

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/13/2022 03:57 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Administrators of the Tulane Educational Fund (S423A220025)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	35	30
Significance		
1. Significance	25	21
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	19
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	17
Sub Total	100	87
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Educator Diversity	5	4
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. Promoting Equity	3	2
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
1. Meeting Student Needs	2	2
Sub Total	10	8
Total	110	95

Technical Review Form

Panel #7 - FY22 SEED Panel - 7: 84.423A

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Administrators of the Tulane Educational Fund (S423A220025)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. A. Quality of Project Design (35 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 training or professional development services to be provided by the proposed project are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services.
(7 points)

(ii) 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.(7 points)

(iii) The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.
(7 points)

(iv) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services.
(7 points)

(v) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.
(7 points)

Please provide Overview Statement on top of first Strength comment.

Strengths:

i. The application demonstrates that the professional learning services to be provided are sufficient in quality (by recruiting, preparing and supporting mentor teachers, e22 (via a high school to career pathway, e25 – as the Aspiring Educator Pathway (AEP, e27) prepares excellent teachers to teach in under-served schools, e21

The project provides numerous teacher certification tracks in various schools, e20, 21

The project demonstrates intensity by requiring all teachers to complete a residency program (e22); and by continually assessing teacher progress (e23).

ii. The proposed project is well-designed and thought out, to build capacity and ensure that yielded results will extend beyond the assistance period.

Applicant specifically states how capacity will be built and maintained in several ways: The use of an abundant pool of EPP applicants, e27 & mitigate selection bias (blind review process, Praxis tutoring, e31); Flexible learning opportunities, e32). Continually builds upon partnerships and apprenticeships, e28; Support of teachers to curb the attrition of new teachers (financial support/Praxis reimbursement, e32); and continuously building upon new knowledge and expertise, as well as the use of tech-based solutions (recruitment & retention) e28.

- iii. There is evidence that the project will be grounded in a Logic Model framework (e30), that underly the propose research and the quality of that framework (e30-32); use of the WWC framework
- iv. The proposed project demonstrates a collaborative effort (LEAS, nonprofits, community colleges, e32), to maximize the effectiveness of the project.
- v. The proposed project design demonstrates that, if successfully implemented, it will address the identified needs of the target population, e28-e31.

Weaknesses:

- iv. The proposed project does not mention if/how the community and family might be engaged, e28
- v. The project is limited in that it does not specifically address any foresight (i.e., contingency plan) on anticipating mishaps or how unintended mishaps might be addressed, should the need occur.

Reader's Score: 30

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. B. Significance (25 points)

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

**(i) The importance or magnitude of the results or outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project, especially improvements in teaching and student achievement.
(7 points)**

**(ii) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and to the anticipated results and benefits.
(6 points)**

**(iii) The potential for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing program of the agency or organization at the end of Federal funding.
(6 points)**

**(iv) The extent to which the results of the proposed project are to be disseminated in ways that will enable others to use the information or strategies.
(6 points)**

Please provide Overview Statement on top of first Strength comment.

Strengths:

- i. The project demonstrates the importance or magnitude of the results/outcomes are likely to be attained by the project, particularly resulting in improvements in teaching and student achievement. This is evidenced by, the number of highly effective teachers that are being trained (i.e., ~ 20% of the total educator workforce in New Orleans) and 70 underserved schools resulting in an achievement impact on ~40,480 students, e36 - e39.
- ii. The projected budget is reasonable, in that it will impact ~20% of New Orleans' entire workforce and 92% (40,480) of New Orleans' student population, e41, e42
- iii. The proposed project highlights the potential for the incorporation of the project purposes, activities, or organization that will sustain/benefit, as detailed in the applicant's proven history of recruiting and preparing highly effective, diverse educators. There is also a well thought out training and use of mentor teachers, as well as the

development and use of an online platform, e42

iv. The project supports the dissemination of results and the capability for others to use the results of this project, by making the evaluation of the project available to other educators – via use of organizational networks, journal publications, conference presentations, blogs and via social media, e43

Weaknesses:

iv. The project does not address or anticipate hiccups (contingency plan) in the dissemination of the results; The dissemination of results to teachers, who are often unable to attend conferences, might be better suited via Teacher Professional Learning, meetings

Reader's Score: 21

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. C. 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 the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(i) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable. (10 points)

(ii) 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. (10 points)

Please provide Overview Statement on top of first Strength comment.

Strengths:

i. The proposed project has clearly measurable goals and objectives (e44); specific timelines for accomplishing the stated goals.

The project clearly delineates the specific roles and responsibilities of key program staff, e45, e46; activities and roles are clearly aligned to the intended objective, with clear timelines, e47,e48

ii. The management plan is strong and specific enough to achieve the proposed objectives within the time and anticipated budget, e47,e48

Weaknesses:

i. There is no evidence to cite in the project producing an evaluation plan that meets all WWC standards, e49

ii. There is no “wiggle room” in the budget in the event of any unforeseen matters, that may negatively impact the budget

Reader's Score: 19

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. D. 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, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the WWC standards with or without reservations as described in the WWC Handbook.

(4 points)

(ii) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(4 points)

(iii) The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.

(4 points)

(iv) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on Relevant Outcomes.

(4 points)

(v) The extent to which the design for implementing and evaluating the proposed project will result in information to guide possible replication of project activities or strategies, including information about the effectiveness of the approach or strategies employed by the project.

(4 points)

Please provide Overview Statement on top of first Strength comment.

