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

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Chico State Enterprises (S423A220083)
Reader #1: **********

		Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions			
Selection Criteria			
Quality of Project Design			
1. Project Design		35	34
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	93
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	103

Panel #8 - FY22 SEED Panel - 8: 84.423A

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

Applicant: Chico State Enterprises (S423A220083)

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 has developed an adequate project design that is thoughtful and clear around important goals. The SEL and HCE interventions are well designed and supported by relevant research.

    (i) The applicant presents the GREAT Teachers Pipeline that will develop and deploy training, professional development (PD), and student services to meet three goals of this project (p. e22). The goals include academic advising; training and use of social emotional learning(SEL) and health-centered engagement (HCE); and integrated technology support. The applicant intends to deliver evidence based advising consistent with WWC Practice Guide Effective Advising for Post-Secondary Students (Karp et al, 2021). The applicant's renewed approach is based on Miller et al (2021) that includes caseload, integrated technology, and student engagement.

    The SEL and HCE includes the development of resiliency skills to attend to Darling-Hammond's (2017) concern around attrition. The applicant appropriately undergirds the project with SEL as these are essential to all learning (Jones & Kahn, 2017). The plan is to move heretofore SEL to an HCE orientation to more accurately meet the needs of a diverse student population (p. e23). The applicant points out that HCE is not just for students but also for the educators and communities as it attends to ensuring all voices are included.
    Culturally sustaining practices are included in the project. This, according to the applicant, is important for diverse and underrepresented teachers as they assist incoming teachers see themselves in the curriculum (p. e24).

The importance of building PD that is focused on theory and classroom practices is an integral component of the applicant's plan. Research supports this as an antidote to isolation and unbelongingness (p. e24).

The applicant presents three evidence-based recommendations (WWC compliant) for technology to support student learning. An example of this is the personalization and readily available digital resources (p. e25). The outcome is to increase engagement between students and gather feedback. Students in the project will utilize podcasts and instructional videos to maximize the instructional efficacy.

The research base used by the applicant is thorough and meets the expectations of this criterion.

(ii) The applicant's plans to increase capacity of underserved students is robust. It is reasonably likely to endure beyond the funding cycle. For example, the applicant highlights the momentum of degree completion and SEL awareness of students. In addition, the collaborative opportunities involve several K12 partners. The hoped-for outcomes include increased trust and partnerships operating beyond the funding.

The activities include Summer Bridge, Educational Opportunity Program, First Year Experiences. These are designed to meet the needs of underserved populations (p. e26). The applicant's interest in extending partnerships with surrounding LEAs is a leverage opportunity for underserved students that is supported by research (Coburn, 2003).

(iii) The applicant presents a cogent, thorough, and detailed conceptual framework and logic model. The latter (p. e29) includes goals/objectives, inputs, outputs/activities, and both short-and long-term outcomes. It is well designed and provides an effective overview of the project's components. The Theory of Change includes identified barriers and solutions. It is clear and compelling. The School of Education's conceptual framework includes a commitment to diversity.

(iv) The applicant includes several partners in this work. For example, the REACH program supports first-generation freshmen from traditionally underserved backgrounds (p. e29). Other partners include mentoring agencies, the Educational Opportunity Program, and the Cross-Cultural Leadership Center. The University provides significant counseling and academic support, as ethnic and socioeconomic status can be associated with undiagnosed intellectual and developmental disabilities (Emerson, 2012).

(v) The applicant clearly addresses issues of underrepresentation in schools. The project aims to provide access to utilize SEL pedagogies that designed to reinforce and increase capacity and create access to careers in education (p. e31).

The outcomes are likely to increase retention of teachers over time.

Weaknesses:
(i) No weaknesses noted.

(ii) No weaknesses noted.

(iii) No weaknesses noted.

(iv) It is not clearly and specifically discussed how the collaborative efforts of the partners and the applicant will lead to the maximization of efficacy in the project. For example, the applicant lists training for paraprofessionals but does not include specifics. (1 point not awarded).

(v) No weaknesses noted.

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. B. Significance (25 points)

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

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

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

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

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

Please provide Overview Statement on top of first Strength comment.

