

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/13/2022 02:08 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The Corporation of Mercer University (S423A220036)

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	20
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 #1 - FY22 SEED Panel - 1: 84.423A

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: The Corporation of Mercer University (S423A220036)

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 thoroughly describes the training and professional development services that will be provided by the proposed project. The quality, intensity and duration of the training/professional to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services is appropriate for the proposed plan. The proposed project is appropriately designed to build capacity. Firm evidence of how the applicant will yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance is noted in the narrative. The applicant provides a strong conceptual framework underlying the proposed research activities. Limited evidence that the planned project involves the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services is described in the narrative. Further, the applicant appropriately discusses the needs of the targeted area, and describes a proposed project that is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population.

i. The proposed residency program is clearly designed with sufficient quality, intensity, and duration. The GENERATE residencies will progress through a five-semester (18 month) rigorous, research-based and fully accredited master's program. The rigorous course work consists of 31 credit hours that develop knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary for teachers to develop the content and pedagogy necessary to support diverse learning needs of P-12 students. Participants will also be provided the professional development series that will prepare them to pass the GACE CS assessment and gain credentials to teach Introduction to Cybersecurity (e27). The proposed residency cohort structure enables residents to learn through collaboration and co-teaching with highly qualified, experienced mentor teachers (e27). The applicant will also include a GENERATE Summit focused on research and lessons learned (e28).

- ii. The applicant provides appropriate evidence that they will build capacity through targeted placements with a focused effort on recruiting career changers and paraprofessionals already employed with partner LEA's (e28). Additionally, all residents will be asked to complete a service agreement of three years within the district (e29). The proposed induction plan will support residents for three years beyond graduation with monthly gatherings addressing topics such as: implementing evidence-based practices, working with diverse student populations, collaborating with colleagues effectively and developing sustainable resources (e29).
- iii. A solid conceptual framework that extends the work of Dr. James Comer and Maurice Falk, which highlights the healthy development of students, undergirds the proposed project (e30). The applicant clearly aligns the conceptual framework components, to the aspects of the components and the GENERATE Program Elements (e33).
- iv. A list of partners the applicant will collaborate with is listed and described. Partners include the MU's College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (CLAS) and Dalton State College, LEA's (Bibb, Clayton, Dublin City, Pike, Twiggs, and Whitfield County Schools).
- v. The applicant clearly identifies a need for more diverse teachers. Because of the pandemic, many systems are seeing higher percentages of teachers exiting the classroom early. The Governor's Office of Student Achievement (GOSA) reported only 49 of GA's 180 LEAs had teacher retention rates at or above 90%. Research from GOSA further revealed during the 2019-2020 school year, 1,455 teachers in GA's public schools were identified as holding provisional or "other" certificates revealing many classrooms in the state are being taught by persons who were not certified based on state requirements (e19). The proposed project will appropriately meet the specified need. Specifically, GENERATE will address the LEAs needs by producing 170 additional teachers and providing CS and CBS PD to all partnering LEAs' personnel (e38).

Weaknesses:

- i. No weaknesses noted
- ii. No weaknesses noted
- iii. No weaknesses noted
- iv. The applicant failed to describe how they will collaborate with the partners. It is unclear what each partner will provide to the overall proposed project (including, personnel, facilities, and resources (5 points not awarded).
- v. No weaknesses 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 clearly describes a significant impact that are likely to be attained by the proposed project, especially improvements in teaching and student achievement. The budgeted items provided in the application are appropriate and reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and to the anticipated results and benefits. Additionally, the applicant provided limited evidence of a plan for incorporating the project activities into the current program after Federal funding has ended. However, thorough evidence of how the applicant plans to disseminate in ways that will enable others to use the information or strategies is provided in the narrative.

Supporting Statements:

i. The applicant provides clear evidence indicating GENERATE will impact over 92,000 P-12 students in five years. Teachers will gain the tools to implement a holistic approach to teaching, which allows them to respond to students' academic and non-academic needs effectively (e38). Specifically, the applicant notes, 92,000 students will have access to effective educators skilled in CS and CBS instruction holistic development, and CRP. Residents (170) will receive a MAT degree which affords them to begin their teaching career at a higher level in pay and certification. Further, educators in partnering LEAs will have access to a suite of PD opportunities that can improve their instruction (e38).