Strengths:

i. The project is strong in that it will provide evidence that, if well-implemented, it will produce evidence regarding the effectiveness of the project, meeting WWC standards, e49 – measuring both teacher effectiveness and student achievement. Both formative and summative evaluations will be used, e49 and the project will use baseline data to help analyze results.

ii. The project will provide both qualitative (annual evaluation reports, performance feedback, e52 and quantitative (e.g., Power Analysis, e51, Teacher Retention Model, e51) evaluation methods will be employed; and demonstrates that it will allow for timely performance feedback and periodic (formative) assessments, e52

iii. The project demonstrates the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce both quantitative and qualitative data, e51, e52, e53-54

iv. The project demonstrates that the evaluation methods used will provide valid and reliable performance data, in that methods will be triangulated, allowing for multiple ways to view and analyze data, e54

v. The project demonstrates that is designed to ensure that others will be able to replicate findings of the proposed project.

Weaknesses:

i. All WWC standards are not clearly addressed

.
.

v. There is no detailed outline for the replication plan. More specifically, the project evaluation is not designed in such a way as to ensure that others will be able to replicate the findings, e55, e56

Reader's Score: 17

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. Competitive Preference Priority 1: Increasing Educator Diversity (Up to 5 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 high-quality, comprehensive teacher preparation programs that have a track record of attracting, supporting, graduating, and placing underrepresented teacher candidates, and that include one year of high-quality clinical experiences (prior to becoming the teacher of record) in high-need schools.

Strengths:

1. There is a 1-year residency program, e31; comprised of dedicated recruitment staff, e32
1. To help attract and retain high quality teachers of color, teachers will be provided:
 - financial support (e.g., Praxis reimbursement), e32
 - flexible learning opportunities (synchronous and asynchronous; evening, day, weekend), e32
 - stipends, summer employment, tutoring, e32

Weaknesses:

1. No clear evidence to ensure that teachers will be placed in high-needs schools

Reader's Score: 4

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 2

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2: Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities (up to 3 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—

(1) In one or more of the following educational settings:

- (i) Early learning programs.
- (ii) Elementary school.
- (iii) Middle school.
- (iv) High school.
- (v) Career and technical education programs.
- (vi) Out-of-school-time settings.
- (vii) Alternative schools and programs.
- (viii) Juvenile justice system or correctional facilities;

(2) That examines the sources of inequity and inadequacy and implements responses that include pedagogical practices in Educator preparation 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:

1. The applicant states that the project focuses on elementary – high-school students, e23
2. The applicant demonstrates that the proposed project is designed to promote educational equity and adequacy of resources and opportunities, e32 and begins to examine sources of inequity, e39
- The applicant proposes to use NIET rubric to evaluate teacher’s culturally relevant and anti-racist pedagogy, e33 and to motivate students by providing meaningful/hands-on relevant activities that connect with students’ interest, life experiences and cultural heritage, e33.

Weaknesses:

2. The applicant does not thoroughly highlight/discuss sources of inequity

Reader's Score: 2

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 3

1. Competitive Preference Priority 3: 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 developing and supporting Educator and school capacity to support social and emotional learning and development that—

- (1) Fosters skills and behaviors that enable academic progress;**
- (2) Identifies and addresses conditions in the learning environment, that may negatively impact social and emotional well-being for Underserved Students, including conditions that affect physical safety; and**
- (3) Is trauma-informed, such as addressing exposure to community-based violence and trauma specific to Military- or Veteran-Connected Students.**

Strengths:

- (1) The project is designed to foster skills and behaviors that enable academic success, via improving students’ social, emotional, academic and career development, e32, particularly for under-served students (e36)
- (2) The project identifies and addresses conditions in the learning environment that may negatively impact students’ social and emotional well-being, e15, e16
- (3) There is evidence that the project will use a trauma-informed SEL (i.e., CASEL framework), e26, e32

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/13/2022 03:57 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/13/2022 01:56 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Administrators of the Tulane Educational Fund (S423A220025)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	35	30
Significance		
1. Significance	25	25
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	16
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Sub Total	100	91
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Educator Diversity	5	5
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. Promoting Equity	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
1. Meeting Student Needs	2	2
Sub Total	10	10
Total	110	101

Technical Review Form

Panel #7 - FY22 SEED Panel - 7: 84.423A

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Administrators of the Tulane Educational Fund (S423A220025)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. A. Quality of Project Design (35 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 training or professional development services to be provided by the proposed project are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services.
(7 points)

(ii) 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.(7 points)

(iii) The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.
(7 points)

(iv) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services.
(7 points)

(v) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.
(7 points)

Please provide Overview Statement on top of first Strength comment.

Strengths:

The applicant provides adequate evidence of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration of the proposed project. The project will have 351 educators by 2025 and continue to improve recruitment. The applicant provides clear evidence that the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services and demonstrates the need for their target audience. However, The applicant provides limited details on how collaborative partners will be used to maximize the effectiveness of project services.

i. The applicant provides adequate evidence that the project's training or professional development services to be provided by the proposed project are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services. The applicant indicates all Induction Models implemented by NOLA SEED EPP Partners are sufficient in quality, intensity, and duration, as determined by a study that meets the What Works Clearinghouse (e22). For example, building district and school capacity of LEAs will include mentor teachers assigned caseloads of between 1-5 residents. Mentors will receive LDOE credentials, which include 64 hours of workshop training provided by a state-approved vendor and preparation from EPP program experts. Lastly, EPP faculty and Mentor Teachers and an average of 200 hours of PD, as well as monthly reflection, goal-setting, and coaching sessions with Mentor Teachers (e22-23).