Strengths:

The potential for impactful outcomes is likely with this Grow Your Own project. The applicant has developed an adequate plan where the outcomes are reasonably impactful for the profession and students in the areas of SEL.

(i) The applicant discusses the Grow Your Own (GYO) program in this project to strengthen the teacher pipeline. It is well supported in the literature and the applicant cites several relevant sources. The augmentation to typical GYO programs by the applicant in the inclusion of SEL and HCE along with a year-long residence is likely to achieve the magnitude that the Secretary specifies in this grant criterion. One of the areas of excellence in design is the constructed opportunity for students to see themselves in their teachers (p. e31), and this is supported in relevant research. This is an important component for populations that have been disadvantaged over time. The inclusion of emotional support and connections are active components in achieving the importance standard. The opportunity to build capacity and increase instructional strategies to implement evidence-based SEL practices is a benefit for the teachers and the LEAs (p. e32). Finally, the applicant provides access to high school students for college level courses.

(ii) The applicant's narrative around costs is compelling. The cost to become a school teacher is often beyond the financial capabilities of underserved populations. This exacerbates the present situation in schools and continues to create inequities. The funding from the SEED grant will support and impact 720 students at a per student cost of $18,673 (p. e33).

(iii) The applicant is clear about the intended outcomes of the proposed GYO program. With the strong partnership with the LEA and partners, it has the potential to build organizational capacity, readiness, and the opportunity to create professional communities of practice (p. e34). Students will see themselves in the teachers and it demonstrates a viable pathway to a career in education.

(iv) Beginning with sharing outcomes through collaboration with the LEAs and the stakeholders, the applicant plans on a multilayered dissemination plan. Examples include quarterly meetings, webinars, and reporting at the Summer Institute. Dissemination in the University is also identified and regional and national conferences (p. e36).

Weaknesses:

(i) No weaknesses noted.

(ii) The significant cost per participant is a concern (p. e33). It is not an easy calculation to determine the additional value for LEAs and students in the schools, as the value of seeing themselves in the teacher cadre may be of a significant value that is not expressed in dollars and cents. (2 points not awarded).

(iii) The applicant does not adequately discuss specifics of sustainability of the program after the funding period. The applicant's assertion that the sustainable model will be enhanced by directly integrating with existing programs is not clear (p. e34). For example, if the model is resource intensive, the continuance of the program without the resources may be at risk. In addition, the claim made by the applicant relative to self-renewing lacks specifics; the increase in diversity in the teaching ranks may influence a portion of sustaining outcomes but other areas are not as clear. (2 points not awarded).

(iv) No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 21

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

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

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

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

Please provide Overview Statement on top of first Strength comment.

 Strengths:

The applicant presents an adequate management plan that is comprehensive, detailed, and inspired for its Grow-Your-Own (GYO) project. The goals, objectives, and outcomes are clear, cogent, and aligned with the conceptual framework and its theory of change.

(i) The applicant presents a thorough and comprehensive discussion of the project's goals, objectives, measures, timelines, and individual(s) responsible for attaining each objective (p. e37). For example, in Goal 1 one of the objectives is to recruit and retain diverse candidate students at all stages of higher-education. The plan also includes the responsible parties for achieving the outcomes along with reasonable timelines. The outcomes tied to this objective are aligned and specific. The individuals responsible are clearly noted, and specific tasks are included. All of these are organized and presented by goal.

(ii) The applicant's careful creation of the management plan and its granular notations implies that these areas will be achieved and monitored for on-time completion. The applicant discusses the financial capacity and drills data down to the cost per participant. The plan prepares a thoughtful discussion around responsibilities and capacity (p. e39).

Timelines are included. The professionals who will oversee these areas are quite competent and positioned appropriately

in the organization. Key activities are clearly identified along with a very specific timeline of completion (p. e41).

Weaknesses:

(i) No weaknesses noted.

(ii) The applicant's lack of specific discussions around milestones in the project's management plans is a weakness. While other specifics are included, discussions around milestones are substantially missing in the narrative and exhibits. (2 points not awarded).

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 applicant designs an exceptional and comprehensive mixed-methods evaluation plan that is compliant with What Works Clearinghouse standards. The variety and array of evaluative strategies are significant and all inform progress and potential replication.