ii. The applicant specifies that costs associated with the proposed project are for direct services or supplies. Personnel costs were determined based on the number of hours projected to complete the work. Compensation for PIs was determined by the percentage of time PIs would be working on their parts of the grants (e39). Additionally, there are three groups of in-service teachers involved in the study. Mentor Teachers (Mentors) assigned to teacher candidates (n =170), comparison classroom teachers (Comp, n = 170), Aspiring Leader Mentors (n=84) and high needs content teachers who are neither mentors nor comparison classroom teachers (teacher participants – residents, mentors and comparison classroom teachers, n = 524). The applicant estimates that each classroom contains 25 students (K-12 Students). Therefore, with 25 students, the total number of K-12 student participants is 92,500 over five years (e11). With this, the proposed budget of \$9,739,048 at a cost of \$105.29/per child is reasonable.

iii. GENERATE will host an annual summit; once initiated and determined to be beneficial, these summits will continue to be held annually following the funding period (e41). Additionally, the PT will also seek funds from new private sources such as local businesses and banks to support ETAC. Funds to sustain activities are being sought through a newly formed MU Philanthropic Leadership Board (e41).

iv. The applicant will present their findings to local School Boards of the partnering LEAs. They will hold five knowledge cafés to enable supportive but critical discussion of the findings and their implication. The "Knowledge Cafes" will involve a mix of stakeholders, e.g., career changers, current Residents, Mentors, P-12 educators, higher education faculty, community members, and state agencies, and will be facilitated by members of the PT and local stakeholders (e42). Open access to all reports and other outputs will be available. Additionally, the applicant will disseminate information through conferences and professional teacher education associations and networks (e42).

Weaknesses:

i. No weaknesses noted

ii. No weaknesses noted

iii. Although the applicant discussed ways to potentially gain funding to continue to support the project, they did not address incorporation of the proposed activities into the current program after federal funding ends (e41) (4 points not awarded).

iv. No weaknesses noted

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:

The management plan provided included four clearly articulated goals, objectives and outcomes that are clearly measurable. In addition, the management plan is thoroughly developed and can be achieved on time and within budget. The responsibilities for the key personnel are clearly listed in the narrative. In addition, the applicant provides a detailed management chart including objectives, activities, timelines, personnel and milestones that are outlined for clearly accomplishing project tasks.

i. Four clearly articulated goals with corresponding objectives and measurable outcomes are articulated in the narrative. The goals and objectives are clearly mapped to the activities and the short-term and long-term outcomes (e44-e45).

ii. The applicant clearly outlines the interrelationship between activities, responsibilities, timelines, milestones, and persons responsible for accomplishing project tasks (e51-e55). Key personnel include the principal investigator, project coordinator, data manager, project liaisons, and MSI recruiter (e48-e49). The project coordinator will manage all aspects of the project, including personnel, fiscal, curriculum, partner outreach, vendor relations, evaluation and student engagement to ensure timely implementation and compliance (e48).

Weaknesses:

i. No weaknesses noted.

ii. No weaknesses 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:

Comprehensive evidence of an evaluation plan that is grounded in research that, if well implemented, will produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the WWC standards with or without reservations as described in the WWC Handbook is noted in the narrative. The evaluation plan contains detailed information on the extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. Formative and summative data will be collected. The performance measures described are clearly aligned to the project goals, and the research questions described should produce both quantitative and qualitative data. Detailed data is provided to determine that the results will be valid or reliable. Further, the applicant provided a plethora of strategies for dissemination of data and results for replication of the study.

i. The applicant clearly noted that the evaluation team will conduct formative and summative assessments of the proposed program (e56). GENERATE will use a quasi-experimental study using an intern's class (treatment) compared to a comparison class in the same school to meet WWC standards that will demonstrate the effectiveness of targeted professional development in a teacher residency program (e14; e57). GENERATE PLC's work plans build from the Knowledge Arts model (Perkins, 2004) and an AAR plan with Teacher-Intern-Professor (TIP) groups, providing a strong empirical-research base for their model (Curlette, Hendrick, Ogletree, & Benson, 2014) (e56). Similar to the AAR study the applicant will implement a quasi-experimental study using a Resident's class (treatment) compared to a comparison class in the same school, which is matched on grade level, academic performance, subject, curriculum, ethnicity, and gender (e56).

