

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/13/2022 01:50 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Georgia State University Research Foundation, Inc. (S423A220053)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	35	34
Significance		
1. Significance	25	23
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	19
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
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 #10 - FY22 SEED Panel - 10: 84.423A

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Georgia State University Research Foundation, Inc. (S423A220053)

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 details a comprehensive and detailed proposal that provides professional development and will highly likely lead to improvements in practice from the participants. For example, the project is a three-year teacher residency program that contains strategic partners, HBCUs to recruit graduates to enroll into GSU's M.A.T. program.

i) The applicant presents a very comprehensive and detailed proposal that seeks to provide professional development and will highly likely lead to improvements in practice from the participants (pg. e21). The project is an intensive three-year teacher residency program that enrolls students from diverse backgrounds to GSU's undergraduate pathways to teacher certification program and the applicant will partner with HBCUs to recruit recent graduates to enroll in GSU's M.A.T. program. These pathways toward degree attainment, DEI focused training, and focus on high need subjects together create a very strong approach to increase diverse educators in the field and increase student learning outcomes.

ii) The applicant provides evidence that the project will yield results and build capacity beyond the period of Federal financial assistance (pg. e28). The applicant clearly defined the difference between not just collaboration and groups but rather the disciplines and collective deliberation (pg. e28). It is apparent the project brings together authentic collaborative action and will build capacity as a result. For example, the project includes very important partners, GSU College of Education & Human Development, Atlanta Public Schools, school leaders, and teachers, and local community organizations, HBCUs, and national non-profits (pg. e28).

iii) The project illustrates a strong conceptual framework that demonstrates activities (pg. e21). The project's framework includes collaborative communities of practices for all educators and stakeholders, understanding of effective practices, and theory of change for a vehicle of transformation. More specifically the framework includes residency experiences (pg. e24-25), teaching training, equity-centered friends, culturally relevant pedagogy institute, equity facilitation fellows, and black and BIPOC male educator programming (pg. e27).

iv) The applicant provides a strong plan for bringing together partners that will contribute to the change they seek to create and to maximize the effectiveness of the project services (pg. e28). One great example is how the applicant collaborates with partners in hybrid positions and learning opportunities such as a psychologist who works with all partner organizations, a district funded coordinator of district-university partnership work, and partners with Literacy Lab, and Leaning Men Fellowship for new pathways into teaching for Black and BIPOC males.

v) The project design is appropriate to and will highly likely meet the needs of the targeted population (pg. e31). The project took into consideration and listen to the needs of the key stakeholders, Atlanta Public Schools, teachers within APS to create equitable learning environments, and teacher educators and college-level leaders at GSU.

Weaknesses:

i) The applicant cites that there is a need for special education but does not detail in a recruitment plan how special education will be a focus of the project to address the identified need. And in particular the project does not detail how it will address recruiting.

Reader's Score: 34

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 project provides evidence of the significance, e.g., it seeks to impact over 5,000 teachers and the district's 51,000 students. The costs are reasonable provided the number of students served, 100 new teachers in high schools and professional development for over 310 educators.

i) The project has a significance to impact over 5,000 teachers and the district's 51,000 students (pg. e34). The project

focuses on preparing cohorts of teachers and broad professional development for all APS educators for a full day of professional development focused on culturally responsive pedagogical practices and equity-centered SEL.

ii) The costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons served and anticipated results (pg. e35). The project will provide induction experience for 100 new teachers in high schools and professional development for over 310 educators.

iii) Goal four of the project focuses on the applicant's commitment to identifying a shared agenda across partner that aim to influence improvements with their goals (pg. e36). This commitment designed in the project will help to ensure project's purposes will benefit the partners after Federal funding has ended.

iv) The applicant provides a strong dissemination program to share results that could be used by others (pg. e44). For example, results will be shared with local stakeholders, at national and regional conferences and research summits.

Weaknesses:

v) It is not clear that the costs for marketing is reasonable. These costs are high and could be provided by partner organizations (pg. e352).