ii. The applicant provides adequate evidence the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results

that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance. For example, the applicant indicates an increased EPP pool of applicants, resulting in 351 aspiring educators by 2025. Secondly, NOLA SEED will fund a partnership with NCGYO that will support LEAs and EPPs to create qualifying apprenticeship programs. Once this is established the program will create new revenue to sustain the EPP applicant pipeline (e28). The program will increase teacher retention through improved preparation and targeted recruitment. Lastly, the program will build new knowledge and expertise among faculty and technology platform improvement for more centralized recruitment (e28).

iii. The applicant demonstrates there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework. For example, the applicant indicates the NOLA SEED Logic Model that includes objectives, inputs, strategies, outputs, short term outcomes and medium-term outcomes (e29-30). Also, conceptual frameworks such as the WWC Moderate Evidence of Effectiveness will support key strategies (e31).

iv. The applicant provides limited evidence that the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services. For example, NOLA SEED brings together four successful talent preparation providers. Partners have partner meetings to build on their individual strengths, share effective strategies, and align on key project activities (e35).

v. The applicant demonstrates of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs. NOLA SEED's target audience is New Orleans underserved schools and their students. Table 6 outlines the needs for those schools and their students along with the evidence of need, outcome, and strategies (e36-37).

Weaknesses:

- i. None noted
- ii. None noted
- iii. None noted
- iv. While the applicant provides evidence of having collaborative partners. The applicant provides limited details on how collaborative partners will be used to maximize the effectiveness of project services (e34-35).
- v. None noted

Reader's Score: 30

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. B. Significance (25 points)

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

**(i) The importance or magnitude of the results or outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project, especially improvements in teaching and student achievement.
(7 points)**

**(ii) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and to the anticipated results and benefits.
(6 points)**

**(iii) The potential for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing program of the agency or organization at the end of Federal funding.
(6 points)**

(iv) The extent to which the results of the proposed project are to be disseminated in ways

that will enable others to use the information or strategies.
(6 points)

Please provide Overview Statement on top of first Strength comment.

Strengths:

The applicant provides evidence the results of the project will be attained to see improvements in teaching and student achievement. Costs of the project are reasonable in relation to the scope of the project and the project has the possibility to be disseminated for others to use.

i. The applicant provides adequate evidence of the importance or magnitude of the results or outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project by recruiting diverse and culturally competent teachers and increasing and growing the teacher pool (e37). Also, increase and accelerate teacher development and retention through mentorship and coaching and providing induction support (e39-40). Lastly, the project will improve educators' SEL and culturally responsive teaching skills through activities that will result in teachers being better equipped to create inclusive, supportive unbiased environments (e40).

ii. The applicant provides clear evidence that the costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and to the anticipated results and benefits. Federal assistance will create a robust teacher workforce and a well-prepared applicant pool. For instance, the per teacher cost is \$9,903 in federal funds, or \$27,696 in total project funds (e41). Also, 351 Aspiring Educators are added to the pool of EPP applicants, and 500 high school and college students will be in the teacher pipeline, at a per-person cost of approximately \$2,859 (e41).

iii. The applicant provides clear evidence of the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing program of the agency or organization at the end of Federal funding. For example, all NOLA SEED Talent Partners (have established infrastructure and systems for curriculum development, partnerships, recruitment, delivering coursework, supporting field experiences, and continuous improvement (e42). Funding will expand enrollment to maintain over the long term, and funded training will create permanent shifts in programming for sustainment (e42).

iv. The applicant provides clear evidence of the results of the proposed project are to be disseminated in ways that will enable others to use the information or strategies. For example, an external evaluation team, Abt Associates will conduct both an implementation and impact evaluation. The Abt team will develop and disseminate findings from our implementation and impact evaluations through peer-reviewed journals, presentations, academic and practitioner-oriented conferences (e43).

Weaknesses:

- i. None noted
- ii. None noted
- iii. None noted
- iv. None noted

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. C. 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 the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

**(i) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.
(10 points)**

**(ii) 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.
(10 points)**

Please provide Overview Statement on top of first Strength comment.

Strengths:

The applicant provides clear evidence of the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project. The management plan is clearly defined and includes timelines, roles and responsibilities, and activities.

i. The applicant provides clear evidence of the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable. For example, Table 7 outlines specific and measurable NOLA SEED project goals, objectives, and outcomes are outlined and are aligned to all SEED performance measures (e44-45). Specifically, Goal 3 will advance the field by evaluating and disseminating a codified approach to teacher preparation that improves students' academic and non-academic outcomes. Objectives include evaluating the outcomes to identify high and low-impact teacher preparation strategies. Outcomes will include a practice guide to be shared as described in including 4 presentations and 4 blog posts on a platform with over 12,000 readers (e45).

ii. The applicant provides clear evidence 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. Partners have been put in place to assist in achieving the goals. Table 8 presents a detailed management plan including activities, roles and responsibilities, and timelines (e47-49). For example, Nonprofit partner NSNO will support and assist grant and program management. NSNO will hire a full-time dedicated role, Talent Director, to manage the HS2CT program and manage the NSNO job board website (e46).

Weaknesses:

- i. None noted
- ii. None noted

Reader's Score: 16

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. D. 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, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the WWC standards with or without reservations as described in the WWC Handbook.
(4 points)**

**(ii) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.
(4 points)**

(iii) The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.

(4 points)

(iv) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on Relevant Outcomes.

(4 points)

(v) The extent to which the design for implementing and evaluating the proposed project will result in information to guide possible replication of project activities or strategies, including information about the effectiveness of the approach or strategies employed by the project.

(4 points)

Please provide Overview Statement on top of first Strength comment.

Strengths:

The applicant provides clear evidence of the methods of evaluation and will provide feedback for outcomes. The narrative indicates the performance measures and impacts for each objective and is valid and reliable.

