staff and their roles, percent time on project, and whether they are grant-funded or provided by partners as in-kind contributions (e85-87).

Page e88 describes formative assessments that will be used and reviewed monthly for some data, and also annually, including focus groups and interviews.

A thorough Management Chart by Objectives provides a useful reference and guide for accomplishing project activities (Table 1, e89-92).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were found in the project's Management Plan.

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:

   National University addressed each of the Competitive Priorities seriously, and upfront in the application, including listing them in the Appendix H1 Table of Contents, along with Absolute Priority 2.

   The applicant meets this Priority 1 in being an HSI and MSI (an ANAPISI), meeting (criterion a), and in its articulated reforms planned to improve their teacher preparation program as included in criterion b).

   Weaknesses:

   No weaknesses were found in this highly competent proposal to increase educator diversity.

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:

   Thorough articulation of how the partnership will meet the several elements required for this CPP to support their growing diverse educator workforce that will ultimately strengthen K-12 student learning.

   Detailed steps are described over the course of four pages (e20-23), including the roles of different partners, methods of instruction, and coursework.

   They also incorporate some cutting-edge, way-cool, virtual learning platforms / experiences that will be developed and used, e.g., simSchool (e21-22).

Virtual observation tools are also to be used to gather feedback to assist clinical practice improvements (e22).

State standards, such as TPE, are adhere to for clinical practice courses (e23).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses could be found.

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:

   Again, a thorough description is provided of how the partnership will meet students' SEA needs, including those of the college students, so that the SEA needs of their K-12 students can also be met in the future and ongoing.

   Well thought-out plans, based on proven theory and practice, for meeting diverse educators' and their K-12 students' SEA needs (e4-25).

   e24: The applicable "academic development principles" that address this CPP are further discussed in the Project Design narrative.

   e24: They will use "Harmony SEL playbook activities" to intersect theory and practice in their courses.

   e25: They seek to have their students learn cognitively and affectively.

   Weaknesses:

   No weaknesses were to found.

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:

   NU provides a detailed narrative on how their activities will promote equity in student access to resources and opportunities (e25-27).

   NU's Inclusive Excellence Council is a resource to the Partnership (e26).

   The program's residency focuses on the holistic embedding of DEI as the element that holds all aspects of the program together (e25).

   They will use the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) to guide the evaluation and content delivery. IDI is a research-based, proven-valid guide to measure cross-cultural outcomes (e27).

   Weaknesses:

   There are no weaknesses in meeting this CPP.

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 incorporates / builds on the GYO model.

Weaknesses:

Not selected as meeting the Invitational Priority. No points are awarded anyway.

Reader's Score: **0**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/06/2022 06:43 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: National University (S336S220047)
Reader #3:   **********

	Points Possible	**Points Scored**
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	25
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	16
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	102

Technical Review Form

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

Applicant: National University (S336S220047)

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 presents a collaborative partnership with community agencies (pg. e27). Involving the community stakeholders is an effective way to increase diversity through engaging leaders in the community and provide a strong network of support.

   The project provides a strong rationale for including culturally relevant immersion, e.g., during induction, new teacher will be immersed in the culture of their school and of the community at large (pg. e29).

   ii) The performance measures are clearly specified and measurable, e.g., by September 30 of each project year, the Governance Council and Work Teams will have met at least quarterly (pg. e30).

   iii) The applicant models the residency after an adapted medical residency clinical practice approach (pg. e35) and is designed to increase diversity.

   v) The program design includes a plan for continuous improvement.

   vi) The project is highly likely to build capacity and yield results after the period of Federal funding has ended.

   Weaknesses:

   i) Although the applicant provides that it will fill shortages in special education, dual-language immersion, English language needs, and elementary education (pg. 16), it is unclear where the specific areas of shortage is in the district. Details around the shortage would be helpful in illustrating the need and steps and strategies in recruiting in the specific areas of need would help to build a strong need.

   ii) The applicant does not detail goals. It appears the objectives are actually the goals since they are broad and the sections under objectives are the objectives.

iv) The applicant provides a description of the redesigned courses leading to the Masters degree (pg. e43), however, the details of the finalized courses are not clear since the applicant will plan the course redesign November 2022 through May 2023.

Reader's Score: 25

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 cites outcomes measures that would provide valid and reliable performance data on outcomes such as pre-post survey to measure the effectiveness of the partnerships, the California Subject Examinations for Teachers, Reading Instruction Competence Assessment, CalTPA, and observation protocols (pg. e62). The applicant cites the use of quantitative and qualitative measures.

ii) The applicant identifies an external evaluator and a team of 10-member external evaluation team that will design surveys, assess the validity and reliability of assessment instruments, teacher residency programming, and cognitive and social-emotional dimensions of student development (pg. e64).

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not detail a clear data collection plan with details when each target dates for the performance measures. For example, who is responsible for collecting the data, how often it is collected during the duration of the project, and how will it be reviewed.

Reader's Score: 16

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 presents a strong support for student support and resources to carry out the objectives of the program (pg. e74). For example, the applicant is leveraging in-kind support. Other support systems include the NU Office of Institutional Research that will support reporting and grant management; the NU System Information Technology Department provides a variety of software, desktop and laptop computers; and a variety of other offices at NU that will provide support.

ii) The budget is adequate to support the program. They are aligned with the activities and the applicant described the partners support and needs in which most are personnel costs and direct student support.

iii) The costs are reasonable to support the goals, objectives, and outcomes. The program serves over 100 teacher residents and provide $26,000 per resident over a five-year period with a $5,000 per mentor teacher. A large percentage of the funds are allocated to the resident support.

iv) The applicant provides that their partners' support is a commitment to the sustainability of the project after the period of Federal funding has ended.

v) The applicant includes strong commitment from each partner that will contribute to the success of the program.

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 details a comprehensive management plan that includes six work teams, recruitment, residency teacher

preparation, cultural immersion, induction/mentoring, equity and teacher cultural alignment, and assessment. The applicant provides a detailed management plan with objectives, timelines, and which team is responsible to complete pg. e89).

ii) The applicant provides a formative assessment plan where teams will meet regularly, monthly to discuss data and make continuous improvements (pg. e87).

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:

   The applicant provides that they are a nonprofit designated HSI and ANAPISI. Furthermore, NU has a successful track record of increasing diversity by recruiting, preparing, and supporting underrepresented teacher candidates (pg. e18).

   Weaknesses:

   No weakness 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 provides that they will align their recruitment with the workforce needs to address teacher shortages and will review and assess the curriculum.

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 applicant provides that the program is designed to meet the SEL needs of students from underrepresented populations through the creation of inclusion, safe climates, and evidence-based practices.

   ### 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 details pedagogical practices to provide equitable, identify safe learning environments, and culturally sustaining pedagogy in relation to the school and community context of Chula Vista (pg. e25).

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