ii. The applicant clearly articulates that they have chosen to use Stufflebeam's CIPP Model of Program Evaluation as the overall approach to the evaluation. Within the context of the CIPP model, the evaluation team will use a mixed-methods approach, allowing them to meet multiple purposes and avoid tradeoffs that they would otherwise be forced to decide upon, such as internal versus external validity (e61). Formative and summative data will be collected, which are outlined in the logic model (e44-e45).

iii. The applicant will collect appropriate quantitative and qualitative data. Matched classroom data on matched classrooms on curriculum, grade, ethnicity, and achievement level will be collected and evaluated (e61). Qualitative data from surveys and interviews will also be collected and analyzed (e62). The applicant will conduct a meta-analysis and data which will consists of an ANOVA and propensity score analysis for each year and accumulated over the years (e62).

iv. A detailed plan is in place for the collection of data, data source, performance indicator to be measured, timeline and the person responsible. This will ensure that valid and reliable data is collected and analyzed to yield valid and

reliable results (e64).

v. A plethora of ways for dissemination of data and results are noted in the narrative. National dissemination will include presentations at the American Education Research Association (AERA) annual conferences and the publication of student and faculty research in peer-reviewed journals (e72).

Weaknesses:

- i. No weaknesses noted
- ii. No weaknesses noted
- iii. No weaknesses noted
- iv. No weaknesses noted
- v. No weaknesses noted

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:

The proposed project GENERATE plans to recruit career changers from MSIs and traditional candidates from a LEA that serves Hispanic students in large numbers (e23). The applicant also clearly indicates that DSC is the only HSI in the state of GA and does not offer a MAT, therefore, MU will work directly with DSC's School of Arts and Sciences (SAS) to recruit career changers to pursue a degree in education. DSC's SAS students will be offered priority admission status with a non-fee, streamlined application process. An MSI Recruiter will be hired to coordinate all aspects of the GENERATE MSI Recruitment Initiative. The Recruiter will connect MSI graduates with GENERATE partner LEAs, helping to recruit and enroll the graduates in the Residency program (e23). The MSI Recruiter will strategically partner with HSIs, HBCUs, and other MSIs to promote teaching as a viable and noble profession that provides a competitive salary, benefits, and sought-after retirement plan (e23).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses 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:

With the proposed program P-12 students will have equitable access to resources and opportunities as MU and DSC develop highly qualified, diverse educators who are skilled in CS and CBS. ETAC participants, residents, mentors, and teachers in partnering LEAs will have access to the CS/CBS modules preparing them to obtain the CS endorsement addressing the significant need for additional P-12 CS educators in the state. The applicant reports data noting, there are over 1000 high schools and over 1300 middle schools in GA and only 615 credentialed instructors in the system (Helm, 2021). Additionally, the applicant clearly reports in 2019, the state of GA passed Senate Bill 108 (SB 108), requiring all middle and high schools to offer CS by 2024. In January 2022, the National Security Memorandum was signed into law, aimed at improving CBS as well as statements to the US about improving cyber defenses and mandating new measures for the Federal Government. This proposed project will clearly meet the needs of these bills in the state and in the US (e24).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses 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 proposed project GENERATE, is clearly designed to address the social, emotional, and academic needs of the targeted population through a holistic approach. The following components of the proposed project will be embedded in the design to ensure educators can address the holistic needs of students: 1) Residents will develop lessons focusing on the six developmental pathways and 2) Residents will have a space to discuss classroom challenges they have faced with Residency peers in an environment that models' holistic development principles (e25).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/13/2022 02:08 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/14/2022 02:36 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The Corporation of Mercer University (S423A220036)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	35	31
Significance		
1. Significance	25	21
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	20
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Sub Total	100	92
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	102

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - FY22 SEED Panel - 1: 84.423A

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: The Corporation of Mercer University (S423A220036)

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 clearly identifies a strategy for professional development that is of quality, intensity, and duration. As proposed, the project only demonstrates a limited possibility of building capacity that it should yield results beyond the period of the federal grant. The conceptual framework is adequate, and as such, should shapes the quality of the proposed activities. The proposed project partners in this collaboration maximize the effectiveness of the proposed program services. As a result, the design of the project is appropriate to, and successfully address the identified needs.

Supporting Statements:

Strengths:

A1 – GENERATE will work with career changers who are from nontraditional preparation and certification routes or pathways by providing them with mentors, computer science (CS) and cybersecurity (CBS) training, professional development (PD) in holistic development, linguistic justice, and equitable discourse, a Master of Art in Teaching (MAT), that will lead to initial teaching certification to serve in traditionally underserved LEAs, and three years of induction supports (AP1 Act. 1).