Supporting Statements:

Strengths:

i. The applicant provides clear evidence of the methods of evaluation that will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the WWC standards. The evaluation will address five research questions. The questions and impact and implementation evaluation are outlined in Table 9 along with the data source (e49). The applicant also indicates an evaluation timeline (e49). For example, Abt will assess the baseline equivalence of teachers and students in the treatment and comparison groups for all impact analyses using years of teaching experience (e50). WWC standards will be measured by the baseline equivalence to be estimated for each outcome analysis (e50).

ii. The applicant provides clear evidence of the methods of evaluation that will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. For example, Abt will meet monthly with the NOLA SEED project leadership team to provide feedback on the evaluation activities and findings (e52). Abt will also discuss progress, finding, implementation and impact data during monthly meetings. An annual report will provide the project team with a formal, annual evaluation report that will provide quantitative findings and impact (e52).

iii. The applicant provides clear evidence that the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible. Table 11 outlines performance measures and impacts for each objective and includes what data will be assessed (e53).

iv. The applicant provides clear evidence that the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on Relevant Outcomes. For instance, all outcome measures will meet WWC face validity, reliability, and domain requirements and will not be over-aligned with the intervention and all teacher-and student-level data for the impact evaluation (e54). Abt will use a validated observation tool to determine reliability to measure teacher culturally responsive teaching and perceptions (e55).

v. None noted

Weaknesses:

i. None noted

ii. None noted

iii. None noted

iv. None noted

v. The applicant indicates that the impact evaluation will provide evidence of the impact and will develop recommendations for possible replication in other school districts. However, there are no details outlining possible replication plans. Therefore, it is difficult to assess (e55).

Reader's Score: 20

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. Competitive Preference Priority 1: Increasing Educator Diversity (Up to 5 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 high-quality, comprehensive teacher preparation programs that have a track record of attracting, supporting, graduating, and placing underrepresented teacher candidates, and that include one year of high-quality clinical experiences (prior to becoming the teacher of record) in high-need schools.

Strengths:

CPP1 will be addressed through the recruitment of diverse teachers that reflect the demographics of the students in high-need areas. This program will fund program accessibility through financial supports such as stipends and scholarships, flexible learning opportunities, and community partnerships (e32 and e184).

Weaknesses:

None noted

Reader's Score: 5

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 2

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2: Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities (up to 3 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—

(1) In one or more of the following educational settings:

- (i) Early learning programs.**
- (ii) Elementary school.**
- (iii) Middle school.**
- (iv) High school.**
- (v) Career and technical education programs.**
- (vi) Out-of-school-time settings.**
- (vii) Alternative schools and programs.**
- (viii) Juvenile justice system or correctional facilities;**

(2) That examines the sources of inequity and inadequacy and implements responses that include pedagogical practices in Educator preparation 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:

CPP2 will be addressed by providing culturally relevant and anti-racist pedagogy and curriculum including motivation, relevant activities, and teacher knowledge of cultural heritage and student interest. EPP partners will integrate Culturally Responsive Teaching practices throughout the coursework, workshops, and clinical experiences, and some utilize research-based observational evaluation tools (e32).

Weaknesses:

None noted

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 3

1. Competitive Preference Priority 3: 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 developing and supporting Educator and school capacity to support social and emotional learning and development that—

- (1) Fosters skills and behaviors that enable academic progress;
- (2) Identifies and addresses conditions in the learning environment, that may negatively impact social and emotional well-being for Underserved Students, including conditions that affect physical safety; and
- (3) Is trauma-informed, such as addressing exposure to community-based violence and trauma specific to Military- or Veteran-Connected Students.

Strengths:

- 1) CPP3 will foster skills and behaviors that enable academic progress that will lead to student achievement and social-emotional and physical outcomes through the implementation of a curriculum based on SEL frameworks and research (e34).
- 2) Partners integrate SEL competencies into clinical components, such as mentorship, coaching, evaluation, observations, and Residents' development plans
- 3) The applicant provides evidence that CPP3 will implement CASEL's framework to build participants' ability to foster a trauma-informed climate that reduces harm and creates a restorative environment to meet students social and emotional needs (e34).

Weaknesses:

None noted

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/13/2022 01:56 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/13/2022 01:41 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Administrators of the Tulane Educational Fund (S423A220025)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	35	32
Significance		
1. Significance	25	25
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	20
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	19
Sub Total	100	96
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Educator Diversity	5	5
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. Promoting Equity	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
1. Meeting Student Needs	2	2
Sub Total	10	10
Total	110	106

Technical Review Form

Panel #7 - FY22 SEED Panel - 7: 84.423A

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Administrators of the Tulane Educational Fund (S423A220025)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. A. Quality of Project Design (35 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 training or professional development services to be provided by the proposed project are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services.
(7 points)

(ii) 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.(7 points)

(iii) The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.
(7 points)

(iv) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services.
(7 points)

(v) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.
(7 points)

Please provide Overview Statement on top of first Strength comment.

Strengths:

Overview Statement:

The applicant described an adequate project design. The applicant clearly articulated the extent to which the training or professional development services to be provided by the proposed project are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services. The applicant clearly demonstrated how the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance. The applicant clearly articulated the extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework. However, the applicant does not adequately describe how the services to be provided by the proposed project will involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services. There are no details for how the effectiveness of the project services will be maximized.

