

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/16/2022 06:58 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** The Research Foundation for SUNY on behalf of U. at Buffalo (S423A220055)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	35	34
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	25	21
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	18
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	93
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
1. Educator Diversity	5	5
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
1. Promoting Equity	3	3
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 3</b>		
1. Meeting Student Needs	2	2
<b>Sub Total</b>	10	10
<b>Total</b>	110	103

# Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - FY22 SEED Panel - 4: 84.423A

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

Applicant: The Research Foundation for SUNY on behalf of U. at Buffalo (S423A220055)

## 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 proposed program is robust and of sufficient quality, intensity and duration. It will consist of a 16-months guided apprenticeship, leading to a master's degree and a five-day Teacher Residency Summer Institute during the summer before the program (e18). Multiple mechanisms for building capacity are embedded within the project's design. The applicant has indicated that their approach to professional learning through residency is informed by principles of collaborative professionalism (Hargreaves & O'Connor, 2018). The applicant has engaged in partnership with a Graduate School of Education and four school districts. The proposed program is likely to successfully meet student needs. Program evaluations have shown that 75% of residents strongly agreed they feel prepared to implement and enact culturally responsive-sustaining practices in their classrooms; and preliminary results on the selected program model have shown significant and positive impacts on student achievement in ELA and mathematics.

The proposed program is robust and of sufficient quality, intensity and duration. The program will include cohort-based coursework, collaborative seminars, and clustering of resident-mentor pairs in a smaller number of partner schools to create a community of support (e18). Modules for coursework will relate theory to practice through application of concepts during the residency year.

The proposed program will consist of a 16-months guided apprenticeship, leading to a master's degree. During the first summer, residents will also participate in a five-day Teacher Residency Summer Institute (e18) to prepare them for the preparation journey. The program's design is multifaceted and provides multiple opportunities for learning and practice as

educators go through their preparation.

Multiple mechanisms for building capacity are embedded within the project's design. At the start of the school year, residents co-teach alongside their mentor teacher, while taking coursework. Through a gradual release model, residents' experiences are scaffolded throughout the year until they become the teachers of record (e18). Working alongside mentor teachers, who are selected based on their effectiveness ratings of effective or highly effective (e20), provides candidates the opportunity to learn from some of the best and to receive their ongoing support as the candidates apply what they have learned. This model allows for real time feedback and correction, to maximize capacity building.

The cohort-based model includes clustering teachers in schools (e18), which supports the development of relationships to support each candidate's professional practice. Professional relationships that allow for conversations and engagement build capacity by allowing educators to learn from one another as they share best practices and deconstruct areas of concern.

Early-career teachers who are graduates of the residency will be invited to take on leadership roles through the Consortium. This will require them to generate session topics, organize affinity groups (e23), and co-facilitate sessions at the annual Teacher Residency Summer Institute (e24). All of these activities support the building of capacity among educators as they are forced to dig deeper into their practice and apply what has been learned.

The applicant has indicated that their approach to professional learning through residency is informed by principles of collaborative professionalism (Hargreaves & O'Connor, 2018) which provide the theoretical foundations of the project's sustained, recursive, practice-based approach to professional development (e21).

The applicant has engaged in partnership with a Graduate School of Education and four school districts (e14). The proposed collaboration seems appropriate to execute the program and all of its components, including coursework, professional development and the provision of mentor teachers, coaches, etc. The applicant has demonstrated a clear plan for the execution of duties related to various aspects of the program.

The proposed program is likely to successfully meet student needs. Program evaluations have shown that 75% of residents strongly agreed they feel prepared to implement and enact culturally responsive-sustaining practices in their classrooms (e40). Creating and maintaining culturally responsive classrooms will support diverse students in their learning and create an environment in which they feel more included, which has been shown to have positive effects on student achievement.

Preliminary results on the selected program model have shown significant and positive impacts on student achievement in ELA and mathematics when beginning teachers are supported through coaching (e28). These preliminary findings support the likelihood that the educators participating in this program are likely to help meet and address student needs.