GENERATE will establish a residency program designed to identify, recruit, mentor, and support Residents and mentor teachers in high needs, shortage content areas in underserved schools. GENERATE will pay Residents a living wage

stipend of \$30,000.00 while they pursue teacher certification, participate in a year-long residency, and obtain a Master's degree.

A1 - The program of study consists of 31 credit hours that develop knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary for teacher candidates to develop the content and pedagogy necessary to support the diverse learning needs of the students in the districts where they will complete their residencies, and ultimately work as teachers of record.
7 points awarded

A2 - GENERATE is designed to build capacity and yield results extending beyond the period of Federal financial assistance. There are several elements to contribute to capacity building, including targeted placements of teacher residencies with a focused effort on recruiting career changers and paraprofessionals already employed in the partnering LEA and providing all Residents with PD (Goals 1-4).

A2 - The high-quality mentoring and induction initiatives within GENERATE include features and components consistent with research, such as problem-solving, implementing literacy programs, and incorporating essential components of science and reading instruction.
3 points awarded

A3 - This framework highlights the healthy development of students along six critical developmental pathways: cognitive, social, language, ethical, physical, ethical, and psychological. (p. 15). Educators must understand how developmental processes interact and unfold over time if they are to design supportive environments for development and learning. (p. 17).
7 points awarded

A4 - Mercer University is poised to lead collaborative work and has partnered with appropriate partners to maximize the effectiveness of GENERATE. (p. 19). The SEED grant will scale that initiative by providing the opportunity to develop the courses into self-paced modules. (p. 20). The target for this intervention is described in data provided on p. 21, on the LEA Partner Demographics and Teachers Teaching out of field.
7 points awarded

A5 - Research reveals that schools with high minority student enrollment have four times as many uncertified teachers as their counterparts in non-minority school settings (Sutcher, et al., 2019). These results reveal the systemic presence of unqualified, inexperienced, and out-of-field teachers in schools where minority students are the predominant population, as well as in rural areas of the country. The pandemic and political unrest challenges were pervasive across the country and have caused increased teacher turnover and departure from the classroom. (p. 22).
7 point awarded

Weaknesses:

A1 – No weaknesses noted.

A2 – It is unclear how the applicant proposes to develop the components that build capacity beyond the federal award (p. 14 – 15).
4 points

A3 – No weaknesses noted.

A4 – No weaknesses noted.

A5 – No weaknesses noted.

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 proposed project demonstrates improvements in teaching and student achievement. The proposed relationship to numbers served and anticipated results and benefits demonstrate that project cost are reasonable. As proposed, however, there is limited potential for the applicant to incorporate the project activities into the ongoing program of the organization at the end of federal funding. The application documents how the proposed project will be disseminated to enable others to use the strategies generated in this project.

Supporting Statements:

Strengths:

B1- GENERATE will create an evidence-based model for teacher preparation that increases teachers' effectiveness in strengthening students' holistic needs that are central to short-and long- term outcomes, including employment and retention.
7 points

B2 - The applicant proposes \$9 million (e181) to serve 170 participants (400 mentors and 120 aspirants) which seems reasonable, considering the scope of program services. In addition, the allotment of \$30,000 is proposed as a living allowance during residency (p. 24) to serve 170 participants (e38) assumes the potential benefits.
6 points

B3 - At the end of the federal funding, there is potential for MU and partners to continue to incorporate GENERATE components. Sustaining the activities after the funding period will occur via the institutionalization of the model by the PT. After the funding period, MU will continue to offer the MAT cohort model supported by mentors and the CS and CBS modules. (e40)
2 points awarded

B4 – the applicant proposes a dissemination strategy that will increase the likelihood of replication and scalability of the

effort to maximize the magnitude of results, starting with the visual identity of the project (e41), and including a major media campaign and articles in professional journals. (e42). The project proposes to provide open access, modules, and to host an annual summit to support replication (e42)
6 points

Weaknesses:

B1 – No weakness noted

B2 – No weakness noted

B3 – There are no specific strategies for incorporating project purposes, results, and benefits into the organization beyond “seeking additional funding” (p. 25 – 26).

4 points

B4 – No weaknesses noted

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:

The goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the project are clearly specified and measurable, as described in the application narrative. The applicant proposes a compelling management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget. The plan includes clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing the project tasks.

