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

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Voorhees University (S423A220089)
Reader #1:   **********

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	35	29
Significance		
1. Significance	25	21
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	20
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Sub Total	100	90
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Educator Diversity	5	5
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. Promoting Equity	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
1. Meeting Student Needs	2	2
Sub Total	10	10
Total	110	100

Technical Review Form

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

Applicant: Voorhees University (S423A220089)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. A. Quality of Project Design (35 Points)

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

(i) The extent to which the training or professional development services to be provided by the proposed project are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services.
(7 points)

(ii) The extent to which the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance.(7 points)

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

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

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

Please provide Overview Statement on top of first Strength comment.

Strengths:

i.   The applicant demonstrates that project is of sufficient quality, intensity and duration to lead to improvements in teacher instruction, e21

ii.   The project notes that it will build capacity in two ways: First by investing in human capital to promote deep learning and second: By providing ongoing mentoring and professional learning, e35, e36

iii.   The applicant's project is grounded in the What Works Clearinghouse design standard (e39) as well as utilizing the Logic Model, e37, e39+

iv.   There is evidence that the project will collaborate with national partners (i.e., The Center of Excellence for Educator Preparation and Innovation (VU-EPI); Verna Gray and the Gray Charter School; The Institute for Organizational Coherence (IOC), the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), The Center for Research & Mentoring of Black Male Students & Teachers at Bowie State (CRMBMST); and several other institutions to maximize the effectiveness of the proposed project, e42

v.   The project addresses the needs of the target population (under-served/at-risk students) or other identified needs, e42, e43.

Weaknesses:

i.   There is no explanation regarding how professional development will lead to improvement in teaching and learning, e21

ii.   There is no clear explanation of how capacity will be done after the federal financial assistance ends, e35, e36

iii.

iv.   The project does not explain why the particular partners were selected/what they bring to the table, e42

Reader's Score: 29

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

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

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

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

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

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

Please provide Overview Statement on top of first Strength comment.

Strengths:

i.   The magnitude of results in teaching and particularly increased student achievement, specifically by increasing equity, expanding deeper/virtual learning, inquiry-based instruction and progressive micro-credentializing, which will lead to better teacher preparation and increased academic performance among students, e45, e46.

ii.   The proposed project costs are reasonable, considering the number of teachers impacted, the number of students impacted (10,000), around the country using micro-credentials, e48

iii.   The investment of project resources will empower the university and its partners to use virtual, technology supports to support teachers in high-need schools, in order to improve the learning of students, e48

iv.   The project outlines four areas of potentially lasting impact and the dissemination of data that will enable others to benefit from the project's findings, e49, e50

Weaknesses:

ii. Although the applicant mentions budgeting costs, it is unclear how funding will be split across all entities (e.g., percentages, e48

iii. There are no specific details on how the impact of the ongoing program will continue, even after federal grant-funding

Reader's Score: 21

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

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

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

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

Please provide Overview Statement on top of first Strength comment.

Strengths:

i.　　　The project is grounded in evidence-based, peer-reviewed research that is designed to meet specific goals, which are further delineated into several measurable objectives, e50, e51

ii.　　　The project thoroughly provides an adequate management plan to achieve the goals and objectives of the proposed project. The plan addresses within budget, clearly defined responsibilities and timelines and milestones for accomplishing tasks, e50-e55

Weaknesses:

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:

i.   The applicant will use a nationally recognized external evaluator, who will be capable of evaluating the effectiveness of the project and yield evidence of effectiveness to meet WWC standards, e57, e58

ii.   The proposed project is specifically designed to ensure the existence of performance feedback and the periodic (formative) assessments, e59.

iii.   The performance measures related to outcomes in the project will produce both quantitative (via teacher feedback and qualitative data (via student achievement, e61, e62

iv.   The methods used for evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on the relevant outcomes, as both formative and summative evaluation methods will be utilized, e63

v.   The proposed project is designed in such a way as to provide information to guide future researchers/educators to replicate the project, including information about the effectives of the approach/strategies employed by the project, via an implementation guide and an impact guide, which incorporates an outcome evaluation – using rubrics, surveys, focus group interview guides and assessment data, e65,

Weaknesses:

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:

   1.   The proposed project demonstrates the importance of projects designed to increase recruitment, outreach and preparation/support and retention of a diverse educator workforce and the strength of partnering with national and community organizations to achieve the goal, specifically geared toward impoverished (Title 1) districts and high-needs schools (e17, e18).