Reader's Score: 23

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 details a strong management plan that identifies objectives and outcomes for each goal which is measurable. The milestone and timeframes are very detailed.

i) The applicant provides a clear and detailed management plan that identifies objectives and outcomes for each goal (pg. e46-47). Each goal and objective includes a method for which it would be measured.

ii) The management plan is very detailed and includes clear milestones, timeframe for each year and the responsible person(s) to carry them out (pg. e48). This detailed management plan will highly likely results in the applicant carrying out the project on time and on within budget.

Weaknesses:

ii) It is unclear who is involved on the CECE team, more details are needed to provide specifics since the project personnel has a large staff (pg. e48).

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 identifies an independent evaluator who has experience conducting independent evaluations. The evaluation will meet WWC standards. The applicant describes a detail plan for implementing and evaluating the proposed project.

i) The applicant cites an independent evaluator who has substantial experience conducting independent evaluations (pg. e49). The project design meets WWC standards, a study of Fidelity of Implementation, and a process study with rapid feedback to support CREATE reaching performance goals.

ii) The applicant built a method of evaluation that will provide performance feedback (pg. e57). For example, during each semester, the project will identify programmatic needs for improvement to achieve implementation targets, and in each cycle, will implement, study, and scale change efforts to achieve the goal.

iii) The applicant provides evidence that the project will use objective performance measures that are clearly related to the outcomes of the project (pg. e39). The applicant provides a detailed fidelity of implementation matrix (pg. e59), and details treatment and control contrast. The applicant includes formative and summative assessments.

iv) The applicant provides confirmatory and exploratory outcomes for each research question and have identified valid and reliable outcomes for each outcome measure (pg. e61 and appendix 1).

v) The applicant provides a detail plan for implementing and evaluating the proposed project (pg. e61). The applicant provides examples of ways the evaluation would be shared such as in conferences and academic journals.

Weaknesses:

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 provides a teacher residency program that seeks to increase educator diversity through partnering with APS and HBCUs (pg. e19).

Weaknesses:

No weakness 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 promotes equity in student access to educational resources and opportunities through support at the college level in training teachers from diverse backgrounds to teach in diverse school districts in subjects with high need.

Weaknesses:

No weakness 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 evidence of meeting students social, emotional, and academic needs (pg. e19-20). The applicant partners with important partners who also have experience in SEL and the applicant embeds SEL in their content delivery.

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/13/2022 01:50 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/13/2022 06:37 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Georgia State University Research Foundation, Inc. (S423A220053)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	35	33
Significance		
1. Significance	25	21
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	17
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	1
Sub Total	10	9
Total	110	100

Technical Review Form

Panel #10 - FY22 SEED Panel - 10: 84.423A

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Georgia State University Research Foundation, Inc. (S423A220053)

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 name of the project is CREATE: Cross-Institutional Collaboration and Reimagining toward Equity, Access, and Teacher Effectiveness: Expanding and Sustaining Project CREATE. The project will enable the partners to scale promising portions of the new structures between the collaborators. The applicant presents excellent descriptions of the various collaborative activities, their durations and intensity, as well as the goals each supports.

Supporting Statements:

Strengths:

(i)The applicant provides clear details and specifics of duration, training, and professional development services to be provided by the project that are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the participants. For instance, the intensity and duration of the residency requirements are clearly described and include specific details, such as the expectations for summer, clinical practice, collaborative learning, and alumni. In addition, the institutes have appropriate support structures, such as a year-long Equity Facilitation Fellowships for deeper application to create equity centered school environments. (p. e16, e19, e22)

(ii)The project is designed to build capacity by working with 28 high-needs schools, train 100 new teachers and provide professional development to 310 experienced educators. (p. e284) In addition, capacity is increased due to the processes planned to reimage local support structures through regular meetings between teacher preparation education, district,

state and university personnel. (p. e37)

(iii) The applicant provides a conceptual framework that has as its foundation, evidenced-based strategies that meet the WWC standards without reservation-from the works for Young and Glazeman regarding the strengths of collaborative communities of practice. In addition, the SEL equity competencies from Markowitz and Bouffard's work are included in the credentialing processes in order to transform the learning framework and are part of the week-long Equity Centered Critical Friends Institute.