Supporting Statements:

Strengths:

C1 – The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved are clearly specified and measurable are outlined in the GENERATE Logic Model. The Logic Model will guide activities, deliverables, and outcome evaluation that focuses on alignment between services and the goal, objectives, and outcomes of GENERATE. (e43)

C1 - The applicant provides a clear delineation of project objectives in a logic model format (e44-e47) that provides the project goals, objectives, activities, and short and long term outcomes. The project plan is detailed, succinct, and clear.
10 points.

C2 – The applicant provides a detailed explication of the proposed project objectives to supplement the logic model (C1, e44-e47), with key personnel, duties and responsibilities for each and allied project partners and a detailed project timeline with persons responsible (e51 – e55)
10 points

Weaknesses:

C1 – no weakness noted

C2 – no weakness 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:

The applicant proposes methods of evaluation that will produce evidence of the project's effectiveness that meet WWC standards with or without reservations. Further, the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and periodic assessment of progress towards achieving the intended outcomes. The evaluation plan uses objective performance measures, will produce both quantitative and qualitative data, and will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes. The design for implementing and evaluating the proposed project will result in possible replication of the project activities or strategies.

Supporting Statements:

Strengths:

D1 - The AAR studies with TIP groups are anchored in three respects: (1) through common methodology, primarily quasi-experimental designs; (2) through a common overall construct, student achievement; and (3) through attention to participants' inquiry skills and data interpretation ability. The studies are then summarized with meta-analysis, which provides three advantages: a large sample size, increased generalizability of results because of various settings, and the ability to examine study characteristics as moderator variables. A previous study (Curllette et al., 2014) was very successful in summarizing TIP groups with AAR using metaanalysis, which resulted in an effect size of .387 that was statistically significant ($p < .05$). The forest plot in the meta-analysis (Borenstein, Hedges, Higgins, & Rothstein, 2009), shows the results of 25 previous TIP with AAR studies, and is presented in Appendix G as evidence for the high likelihood of success for TIP with AAR in GENERATE. Recent meta-analyses all had statistically significant effect sizes, exceeding the target effect size of .20.

4 points

D2 - This residency model builds on research validated by previous residency models for teachers (Bohan & Many, 2011) and best practices in the literature for teacher residencies (e.g., Berry et al., 2008; Klein et al., 2013; Solomon, 2009). GENERATE residency provides candidates opportunities to apply their theoretical knowledge in the school's context, thereby providing contextualized, experiential learning that supports the development of highly effective teachers. Through ongoing, sustained collaboration within PLCs focused on developing teaching ability embedded within the schools (Hargreaves & Fullan, 2013), complementary supporting activities, and individualized mentoring and coaching (Browne- Ferrigno & Muth, 2004), the instructional capacities will improve as they support and develop teachers' practices, thus improving students' engagement and academic achievement.

4 points

D3 - All the quantitative evaluations employ designs that are in line with the WWC standards through the use of matched comparison classrooms to treatment classrooms (quasi-experimental designs). Two strong features of the quantitative evaluation are the following: (1) the use of matched classrooms on curriculum, grade, ethnicity, and achievement level to evaluate student achievement using the TIP with ARR approach with a quasi-experimental design, and (2) the use of meta-analysis to accumulate results across AAR studies which increase the generalization of results. (p/ 46)

D3 - Qualitative research focuses on the description, conceptual construction, and contextual factors concerning a situation, event, or lived experience. GENERATE's qualitative approach (see Merriam, 2009) will include collecting data from various stakeholders to determine how they make meaning of their participation in the program and how they incorporate what they learn to the benefit, directly or indirectly, of school students. (p. 46).

4 points

D4 – The applicant provides indicators that lend themselves to valid and reliability for the purposes of this project.

4 points

D5 – The applicant proposes a comprehensive dissemination strategy that includes the local community and expanding to international consortiums (e72). Through the various dissemination efforts that includes a focus on the GA educational research association and appropriate educational journals in addition to AERA and publication of student and faculty research in peer reviewed journals, the applicant will ensure probable replication.

4 points

Weaknesses:

D1 – no weakness noted

D2 – no weakness noted

D3 – no weakness noted

D4 – no weakness noted

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:

The applicant plans to recruit from MSIs or HBCUs (e22)

Weaknesses:

None

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:

CS and CBS are amongst the highest priorities for the state of GA and the United States. P-12 students will have equitable access to resources and opportunities as MU and DSC develop highly qualified, diverse educators who are skilled in CS and CBS (e24).