Supporting Statements:

Strengths:

(i) The applicant clearly articulated the extent to which the training or professional development services to be provided by the proposed project are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services. For example, as mandated by the Louisiana Department of Education (LDOE), all Educator Preparation Programs (EPPs) include a residency of at least one year. The project partners have developed intensive

Induction Models to support residents' and teachers' success for a minimum of their first two years of teaching (Year 1 as a resident; Year 2 as the teacher of record). The applicant demonstrates that all Induction Models implemented by the proposed project are sufficient in quality, intensity, and duration, as determined by a study that meets the What Works Clearinghouse (moderate evidence), with a rating of "meets WWC group design standards with reservations: (Young et al, 2017). Using randomized controlled trials and a quasi-experimental design, Young et al investigated The New Teacher Center's (NTC) induction model to determine its effectiveness in preparing teachers. Finding revealed that, when implemented with fidelity in their first two years of placement, NTC's induction program had an overall positive effect on student achievement. The applicant clearly aligns each of the NT Induction Model Key Components to the NOLA SEED EPP Partners (Tulane, Xavier, and TNTP) Induction Model Components (moderate evidence of effectiveness (pages e19-e27). (7 points)

(ii) The applicant clearly demonstrated 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. For example, the applicant describes the following strategies to build capacity and sustain results: an abundant pool of EPP applicants, new sources of revenue, increased teacher retention, new knowledge and expertise, and technology solutions for a single point of entry (recruitment and placement). The proposed project will result in 351 Aspiring Educators, who will constitute a sustained and continuous pipeline of EPP applicants that expands the number of highly effective educators entering underserved schools. In 2021, the National Center for Grow Your Own (NCGYO) led the effort to establish the K-12 teacher occupation as eligible for registered U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) apprenticeships. The proposed project will fund a partnership with NCGYO that will support Local Education Agencies (LEAs) and EPPs to create qualifying apprenticeship programs. Apprenticeship programs will create new revenue to sustain the EPP applicant pipeline beyond the SEED funding period. The proposed program will improve preparation and target the recruitment of local teacher candidates, which will curb teacher attrition beyond the grant period, increase a LEAs' financial and talent capacity. The proposed project will build expertise among EPP faculty so that they are equipped to better recruit and prepare diverse candidates and to improve culturally responsive teaching and SEL skills of future educators. The technology for a single point of entry for recruitment and placement is a centralized teacher recruitment platform that will be sustained beyond the SEED grant period (pages e27-e29). (7 points)

(iii) The applicant clearly articulated the extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework. For example, the applicant indicates that the logic model is a conceptual framework that articulates the project objectives (which are aligned with AP1 and CPPS 1-3) and accompanying strategies to achieve project outcomes. The logic model includes inputs, strategies (objectives), outputs, and outcomes (short-term; medium-term; long-term). The proposed project will recruit, prepare, and retain effective, diverse teachers with local ties and build a sustainable, robust pipeline of Aspiring Educators who will serve in underserved schools. The applicant provides research, such as: A comprehensive model of teacher induction: Implementation and impact on teachers and students (Young, V., Schmidt, R., Wang, H., Cassidy, L., and Laguarda, K. (2017) (pages e29-e34; e186; e223). (7 points)

(iv) The applicant indicates that the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners. The proposed project brings together four (4) successful talent preparation providers (three EPP partners and Reach) with varied program types to create a comprehensive approach to dressing the teacher supply and training gaps. For example, by pairing the alternative certification program offered by TNTP with Reach University's job-embedded bachelor's degree, teacher candidates are provided with an option to achieve certification in just three years, as opposed to the five required by more traditional pathways. The program administrator, New Schools for New Orleans (NSNO), creates the infrastructure to align core content across the pathways and provides multiple accessible pathways to teacher preparation and certification (pages e34-e36). (4 points)

(v) The applicant clearly articulated the extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population underserved schools and other identified needs. The applicant thoroughly aligns each need to the evidence of need, outcome, and strategies. The applicant describes the evidence of the following need: Need 1: A robust, well-prepared educator workforce; Need 2: Increased teacher retention; Need 3: Effective educators; and Need 4: Diverse teachers. The strategies for each of these four (4) needs as aligned to each of the four (4) objectives (pages e36-e37). (7 points)

Weaknesses:

- (i) No weaknesses were noted.
- (ii) No weaknesses were noted.
- (iii) No weaknesses were noted.
- (iv) The applicant does not adequately describe how the services to be provided by the proposed project will involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services. There are no details for how the effectiveness of the project services will be maximized.
- (v) No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 32

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. B. Significance (25 points)

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

- (i) The importance or magnitude of the results or outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project, especially improvements in teaching and student achievement. (7 points)**
- (ii) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and to the anticipated results and benefits. (6 points)**
- (iii) The potential for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing program of the agency or organization at the end of Federal funding. (6 points)**
- (iv) The extent to which the results of the proposed project are to be disseminated in ways that will enable others to use the information or strategies. (6 points)**

Please provide Overview Statement on top of first Strength comment.

Strengths:

Overview Statement:

The applicant demonstrated an exceptional description of the significance of the proposed project. The applicant clearly articulated the importance and the magnitude of the results and the outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project, especially improvements in teaching and student achievement. The proposed project will recruit and prepare 552 highly effective, diverse, and culturally competent educators. These teachers will directly impact 70 underserved schools, where 40,480 students are enrolled. The applicant describes the potential for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing program of the agency or organization at the end of Federal funding is clearly

articulated; and provides a comprehensive description of how the results of the proposed project are to be disseminated in ways that will enable others to use the information or strategies.