   The project includes a 1-year clinical experience, e15, e22

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:

   1. The applicant demonstrates that the proposed project is geared toward K-12 students in high needs schools, e12, e18

   2. The applicant examines potential sources of inequity and ways to mitigate them, as well as providing professional development programs that are designed to prepare teachers to create educational environments for students that are more inclusive, supportive, equitable and unbiased, e 17+.

   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:

1. The project fosters skills and behaviors that enable student academic progress, via an SEL competency-based framework, module I-VI, e19

2. The applicant identifies and addresses conditions in the learning environment that may negatively impact student learning and ways to mitigate (e18). The applicant provides evidence that a conceptual (social-emotional) framework will be developed, in collaboration with CASEL (e18). The project also includes a 6-credit Social Emotional Learning modular class for teachers, e19.

3. The SEL framework is trauma-informed, specifically to address students' mental heath needs, to support the social, emotional and mental health of students, e19

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/13/2022 04:00 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Voorhees University (S423A220089)
Reader #2:   **********

		Points Possible	**Points Scored**
Questions			
Selection Criteria			
Quality of Project Design			
1. Project Design		35	30
Significance			
1. Significance		25	21
Quality of the Management Plan			
1. Management Plan		20	20
Quality of the Project Evaluation			
1. Project Evaluation		20	20
	Sub Total	100	91
Priority Questions			
Competitive Preference Priority			
Competitive Preference Priority 1			
1. Educator Diversity		5	5
Competitive Preference Priority 2			
1. Promoting Equity		3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 3			
1. Meeting Student Needs		2	2
	Sub Total	10	10
	Total	110	101

Technical Review Form

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

Applicant: Voorhees University (S423A220089)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. A. Quality of Project Design (35 Points)

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

(i) The extent to which the training or professional development services to be provided by the proposed project are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services.
(7 points)

(ii) The extent to which the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance.(7 points)

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

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

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

Please provide Overview Statement on top of first Strength comment.

Strengths:

The applicant provides adequate evidence that training or professional development services are sufficient, quality, intensity, and duration to lead to practice improvement. The project will yield results and build capacity using a conceptual framework to lead the proposed project. Also, Partners are involved in the proposed project. There are no details as to how the professional development will improve the participants as educators or evidence of how the project will yield results and build capacity.

i.   The applicant provides strong evidence that the training or professional development services are sufficient, quality, intensity, and duration to lead to practice improvement. For example, the Chicago SEED program will include a certification pathway where up to three teacher cohorts will pursue a 14-month pathway to become a teacher. (e21).

ii.   The applicant demonstrates that the project will yield results and build capacity that will extend beyond funding. Specifically, EPI will provide access to competency-based micro-credentials to each teacher at all levels in social-emotional learning (SEL) and culturally responsive pedagogy (CRP). These micro-credentials are grounded in how to deliver SEL and CRP using an equity-driven conceptual framework (e36). Also, VU-EPI will design competency-based micro-credentials in partnership with our national collaborators to empower teachers at all levels with the tools needed to significantly raise student achievement (e36-37).

iii.   The applicant demonstrates that there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research. The applicant provides evidence of support study for each component: professional development and coaching, professional learning, and National Board Certification. Also, the logic model is provided in alignment with the evidence of effectiveness and will guide the process and outcome evaluation that are focused on the objectives, inputs, activities, outputs, and short-term and mid-term outcomes (e39-40).

iv.   The applicant provides strong evidence that the services to be provided by the project involve a collaboration of appropriate partners. The applicant indicates national partners have been identified to provide professional development. For example, the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards will provide a pathway for National Board Certification for teachers who have improved student achievement for 3-5 years and are preparing to pursue a career as an instructional leader (e41).

v.   The applicant provides clear evidence that the design of the project is appropriate and will address the needs of the target population. The project will work with Youth Connection Charter School which works as a mix of alternative education programs and innovative instructional strategies for disadvantaged youth. There are 19 campuses and placement for newly certified teachers will follow priority (e43). Project stages, needs, and strategies are outlined in the narrative (e44).