#### **Weaknesses:**

The applicant has indicated that their approach to professional learning through residency is informed by principles of collaborative professionalism (Hargreaves & O'Connor, 2018), but they have not explicitly stated their conceptual framework for the project.

**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 magnitude of impact for the proposed project is likely to be great. Elements of the proposed program will become embedded in the university partner's existing educator preparation program and be expanded to additional partner districts. The applicant has not provided detailed line items for each expenditure, making it difficult to fully assert whether costs are reasonable. The applicant has a history of disseminating information relative to its educator preparation program. In relation to this project, the applicant plans to participate in discussions at the state national level, using project findings to support the expansion of residency as a means for transforming teacher education.

The magnitude of impact for the proposed project is likely to be great. The project will create forty residents in partner district, and nearly three hundred established and emerging teacher leaders' will be supported by the project's tiered, professional learning activities (e41).

The proposed project will have a wide breadth of impact. It is planned to impact 110 educators through the residency, impacting approximately 2500 K-12 students, and more than 275 emerging and developing teacher-leaders in professional learning activities that will impact approximately 10,000 students across the four partner districts (e43).

Elements of the proposed program will become embedded in and allow the university partner to expand upon their existing residency program and broaden their reach to include professional learning activities for residency program graduates (e41). Building upon an already existing and successful program increases the likelihood that these new elements will be maintained.

The proposed residency model will become embedded in new districts as the university partner expands to additional partner districts, increasing collaboration across districts and facilitating a community of practice highlighting effective practices in varied school contexts (e41).

The applicant has a history of disseminating information relative to its educator preparation program. Recently, the applicant published a book (Gorlewski et al., 2022) intended to serve as a guide to others seeking to establish residency programs. Findings related to the existing preparation program have also been disseminated at annual meetings of the American Educational Research Association (AERA) and American Educational Studies Association (e44). In relation to this project, the applicant plans to participate in discussions at the state national level, using project findings to support the expansion of residency as a means for transforming teacher education.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant has not provided detailed line items for each expenditure. For example, total personnel costs are budgeted at approximately \$1M (e159), but it is not clear how much each staff member will be paid. Without that level of detail for each budget category, it is difficult to ascertain with certainty whether budgeted costs are reasonable.

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 applicant has provided clear goals and objectives, with measurable outcomes directly aligned to the project's design. The provided management plan has clearly defined responsibilities and milestones, but the provided timelines are broad but the timelines provided are broad, reducing the likelihood that the project will be completed on time and within budget.

The applicant has provided clear goals (e12) and objectives (e17-23), with measurable outcomes (e12). Providing clear goals and objectives helps direct implementation of the project toward its intended outcomes. Having measurable outcomes reduces bias in evaluating the project's impact.

The provided goals (e12), objectives (e17-23) and outcomes (e12) directly align to the project's design and activities. Having this level of alignment supports effective evaluation and management of the program as it is implemented.

The applicant has provided a management plan with clearly defined responsibilities and milestones (e45-47). Clearly assigning responsibilities and identifying milestones helps create accountability and provide direction for program implementation. Both of which help support the project being completed on time and on budget.

#### Weaknesses:

The applicant has provided a management plan with clearly defined responsibilities and milestones, but the provided timelines are broad (e.g., summer 2023, fall 2022) (e45-47). Providing specific timelines for various aspects of the project helps to ensure elements of the project are completed time so that the entire project is executed and implemented as planned during the grant cycle.

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 project's evaluation will meet WWC standards with reservations. The proposed project will include an implementation study that will allow for performance feedback and permit periodic assessment. The project's performance measures are objective and clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project. The proposed evaluation is likely to lead to valid and reliable performance data, given that it will be conducted by an external evaluator and include multiple sources of data. The project's impact evaluation and newly authored book will provide information on the project's outcomes, implementation and strategies.

The design of the project's evaluation includes components that will produce evidence about the project's effectiveness of the project that meet the WWC standards with reservations.