(i) Citing an overarching goal of increasing the capacity of a self-sustaining diverse teacher pipeline that will serve LEAs and the region with effective teachers, the applicant has created a thoughtful, cogent, and well supported evaluation plan. The applicant's evaluation methods are reasonable and align with the WWC Standards (p. e45). The applicant presents three research questions that are essential. The evaluation of the project represents a significant array including evaluating evidence of efficacy that meets WWC Standards. The Project Director is tasked with leading the evaluation process in concert with a variety of stakeholders and partners.

(ii) The applicant presents a plan to monitor periodic program implementation around four areas including development, accountability, monitoring, and dissemination of understanding. For example, the mixed methods design is constructed around a variety of sources that are qualitative and quantitative. These provide a look at the progress of the project in enhancing teacher education at the university and at sites (p. e46).

The applicant presents outcomes, research questions, data sources, and analyses in a table; the information is clear and specific (p. e46). The evaluations proposed meet the WWC Standards, and are supported in the evaluative literature. For example, the project's key outcome measures align with WWC Protocols and examine evidence of progress by students (p. e48).

The proposed collaboration with LEAs and the Advisory Board to design formative assessments is likely to inform understanding of progress.

(iii) The applicant provides specifics around the various performance approaches that are planned to collect, record, and document implementation in both quantitative and qualitative methods (p. e49). Examples include interviews, surveys, observations, and student performance. Each assessment is aligned to an objective performance measure that will inform progress.

(iv) The applicant intends on using, to the greatest extent, instruments that are identified as valid (p. e51). The narrative is sufficiently detailed and thoughtful. The evaluation methods are consistent with Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing (p. e51).

(v) The planned for continuous progress monitoring and regular feedback from participants is well thought out. The applicant presents specifics of documentation including fidelity agreements, instrumentation, and annual reports (p. e52). Sharing of program information will be widely disseminated from social media to peer-reviewed publications. The dissemination plan includes ratings consistent with WWC reporting standards.

Weaknesses:

(i) No weaknesses noted.

(ii) No weaknesses noted.

(iii) No weaknesses noted.

(iv) No weaknesses noted.

(v) No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

 1. **Competitive Preference Priority 1: Increasing Educator Diversity
    (Up to 5 points)**

    Under this priority, applicants must develop projects that are designed to improve the recruitment, outreach, preparation, support, development, and retention of a diverse educator workforce through adopting, implementing, or expanding high-quality, comprehensive teacher

preparation programs that have a track record of attracting, supporting, graduating, and placing underrepresented teacher candidates, and that include one year of high-quality clinical experiences (prior to becoming the teacher of record) in high-need schools.

Strengths:

The applicant's plans to increase capacity of underserved students is robust. It is reasonably likely to endure beyond the funding cycle. For example, the applicant highlights the momentum of degree completion and SEL awareness of students. In addition, the collaborative opportunities involve several K12 partners. The hoped-for outcomes include increased trust and partnerships operating beyond the funding.

The activities include Summer Bridge, Educational Opportunity Program, First Year Experiences. These are designed to meet the needs of underserved populations (p. e26). The applicant's interest in extending partnerships with surrounding LEAs is a leverage opportunity for underserved students that is supported by research (Coburn, 2003).

The applicant presents a cogent, thorough, and detailed conceptual framework and logic model. The latter (p. e29) includes goals/objectives, inputs, outputs/activities, and both short-and long-term outcomes. It is well designed and provides an effective overview of the project's components. The Theory of Change includes identified barriers and solutions. It is clear and compelling. The School of Education's conceptual framework includes a commitment to diversity.

The applicant provides on-going professional development, mentoring, coaching, and other supports to develop the participant's professional stature as a teacher. All participants will be involved in the summer boot camp prior to entering their own classroom (p. e19). The second goal that is applicable to this priority preference is the opportunity for the participants to earn advanced credentials in their first three years of teaching; this, then, may support retention goals pursuant to the criterion.

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 clearly states and plans culturally sustaining practices are included in the project. This, according to the applicant, is important for diverse and underrepresented teachers as they assist incoming teachers see themselves in the curriculum (p. e24).