(iv) The applicant describes a cohesive set of services provided by the project that involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services. The applicant provides a convincing discussion regarding the specific focus areas with detailed descriptions for collaboration, with capacity of each discussed in terms of the humans involved, materials, financial support, organizational strength, and structural practices which serve as foundational work for sustainability. (pp. e21-e22)

(v) The applicant identifies that the target school district striving for equitable access has 75% teachers of color, 84% students of color and 78% of students qualify for free or reduced lunch. Teacher turnover rates are an issue and 63% of school leaders aren't happy with the educator applicant pool and 30% of new educators leave within 5 years.

Weaknesses:

(i) No weaknesses noted.

(ii) No weaknesses noted.

(iii) No weaknesses noted.

(iv) No weaknesses noted.

(v) The applicant does not provide a robust recruitment plan, and the efforts are poorly developed. The details found in the need section are not addressed, such as special education teachers.(p e22)

Reader's Score: 33

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 discusses improvements in teaching and student achievement but does not make a strong case for significance. For example, the project has the potential to impact over 5,000 teachers who in turn impact over 51,000 students. The schools will benefit from one full day of professional development regarding cultural responsiveness and equity-centered SEL and the project plans to train 2 educators from each school to lead the work.

Supporting Statements:

Strengths:

- (i)The applicant bases their justification for the cost of resident stipends as a way to keep teachers from needing part-time jobs while studying which makes these costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and to the anticipated results and benefits. (p. e41)
- (ii)The CREATE program has a 96% retention while the control group has a 63% retention which is a 33% cost savings. There are other cost benefits, as Black teachers teaching Black students results in lower suspension rates, higher attendance rates and higher academic achievement. The applicant discusses calculation of the value of program benefits, such as the cost of losing 50 teachers is over \$1 million, high school graduates earn \$260,000 more in a lifetime than a drop out. (p. e43)
- (iii) Since 19,000 students dropout last year, this is a large economic impact on social systems, community infrastructure and families. The applicant provides a convincing description of the concept of SEL as an important tool for decreasing educator attrition through self-care using the same concepts on themselves that they practice with their students.(p. e302)
- (iv)The applicant provides supportive evidence for capacity through program teams at each school and plans to narrow the gap between research and practice so that universities and schools are more closely aligned. (p. e36) The applicant would do well to share the concept of building social capital and utilizing SEL with teachers as a self-care mechanism in order to increase satisfaction and lessen burnout. The applicant details how results of the project are to be disseminated in three primary ways: 1) research to support program improvements, 2) stakeholder sharing to encourage sustainability, and 3) share strategies with others so as to be replicable. (p. e42)

Weaknesses:

- (i)The applicant did not make a strong case for the importance or magnitude of the results or outcomes likely to be attained by the project.
- (ii)The costs are excessive with student stipends costs and many staff member costs are too high. The costs are not reasonable, for example the allocation for marketing is high and could be done through in-kind match with collaborators.
- (iii) No weaknesses noted.
- (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:

Overview Statement: The applicant clearly has a strong foundation of experienced people to implement this project. For example, there is a long list of personnel, mostly PI or Co-PI roles which aren't really explained completely. (pp.e342-e345) The management of so many part-time personnel and costs associated with so many people, make this a difficult program to implement

Supporting Statements:**Strengths:**

(i)The applicant provides clearly specified and measurable goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the project. For example, with goal 1 objectives include: increased teacher diversity, more students from the Hispanic Institution, more reports of feeling connected, improved instructional skills through SEL and residents commit to working in high-needs schools. (pp. e46-e47, e347)

(ii) The management plan provides convincing evidence of accomplishment of project tasks in a timely fashion. For example, the timeline includes clearly defined personnel responsibilities and milestones for accomplishing project tasks. The timeline includes evaluative processes and dissemination. The budget includes personnel, 3 years of training stipends, travel, supplies, software, curriculum fingerprinting, background checks, online costs, workshops and contractual expenses for micro-credentialing, intergeneration learning labs, online pathway creation costs and learning packages. (pp. e325-e365) There are strong in-kind donations from the schools and the institutions of higher education. (p. e48)

Weaknesses:

(i)The teacher diversity measure includes only Black teachers, which is not particularly supportive of other diverse populations of underrepresented groups.