Supporting Statements:

Strengths:

(i) The applicant clearly articulated the importance or magnitude of the results and the outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project, especially improvements in teaching and student achievement. For example, the proposed project will recruit and prepare 552 highly effective, diverse, and culturally competent educators. These teachers will directly impact 70 underserved schools, where 40,480 students are enrolled. The SEED funding will also enable Aspiring Educator Pathways (AEP) programs to prepare Aspiring Educators to fill the pipeline of EPP applicants. This is a 200% increase over current levels. The Brookings Institute research reveals that proper implementation of standards-alignment curriculum leads to greater academic performance. All partners will provide rigorous coursework (pre-service) aligned to Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium, (InTASC) and Louisiana Components of Effective Teaching. The applicant, in the evaluation section, describes the Impact Evaluation, including the following Research Question (RQ) #3: What is the impact of NOLA SEED on student achievement (pages e38-e40; e49). (7 points)

(ii) The applicant demonstrates that the costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and to the anticipated results and benefits are clearly articulated. For example, by 2025, the investment of \$10,684,881 in federal funds will result in: 552 diverse certified teachers (20% of the entire workforce) will be recruited, prepared, and placed in 70 schools and will improve academic outcomes for an estimated 40,480 students (92% of the total student population). The per teacher cost is \$9,903 in federal funds, or \$27,696 total project funding. This figure compares favorably when considering the cost of replacing one lost teacher in an urban district like New Orleans is \$21,000. The other results include: 351 well-prepared Aspiring Educators being added to the pool of EPP applicants. This is more than double the estimated current number of applicants in all EPPs in New Orleans. The proposed project will also result in 500 high school and college students that will be in the teacher pipeline, at a per person cost of approximately \$2,859; and 210 high school students will be enrolled in HS2CT programs, at a per person cost of approximately \$2,859 (pages e40-e42). (6 points)

(iii) The potential for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing program of the agency or organization at the end of Federal funding is clearly articulated. For example, NOLA SEED funding will expand the enrollment to a degree that the organizations are equipped to maintain over the long term. The funding to improve activities related to pre-service training will replace existing activities and will easily be incorporated into the partners' core work. The SEED-funded training for EPP faculty and related improvements to coursework and mentoring are designed to be permanent shifts in programming and will sustain long after the grant term has ended. The applicant demonstrates that expanding the online platform to support Aspiring Educators to find a preparation program that meets their needs and supports the placement of NOLA SEED-trained educators aligns with current work streams. The new HS2CT school sites are prepared to allocate funding to the implementation of a college persistence program. The management plan includes a timeline for Goal 2: Launch, expand, and improve 2 innovative GYO Aspiring Educator Pathways (Reach & HS2CT) to provide a robust, sustainable pool of future EPP applicants with local ties (pages e42-e43; e48). (6 points)

(iv) The applicant provides a comprehensive description of how the results of the proposed project are to be disseminated in ways that will enable others to use the information or strategies. The external evaluation team, Abt Associates, will conduct both an implementation and impact evaluation, resulting in interim and final research reports. Utilizing a quasi-experimental design meeting What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) standards with reservations, the propose project will investigate high-impact strategies implemented by the NOLA SEED Partners. The Abt team will develop and disseminate findings from the implementation and impact evaluations through peer-reviewed journals, presentations, and academic and practitioner-oriented conferences. The NOLA SEED Partners will leverage their collective extensive network of organizations, policy makers, journalists, and leaders to disseminate grant findings through the publication of articles, presentations at conferences and convenings, blog posts, and social media (page e43). (6 points)

Weaknesses:

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

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. C. 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 the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (i) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable. (10 points)**
- (ii) 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. (10 points)**

Please provide Overview Statement on top of first Strength comment.

Strengths:

Overview Statement:

The applicant demonstrated an exceptional management plan. The applicant describes clearly specified and measurable goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project. The proposed project describes the highly qualified team of the partners who are well-positioned to achieve the goals of the proposed project on time and within budget. The applicant describes a comprehensive 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.

Supporting Statements:

Strengths:

- (i) The applicant describes clearly specified and measurable goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project. For example, the applicant aligns specific and measurable goals, objectives, and outcomes. The goals, objectives, and outcomes are aligned to all SEED performance measures (pages e43-e45). (10 points)

(ii) The applicant describes a comprehensive management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks. The proposed project describes the highly qualified team of the partners who are well-positioned to achieve the goals of the proposed project on time and within budget. The applicant provides a description of the project management, the EPP Program Staff, the AEP Program Staff, and the External Evaluator. The applicant provides resumes and job descriptions for each role in Appendix B. The applicant describes a comprehensive NOLA SEED management plan, with each goal, aligned to objectives, activities, roles, and a timeline (Year 1; Year 2; Year 3) (pages e45-e49; Appendix B). (10 points)

Weaknesses:

(i) No weaknesses were noted.

(ii) No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. D. 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, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the WWC standards with or without reservations as described in the WWC Handbook.

(4 points)

(ii) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(4 points)

(iii) The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.

(4 points)

(iv) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on Relevant Outcomes.

(4 points)

(v) The extent to which the design for implementing and evaluating the proposed project will result in information to guide possible replication of project activities or strategies, including information about the effectiveness of the approach or strategies employed by the project.

(4 points)

Please provide Overview Statement on top of first Strength comment.

Strengths:

Overview Statement:

The applicant described an adequate evaluation plan, The applicant demonstrates how the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the WWC standards with or without reservations as described in the WWC Handbook. The applicant demonstrates that the evaluator will conduct a rigorous, independent evaluation of NOLA SEED that will measure the program impact on teacher and student outcomes using a rigorous quasi-experimental design specified to meet What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) standards with reservations; and provide formative feedback to the extent to which NOLA SEED is implemented and is meeting specified performance objectives. The applicant demonstrates how the design for implementing and evaluating the proposed project will result in information to guide possible replication of project activities or strategies. However, the applicant does not develop a clear plan that includes specific information on the possible replication of project activities or strategies, including information about the effectiveness of the approach or strategies employed by the project.

