

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/07/2022 12:03 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Southeastern Louisiana University (S336S220066)

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	27
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	108

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - Panel - 3: 84.336S

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Southeastern Louisiana University (S336S220066)

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:

Overview:

The applicant clearly provided a strong need and evidence-based rationale that is supported by the logic model. Goals with aligning outcomes clearly defines the project's plans to enhance the undergraduate teacher preparation program to support novice teachers. The project design is thoroughly communicated and displays current knowledge of stakeholder needs and practice.

- i. The applicant provides a strong rationale that is firmly justified in evidence-based research. The applicant details each component of the project using the logic model to support guiding practices. The logic model clearly aligns resources, strategic inputs, outputs, and short-term and long-term outcomes to the goals of the proposed project. Project activities are guided in research and practice that supports the needed enhancement of undergraduate teacher preparation programs that will support novice teachers through mentorship and coaching that will impact the recruitment and retainment of teacher candidates in partner school systems.
- ii. The applicant clearly communicates the goals, objectives, and outcomes for this project in Table 1 (e20-22). Goals are correlated with the outcome measurements and assessment of success. Specifically, identifying percentage changes of university faculty who are satisfied in the use of NIET ATR for high quality evaluation and feedback through training; identifying number and percentage changes number of recruitment efforts for diverse applicants; and measurement of perceptions about mentor teachers (e20-e22).
- iii. The applicant clearly shared how this project is a part of a comprehensive plan to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students. Namely, how this program will assist moving students through moving students through pipeline of preparation to professional practice. Also, using school community stakeholders to partner and be sure that the vision is shared among all entities that will be included. Lastly, ensuring the use of the NIET to provide clinical training for faculty, mentors, and other training participants (e35; e37-e38).

- iv. The applicant showed strong evidence that the proposed project is informed through a review of current research on components that are set to improve teacher preparation. The applicant includes research on coherence between coursework and practice, rigorous clinical experience, and diversifying the teacher workforce (e37-e38).
- v. The applicant strongly displays how performance feedback and improvement are integral to the project design. For example, the application denotes coaching using NIET to engages partners and participants in mentorship to implement change. The applicant also specifically identified clinical experiences and induction program to be used as ways to receive ongoing feedback and improvement for the project (e37-e38).
- vi. The applicant strongly outlines how this project will build capacity yield long term results. Specifically, the BRIDGE program will implement an ongoing “train the trainer” model that will use NIET to continuously support novice teachers (e40). Also, the program will be directly aligned with the needs of the teachers and students needs from the partner LEAs. Mentor teachers will provide ongoing induction support and feedback (e40).

Weaknesses:

- i. None noted
- ii. None noted
- iii. None noted
- iv. None noted
- v. None noted
- vi. 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:

Overview:

The applicant provides a comprehensive evaluation plan that includes hiring needed staff to record process, collaboration among project stakeholders to gather summative and formative data. The evaluation plan will ensure valid and reliable performance monitoring to provide progress and data. Data will also deploy system tracking to father program progress and impact. The narrative describes a feasible evaluation plan that is appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes.

- i. The narrative supports clear evidence and alignment of measuring data which can provide valid and reliable data outcomes. For example, establishing an evaluation team including NIET as a partner to deploy data systems to track data for fidelity, using various modes of assessments and measurements to evaluate various forms of data such as teacher interviews and surveys. Also, the evaluation team will collect and track data throughout the process to assess program impact (e45). Lastly, student outcomes will be measure valid and reliable performance data using the state department data center (e46).

ii. The narrative shared that the evaluation will use a wide range of points of measurement, strategies and methods that will be aligned with program goals. Qualitative and quantitative data from multiple sources will ensure thoroughness (e46). Each goal is connected to a research question and rubrics for quality evaluation and feedback is also clearly noted in the narrative (e43-e44).