Weaknesses:

i.   The applicant provides details on the professional development services' sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead practice improvement. However, there are no details as to how the professional development will improve the participants as educators (e21-22).

ii.   The applicant provides limited evidence of how the project will yield results and build capacity that will extend beyond funding. More details are needed to fully assess the criterion.

iii.   None noted

iv.   None noted

v.   None noted

Reader's Score: 30

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. B. Significance (25 points)

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

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

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

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

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

Please provide Overview Statement on top of first Strength comment.

Strengths:

The applicant provides adequate evidence of provide professional learning opportunities for up to 705 teachers impacting 7,500 students. Resources for SEED will empower partners and program participants to work on closing education equity gaps for students of color in poverty. More details are needed on how SEED improvements will continue in partner schools.

i.   The applicant provides clear evidence that the importance of the results will be attained by the project. For example, the project will provide professional learning opportunities for up to 705 teachers impacting 7,500 students (students enrolled at Youth Connection Charter School campuses. Also, impacting 4,400 students in districts nationally that will be practicing teachers who are taking micro-credentials. SEED is a significant project designed to implement professional learning models that will systemically change diverse content and test the efficacy of models designed to serve large numbers of teachers to expand the potential for positive outcomes.

ii.   The applicant demonstrates that the project costs are reasonable in relation to the number person to be served and to the anticipated results and benefits. For example, expenses include personnel and fringe benefits costs, travel, supplies, training, facilities, and matching funds (e48).

iii.   The applicant demonstrates the potential for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing program of the agency or organization at the end of the grant. Resources from SEED will empower VU-EPI and partners to use virtual, technology to support teachers who serve in high-need schools, so they are equipped to solve problems of practice and accelerate the learning of all students (e48). Funding will empower partners to continue the work of closing education equity gaps for students of color and students in poverty (e49).

iv.   The applicant provides evidence of the results of the proposed project is to be disseminated in ways that will enable others to use the information or strategies. For example, expanding efforts to teachers by having the opportunity to pilot clinical education programs, creating additional Micro-Credentials that meet teacher needs, and developing a training model to alleviate teacher shortages (e49-50).

Weaknesses:

i.   None noted
ii.   The applicant provides evidence on the project costs along with budget line items and narrative. However, more specific details are needed to better understand how costs will be split in order to fully assess this criterion (e42).
iii.   The applicant provides information on the activities and benefits of the project. However, more details would be helpful as to how SEED improvements will continue in partner schools (e48-49).
iv.   None noted
v.   None 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 provides adequate evidence of a management plan that will include goals, objectives, and outcomes for the project. The management plan includes equal access, timely implementation, budget oversight, procedures, personnel, and timeline.

i.   The applicant provides clear evidence that the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are specified and measurable. Specifically, the narrative provides an outline detailing the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the project (e50).

ii.   The applicant provides strong evidence 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, the management plan includes equal access, timely implementation, budget oversight, procedures, personnel, and timeline. The narrative indicates details of the roles and responsibilities of those that will carry out the work and processes for implementation (e50-53). For instance, for personnel, the applicant presents information on establishing an advisory board and hiring a program director, instructional team, and additional staff. Lastly, an implementation plan is also in the narrative and outlines milestones, parties responsible for the tasks, and timelines (e55-57).

Weaknesses:

i.   None noted
ii.   None noted

Reader's Score: **20**

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Please provide Overview Statement on top of first Strength comment.

Strengths:

The applicant provides adequate evidence of the quality of the project evaluation. The applicant indicates that the evaluation plan will use the FORECAST Model and include a Quasi-Experimental Design. Evaluation personnel will be in place and the replication support team will provide data regarding the steps taken to implement the project Voorhees will publish the Chicago SEED implementation guide and impact guide to the SEED Instructional Excellence Clearinghouse.

i.   The applicant provides clear evidence of the methods of evaluation that will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the WWC standards. For example, the evaluation plan will utilize the FORECAST Model for feedback (e58). The evaluation will include a Quasi-Experimental Design (QED) assessment of outcomes through a comparison of treatment and control group teachers (e58). EduShift will use a propensity-score matching (PSM) approach designed to meet WWC standards with reservations (e58).