The importance of building PD that is focused on theory and classroom practices is an integral component of the applicant's plan. Research supports this as an antidote to isolation and unbelongingness (p. e24).

The applicant presents three evidence-based recommendations (WWC compliant) for technology to support student learning. An example of this is the personalization and readily available digital resources (p. e25). The outcome is to increase engagement between students and gather feedback. Students in the project will utilize podcasts and instructional videos to maximize the instructional efficacy.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 3

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 3: Meeting Student Social, Emotional, and Academic Needs (up to 2 points)**

   Projects that are designed to improve students' social, emotional, academic, and career development, with a focus on Underserved Students, through developing and supporting Educator and school capacity to support social and emotional learning and development that—

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

   Strengths:

   The applicant's goals include academic advising; training and use of social emotional learning (SEL) and health-centered engagement (HCE); and integrated technology support. The applicant intends to deliver evidence based advising consistent with WWC Practice Guide Effective Advising for Post-Secondary Students (Karp et al, 2021). The applicant's renewed approach is based on Miller et al (2021) that includes caseload, integrated technology, and student engagement.

   The SEL and HCE includes the development of resiliency skills to attend to Darling-Hammond's (2017) concern around attrition. The applicant appropriately undergirds the project with SEL as these are essential to all learning (Jones & Kahn, 2017). The plan is to move heretofore SEL to an HCE orientation to more accurately meet the needs of a diverse student population (p. e23). The applicant points out that HCE is not just for students but also for the educators and communities as it attends to ensuring all voices are included.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: **2**

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/12/2022 03:38 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Chico State Enterprises (S423A220083)
Reader #2:   **********

		Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions			
Selection Criteria			
Quality of Project Design			
1. Project Design		35	30
Significance			
1. Significance		25	20
Quality of the Management Plan			
1. Management Plan		20	18
Quality of the Project Evaluation			
1. Project Evaluation		20	20
	Sub Total	100	88
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	98

Technical Review Form

Reader #2:   **********

Applicant: Chico State Enterprises (S423A220083)

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 has proposed a project design that addresses Absolute Priority 1. Services and strategies to implement those services are adequately proposed.
(i)   The applicant provides strong 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, the applicant will develop and provide, over a three-year period, training, professional development and student services (e.g., academic advising, social and emotional learning (SEL) and culturally sustaining practices, and healing centered engagement (HCE). Student services are researched based and informed by WWC Practice Guide (e.g., academic advising - Effective Advising for Post-Secondary Students, Karp, et.al. 2021); SEL and HEC (e.g., National Center for Learning Disabilities, 2021, CASEL, 2021).

(ii)   presents relevant studies that meet WWC Standards. The studies demonstrate the efficacy of teacher development regarding the efficacy of teacher preparation from Work Works Clearinghouse inform the content of professional development and validate the quality (e22). Credential, credentialed and Master's level candidates will receive services for a duration of three years. The intensity of the services are delineated and detailed and include a foci on academic advising (e22), SEL learning and health centered engagement (e23) culturally sustaining practices (e24) and technology (e25). Taken together, the content, time-length and concentrated focus of the professional development services are adequate to achieve the project outcomes.
(7 pts)   (ii) The

applicant temperately suggests ways in which the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance. Examples of efforts are realized through on-going collaboration with K-12 school districts, consistent yearly programing of professional development activities, and a continued evaluation of needs, supports and services to name a few (e26). The proposed activities reflect aspects of the applicant's design and may be achievable with support from the applicant and partners.   (7 pts)

(iii) The applicant has adequately delineated a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework. Based upon relevant, current research, the model examines factors know to help students overcome the social and ecological barriers students face entering college and exiting to the workplace. The Theory of Change is presented and includes the inputs necessary to achieve the desired outcomes. The conceptual framework is validly supported by empirical evidence (e27-29).
   (7 pts)

(iv) The applicant aptly demonstrates that the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services. Partnerships address various aspects of the services being offered such as mentoring (i.e., Peer Plus Mentors, Wayfinders Mentoring, and First Year Experience Peer Mentors); social equity (i.e., the Educational Opportunity Program, the Cross-Cultural Leadership Center and the Gender and Sexuality Equity Coalition); as well as organizations who provide advising and counseling. The partnerships should maximize the effectiveness of program services inasmuch as students have a range of additional resources available to them that are aligned with project outcomes and their successful matriculation (e30).
(7 pts)

(v) The applicant identifies 5 salient reasons showing the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs. Some examples outline how the project (1) creates new pathways for underserved students to receive tools to support career advancement (2) building stronger connections through increased mentoring and advising and (3) providing financial support to address barriers to education. The project creates a design based upon the needs of high-risk schools and other identified needs, such as SEL learning models (e31).   (7 p

Weaknesses:

(i)   No weaknesses were noted.