(ii)There is little information provided regarding program management such as personnel performance evaluations, student records or staff records management or fiscal management processes. The roles for personnel are not well defined. (p, e48)

Reader's Score: 17

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 evaluation plan is detailed, concise and workable. The evaluation plan will document teacher trained and successful collaborative work with parents, administrators, and the community to support students academically and social-emotionally to transform learning experiences.

Supporting Statements:

Strengths:

(i)The applicant provides a clear timeline and viable matches for the comparison data sets for evaluation processes for each of the four cohorts. (pp. e53-e54)The applicant is utilizing the same independent evaluator as before and the project is building upon the multi-year existing partnership. The methods will include process and impact studies with the models detailed, the research questions provided, and the WWC study or report that supports each concept. One of the most interesting analyses for retention, is the level of teacher resiliency. (pp. e50. e54-e56)

(ii)The methods of evaluation will provide formative performance feedback to support what works and change what needs improvement. In addition, a broader scale for replication is needed and will utilize surveys and interviews to support program models that need strengthening. The key components are described in conjunction with their indicators of fidelity and the measurable threshold. (p. e58) Periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes in part of the overall management plan, with some data gathered monthly, some quarterly and some twice a year. The plan includes monthly cohort meetings, program staff meetings and quarterly assessment of the comparison group.

(iii)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 from surveys, feedback, and meetings.

(iv)The evaluation plan will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes including the comparison group and cohorts. (pp. e376-e377)

(v)The evaluation plan includes assessment of student achievement, especially in CREATE classrooms. The project implementation and evaluation will result in information to guide possible replication of project activities and strategies, including information about the effectiveness of the approach or strategies employed or adjusted. (e50, e54)

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:

Goal 1 of the application is to recruit, support and retain early career educators, especially Black identified educators who utilize justice-centered practices. (p. e20) CREATE requires an entire year of clinical experience prior to teachers becoming instructors of record in the high-needs schools. The applicant discussed teachers who work with historically marginalized youth and plans to recruit talented committed residents, provide a 5-week pre-service training and two years of in-service mentoring. (pp. e22, e26-e27, e350) The focus on undergraduate 3-year residency is a strategy to overcome the high attrition rates. Other strategies include recruitment of dual-certified teachers, special education teachers, male educators with high school degrees and alternative certification for 6-12 teachers. HBCU partnerships. (p. e284)

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:

The applicant examines the sources of inequity, especially in historically marginalized youth, which creates a strong focus for project design to help build school structures that support diverse students and teachers. (p. e46, e52, e310, e284) Recognition of the inadequacies will have responses in the implementation 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 (p. e312-e315)

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:

- (1) The applicant fosters skills and behaviors that enable academic progress through rigorous curriculum and classroom cultures that are healing and advocate for students. The applicant discusses collaborative communities with equitable access and relevant curriculum that support joy-filled learning spaces. The other aspect of SEL discussed in this application is utilizing it for teacher peace of mind as a retention strategy. The partners also embed SEL in planned services so that students experience a wide support network. (p. e352, e304)
- (2) The applicant identifies and addresses conditions in the learning environment that may negatively impact social and emotional well-being for underserved students and their teachers. For teachers, this includes school climate perceptions, sense of belonging, burnout and racial equity-pretty similar to the issues for students.
- (3) Not addressed.

Weaknesses:

- (1) No weaknesses noted.
- (2) No weaknesses noted.
- (3)The applicant does not fully address trauma-informed issues, such as addressing exposure to community-based violence and trauma specific to Military- or Veteran-Connected Students.