ii.   The applicant demonstrates that the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. CHICAGO SEED evaluation includes feedback mechanisms and strategies to promote continuous improvement. The participants and feedback mechanisms and continuous improvement strategies are outlined in the narrative (e59-61).

iii.   The applicant provides clear evidence that the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible. The goals, objectives, outcomes, and performance indicators chart and the Logic Model identify anticipated short-term and long-term outcomes aligned to each objective (e61). An outline for performance measures, objectives, and assessments is detailed in the narrative (e61).

iv.   The applicant provides strong evidence the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on Relevant Outcomes. Evaluators and project personnel will collect baseline data to set annual benchmarks each year. Evaluation for each project goal, objective, and the outcome will measure formative data and summative data. Formative data will test the validity of the implementation model for relationships between interventions and outcomes. Summative data will measure the effectiveness of the program (e63).

v.   The applicant provides evidence 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. The project's plan to disseminate includes producing an implementation guide and impact guide. The replication support team will provide data regarding the steps taken to implement the project and Voorhees will publish the Chicago SEED implementation guide and impact guide to the SEED Instructional Excellence Clearinghouse (e63).

Weaknesses:

i.   None noted
ii.   None noted
iii.   None noted
iv.   None noted
v.   None noted

Reader's Score: 20

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

   Under this priority, applicants must develop projects that are designed to improve the recruitment, outreach, preparation, support, development, and retention of a diverse educator workforce through adopting, implementing, or expanding high-quality, comprehensive teacher preparation programs that have a track record of attracting, supporting, graduating, and placing underrepresented teacher candidates, and that include one year of high-quality clinical experiences (prior to becoming the teacher of record) in high-need schools.

   Strengths:

   The applicant provides adequate evidence that the project will address CPP1 by recruiting male teachers from nontraditional backgrounds to recruit them to get a certification to teach (e17).

   Weaknesses:

   None noted

Reader's Score: 5

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

   Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that the applicant proposes a project designed to promote educational equity and adequacy in resources and opportunity for Underserved Students—

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

   (2) That examines the sources of inequity and inadequacy and implements responses that include pedagogical practices in Educator preparation programs and professional development programs that are inclusive with regard to race, ethnicity, culture, language, and disability status so that educators are better prepared to create inclusive, supportive, equitable, unbiased, and identity-safe learning environments for their students.

Strengths:

CPP2 will be addressed by providing micro-credentialing to help teachers learn more about the impact equity and achievement gaps have on students. The Closing the Achievement Gap credential will be six months with information on differentiated instruction and assessment, closing achievement and equity gaps, and assessment of teaching and learning (e17-18).

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:

   CPP3 will be addressed by providing teachers the opportunity to learn more about SEL and CASEL to build the competence in self-awareness, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision-making. The Social-Emotional Learning Competency-Based Micro-credential has six modules including evidence-based strategies to address Trauma-informed practice and designing inclusive learning environments (e18)

   Weaknesses:

   None noted

Reader's Score: 2

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

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Voorhees University (S423A220089)
Reader #3: **********

		Points Possible	**Points Scored**
Questions			
Selection Criteria			
Quality of Project Design			
1. Project Design		35	30
Significance			
1. Significance		25	20
Quality of the Management Plan			
1. Management Plan		20	20
Quality of the Project Evaluation			
1. Project Evaluation		20	20
	Sub Total	100	90
Priority Questions			
Competitive Preference Priority			
Competitive Preference Priority 1			
1. Educator Diversity		5	5
Competitive Preference Priority 2			
1. Promoting Equity		3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 3			
1. Meeting Student Needs		2	2
	Sub Total	10	10
	Total	110	100

Technical Review Form

Reader #3:   **********
Applicant: Voorhees University (S423A220089)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. A. Quality of Project Design (35 Points)

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

(i) The extent to which the training or professional development services to be provided by the proposed project are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services.
(7 points)

(ii) The extent to which the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance.(7 points)

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

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

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

Please provide Overview Statement on top of first Strength comment.