Supporting Statements:

Strengths:

(i) The applicant demonstrates how the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the WWC standards with or without reservations as described in the WWC Handbook. The applicant demonstrates that Abt Associates (Abt) will conduct a rigorous, independent evaluation of NOLA SEED that will measure the program impact on teacher and student outcomes using a rigorous quasi-experimental design specified to meet What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) standards with reservations; and provide formative feedback to the extent to which NOLA SEED is implemented and is meeting specified performance objectives. The evaluation will address five research questions (RQs), which are stated and aligned to data source, impact evaluation, and implementation evaluation. The impact evaluation, which will address RQs 1 through 3, will examine the effect of NOLA SEED on teacher retention, student attendance, and student achievement on the Louisiana state standardized student assessment. The RQs will be addressed using a quasi-experimental design in which first-year NOLA SEED teachers are compared to other first-year teachers in Orleans Parish trained through other EPPs. If the grant is renewed to years 4 and 5, the analyses would be based on combined cohorts to improve statistical power. Following WWC Study Review Protocol, v1.0, Abt will assess baseline equivalence of teachers and students in the treatment and comparison groups for all impact analysis using years of teaching experience and the prior year achievement of their student on the LEAP ELA and Mathematics assessments. The evaluator will assess whether treatment and control conditions differ using WWC standards (pages e50-e51). (4 points)

(ii) The applicant clearly describes how the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. For example, the design of the implementation evaluation will yield quantitative (surveys, administrative) data and qualitative (interviews, focus groups) data and will be informed by the strategies, outputs, and outcomes included in the logic model. The evaluator will collect data from a variety of sources in order to determine the extent to which NOLA SEED is being implemented with fidelity as well as to provide NOLA SEED with feedback for continuous improvement of the program. The evaluator will meet monthly with the NOLA SEED project leadership team to provide timely performance feedback on the evaluation activities and findings. During these meetings, the evaluator will discuss progress toward developing data collection protocols, analyzing implementation and impact data, initial findings, and challenges encountered during the prior month (pages e51-e53). (4 points)

(iii) The applicant demonstrates how the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible. The evaluator will help NOLA SEED to assess the extent to which the program is meeting performance

measures that are clearly aligned with each of the four (4) project objectives and measure intended project outcomes. The performance measures, with baselines in SY 2022-23), include each objective aligned with performance measures and data to be collected (pages e53-e54). (4 points)

(iv) The applicant clearly describes how the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on Relevant Outcomes. The evaluation will incorporate valid and reliable data on NOLA SEED performance in meeting its objectives and outcomes. For the impact study, all outcome measures will meet WWC face validity, reliability, and domain requirements and will not be over-aligned with the intervention, and all teacher- and student-level data for the impact evaluation (outcome, prior academic achievement, demographic, and background characteristics data). The Impact Evaluation Outcome Measures include each WWC Domain, aligned with the outcome, level (teacher; student), and cohort. The applicant also describes the Teacher Culturally Responsive Survey Reliability and Validity and the Teacher Culturally Responsive Observation Reliability and Validity (pages e54-e55). (4 points)

(v) The applicant demonstrates how the design for implementing and evaluating the proposed project will result in information to guide possible replication of project activities or strategies. The impact evaluation will generate rigorous evidence regarding the impact of the proposed project on teacher retention and students' attendance and academic achievement in English Language Arts (ELA) and Math. The implementation evaluation will provide information on how the strategies are being implemented, facilitators, barriers to successful implementation, participants' perceptions of their experiences with NOLA SEED, and the extent to which the project meets the intended performance measures. All of this information will be used to develop recommendations for possible replication of effective strategies in other school districts. The applicant describes the dissemination process in Objective 3.3: Disseminate learning, practices, and artifacts to scale and replicate effective strategies to prepare diverse teachers for underserved schools. The applicant will share findings through blog posts and social media (Blogs) and the applicant will deliver 3 academic and practitioner-oriented presentations/publication (pages e49; e55-e56). (3 points)

Weaknesses:

(i) No weaknesses were noted.

(ii) No weaknesses were noted.

(iii) No weaknesses were noted.

(iv) No weaknesses were noted.

(v) The applicant does not develop a clear plan that includes specific information on the possible replication of project activities or strategies, including information about the effectiveness of the approach or strategies employed by the project.

Reader's Score: 19

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. Competitive Preference Priority 1: Increasing Educator Diversity (Up to 5 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 high-quality, comprehensive teacher preparation programs that have a track record of attracting, supporting, graduating, and placing underrepresented teacher candidates, and that include one year of high-quality clinical experiences (prior to becoming the teacher of record) in high-need schools.