Reader's Score: 1

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/13/2022 06:37 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/13/2022 11:02 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Georgia State University Research Foundation, Inc. (S423A220053)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	35	33
Significance		
1. Significance	25	21
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	18
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 #10 - FY22 SEED Panel - 10: 84.423A

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Georgia State University Research Foundation, Inc. (S423A220053)

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 design of the project is well developed providing a clear rationale and activities that will provide teacher candidates support in becoming credentialed and working in schools. The focus on equity will benefit the participants as well as the districts in which they teach.

i. The residency experience outlined in the narrative is rigorous and focused on incremental release to teaching with support that will allow participants to receive the necessary feedback to be successful (p. e25). The professional learning is high quality and offered in a manner that will ensure impact. For example, the Culturally Relevant Pedagogy Institute includes both an intensive 4-day training followed up with monthly opportunities to revisit content and work at participants school sites as well as follow-up mini conferences which demonstrates sufficient intensity of the exposure to the content (p. e27).

ii. The narrative includes a clear plan for the development of staff and resources that will continue to impact the target group beyond the funding period of the grant. For example, the development and implementation of a micro-credentialing opportunity for educational leaders to receive training and certification in elements important for successful leadership such as coaching or urban educational endorsements (p. e30).

iii. The narrative includes a clear conceptual framework that guides the proposed work. For example, the focus on strategies within a community of practice and the theories of change espoused in the narrative are research based and

will ground the work in proven theories (p. e21).

iv. The narrative clearly describes a collaborative process where many educational and community partners have been identified and involved in the implementation of the project. For example, the project will not only include local school districts but also organizations like Literacy Lab: Leading Men Fellowship which will allow for a broader focus for the project activities (p. e29). The included letters of support clearly demonstrate that the partner organizations will provide assistance to the lead applicant in the planned activities (p. e251).

v. The narrative clearly the identified needs of various stakeholders and how the project will address these needs. For example, project will focus on the needs of current teachers to address burnout and provide training in equity issues in the classroom to address a need identified from a majority of stakeholders (p. e33).

Weaknesses:

i. No weaknesses were noted.

ii. No weaknesses were noted.

iii. No weaknesses were noted.

iv. No weaknesses were noted.

v. The narrative notes that there will be a focus on recruitment, but it is unclear what exactly will be done to improve or address some of the recruitment efforts. For example, the narrative states that the lead applicant will seek to recruit more special education and dual-certification teachers but does not provide information on how they will do the recruiting (p. e22).

Reader's Score: 33

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 planned project will have a significant impact on the participants and the districts in which they serve. The activities are well aligned to the overall goals and objectives and will provide meaningful impact. The budget is clear on most elements but seeks to fund many positions that are not clearly aligned to the project.

- i. The impact of the project on participants and the partnering organizations is clearly identified in the project narrative (p. e38). The focus on reaching potential new teachers with deep, sustained training will result in teachers who are better prepared to impact students in high needs areas (p. e36). The work around equity and racism provided to current teachers through workshops and credentialing programs will impact school districts and will provide lasting impact on participants (p. e38).
- ii. The argument for return on investment for the project activities highlights the thought included in the development of projects and stipends associated with the project (p. e42).
- iii. The narrative includes a clear discussion of how the proposed project is part of the current activities and how it will be included in future work by the lead applicant and partnering organizations. For example, the lead applicants describe the pilot projects done to test the planned activities and the needs assessment information used to develop the specific approach (p. e35).
- iv. The dissemination plan included in the project narrative is clearly outlined and will benefit future research who will use the data for replication. For example, the policy briefs and national conference presentations will provide data and evidence of the impact of the proposed project to interested researchers and stakeholders (p. e45).