Strengths:

Overview Statement:
The applicant described a limited design for the proposed project. The applicant clearly articulated the extent to which the training or professional development services to be provided by the proposed project are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration. The applicant clearly articulated the extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework. The applicant clearly articulated the extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs. However, the applicant does not fully articulate how the training and professional development will lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services. The applicant does not demonstrate a clear plan on how the proposed project will yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance. The applicant does not adequately describe how the services to be provided by the proposed project will involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services.

Supporting Statements:

Strengths:

(i) The applicant clearly articulated the extent to which the training or professional development services to be provided by the proposed project are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration. For example, the applicant describes the following

stages of Chicago SEED programming: Stage 1; Providing a certification pathway for aspiring teachers and nontraditional candidates to serve in traditionally underserved LEAs; Stage 2: Providing teachers with evidence-based professional development activities that address Literacy, Numeracy, STEM, Special Education, ELL, and other needs; and Stage 3: Providing blended coaching and facilitating networks for improvement as a Mode of Inquiry to Accelerate Student Achievement. The applicant describes the elements of Stage 1: Preparation for Licensure/Certification for Teachers and Non-traditional Candidates; Clinical Education for Aspiring Teachers and Non-Traditional Candidates; Candidate Selection; Enrollment Agreement; Residency; Competency-Based Assessment; and Digital Portfolio. The applicant describes the elements of Stage 2: Competency-Based Micro-Credentials; Social Emotional Learning (SEL) Credential; Instructional Excellence Credential; Progressive Micro-Credentials, Equity in Education/Closing the Achievement Gap Progressive Credential; Special Populations, Special Education, English Language Learners Progressive Credential; Literacy Progressive Micro-Credential; Mathematics Progressive Micro-Credential; and STEM/Computer Science Progressive Credential. The applicant describes the elements of Stage 3: Instructional Coaches; Instructional Excellence Clearinghouse; and Virtual Deeper Learning Network for Improvement. The applicant describes the training and professional development services that are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration (pages e21-e35). (6 points)

(ii) The applicant provides general information on how the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance. For example, the applicant describes its two-fold commitment: build the capacity through an investment in human capital to foster deep learning in schools; and provide the coaching, mentoring and professional learning needed to positively maximize teachers to accelerate results in student learning, growth and achievement (pages e35-e37). (5 points)

(iii) The applicant clearly articulated the extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework. For example, the applicant, as well as all partners, firmly believe: Core Values and Beliefs Guide and Inform the Work; There is No Substitute for Excellent Teaching; Great instructional Leadership Fosters Highly Effective Teaching; and The Project Tools Will Intentionally Improve the Efficacy of Teachers. Cultivating a diverse pipeline of highly effective teachers is critical to fostering an inclusive, supportive equitable, unbiased, and identity-safe culture that is evidenced by significant growth in student learning and achievement. The applicant provides a comprehensive description of the evidence of effectiveness aligning each evidence study (Professional Development and Coaching; Professional Learning; National Board Certification) to the citation, What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) rating, process, evidence, citation outcomes, and relevance to project. The applicant provides its conceptual framework in the logic model, which includes objectives, inputs, activities, outputs, and outcomes (short-term, mid-term, long-term) (pages e37-e40). (7 points)

(iv) The applicant effectively describes services to be provided by the proposed project that involve the collaboration of partners. The applicant clearly aligns each program/provider to the purpose/impact for professional development. The applicant describes the role of the following partners: The Center of Excellence for Educator Preparation and Innovation at Voorhees University; Verna Gray and the Gray Charter School; The Institute for Organizational Coherence (IOC); The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS); Center for Research and Mentoring of Black Male Students and Teachers at Bowie State (CRMBMST), National Equity Project (NEP); Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL); and KDR Global Education Solutions (KDR) (pages e40-e42). (5 pages)

(v) The applicant clearly articulated the extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs. For example, the applicant describes the needs of the LEA: Youth Connection Charter School (YCCS). There are 19 campuses in the Youth Connections Charter School and the applicant provides data on the demographics and needs of each campus. The applicant describes the three Project Stages aligned to the needs identified by the Planning Team. The applicant lists four (4) SEED needs carefully and thoroughly aligned to SEED Strategies (pages e42-e44). (7 pages)

Weaknesses:

(i) The applicant does not clearly articulate how the training and professional development will lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services (pages e21-e35).