Weaknesses:

- i. None noted
- ii. 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:

Overview:

The applicant provides evidence that they have support including facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources from the applicant organization. In addition, the applicant provides evidence of a sound, reasonable budget in relation to the project expenditures and needs. However, they do not provide a multi-year financial model and plan. The applicant does clearly demonstrate they have resources and partnerships to operate the project after the end of the grant.

i. The application adequately provides strong evidence they have support including facilitates, administration of the grant, and expertise and learning resources. For example, the university partner will provide needed items such as facilities, equipment, and supplies when needed (e37-e38). The office of office of sponsored research will provide administrative support and collaboration for data reporting. Lastly, the college of education will have direct connections and relationships with the students participating in the prospective project (e37-e38).

ii. The application clearly described an outlined budget that will be adequate to support the proposed project. The applicant dictates that this project will build capacity that can continue after the project ends. Budget mainly includes personnel, fringe benefits, travel with line items in continuation for five years. Matching funds from partners are also

outlined (e192).

iii. The applicant clearly provides a budget that is reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project (e192-e212). Specifically, the budget items for personnel, fringe, travel, and contractual are clearly aligned to the objectives and are reasonable expenses (e192-e212). Additionally, the applicant developed the budget to build toward sustainability beyond the length of the project.

iv. The applicant adequately indicates that they have resources to support the grant beyond the granting period. For example, the applicant indicates leaders from key partner agencies will engage regularly in preparation for the initial activities supported by the proposal (e55). Additionally, each partnering district will be tasked with designing and allocating resources for the sustainability of implementing the induction program (e55). Finally, the districts commit to collaborating with partners to recruit, select, and support high-quality mentors for teacher candidates and novice teachers during and beyond the project period (e55).

v. The applicant gives clear and strong evidence of each partner and their role in the project. For example, LEAs and the university has formal MOUS that articulate the roles and responsibilities. NIET's role is also shared in the narrative. The management plan outlines specific tasks for each partner (e57).

Weaknesses:

- i. None noted
- ii. None noted
- iii. None noted
- iv. The applicant failed to provide a clear multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan to support the proposed project beyond the grant period (e54-e55) (3 points not awarded).
- v. None noted

Reader's Score: 27

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:

Overview:

The applicant provides an adequate management plan to accomplish project goals, objectives, responsible parties, and milestones for completed tasks. There is strong evidence that there will be systems in place to ensure feedback and continuous improvement by having an Advisory Board and Project Director to manage the initiative.

- i. The applicant provides an appropriate management plan that sets out the goals, proposed time and within budget. The

plan also defines responsibility of all partners and milestones for accomplishing tasks. For example, Goal 1 will include the university faculty and staff, LEA staff, and NIET staff. Each project partner will identify the advisory board characteristics and members in the 2022-23 school term and milestones for meeting quarterly will continue for the duration of the project. Qualified personnel with their duties are found in Table 4 (e60-e63).

ii. The applicant provides a thorough plan for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project. For example, the Advisory Board comprised of identified and diverse stakeholders will provide continuous feedback and communication among all partners to share strengths and areas of improvement. The Project Director will manage all operation of the proposed project. This person will ensure all aspects of the initiative are completed in a timely fashion.

Weaknesses:

- i. None noted
- ii. 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:

Overview:

The applicant provides adequate evidence of a program that is designed to reforms 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.

- i. None noted

ii. The applicant provides strong evidence of the percentage of underrepresented minorities in the proposed target schools (e16-17). Adequate evidence of a program that will reform a teacher education program by improving the diversity of teacher candidates is provided in the narrative. For example, the applicant specifies emphasis on preparing, supporting, and retaining diverse teacher candidates (e17).

Weaknesses:

- i. None noted
- ii. 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:

Overview:

The applicant provides clear evidence in the narrative of a proposed project that is designed to increase the proportion of well-prepared, diverse and effective educator serving students, with a focus on increasing the number of teachers that are certified and teaching in their field.