The proposed project will include an implementation study that will allow for performance feedback and permit periodic assessment (e48). The implementation study is intended to address variations in implementation, success of the program's efforts from the stakeholders' perspectives, and how the project influences professional growth of mentor teachers, to name a few.

The project includes an Advisory Council that will provide oversight and meet quarterly to review ongoing formative assessments and evaluation data to determine needed revisions and refinements to project components (e47).

The project's performance measures are objective and clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project. The applicant has also identified performance measures to evaluate each portion of the project (e48-49). A mixture of qualitative (e.g., surveys, assessments) and, qualitative (e.g., focus groups, interviews) data.

The proposed evaluation is likely to lead to valid and reliable performance data. The evaluation will be conducted by an external evaluator (e47), which will help to reduce bias in the findings.

The proposed project will use multiple sources of data for evaluation (e150-151). Using multiple data sources allows for triangulation of the data which supports the validity of findings.

The project's impact evaluation will assess the instructional practice of program graduates, outcomes of students in the classes of graduates, and the retention of graduates after one year of teaching (e52). This information, in conjunction with the program's book (e44) will support replication of the program and its success by other educators.

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**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 has track record of recruiting and preparing diverse educators. To date, the program has prepared three cohorts with more than 60% of residents coming from underrepresented, minority backgrounds (e15). Having this history and experience better prepares the candidate to be successful in recruiting and preparing diverse candidates for the proposed program.

In an effort to support recruitment of more diverse candidates, the applicant has eliminated application barriers, such as the GRE and application fees, which research indicates disproportionately screen-out prospective teachers of color (e18).

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**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 proposed project will prepare diverse educators for K-12 schools. The project's coaching model is student-centered, integrating the academic and social-emotional needs of students, considering students' optimal learning environments that create emotionally, intellectually, and physically safe environments, provide equitable, culturally responsive, and rigorous curriculum and instruction, and meet the needs of diverse learners (e28). This level of coaching will help educators examine and address sources of inequity within their classrooms.

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**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:**

Candidates in the proposed program will learn to explicitly support students in developing their social emotional skills, such as collaborating with peers and persisting through challenging tasks (e15).

Teacher residents, mentor teaches, and school leaders will engage in regular, collaborative engagements aimed at (1) more deeply understanding students' SEL needs, (2) recognizing effective instructional and SEL strategies that promote positive engagement and learning in the classroom, (3) selecting and implementing culturally-responsive SEL strategies and integrating them meaningfully into instruction, and (4) collectively reflecting on and setting goals for classroom-specific SEL practices (e25).

During the summer institute, two half-day trainings will be provided to residents, building and district leaders, and mentor teachers. Training one will focus on SEL and the relation of trauma-informed and culturally responsive SEL practices to promote positive student development (Graves et al., 2017). Training two will include content on infusing general evidence-based SEL intervention practices to various instructional areas. Following the summer institutes, monthly online

modules will focus on implementation of prevention strategies aimed at supporting culturally responsive classroom management (e35).

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**Reader's Score:**     **2**

---

**Status:**           Submitted

**Last Updated:**   07/16/2022 06:58 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/19/2022 03:21 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** The Research Foundation for SUNY on behalf of U. at Buffalo (S423A220055)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	35	33
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	25	25
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	20
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	98
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
1. Educator Diversity	5	5
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
1. Promoting Equity	3	3
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 3</b>		
1. Meeting Student Needs	2	2
<b>Sub Total</b>	10	10
<b>Total</b>	110	108

# Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - FY22 SEED Panel - 4: 84.423A

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

Applicant: The Research Foundation for SUNY on behalf of U. at Buffalo (S423A220055)

## 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:

Overall, the design of the proposed project is appropriate to and has promise to successfully address, the needs of the target population relative to sufficient professional development, capacity-building efforts, and collaboration of identified partners to ensure the project's successful implementation at the secondary level.