(ii) The applicant does not demonstrate a clear plan on how the proposed project will yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance (pages e35-e37).

(iii) No weaknesses were noted.

(iv) The applicant does not adequately describe how the services to be provided by the proposed project will involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services. There are no details for how the effectiveness of the project services will be maximized (pages e40-e42).

(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:

Overview Statement:
The applicant provided a limited description of the significance of the proposed project. The applicant clearly articulated the importance and magnitude of the results or outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project, especially improvements in teaching and student achievement. The applicant provides a comprehensive description of how the results of the proposed project are to be disseminated in ways that will enable others to use the information or strategies. However, it is unclear how the costs are reasonable in relation to how the funding is provided for all entities; and it is unclear how expanding efforts, such as accelerating, expanding, and improving current efforts, will sustain the program.

Supporting Statements:

Strengths:

(i) The applicant clearly articulated the importance or magnitude of the results or outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project, especially improvements in teaching and student achievement. For example, the significance of SEED includes the following: increasing equity in education; expanding virtual deeper learning; inquiry-based professional development; inquiry-based instruction; and progressive micro-credentials. During the three-year project, Chicago SEED will provide professional learning opportunities for up to 705 teachers impacting 7,500 students (nearly 3,100 PK-12 students enrolled at 19 Youth Connection Charter School campuses and 4,400 students in districts around the country whose practicing teachers are taking micro-credentials in Stage 2) (pages e45-e47). (7 points)

(ii) The applicant describes the number of persons to be served and the anticipated results and benefits. For example, the applicant, the higher education partners, national partners, and partner schools will provide quality resources to support the implementation of SEED and promote sustained programming beyond the three-year grant period. The proposed budget includes line items for personnel and fringe benefits, travel, supplies, contractual, in-service training, indirect cost, and matching funds. The applicant provides the facilities and other commitments by the applicant and the partners. During the three-year project, Chicago SEED will provide professional learning opportunities for up to 705 teachers impacting 7,500 students enrolled at the 19 Youth Connection Charter School campuses, and numerous students in districts around the country (pages e47-e48). (3 points)

(iii) The applicant describes the potential for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing program of the agency or organization at the end of Federal funding. For example, as the SEED partnership continues to build virtual support, the partnership will seek to significantly increase the number of districts serving high-need schools. The applicant and SEED partners believe that expanding access to Exceptional Teaching, aligned to long-term partnership priorities and improvement in teacher support initiatives, will sustain programs beyond the grant period (pages e48-e49). (4 points)

(iv) The applicant provides a comprehensive description of how the results of the proposed project are to be disseminated in ways that will enable others to use the information or strategies. The applicant describes four areas for potential lasting impact beyond the grant: the development of a training model; the creation of additional Micro-Credentials; the opportunity to pilot a clinical education program; and the continuation of the Virtual Deeper Learning Network for Improvement. The applicant demonstrates that the proposed project has the potential to revolutionize the way teachers are trained, locally to globally (pages e49-e50). (6 points)

Weaknesses:

(i) No weaknesses were noted.

(ii) It is unclear how the costs are reasonable in relation to how the funding is provided for all entities (pages e47-e48).

(iii) It is unclear how expanding efforts, such as accelerating, expanding, and improving current efforts, will sustain the program (pages e48-e49).

(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:

Overview Statement:
The applicant described an exceptional management plan for the proposed project. The applicant described clearly specified and measurable goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project. The applicant clearly described 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. The applicant described a comprehensive management plan, including equal access, timely implementation, budget oversight, procedures, personnel, and timeline.

Supporting Statements:

Strengths:

(i) The applicant describes clearly specified and measurable goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project. For example, the applicant clearly aligns the goal, objectives, outcomes, measures, and data source. In the evaluation section, the applicant aligns the goal to five (5) performance measures; and aligns the objectives to outcomes, measurable indicators, timeline, and source of data (pages e50; e61-e62; e138-e142). (10 points)

(ii) The applicant clearly describes 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. The applicant describes a comprehensive management plan, including equal access, timely implementation, budget oversight, procedures, personnel, and timeline. This management plan will ensure timely completion of grant activities and promote continuous improvement. The applicant thoroughly aligns each of the project personnel and level of effort, to their qualifications, and to their job responsibilities. The applicant provides a comprehensive implementation timeline, and aligns milestones (administrative, implementation), responsible party, and timeline (Year 1, Year 2, Year 3). The timeline includes the following: SEED Grant Administrative Activities; SEED Procedures/Curriculum/Modules/Micro-Credentials/Endorsements/Licensure; and Replication (Scaled Impact) Strategies (pages e50-e57). (10 points)

Weaknesses:

(i) No weaknesses were noted.