The applicant gave clear evidence of the proposed project will address CPP 2 by focusing on the preparation of teachers in the shortage areas designated by partner districts. The university will aim to produce teachers that able to teach with a certification and in their field (e17).

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:

Overview:

The applicant clearly provides a proposed project that will foster a sense of belonging and inclusion for underserved students. The proposed plan will appropriately implement evidenced-based practices for advancing student success for underserved students.

The narrative gives clear evidence of offering candidates that are recruited to the project support students' social, emotional, academic, and career development needs. For example, the university's The Lion Intervention Network (LINK) is one way the University helps students succeed. Developed to identify students who are facing academic challenges and/or personal hardships that are hindering their academics (e18).

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:

Overview:

The applicant shared a specific targeted population for the proposed project. In addition, they have examined the sources of inequities that could be used to develop the project and insure appropriate pedagogical practices would be included.

a. Clear evidence is provided that CPP4 will be addressing inequities in elementary and secondary schools in partner districts by ensuring that teachers prepared through Southeasterns' residency program are adequately equipped to address the needs of students in those districts. The most effective way to address equity gaps is to ensure that every student has a well-prepared teacher.

b. The applicant clearly indicates that they will serve a high-need LEA in which 61% of its student population is from racial/ethnic minority backgrounds and 79% are classified minority districts. The needs assessment also notes that the average teacher turnover rate is 15%, which exceeds the average state teacher turnover rate of 11%. (e16). Additionally, the applicant clearly indicates while more than half of the students are of color, only about one-fourth of the teachers are of color (e16-e17). Further, the LEA meets the high-need LEA definition, where at least 20% of the children served by the LEA are children from low-income families and for which there is a high teacher turnover rate (e16-e17).

Weaknesses:

- a. None noted
- b. 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 did not apply for this invitational priority.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not apply for this invitational priority.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/07/2022 12:03 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/06/2022 11:38 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Southeastern Louisiana University (S336S220066)

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	27
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	108

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - Panel - 3: 84.336S

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Southeastern Louisiana University (S336S220066)

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) Tangipahoa Parish is a high-need LEA with 61% of its student population from racial/ethnic minority backgrounds, 79% classified as economically disadvantages, 63% of classes taught by appropriately certified teachers and a teacher turnover rate exceeding the state average by 36% supports the rationale for the project. (page e16-e17). Effective teacher candidate training and clinical experience with supports in early years will increase the likelihood of retaining effective teachers demonstrates a rationale (page e81).
- (ii) Clearly specified and measurable goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project justify the quality of the proposed project design (page e20-e35).
- (iii) The Advisory Board will support aligning vision for effective teaching and learning practices between the program and partner districts and the National Institute for Excellence in Teaching (NIET) will provide training for clinical faculty, preservice mentors, induction mentors and directors that is aligned and well-connected. This is evidence of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students (page e35). By embedding a teaching standards rubric into coursework, high-quality clinical experience, and a comprehensive induction plan, the project reflects up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice (page e37-e38).
- (iv) Through diversifying the teaching workforce the proposed project is adequate in reflecting up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice (page e37-e38).
- (v) Feedback delivered through coaching, clinical experiences, and the induction program support performance feedback and continuous improvement being integral to the design of the proposed project (page e40).
- (vi) The "train the trainer" model and a collaborative triad between Southeastern faculty, NIET, and District and school leaders are evidence that the project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance (page e40-e41).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted

Reader's Score: 30

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

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

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

Strengths:

- (a) NIET's Research and Evaluation Department with extensive experience supporting large-scale evaluations of education programs lead the evaluation with a plan that supports the program's theory of actions (Page e82). A rigorous data collection process using qualitative data to assess fidelity of implementation as well as interview survey data being triangulated for higher level of validity and focus groups being recorded, transcribed, and coded all provide evidence that methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes (Page e44-e45).
- (b) The Logic Model present the strategies and outputs to support the methods of evaluation as being thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the project (Page e81). Table 2 presents research questions with applicable sub-questions, data sources, and alignment to goals (Page e43-e44)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