Weaknesses:

None

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:

Generate will prepare teachers to address student's holistic development. Holistic education is a comprehensive approach to teaching where educators seek to address student's emotional social, ethical, and academic needs in an integrated learning format. (e25).

Weaknesses:

None

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/14/2022 02:36 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/13/2022 01:40 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The Corporation of Mercer University (S423A220036)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	35	30
Significance		
1. Significance	25	20
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	20
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Sub Total	100	90
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	100

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - FY22 SEED Panel - 1: 84.423A

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: The Corporation of Mercer University (S423A220036)

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 provided appropriate details for the project design that included professional development training. Throughout the project, the applicant adequately demonstrates that building capacity will occur throughout the project. The applicant satisfactorily outlined a conceptual framework and discussed the project's effectiveness. Additionally, the applicant shared sufficient evidence to support the project's proposed collaboration of partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project service. The applicant provided a clear extent to which the proposed project is appropriate to the targeted population.

i. The applicant provided sufficient training and development that will be provided to the Residents (e11). The components include a n admission and advising model, residency program, PLC, Generate Summit, etc.

ii. The applicant will recruit candidates from within LEAs i.e., paraprofessionals and require a three-year obligation to the school district (e28). GENERATE's induction plan will support Residents for three years beyond graduation (e29). The applicant states that to sustain the induction program, VICs who facilitate this process will partner with Aspiring Leaders and veteran educators who work with the school districts to support induction.

iii. The applicant shared that the conceptual framework extends the work of Dr. James P. Comer (e30). Figure 1: Developmental Pathways is provided (e31). The applicant shares that GENERATE will use a holistic approach to educate children (e31). Table 1. GENERATE elements are mapped into the framework (e33).

iv. The applicant stated that Tift College of Education, Woodrow Wilson Teaching Fellows, and National Science Foundations are all partners. Additionally, Dalton State College and Bibb, Clayton, Dublin City, Pike, Twiggs, and Whitfield County School districts are listed as partners (e35-37).

v. The applicant adequately provides elements that will dress the targeted population (e37).

The applicant shares that the GENERATE project will address the LEAs needs by producing 170 additional teachers... (e38).

Weaknesses:

i. None noted.

ii. None noted.

iii. None noted.

iv. The applicant failed to provide the extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project involved collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services. 5 points deducted.

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 provided an overview detailing the results and outcomes for the project and provided a table graphing the dissemination of the details of the project. There is sufficient evidence to suggest that the extent of the costs is reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served. The applicant provides limited evidence that the project's activities will extend beyond the end of Federal funding. The applicant provided sufficient details to determine the extent to which

results of the proposed project are to be disseminated in ways that will enable others to use the information or strategies.

i. The applicant adequately addresses the significance of GENERATE by sharing the evidence-based model that focuses on short-and long-term outcomes and focuses on developing a diverse and effective pipeline for highly qualified educators (e38). The applicant provides the impact in two key areas: the number of students..... and recruitment and retention of teachers of color (e38).

The applicant shares that the residents will support the improvement of over 92,000 PK- 12 students and gain a MAT (e38). 80% of educators serving high needs schools and are highly effective is a goal indicated in the goal matrix(e38).

ii. The applicant provides details on the number of residents (170) will become teachers (e39).

The applicant provides a living wage of \$30,000 to each Resident during the one-year residency. The applicant states that it costs \$105.29 per child (92,000) and the request of \$9,739,048 for the proposal.

iii. The applicant provides an explanation stating that after the funding period, MU will continue to offer the MAT cohort model supported by mentors.... (e40).

iv. The applicant indicates that marketing materials will be developed to recruit residents and it will be disseminated through various state organizations (e41). Information will be shared with the local school boards at the partnering LEAs. The applicant also states that Knowledge Cafes will involve stakeholders to discuss how research practices fit into the current work (e41). The applicant provided a table (3) entitled: Dissemination Plan Strategy Monitoring (e43).

Weaknesses:

i. None noted.

ii. None noted.

iii. The applicant did not fully address the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing program of the organization at the end of Federal funding. 5 points deducted.

iv. None noted.

Reader's Score: 20

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 addressed the quality of the management plan by providing a logic model including partners, goals, objectives, activities, short and long-term outcomes that are appropriately outlined to accomplish the project's tasks. Additionally, the applicant provides an adequate management plan that is suitably developed. The provided management plan, if well implemented, can be achieved on time and within the budget. Key personnel are listed in the narrative.