The project well demonstrates that the training and professional development services to be provided are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services. As indicated on pages e30 and e31, for example, the project will provide a week-long, 35-hour) institute with sessions facilitated by the program team, faculty, district, and school leaders, provide monthly clinical experience coaching sessions and follow-up, and forty-five hours of class contact-hours for each course.

The project design evidence sound capacity-building efforts that will yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance. As noted in the narrative, a part of its capacity-building efforts, for example, the project will draw upon the expertise of the project's clinical coaches, who provide induction support during the first two years of teaching, meeting regularly with program alumni, participating in systemic professional development, and facilitating professional learning communities focused on teacher effectiveness as related to student performance. Additionally, the project's career induction specialists work in collaboration with district-provided early career mentors, spending several hours per month with residents to strengthen the clinical connections necessary to support a strong professional network (p. e21). The applicant was also awarded a year-long extension grant that will allow the project to expand its offering and

enable the project to potentially attract widespread of the residency model and teacher leadership pathway (p. e41).

The proposal consists of a comprehensive concept guided by a logic model that demonstrates evidence-based activities to support the quality of that concept (p. e142). As noted on page e44, for example, Research on the project's innovative program features has the potential to contribute to the advancement of theory, knowledge, and practice related to modularization of coursework that leverages residency classroom experiences; the use of cohort and networked support models in improving teacher retention, particularly for teachers of color working in mid-sized urban districts; and the impact of co-teaching residencies on P-12 student outcomes.

The collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services is well demonstrated. For example, the project will partner with Virginia Commonwealth University's Center for Teacher Leadership to provide mentor teachers, clinical experience coaches, induction specialists, and teacher leaders with professional development in the New Teacher Coaching for equity model (p. e32). Collaboration efforts are also demonstrated via letters of support from the project's partnering districts. For example, one school district will provide regular release time for teachers and university faculty to engage in professional development as well as provide data to the project for program evaluation purposes (p. e137).

The applicant well demonstrates a project design that is appropriate to and has promise to successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs. For example, through the expansion of its co-teaching residency program to include professional learning in culturally responsive-sustaining practices that support social-emotional learning, and paired mentoring for project residents, the project will be able to address the following challenges experienced by the target school district. Challenges of the target school districts include but are not limited to a substantial increase in retirements and turnover in the past two years, and many teachers in the partner districts currently hold initial, emergency, or temporary licensure to teach until exams are passed due to turnover during the pandemic. Additionally, the project includes demographic data regarding the high percentage of racially and ethnically diverse students, high percentages of students with disabilities, high percentages of English Learner students, and high percentages of students eligible for free or reduced lunch (pp. e38, e39).

**Weaknesses:**

Although the proposal includes a logic model to guide the project's overall implementation, the applicant failed to provide a conceptual framework visual or diagram to support underlying the proposed research or demonstrated activities the applicant will institute to address the project's identified need and significance.

**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:**

Overall, the applicant clearly demonstrates that the significance of the project is relevant to the identified needs of the target population. The significance is also appropriate to accomplish the specific activities anticipated carrying out relative to addressing the administrative leadership needs identified.

The importance or magnitude of the results or outcomes likely to improve teaching and student achievement is evidenced by the proposal. As indicated in the narrative, for example, the overall significance of the project is the anticipated outcomes of expanded professional learning for mentor teachers and induction specialists resulting in increased effectiveness of instructional mentoring, contributing to resident retention and learning, and leading to improvements in student-level outcomes (p. e42).

As outlined in the project and budget narratives, the applicant well demonstrates costs that are reasonable to serve 275 emerging and developing teacher leaders (p. e43). Costs outlined in the budget narrative such as personnel, travel, equipment supplies, and stipends, are also reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project (pp. e159-e164).

The incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing program of the agency or organization at the end of Federal funding is evidenced. As indicated in the narrative, for example, the project anticipates that district and school leaders' capacity for supporting novice teachers, particularly novice teachers of color, will be improved through professional learning community participation. Also, the university faculty's capacity to engage residents in coursework that leverages classroom practice will be further enhanced through the expansion of the proposed residency model. Further, the applicant anticipates that by enhancing and expanding its offerings, the project will build greater organizational capacity for teacher leadership, effective professional learning, and innovative teacher preparation models that are community-centered and district-serving (p. e41).

The proposal developed a concise process for which the results and strategies of the proposed project can be disseminated. As noted in the narrative, for example, project leaders published a book that is intended to serve as a guide to others seeking to establish residency programs. Additionally, other efforts include the dissemination of project findings related to our existing residency program and its first two cohorts at the annual meetings of the American Educational Research Association and American Educational Studies Association (p. e44).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were noted.

**Reader's Score: 25**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan**

**1. C. Quality of the Management Plan (20 points)**

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

**(i) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed**

**project are clearly specified and measurable.  
(10 points)**

**(ii) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.  
(10 points)**

**Please provide Overview Statement on top of first Strength comment.**

**Strengths:**

Overall, the applicant presents a comprehensive management plan that is sufficient to successfully implement the project's goal, objectives, and measurable outcomes. The proposal also outlines personnel to the project with clearly delineated roles and responsibilities to ensure the appropriateness of timelines and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

One broad goal aligned with specific objectives and measurable outcomes that are appropriate and have promise to address the needs of the target population is presented. As indicated on page e12, for example, the applicant's overall goal is to recruit, prepare, support, and retain demographically diverse cohorts of teachers for high-need schools in high-need districts through a collaboratively developed community-focused teacher residency program anchored in evidence-based, equity-centered practices. The three objectives are appropriate to the design of the project. One of the objectives, for example, is to recruit, prepare, support, and retain demographically diverse cohorts of teachers for high-need schools in high-need districts through a collaboratively developed community-focused residency program anchored in evidence-based, equity-centered practices (pp. e45-e47).

The proposal boasts a comprehensive management plan to achieve the project's goal and objectives. For example, the proposal includes a visual representation that clearly delineates the responsibilities of project personnel as well as timelines, milestones, for accomplishing project tasks, and project personnel responsible for each task or activity that is aligned with the project's objectives. The proposal also outlines the qualifications of core personnel for the project. The project director, for example, will be responsible for coordinating all components of the grant, as well as managing fiscal resources to ensure timely expenditure of funds, and lead the advisory board to encourage collaboration (pp. e45-e47).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were noted.

**Reader's Score: 20**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation**

**1. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (20 points)**

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

**(i) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the WWC standards with or without reservations as described in the WWC Handbook.  
(4 points)**

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

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

**quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.**  
**(4 points)**

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

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

**Please provide Overview Statement on top of first Strength comment.**

**Strengths:**

Overall, the proposal's method of evaluation is thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the context for which the project proposes to be implemented, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and intended. Further, the evaluation methodology has promise to produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that meets the WWC standards.

The applicant's methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the WWC standards with reservations is clearly demonstrated. As indicated in the narrative, for example, the evaluation design includes methods to support formative evaluation activities to provide performance feedback to the project's personnel to permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. The design also includes components that will produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the WWC standards with reservations (p. e47). The evaluation is also inclusive of identified research questions related to the anticipated outcomes of the project. Further, the project's evaluation process will include a quasi-experimental design with a matched sample of teachers will be used to examine the impact of the project on student achievement, instructional practice, and teacher retention (pp. e48, e49).

The proposal well demonstrates that the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. For example, will engage in ongoing interim reporting of key descriptive information for formative feedback and program improvement, including emerging findings from surveys, interviews, and content assessments of teachers and students, to provide timely feedback to improve the program toward the intended outcomes (p. e51).