Weaknesses:

- i. No weaknesses were noted.
- ii. The projected costs for the number of staffed positions appears to be excessive (p. e341). The project will pay for a high numbers of staff members that appear to be tangentially connected to the project activities. For example, Dr. Ortiz will receive 27% of his salary from the project in years 2 and 3 doing research that is associated with his current position and teaching math courses (p. e343). Also, the project will fund a 100% of a post-doctoral candidate to do research that is poorly defined (p. e343).
- iii. It is unclear how the significant financial requirements of the project will be supported beyond the end of the project period. For example, there is no discussion regarding the continued funding of the \$18,000 per student stipend that will be paid to participants who enroll in courses during year 2 (p. e30). Also, it is unclear how the project will continue to fund the many staff members identified to contribute to the work of the project at its conclusion (p. e342).
- iv. No weaknesses were 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 includes many elements that will provide direction for the implementation of the planned project. The milestones and timeline help provide structure to the planned activities, but it is not clear what the roles of the many staff members will be in the project.

i. The goals, objectives and outcomes of the proposed project are clearly articulated and aligned to the overall activities of the project (p. e46). Each of the goals includes outcomes that can be measured and will contribute to the information regarding impact of project on participants and schools. For example, the focus on the increase of Black teachers in the residency program will benefit the students they serve (p. e45). The logic model provides clear information about the connections between the identified project activities and expected outcomes (p. e284).

ii. The staff identified to lead the project are well qualified and have the appropriate experience to execute a project of this scope and magnitude. For example, Dr. Cross has experience leading funded programs at a similar level (p. e75). The management plan includes information and milestones that will guide the implementation and oversight of the funded project (p. e48).

Weaknesses:

i. No weaknesses were noted.

ii. The responsibilities of the identified personal are poorly defined. For example, it is unclear who is on the CECE team and what their specific role will be in the project (p. e48).

Reader's Score: 18

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 narrative includes a strong evaluation that aligns well to the project goals and objectives. The measures employed to identify impact of the project are well designed and possess sufficient reliability and validity. The methods of the evaluation are clearly aligned to the What Works Clearinghouse with reservations and will be a useful tool for future research.

i. The included evaluation timeline is a useful tool that will guide the process for collecting data around the project (p. e50). The methods proposed in the evaluation will meet the requirements of the What Works Clearinghouse with reservations. For example, the evaluators will use matching techniques that will ensure appropriate comparisons as well as monitoring baseline equivalence on multiple measures (p. e54). The sample size and statistical power of the proposed analysis also meet the requirements for the What Works Clearinghouse (p. e55).

ii. The evaluation includes a clear implementation plan that is linked to the various components of the project and the identified outcomes. For example, the development of a Fidelity of Implementation Matrix will be a valuable tool for project administration to use during their regularly scheduled meetings to identify shortcomings or program successes (p. e59). The use of surveys of participants will allow for project administration to help identify contextual factors that are impacting implementation (p. e59).

iii. The evaluation includes multiple objective measures that are clearly aligned to the project activities and proposed outcomes. For example, the evaluation will measure both teacher and student impact using test scores and teaching measures (p. e53). The variety of measures used to evaluate the activities associated with the project are robust and will provide a great deal of evidence of impact (p. e52).

iv. The tools and resulting data used to evaluate the impact and implementation of the proposed project are of high quality and demonstrate appropriate reliability and validity (p. e53).

v. The evaluation is thorough and uses techniques and approaches that will produce data that will guide future research and the implementation of the project (p. e60).

Weaknesses:

i. No weaknesses were noted.

ii. No weaknesses were noted.

iii. No weaknesses were noted.

iv. No weaknesses were noted.

v. No weaknesses were 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 narrative includes a clear plan to provide a high-quality residency experience to attract a diverse teaching pool (p. e20). The goals, objectives and measures are clearly focused on providing evidence of increased participation of Black teachers as well as toward the retention of these teachers in the workforce (p. e23). The project provides alternative means of teacher certification to address barriers experience by participants (p. e23).

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 narrative is a well-developed plan that focuses on addressing inequity and lack of access for traditionally underserved students and potential teachers (p. e20). The project focuses on providing meaningful residency experiences for teachers to allow them to learn methods that will improve the teaching environment and allow students to access content through a social justice lens (p. e24).

Weaknesses:

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 proposed project is designed to address the trauma experienced by both teachers and students and allow them to gain a better understanding of how they contribute to society (p. e24). The focus on Socioemotional Learning (SEL) will allow for teachers to address issues in their own lives and learn skills and methods that will address issues of their future students (p. e25).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/13/2022 11:02 AM