- i. The goals, objectives, and outcomes are embedded into the proposal (e44-47). Several School districts have provided costs for the facility usage, etc. They include the following: BIBB, Claton, Dublin, Pike, Twiggs, County School districts. Additionally, the applicant provides a Logic Model that lists objectives, partners, activities, etc. (e47).
- ii. Sufficient evidence is noted in the management plan to achieve the objects of the proposed timelines, etc. For example, the overseers of the grant are listed with their specific responsibilities outlined under each role for grant management i.e., Project Coordinator, Data Manager, etc. (e48-49).

Weaknesses:

- i. None noted.
- ii. None 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:

The applicant shares that the effect of residency participants on student learning will be assessed using anchor action research (AAR). Additionally, qualitative assessments will be used throughout the program (e56). The evaluation plan is grounded in research and is aligned to WWC standards with or without reservations as described in the WWC Handbook. The evaluation plan has details embedded to describe the extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress towards achieving the intended outcomes. The applicant shares that both formative and summative data will be used to collect evidence for outcomes. Additionally, the research methods listed to be used are both qualitative and quantitative. Furthermore, the proposal provides details to determine the validity and reliability of results and the study is replicable based on the provided strategies for dissemination.

i. The applicant will use a quasi-experimental study using a Residents' class compared to a comparison class in the same school(e56). The applicant stated that GENERATE will adopt the Transtheoretical Model of Change. Additionally, a focus on Deepening Knowledge, Changing Values and Developing Skills will be used to evaluate the project(e58-59).

ii. The applicant provided research on the effects of having a highly qualified educator in a classroom (e59). Additionally, the applicant states that the residency model will include a series of PLCs from external experts, university partners, etc. (e60). The applicant states that through the cohort model, teacher residents will have the opportunity to further develop strategies that foster diversity, equity and inclusion (e60).

iii. The applicant states that all quantitative evaluations employ designs that are in line with the WWC standards. Additionally, they list two features of the quantitative equations: the use of matched classrooms on curriculum..... and the use of meta-analysis to accumulate results across AAR studies (e61). Additionally, the applicant states that GENERATE qualitative approach (see Merriam, 2009) will include collecting data from various stakeholders to determine how they make meaning of their participation in the program and how they incorporate what they learn to the benefit, directly or indirectly, of school students (e62).

iv. The applicant provided a table that outlines the data sources, indicator, targets, timelines and facilitators of the project (e64). Additionally, the applicant provides a narrative for the five SEED indicator Performance Measures (e 65-72).

v. The applicant discussed the dissemination of the project to local communities and expanding to international consortiums. Additionally, the applicant speaks to University and State dissemination with a focus on the GA Educational Research Association and educational journals.

Weaknesses:

i. None noted

ii. None noted

iii. None noted

iv. None noted

v. None noted

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:

The applicant shares that project GENERATE plans to recruit career changers from MSIs and traditional candidates from a LEA that serves a large Hispanic student population (e23). The applicant states that one of the partners, ETAC will offer students a two-week summer camp to potential residents. (e23). Additionally, the applicant provided PLC work to include linguistic justice, equitable discourse, CRP and equitable classrooms(e24).

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:

The applicant states that students in P-12 will have equitable access to resources and opportunities as MU and DSC develop highly qualified educators (e24). Additionally, the applicant states that CS and CBS are amongst the highest priorities for the state of GA and the United States (US). P12 students will have equitable access to resources and opportunities as MU and DSC develop highly qualified, diverse educators who are skilled in CS and CBS (e61).

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:

The applicant stated that the students will be addressed using holistic development. Two components will be embedded: 1) Develop lessons focused on six development pathways and 2) space to discuss classroom challenges faced using holistic developmental principles (e25). The applicant stated that GENERATE was developed to meet the standards of the WWC (e26). Additionally, the applicant states that GENERATE is based on evidence of preparing and retaining highly diverse secondary teachers (e26). The applicant addresses training and development services by outlining seven focus areas (e28). Also, the applicant states that there will be an induction plan to support the residents for three years beyond graduation (e29). The applicant shares that guiding the project is a conceptual framework that extends the work of Dr. James P. Comer. The work will address six critical developmental pathways: cognitive, social, language, ethical, physical, ethical and psychological (e30).

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/13/2022 01:40 PM