The applicant well demonstrates that the proposed methods of evaluation will involve 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. For example, a wide range of data will be used to measure program performance for performance feedback. Analyses will be shared with leaders quarterly to support discussions of program implementation and design. Data will come primarily from ongoing program surveys and qualitative interviews and focus groups with a purposeful selection of key program participants including teacher residents, mentor teachers, and developing teacher leaders. The evaluation team will also collect and review program documents and administrative data (p. e51). The project also identified primary and secondary types of data, and the sources of the data that are aligned with the evaluation questions (p. e150, e151).

The proposal evidence sound methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes. As noted in the narrative, surveys measuring various domains of teaching knowledge and practice will be developed and administered twice per academic year to assess teachers' self-reported level of knowledge development, current educational practice, and preparedness for teaching in a high-needs school context. Additionally, data collected from interviews and focus groups will be used to understand the experience and decision-making underlying program implementation (pp. e51, e52).

The applicant outlines specific details regarding how 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. As indicated in the narrative, for example, longitudinal resident interviews will be used to gauge teacher outcomes. Classroom observations of high-impact practices



will be used to assess the quality of instructional practice specific to social and emotional learning strategies, and student outcome data will be collected to gauge student social, emotional, and behavioral outcomes (pp. e53, e54).

**Weaknesses:**

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 applicant presents sound information that the proposal is designed to improve the recruitment, outreach, preparation, support, development, and retention of a diverse educator workforce. For example, the applicant proposes to recruit, prepare, support, and retain demographically diverse cohorts of teachers for high-need schools in high-need districts through a collaboratively developed community-focused residency program anchored in evidence-based, equity-centered practices (p. e19).

**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 proposal presents evidence that the applicant's pedagogical practices in Educator preparation programs and professional development programs are inclusive with regard to race, ethnicity, culture, language, and disability status so that educators are better prepared to create inclusive, supportive learning environments for their students. As indicated on page e20, as a part of addressing the identified needs of the target group, the tenets of the project will include the recruitment, development, and support of high-quality mentor teachers and induction specialists in residency partner schools by implementing evidence-based coaching and induction support models.

**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 applicant well demonstrates that the proposal fosters skills and behaviors that enable academic progress. For example, the applicant's proposed tiered, multifaceted series of evidence-based professional learning activities focused specifically on culturally relevant transformative SEL will broaden our reach to non-residency partner districts, equipping teacher-leaders with additional evidence-based strategies for fostering inclusive, equitable learning environments for students (p. e15).

**Weaknesses:**

Weaknesses were noted.

**Reader's Score: 2**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 07/19/2022 03:21 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/20/2022 11:12 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** The Research Foundation for SUNY on behalf of U. at Buffalo (S423A220055)

**Reader #4:** \*\*\*\*\*

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

# Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - FY22 SEED Panel - 4: 84.423A

Reader #4: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: The Research Foundation for SUNY on behalf of U. at Buffalo (S423A220055)

## 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 project will address Absolute Priority 1. It will be implemented in four high-need school districts in Western New York

(i) The applicant provides comprehensive evidence that the professional development services to be provided by the proposed project are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services. For example, elements that predict quality (e.g., consortium-based action research, Zeichner, 2003 and culturally responsive approaches to Social and Emotional Learning (Parkhouse, 2021) are supported by research. Furthermore, the applicant demonstrates Table 6: Intensity and Duration Chart are sufficient. This chart succinctly summarizes the professional development service, explains its purpose and identifies a relevant timeline. The frequency and duration of the service varies and can be for 2-hour time-span once monthly to 2 half-day sessions weekly. Through exposure to the academic content, preservice training and an on-line training platform, novice teachers will build a foundation of content knowledge and instructional skills that will accelerate their ability to prepare students to meet the demands of academic advancement with the skills to appropriately navigate social and emotional responses (e30-34).  
(7 pts)

(ii) The applicant provides a detailed analysis of how the project design will build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance. For example, the current program is an extension of a previous Teacher Quality Partnership Grant and therefore some of its resources are already inculcated into some of the target school districts. Several other strategies are proposed to infuse the project activities and impacts to build the human, material, structural, and organizational capacity. An example of strategies to build human capacity are reflected in an increase the human

capacity of forty residents in the partner district. Nearly three hundred established and emerging teacher leaders' will be supported by a tiered, professional learning activities (e.g., NTC training, collaboration and co-teaching training, induction support, and engagement in consortium activities, SEL modules and coaching) (e41). (7 pts)