(ii)   The applicant failed to provide substantiating support through a plan or process for implementing the activities needed to support sustainability. It is unclear how the strategies will be effective without funding for personnel, a plan for collaboration and particularly retention of students who have matriculated through the program who can continue to implement the project to underserved students.

(iii)   No weaknesses were noted.

(iv)   No weaknesses were noted.

(v)   No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 30

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. B. Significance (25 points)

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

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

(ii) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be

served and to the anticipated results and benefits.
(6 points)

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

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

Please provide Overview Statement on top of first Strength comment.

Strengths:

The applicant adequately demonstrates that the proposed project will provide results for a large audience of students and is supported by existing infrastructures and personnel.
(i)   The applicant adequately shows the outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project to include an increase pipeline of diverse educators, students who are more emotionally connected and increased student achievement (e32). A vast number of students will be served by the project and therefore, the magnitude to underserved students is great. It is important for students enrolled in this program as it may positively change the trajectory of their lives given productive careers in education and/or successful matriculation through college. (7pts)
(ii)   (ii) To an adequate extent, the costs are reasonable (e.g., $13.4 million) over a three-year period and in relation to the number of persons to be served (e.g., 750). A large cadre of students will be impacted by the project and receive credentials or degrees to add to the existing pool of diverse teachers within under-high-needs schools (e33). (6pts)
(iii) The potential for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing program of the agency or organization at the end of Federal funding is possible. For example, the project builds upon and existing infrastructure and relationship with LEA's. In addition, the project will continue to provide in-kind funding (i.e., personnel, campus resources, etc.) for continuation after Federal funding ends. These identified resources significantly contribute to continuing the services. (e35). (6pts)
(iv) The strategies to disseminate the project are acceptable. For example, sharing of information in multiple ways with multiple audiences is evident (e.g., stakeholders, LEA's, webinars and other media; and through professional development sessions). These are methods that make the results usable for other audiences and available for potential replications (e37). (6 pts)

Weaknesses:

(i)   No weaknesses were noted.
(ii)   The overall budget is high (e.g., $13.4 million) over a three-year period of time. It would be helpful if the applicant identified alternative funding sources as this budgetary level would be hard to achieve after Federal funding ends.
(iii)   No weaknesses were noted.
(iv)   No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

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

considers the following factors:

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

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

Please provide Overview Statement on top of first Strength comment.

Strengths:

The management plan includes the critical and essential components to address the project objectives and achieves its outcomes.
(i) The goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable. For example, the applicant has 3 goals and each goal has subordinate objectives which are written with a degree of measurement. The goals, objectives and outcomes are aligned with the project design, address student needs and predict favorable outcomes. (37). pts)   (ii)
The management plan is adequate to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks. Table 2C clearly delineates the goals, objectives, persons responsible and timeline. The roles and responsibilities of the project team, project director and personnel such as faculty and mentors are discussed (e38-44). (10 pts)

Weaknesses:

(i)   No weaknesses were noted.
(ii)   The applicant failed to include milestones in the management plan which may not allow opportunity to monitor project progress and make intermittent changes, as necessary. This has the potential of not able to keep the project on track.

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 evaluation plan is well developed and includes an internal evaluator who also serves as the project director. The plan includes methods of data collection and analysis and performance feedback.