(ii) No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

   Please provide Overview Statement on top of first Strength comment.

   Strengths:

   Overview Statement:
   The applicant described an exceptional evaluation plan for the proposed project. The applicant demonstrates how the methods of evaluation will produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the WWC standards with or without reservations as described in the WWC Handbook. The applicant describes how the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. The applicant clearly describes how the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes. The applicant demonstrates how the design for implementing and evaluating the proposed project will result in information to guide possible replication of project activities or strategies, including information about the effectiveness of the approach or strategies employed by the project.

   Supporting Statements:

   Strengths:

   (i) The applicant demonstrates how the methods of evaluation will produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the WWC standards with or without reservations as described in the WWC Handbook. The evaluation methods include the evaluation methodology and how the design meets WWC standards. The evaluators will utilize the research-based FORECAST Model (FORmative Evaluation, Consultation, and System Techniques) as an objective evaluation structure. Four tiers of evaluation will provide a validated framework to assess the progress of Chicago SEED and support continuous improvement of the effort. The applicant describes the following research question (RQ): Do students of Chicago SEED teachers academically outperform students of Non-SEED teachers? The design meets What Works Clearinghouse Standards and will include a Quasi-Experimental Design (QED) assessment of outcomes through comparison of treatment and control group teachers. The applicant describes the matching and effect size for the impact evaluation, in which the Evaluation Team, EduShift (ESI), will use a propensity-score matching (PSM) approach designed to meet WWC standards with reservations (pages e57-e59). (4 points)

(ii) The applicant clearly describes how the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. The applicant describes evaluation that includes feedback mechanisms; and strategies to promote continuous improvement. The proposed project is designed to engage teachers and solicit performance feedback to ensure diverse perspectives influence project quality and sufficient data are available to facilitate an objective, external process/outcome evaluation of the project results (formative/summative evaluation). The applicant demonstrates the feedback mechanisms by aligning the participants to the feedback strategies/mechanisms, and frequency of feedback strategies. The applicant describes the continuous improvement mechanisms by aligning the participants to the continuous improvement strategies (pages e59-e61). (4 points)

(iii) The applicant demonstrates how the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data. The applicant clearly aligns the goal, objectives, outcomes, and performance indicators. The applicant describes how the implementation of the FORECAST Model, which includes Process Evaluation, Outcome Evaluation, Data Collection, Evaluation Tools Aligned to Objectives, Data Analysis and Reporting, will provide a structured evaluation methodology promoting objective analysis of Chicago SEED throughout the grant (pages e61-e62). (4 points)

(iv) The applicant clearly describes how the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes. The evaluators and project personnel, upon funding, will collect baseline data for all performance indicators to set annual benchmarks for each year of the project, and to facilitate comparison of results for a thorough evaluation of the proposed project. The applicant describes the formative and summative evaluation. The applicant describes the data collection, the evaluation tools aligned to objectives, the data analysis, and the reporting. The applicant clearly describes the process on how the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes (pages e62-e64). (4 points)

(v) The applicant demonstrates how the design for implementing and evaluating the proposed project will result in information to guide possible replication of project activities or strategies, including information about the effectiveness of the approach or strategies employed by the project. The applicant describes how the evaluation plan is designed to provide information to grant managers, stakeholders, and the field interested in the success, outcomes, and the implementation of the professional learning model. The evaluation process and outcomes will provide data needed to monitor fidelity to and document the scope and sequence of the model; and to assess the impact of program elements on teacher and student outcomes. The applicant will form a Replication Support Team to both disseminate evaluation results to stakeholders and to promote replication of the successful strategies informed by the evaluation data. The applicant describes how the evaluation strategies will promote the dissemination, replication, and scalability, including the Implementation Guide, and the Impact Guide (pages e64-e65). (4 points)