(iii) The applicant provides the conceptual context that drives the project design. The demonstration activities are aligned with the program objectives, short term and long- term outcomes, which are clearly delineated. The framework is adequate to achieve the project outcomes.. A Logic Model is found on e143 (Appendix G). (7 pts)

(iv) The applicant has delineated the following partners: the University of Buffalo Graduate School of Education, Buffalo City School District, Sweet Home Central Schools, Amherst Central Schools, Kenmore Tonawanda Schools, VCU Metropolitan Educational Research Consortium (External Evaluation Team).

(7 pts)

(v) The proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs. Several needs are identified and potentially addressed by the project to include increasing the pool of highly trained, diversified educators, retention of a diverse workforce, increasing the knowledge base of new and experienced teachers, developing a cadre of mentor teachers, developing a culture of equity and social learning adaptations and increasing student achievement (e42). (7 pts)

#### **Weaknesses:**

(i) No weaknesses were noted.

(ii) No weaknesses were noted.

(iii) No weaknesses were noted.

(iv) It is unclear how the partnerships maximize the effectiveness of project services as the applicant does not discuss their contributions or support.

(v) No weaknesses were noted.

**Reader's Score: 32**

#### **Selection Criteria - Significance**

##### **1. B. Significance (25 points)**

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

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

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

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

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

**Please provide Overview Statement on top of first Strength comment.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant provides evidence of the worthiness of the project to a large number of stakeholders and partners. In addition, the applicant demonstrates how the project can be disseminated to others who might benefit from its utility to teachers and students.

(i) It is highly likely that the outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project will be significant to a large number of school district personnel (i.e., teachers, administrative personnel and district stakeholders), students, and University personnel. For example, the professional learning experiences will impact approximately 110 diverse educators and approximately 2500 K-12 students in participating classrooms. In addition to experienced teachers, the project has the potential to impact approximately 275 emerging and developing teacher leaders who in turn will impact approximately 10,000 students across our four partner districts (e43). In addition, the proposed project may; (a) impact concerns within the school districts regarding teacher supply, teacher quality and teacher diversity; (b) enhance student achievement through a diversified workforce and (c) impact teaching practices and student achievement through intense professional learning activities (e43).

(7pts) (ii) As reflected in the budget, narrative, the costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and to the anticipated results and benefits (e163) The applicant provides the targeted number of participants to be served. For example, participants/Year: Y1 total 150. In year 2, project participants equal 170 and in year 3, project participants equal 180 (e42). (6pts)

(iii) The applicant provides an adequate response to the subfactors. For example, the project builds upon an existing project and expands services to a new cadre of students who will take the new learning models, instructional practices and student supports into their respective school districts. In addition, the applicant provides a chart that details with specificity, methodology to ensure sustainability (e.g., human capacity, material capacity, structural capacity and organizational capacity). An example of human capacity are the 40 school district residents and 300 novice residents matriculating through the proposed project. These strategies show good promise that the project purposes, activities, or benefits will be incorporated into the ongoing program of the agency or organization at the end of Federal funding (e41).. (6pts)

(iv) The applicant provides adequate strategies to disseminate the proposed project in ways that will enable others to use the information or strategies. Examples include publication of a book regarding the establishment of residency programs; dissemination of findings at annual meetings of the American Educational Research Association (AERA) and American Educational Studies Association (AESA), publications in professional journals and presentations at educational conferences (e43-44).

**Weaknesses:**

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

**Reader's Score: 25**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan**

**1. C. Quality of the Management Plan (20 points)**

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

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

**(ii) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.  
(10 points)**

**Please provide Overview Statement on top of first Strength comment.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant has developed a management structure with highly qualified personnel to provide effective oversight of the project implementation.