Strengths:

The applicant provides a comprehensive description of Competitive Preference Priority 1: Increasing Educator Diversity. In the logic model, the applicant describes Objective 2: Increasing Educator Diversity (CPP1). The applicant describes the strategies, such as to increase accessibility to better recruit and retain diverse, local talent; provide financial support; provide online learning; provide Praxis tutoring; develop community partnerships; utilize flexible scheduling; provide multiple start dates; and launch the Aspiring Educator Pathways (AEP) program. The applicant, in the logic model, aligns strategies to the outputs (large pool of diverse, local applicants; Learning Hub for 5 programs); to the short-term outcomes (more local, diverse teacher candidates; increased AEP enrollment); medium-term outcomes (strengthened educator pipeline with diverse and local teachers and increased Educator Preparation Programs - EPP enrollment); and long-term outcome (recruit and prepare 552 teachers and 351 Aspiring Educators). The following strategies for CCP1 are linked to Tulane, Xavier, and The New Teacher Project (TNTP): financial incentives to remove barriers and support retention; selective recruitment process; dedicated recruitment manager; high-touch community outreach; blind review/selection staff trained to mitigate implicit bias; flexible scheduling and multiple start dates to increase access; and Praxis tutoring and preparation (pages e23; e30; e183-e184).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 2

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 2: Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities
(up to 3 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—

(1) In one or more of the following educational settings:

- (i) Early learning programs.**
- (ii) Elementary school.**
- (iii) Middle school.**
- (iv) High school.**
- (v) Career and technical education programs.**
- (vi) Out-of-school-time settings.**
- (vii) Alternative schools and programs.**
- (viii) Juvenile justice system or correctional facilities;**

(2) That examines the sources of inequity and inadequacy and implements responses that include pedagogical practices in Educator preparation 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 addresses the Competitive Preference Priority 2: Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities. The applicant lists the following strategies for CPP2: research-based Culturally Responsive Teaching (CRT) coursework; CRT competencies integrated into evaluation rubrics; candidates establish CRT competencies goals and receive growth feedback; offer clinical experiences in teacher shortage areas; and offer advanced certification in teacher shortage areas (page e24). The applicant, in the logic model, aligns Objective 3: Promoting equity in student access | K-12 schools (CPP2), to strategies (integrate CRT methods into practice; implement curriculum designed to analyze and dress educational inequities; and utilize development tools that integrate CRT competencies); the outputs (increase residents' CRT capacity; increased student; knowledge of educational inequities); and long-term outcomes (improved performance and growth of students in standardized tests) (pages e30; e183-e184s).

(1) The applicant proposes a project designed to promote educational equity and adequacy in resources and opportunity for underserved students (1) In one or more of the following educational settings: early learning programs, elementary school, middle school, high school, and career and technical education (page e21).

(2) The applicant demonstrates that the proposed project will promote culturally-responsive teachers that understand and integrate students' cultural backgrounds in order to minimize conflicts, build trusting relationships, and increase learning (Weinstein et al., 2004). Research has shown that this approach leads to more positive student outcomes, specifically for youth of color (Hanley & Noblit, 2009; Burns et al., 2005). All EPP and AEP partners, including HS2CT programs, will implement curriculum to analyze and address educational inequities. The applicant will support other EPP partners to adopt high quality tools and develop effective systems to support the preparation of residents. AEP programs (Reach and HS2CT) utilize a social justice and equity lens by weaving methods of Culturally Responsive Teaching and cultural competencies through course content and field experience. Pathways2Teaching is a critical race pre-collegiate curriculum that focuses on critical pedagogy and sociopolitical development theory. The purpose is to increase students' awareness of historical and contemporary educational inequities, thereby preparing them to become equity-oriented, community responsive future teachers (Gist et. al, 2019) (pages e32-e35).

Weaknesses:

(1) No weaknesses were noted.

(2) No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 3**1. Competitive Preference Priority 3: 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 developing and supporting Educator and school capacity to support social and emotional learning and development that—

(1) Fosters skills and behaviors that enable academic progress;

(2) Identifies and addresses conditions in the learning environment, that may negatively impact social and emotional well-being for Underserved Students, including conditions that affect physical safety; and

(3) Is trauma-informed, such as addressing exposure to community-based violence and trauma specific to Military- or Veteran-Connected Students.

Strengths:

The applicant provides a comprehensive description of Competitive Preference Priority 3: Meeting Student Social, Emotional, and Academic Needs. The applicant provides a list of strategies to meet CPP3: targeted professional development on effective partnerships with families and health professionals; SEL competencies integrated into the evaluation rubric; candidates establish Social Emotional Learning (SEL) goals and receive growth feedback; and candidates build competencies grounded in a research-based SEL framework (page e24).

(1) The project fosters skills and behaviors that enable academic progress. The applicant describes Objective 4: Meeting Students' social, emotional, and learning (SEL) needs (CPP3). In the logic model, the applicant aligns strategies (implement curriculum grounded in a research-based SEL framework; integrate SEL competencies into clinical experiences); to outputs (SEL-focused coursework and development tools; multiple structures to develop SEL skills); to short-term goals (increased knowledge of SEL skills for both teacher candidates and students); and long-term goals (improved performance and growth of students on standardized tests) (pages e30; e183-e184).

(2) The applicant clearly identifies and addresses conditions in the learning environment, that may negatively impact social and emotional well-being for underserved students, including conditions that affect physical safety. The applicant indicates that SEL coursework builds students' skills in CASEL's 5 core competencies: self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills, and making responsible decisions (students can choose how to act or respond to a situation based on learned behaviors, such as ethics, safety, and the well-being of others (page e33-e34; e184).

(3) The applicant clearly describes Objective 4: Enhance EPPs to increase educator and schools capacity to meet students' social, emotional, and learning (SEL) needs by providing a trauma-informed climate that addresses conditions that negatively impact students' social-emotional and physical well-being (CPP3). Tulane and TNTP utilize CASEL's framework to build residents' ability to foster a trauma-informed climate that reduces harm and creates a restorative environment to meet student social and emotional needs. Frameworks include approaches to integrate SEL competencies into academic instruction and partner with stakeholders, such as families and mental health professionals (pages e33-e34).

Weaknesses:

(1) No weaknesses were noted.

(2) No weaknesses were noted.

(3) No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: **2**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/13/2022 01:41 PM