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 applicant provides a clear description of Competitive Preference Priority 1: Increasing Educator Diversity. The proposed project is intentional in its approach to partnering with The Center for Research & Mentoring of Black Mae Students & Teachers at Bowie State University, a top-ranked Historically Black College and University (HBCU). This University has effectively designed evidence-based preparation programs to attract and retain teachers of color. The applicant is also partnering with the Oakland University Center for Eradicating Racism and the Center for Research. These two partners will design and offer a micro-credential in Equity in Education/Culturally Responsive Pedagogy. The goal is to empower teachers at all levels with the core competencies needed to promote rigor and engagement to advance equity, diversity, and inclusion. The applicant describes how the proposed project will include one year of high-quality clinical experiences in high-need schools (pages e15-e17; e22; e111).

   Weaknesses:

   No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

   Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that the applicant proposes a project designed to promote educational equity and adequacy in resources and opportunity for Underserved Students—

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

   (2) That examines the sources of inequity and inadequacy and implements responses that

include pedagogical practices in Educator preparation programs and professional development programs that are inclusive with regard to race, ethnicity, culture, language, and disability status so that educators are better prepared to create inclusive, supportive, equitable, unbiased, and identity-safe learning environments for their students.

Strengths:

The applicant provides a clear description of the Competitive Preference Priority 2: Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities. The applicant proposes a project designed to promote educational equity and adequacy in resources and opportunity for underserved students.

(1) The proposed project will include the following educational settings: (i) early learning programs; (ii) elementary school; (iii) middle school; and (iv) high school (pages e17-e18).

(2) The applicant provides a plan for teachers to have the opportunity for extended learning by competing the Equity in Education credential, followed by the Closing the Achievement Gap Progressive Credential. This micro-credential will assist current and future teachers in creating and sustaining environments that provide equal access to teaching and learning programs for all students and educators. The applicant describes Stage 1: Equity in Education/Culturally Responsive Pedagogy (a 6-month course of study leading to a credential and 6 credits); and Stage 2: Closing the Achievement Gap Progressive Credential Components (a 6-month course of study leading to credential and 8 graduate school credits; Equity Credential prerequisite) (pages e17-e19).

Weaknesses:

(1) No weaknesses were noted.

(2) No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 3

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

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant provides a comprehensive description of Competitive Preference Priority 3: Meeting Student Social, Emotional, and Academic Needs. The proposed project is 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. The proposed project will use the evidence-based

conceptual framework developed by the Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL). The proposed project will design a competency-based micro-credential in social-emotional learning that current and future teachers will access during the proposed project, CHICAGO SEED. The core standards that CASEL 5 address includes: self-awareness; self-management; social awareness; relationship skills; and responsible decision-making. The goal is to empower teachers to apply the CASEL 5 in their schools to create a sense of belonging, celebration, and appreciation for students with multiple intelligences at various developmental stages from childhood to adulthood and across diverse cultural contexts (pages e18-e19).

(1) The proposed project fosters skills and behaviors that enable academic progress. The CASEL 5 will assist teachers in an understanding of how students' social, emotional, and cognitive developmental levels inform the design of Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) standards, instruction, and assessment in classrooms and schools, and the responsibility each teacher has to create a school culture where every student thrives social, emotionally, and academically (pages e18-e19).

(2) The proposed project 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. Modules will be informed by the recent work of the U.S. Department of Education and its guidance: Supporting Child and Student Social, Emotional, Behavioral, and Mental Health needs. The Social Emotional Learning Competency-based Micro-credential includes Module II: The Tenets of Creating A Culture of Belonging: Fostering an Inclusive, Supportive, Unbiased, and Identity-safe Environment (pages e18-e19).

(3) The proposed project is trauma-informed, such as addressing exposure to community-based violence and trauma. The applicant describes the Modules that are included in the Social Emotional Learning Competency-Based Micro-credential. The applicant includes Module VI: Using Evidence-Based Strategies to address Trauma-Informed Practice (pages e18-e19).

Weaknesses:

(1) No weaknesses were noted.

(2) No weaknesses were noted.

(3) No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 2

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