(i) The applicant appropriately presents a management plan that clearly articulates the goals, objectives and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable. For example, Table 6 on page e45 shows each of the objectives, activities, timeline and person(s) responsible. The plan spans the life of the grant (e.g., from Fall 2022 through Spring 2024). Outcomes of the project are clearly articulated and aligned with project objectives (p(10 pts)

(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. For example, Table 6 on page e45 shows each of the objectives, activities, timeline and person(s) responsible. The plan spans the life of the grant (e.g., from Fall 2022 through Spring 2024).

The applicant has identified several qualified personnel who have extensive experience in the design and implementation of the project as teacher professional development in the areas of reading instruction. The management experience of these personnel significantly increases the likelihood of effective implementation of the project (Appendix) The applicant offers sufficient information on the level of support and resources they will supply to implement the proposed project.

**Weaknesses:**

- (i) No weaknesses were noted.
- (ii) Milestones were not addressed in the management plan.

**Reader's Score: 19**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation**

**1. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (20 points)**

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

**(i) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the WWC standards with or without reservations as described in the WWC Handbook.  
(4 points)**



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

**(4 points)**

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

**(4 points)**

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

**(4 points)**

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

**(4 points)**

**Please provide Overview Statement on top of first Strength comment.**

**Strengths:**

The proposal includes an evaluation plan designed to meet What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) standards with reservations- a quasi-experimental design will be used. The plan includes strategies to ensure feedback on an intermittent basis to monitor the project progress. The plan is adequate to achieve the stated objectives and outcomes.

(i) The applicant indicates that a quasi-experimental design (QED) with a matched sample of teachers will be used to examine the impact of UBTR on student achievement, instructional practice and teacher retention (e50). The applicant also indicates that baseline equivalence for the quasiexperimental component of the evaluation will be established for groups in the analytic samples (teachers and students in the UBTR treatment vs. non-UBTR conditions) to meet the WWC standards with reservations. The methods are appropriate. (4 pts)

(ii) The applicant adequately demonstrates that the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. For example, data collection and analysis methods are discussed and include program surveys (e51); interviews and focus groups (e52), administrative data, and program documents (e52).

(4 pts)

(iii) The applicant adequately articulates how the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible. (4 pts)

(iv) The applicant gives a satisfactory response on how the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on Relevant Outcomes and produce quantitative and qualitative data. Descriptions of measures and data sources can be found in Table 5 (Appendix H). (4 pts)

(v) The applicant provides salient information to ensure that the design (e.g., a quasi-experimental study) 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. For example, teacher resident outcomes, student outcomes and retention studies will be examined (e53-54). Successful results can be used by others in similar community-based university partnership programs. (4 pts)

**Weaknesses:**

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 appropriately indicates that it will recruit, develop, and support high-quality mentor teachers and induction specialists in residency partner schools by implementing evidence-based coaching and induction support models. The applicant provides strategies to encourage retention and build upon a successful history, i.e., track record of teacher development with residency requirements (p.2)

**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 demonstrates that the project promotes educational equity by recruiting and retaining and developing the skills of a diverse workforce to provide quality instructional practices to a diverse student population. Students in grades K-12 in high needs school districts will be the recipients of the project services (p.2). Teachers will engage in evidence-based professional learning activities focused specifically on culturally relevant transformative SEL will broaden our reach to non-residency partner districts, equipping teacher-leaders with additional evidence-based strategies for fostering inclusive, equitable learning environments for students.

**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 has satisfactorily addressed Competitive Preference Priority 3 to improve students' social, emotional, academic, and career development. The population is to implemented with high-needs students who are marginalized and culturally and linguistically diverse in 17 school districts. The applicant will train and mentor teachers to provide culturally responsive approaches to Social and Emotional Learning (Parkhouse, 2021), which is supported by research (e15, e25 and e35).

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

**Reader's Score:** 2

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 07/20/2022 11:12 AM