(i) The applicant provides comprehensive evidence that 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. For example, the evaluation is informed by the researched based practice guides for advising and the use of technology for post-secondary students. This foundation should produce results that meet WWC Standards with reservations (e47-38). (4 pts)

(ii) The applicant substantially delineates how the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. For example, the applicant describes a 5 step process that will occur at each stage in the evaluation process that includes development of formative measures, analyzing, monitoring and making recommended changes, as necessary and formulating strategies to continue after the funding ends. This process allows for intermittent monitoring of the performance feedback and may permit more successful implementation (e48-49).
(4 pts)

(iii) The applicant concisely states that the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible. The applicant explains the process to be used effectiveness, cultural attitudes and cultural technologies, the applicant will use established measures (e50). Quantitative and qualitative surveys will be used to gather necessary information. The applicant states that their outcome measures align with SEED program performance measures (e49)).
(4 pts)   (iv) The applicant provides several outstanding ways to ensure the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on Relevant Outcomes. The strategies are adequate. For example, the applicant intends to (1) use existing validated measures when appropriate (2) triangulate data (3) use objective measure of observable behaviors (4) develop new scales as necessary and (5) conduct item analysis for surveys, etc. The plan demonstrates that the methods will provide valid and reliable data (e51). (4 pts)

(v) The design for implementing and evaluating the proposed project will overwhelmingly result in information to guide possible replication of project activities or strategies is adequate. It may include information about the effectiveness of the approach or strategies employed by the project. In terms of replication, materials, memos, measures, curriculum and data will be posted on the website. Methods for data collection and analysis will also be documented and can be used for possible replication. In addition, the dissemination plan will be aligned with WWC standards for effectiveness (e51-52). (4 pts)

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 main goal of the proposed project is to increase the pipeline of a highly qualified, diverse population of teachers to serve in school districts with underrepresented populations. The applicant will implement a comprehensive teacher preparation program.
   The applicant states the project builds upon 125 years of teacher preparation and partnerships and a successful history of coteaching, residency and professional development models (e16).

   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 intends to provide professional development activities that integrate and address inequities, culturally responsive and sustaining curriculum development, social and emotional learning and healing centered approaches. The educational setting has been identified as high schools in high needs schools that serve predominately under-served students. The schools lack resources and services and staff do not reflect the ethnicities of their students. The applicant cites research-based data that address the source of inequities and inadequacies among low income, minority students and proposed professional development to address the lack. Students will have access to additional resources, such as mentoring and advising and community-based resources as well as opportunities for career and educational advancement.

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 comprehensively addressed efforts, strategies and services to identify and address the need for CASEL's social and emotional learning. The applicant will provide focused professional development, in-school resources and University supports to develop teacher and student competencies attendant to addressing the barriers underserved students face in the academic and emotional learning.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: **2**

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/14/2022 10:08 AM

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/12/2022 04:45 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Chico State Enterprises (S423A220083)
Reader #3: **********

		Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions			
Selection Criteria			
Quality of Project Design			
1. Project Design		35	33
Significance			
1. Significance		25	20
Quality of the Management Plan			
1. Management Plan		20	18
Quality of the Project Evaluation			
1. Project Evaluation		20	18
	Sub Total	100	89
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	99

Panel #8 - FY22 SEED Panel - 8: 84.423A

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

Applicant: Chico State Enterprises (S423A220083)

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 Chico State G.R.E.A.T. Teachers Pipeline Project is an impressive and exhaustive attempt to increase the number of highly effective teachers from diverse backgrounds into the California public school system. Up to 750 teachers and aspiring teachers are to be affected by participation in this effort.

Supporting Statements:

Strengths:
• i. ii. The stated overall goal and emphasis of merit is to increase the capacity of a self-sustaining diverse teacher pipeline. The plan to achieve this goal is well reasoned, specific, and likely to achieve positive results over time.
• iii. This is a well-designed plan (e15)

• iv. Partner Butte County Public Schools which includes Chico Unified School District, is a sound selection as it demonstrates need (78% of students are identified as economically disadvantaged; and possesses one of the highest Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACE) rates in California. (e20) includes a compelling student to teacher ethnicity comparison chart. (e18-20)

• v. Academic advising, training educators to utilize SEL, and applying an existing resource called Healing-Centered Education (HCE) as well as integrated technology support strength the likelihood of meeting stated goals and success. (e22) Project is appropriate and will likely address the needs of the target population.