1. C. Adequacy of Resources (30 points)

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

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

Strengths:

- (i) Southeastern will provide for the program as well as networking and alumni opportunities and the district partners will provide facilities for coaching, training, and smaller PLC's demonstrating adequacy of support (page e37) Southeastern's Office of Sponsored Research and Programs will provide administrative leadership and fiscal management and collaborate with partners to collect appropriate data demonstrating support (page e37-e38).
- (ii) The Budget Summary is thorough and adequate to support the proposed project (page e192-e212)
- (iii) The costs for personnel, fringe, travel, contractual, and other line items included in this proposal are based on actual costs and similar-level personnel and services (page e53, e192)
- (iv) The grant partners have committed to match resources equivalent to the requested funding from the US Department of Education (page e51)
- (v) The Office of Sponsored Research and Programs oversees millions in grants, contracts and subawards each year (Page e54).
- (vi) Letters of support, ongoing collaboration, and in-kind contributions support demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project (e54, Appendix E).

Weaknesses:

- (v) The multi-year plan is missing from the application.

Reader's Score: 27

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan**1. D. Quality of the Management Plan (20 points)**

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

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

Strengths:

- (i) The Management Plan has clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones to support achieving the objectives of the proposed project (Page e57-60) The Qualifications of Project Personnel Table supports the defined responsibilities of each role in the project (page 60-e63).
- (ii) The Advisory Board meetings will provide a continuous feedback loop between Southeastern and district partners and the Project Director will manage all aspects of the initiative which ensures feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project (Page e63-e64).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 20

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

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

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

Strengths:

(b) The project will address the local teacher shortage not only by preparing more than 375 teachers in high-need areas, but also by increasing retention of novice teachers through high-quality induction programs that include trained mentors (Page e17) The project aims to recruit teacher candidates from underrepresented populations and provide support to ensure their persistence through the program and ultimate retention in the classroom (Page e17). The project incorporates opportunities for teacher candidates to understand and apply effective use of technology, instructional techniques, and strategies consistent with the principles of universal design (Page e19) The College of Education at Southeastern, in collaboration with Tangipahoa Parish School System, St. Charles Parish School System, and the nonprofit NIET, proposes to build a pipeline of highly-effective and diverse novice teachers through an innovative teacher preparation program (Page e19)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 4

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

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

Strengths:

- The University will aim to produce more teachers aligned with the current needs of the districts to reduce both out-of-field and uncertified teaching (page e17).
- The project will address the local teacher shortage by preparing more than 375 teachers in high-need areas (page e17)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 3

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

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

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

Strengths:

- The Lion Intervention Network (LINK) identifies students who are facing academic challenges and/or personal hardships (i.e. financial, homelessness/displacement, loss of loved one, car accidents, non-life-threatening behaviors, etc.) that are hindering their academics, LINK connects students with any extra help they might need along their educational paths to success.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 2

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 4

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

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

- a) **In one or more of the following educational settings:**
 - (1) **Early learning programs**
 - (2) **Elementary school.**
 - (3) **Middle school**

- (4) High school
- (5) Career and technical education programs.
- (6) Out-of-school-time settings.
- (7) Alternative schools and programs.

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

Strengths:

- Teachers prepared through Southeastern's residency program are adequately equipped to address the needs of students in those districts. The most effective way to address equity gaps is to ensure that every student has a well-prepared teacher (page e18).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 2

Invitational Priority - Invitational Priority

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

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

Strengths:

Did not apply

Weaknesses:

Did not apply

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/06/2022 11:38 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/07/2022 09:09 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Southeastern Louisiana University (S336S220066)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	30
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Adequacy of Resources	30	27
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	108

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - Panel - 3: 84.336S

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Southeastern Louisiana University (S336S220066)