• A strong and comprehensive Theory of Change and also Logic Model (e29) illustrates a thorough plan to apply evidence-based solutions to existing barriers in the local school district (CUSD). (e28)

• Students in this project can access innovative sources of community at Chico State campus including the Cross-cultural Equity Center, and the Gender and Sexuality Equity Coalition. (e29-30)

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses:

v. The discussion of sustainability is lacking.

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 GREAT Teachers Project communicates a compelling plan to address a significant and present need in the local partnering school district, given the disparity of opportunity and resources among the student population.

Supporting Statements:

Strengths:
*   i. THE GYO design for capacity building with justified and appropriate stated outcomes aligns very well with SEED grant goals. (e31)   Outcomes are likely to be attained.
*   iii. The dissemination plan to "tell the story" as this project unfolds and is completed, is a strong factor in bringing focus on the significance of this challenge. Summer training Institutes, teacher state and national conferences are cited as part of the plan to bring the learning forward. (e35)
*   i. Mentoring strategy described is likely to foster student/participants' perceptions of becoming better connected academically, and seeing themselves reflected in the classroom culture. Planned improvements in reaching and learning are likely to be attained. (e31-32)

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses:

*   ii. Though the costs listed are explained well, the conceptual difficulty presented is one of comparative challenge. True, the cost of traditional teacher credentialing in California is prohibitive; however, the budget request of $13.4 million (not including a $7m match) seems prohibitive. While the Applicant cites a per participant cost of $18,673, the "n" of 720 students casts doubt upon the selection criterion about the cost being "reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served."   (e32-33)

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

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

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

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

Please provide Overview Statement on top of first Strength comment.

Strengths:

Overview Statement: This is an extraordinarily well- conceived management of a significant, complex project. Applicant capabilities and project outcomes are clear and compelling.

Supporting Statements:

Strengths:
• Table 1 Goals and Objectives represents a complete, compelling, comprehensive, and focused plan, likely to achieve success. (e36-38)
• Project Director Dr. Seipel has extensive grants management experience and content expertise. Drs.Semrod and Moffit additionally offer credible experience as credential pathways coordinators. Academic advisors listed appear similarly competent to complete said work. (e39-41)
• The Organizational Capacity to manage this grant is documented. Chico State with a total enrollment of 17,000 students, has a demonstrated positive track record as an Hispanic Serving Institution. (e40)
• Table C2 illustrates clear and thorough activities, objectives, milestones and outcomes to pursue the project goals and expand outreach to those that honor and promote diversity. (e43)

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses:
ii. Milestones are not delineated.

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:

Overview Statement: The Evaluation Plan presented is robust, strong, comprehensive, and ambitious. For the most part, it appears doable and likely to contribute to the effort.

Supporting Statements:

Strengths:

•
•   i. It appears the evaluation plan is grounded in WWC standards, and therefore maximizes the evidence of effectiveness.
. iii.   The proposed evaluation methods will produce documentation of progress toward intended outcomes.
•   iv. The research questions cited attempt to capture whether the GREAT Teacher participants are more, or less, likely than nonparticipants to remain in the field, to create inclusive and equitable environments, and safe learning environments, and to foster social emotional learning in their environments. (e45-46).

v.   Replication of this project is enhanced by this evaluation design.

 Weaknesses:

Weaknesses:

•   ii.   Research Question 1 regarding the likelihood of GREAT teacher participants remaining in the field seems questionable during the time period of this grant. (e45). The Applicant asks a question that cannot be answered in the grant period.

Reader's Score: 18

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:

    Supporting Statements:

    Strengths:
    •   The entire proposal narrative speaks with credibility and vision about increasing educator diversity. Such narrative to CPP1 begins on (e16)

    Weaknesses:

    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:

Supporting Statements:

Strengths:
•   The Applicant includes a focused narrative about using social media tools such as Google Suite, Blackboard, Canvas, Remind, and Zoom accessibility for students and participants. (e22-23)

Weaknesses:

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:

Supporting Statements:

Strengths:
•   A particularly sound strategy included in CPP3 discussion is utilizing healing-centered approached for student participants. This is innovative and appropriate to the project goals. (e16)

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: **2**

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/12/2022 04:45 PM