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 proposed partnership will lead to an expanded pool of well-prepared and diverse teacher candidates by providing transition from "preparation to practice" through the BRIDGE program. (pg. e36) 5
- (ii)The objectives, measures, and desired outcomes for the BRIDGE will demonstrate the impact of the program by generating a robust/exhaustive set of effectiveness data such as percentage of teacher candidate's observations, number of workshops conducted, and other data points. (pgs. e20-e22) 5
- (iii)The proposed BRIDGE strategy will improve teaching and learning by students receiving training during the transition from preparation to practice and with curriculum well-aligned to the expectations of the teaching position. The activity allows this group to experience additional learning through the BRIDGE program. (pg. e36) 5
- (iv)The design of the proposed project is supported by evidence-based practices such as Coherence between Coursework and Clinical Practice and Rigorous Clinical Experiences. (pg. e37) 5
- (v)The program performance feedback and continuous improvement will demonstrate levels of effectiveness by regularly providing cycles of program data review and feedback opportunities inherently embedded in the instructional coaching cycle/program. (pgs. e39-e40) 5
- (vi)The proposed project will sustain beyond the period of Federal financial assistance by implementing a train the trainer model, clinical experiences and induction training to remain beyond the grant. (pgs. e41) 5

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses

Reader's Score: 30

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

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

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

Strengths:

- (i) The evaluation strategy will provide adequately valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes by collecting and monitoring data that is clearly aligned to the program desired outcomes, such as implementation fidelity and instructional effectiveness data, on formative and summative cycles. (pg. e44) 10
- (i) The evaluation strategy will prove to be quite feasible and appropriate by directly aligning the timeline (such as annual employment data) and the data collection process with the identified objectives, measures and desired outcomes of the proposed project. (pgs. e43-e44) 10

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses

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 various supports stem from each of the partner organizations, which suggests exemplary capacity for the proposed program to be implemented with fidelity. (pgs. e51-e53) 6

(ii)The expenditures outlined in the proposed project's budget suggests fiscal capacity to adequately implement the BRIDGE. (pg. e53) 6

(iii)The proposed project costs for the identified personnel are reasonable given that the funded roles are currently in place. The intended impact of the program includes sustainable efforts (pg. e53). 6

(iv)The applicant demonstrates adequate capacity to operate the project beyond the life of the grant by the established internal and external partnerships and commitments. (pg. e54)3

(v)The proposed finances and resources offered from the partners demonstrate an exemplar level of relevance and commitment. (pgs. e52-e53). The applicant letters of support and MOUs also demonstrate relevance and commitment. (pg. e55) 6

Weaknesses:

iv)The application lacks a clearly defined timeline, milestones, and a multiyear financial and operating model.

Reader's Score: 27

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 proposed project will increase the number of better prepared teacher candidates by the partners managing a clearly defined implementation project activity timeline as outlined in the management plan (pgs. e57-e62) related to the launch of the program and other implementation processes. Regular meetings of this team provide a forum for monitoring progress and assessing the effectiveness of major project tasks (p. e60-e61). Qualifications are included for key project managers and personnel to provide evidence of leadership and expertise needed to oversee the implementation of proposed project tasks (p. e62-e63). An TQP Management timeline provides a scope in carrying out the objectives of the proposed project on time.10

(ii)The project will develop a culture around feedback and continuous improvement by working with NEIT to lead the evaluation and data review process and structures

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses

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 proposed project will increase the diversity of the teaching pool by creating teacher pipelines for underrepresented teacher candidates. (pg. e17)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses

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 proposed project will increase the diversity of the teaching pool by establishing the BRIDGE program. (pgs. e17)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses

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 proposed project will improve the students' social, emotional, academic and career development offering students access to supports like LINK. (pg. e18)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses

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 proposed project will promote educational equity by addressing inequities in elementary and secondary schools. (pg. e18)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses

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 proposed project will decrease the number of inequities for students enter the teacher education. (pg. e18)

Weaknesses:

No weakness

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/07/2022 09:09 PM